BOURDIEU AND PUBLIC SERVICE INTERPRETING AND TRANSLATION. TOWARDS A SOCIAL THEORY IN PSIT[1]

Carmen Valero Garcés
Laura Gauthier Blasi
Universidad de Alcalá, Madrid

Abstract

Within *Translation Studies* (TS), *Public Service Interpreting and Translation* (PSIT) is a relatively recent area (Critical Link 1995), still fighting for academic and professional recognition inside and outside the limits of that discipline. The growing interest for PSIT is undoubtedly linked to the migration phenomenon, a phenomenon that is modifying Western societies and taking roots in political, social, cultural and linguistic aspects among others. Immigrants may bring unknown languages and cultures, and at the same time they may not know the language and culture of the majority. The intervention of intermediaries (interpreters and translators) who make communication possible is generally recognised. But the controversy about the role(s) these intermediaries have to perform in public services (hospitals, police stations, schools, customs, government offices) seems to be one of the main difficulties to obtain academic and institutional acceptance and recognition. Following the influence of Bourdieu´s social theory in certain areas of TS (Simeoni 1998, Heilbron and Sapiro 2002, Inghilleri 2003, 2005), it is our intention to apply the basic concepts of his theory ('field', '*habitus*' '*field*' '*illusio*' '*symbolic capital*') to PSIT in an attempt to explain the performance of these 'visible' interpreters. New areas of research in the development of a sociological theory of PSIT will also be suggested.

Resumen

Dentro de los *Estudios de Traducción*, la *Traducción e Interpretación en los Servicios Públicos* (TISP) es un área relativamente reciente (Critical Link 1995) en lucha todavía por conseguir el reconocimiento académico y profesional que se merece dentro y fuera de los límites que marca dicha disciplina. En esta lucha, es innegable que el fenómeno migratorio deja sentir su influencia, fenómeno capaz de modificar las sociedades y fuertemente enraizado en aspectos políticos, sociales, culturales y lingüísticos entre otros. Gran parte de las dificultades para conseguir esa aceptación y reconocimiento de TISP se halla en la controversia que envuelve el papel del traductor e intérprete se halla en sus actuaciones en los servicios públicos (hospitales, comisarías, centros de refugiados, oficinas de extranjería, centros educativos, oficinas del Estado, etc.). En un intento por explicar la actuación de estos intérpretes, que con frecuencia y, sobre todo, en determinados ámbitos (p. ej. sanitario, educativo, asilo y refugio) va más allá de la invisibilidad y del mero trasvase lingüístico, y siguiendo la influencia que la teoría social de Bourdieu está teniendo en otras áreas de los *Estudios de Traducción*, (Simeoni 1998, Heilbron y Sapiro 2002, Inghilleri 2003, 2005), es nuestra intención tratar de aplicar los conceptos fundamentales (*habitus*, *campo*, *illusio o capital simbólico*) de las teorías bourdianas a la TISP y analizar el papel del intérprete desde sus presupuestos, así como sugerir nuevas vías de investigación para el desarrollo de un teoría sociológica de la TISP.

Key words: Public Service Interpreting and Translating. Sociology. Bourdieu. Migration. Minority languages and cultures.

Palabras clave: TISP. Sociología. Teoría social. Bourdieu. Inmigración.

---

1. Introduction

Public Service Interpreting and Translation (PSIT) is a discipline which is born of society's inherent need to communicate when different languages and cultures are brought together. Given the strong social character of this discipline, and in order to embrace other areas of knowledge, attempts are needed to develop theories and to move beyond translation's reflections upon itself.

A multidisciplinary perspective would allow us to reflect upon the phenomena which are intrinsic to an intercultural society and how they impact the three-way interaction between a public service professional, clients who don't share the surrounding language and culture, and the translators and interpreters (T/I) who facilitate the communication between them.

Along these lines, Berman (1989: 675) defines the development of a theory of translation as "the reflective use of the experience which is translation and not as a theory which would serve to describe it, analyze it and at times, govern over it." Departing from these ideas, and based upon the empirical manifestations of PSIT, we shall attempt, in this article, to outline the premises behind a sociological, or socio-traductological as some have dared to call it (Gambier 2007:207), theory of PSIT. To accomplish this, we shall apply the Bourdeauian notions of *habitus, field, illusio,* and *symbolic capitalism* to the context of the three-way conversation, which will be viewed as a microcosm of society and the social game. At the same time, we will delve into the role of the public services translator/interpreter, and attempt to sketch a profile of this figure based our application of these new concepts to PSIT. As a starting point we shall propose a definition of PSIT so that, over the course of the pages to come, we can show the true impact of this multidisciplinary perspective upon PSIT theory.

2. Defining Concepts

2.1. What is PSIT?

The era of migration that forms part of the twenty first century calls for a new approach to social reality. In this connection, PSIT emerges from the meeting of cultures, as a discipline which is intrinsic to man's multiple needs for communication. The attempt to institutionalize PSIT, however, is contingent upon the acceptance and recognition of our societies' progression towards becoming multicultural and intercultural and the new principles involved. It is also dependent on acknowledging immigrants as users of public institutions and services. We will begin by defining the concepts of multiculturalism and interculturalism, which will allow us to expand upon the notions of Bourdieuian *enjeux* – or what is at stake- in PSIT.

Multiculturalism refers to the presence of groups of people in a particular society who, as a consequence of ethnic, linguistic, religious, or national differences, hold different cultural codes. Interculturalism, on the other hand, would refer to the response to the pluralism of the multicultural society. In this respect, Palop (1997: 51) adds that the term "intercultural" refers to the ability to coexist, to mutual comprehension, and to the interaction between groups of people from different cultures that occupy the same territorial space.

PSIT plays a fundamental role as the linguistic link in communicative situations in which different cultural groups coexist in the same space. PSIT facilitates this coexistence by providing the ideal framework when, as Palop says, "an intercultural microcosm, mutual comprehension and interaction among groups of people with different cultures" come into play (1997:51). Baumann (1999:163), in turn, asserts that the multicultural ideal lies in maintaining a permanent vision of equality across all cultural differences. For him, multiculturalism should lead to "the formulation of a question that can bring together a division that is believed to be absolute in any context." Further along he adds that (1999:169) "nothing in social existence is grounded in the absolute, not even the idea of what defines the majority or a cultural group"

Wadensjo (1998:33), in turn, defines PSIT as a discipline which takes place in public service settings in order to facilitate communication between official staff and clients: in police stations, immigration offices, healthcare facilities, schools, and other similar service settings.

Along these lines, Lesch (1999:93) calls attention to the asymmetries involved in these types of interaction, affirming that the principle objective of PSIT lies in "an attempt to balance out the power relationships between the provider and the recipient, by putting the need for communication first". Cluver (1992:36), focusing the work of the T/I on the needs of public service users, said that not only does PSIT "consist of the provision of information in other languages, but also the transmission of this information in such a way that it is more easily understood by marginalized communities." In this respect, Valero and Mancho (2002:13 15-23) go even further, when they assert that PIST can be defined as communication with a specific audience that forms part of a cultural and linguistic minority group and whose unfamiliarity extends beyond mere language, to the host society's system of values, practices and representations.

It is here that we glimpse the social magnitude that PSIT takes on in practice, both in societies favoring multiculturalism and those where interculturalism is preferred, and where Bourdieu's concepts offer an ideal framework with which to theorize about the nature of this discipline. We will begin by defining these basic concepts.

2.2. Bourdieu's Social Game: An overview of the concepts of habitus, field and symbolic Capital

According to Pierre Bourdieu (1980:88), the mechanism of social organization must be understood according to two key concepts, *habitus* and field. Through the concept of *habitus*, we understand social organization as a system of relationships which is composed of invisible structures. This notion implies that subjects or agents are socially produced in states occurring prior to the system of social relations. It also indicates that these subjects' practices are conditioned on one hand, by all of the history integrated as *habitus* and, on the other, by the production of differences between the social subjects, based on the conditions in which they have been produced. The *habitus* is, therefore, a framework through which the world is perceived and which determines one's actions within it and is fundamentally constituted on the basis of first experiences (primary *habitus*) and those related to adult life (secondary *habitus*):

> [The *habitus* are] systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations and can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them. Objectively "regulated" and "regular" without being in any way the product of obedience to rules, they can be objectively orchestrated without being the product of the organizing action of a conductor. (Bourdieu 1980: 88-9)

Bourdieu (1984:115), in a later text, adds:

> The *habitus* is therefore a product of the social structure and at the same time, is what enables the reproduction of these social structures, because it is the internalization of these structures. It is this element that permits *habitus* to be related to social classes: An acquired *habitus* of class that will perpetuate experiences, practices and categories of perception and taste that correspond to each social position.

This aspect of the *habitus* is fundamental in terms of its relation to PSIT, a discipline which while perhaps not characterized by its consideration of social class, is one which is very much defined by the account it takes of the cultural factors – or cultural *habitus* – which come into play during the three-way interaction.

If the *habitus* is the internalization of what is on the exterior and results in the creation or perpetuation of the system of relations, then field is that area of social life where it is practiced. This field is both a field of forces and a field of struggles within which the agents confront one another, with different means and ends, according to their position within the structure of the field of forces. In this way, they contribute to the conservation or transformation of this

structure. For Bourdieu, the fields operate as relatively autonomous social universes, each with its own rules and sense of the game. It is within these fields that the specific conflicts unfold between those agents involved. Education, bureaucracy, religion, science and art, to name a few, are all specific fields. This means that they are structured according to those characteristic conflicts in which different perspectives are pitted against each other, each struggling to prevail. 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.

For this reason, and according to Bourdieu (1997: 48-49), a field can also be defined as

The specific objectives and interests that are irreducible to the objectives and interests of other fields […] and that are not perceived by someone who has not been constructed to enter this field […] For a field to operate, there must be objectives and people who are prepared to enter the game, who are endowed with the *habitus* and its implied knowledge and recognition of the intrinsic laws of the game, of the objectives, etc.

Fields are, thus, occupied by social agents with different *habitus* and capital, who compete for the field's material resources, as well as for its symbolic resources. In addition to economic capital, capital includes cultural capital, social capital, and any other type of capital perceived as natural. All this capital makes up what Bourdieu calls symbolic capital. Symbolic capital is an ordinary property; It is the physical strength or the warlike value that, when perceived by social agents endowed with categories of perception and appreciation that enable them to perceive, know and recognize it, becomes symbolically efficient, a veritable magical power: a property which responds to socially constituted collective expectations or beliefs that allow it to exert a kind of action from a distance, without any physical contact (Bourdieu 1997: 171-172)

This symbolic capital (Bourdieu gives the example of 'honor' in Mediterranean societies, among others) only exists to the extent that it is perceived by others as valuable. This means to say that it has no real existence, but is instead a cash value based on other people's recognition of its power. For this recognition to take place, there needs to be social consensus about "the value of value", to put it one way. Put another way, symbolic capital is nothing more than economic or cultural capital when it is well-known and recognized. Bourdieu (1984:114) likens the field to a playing field, which, in order to function, requires objectives and people who are prepared, "endowed with *habitus*, which implies knowledge and recognition of the laws which are intrinsic to the game and what is at stake" This sense of the game, defined by Bourdieu (1994:154) "as one of the privileges of having been born into the game itself", entails having a sense of one's position within this game. Each agent will have practical, physical knowledge of his position in the social space.

To summarize, one could say that, according to the Bourdieuian vision of social organization, fields operate as autonomous spheres, with their own rules and sense of the game. There, different modes of domination are defined for each field and in relation to other fields. The agents in these fields have the *habitus* incorporated within them. In other words, they possess acquired dispositions which generate practices and representations that, when coupled with the available resources, enable them to play in the different social fields. In this way, the *habitus* contribute to the reproduction and transformation of the social structure.

The *habitus* are, therefore, our way of representing ourselves in the outside world so that we can participate within it. It functions on an unconscious level within us and it defines our perceptions and actions within the game, according to the position that each of us occupies within it. This enables us to overcome the differences derived from the different lifestyles of each social class. It includes the totality of one's actions and thoughts, which form the basis for one's decisions, and it comprises all of one's learned conduct and judgments.

2.3 Relationships between PSIT and Bourdieuian theories. Possible lines of investigation

The Bourdieuian concepts give rise to numerous possibilities or lines of investigation that enable us to delve more deeply into PSIT theory. An initial approach, through which we consider the microcosm as playing field, permits us to raise and reinforce the *enjeux* of the theory. Essentially, the development of a social theory of PSIT would involve the deduction of the rules of the game based on observations of the players' actions. To achieve this, we will need 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, we will have to deduce, based on the T/I's actions, the type of game being played and finally, secure their recognition by other fields.

Based on our study of the fields, if the agents that make up the PSIT communication triangle (public service clients, translators and interpreters and service providers) are part of a specific field and have different *habitus* incorporated within them, the following questions need to be asked: How is this communication organized? Will the T/I 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 *habitus* study's point of view from different angles, as well as the dispositions that generate practices and representations. They will make it possible for us to study, for example, the power relationships likely to be established between the different agents and between the T/I's two languages and cultures. Drawing on previous empirical studies, we can then try to develop a theory capable of bringing together the distinctive features that are inherent to PSIT.

In the following pages, we will propose some initial theoretical approaches that will allow us to glimpse the impact that Bourdeauian ideas can have on PSIT theory.

3. Initial Theoretical Approaches

3.1. The convergence of Bourdieuian concepts and PSIT

Gouanvic (2007: 81-82), in applying Bourdieuian theories to traductology, points out that translation in general, understood as something which is practiced (which allows us to include interpreting as well), is part of the same field as the original text to be translated. Therefore, the objectives of these translations are the same as those of the target field. As we have previously mentioned, Wadensjo (1993:33), as part of his definition of PSIT, indicated that police stations, immigration offices, welfare offices, schools and other similar service settings, which could all be considered fields, are all settings where this specialty is practiced.

The Translator/Interpreter's *habitus*, following Gouanvic (2007:82), would result from the coming together of two languages and cultures. In other words, the T/I's bilingualism and biculturalism would be what forms his *habitus* and through translation and interpretation, it could be possible to observe the different *habitus* needed for each field. As the author points out (2007:84),

> Translation is not a homogeneous field and it is fundamental that we make distinctions between the types of practices involved in translations across specific fields. […] One may not speak of *habitus* as a social progression without first bearing in mind the state of the fields in which the agents practice.

Therefore, if the objective of PSIT is, and on this point we agree with Culver (1992:36), to transmit information in a way that it is more easily understood by the minority communities, it would be interesting to be able to observe, in the specific fields, the *habitus* through which this objective is attained. One example of this might be the sense of position that allows the T/I to make adjustments to his practices and to understand the social representations of both parties, so as to ease their entry into the game.

In this web of relationships, one cannot overlook the idea of *power*. The inequalities (social, economic, educational) between the agents involved, so characteristic of PSIT, are nothing other than "an attempt to balance out power relationships between the provider and the recipient, prioritizing the need for communication" (Lesch 1993:93). Gouanvic (2007:90) also asserts that "translation is (therefore) marked by the power relationships between the source and target fields."

In this sense, Crozier and Freidberg (1977:20) explain that collective action operates upon the principle of integrating the social actors, each of whom is driven by his individual and diverging goals and united to the others in the pursuit of the collective goals. This integration implies a relationship – according to the relational conception of social organization proposed by these authors – in which two or more actors will try to assert themselves over the other(s), thus setting in motion a power relationship that will be established in two different ways: i) by force or ii) through negotiation. The negotiation or exchange, according to the idea of the power relationship as the link which gives structure to the social space and to the relationships between the actors, is fraught with areas of uncertainty (or the actors' degree of freedom or freedom to act). The actors 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, in turn, is unbalanced, given that each actor will know how to act towards the other in order to attain, as a result of the negotiation, his individual goals. In this way, Crozier and Friedburg (1977:73) explain that this interrelationship can be defined as "a relationship based on force in which one can obtain more in his favor but in which, by the same token, one will never find himself to be completely lacking in respect to the other". In this respect, Bourdieu (2002: 19-20) asserted that "these structures can only operate thanks to the collaboration of the agents, who have internalized the structures upon which the world is organized." Furthermore, referring to linguistics, he maintained that when two speakers began to speak, not only did their linguistic competencies come into play, but also their social competencies, since it was understood that the word or the right to speak depended on the types of symbolic capital at stake, which were recognized "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 gender, religion, economic status and social status.

In PSIT, 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 T/I himself. This would also permit us to observe the T/I'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, as proposed by Bourdieu. Gouanvic (2007:88), referring to literary tradition, explains it in the following way:

> The socio-historical determinants which have produced the literary works and their objectives within the literary source context naturally break away from the objectives of the target literary field, which translation is part of.

Applying the concept of *off-centering* to the field of PSIT, which is characterized 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, cultural clashes and social and educational inequalities. In this manner, when it comes time to pass the message into the other language, shifts inevitably occur in the source and target field objectives.

Inghilleri (2003: 243-245), in her application of Bourdeauian theories to interpreting, believes that the interpreter's *habitus* and the field in which the interpreting takes place can play a crucial role in what is considered to be a "legitimate translation" within a particular context. Inghilleri questions whether the field of translation and interpreting can be considered a field in the Bourdieuian sense of the term. Simeoni (1998:19) prefers to speak of pseudotranslation or "a would-be field of translation." Inghilleri, however, prefers to believe that T/I possess specialized competencies which generate and are generated by the capital of linguistic and cultural variants which, although clearly linked to other fields, take on a unique form and begin to function differently in specific translation and interpreting contexts.

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 language (phonological, lexical and stylistic variation), but also with the varieties of use authorized for a particular language. He thus asserts:

> The act of translation 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.

Such assertions serve to refute or move away from the traditional idea of the T/I remaining passive and subordinate to the norms of his or her profession (norms as to what is acceptable and appropriate). Translators and interpreters 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 between a certain predictability and the inevitable changes, or as Bourdieu would say, adherence to and divergence from the norms can take place at any place or time, either at the uppermost or macrostructural level, the local level, or any meeting of the two.

3.2. Towards a sketch of the Public Services Translator/Interpreter

Following Bourdieu and drawing on information from other writers (Anker 1991, Barsky 1996, Blommaert y Maryns 2001), Inghilleri (2003:252), in her study of interviews to asylum/refugee seekers, points out that the main objective for all the participants involved, including the T/I, is to produce meanings which are acceptable to the host/culture environment. She remarks that the asylum or refugee seeker (the linguistic and cultural "other" in this context) must present an account which is believable and coherent within the cultural context and for the cultural context of the target language. In other words, the account must be presented in a way which is appropriate to the political, cultural and linguistic reality of this context.

This "translational" norm, which is directed towards the host culture, goes hand in hand with the assumption that the asylum office operates in a monolingual context, despite the fact that the reality of the situation calls for a multilingual asylum process. No shifting in objectives is produced (that is, a specific way of communicating information while bearing in mind the diversity involved) and the parties involved (police officer, judge, lawyer, asylum seeker, etc) either do not try to do not succeed in adapting their participation to the context.

This assumption regarding monolingualism goes beyond the relationship that exists between the language in which the law is written and legal language itself or that between the specific meaning to be communicated and what the words mean in the official language. For this reason, the importance of cultural knowledge needs to be recognized. It is this knowledge that permits those meanings to be deciphered in order to guarantee, to the greatest extent possible, that they are understood.

Returning to Bourdieu once again, let's take as an example the right to a Translator/Interpreter which, as a constitutionally recognized right, is part of PSIT's symbolic capital within the Spanish legal field. A case could occur in which the asylum seeker or immigrant detainee does not view this right as capital, since it is not a recognized right in his

country of origin. It is also possible that this right might be applied with restrictions or variable terms. For example, it might be the government who appoints the interpreter or perhaps the client must be the one to bring the interpreter. It is also possible that there won't be any interpreter available in a certain language and that the client won't be able to exercise the right. Whatever the case, the outcome is the creation of a monolingual situation.

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 *habitus* would come into play. To be sure, these actions take place within and through the interpreting that goes on between a T/I and the clients, a T/I and the judges or other professionals and a T/I and the institutions. When it comes time to negotiate these relationships (often simultaneously) interpreters can find themselves in the middle of potentially competing agendas.

In this respect, the research done by Anker (1991: 252-264) offers up a good example. In her research, she analyzes United States asylum interviews in which the participants are a judge, attorney (bilingual), asylum seeker, and interpreter. Anker mentions two types of interpreters: the professional certified interpreter (similar to the sworn interpreter) and the freelance interpreter, the latter of which has received no specific training and is 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 "daño físico" or "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.

This example underscores the conflict that currently exists in terms of work method: between the adherence to a literal translation model and the need for translation which is adapted to context, of which the so-called "advocacy model" is an example (see Cambridge 2002: 51). The same thing occurred in the case of the interpreter's translation of the word "cuartel" for "the police station or 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.

According to Inghilleri's research (2003:258), the freelance interpreters (who had received little training) tended to interpret using the literal translation model, while the interpreters with more training (certified interpreters, in this case), showed more freedom in their decision making, approaching the bilingual advocacy model. However, their interpretations sometimes led them to alter or omit elements from the asylum seeker's original testimony. This is illustrated by one interpreter's statements, when he admitted that he omitted certain names because he did not want to trouble the judge with so many names. Another interpreter avoided interpreting a question because he felt it was "a hurtful question" for the client. The research also showed that freelance interpreters (especially when they come from a cultural context similar to the client) become more involved in the cases and exhibit a certain tendency to improve upon the testimonies and to council the client during the pre-trial sessions. A certain tendency was also revealed towards the use of the third person and talking with the clients prior to translating the information into English.

All things considered, and based on the abovementioned examples and observations, taking Bourdieu's ideas into account when interpreting would help the interpreter decide which stance to take. Without a doubt, being conscious of the practices and representations of each of the agents participating in the game would help the interpreter to negotiate meanings when choosing between what the client "says" and what the clients "wants to say", to which we should add what the applicant "should say".

This situation is repeated in other everyday situations in PSIT settings: medical appointments, parent-teacher conferences, police interrogations of immigrant detainees, etc. Translators and Interpreters must be familiar with the different types of discourse (legal, medical, etc.), know how to navigate within a given field, and make these strategies and

conventions part of their *habitus* so that they may reproduce what is expressed by speakers in positions of authority (doctors, judges, teachers).

Here, multiple questions arise: What happens when the translator/interpreter'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 T/I is more closely aligned with the immigrant than the government official? With the defender than the accuser? with the patient than the doctor? With the immigrant than the police officer? Or rather: Will the T/I´s affiliation with a certain minority group influence his 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 T/I's ideas about justice or injustice play an influence? Or the fact that the T/I must face difficult situations and deal with mixed emotions as part of his work? What happens when what is considered a crime in one country is not a crime in the other country and therefore, no precise term exists?

These and many other questions raised by authors such as Vidal (2005: 275) find some answer in the recent research by Angelelli (2003), Valero y Martin (2008), Garre (1999), Feldman (2000) or Brunette (2003). These authors question the universality of the theories and the idea of objectivity in T/I. Translating consists of rewriting; an idea which has been expressed across fields as diverse as cultural studies, feminist theory, literary theory or the different schools of philosophy. Bourdieu's sociological theories are just one more contribution to this. From this perspective, the research 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. These strategies are more in line with the advocacy model than with the literal translation model and they raise an entire series of questions around the T/I's decision making. These questions are related to the participants' knowledge of the function of interpreting itself, the potential conflicts that can arise from these participants' different objectives (skopos) within the interpreting or translating process, or the inter- and intra- cultural nature of interpreting.

The answer to such questions need not only be framed as a problem related to the quality of the translation or interpretation or the translator or interpreter's good or bad performance. The decision to follow the literal interpreting or translation method (the invisible interpreter) or the advocacy model (the visible interpreter) can also be the product of training issues or issues related to the clients' experience or cultural ties. However, another factor that can influence this choice is the impact of the possible influences that can affect the decision making, which can be explained through the related concepts of field, *habitus* and norms. These are influences which are present in the translating and interpreting context and which are associated with the transmission of information into the other language.

The T/I tends to perform in monolingual/monocultural fields and must be capable of creating the illusion of transparency with the decisions he makes. These decisions may or may not result in negotiations between the parties (asking for something to be repeated, that someone speak more slowly, for the explanation of some concept…). It is also possible not to seek out this negotiation and to simply assume that one is there to transmit the message and create the impression, to the court during a trial for example, that the communication is flowing smoothly. A literal translation, on the other hand, can lead to more difficulties, resulting in a too formal or strange sounding account or one that reminds or makes the court aware of the presence of the "other" – with his different language and culture. This breaks the rules of the game for the trial, the medical appointment or the asylum interview. If this occurs, the T/I 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". The conclusion – and we agree with Inghilleri on this point – is that the legal and political fields and their corresponding *habitus* are, at times and in certain contexts, more influential than the T/I's own decisions.

In the following segment, we offer a brief analysis of a specific interaction, in order to emphasize the disruptions that can occur during a doctor-patient interview occurring in a monolingual context, in which the interactions follow highly systemized protocols.

3.3. Cultures in contact: An example of disruption in a systemized interaction occurring in a monolingual context

The analysis of the excerpt provided below, which depicts a medical consultation between a doctor and an immigrant patient who does not have a strong grasp of the language or culture of the Spanish healthcare setting (Gauthier 2009), highlights the disruptions that can occur in the systemization of the medical interview.

(1) Example 1:
Doctor: You are going to go to Ferial Street
Patient: Aha.
Doctor: With this paper.
Patient: Aha.
Doctor: And there they are going to tell you what day you will need to go to get the radiograph. Do you know what a radiograph is?
Patient: Ah?
Doctor: An x-ray
Patient: Okay
Doctor: But you have to make the appointment
Patient: Okay
Doctor: Okay?
Patient: Okay

In this excerpt, the doctor pauses what he is saying four times in order to give the patient time to speak, because he wants to make sure that the patient understands the instructions. If the *enjeux* of the interaction depend on the actors reaching their common and individual objectives, the doctor should make sure that the patient has understood the measures proposed for this outcome (the patient's treatment). In terms of the modes of domination exerted within the interaction, according to the categories of perception that impose the symbolic capital at stake, the doctor is the person who actually has the monopoly in terms of who speaks. However, in this situation and in order for the objectives at stake to be attained, the doctor must give the patient more of a turn to speak and in this manner, grant him more speaking power.

In the systemized 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, since each person has a sense of position integrated within him that includes experiences, conduct and behavior. In the patient-doctor interview, however, the patient comes to occupy the position of "other-outsider-stranger", which opens up areas of uncertainty according to which the doctor must act (and in this manner, will expand the perspective according to which both – the doctor and the patient- must act)

In the following example, we observe how the process of control (over the areas of uncertainty) of the doctor over the patient, a process which makes it possible to systemize the interaction and the social reaffirmation of the fields of symbolic forces that filter through the figures of the doctor/knowledge – patient/ignorance, is affected.

(2) Example 2
Aide: How old are you?
Patient: 25-27
Aide: 25-27, okay. (Laughter)

The actors don't manage to completely enter the game (one by giving an approximate answer, the other by not considering this approximate answer to be valid). Since they do not "know" how to interact with one another, the power relationship that would enable the systemization has no shape, given that the game of control over the sources of uncertainty eludes the actors' perception.

In example 3, 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. 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.

(3) Example 3
Doctor: Tell him that goiter is the increase in the size of the thyroid, which is a gland
Interpreter: He's telling you that it is a piece of flesh which they take out and it doesn't return
Doctor: And he doesn't have a thyroid any longer, so his thyroid can't increase in size because he doesn't have one.
Interpreter: They've taken out your thyroid and if there isn't one, it can't come into being/appear.

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.

4. Conclusion

Throughout the course of this article we have tried to apply some concepts from the French sociologist Bourdieu's theories to Public Services Translating and Interpreting. In doing this, we have aimed to sketch some lines of investigation that would enable us to develop a sociological theory of PSIT. As a means of concluding our study, we might say the following:

Bourdieu considered sociology to be a combat sport, a – social - game with its own system of rules. The players born into this game are familiar with the basic rules which enable them to enter into this game. Entering 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. This also raises the following question: What happens when a player doesn't know how to play? In our opinion, this is the key question upon which PSIT theory, which is developed through observing the rules of the social game, should originate. The T/I's presence helps determine that the players play by the rules and creates that *illusio* or illusion of transparency (or of a monolingual context), which involves its own practices and representations, All things considered, PIST amounts to a rewriting, not with the aim of trying to reproduce the original message, but in order to produce a text in line with the environment, the recipient of the communication, and the host culture.

Bibliographic references

ANKER, Deborah. (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: Howard Adelman (ed) 1991. *Refugee Policy: Canada and the United States*. Toronto: York Lanes Press.

ANGELELLI, Claudia. (2003) "The Interpersonal Role of the Interpreter in Cross-Cultural Comunication". In: Brunette, Louise; Bastin, Georges; Hemlin, Isabelle; Clarke, Heather (eds). 2003. Critical link, Amsterdam: Benjamins. pp.15-26.

BARSKY, Robert. (1996) "The Interpreter as Intercultural Agent in Convention Refugee Hearings". *The translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication* 2.1: 45-63

BAUMANN, Greg. (1999) *El enigma intercultural, un replanteamiento de las entidades nacionales, étnicas y religiosas*. Barcelona: Paidós studio.

BERMAN, Antoine. (1989) "La traduction et ses discours". Meta XXXIV : 672-679.

BLOMMAERT, Jan & Maryns, Katrijn. (2001) "Stylistic and thematic shifting as a narrative resource: Assessing asylum seekers' repertoire". *Journal of Cross-Cultural and Inter-language Communication* 20: 1. pp 61–84.

BOURDIEU, Pierre. (2002) *Entretien mené par Antoine Spire assisté de Pascale Casanova et de Miguel Benassayag*. Paris: Edition de l'Aube, *1989-1990*. pp. 19-20.

BOURDIEU, Pierre. (1997) *Méditations Pascaliennes*. Paris: Seuil

BOURDIEU, Pierre. (1994) *Raisons pratiques. Paris: Seuil.*

BOURDIEU, Pierre. (1987) *Choses dites*. Paris: Minuit.

BOURDIEU, Pierre. (1984) *Question de sociologie*. Paris: Minuit.

BOURDIEU, Pierre. (1982) *Ce que parler veut dire.* Libération: 19 de Octubre.

BOURDIEU, Pierre. (1980) *Le sens pratique*. Paris: Minuit

BOURDIEU, Pierre. (1979) *La distinction, critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Minuit.

BRUNETTE, Louise. (2003) "Interpreters in the Community". *Selected papers from the Third International Conference on Interpreting in Legal, Health and Social Settings*. Montréal, Quebec: John Benjamins.

CAMBRIDGE, Jan. (2002). "Unas ideas sobre la interpretación en los centros de salud". *Traducción e Interpretación en los Servicios Públicos: Nueva necesidades para nuevas realidades. Community Interpreting and Translating; New Needs for New Realities.* Eds. C Valero Garcés y G. Mancho. Alcalá de Henares: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad. 52-28

CLUVER, A. (1992) "Trends in changes of translating domains: an overview". *Changes in translating domains*. Eds. H.B Weiss y F.H. Jacobs. New-York: Aldine de Gruyter. 195-216.

CROZIER, Michel y Erhard Friedberg. (1977) *L'acteur et le système, les contraintes de l'action collective*. Paris: Seuil.

FELDMAN, Stephan.M. (2000) *American Legal Thought from Premodernism to postmodernism. An Intellectual Voyage*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

GAMBIER, Yves. (2007) "Y a-t-il une place pour une socio-traductologie?". In Wolf, Michaela y Alexandra Fukari (eds.) 2007. *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam-Philadelfia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. pp. 205-217.

GARRE, Marriane. (1999) *Human Rights in Translation. Legal concepts in different languages*. Copenhagen: Handelshjskolens Forlag & Copenhagen Business School Press.

GAUTHIER, Laura (2009) "En busca de una teoría sociológica de la Traducción e Interpretación en los Servicios Públicos: Análisis de discursos". XXVII Congreso Internacional de AESLA.26-28 de Marzo de 2009.Universidad de Castilla La Mancha: Ciudad Real.

GOUANVIC, Jean-Marc. (2007) "Objectivation, réflexivité et traduction. Pour une re-lecture bourdieusienne de la traduction". In Wolf, Michaela y Alexandra Fukari (eds.) 2007. *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam-Philadelfia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. pp. 79-92.

HEILBRON, Johan y Gisèle Sapiro. (2002) "La traduction littéraire, un objet sociologique". *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 144. pp. 3-6.

INGHILLERI, Moira. (2005) "The sociology of Bourdieu and the construction of the 'object' in translation and interpreting studies". *The Translator* 11:2. pp. 125-145.

INGHILLERI, Moira. (2003) "*Habitus*, field and discourse: Interpreting as a socially-situated activity". *Target* 15:2. pp. 243-268.

LESCH, Harold. (1999) "Community translation: right or privilege". In Erasmus, Mabel (ed.) 1999. *Liaison Interpreting in the Community*. Pretoria: VanSchaik. pp. 90-98.

LUCAS, Francisco Javier de. (1997) "De la cotidianeidad multicultural a la democracia intercultural: Un laberinto de equívocos". In Hernández-Sacristán, Carlos y Morant-Marco, Ricard (eds.) *Lenguaje y emigración*. Valence: Université de Valence.

PALOP-IRANZO, Andrés. (1997) "La interculturalidad: revisión conceptual". In Hernández-Sacristán, Carlos y Morant-Marco, Ricard (eds.) *Lenguaje y emigración*. Valence: Université de Valence.

SIMEÓN, Daniel. (1998) "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's hábitus". *Target* 10. pp. 1-39

VALERO-GARCÉS, Carmen y Anne Martin. (2008) (eds.) *Crossing Borders in Community Interpreting: Definitions and Dilemas*. Ámsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Library Publishing.

VALERO-GARCÉS, Carmen y Guzmán Mancho-Varés (2002) (eds.) *Traducción e Interpretación en los Servicios Públicos: Nuevas necesidades para nuevas realidades / New Needs for New Realities*. Alcala de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá.

VIDAL-CLARAMONTE, Carmen Africa (2005) "Representing the 'Real', Pierre Bourdieu and Legal Translation". *The Translator* 11:2. pp. 259-275

WADENSJO, Cecilia (1993) "The double role of a dialogue interpreter". In Pochhacker, Franz y Miriam Shlesinger (eds.) *The interpreting Studies Reader*. London: Routledge. pp. 355-370.

WADENSJÖ, Cecilia (1998) "Community interpreting". In Baker, Mona (ed.) *Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*. Manchester: Multilingual Matters. pp. 33-37.

WADENSJÖ, Cecilia (1998). *Interpreting as Interaction*. London & New York: Longman.