

Communicating in Multilingual Societies. Expanding the Role of the Interpreter in Public Service Interpreting

Carmen Valero-Garcés

University of Alcalá, Madrid, Spain

carmen.valero@uah.es

<http://www2.uah.es/traduccion>

ABSTRACT

After more than a decade of quick continuous increase in the flow of people from Africa, Eastern Europe, and Asia to Europe (EU) countries, the need to develop initiatives to overcome all kinds of barriers (linguistics, socio-cultural, political, economic, and so on) is still a sort of emergency in some countries. The use of a third party or intermediary in public services has been – and still is – a solution to overcome the linguistic and cultural barriers. The variety of setting in which these encounters take place (hospital, schools, government offices, police stations, customs, checkpoints, etc.) raises questions about the role played by this intermediary, the importance of culture, the recognition of his/her job as a profession, and the consideration of the different attitudes by society and its institutions. It is my intention to analyze the profile of the intermediaries as they perceived themselves using some surveys conducted in 1998, 2002, 2006 respectively. The comparison of the results will show, on the one hand, whether the characteristics of these intermediaries and the role(s) of the public-service interpreter has changed over the last few years when compared to the traditional role assigned to them and, on the other hand, which the new tendencies are.

1. Introduction

At the end of the last century, a quick continuous increase in the flow of people from Africa, Eastern Europe, and Asia to European Union (EU) countries opened new questions regarding intercultural communication and the need to develop initiatives to overcome all kinds of barriers (linguistic, socio-cultural, political, economic, and so on). After more than a decade, the debate is still open and the decisions taken are evidence of a wide variety of initiatives. This paper concentrates on one very specific topic: communication with minority groups who do not speak the contact language through a third party or intermediary in public services. The variety of settings in which these encounters take place (hospitals, schools, government offices, police stations, customs checkpoints, etc.) raises questions about the role(s) played by the intermediary, the importance of culture, the recognition of his/her job as a profession, the acceptance of varied forms of professionalism, and the consideration of the different attitudes by society and its institutions. It is my intention to analyze the profile of these intermediaries in Spain as they perceive themselves using three surveys conducted in 1998, 2002 and 2006, respectively. The comparison of the results will show whether the role of the public-service interpreter has changed over the last few years when compared to the traditional role assigned to interpreters and what we know about the profession nowadays.

2. Challenges in Growing Multicultural Societies: Public Service Interpreting and Translating

Let me first talk briefly about one of the main challenges in the growing multicultural societies: the migration phenomenon in Southern EU countries (Italy, Spain, Portugal, Greece, Malta).

1st Global conference. Multiculturalism, Conflict and Belonging. A Diversity and Recognition Project.

3rd – 6th September 2007, Mansfield College, Oxford, UK

Migration is not a new phenomenon, but in recent decades, migration movements have intensified. Many immigrants or refugees bring with them a language or culture unknown in their host countries and, at the same time, they do not know the host country's language and culture either. In a changing society, such a situation obviously raises new questions and demands solutions.

One of the most frequent questions present in many different contexts is that of linguistic communication. Nevertheless, this subject has not been seriously examined, despite the variety of languages in the EU, its long tradition in learning and teaching foreign languages, and the existence of educational exchange programs such as *Erasmus* or *Socrates*. Consequently, the minority languages spoken by the new immigrant population are rarely considered when developing strategies to facilitate the integration of these very people, who often have a limited knowledge of the official language(s) of the host country, and who are faced with different contexts (in hospitals, schools, banks, police stations, government agencies, etc.). They also have to make themselves understood to a variety of interlocutors with diverse linguistic accents and backgrounds and/or frequently rely on a third person to communicate.

Different countries show differing degrees of awareness of these realities and, as a consequence, of the action they take. As far as I know in southern EU countries, the local councils are the ones who usually deal with migrants and refugees, in some instances in cooperation with different ministries of the respective countries or with charity or non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and they have to rely on the communicative skills of their own personnel or volunteers who speak both the official language and the language of the user. In fact, it is volunteers who do most of the interpreting and translating when it comes to housing matters, official bureaucracy, and/or medical assistance, even though they frequently have a limited command of the languages involved and lack training in interpreting and translating, as previous studies have already shown (Valero-Garcés 1999, 2000, 2003, 2004).

This research has shown that people who do not know the official language manage to make themselves understood through the help of the so called 'intermediaries' 'third parties' 'mediators' or 'interpreters' who usually are their friends, relatives, and many times children who speak the new language better than their parents. These intermediaries are the bridges between providers and users and, thanks to the help immigrants are able to cope with their problems in their interactions with refugee organizations, government offices, landlords, shop assistants, and bankers, in person and sometimes even over the phone.

Official translators and interpreters tend to exist in most countries, but they are not very often used in public services. Thus, as is the case of Spain, there are two officially recognized professional categories: 1. The Sworn Translator and Interpreter (*Traductor e Intérprete Jurado*), 2. The Court Translator and Interpreter (see Mayoral 2003 and Sali 2003, respectively).

To these two 'officially recognized' categories, a third one can be added: the immigrant hired by the government (e.g. Home Office, Ministry of Education, local agencies, etc.) to work as a freelance interpreter and translator. Many of these people have also worked as volunteers and have some expertise, but they themselves recognize that they continue to have difficulties and that they need some training, as will be seen later.

In this paper, I will concentrate on the role of this intermediary in public services. In doing so, I will first briefly deal with the literature available on the role of the intermediary in multicultural societies; second, I will refer to three empirical studies on the perception of the role of these intermediaries in Spain; and thirdly, I will point out a few conclusions that can be made from comparing the results of the studies.

3. The Role of the Intermediary in a Multicultural Society

1st Global conference. Multiculturalism, Conflict and Belonging. A Diversity and Recognition Project.

3rd – 6th September 2007, Mansfield College, Oxford, UK

History is full of examples of intermediaries in many different settings performing many different roles. They participate in business, politics, courts, hospitals, schools, etc. They have also been labeled differently: mediator, chairman, cultural broker, go-between, middleman, etc. As Wadensjö (1992: 42) points out, a look at other disciplines such as Sociology, Anthropology, and Ethnography that have traditionally relied on mediators, may help to discover and redefine the role of the mediator in interlinguistic communication. She writes:

[...] to act as a broker would be to take more independent measures to initiate or promote negotiation, while a 'go between' only would carry out initiatives coming from the primary parties.

[...] a 'mediator' would signify a person who assists in the solving of a conflict at hand, while 'middleman' would denote more generally an individual promoting communication between two parties (which thus would include the function of a 'mediator').

Katan (1999: 11) refers to these intermediaries as 'cultural mediators', whose task it is "to mediate the non-converging world-views or maps of the worlds, so allowing the participants to cooperate to the degree they wish."

The term 'cultural mediator' for defining the role of the translator as a mediating agent was first introduced by Boechner (1981) in *The Mediating Person and Cultural Identity*, an interesting collection of articles by different authors. The concept, however, is not new. Steiner (1975: 45) had already discussed it, though he focussed mainly on the linguistic aspect. Boechner went further by considering translation as only a part of the mediator's task.

Taft (1981: 53) in his contribution to this volume, defines the role as follows:

A cultural mediator is a person who facilitates communication, understanding, and action between persons or groups who differ with respect to language and culture. The role of the mediator is performed by interpreting expressions, intentions, perceptions, and expectations of each cultural group to the other, that is, by establishing and balancing the communication between them. In order to serve as a link in this sense, the mediator must be able to participate to some extent in both cultures. Thus a mediator must be to a certain extent bicultural.

Taft (1981: 73) also explains the skills and abilities the mediator must possess in both cultures and concludes that the mediator is not only "two skills in one skull" but that "in order to play the role of mediator, an individual has to be flexible in switching his cultural orientation."

Since the activity of interpreting and translating is considered an example of mediation, some scholars and practitioners share this more open position, one that rests on the idea of the translator and interpreter as a visible party, an idea supported by authors like Brislin (1981: 213) or Knapp-Potthof and Knapp (1981: 183). These scholars even suggested that the translator and interpreter "within certain limits may develop his or her initiatives, introduce new topics, give comments and explanations, present arguments, etc."

In countries like Spain, where the phenomenon of migration is quite recent when compared with other EU countries like UK, Sweden or Germany, this idea of the mediator as the person who provides linguistic and cultural assistance is a growing tendency in certain areas. That is, a mediator as a synonym for translator (working with the written language) or for interpreter (working with the spoken language).

Not everybody agrees, however, that the role of the translator/interpreter should be defined as cultural mediator. Some still support the traditional model, as stated by Kondo (1990: 59), that attempts to impose limits on the translator's intervention. From this perspective, the idea of deliberately making changes to the form of the text and manipulating the words in order to aid understanding across cultures is viewed with suspicion. When the mediator also has to deal with different languages- as it usually happens in Spain at least- the term used to refer to him/her is 'public service interpreter' (or 'community interpreter'); and the activity performed is referred as 'public service interpreting'

1st Global conference. Multiculturalism, Conflict and Belonging. A Diversity and Recognition Project.

3rd – 6th September 2007, Mansfield College, Oxford, UK

(PSI) (mostly in UK and other EU members), ‘community interpreting’ (CI) (mostly in Australia, USA), or ‘cultural interpreting’ (mostly in Canada).

The literature on PSI is full of examples of the never-ending discussion about the roles of the interpreter and/or translator even though PSI is really quite a new area of interest when compared to other types of interpreting work, such as conference interpreting. As pointed out by Pöchhacker (2004: 30), it was only in the mid 1990s that PSI become a topic of international cooperation and exchange, a field of research, and an area of interest for practitioners.

The international conference on Interpreting in Legal, Health, and Social Service Settings held at Geneva Park, near Toronto, Canada in 1995, has been considered a milestone event for the development of this area (see Carr et al. 1997). The title of the conference, “The Critical Link/Un maillon essentiel”, has been institutionalized as a conference series; the second and third editions were held in Vancouver in 1998 (see Roberts et al. 2000), and in Montreal in 2001 (see Brunette et al. 2003). Critical Link 4 was held in Stockholm in 2003, the first time in Europe, and the last Critical Link (5) was held in Sydney, Australia, in 2007.

All this activity is proof of a growing interest in CI. But there is still much to be done. As Pöchhacker (2003: 30) pointed out some years ago:

(...) most of the common ground in community interpreters worldwide has consisted in the lack, rather than the existence, of professional standards, remuneration, and training, and those promoting harmonization at the national and international levels have found it difficult to achieve substantial progress.

Pöchhacker also commented on the lack of interest or the inability of public-sector institutions to pay for professional interpreting services, which influences the efforts dedicated to investing in higher-level training and research. Though I agree with the author, some signs of change can be seen. I could point out to an increasing number of training courses, and research projects; the recognition of some scholars as influential authors in the fields of PSI for their professional experience and academic achievements (e.g. Holly Mikkelson; Cecilia Wadensjö, Anne Corsellis; Franz Pöchhacker, Sandra Hale, Roda Roberts); the acceptance of seminars, workshops or special sessions on PSI in conferences dealing with the broad topic of translation and interpretation; or the organization of international conferences dealing exclusively with PSI. As an example I could mention the three conferences that took place in different countries of the EU in 2005. The titles of these conferences are also revealing: “Breaking Down The Barriers: A Team Effort,” at Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, 19-21 March, 2005; “Translating and Interpreting as a Social Practice,” at the Department of Translation Studies ITAT, University of Graz, Austria, 5-7 May, 2005; and “Translation as Mediation or How to Bridge the Linguistic and Cultural Gaps,” at the University of Alcalá, Madrid, Spain, 28-29 April 2005 (Valero-Garcés ed. 2005). This last event was in fact the II International Conference on Public Service Translation and Interpreting (PSI&T) held in Spain, the first one being held in 2001 with the title: Community Interpreting and Translating: New Needs for New Realities (Valero et al 2002). In 2008 the III International Conference on PSI&T will take place under the topic: “Challenges and alliances in PSI&T research and practice”. All these are new incentives for investing in training, research, academization and profesionalization of PSI.

Coming back to the never-ending topic of discussion in the field of Translation and Interpreting Studies- that is the visibility vs. the invisibility of the translator and interpreter (T&I) or in other words, the different role(s) of the T&I-, this is an inexhaustible topic in PSI. The traditional view of the interpreter as a ‘language-switching operator’ (‘conduit model’) by Seleskovitch and Lederer (1989) is often questioned by scholars and practitioners who see interpreters as essential partners in a cross-cultural conversation (Roy 1989, 2000; Wadensjö 1995, 1998), and co-constructors of the interaction (Angelelli (2003). The interpreter is seen as a visible agent with all the social and cultural factors that allow

her/him to co-construct a definition of reality with the other co-participants to the interaction (Angelelli 2003: 17), while the idea of an 'invisible' interpreter is considered as an illusion.

The contributions to Critical Link 3, 4, and 5 and to the other conferences mentioned earlier contained some good examples of the participation of interpreters as social actors. They have also demonstrated the importance of incorporating the results of this empirical research in training programs for future PSI, and thus contribute to the professionalisation of the third party or intermediary, a figure which is not (fully) recognized in many countries. It is also worth to point out that, even though more and more opportunities seem to appear every day, it is still true what Roberts (2002:169) stated in 2002: “Much, if not most, community interpreter training is provided by organizations which hire community interpreters.”

Some exceptions are beginning to emerge. One example is the training program on public service interpreting and translation held at the University of Alcalá, Madrid, Spain made up of three undergraduate courses and a Masters on Intercultural Communication and Public Service Interpreting and Translating in different pairs of languages (See <http://www2.uah.es/traduccion>). The training program started in 2001 thanks to a group of scholars which, under the name FITISPos (Training and Research in PSI&T), also carry out relevant research, establish communication and cooperation links with local and national public institutions, and actively campaign to involve academics, working professionals and semi-professionals and institutional decision-makers in a CI professionalizing process that is all but easy. The findings of these studies were quite significant concerning the frequency of contact between institutional staff and foreigners, the existing reality of “natural interpreting” (to use Pöchhacker’s term for interpreting by relatives, friends, or people who accompany the user in general), the staff’s perceptions of the quality of the communication with foreigners, and their suggested solutions for communication problems.

Following the results of three of these studies conducted in 1998, 2002, and 2006 will illustrate the way these intermediaries perceived themselves. The comparison of the results will show whether the role(s) assigned to them has changed over the last few years, and which the new tendencies are.

4. Translators and Interpreters as Mediators in PSI. Empirical Studies

In Spain, as in many other EU countries, there are no officially recognised interpreters in hospitals, schools, immigration offices, and other public services. The ones in charge of making communication possible are simply people who know at least two languages, have some experience and occasionally some training.

The specific objectives of the 1998, 2002, and 2006 studies were twofold: on the one hand, to analyze and compare the main difficulties encountered working as interpreters in public settings, and, on the other, to analyze and compare the roles that these interpreters think they have to perform when acting in these public settings.

The primary data for the three projects come respectively from 50, 46 and 67 surveys of people (mostly immigrants) who worked in the northern area of Madrid as interpreters and translators for NGOs or for the government when required, or simply as volunteers or assisting their families and friends (for more detailed information about the 1998 and 2002 surveys see Valero-Garcés 2003, 2004).

As for the intermediaries’ profile, data from the three studies are very similar and show that these interpreters are between the ages of 25-40; they have come from different countries for different reasons (as refugees, economic immigrants, illegal immigrants, for family regrouping, etc.); they have lived in Spain between six months and 10 years; and they usually have an advanced level of Spanish, though mostly of them without any formal education in the language. Their educational backgrounds are quite different, ranging from the illiterate to university graduates in their

1st Global conference. Multiculturalism, Conflict and Belonging. A Diversity and Recognition Project.

3rd – 6th September 2007, Mansfield College, Oxford, UK

countries of origin, and almost none of them had received instruction as interpreters or translators in Spain or in their countries, though they would have liked to have had access to some training. All of them have voluntarily served as liaisons for friends and family, and when it comes to paid work, 25% say that they found employment through an NGO or a family member or friend, and 50% work or have worked for NGOs, public services or institutions (hospitals, schools, and government agencies). They also affirm that they usually perform or have performed voluntary aid work, often times with immigrants (60%) and less frequently with refugees (30%).

As for specific training in public service interpreting, some of them (10 out of 50) had received specific instruction in community interpreting (250 hours, 10 people) from the University of Alcalá, Madrid, and some others had received some instruction as cultural mediators in NGOs (one-day instruction, 10 people), or at the EMSI (a 45-hour seminar, 20 people), but most of them have not received any language instruction or training in interpreting and translating skills. In the three studies, women made up the majority of mediators (75% in both).

The two key questions related to this study were: 1. what are the main difficulties you have encountered when working as an interpreter? and 2. which roles do you think that have to be performed in or associated with your job as an interpreter?. Charts 1 and 2 contain the results in the three projects and the alternatives that were given as well as the percentages obtained:

Intermediaries in Public Services	1998	2002	2006
QUESTION 1. <i>What are the main difficulties you have encountered when working as an interpreter?</i>			
a. Problems in understanding dialects or specific accents	60%	63.6%	67.1%
b. Problems in understanding technical or semi-technical words	75%	55%	76%
c. Problems related specifically to translating and interpreting skills	70%	55%	62.6%
d. Problems derived from the lack of familiarity with the situation, place, or people	40%	45%	34.3%
e. Problems with deciding which position to adopt	40%	55%	66.3%
f. Problems derived from some sort of pressure from the providers of services	20%	52%	52.1%

Chart 1. Difficulties encountered by translators and interpreters in PSI

As Chart 1 shows in Section 1a, there is very little difference between both projects (60% - 63.6%, 67.1% respectively) regarding difficulties involved in understanding dialects or specific accents. This is a very common occurrence for certain languages, one of these being Arabic, the largest groups together with Romanians in the Madrid area. Arabic has different dialects depending on the country or area the speaker comes from, however the same person is usually asked to interpret for people from different countries, e.g. someone from Morocco interpreting for someone from Algeria, Egypt, or Tunisia. The same happens with most people coming from Eastern European countries or ex-Soviet republics, e.g. a Pole or a Ukrainian interpreting in Russian.

As for problems understanding and translating technical or semi-technical words (1b), which can occur when working with doctors, social workers, or legal representatives, the percentage (over 50% in the three projects) is higher in the first and third projects. One of the reasons for this when comparing the first and second project could be that the

1st Global conference. Multiculturalism, Conflict and Belonging. A Diversity and Recognition Project.

3rd – 6th September 2007, Mansfield College, Oxford, UK

intermediaries knew the languages better in 2002, having lived in Spain longer and also because they were more familiar with the institutions and public services. However, there is no clear evidence of this because the length of residence of the respondents in Spain varies in the three projects from a few months to a few years. And, as the third projects shows, there are still a high percentage of people who have difficulty with specific language.

In the case of 'technical' problems related to interpreting or translating (1c), the percentage (above 50% again) is higher in the first and third projects, but the problems interpreters have are quite similar: poor short-term memory, problems remembering exactly what they have heard, changes in attitude concerning the right way to interpret using the first or third person, and problems deciding between the use of the colloquial 'tu' or the formal 'usted' in Spanish.

In the three projects some problems related to a lack of familiarity with the situation, the place, or the people they are working with (1d) (40%, 45%, and 34.3 respectively) are also showed, but in a less significant percentage (less than 50%). However the results indicate problems when deciding which position to adopt (1e) (40%, 55%, 66.3% respectively): either being compliant with the users or the providers, or trying to be neutral. These results might illustrate the confusion between the traditional figures (and roles to be performed) of “mediators” and “interpreters”, as well as a tendency to admit a more open role for the interpreter.

The distance between the three projects with respect to problems arising from pressure applied by the providers of services (1f) (20% in 1998, as opposed to 52% in 2002 and 2006) is also significant. A possible reason is that more of intermediaries are needed as the immigrant population is higher too, the government has not articulated new measures to give a response to these demands, less time is left for each encounter, and authorities expect that the intermediary solves all these problems – linguistic, cultural and even administrative – In short, they are not used to working with interpreters and which tasks they have to perform. However, more research needs to be done on this topic.

Intermediaries in Public Services	1998	2002	2006
QUESTION 2. Which roles do you think that have to be performed in or associated with your job as an interpreter?			
a. Linguistic intermediary + cultural mediator	75%	70%	76%
b. Explain technical words or difficult expressions	98%	70%	75%
c. Correct misunderstandings produced by lack of knowledge of language and cultures	64%	69%	66%
d. Adapt the language when necessary (simplifying or explaining)	55%	72%	82.2%
e. Extra-linguistic activities	75%	45%	76%

Chart 2. The translators and interpreters' own perceptions about their roles

Chart 2 contains information about the roles the informants think they have to perform as intermediaries. With the first question (2a), I wanted to know whether they considered themselves as just 'linguistic intermediaries,' or as 'linguistic intermediaries and cultural mediators' at the same time. The results show that in the three projects a high rate of those surveyed consider that the intermediary is not only a 'linguistic' translator or interpreter, but also a cultural mediator who has to explain the hidden meaning or the differences between the cultures (over 70% in the three projects). They also consider that they have to explain technical words or difficult expressions (98%, 70%, 75% respectively), as is seen in (2b). They also agree when it comes to correcting misunderstandings produced by a lack of knowledge of the languages or cultures (64%, 69%, 66% respectively) (2c). They think that they have to adapt the text

1st Global conference. Multiculturalism, Conflict and Belonging. A Diversity and Recognition Project.

3rd – 6th September 2007, Mansfield College, Oxford, UK

to the reader (2d) (55%, 72%, 82.2%), simplifying or explaining, and even omitting information (as 20 informants said in the 2006 project).

Results for performing other extra-linguistic activities: filling out application forms, completing reports, talking to social workers, making phone calls, etc., also show a significant difference between the first, third and second project (75% , 45%, 76% respectively) (2e). A possible explanation could be that some of those surveyed in 2002 received some instruction as interpreters, but more research needs to be done.

V. Conclusions

The increasing mobility of people with different languages and cultures produces changes in the structure of society as well as in the way relationships are established. These changes also give rise to communication problems. Governments and societies develop strategies and take various kinds of measures to facilitate communication in emerging multicultural societies. However, different degrees of awareness are perceived and, consequently, the action taken also varies, ranging from providing official linguistic assistance in public services to forcing the new population to make themselves understood or to depend on the help of friends, relatives, and in many cases children who speak the new language better than their parents. As a consequence of this latter reality, there is a risk of miscommunication and loss of information, and the need for intermediaries is obvious. Intermediaries have always been used, being called brokers, chairmen, cultural mediators, translators and interpreters, and they act in many settings: business, politics, schools, public services, etc.

When dealing with immigrants and refugees in public services, two elements play an important role: minority languages and distant cultures. The influence of both and the challenges they pose lead to changes in the role traditionally assigned to these intermediaries, called interpreters and translators. Some scholars and practitioners in Western society still consider these intermediaries to be walking dictionaries more than cultural mediators. The changes in society, however, indicate the need to revise role of these individuals and to allow them to more actively participate in the communication process.

The empirical research conducted shows these changes, in addition to the new role assigned to them by the emerging multicultural societies and their institutions. Data show that a decade ago the linguistic intermediaries in Spain were mostly untrained, nearly always volunteers or freelance interpreters hired by the government when the need arose. The same situation still seems to persist but some changes are also more evident as, for example, in relation to training or new roles assigned. When these intermediaries were asked about the main difficulties they encountered when interpreting, data shows that— after almost a decade had passed between projects (1998-2002 -2006)—there is still a high percentage of people who have difficulty with language-related issues (dialects, accents, specific vocabulary) and with interpreting and translating skills (memory, note taking). These problems could indicate that some specific training is still needed.

When these intermediaries were asked for their perceptions of their role, data clearly show in the three projects (up to 50% in each case) that these linguistic intermediaries assume that their role goes further than the traditional role of simple linguistic exchanges as assigned to conference interpreting. They felt that their role is to deal with issues and explain deficiencies in communication related to cultural differences, the use of specific vocabulary, or to adapt their way of expression to their interlocutors, along with other related tasks (filling out forms, giving reports, offering phone help, accompanying the person in question to some public services, etc.) that help the parties understand each other.

In short, as an answer to the main objectives of this paper, the findings in the three projects show that, on the one hand, the intermediaries themselves reveal high percentages of some difficulties that could be solved with some specific training, and, on the other hand, these intermediaries did not consider their role to be invisible. To a greater or lesser extent, they perceived that they play a visible and active role in facilitating communication, one that is not only restricted to switching from one language to another.

More research needs to be done. However, these findings are very important in revealing the ongoing lack of training and the need for more as well as in challenging the myth of the invisible interpreter and the need to redefine the traditional monolithic view of the invisibility of the interpreter. Similar results have been obtained in other studies carried out in other countries (Angelelli 2003, 2005; Bot 2003, Valero –Garces & Martin in press).

Bibliographic References

- Angelelli, C. (2003): “The Interpersonal Role of the Interpreter in Cross-Cultural Communication.” In L. Brunette et al. *Critical Link 3*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 15-26.
- Angelelli, C. (2005). *Medical Interpreting and Cross-cultural Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boechner, St. (ed.). (1981). *The Mediating Person: Bridges between Cultures*. Cambridge: Schenkman.
- Bot, H. (2003): “The Myth of the Uninvolved Interpreter Interpreting in Mental Health and the Development of a Three-person Psychology.” In L. Brunette et al. *Critical Link 3*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 27-35.
- Brislin, R. (1993). *Understanding Culture's Influence on Behavior*. Orlando, Fl.: Harcourt Brace.
- Brunette, L., G. Bastin, I. Hemlin, y H. Clarke, (eds.) (2003) *The Critical Link 3: Interpreters in the Community. Selected Papers from the Third International Conference on Interpreting in Legal, Health and Social Service Settings*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Carr, S. E., R. Roberts, A. Dufour, y D. Steyn (eds.). (1997). *The Critical Link: Interpreters in the Community*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- Hemlin, I., and H. Clarke. (2003). “Preface”, in Brunette, L., G. Bastin, I. Hemlin, y H. Clarke, eds., *The Critical Link 3*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Katan, D. (1999). *Translating Cultures*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Knapp-Potthoff, A. & Knapp, K. (1981): “The Man (or Woman) in the Middle: Discoursal Aspects of Non-Professional Interpreting.” In St. Bochner, ed., *The Mediating Person: Bridges between Cultures*. Cambridge: Schenkman, 181-201.
- Kondo, M and Tebble, H. (1997): “Intercultural Communication, Negotiation and Interpreting.” In J. Taylor and Y. Gambier, eds., *Conference Interpreting. Current Trends in Research. Proceedings of the International Conference on Interpreting: What Do we Know and How?* Turku: Finland, 25-27 August 1994. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 149-166.
- Mayoral, R. (2003). “Los cambios en la profesión del Traductor e Intérprete Jurado en España.” In Valero-Garcés, C. (ed) *Traducción e Interpretación en los Servicios Públicos. Contextualización, actualidad y futuro*. Granada: Comares: 127-132.
- Roberts, R. (ed.) (2000). *The Critical Link 2: Interpreters in the Community*. Amsterdam/Filadelfia: John Benjamins.
- Roy, C. B. (1989): “A Sociolinguistic Analysis of the Interpreter’s Role in the Turn Exchanges of an Interpreted Event. Ph. D. diss., Georgetown University: Washington D.C.

1st Global conference. Multiculturalism, Conflict and Belonging. A Diversity and Recognition Project.

3rd – 6th September 2007, Mansfield College, Oxford, UK

- Roy, C. B. (2000). *Interpreting as a Discourse Process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sali, M. (2003). “Traducción e interpretación en la administración de justicia (española).” In Valero Garcés, C. (ed.) *Traducción e Interpretación en los Servicios Públicos. Contextualización, actualidad y futuro*. Granada: Comares: 147-170.
- Seleskovitch, D., and M. Lederer. (1989). *Pedagogie raisonnée de l'interprétation (Traductologie 4)*: Bruxelles: Didier Erudition Opoce.
- Steiner, G. (1975). *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford: OUP.
- Taft, R. (1981). “The role and personality of the Mediator.” In St. Bochner, ed., *The Mediating Person: Bridges between Cultures*. Cambridge: Schenkman, 53-88.
- Valero Garcés, C. ed. (2005). *Traducción como mediación entre lenguas y culturas/Translation as mediation or how to bridge linguistic and cultural gaps*. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá.
- Valero Garcés, C., y G. Mancho, eds. (2002). *Traducción e Interpretación en los Servicios Públicos: Nuevas necesidades para nuevas realidades/ New Needs for New Realities*. Alcalá de Henares: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad.
- Valero-Garcés, C. & Martin, Ann. (2008). *Building Bridges. The Controversial Role of the Community Interpreter*. The Netherlands: Benjamins (in press)
- Valero-Garcés, C. (1999). “Community Interpreting and Translating in the Spanish Social-Context.” In *Language is a Human Right: Fourth International Forum and First European Congress on Court Interpreting and Legal Translation*. Graz, Austria: Institute für Translator and Interpreter Training, 1999, 50-56.
- Valero-Garcés, C. (2000). “Cultural Parameters in Translation and Interpreting: New Ethics for a New Breed of Mediators in Public Services?.” In S. Meiri et al., eds., *La Traduction: diversité linguistique et pratiques courantes*. Túnez: CERES, Serie Linguistique n° 11, 2000, 253-264.
- Valero-Garcés, C. (2003). “Responding to Communication Needs: Current Issues and Challenges in Community Interpreting and Translating in Spain.” In L. Brunette et al. *Critical Link 3*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 177-192.
- Valero-Garcés, C. (2004): “Barreras lingüísticas en la comunicación intercultural. Datos y acciones.” *OFRIM, Revista especializada de inmigración*. Suplementos II. June 2004, 17-36.
- Wadensjö, C. (1992). *Interpreting as Interaction: On Dialogue-Interpreting in Immigration Hearings and Medical Encounters*. Linköping: Linköping University.
- Wadensjö, C. (1995). “Dialogue Interpreting and the Distribution of Responsibility.” *Hermes. Journal of Linguistics* 14, 111 -129.
- Wadensjö, C. (1998). *Interpreting as Interaction*. London and New York: Addison Wesley – Longman.