A sociological perspective on TIPS. Explorations into the translator's/interpreter's (in)visibility in *Translation and Interpreting in Public Services*

CARMEN VALERO GARCÉS

University of Alcalá

Abstract

The paper presents Pierre Bourdieu's theories and suggests they may be fruitfully applied to the teaching and practice of translation and interpreting in public service settings.

1.   Introduction. Towards a sociological approach in *Translation Studies*

Given the range of approaches taken when defining the nature and scope of *Translation and Interpreting in Public Services* (TIPS), I will limit my discussion to the perspective adopted in the present study: TIPS is a specific area within the field of Translation Studies dedicated to the study of the communication that occurs in public service settings between service providers and clients. These clients are typically members of a minority group whose unfamiliarity goes beyond mere language, and extends to the system of values, practices and representations present within the host society (Valero Garcés/Mancho 2002: 15-23).

The era of migration, which forms such an integral part of the twenty-first century, calls for a new approach to social reality. In this connection, TIPS emerges from the meeting of cultures as a discipline which is intrinsic to man's varied communicative needs The attempt to institutionalise TIPS, however, is contingent upon the acceptance and recognition of our societies' progression towards multiculturalism and interculturalism and the new principles this involves. It is also dependent on society's recognition of immigrants as members of the society and users of public institutions and services.

In this sense, TIPS plays a fundamental role as the linguistic link in communicative situations in which different cultural groups coexist in the same space. TIPS facilitates this coexistence by providing the ideal framework when, as Palop Iranzo says, "an intercultural microcosm, mutual comprehension and interaction among groups of people with different cultures" come into play (1997: 51).

At the same time, the growing number of publications concerning a social theory of translation (e.g. one of the first issues of *MonTI, Monographs in Translation and Interpreting* is devoted to applied sociology in Translation Studies) is of great significance. This is accompanied by different voices, which demand a shift towards sociological approaches (or a "sociological turn") (Wolf 2010, Gouanvic 1999, Snell-Hornby 2006), thus moving even further beyond the "cultural turn" of the 1990s, as explained by Lefevere and Bassnett (1990, 1998). This new "cultural" perspective broadens that of Translation Studies (TS) as well, favoring the use of new methodologies in the analysis of the translation process and revealing new elements that underlie the translation activity – e.g. the power relations – thus pointing to the fact that translation can never be neutral.

As Bassnett and Lefevere stated:

> there is always a context in which the translation takes place, always a history from which a text emerges and into which a text is transposed [...] Translation as an activity is always doubly contextualized, since the text has a place in two cultures. (1990: 11)

These statements led to a redefining of the objective of the study of translation. Some years later new approaches in TS such as feminist translation (Simon 1996), postcolonial translation (Spivak 2004/1993, Niranjana 1992), ethnographic approaches (Valero Garcés 1995), and intercultural approaches (Snell Hornby 1997) emerged. Along with this tendency there have been an increasing number of studies dedicated to the role of the translator and the interpreter (Tymoczko 2007, Valero Garcés/Martin 2008, Chesterman 2009).

Returning to TIPS, these studies, when linked to the daily reality of the translator/interpreter (Tr/In) and the role(s) that she/he must perform, make us see the need to redefine the traditional concept of interpreter. Thus, rather than viewing the Tr/In as a faithful transmitter of words from one language to another ("conduit model"), we move towards more sociologically based models given that, in TIPS, the Tr/In's work takes place in contexts which are strongly rooted in society. Furthermore, in one sense or another, this activity is one that influences the creation/remodeling of new multicultural societies in settings which, until now, have been monocultural (e.g. Italy or Spain), but which have seen this change brought about with the arrival of the immigrant population.

Along these lines, the sociological theories of Bourdieu provide us with an appropriate framework with which to first define and understand the debate around the role of the translator and interpreter and, from there, propose a model of practice.

I shall now briefly describe the Bourdieuian theory.

Bourdieu (1980: 88) considers society to be a sport, a social game with its own system of rules, where the players are familiar with the basic rules which enable their participation. Entering into the game therefore entails having a feel for the game, this being one of the privileges of having been born a participant. It is this

privilege which enables us to employ more or less unconsciously the practices inherent to the rules of this game. These practices are used to construct the social space, which is structured upon its own system of values.

The mechanism of social organisation is to be understood through two key concepts: *field* and *habitus*. *Fields* are autonomous spheres, each with their own rules and feel for the game. Different modes of domination are defined for each *field* and in relation to other *fields.* The agents in these *fields* have the *habitus* or possess acquired dispositions which generate practices and representations that enable them to play in the different social *fields*. In this way, the *habitus* contribute to the reproduction and transformation of the social structure. Each *field* comprises the action of three agents:

1. The existence of a common capital (knowledge, abilities, power etc.);
2. The struggle to appropriate this capital;
3. A hierarchy formed between those who hold the capital and those who aspire to do so.

Belonging to a *field* means that one is familiar with the rules of the game and is endowed with *habitus*, which implies knowledge and recognition of the laws which are intrinsic to this game and the objectives thereof.

It is here that I glimpse the social magnitude that TIPS takes on when practiced in multicultural societies and where Bourdieu's key concepts of *field* and *habitus* provide an ideal framework with which to theorise about this area of TS. The Bourdieuian concepts give rise to numerous possibilities or lines of investigation that enable us to delve more deeply into TIPS theory.

2.   Towards a sociological approach in *Translation and Interpreting in Public Services*

Bourdieu's theory, as Gouanvic points out (2010: 122), was not designed for translation, but there is nothing precluding a sociological theory of translation from drawing upon his ideas. Bourdieu (1999: 221) initiated a discussion on translation in a text entitled "The Social Conditions of the International Circulation of Ideas". He did not pursue it further, even though he provided some indications for how one might continue when stating:

> the fact that texts circulate without their context, that – to use my terms – they don't bring with them the field of production of which they are a product, and the fact that the recipients, who are themselves in a different field of production, re-interpret the texts in accordance with the structure of the field of reception, are facts that generate some formidable misunderstandings [...]. (Bourdieu 1999: 221)

Following Bourdieu's consideration of the society we live in as a playing field, essentially, the development of a social theory of TIPS would involve the deduction of the rules of the game based on observations of the players' actions. To achieve this, the first step will be to determine the type of game that lies behind certain actions, establish who the players are, and the space in which they are playing (*field*). Once all of these parameters are established, and based on the Tr/In's actions, the type of game being played could be deduced.

Considering that the agents that make up the TIPS's communication triangle (public service clients, intermediaries, and service providers) are part of a specific field (e.g. healthcare, legal, educational etc.) and they have different *habitus*, some questions arise:

How is this communication organised? Will the Tr/In have to move between different fields? Is that possible? Will a context-specific translation or interpretation be more appropriate than a literal translation or interpretation?

These questions lead us to consider the study of the *fields* and *habitus* from different angles, as well as the dispositions that generate practices and representations. Before that, I propose that we take a closer look at the discussion of the potential gains and the ethical implications of a "sociological turn", a question that has been posed by various TS scholars, as well as the implications it could have for the practice of translating and interpreting (T&I).

In her volume *The Turns of Translation Studies. New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?* (2006), Snell-Hornby announces the break up or shift of paradigm (or turn) with traditional views and the introduction of new perspectives based on established approaches. These new perspectives serve as a basis for sketching new horizons and for further developments in a specific area. Furthermore, Wolf (2010: 32) claims that regarding the translator as a constructed and constructing subject in society entails a serious shift in the view of both the translation concept and the research domain of TS.

As Wolf (2010: 32) goes on writing, it seems as if TS is particularly inclined towards the shift of paradigms, or "turns". This results partly from the fact that it is by nature located in the contact zones "between cultures", and is therefore exposed to different constellations of contextualisation and structures of communication, but is also the product of the make-up of the discipline itself.

After the "cultural turn" of the 1990s, all major approaches, in one way or another, had begun to take into consideration the cultural factors in translation. About one and a half decades later, the insights gained from this newly developed perspective lead to a view of translation as a social practice. One of the results of this shift is that the role of the agents involved in the translation process is brought into the foreground. Viewed from this perspective, any translation is necessarily bound up within social contexts: on the one hand, the act of translating, in all its various stages, is undeniably carried out by individuals who belong to a social system; on the other, the translation phenomenon is inevitably linked to social institutions, which greatly determine the selection, production and distribution of translation, and as a result the strategies adopted in the translation itself.

This is evidenced by a number of works which have contributed to the emergence of a "sociology of translation", and have delivered valuable insights into the functioning of the translation process, the construction of a public discourse on translation and of the self-image of translators, among other crucial issues (see e.g. Gouanvic 1999, Wolf/Fukari 2007, Pym/Shlesinger/Simeoni 2008, Chesterman 2006, Díaz Fouces/Monzo 2010)

The topic has also been addressed from other perspectives and within other contexts. Thus Cronin (2003: 134), referring to the context of globalisation, asks whether translators have the task of counteracting global asymmetries, at least in

Carmen Valero Garcés

the translation field, in order to promote a democratic cultural exchange. He makes a plea in favour of "an activist dimension to translation which involves engagement with the cultural politics of society at national and international levels", and particularly emphasises the significance of translation training institutions and their pedagogical programmes that might promote the translator's responsibility.

Chesterman (1997: 147) also criticises the traditional view of the concept of loyalty to the various parties in the communications event, as do Arrojo (1997), Pym (1997), Koskinen (2000) and others, who agree that the discussion of ethics in translation cannot be restricted to the notion of fidelity or other related concepts. And Venuti argues that, consequently, "any evaluation of a translation project must include a consideration of discursive strategies, their institutional settings, and their social functions and effects" (1998: 82).

This same position could be adopted in TIPS where the social configurations play a major role, not only because they shape the discursive strategies adopted in the course of the translation process, but also because they are responsible for the make-up of the settings in which the various agents operate. In this sense, Tr/In – in whatever work setting they may operate – should dispose of the same rights and responsibilities as the other social agents involved in the communication process and, consequently, should be able to abandon their traditional position of (supposed) neutrality and invisibility and assume responsibility. Such responsibility is additionally conditioned by socio-political factors and – subsequently – has serious consequences for the Tr/In's professional, social and political position in society. We only need to consider new factors/elements such as the era of globalisation, the migration movements, the configuration of new multicultural societies, the technological development, the internet revolution and, last but not least, the present financial crisis, with its yet unexplored consequences for the translation and interpreting activity.

Translation, in its broadest sense, not only reflects and transfers existing knowledge, but continuously creates new knowledge, especially in TIPS where so many different cultures and languages have been put in contact for the first time. Yet translation can both promote asymmetrical power relations between languages or cultures and offer a form of resistance, as can be seen in the postcolonial context, or can create the illusion of a monolingual / monocultural society when the "other" finds a place, as can happen in TIPS contexts.

We have witnessed – and still are witnessing – the emergence of new societies made up of different cultures all immersed in a global society which has brought about new types of work settings and new codes of reference that inevitably favour a potential change in the traditional views of the translator figure and his or her translatorial practice.

In this web of relationships, one cannot overlook the idea of *power*. Following Lesch, the main objective of TIPS is to balance the inequalities (social, economic, educational) between the agents involved, in "an attempt to balance out power relationships between the provider and the recipient, prioritising the need for communication" (1999: 93).

Gouanvic (2007: 90) also asserts that "translation is (therefore) marked by the power relationships between the source and target fields". The negotiation or

exchange, according to the notion of power relationship as the link which structures the social space and the relationships between the actors, is accompanied by areas of uncertainty (or the actors' degree of freedom). The actors (service providers, clients, and linguistic and intercultural intermediaries) who, because of their situation, resources or abilities, are able to control this uncertainty will use this power to assert themselves over the others.

Within the context of this negotiation, the power relationship will be understood as a reciprocal relationship in which the actors pursue a common objective that conditions the fulfillment of their individual objectives. This reciprocal relationship, especially in TIPS, is unbalanced. Furthermore, each actor tends to act upon the other in order to attain, as a result of the negotiation, his individual goals.

In this sense, Crozier and Friedburg explain that this interrelationship can be defined as "a relationship based on force in which one can obtain more in his favour but in which, by the same token, one will never find himself to be completely lacking in respect to the other" (1977: 73).

Bourdieu (2002: 19-20) calls for collaboration of the agents, who – as he states – have internalised the structures upon which the world is organised. Furthermore, referring to linguistics, Bourdieu maintained that when two speakers began to speak, not only did their linguistic competencies come into play, but also their social competencies, since he understood that the word or the right to speak depended on the types of symbolic capital at stake, which were recognised "according to the categories of perception that they impose" (Bourdieu 1982: 28):

> what is at stake is the objective relationship between their competencies, not just their linguistic competencies, but also the entirety of their social competencies; their right to speak that is objectively dependent on certain parameters such as gender, religion, economic status and social status. (*ibid*.)

In the construction of a sociological theory in TIPS, in the first instance, this reflection would enable us to observe the power relationships that are exerted between the dominant language and culture and the minority language and culture. Secondly and in the same vein, it might be interesting to study, if they exist, the power relationships that are exerted, consciously or unconsciously, between the languages and cultures of the Tr/In himself. This would also permit us to observe the Tr/In's symbolic capital and the notion of *illusio,* as well as the off-centering or shifting in objectives between the target field and the source field.

When applying the concept of *off-centering* to the field of TIPS, which – as already said – is characterised by the lack of homogeneity between the parties, we might speak of sociocultural determinants such as the asymmetry of knowledge, the impossibility of linguistic communication, and the existence of cultural clashes and social and educational inequalities. In this manner, when the time comes to pass the message into the other language, shifts inevitably occur in the source and target field objectives.

The act of interpreting or translation is not, therefore, a mere textual production, but is instead consciously or unconsciously linked to the surrounding environment. This environment is a crucial element, where the importance of

Carmen Valero Garcés

habitus and the need to negotiate between the agents (e.g. judge and accused; doctor and patient) would come into play and Tr/In may be put in the middle of potentially competing agendas.

Thus, being conscious of the practices and representations of each of the agents participating in the game would help the intermediaries to negotiate meanings when choosing between what the client "says" and what the client "wants to say", to which we should add what the client "should say" in the different fields (the police station, the asylum and refugee office, the healthcare room), as Inghilleri (2005) points out.

Previous research (Cambridge 2003, Corsellis 2003, Hale 2008, Valero Garcés 2002, 2007) reveals a wide variety of strategies used to compensate for cultural and/or linguistic asymmetries between the target language/culture and the source language/culture. The use of these strategies is related to the participants' knowledge of the function of interpreting and/or translating itself, the potential conflicts that can arise from the participants' different objectives within the T&I process, or the inter- and intra-cultural nature of T&I.

At this point it is worth mentioning that the Tr/In tends to perform in monolingual/monocultural fields, while the reality is a multicultural/ multilingual situation. He/she must therefore be capable of creating the illusion of transparency through the decisions she/he makes. These decisions may or may not result in negotiations between the parties (asking for something to be repeated, asking someone to speak more slowly, asking for the explanation of some concepts, expanding some concepts, adding some implicit (and obvious for the speaker) information etc.). Thus, when negotiation happens, the Tr/In seeks to create the impression that communication is flowing smoothly. If this occurs, the Tr/In will cease to be "invisible" and will instead become the link that sustains the monolingual context of these encounters, in which there is no place for the "other".

When negotiation is avoided and the Tr/In simply assumes that she/he is there to transmit the message and produce a literal translation, some difficulties can arise, resulting in a too formal or strange sounding account, or one that reminds, or makes the participating agents aware of the presence of the "other" – with his different language and culture.

3. Towards a sociological approach of the role(s) of the translator and inter-
     preter in TIPS

These comments are in line with the increasingly abundant literature on the role of the Tr/In, full of examples that serve to question the literal translation of the message and which support the shift towards a more sociological approach, as the examples below show.

Swabey and Gajewski, based on their study on the role of the sign language interpreter, conclude:

> for many years, interpreters have too often hidden behind the cloak of neutrality, avoiding the realisation that taking no action can be as harmful as an inappropriate action. It will only be possible to develop best practices related to role when

interpreters recognise and accept responsibility for the power they have as participants and co-constructors of meaning in an interpreted interactive event. (2008: 69)

Jacobsen (2003:224), following up on previous studies of how court interpreters actually behave in the courtroom and having studied Danish court interpreters herself, concluded the pretence of the court interpreter's invisibility cannot be sustained.

Vilela Biasi (2003), in her study on the work of court interpreters in Venezuela, also calls for interpreters to take a more active role in ensuring due process in situations where training programmes and regulatory frameworks do not exist, as is often the case in TIPS in many countries.

Hale (2008: 100-121) analyses each of the five most current roles prescribed or adopted by interpreters in Court Interpreting. These are:
- advocate for the minority language speaker;
- advocate for the institution or the service provider;
- gatekeeper role;
- facilitator of communication;
- faithful renderer of other's utterances.

Hale suggests that the most appropriate role for court interpreters is the last one; that of faithful renderer of other people's utterances. Still, she also points out that "taking on this role, however, does not mean interpreters must act as mindless machines. It means attempting to be as accurate as possible within human limitations", and she adds that "working conditions, including the way they are treated by other participants and the way those participants express themselves, will also affect performance".

Healthcare interpreting has also been the focus of various studies which have shed light on the complex role of the interpreters (Angelelli 2003 and 2004, Bolden 2000, Davidson 2001, Metzger 1999, Valero Garcés 2007). These studies have shown interpreters to be essential partners, co-constructors to the interaction, repairing and facilitating the talk, and challenging the notion of neutrality. As Angelelli remarks:

> these scholars underscore the fact that interpreting does not happen in a social vacuum and the importance of describing the role of interpreters in the social context where the interaction is embedded. (2008: 150)

From a Bourdieuian perspective, Inghilleri (2005) also points out that the legal and political fields or any other field relevant in TIPS, and their corresponding *habitus*, are, at times and in certain contexts, more influential than the Tr/In's own decisions and may lead to a breaking of the rules of the game for the trial, the medical appointment or the asylum interview.

A Bourdieuian approach to TIPS also makes it possible to accept the various/different Tr/In profiles. Thus we can find a professional Tr/In whose symbolic capital is formed by professional experience, traditional knowledge of the cultures (history, customs etc.), personal observations, knowledge of the history of conference interpreting, and knowledge of interpreting training curricula with particular reference to "classical standards of quality". However, we can also find a Tr/In whose symbolic capital is formed by practice in specific settings (e.g. healthcare setting accompanying relatives), without any sort of

academic training in T&I, but with a deep linguistic and cultural knowledge of the clients' language and culture he serves and interacts with, and who belongs to the same minority ethnic group.

As far as the *habitus* of these agents is concerned, that of the first interpreter (say, the trained, experienced, professional (conference) interpreter) is closely linked to his symbolic capital and is particularly shaped by the setting he is working in. That of the second interpreter (or, say, the (un)experienced Tr/In in TIPS settings – some trained, some untrained and some volunteers with/without experience) is also closely linked to his symbolic capital, having been acquired through life-long practice, but is more or less exclusively linked to the practice of interpreting.

As some Bourdieuian scholars emphasise (e.g. Krais/Gebauer 2002: 64), different *habitus* can also imply different strategies and behaviours. Thus, some Tr/In have incorporated norms and conventions elaborated by professional associations like AIIC, while others set different priorities and employ other strategies in order to get the message across. If we take a look at the key terms detected throughout the discussion, we find support for this argument: while some colleagues use terms like "professionalism", "standards" or "processional competence" as the basis for their comments, others uses notions like "horizontality", "solidarity", or "equality".

Also, from a Bourdieuian approach, it could be said that the discussion in TIPS regarding the use of two modes of interpreting known as "impartiality" and "advocacy", which represent the Tr/In's invisibility or visibility respectively, is not valid, given that the Tr/In's decisions will depend on the specific situation and agents that intervene in any communicative act.

One more question will help us move forward in our attempt to develop a sociological theory of TIPS: what happens when a player doesn't know the rules of the game?

4. A step further in the development of a sociological theory in TIPS: knowing the rules of the game

Let's consider, on the one hand, the great number of Tr/In volunteers or bilingual persons who work as Tr/In in TIPS; let's consider, on the other hand, the new forms of interlinguistic communication that continue to emerge: telephone interpreting, videoconference interpreting, blogs, chats etc.; let's also consider the specific field of practice: asylum and refugee offices, police stations, healthcare centres, schools, government offices etc. All of this leads us to consider different interpretations and different concepts of reality, which oblige the Tr/In to struggle continuously to produce effective communication.

The question regarding what occurs when a player doesn't know the rules of the game is fundamental if we are to define the role of Tr/In as someone who should not only be familiar with the rules of the social game, but who will also make sure that the players act according to these rules. It is the Tr/In that creates the *illusio* or illusion of transparency (or of a monolingual context), which involves its own practices and representations.

Given that the main aim of TIPS is to produce a text in line with the setting, the recipient of the communication, and the host culture – and necessarily reproduce the original message – the Tr/In is obliged to refute or move away from the traditional idea of the Tr/In remaining passive and subordinate to the norms of his or her profession (norms as to what is acceptable and appropriate). The Tr/In must not be subjected to rigid standards but instead, their work should be viewed within the overall context in which it is performed. This places translating and interpreting in a constant push and pull, or as Bourdieu (1980) would say, adherence to and divergence from the norms can happen at any place and time, either at the uppermost or macrostructural level, the local level or in any interaction between the two.

The discussion is not a new one. Research has been conducted by different scholars from different fields. Inghilleri (2003: 252) applies this Bourdieuian idea to her study of refugee/asylum seeker interviews. Drawing on information from other writers (Anker 1991, Barsky 1996, Blommaert/Maryns 2001), she points out that the main objective for all the participants involved, including the Tr/In, is to produce meanings which are acceptable to the host culture/environment. This implies that the parties (police, judge, attorney, asylum seeker, interpreter) must adapt their participation to the political, cultural and linguistic reality of the specific context (asylum office), which is monolingual even though the reality of the situation implies that the asylum process should be multilingual.

In this respect, the research done by Anker (1991: 252-264) provides a good example. Anker analyses United States asylum interviews in which the participants are the judge, the attorney (bilingual English-Spanish), the asylum seeker and the interpreter. Anker studies the behaviour of two types of interpreters: the professional certified interpreter and the freelance interpreter, the latter having received no specific training and being accustomed to performing other tasks apart from interpreting (translating, providing cultural information, assisting etc.).

During one of the interviews, the freelance interpreter translated "failure" literally as "fracaso" and the applicant's attorney (bilingual) interrupted, saying that the correct translation in that context would be in Spanish "daño físico" ("physical damage"). Further along, the interpreter was asked about the rendering and said that the attorney's translation was the correct option. However, he had gone by the work method known as the "conduit model" or literal interpretation, which had led him to supply a literal answer without giving thought to the context or trying to adapt the interpretation. The same thing occurred in the case of the interpreter's translation of the word "cuartel" as "the police station or the barracks", which, according to the attorney, signified "army barracks". This was important given that the attorney wished to specify the type of institution to the court in order to strengthen the request for asylum and avoid doubts or other interpretations.

The situations where TIPS can take place are quite varied: medical appointments, parent-teacher meetings, or police interrogations of immigrant detainees, to name but a few. For this reason, the Tr/In obviously must be familiar with the different types of discourse (legal, medical, etc.), know how to navigate a given *field* and make these strategies and conventions part of their *habitus* so

Carmen Valero Garcés

that they may reproduce the words of speakers in positions of authority (doctors, judges, teachers).

Here, multiple questions once again arise, implying the need for more research in the future: what happens when the Tr/In's *habitus* and *capital* are more closely related to those of one participant in the exchange than to the other? Or when both participants belong to different *fields* and have different *habitus* and *capital*? Or when, in terms of *habitus* and *capital*, the Tr/In is more closely aligned with the immigrant rather than with the government official? Or with the defender rather than with the accuser? Or with the patient rather than with the doctor? Or with the immigrant rather than with the police officer? Or, in other words: will the Tr/In's affiliation with a certain minority group influence his/her vision and subsequent translation of the exchange? Will all translator/interpreters perform their role in the same manner? Will their participation in the game change if they share the same country and culture with the client or if they do not? Will the Tr/In be influenced by his or her knowledge or view of reality? What happens when the Tr/In has deficient knowledge of the working languages?

Societal influence on the use of language does not go unnoticed by the French sociologist. Language for Bourdieu, in the sense of distinct linguistic capital, is primarily associated with the formal characteristics of languages (phonological, lexical and stylistic variation), but also with the varieties of use authorised for a particular language. He thus asserts:

> the act of translating and interpreting is never a mere textual transfer (oral or written), but is instead consciously or unconsciously influenced by the production and reproduction of cultural meanings. The translators and interpreters, like all social agents, are somehow placed within the production process. (1998: 33)

This comment again questions the universality of approaches and objectivity and impartiality in TIPS, and raises a new question: what is the role of the Tr/In under certain conditions and in specific settings?

5.   Some direct examples from the TIPS field

As a way to illustrate some of the topics discussed in the previous pages, some empirical data follows.

The data comes from three different studies, all of which were conducted at the University of Alcalá by the group FITISPos[1], a group dedicated to research and training. The main objective behind these studies was to analyse the quality of communication with the foreign-born population, in view of the immigration boom experienced in Spain in the final decades of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century. Research was conducted during the years 2007-2010 and the origin of the data is as follows:

1. A questionnaire filled out by professional interpreters regarding their mode of interpreting and their reactions when presented with specific cases.
2. Excerpts taken from reports on internships compiled by students at the University of Alcalá, as part of the Master's in Intercultural Communication,

1   < www.fitispos.com.es>.

Interpretation and Translation in Public Services (MICIT), upon completion of their mandatory internships at external sites.

3. Excerpts from real medical interviews from healthcare centres.

Data is presented below and follows the order detailed above.

The first study concerned the analysis of the different reactions of interpreters performing in similar situations.[2] Different behaviour patterns were observed when it came to deciding how much to intervene or alter the message, as illustrated in the examples below. These examples have been taken from a project conducted in the central area of Spain in 2007. Data were obtained through a questionnaire distributed to 55 experienced interpreters. The questionnaire included the description of a situation in context (case) and two questions, one related to the Tr/In's interpreting model (conduit vs. advocacy or, let's say invisible vs. visible); and the other related to the sorts of emotions and reactions that as a Tr/In she/he might/will experience in that specific situation.

CASE 1: Interpreter and therapist

Situation:

An interpreter remarks:

"I was born in X and I lived there until I was 21 years old. I know my culture very well. I feel very close to my people. It is a nation which for years has been oppressed, tortured and subjugated. I know exactly what it means when a woman from X says that "they" raped her. My hair stands on end and I get goose bumps. I know that there are conspiracies against the town of X and the lies that "they" tell women and how "they" destroy them. For years, our town has been living with a war syndrome. Women have been beaten down psychologically. A therapist that isn't from X can't understand these people. He/she hasn't been through the same things and he/she can't understand how the people feel and what they go through. Unfortunately, I am in the wrong profession. Although I do believe that having worked as an interpreter for so long, I am at times in a position to be a better therapist than the real therapists".

Question 1. Do you agree with these comments? What model of behaviour would you choose? Answers: Impartiality/ Invisibility: 15; Advocacy / Mediation / Visibility: 37

The results indicate a strong inclination in favor of the advocacy model or, say, the visibility of interpreter (71.1 %) as opposed to the impartiality model, which favors the interpreter's invisibility (28.8 %), which is in line (50 % – 26 cases) with the interpreter's remarks: acting as a therapist.

Question 2. Which of the following emotions would you experience? List the options by order of intensity:

Empathy	Need for training	Overestimation of role	Wrong Profession
16	7	12	5

The results indicate a high degree of empathy with the client (30.7%) and statements such as "do my small part to right the wrongs" and "be a better

2   More information in Valero Garcés (2008a, 2008b).

therapist than the professionals because I know how it really is in the country" are frequent.

On the other hand, a significant percentage feels that interpreters overestimate their knowledge and role (23%) and perform another job – besides that of interpreter – for which they have not received preparation. 13.4% felt that they would need training, especially in ethical aspects, to be able to know how far their intervention could go. 9.6% felt that they had chosen the wrong profession and that they were unable to perform their job successfully.

CASE 2. Aggressive Detainee
Situation:
Imagine that you must interpret for someone who has been brought to the police station. You notice that this individual is very nervous and agitated. You feel a bit uncomfortable and you tell the police to be careful. After the questioning they escort the detainee to the van in order to bring him to prison. En route with the two police officers in a van equipped with bars, the detainee manages to reach his hand through the bars and grabs one of the police officers, takes out a pocket knife, and inflicts a mortal wound. The police officer dies. You must continue interpreting for this individual even after this event.

Question 1. How would you act? What model of behaviour would you choose? Answers: Impartiality/Invisibility: 38; Advocacy / Mediation/ Visibility: 14

The results indicate that 73% would appear impartial and would translate with diplomacy and concision, while only 26.9% would try to communicate their distrust or warn the provider of possible problems.

Question 2. Which of the following reactions would you experience? List the options by order of intensity:

Emotions/reaction that you would experience

Powerlessness	Fear	Indifference	Need training	Show no emotions	Wrong profession
7	6	11	2	13	1

As for their reactions, feeling there is a need for training, especially the type of ethical and psychological training that would help them decide more easily how to proceed, once again shows a rather high percentage (25 %). The next reaction, which follows with a slightly inferior percentage (21.1%), is fearfulness, especially of any possible retaliation on the part of the suspect, which could lead the Tr/In to stick to bare-bones translation on the second occasion. Insecurity (13.4%) and powerlessness (11.5%) are other reactions to be taken into account.

The second source of data comes from the Master's students' reports after having completed their internships in the workplace during the academic course 2009-10. The main objective of the internship is to connect students with the real workplace and give them the opportunity to put into practice what has been taught in class. Data shows the following[3].

One of the first recommendations given in the training classes is that the interpreter should introduce himself and his role. However, working with

---

3   For more information about internships and projects related see Valero Garcés (2008c, 2010b).

professionals who have never had the chance to work with an interpreter is a tough task as pointed out, among others, by Corsellis (2002, 2003) and as illustrated by the following comment by a student (comment 1):

> Introducing myself and the interpreter's role in the interview by saying for example: "Good morning, I am the interpreter, I will interpret everything you say and it will be confidential" instead of making people feel relaxed and confident, most of them – especially if they are illegal patients as is usually the case – feel uncomfortable and nervous. (Rosa, Hospital Ramón y Cajal, Madrid, working languages: Spanish-English)

Following some manuals and recommendations by professional trainers, the interpreter's intermediate position between the doctor and the patient had been practised in class. However, this recommendation seems to be of little use most of the time as the students' comments (comments 2, 3, and 4) reveal. The reasons for this may vary. Thus, as one student relates in comment 2, the fact that the presence of an interpreter (a third person) is rarely seen in Spanish hospitals may lead to the following situation (comment 2):

> Where to sit was always a problem, even worse than the language. You never know where to sit or how close to whom. There were no direct instructions. Nobody knew (Valentina, Hospital 1° de Octubre, Madrid. Working languages: Spanish-Bulgarian).

Space is also a problem reported by the students, as Rosa explains in the following comment (comment 3):

> The intermediate position between doctor and patient when interpreting was almost always impossible due to the physical space: a room with the doctor's desk and two chairs; or because the doctor has to examine the patient or take some samples and he went from one place to another. I never knew where to be. (Rosa, Hospital Ramón y Cajal, Madrid. Working languages: Spanish-English)

And, as a consequence, the solution taken by the following student seems to be the most common (comment 4):

> Once in the room with the social worker everything was very calm – I sat down where there was a free seat – there was no point in sitting down in the "impartial mode" – between doctor and patient. (Valentina, Hospital 1º de Octubre, Madrid. Working languages: Spanish-Bulgarian)

The above comments serve to reinforce the Bourdieuian notion that the setting conditions Tr/In performance.

And Fatima, following the traditional recommendation to interpret in the first person, also points out (comment 5):

> I have tried to be the speakers' voice, although sometimes I could not avoid speaking in the third person. I also used some gestures or pointed to the staff or the patient to indicate who I was talking about. (Fatima, Healthcare Center in Azuqueca de Henares. Working languages: Spanish-Arabic)

Another specific problem is terminology and the use of specific vocabulary. Our experience and research show the importance of this issue and the difficulties that can arise when resources are so often unavailable when working with minority languages or when the interpreter lacks this knowledge of the language.

Thus the students work in class with texts of differing degrees of difficulty, and a variety of strategies are practised depending on the language combination in question. The following comment illustrates this point (comment 6):

> I had difficulties with the word "convulsion". The three times it came out I could not remember the word in Bulgarian, and I don't think the patient would have understood either if I had literally translated it. I had to use a paraphrase and explain its meaning. I think this is more professional than to just avoid it or to look for the meaning in a dictionary and give the patient the equivalent in his/her language. (Iulia, Hospital Universitario de Guadalajara. Working languages: Spanish-Bulgarian)

But Valentina in comment 7 also calls attention to the fact that language does not exist in isolation:

> In class we had done some activities simulating situations we would probably find and collecting some glossaries, preparing lists of vocabulary etc. This was really useful, although sometimes the most serious problem was not the language level and terminology. (Valentina, Hospital 1° de Octubre, Madrid. Working languages: Spanish-Bulgarian)

Examples 6 and 7 show the constant necessity on the part of this interpreter to broaden her symbolic capital and to seek appropriate strategies based on the situation at hand.

And Brandon, in comment 8, clearly states another problem – how to interpret incongruities and contradictions produced by one of the participants – which can create confusion and raise the possibility that the interpreter could be blamed for doing a "bad job":

> The patient was a Nigerian boy that spoke English with a very strong accent and the social worker also knew some English. It was really difficult for me to understand what the boy said because of his accent and because he made many grammatical mistakes and used words I'd never heard before. The social worker couldn't understand why I had so many difficulties interpreting. There were many incongruities and contradictions which I heard, and then I had to translate and I felt I was not doing a good job. I had to ask for repetition all the time... Later the social worker told me that she had talked to the boy before and she knew his story. She thought he was trying somehow to cheat her. Then I realised why all the conversation seemed to me so contradictory. (Brandon, Hospital Ramón y Cajal, Madrid. Working languages: Spanish-English)

The above comment is related to the issue of impartiality, which is a subject repeatedly addressed in class and practised with role plays. However, when in the workplace, where conditions and expectations are different, the situation changes and the interpreter has to make a decision. This is clearly described in the following comment (comment 9). Applying a Bourdieuian perspective, this comment illustrates the need to redefine key concepts such as impartiality or loyalty and confirms the appropriateness of a sociological approach to TIPS:

> I found it really difficult to remain silent and to be completely impartial when I was left with the patient in a room, waiting for the doctor or when I was with the social worker, the nurse or the doctor and they wanted to know how the patient felt, what I thought his reactions would be, what I would do if I were in my own country, etc. I had the feeling that my answers would help them communicate in a quicker, more effective way and a few times we exchanged information. It was also a way to find out what

doctors think. (Valentina, Hospital 1° de Octubre, Madrid. Working languages: Spanish-Bulgarian)

Data also shows that a large percentage of interpreters working in public services admit that the tasks that are requested of them usually go beyond the simple transfer of information. They are frequently seen as "catalysts" and cultural consultants. They are asked to master the same cognitive and linguistic abilities as other types of interpreters (conference, court, medical) as well as to observe a code of ethics, but they also need to incorporate other abilities related to the specific setting in which they work (e.g. social, cultural and sometimes religious settings; situations involving asymmetry of knowledge; and even power and gender differences). From a Bourdieuian perspective these abilities are seen as necessary elements and part of the symbolic capital each agent may have. However, when they have not been incorporated, problems such as stress may arise, as illustrated below.

Some of our students who had been (or still were) working as volunteers for NGOs or who had accompanied relatives or friends to the doctor's had experienced certain psychological pressure. The issue of psychological stress had been dealt with in class through commentary, videos, reports from previous research and using certain activities such as asking students to write about a highly emotional experience of their own, which was later discussed in class.

At the workplace this pressure continued to be a problem as the following comment reveals. In this case, the conversation took place with a social worker who had to decide if the patient had the right to receive free medical care or not (comment 10):

> The problem was with the conversation. The client was obviously contradicting himself all the time. I knew that this was not my problem and I just had to interpret what he said to the other party. However I couldn't forget this interview for some weeks and think that I should have probably told the provider about this (Fatima, Healthcare Center in Azuqueca de Henares. Working languages: Spanish-Arabic)

Communicating bad news is quite a common task in TIPS settings, and it is usually practiced in role plays in class. In the following comment, the student is also helped by the professional (quite uncommon in Spain!). However, the psychological pressure is so great that it seems to affect the interpreter, which is why it is a subject that is incorporated into the course syllabus (comment 11):

> I have also experienced situations in which it is necessary to communicate some bad news to the patient like, for example, that the patient is infected with the AIDS virus or suffering from tuberculosis. For many immigrants coming from sub-Saharan countries, these illnesses mean death, and although in Spain there are treatments that allow these people to lead quite a normal life and to live for many years, one of their first reactions is to return to their countries. The doctors already knew this fact, so they know how to handle these situations. Likewise they advised me that I should talk in a soft manner using appropriate vocabulary and give them some sort of mental comfort. The doctors were aware that they didn't know how to express these feelings in the patient's culture and language. Although I followed those instructions, I saw terrible reactions – anger, distrust, helplessness – and the atmosphere was very tense. In those situations I tried to be calm and to interpret all that was said, but the psychological pressure that is experienced is so high that it makes one's job really hard and it is not

Carmen Valero Garcés

easy to forget. (Rosa, Hospital Ramón y Cajal, Madrid. Working languages: Spanish-English)

The next example (comment 12) illustrates an issue which is increasingly being discussed in some institutional circles in Spain – that of mediation. There is an open debate between those who defend the need to develop social, cultural, anthropological and negotiating abilities while neglecting linguistic skills, and those who put all the emphasis on these skills, thus limiting the role of the Tr/In in TIPS (comment 12):

> The figure of the "perfect" interpreter is that of a silent, mysterious professional maintaining distance with the participants, being impartial and reproducing with fidelity the message. However all this seems to produce an effect of coldness when working in the public services area. While completing my internship, I met interpreters who had helped unknown people to register in the Town Hall, who have accompanied them to the doctor, who had had long conversations with both providers and customers to make them understand some reactions, the bureaucracy of this country or some traditions and religious practices. I have met people who work for the government who try to understand immigrants coming from many countries and I have also met immigrants who feel completely disoriented in this country. As the only one who can talk to both parties I find it very difficult – even sometimes cruel – to "be impartial" if you are left alone with the patient after having being given bad news or the professional requires some sort of explanation or asks your opinion. I don't think that providing this information or maintaining some sort of social relationship with the partners in the conversation indicates that you are not acting as a "professional" interpreter. It is necessary to look for some limits between the two ends. It has been a unique experience and I don't regret having talked with my colleagues and partners because this way I learned many interesting things about their work and now I feel better prepared. (Valentina, Hospital 1° de Octubre, Madrid. Working languages: Spanish-Bulgarian)

Finally some excerpts follow from real conversations which will again illustrate that it is impossible to adhere completely to the standards of fidelity or the traditional model, always reproducing what has been heard or translating everything that has been said. As we see below, this is true even if the interpreter is only asking for repetition or clarification:[4]

Excerpt 1 (Medical interview at a healthcare center. D = Doctor, I= Interpeter):

1. D: Bueno, primero vamos a hacerle una historia clínica, le vamos a hacer una exploración física y también le vamos, le vamos a pedir unos análisis ¿de acuerdo? y a partir de los datos que tengamos de los análisis, de la historia y tal, pues vamos a ver si seguimos pensando que la intervención quirúrgica es lo mas aconsejable. *(Good, first we will take his clinical history, we will carry out a physical examination and we will also, we will ask for some tests for him? OK? and starting from the data that we have of the tests, of the history, and so on, then we will see if we still think that surgery is the best option.)*
2. I: ¿Análisis de qué tipo? *(What type of tests?)*
3. D: De sangre *(Blood tests)*

---

4   For more information on this project a see: Taibi/Valero Garcés (2005), Valero Garcés (2002, 2007, 2010a).

We observe that the interpreter talks to the doctor, asking for clarification without translating the questions to the patient.

There are also cases where the interpreter, following the recommendations to interpret in the first person, produces changes with regard to what the patient said, as seen in the next example where "the doctor" (he) changes into "you":

Excerpt 2 (Medical interview at a healthcare centre. P = Patient, D = Doctor, I = Interpreter):

1. P: إذا كان الدكتور إذن بأن العملية هي أحسن حل، فأنا أفضل العملية
   (If THE DOCTOR thinks that surgery is the best solution, I prefer surgery)
2. I: Si cree USTED doctor que es mejor realizar la operación, entonces estoy, estoy de acuerdo.
   (If you think doctor that it is better to perform the surgery, then I, I agree.)

Sometimes confusion arises when cultural or social practices do not form part of the symbolic capital of one of the agents – in this case the "interpreter" – an untrained volunteer.

Excerpt 3 (Medical interview at a healthcare centre. D = Doctor, I = Interpreter, in this case the patient's husband, a very common situation in Spain in the healthcare sector):

1. D: M: Son de Marruecos ¿no? *(You are from Morocco, aren't you?)*
2. I: Sí, sí. *(Yes, yes)*
3. D: Bueno, pues ya nos olvidamos de esto ... A ver ¿qué pasa? *(Ok, let's forget that .... Let me see, what's the matter?)*
   I : Sí, sí. *(Yes, yes)*
4. I: Aquí estamos. *(Here we are)*
   ...
5. D: Está muy blanca. *(You are very white)*
6. P: Sí, (to the doctor) Dile que me duele. (to her husband)) *(Yes, tell him it hurts)*

In Spanish, the expression *¿Qué pasa?* ("what is the matter?") can be used to reach two different pragmatic objectives:
1. Phatic objective: to establish or maintain a cordial relationship or friendship. In this case it is not interpreted as a question, but rather as a greeting and may be answered using an expression such as *aquí estamos* ("here we are"). Both the question and the answer are lacking in meaning or informational content.
2. Informational objective: to ask about what is occurring, about the reason or problem that has brought the patient to see the doctor etc. In this case the participant formulating the question does not wish to get an answer such as "here we are", but instead is soliciting information or, in other words, propositional content.

In other words, firstly, the doctor pronounces the words "¿Qué pasa?" with the intention of asking a question and not of initiating a trivial conversation. It would be necessary to possess different kinds of cultural knowledge such as the structure of the Spanish healthcare system and the time constraints that usually reduce this stage of the doctor-patient interaction to a mere hello in order to focus on the appointment itself. This indicates that the interpreter needs to expand upon his

cultural and social capital. Furthermore, the statement "¿Qué pasa?" is not uttered at the beginning of the conversation, but rather after various exchanges (two of which are included in the recording). Finally, the statement comes after two discourse markers ("Bueno, pues ya nos olvidamos de esto" y "A ver" ("*Well. Let's forget about that*" and "*Let me see*")), the first of which indicates a change of topic ("nos olvidamos de esto") and the second of which suggests an explanation. In other words, even if the initial exchanges had been interpreted as trivial conversation, it was then the moment to get down to the heart of the medical appointment. For these reasons, the interpretation of the intermediary/husband of the patient can be considered erroneous and his reply therefore inappropriate. Thus, in the following exchange (5.) the doctor remedies the misunderstanding, insistent in his attempt to begin the appointment according to the usual procedure which follows (according to Heritage 1997: 144) the standard structure:

– Initial Greetings
– Statement of problems
– Assessment and discussion of the patient's state
– Discussion and prescription of the treatment and/or technical tests
– Good-byes.

Thus the doctor says: "Está muy blanca" ("*You are very white*"), an intervention that can not only be viewed as a verification but also as an invitation to the patient to explain her other symptoms and thus, assist the doctor in the completion of his work.

The analysis of the excerpt above, which depicts a medical consultation between a doctor, an immigrant patient and a volunteer interpreter who does not have a strong grasp of the language or culture of the Spanish healthcare setting, highlights the disruptions that can occur in the systemisation of the medical interview.

In the systemised negotiation process that is typical of doctor-patient interviews, sharing the *habitus* that generates practices and representations allows each participant to find his place within that context, given that each person has a sense of position integrated within him that includes experiences, conduct and behaviour. In the patient-doctor interview above, however, the patient comes to occupy the position of "other-outsider-stranger", which opens up areas of uncertainty to which the doctor must react, redressing the conversation in order to return to the standard structure of the medical interview.

This action on the part of the doctor makes it possible to systemise the interaction and the social reaffirmation of the fields of symbolic forces that filter through the figures of the doctor/knowledge – patient/ignorance, and the interpreter as the necessary link.

In the next example, Excerpt 4, a three-way interaction is presented in which the participants are the doctor, the patient that does not know Spanish and who speaks a Moroccan dialect and his Moroccan companion, who acts as interpreter.

Excerpt 4: (Medical interview at a healthcare centre. P = Patient, D = Doctor, I= Interpreter):

1. D: *Tell him that goiter is the increase in the size of the thyroid, which is a gland.*
2. I: *He's telling you that it is a piece of flesh which they take out and it doesn't return.*

3. D: *And he doesn't have a thyroid any longer, so his thyroid can't increase in size because he doesn't have one.*
4. I: *They've taken out your thyroid and if there isn't one, it can't come into being/appear.*

During his interpretation, the companion reveals, among other things, his visibility, as he does not limit himself to a simple transfer of words. His intervention, even if it appears inaccurate, could also be explained from the perspective of Bourdieuian theory, considering that the interpreter, apart from his obvious difficulty with the Spanish language, tries to produce a message which is appropriate for the recipient in that specific moment and cultural context.

Thus, in the interpreter's first intervention, he does not translate the doctor's explanation ("goiter is the increase in the size of the thyroid, which is a gland"), but instead gives what seems to be a free interpretation ("he's telling you that it is a piece of flesh which they remove and it doesn't return"). This could be motivated, however, by the situation. In his second intervention he again introduces changes with his interpretation when he speaks directly to the patient using the second person ("they've taken out your thyroid") while the doctor used the third person ("And he doesn't have a thyroid any longer"). Applying the Bourdieuian social theory, the interpreter's performance is seen as necessary (not as a deviation). The interpreter forms a part of the social web that goes far beyond the simple act of interpreting, and must adhere to the social, personal, institutional, cultural and personal constrictions of the moment.

In short, this research – in spite of the limited data – suggests once again that the interpreter always acts within a certain context of a specific *field*, in which there can be many different variables that make up his *habitus* and can influence his work.

These variables can be viewed in very different ways. Thus for some practitioners and researchers the responses to the above situations may represent some disadvantage for the Tr/In due to differences in their educational, social, linguistic or cultural background. For others, these responses may represent a lack of preparation as an interpreter, situational influences, the demands of the hiring institution, the influence of the social environment, or a personal choice based on their view of the intervention.

Following upon Bourdieuian theories, these decisions are not an error or wrong decision, but are instead the interpreter's necessary response within a specific *field* which operates according to the rules imposed by the interpreter and his *habitus*.

6.   Some conclusions

Summarising, the growing acceptance that interpreting and translating in public services does not happen in a social vacuum fits well into a sociological theory of TIPS. Viewed in this light, these intermediaries' performances are seen as the necessary task of the Tr/In (not a deviation) who, as part of that social framework, must adhere to the social, political, institutional, cultural, and personal constraints of the moment.

Carmen Valero Garcés

Following this line of thought, I have tried to propose some initial theoretical approaches that will allow us to glimpse the impact that these Bourdieuian ideas might have on TIPS theory. To do this, I have tried to demonstrate how Pierre Bourdieu's theory, with its sociological analysis of practice, is likely to contribute a fruitful framework to TIPS. Bourdieuian sociology allows for all of the characteristics of translation and interpreting to be addressed: by orienting oneself towards the practice of translation and interpreting, it is not only possible to analyse the activity in its *field*, in relation to its agents and their *habitus*, or the rules governing the text's *illusio*, but it is also possible to examine the *symbolic capital* of the cultures in question, the homology of the translation or the interpretation and the original, and to perform a contrastive analysis of source and target texts. It then becomes possible to ask oneself questions concerning ethics, censorship, resistance, power struggles, and the limits of TIPS. I am not alone in claiming a social approach in TIPS. As illustrated in this article, recent discussion about the potential gains and the ethical implications of a social turn in TS have given risen to some interesting research and articles by relevant scholars.

This social approach also has its implications for training. The relevance of concepts such as *field*, *habitus*, *symbolic capital*, or *illusion* becomes obvious with the realisation that these concepts are primarily shaped in translation and interpreting training institutions – the main socialising factor for the agents' future community practice. I agree with those scholars that indicate that what seems necessary is a clear statement favouring a shift from training translators and interpreters for the market – as practiced in the great majority of established departments of Translation Studies – to training them for society.

Such a claim would imply a series of profound transformations in existing curricula, with a particular focus on the inclusion of issues related to politics, ideology and sociology, among others, issues which pertain to any transcultural activity. As seen in the previous pages, data from the students' experience in the workplace seems to corroborate the need to incorporate some of these other skills into their training in class in addition to the traditional ones.

References

Angelelli C. (2003) "The interpersonal role of the interpreter in cross-cultural communication", in L. Brunette / G. L. Bastin / I. Hemlin / H. Clarke (eds) *Critical Link 3: Interpreters in the Community*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 15-26.

Angelelli C. (2004) *Medical Interpreting and Cross-cultural Communication*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Angelelli C. (2008) "The role of the interpreter in the healthcare setting: a plea for dialogue between research and practice", in C. Valero Garcés / A. Martin (eds) *Crossing Borders in Community Interpreting: Definitions and Dilemmas*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 60-82.

Anker D. (1991) "Determining asylum claims in the United States: executive summary of an empirical study of the adjudication of asylum claims before

the immigration court", in H. Adelman (ed.) *Refugee Policy: Canada and the United States*, Toronto, York Lanes Press.

Arrojo R. (1997) "Asymmetrical relations of power and the ethics of translation", *TextconText* 11/1, 5-24.

Barsky R. (1996) "The interpreter asintercultural agent in convention refugee hearings", *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication* 2/1, 45-63.

Bassnett S. (1998) "The translation turn in Cultural Studies", in S. Bassnett / A. Lefevere, *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 123-140.

Bassnett S. / Lefevere A. (1990) "Introduction: Proust's grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights: the 'cultural turn' in Translation Studies", in S. Bassnett / A. Lefevere (eds) *Translation, History and Culture*, London/New York, Pinter, 1-13.

Blommaert J. / Maryns K. (2001) "Stylistic and thematic shifting as a narrative resource: assessing asylum seekers' repertoire", *Journal of Cross-Cultural and Inter-language Communication* 20/1, 61–84.

Bolden G. (2000) "Towards understanding practices of medical interpreting: interpreters' involvement in history taking", *Discourse Studies* 2/4, 387-419.

Bourdieu P. (1980) *Le sens pratique*, Paris, Minuit.

Bourdieu P. (1982) "Ce que parler veut dire", *Libération*, 19/10/1982.

Bourdieu P. (1998) *Practical Reason. On the Theory of Action*, Cambridge, UK, Polity Press.

Bourdieu P. (1999) "The social conditions of the international circulation of ideas", in R. Shusterman (ed.) *Bourdieu. A Critical Reader*, Oxford, UK, Blackwell, 220-228.

Bourdieu P. (2002) *Si le monde social m'est supportable, c'est parce que je peux m'indigner* [entretien mené par Antoine Spire assisté de Pascale Casanova et de Miguel Benassayag], Paris, Edition de l'Aube.

Cambridge J. (2003) "Unas ideas sobre la interpretación en los centros de salud", in C. Valero Garcés / G. Mancho (eds) *Traducción e Interpretación en los Servicios Públicos: Nueva necesidades para nuevas realidades. Community Interpreting and Translating; New Needs for New Realities*, Alcalá de Henares, Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad, 52-28.

Chesterman A. (1997) "Ethics of translation", in M. Snell-Hornby / K. Kaindl / Z. Jettmarová (eds) *Translation as Intercultural Communication*, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 147-157.

Chesterman A. (2006) "Questions in the sociology of translation", in D. Ferreira / A. Assis Rosa / T. Seruya (eds), *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 9-27.

Chesterman A. (2009) "The name and nature of Translator Studies", *Hermes* 42, 13-22.

Corsellis A. (2002) "Interpreting and translation in the UK public service. The pursuit of excellence versus, and via, expediency", in G. Anderman / M. Rogers (eds) *Translation Today. Trends and Perspectives*, 71-90.

Corsellis A. (2003) "Formación de los proveedores de servicios públicos para trabajar con intérpretes y traductores. Habilidades y competencias interculturales", in C. Valero Garcés (ed.) *Traducción e interpretación en los*

servicios públicos. Contextualización, actualidad y futuro, Granada, Comares, 71-89.

Cronin M. (2003) *Translation and Globalization*, London/New York, Routledge.

Crozier M. / Friedberg E. (1977) *L'acteur et le système, les contraintes de l'action collective*, Paris, Seuil.

Davidson B. (2001) "Questions in cross-linguistic medical encounters: the role of the hospital interpreter", *Anthropological Quarterly* 74(4), 170-178.

Díaz Fouces O. / Monzó E. (2010) "What would a sociology applied to translation be like?", *MonTI, Monographs in Translation and Interpreting* 2, 9-28.

Gouanvic J. M. (1999) *Sociologie de la Traduction. La science-fiction américaine dans l'espace culturel français des années 1950*, Arras, Artois Presses Université.

Gouanvic J. M. (2007) "Objectivation, réflexivité et traduction. Pour une re-lecture bourdieusienne de la traduction", in M. Wolf / A. Fukari (eds), *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 79-92.

Gouanvic J. M. (2010) "Outline of a sociology of translation informed by the ideas of Pierre Bourdieu", *MonTI, Monographs in Translation and Interpreting* 2, 119-129.

Hale S. (2008) "Controversies over the role of the court interpreter" in C. Valero Garcés/ A. Martin (eds) *Crossing Borders in Community Interpreting: Definitions and Dilemmas*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 99-121.

Heilbron J. and Sapiro G. (2002) "La traduction littéraire, un objet sociologique", *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 144, 3-6.

Heritage J. (1997) "Conversation analysis and institutional talk: analysing data", in D. Silvermann (ed.) *Quantitative Analysis. Issues of Theory and Methodology*, London, Sage, 210-228.

Inghilleri M. (2003) "*Habitus*, field and discourse: interpreting as a socially-situated activity", *Target* 15/2, 243-268.

Inghilleri M. (2005) The sociology of Bourdieu and the construction of the 'object' in Translation and Interpreting Studies", *The Translator* 11/2, 125-145.

Jacobsen B. (2003) "Pragmatics in court interpreting: additions," in L. Brunette / G. L. Bastin / I. Hemlin / H. Clarke (eds) *Critical Link 3: Interpreters in the Community*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 223-238.

Koskinen K. (2000) *Beyond Ambivalence. Postmodernity and the Ethics of Translation*, Tampere, University of Tampere.

Krais B. / Gebauer G. (2002) *Habitus*, Bielefeld: transcript.

Lesch H. (1999) "Community Translation: right or privilege?", in M. Erasmus *et al.* (eds) *Liaison Interpreting in the Community*, Pretoria, Van Schaik, 90-98.

Metzger M. (1999) *Sign Language Interpreting: Deconstructing the Myth of Neutrality*, Washington DC, Gallaudet University Press.

Niranjana T. (1992) *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context,* Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.

Palop Iranzo A. (1997) "La interculturalidad: revisión conceptual", in C. Hernández Sacristán / R. Morant Marco (eds) *Lenguaje y emigración*, Valencia, Universidad de Valencia.

Pym, A. (1997) *Pour une éthique du traducteur*, Ottawa, Presses de l'Université.

Pym A. / Shlesinger M. / Simeoni D. (eds) (2008) *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Simeoni D. (1998) "The pivotal status of the translator's habitus", *Target* 10/1, 1-39.

Simon S. (1996) *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*, London/New York, Routledge.

Snell-Hornby M. (1997) *Translation Studies. An Integrated Approach*, rev. ed. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Snell-Hornby M. (2006) *The Turns of Translation Studies. New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Spivak G. (2004/1993), "The politics of translation", in L. Venuti (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader,* London and New York, Routledge, 369-388.

Swabey L. / Gajewski P. (2008) "Role definition: a perspective on forty years of professionalism in sign language interpreting" in C. Valero Garcés / A. Martin (eds) *Crossing Borders in Community Interpreting: Definitions and Dilemmas*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 51-80.

Taibi M. / Valero Garcés C. (2005), "Miscommunication in institutional interaction through non-qualified interpreters", *Turjumān* 14/2, 27- 53.

Tymoczko M. (2007) *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*, Manchester, St Jerome.

Valero Garcés C. (1995), "Modes of translating culture: ethnography and translation", *META: Journal des traducteurs* 40/4, 556-564.

Valero Garcés C. (2002) "Interaction and conversational constrictions in the relationships between suppliers of services and immigrant users in healthcare centers" *Babel*, 12/4, 469- 496.

Valero Garcés C. (2005) "Terminology and ad hoc interpreters in public services. An empirical study", *Jostrans, The Journal of Specialised Translation* 3, 75-96, http://www.jostrans.org/issue03/issue03toc.htm

Valero Garcés C. (2007) "Doctor-patient consultations in dyadic and triadic exchanges" in F. Pöchhacker / M. Shlesinger (eds), *Healthcare Interpreting. Discourse and Interaction.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 35-52.

Valero Garcés C. (2008a) "La conversación de contacto en contextos institucionales: la consulta médica", in M. E. Placencia / C. García (eds), *Análisis del discurso oral*, Monográfico de *Oralia* 11, 107-131.

Valero Garcés C. (2008b) "¿Error de interpretación, compromiso social o decisión personal? Estudio empírico", *SENDEBAR* 19, 231-242.

Valero Garcés C. (2008c) "Hospital interpreting practice in the classroom and the workplace", in C. Valero-Garcés / A. Martin. (eds) *Crossing Borders in Community Interpreting. Definitions and Dilemmas,* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 165-185.

Valero Garcés C. (2010a) "Challenging communication in doctor/non-native patient encounters. Two perspectives, three types of interaction and some proposals", *Jostrans, The Journal of Specialised Translation* 14, <http://www.jostrans.org/issue14/issue14 _ toc.php>.

Valero Garcés C. (2010b) "The value of internships in PSIT. Looking out of an open window", *Forum* 8/2, 221-240.

Valero Garcés C. / Gautier L. (2010) "Bourdieu y la Traducción e Interpretación en los Servicios Públicos. Hacia una teoría social", *MONTi, Monographs in Translation and Interpreting* 2, 97-118.

Valero Garcés C. / Mancho G. (2002) (eds) *Traducción e Interpretación en los Servicios Públicos: Nuevas necesidades para nuevas realidades / New Needs for New Realities*, Alcalá de Henares, Universidad de Alcalá.

Valero Garcés C. / Martin A. (2008) (eds) *Crossing Borders in Community Interpreting: Definitions and Dilemmas*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Valero Garcés C. / Taibi M. (2004) "Análisis de la interacción comunicativa en contextos institucionales entre proveedores de servicios, usuarios e intermediarios lingüísticos*", Oralia* 7, 207- 228.

Venuti L. (1998) *The Scandals of Translation. Towards an Ethics of Difference*, London/New York, Routledge.

Vilela-Biasi E. (2003) "Court interpreters as social actors: Venezuela, a case study", in L. Brunette / G. L. Bastin / I. Hemlin / H. Clarke (eds) *Critical Link 3: Interpreters in the Community*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 239-245.

Wolf M. (2010) "Translation 'going social'? Challenges to the (ivory) tower of Babel", *MonTI, Monographs in Translation and Interpreting* 2, 29-46.

Wolf M. / A. Fukari A. (eds) (2007) *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.