THE INTERPRETER HEARS VOICES…
ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL PERSPECTIVES
X-RAYED AND INTERPRETED

Juan Miguel Ortega Herráez

juanmiguel.ortega@ua.es
University of Alicante

Catalina Iliescu Gheorghiu

iliescu@ua.es
University of Alicante

Abstract

This paper aims to offer an X-ray of the evolution in Interpreting Studies, from the initial focus on Conference Interpreting to the current boom of Community Interpreting, without neglecting interpreter training, a constant theme in the discipline. Special attention will be paid to the tendencies detected in recent years (among which, a shift towards the history of the field) as well as to those "traditional" insights in Community Interpreting, such as discourse transfer processes, communicative situation specificities, contextual constraints (late 20th century) or the shift towards less agreed upon or elucidated issues (early 21st century), such as the necessary division between mediating and interpreting, quality, the interpreter's role, codes of ethics and dilemmas, including the one on the employment of ad hoc interpreters. Through this paper we aim to contextualize the diverse contributions that make up this volume as an expression of current interests in this discipline.

Resumen

"El intérprete oye voces…perspectivas académicas y profesionales radiografiadas y anotadas"

Este trabajo pretende ofrecer una radiografía de la evolución de los Estudios de Interpretación, desde el interés inicial en la Interpretación de Conferencias hasta el auge

actual de la Interpretación Social, sin olvidar la constante de la investigación en didáctica. Para ello nos detendremos en las tendencias detectadas en los últimos años (entre ellas, un giro historicista), así como en las preocupaciones "tradicionales" en el campo de la Interpretación Social, como son el proceso de traslación discursiva, la especificidad de la situación comunicativa y los condicionantes contextuales (últimas décadas del siglo XX) o el desplazamiento (siglo XXI) hacia cuestiones menos consensuadas o dilucidadas, como la separación necesaria entre los conceptos de mediación e interpretación, la calidad en la interpretación social, el rol del intérprete, los códigos deontológicos y los dilemas éticos, incluido el del uso de intérpretes *ad hoc*. Con ello aspiramos a contextualizar las distintas contribuciones que se enmarcan en este número especial y que son reflejo de los intereses actuales de la investigación en esta disciplina.

Keywords: Interpreting Studies. Interpreting Research. Conference Interpreting. Public Service Interpreting. Community Interpreting. Interpreter training.

Palabras clave: Estudios de Interpretación. Investigación en Interpretación. Interpretación de Conferencias. Interpretación en los Servicios Públicos. Interpretación Social. Didáctica de la interpretación.

1. Research in interpreting: first steps and general trends

An overview on the state of the art of Interpreting research, including both teaching and professional activity issues, is necessary to establish the general framework within which the research contained in this volume has been carried out.

This volume is fully devoted to Interpreting, and includes several studies offering an update on some of the most pressing issues for academics and professionals. Six years have had to go by for *MonTI* to devote two complete volumes to this discipline, a fact that speaks of the evolution of Interpreting as a part of Translation and Interpreting Studies. The first volume of *MonTI* included an enlightening work by Gile (2009), where the evolution and current status of this discipline were thoroughly analysed. The initial (and exclusive) interest in Conference Interpreting (hereafter, CI), has changed over time to include other genres, such as Community or Public Service Interpreting (hereafter, PSI), terms which will be examined later. This evolution has entailed an increase in the number of topics that are studied, and links with other specialties such as psychology and linguistics have also been drawn. Similarly, Gile (2013) confirms the growing interest in placing the focus of Interpreting research away from the initial hotspots (France, Italy or Spain) and taking it, for example, to China, as it can be seen nowadays.

Our proposal could not ignore this evolution, and so it should be understood not as a monograph, but rather as a radiography of some of the baselines of interpreting that are still controversial or remain unknown to the scientific community.

Due to its professional and academic evolution, CI has a longer history as a subject-matter. Many theoretical and practical analyses have been carried out, and eventually resulted in the creation of a significantly high amount of scientific materials that other areas of interpreting have used as a starting point. The case of PSI, however, is different: its academic development started only recently, despite its long history as a human activity. PSI is now a growing sector with some very specific challenges ahead and a dynamic nature, as the issues dealt with are closely related to the ever-changing social reality. For

these reasons, it was impossible to conceive this volume as a monograph or a top-down analysis, where the editors would draw a series of lines of research to be explored first. It was rather understood as a bottom-up analysis, describing the concerns of the academic community regarding two types of issues. First, new research topics, such as interpreting for gender violence victims in a variety of contexts (Toledano *et al.*), curricular design and training in the post-Bologna era (Martin), interpreters' (self) instruction using new technologies (Sandrelli), and the challenges for efficient court interpreting testing schemes and increasing minority language interpreting capacity (Wallace). Second, those areas that have not been thoroughly studied as of yet and therefore need to be debated: the status of trained and natural or ad-hoc healthcare interpreters (Nevado) and the ethical implications of their work (Cox), the "remote control" of telephone interpreters (Fernández), ethics and deontology in the curriculum (Kalina), interpreter face-saving techniques (Lenglet), and (self) assessment of trainee interpreters (Errico and Morelli).

As mentioned above, research in interpreting was first devoted only to CI. It is not the purpose of this article to examine all the scientific ramifications that have arisen from the numerous theories on CI (such as the *théorie du sens* – theory of sense – or effort model theory). For those purposes, we recommend the outstanding works of Gile, Pöchhacker, Shlesinger and Seleskovitch in the international sphere, or those by Baigorri and Collados in Spain. Nonetheless, we do think it is important to briefly refer to two important issues. Firstly, criticism about the quality and lack of compliance of interpreting research with academic or scientific norms, which Gile compiled (2009: 145) with a view to classifying and explaining their causes. On the one hand, Gile detects poor collaboration among researchers who do not belong to the field of Interpreting but investigate it, without citing the most relevant researchers in the field or, what is worse, without establishing any interaction with them. Regarding environment-related factors, Gile notes that the number of scientific works carried out in this field is quite low (especially if compared to research on Translation), even if the situation has improved in the last few decades thanks to the inclusion of Interpreting in many university study programmes. Experimental research is scarce either because professionals are reluctant to be analysed by an external observer, or because many meetings are strictly confidential. Looking back on the specialised scientific journals published in the last few years we can see that, indeed, there is a great amount of works on CI that still focus on features of the interpreting process, such as *cognitive considerations* – memory (Timarova *et al.*, 2014) or how to measure cognitive load in the simultaneous modality (Seeber, 2013; Seeber

2011); *linguistic features* – language in consecutive interpreting notes (Abuín González, 2012), English as the *lingua franca* (Albl-Mikasa, 2013); *phonetics* – non-native accents in the perception of quality in simultaneous interpreting (Cheung, 2013), or the similarities between closely-related languages such as Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian (Hlavac, 2013); *situation characteristics* – interpreting questions and answers sessions in international conferences (Chang & Wu, 2009); *emotional considerations* – interpreters' self-defence mechanisms (Monacelli, 2009) and interpreting under extreme circumstances (Meuleman & Van Besien, 2009).

The second remarkable aspect is the tendency in the last few years to engage in interpreting research from a historical perspective. This approach has been long and thoroughly studied in Translation, but we believe that its rise is newer to Interpreting. For this reason, after publishing landmark works regarding the early days of conference interpreting (such as Baigorri, 2000), there was an increase in the number of studies on key moments in the history of the profession: interpreting in nazi concentration camps (Wolf, 2013); Doña Marina / La Malinche, Hernán Cortés' interpreter during the conquest of Mexico (Valdeón, 2013); interpreting in the conquest of the Canarian archipelago (Sarmiento Pérez, 2011); the first diplomatic interpreters in Spain (Cárceres-Würsig, 2012); and Arabic interpreters in the Spanish Protectorate in Morocco (Arias & Feria, 2012). These are just a few of the many analyses carried out within this trend, which, as could be expected, has a parallel move in Community Interpreting research.

2. Widening the scope to other genres: difficulties in taxonomy and nomenclature

Already ten years ago, Schäffner (2004: 3) said that Interpreting research, which had already been translated into works such as *The Interpreter Studies Reader* (Pöchhacker & Shlesinger, 2002), symmetrical to Venuti's, was much younger than its sister field, Translation. According to Schäffner, research had so far focused on the interpreting process and paid special attention to the simultaneous mode within CI, even if "community interpreting and similar forms of face-to-face interaction have recently seen more attention". Similarly, in their manual on liaison interpreting, Collados and Fernández (2001: 83) warned about the rise of a new tendency "pointing to new modalities in oral mediation, regarded as 'members of the same family'" (*cf*. Alexieva 1997; Hertog 1999), or, at least, capable of laying bridges between them and influencing each other from a theoretical, professional and didactic point of view (*cf*. Mikkelson 1996; Gentile 1997; Smirnov 1997).

As the reader can see, the present issue contains a higher number of articles on PSI, focusing specifically on communicative events that take place in healthcare and social/welfare contexts. In contrast, there is only one article entirely devoted to interpreting in a court context, which leads us to analyse the relatively thorny issue of drawing the boundaries of PSI or Community Interpreting, and establishing the specific fields it covers, alongside the debate on the term that best defines this activity.

It is important to remember that Roberts (2002: 157-175) had already divided interpreting into three categories: Conference Interpreting, Court Interpreting and Community Interpreting. She also offered an overview of the status of both professional practice and teaching of Community Interpreting, an activity which had been less frequently addressed by academics despite being an older activity in the history of humanity; Roberts herself has traced the presence of professional interpreters in Canada back to 1534. Other researchers also claim that Community Interpreting is of earlier appearance: Alonso (2010) admits that *ad-hoc* interpreters have been used in very different contexts throughout the history of humanity, but also confirms the activity (sometimes perfectly regulated) of social and cultural intermediaries working for the authorities during the Reconquista of the Iberian Peninsula (known as "alfaqueques") and the Spanish Conquest of the Americas (nahuatlatos). Giambruno (2008) has also conducted research on interpreting during this period in history.

Allow us to close this historical digression and focus again on the efforts currently being made by the research community to classify interpreting genres. In Jiménez Ivars' proposal (1999), visible differences were drawn between court interpreting and medical/healthcare interpreting. Other authors have taken even more extreme approaches stating that "community-interpreting" could not be regarded as a professional category (González *et. al.*, 1991) given the fact that most interpreters in the sector were, at the time, *amateurs*. Nowadays, researchers seem to have evolved away from such ideas. Otherwise, it would not be possible to explain Mikkelson's warning (1996) on how conference and court interpreters' effort to distance themselves from other types of interpreting, which had become a pattern in the profession (at least in the USA), had lead each tiny group of professionals to go to great lengths to distinguish themselves from untrained interpreters, rather than banding together to win a place at the table.

Be that as it may, the debate on whether court interpreting and PSI belong to the same category has moved beyond academic circles and reached the profession and its regulatory bodies. And so the recently adopted *ISO/FDIS 13611*

Standard (Interpreting – Guidelines for Community Interpreting), draws a clear line between both fields, mainly based upon the existing amount of regulations and rules, which are especially relevant in the judicial sphere. However, the standard also states that certain communicative events and encounters are halfway between both categories: prisons, police stations, immigration centres, asylum-related interviews, law firms, etc. With a view to further analysing this dichotomy, ISO will soon start a new project to establish guidelines for language services in judicial settings. In parallel to this, Abril Martí (2006: 32-82) proposes a wide, comprehensive classification of PSI made on the basis of the common traits observed within the different sub-specialties: participants in the communicative event, the roles they play and the relationships that are established between them (power relationships and cultural heterogeneity); aim, format (dyadic and dialogic) and configuration (specialised and institutionalised professional background) of the communicative situation; type of text/discourse and strategies applied in its elaboration.

Even the name of this interpreting genre has been widely debated on, and many labels have been applied to this specialty during its relatively short life as a research field. Therefore, while English tries to come up with specific terms to define this ever-diverse reality (*Ad hoc, Liaison, Community, Public Service, Community-based* or *Cultural Interpreting*), Spanish tends to adopt a series of terms that do not always succeed in identifying the complexity of the situations and proceedings typical of this activity. This led to the creation of labels such as *Interpretación Comunitaria* (a calque of the English term Community Interpreting which was not very successful), *Interpretación Social* (literally, social interpreting), *Interpretación en los Servicios Públicos* (public service interpreting), *Interpretación de Enlace* (liaison interpreting)*,* and *Interpretación Bilateral* (bilateral interpreting). Nowadays, the terms, sometimes used interchangeably, that have prevailed in the Spanish context are *Interpretación en los Servicios Públicos* (Public Service Interpreting) and, to a lesser extent, as a result of a long debate on its use and misunderstood connotations, *Interpretación Social* (which would be closer to the term Community Interpreting) (cf. Ortega Herráez, 2010: 5-7). On the other hand are the terms linking interpreting and mediation: face-to-face mediation (therefore excluding remote mediation, which would later on claim its own place among the current interpretation modalities), linguistic mediation and intercultural mediation*,* even if Pöchhaker (2008) warned about the risk of this current lack of clarity between terms and concepts, especially after the publication of works such as *Liaison Interpreting in the Community* (Erasmus, 1999), which

included entire chapters devoted to explaining intercultural mediation training models.

It was precisely the limitations of this situational classification that made Mason (1999) advocate for the use of the term *dialogue interpreting* in his illuminating introduction for the special issue he edited for *The Translator*. He aimed to perform a systematic and single-scoped analysis of a complete range of characteristics related to the interpersonal dimension of spontaneous face-to-face communication. Mason's work was thus rooted in early empirical research (Lang 1978; Harris 1981) on the judicial situation in Papua New Guinea and in the behaviour of untrained natural interpreters. He showed the academic world that there was life beyond CI, a life full of new challenges for researchers: role conflicts, group-inherent loyalty, participative framework, and face negotiation. All these aspects were grouped within the same discipline, which therefore included an extremely heterogeneous variety of situations: police, immigration and welfare services interviews, doctor-patient interaction, client-solicitor conversations, business negotiations, court proceedings, and even interpreting TV talk shows. Despite the fact that the use of the term "dialogue interpreting" may entail a risk to exclusively identifying it with the dialogue consecutive technique, which is known to be the most frequent in the settings aforementioned, Mason himself states that the term also includes simultaneous interpreting when it is used in face-to-face interaction.

Within this genre, Mason had already detected the scientific community's preference for more sensitive situations influenced by power, distance or face, while dialogue interpreting for business or diplomacy, where such threats seemed less frequent, received lesser attention. In fact, when analysing the roles of interlocutors, Cambridge (2002) proves that this modality is more widely used in situations entailing a crisis, vulnerability and loss of control, for "nobody requests an interpreter for a shopping trip", whereas Cheng Zang (2012), in an article on dialogue interpreting in high-level political meetings, criticised the lack of literature along these lines, which contrasts with the significant amount of studies on CI within the political and institutional field.

Not to forget the popular expression "Interpreting is interpreting", attributed to Roberts (2002), which summarises most of the current debate on the above mentioned taxonomic considerations (cf. Abril Martí, 2006: 26-33), and Pöchhacker's (2007: 12) "throughout most of history, interpreting was simply interpreting with little need for subcategorisation". It is essential to note that these classifications, as well as any other that may ever be designed according to a different set of criteria, arose as a result of researchers' need to dimension and delimit the framework within which the subject-matter is

analysed. Therefore, Mason (1999) himself says that analyses based upon situational differences, as well as those rooted in the interpersonal dimension of communication (which he slightly prefers), are equally valid. Along the same line of research, Pöchhacker (2007: 12) describes how the traditional classification based upon interpreting modalities ceased to be useful with the rise of new professional contexts where the "social sphere of interaction in which interpreting takes place" is crucial. Maybe for this reason, Pöchhacker's approach is similar to Mason's: he stands for a paradigm based upon interaction discourse analysis, for it makes it possible to bring different theoretical and methodological approaches together. He even warns about the risks of establishing independent paradigms solely on the basis of the professional field where research takes place, which, according to him, would not benefit interpreting research as a discipline.

3. Spain: in the spotlight of Interpreting research

Be that as it may, Interpreting research is certainly very varied and includes analyses from very different perspectives. It can sometimes even be difficult to draw a clear line between them, for it is possible to use paradigms such as Pöchhacker's as a basis and limit them to a single subject-matter within a very specific situational context. This is shown in our radiography, which is purely a sample of how heterogeneous can research perspectives on this field be in our days.

By way of illustration of such a diversified panorama in research, the situation in Spain will be briefly analysed. Surprising as it may be for some, Spain is, according to Gile (2009, 2013), at the core of CI research (together with France, Italy, and now China) as per the number of doctoral dissertations. This is quite a shocking piece of information given the evolution and presence of interpreter training in the Spanish university context, which has not been especially favourable for research in the field. The first undergraduate degrees in Translation and Interpreting offered in Spain had a three-year duration (*diplomatura*), which meant that it was not possible for students to further their training with doctoral studies. Also, training in interpreting was very scarce in two of the three universties where this *diplomatura* was available, which made the University of Granada the only Spanish university that since the 80s had the necessary staff, premises and technical means to train interpreters, ultimately resulting in a boost in research on this discipline (Padilla, 2002). This is why, since the first PhD dissertation back in 1995 by Dr Presentación Padilla (*Memoria y atención en la interpretación de lenguas*), Spain has experienced a boom in Interpreting Studies, with 15 PhDs on CI

until 2009, which stands for 16% of the total worldwide since the 70s, according to the data of CIRIN Bulletin (Gile, 2013). Furthermore, there would be approximately 10 more PhDs to add to these between 2009 and 2014, according to the data provided by CIRIN and TESEO, the Spanish Ministry of Education PhD database.

It should also be noted that the information from the previous paragraph does not include PhD dissertations within the field of PSI. The first thesis on this new field of doctoral research was defended by Dr Cynthia Miguélez in 1997, almost in parallel to the first theses on Conference Interpreting, and analysed court interpreting (*Language mediation in the judicial system: the role of the court interpreter*). The main difference was probably that, while research pace in CI remained stable during the next few years, as already mentioned, PSI research had to wait almost ten years until the field became consolidated and doctoral research bloomed with the works of Ortega Herráez (2006) and Abril Martí (2006), which were followed by 11 more doctoral theses until 2014, according to the data of the Comunica network. This evolution is clearly following a similar trend to that described by Gile, which was previously discussed here. Moreover, continuity in the field seems guaranteed, for a dozen more PhD dissertations are in progress and interest on PSI is rising, as shown by the MA and and even BA theses conducted.[1] Regarding the topics covered, four of the fourteen theses that have been defended so far focus on general PSI issues, two specialise on the healthcare sector, and eight deal with legal-judicial issues (including prisons). Ongoing doctoral work, on the other hand, seems to provide a more balanced overview on the field, since it focuses on a variety of subjects. Maybe this apparent over-representation of court interpreting research is due to the evolution of the profession itself, as will be explained below.

4. Legal interpreting research: precursor of PSI research

Research on legal interpreting, in particular court interpreting, appeared before other PSI subgenres. In fact, according to prior evidence, one of the first studies on this subgenre dates back to the late 1970s, as already mentioned, when Lang (1976, 1978) highlighted the importance of the interpreter's behaviour on the different participants in legal hearings in Papua New Guinea and how the elements of such behaviour (gaze, posture and gestures) may determine to what extent the interpreter is included in the communicative exchange.

---

1. Red Comunica is a Spanish network of researchers in the field of PSI, which is currently drafting a catalogue of research works on a variety of PSI-related topics in Spain.

We must not forget that this professional field is much more regulated than the rest, to the extent that Ozolins (1999) includes a special category, which he calls "the *legalistic* approach" to his classification of the types of official response to communication needs in multilingual settings, taking into account that there is a clear distinction, at very different levels, on the type of response that could be found in areas such as the legal or the social and healthcare fields. That regulation seems crucial when promoting the professional development of legal interpreting. So much so that, regarding some authors, it turns it into a genre by itself — as already observed.

Research on legal interpreting is very broad and varied. On the one hand, there is a solid path of research based on linguistics mainly revolving around the discourse analysis of interpreter-mediated communicative encounters. Hence, we can find classical studies such as those conducted by Hale (2004) or Berk-Seligson (1990), who observed how the interpreter is able to interfere in the control of the communicative situation and how some legal operators, making use of their own professional duties, "manipulate" that situation. The convergence with linguistic studies is such that interpreting studies within legal and police settings may be considered another branch of Forensic Linguistics.

We must also highlight the fact that the legal and judicial field has been subject to linguistic studies that address the role of the interpreter as a coordinator within the triadic communicative encounter. The seminal work by Wadensjö (1998), *Interpreting as Interaction,* which focused on immigration interviews, is one of the most significant studies in the field. In the same vein, in the volumes edited by Mason (1999 and 2001), most of the studies addressing the legal field focus on the study of interpreter-mediated courtroom communication (especially in oral languages, but also, in some cases, sign languages). However, the recent volume edited by Baraldi and Gavioli (2012) is mainly focused on communicative encounters that take place outside the legal field (doctor-patient communication, TV talk shows, job interviews).

Due to different reasons, the role of the interpreter within the communicative exchange, as well as his/her ethical behaviour and professional status, have also been addressed through qualitative and observational methodologies used in Social Sciences (for instance, surveys through the use of questionnaires; observational studies; analysis of interviewee interpreter narratives; ethnographic reports, etc.). Among the studies that follow this type of methodologies, we can mention the one conducted by Ortega Herráez (2006), in which the existing difference between what the codes of ethics propose and the "professional" daily practice of a representative group of court interpreters

working in Spain is highlighted. As interpreters seemed to take a more active and visible role than was expected from them, attention should be paid to the extent to which such role would interfere with legal operators' decision-making or procedural strategies.

As for Martin and Taibi (2012) and Martin and Ortega (2014), they also address issues related to the role of legal interpreters within the context of the Madrid train bomb trial. In this case, from hearing transcriptions and recordings, as well as the narrative of interpreters, they explore the use of simultaneous interpreting in the hearing, which facilitated interpreter invisibility, given their physical separation from the rest of actors in the courtroom. However, the use of that mode also put an end to the triadic face-to-face relation between actors, which increased the feeling among legal operators that interpreting is a mechanic activity and also made them feel that they were losing control over interpreters and the interpreting process itself. Professional socialisation of interpreters was also shown to be crucial in order to guarantee the success of the interpreting assignment, despite the technical problems that occurred. Without a doubt, these pieces of research are valuable contributions to the discussion on the possible similarities and differences between conference and legal interpreting.

The same observational methodologies are also used by Ortega and Foulquié (2008) within the police context and by Martínez-Gómez (2011) in prison settings. As we can see, there is a wide range of fields, situations and communicative encounters that have been looked up thanks to this type of methodologies.

Hale's (2008) proposal on the role of the interpreter could be applied in most of these studies cited. According to her, the interpreter's role may vary depending on to what extent requirements such as accuracy on the conveyance of pragmatic meaning and impartiality are observed. At the same time, such requirements are subject to the interpreters' awareness of role, with "advocate for the powerless participant" at one end of the spectrum and "faithful renderer of the original utterances" (high level of accuracy in the conveyance of meaning and structures, as well as total impartiality, delegating the responsibility of this act to the ones that perform it) at the other end. This last role is the one recommended by the author for legal settings, as in her opinion, it implies less risks than the rest of roles, although she admits that the assumption of this role does not necessarily mean that interpreters act as mindless machines without power of discernment.

Another important part of studies on the legal and judicial field, although not always considered "research" by the most traditional approaches, but

without a doubt worth highlighting due to the degree of transference of the results to society, is formed by contributions of educational (manuals, teaching resources of different types), professional (position reports, recommendations, good practice guidelines) or even of political (act plans, legislation, etc.) nature. Among these studies, the results of the different projects funded by the European Union within the criminal justice context are of special interest. Ultimately, these results have allowed EU authorities to gain further understanding of the professional reality of legal and judicial interpreting in the Member States and to pass specific legislation on this issue which must be incorporated to the national legislation. In addition, thanks to these projects, interpreters, interpreter trainers and the authorities themselves have more resources at their disposal. Contributions such as the one made by Toledano *et al*. in this volume, haven taken shape within one of these applied research projects, the Speak out for Support (SOSVICS) project.

5. Recurring issues on this subject

As a counterpart of those first perceptions (the translator as a machine) or metaphors, such as the conduit metaphor evoked by Reddy (1979) and revisited by Mason in 2004, on grounds of which Roy (1990) suggested a self-perception problem for interpreters (whose role in interpreting still remained uncertain), a series of descriptive studies came out in the nineties. These descriptive studies coexisted with prescriptive viewpoints which made such recommendations as "the interpreter should be as close to verbatim and literal in content and meaning as possible" (Berk-Seligson 1990). However, these recommendations were not sufficient and given the flows detected in the explanation of different professional criteria, researchers had to rely on theories borrowed from the field of sociology.

In this analysis of Interpreting research focused on the aspects addressed in this volume, in which the interest in Community Interpreting prevails, we consider it convenient to go back to 1999, when Mason identified four lines of research in conversational interpreting: (1) **Participation framework**, covering what Goffman labelled as *interaction order* and his answer to situation and communicative setting limits, a fertile land first discovered by Mona Baker's book *Translation and Conflict* (2006) and cultivated by Tebble and Wadensjö from an Interpreting approach. The approach that addresses the interpreter's visibility in war zones may stand out in this field. According to Inghilleri (2004), it leads to another line of research: **the concepts of power and face** in social interpreting that have been investigated by Tebble (1999) and Krouglov (1999) in the use of litotes (*hedges*). Within this field, Mason highlighted the

need for a deep study which was followed by Stewart (2001). Initially, these studies were carried out from empirical data gathered by researchers to which linguistic theories mainly focused on conversational analysis were applied. Later on, these theories evolved into a more abstract perspective whose topics of interest were focused on rules, power and ideology. (3) **The lexical choice** and its value in the synchronous or simultaneous speech or a medium-term speech in transcultural situations and the ways of negotiating the most appropriate speech is one of the lines of research that researchers have not been able to investigate in greater detail, apart from studies on ad hoc interpreters as the one conducted by Meyer (2001), Bührig and Meyer (2004) on the transference of meaning, as the ones conducted by Guo (2013) and Tao (1996) reminding us of Consorte's functional point of view or Tebble's hallidayan approach to the registers. (4) **The interpreter's visibility** and the analysis of the audience when it is wrongly considered monolingual is a line of research based on basic studies as the one carried out by Pym (1999) on the O. J. Simpson trial, or the one conducted by Straniero (1999) on TV programmes such as chat shows and how this direct and indirect receptive audience has an influence on the interpreter's style.

In this sense, Angelelli (2000: 580) addresses quality criteria in social interpreting and warns us against the negative consequences of blind transference of quality criteria of CI into the social field, having its own special features and complexities. According to Angelelli, there are more differences than similarities in this field. In fact, Garzone (2000: 97) takes a step forward and, from a methodological point of view, hesitates about the reliability for the analysis of the written transcription of an oral speech that, as she verifies, had coherence, logic, and was understandable by its original public. Quality criteria are related with one of the touchstones of interpreting: ethics, addressed in our volume by Kalina, preceded by authors such as: Baker and Maier (2011), who thoroughly studied ethical issues in training, implying the awareness of responsibilities in society by the interpreter; Dean and Pollard (2011), on the binding dependence of the context that shapes ethic precepts; or Tipton (2011), who addresses ethical, cultural and professional issues in training between the interpreter and the military personnel in war zones such as Iraq. Brander de la Iglesia (2013: 255-273) cites theoretical reasons in favour of training interpreters so they can be aware of the differences between *ethics* in a philosophical sense, *deontology* as a part of ethics that establishes the rules concerning one profession and *applied ethics* as the branch that is in charge of creating behaviour codes and rules. With approaches such as those conducted by Harris (2003), Martínez Navarro (2010), Diriker (2004), Apostolou (2005)

and a great amount of studies on ethics and ideology in translation (Hermans, Pym, Munday, and especially Baker), from which interpreting does not seem to have taken benefits, the ethical dilemma that takes place between the principle of impartiality and the interpreter's inner morality is still present. This is especially visible in the field of Community Interpreting, which is not regulated in Spain yet (unlike other countries) leading to changes in the interpreter's perspective and position. Innovative studies such as the one conducted by Alexander *et al.* 2004 (in a British context) have investigated these dilemmas from an interdisciplinary approach. The same applies to Martínez-Gómez's innovative approach (2011) mentioned before, verifying what Schäffner (2004: 3) had already noticed when drafting the research panorama of this field. In other words, if the interpreting process had drawn all the attention until then, now other equally important aspects appeared on the scene such as "the communicative and social dimensions of interpreting as well as ethical and sociological issues".

This brief review allows us to observe that the last decade of the 20th century provided studies on the speech conveying process or on the special features of the communicative situation and the contextual determinants that are involved in the conversational analysis within the field of Community Interpreting. On the contrary, during the first decade of the 21st century the scientific community was worried about new issues in their content or methodology (power, courtesy, relevance) or issues that were still to be elucidated, such as the necessary separation between concepts of mediation and interpreting, Community Interpreting quality, the interpreter's role, codes of ethics and ethical dilemmas, including the use of ad hoc interpreters, rather than issues that were more or less settled. Ad hoc interpreters within social contexts, and especially the use of children in doctor-patient communication, is a recurring analysis point which was firstly studied by Cambridge, Pöchhacker or Kadric, followed by Bührig and Meyer (2004), who address aspects such as informed consent and difficulties that the intercultural dimension implies. In this sense, although broadening the spectrum, other authors such as Baraldi and Gavioli (2007) investigate the emotional factor, which is very significant in medical interpreting, starting with empirical studies such as those carried out by Bolden (2000), Davidson (2000), Kim (2001) or Tebble (1999) in order to identify to what extent the conversational mediator has access to "the feelings of the speakers" and has the chance of "promoting affective expectations" on their behalf.

6. Research on teaching: a constant in Interpreting Studies

Meanwhile, the academic world is still worried about issues related to interpreter training, a constant as we have been able to observe in the different research paradigms. In fact, as Gile (2009) mentioned, at the beginning, at least in the western world, CI research was not only carried out by professional interpreters, but it was exclusively focused on the didactic application of theoretical models, such as the theory of sense (through, among others, the study conducted by Seleskovitch and Lederer (1989) *Pédagogie Raisonnée de l'Interprétation*), aimed at explaining the interpreting process in isolation and without relying on psychological or linguistic research. Indeed, that paradigm has exerted an enormous influence on interpreter training for many years. As a consequence, this pursued connection between theory/research and teaching, according to Iglesias (2007: 98, 106), may have not been fully reached due to the fact that (conference) interpreting training programmes were not just based on theoretical models such as the one mentioned above, but were also heavily conditioned by the postulates of AIIC (International Association of Conference Interpreters) when it came to defining trainers' profile, directionality, content sequencing or the type of training (undergraduate vs. postgraduate). Furthermore, in the early stages, the direct application of theoretical paradigms to teaching models did not seem to be clear.

Nevertheless, this has been gradually mitigated thanks to the consolidation of Interpreting Studies, their uncontested presence in the university context and their relative independence from some postulates elaborated in the professional world. Not to mention the evolution of such postulates, for instance, AIIC`s, where traditionally controversial issues have started to be openly and unreservedly addressed in the past few years (for example, organising and sponsoring seminars for interpreter trainers on how to teach interpreting into a B language). The evolution of theoretical models is followed by their application to the teaching context. Proposals such as Gile's Effort Models (1985), mainly designed for teaching, are a good evidence of this; as well as contributions made by Gran and Fabbro (1988) based on Neurophysiology or research on Cognitive Psychology conducted by Padilla (1995) addressing issues related to the training process.

Curricular design constitutes, as far as teaching is concerned, another important aspect. As we have already observed, shaping training programmes has originated numerous debates. As Sawyer (2004) exposed in the prologue of *Fundamental Aspects of Interpreter Education*, this is a field that is "under-researched and under-studied", despite the existence of different proposals

(linear model, Y-model, parallel model, etc.) on the organisation of interpreting training programmes (cf. Iglesias 2007, for a general overview).

Over the years, these have been the foundations on which an extensive literature has been elaborated; both researchers and trainers have made new and necessary contributions of training-curricular nature within Interpreting Studies. All this has been possible thanks to the consolidation of the discipline as a research subject-matter, the appearance of specific programmes focused on interpreting trainer and research training (apart from the numerous PhD programmes all over the world, the Master of Arts in Interpreter Training at ETI in Geneva should be mentioned by way of illustration), the organisation of scientific meetings with specific panel discussions on teaching in which trainers can exchange ideas and methodologies with other colleagues, the appearance of journals specifically focused on teaching (for instance, *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*) or the curricular revision that took place in the European Union with the Bologna Process.

This tendency within Interpreting Studies is in very good shape, especially in Spain, where recent research has explored some of the currently debated issues in the field of interpreter training, alongside other issues which could have a significant influence in this field. By way of illustration we could mention, among others, the studies carried out by: Abril Martí (2006) on the curricular basis of PSI; Manuel Jerez (2006) on the application of new technologies and action research; Blasco Mayor (2007) on developing aural skills in the source language in order to improve interpreting training; Opdenhoff (2011) on directionality in interpreting; Hunt Gómez (forthcoming) on the design of real teaching material aimed at legal interpreter training, or Calvo Encinas (2010), who does not forget interpreting in her study on curricular design. Without a doubt, training issues have drawn the attention of researchers since the beginning of the discipline and it is transversally found in all of its variants, whether Conference, Community or Legal Interpreting — although not all of them have shown the same degree of interest nor the same efforts have been dedicated to research those topics, which is the reason why some fields have experienced golden ages over the rest.

7. Instead of conclusions...

Taking into account this complex panorama, this volume has been organised over three main sections within the interpreting activity: interpreting in the social field, interpreter training innovation and the presence of ethics in both the profession and training, as well as some current issues noticed by researchers and trainers of this field. We therefore delve in aspects such as:

community interpreting practice (in one of its newly explored variants, gender violence contexts), deontology and ethical dilemmas (among them, the invisibility of interpreters), the controversial need to visualise remote interpreting, the recurring discussion on the uncertainty of the community interpreter's role (from which many hesitations have arisen when defining quality standards), interpreter training in Spain after the EU harmonisation process, the role of new technologies in interpreter training, as well as an issue arising from the theory of politeness and very common in communicative situations in which there is a power asymmetry, namely face threatening acts (FTA). This concept is applied to simultaneous interpreting situations, somehow unexpectedly, since we usually find it in community interpreting stances. In short, this volume aims to offer a comprehensive overview based on several analytical foci, intertwining research and teaching approaches upon the professional reality interpreters have to face. In their professional practice interpreters experience doubts and perplexities which they have to systematically solve and overcome, whether they are of conceptual, ethical or functional nature. In that process the role theorists and trainers play is of utmost importance and makes a necessary contribution for the advancement of the ancient legacy of such a fascinating and complex profession. Ultimately, this volume constitutes a point of convergence and reason for new research.

References

ABRIL, María Isabel. (2006) *La Interpretación en los Servicios Públicos: Caracterización como Género, Contextualización y Modelos de Formación. Hacia unas Bases para el Diseño Curricular*. Granada: Universidad de Granada.

ABUÍN GONZÁLEZ, Marta. (2012) "The language of consecutive interpreters' notes: differences across levels of expertise." *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 14:2, pp. 55-72.

ALBL-MIKASA, Michaela. (2013) "ELF speakers' restricted power of expression." *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 8:2, pp. 191-210.

ALEXANDER, Claire; Rosalind Edwards & Bogusia Temple; with Usha Kanani; Liu Zhuang; Mohig Miah & Anita Sam. (2004) *Access to services with interpreters: User views*. York: Rowntree Foundation. Electronic version available at: http://www.jfr.org.uk/book-shop/eBooks/1859352294.pdf.

ALONSO, Icíar. (2010) "Figuras mediadoras y espacios fronterizos. Algunos lugares comunes." In: Various authors (Grupo Alfaqueque). 2010. *Los límites de Babel*. Madrid/Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert, pp. 47-76.

ANGELELLI, Claudia. (2000) "Interpretation as a Communicative Event: A Look through Hymes' Lenses." *Meta* 45:4, pp. 580-592.

Apostolou, Fotini. (2009) "Mediation, manipulation, empowerment: Celebrating the complexity of the interpreter's role." *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 11:1, pp. 1-19.

Arias, Juan Pablo & Manuel Feria. (2012) *Los traductores de árabe del Estado español: del Protectorado a nuestros días*. Barcelona: Bellaterra.

Baigorri Jalón, Jesús. (2000) *La interpretación de Conferencias. El nacimiento de una profesión. De París a Nüremberg*. Granada: Comares.

Baker, Mona. (2006) *Translation and Conflict*. London: Routledge.

Baker, Mona & Carol Maier. (2011) "Ethics in Interpreter and Translator Training." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 5:1, pp. 1-14.

Baraldi, Claudio & Laura Gavioli. (2007) "Dialogue interpreting as intercultural mediation." In: Grein, Marion & Edda Weigand (eds.) (2007) *Dialogue and culture*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 155-175.

Baraldi, Claudio & Laura Gavioli (eds.) (2012) *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Berk-Seligson, Susan. (1990) *The Bilingual Courtroom: Court Interpreters in the Judicial Process*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Blasco Mayor, María Jesús. (2007) *La comprensión oral en el desarrollo de la pericia de la interpretación de conferencias*. Granada: Comares.

Bolden, Galina B. (2000) "Towards Understanding Practices of Medical Interpreting: Interpreters' involvement in history taking." *Discourse Studies* 2:4, pp. 387-419.

Brander de la Iglesia, María. (2013) "Does it pay to be good? Quality and Ethics in Interpreter Education." In: García Becerra, Olalla; E. Macarena Pradas Macías & Rafael Barranco-Droege (eds.) 2013. *Quality in interpreting: widening the scope. Vol. 2*. Granada: Comares, pp. 255-274.

Bührig Kristin & Bernd Meyer. (2004) "*Ad hoc*-interpreting and the achievement of communicative purposes in doctor-patient-communication." In: House, Juliane & Jochen Rehbein (eds.) 2004. *Multilingual Communication*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 43-62.

Cáceres-Würsig, Ingrid. (2012) "The *jeunes de langues* in the eighteenth century: Spain's first diplomatic interpreters on the European model." *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 14:2, pp. 127-144.

Calvo Encinas, Elisa. (2010) *Análisis curricular de los estudios de traducción e interpretación en España*. Granada: Universidad de Granada.

Cambridge, Jan. (2002) "Interlocutor Roles and the Pressures on Interpreters." In: Valero Garcés, Carmen & Guzmán Mancho Barés (eds.) 2002. *Traducción e Interpretación en los Servicios Públicos: Nuevas Necesidades para Nuevas Realidades. Community Interpreting and Translating: New Needs for New Realities*. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá, pp. 121-126.

CHANG, Chia-chien & Min-chia Wu. (2009). "Address forms shifts in interpreted Q&A sessions." *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 11:2, pp. 164-189.

CHEUNG, Andrew K.F. (2013) "Non-native accents and simultaneous interpreting quality perceptions." *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 15:1, pp. 25-47.

COLLADOS AÍS, Ángela & María Manuela Fernández Sánchez. (2001) "Fundamentos teóricos de la interpretación bilateral." In: Collado Aís, Ángela & María Manuela Fernández Sánchez (eds.) 2001. *Manual de interpretación bilateral.* Granada: Comares.

DAVIDSON, Brad. (2000) "The Interpreter as Institutional Gatekeeper: The social-linguistic role of interpreters in Spanish-English medical discourse." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4:3, pp. 379-405.

DE MANUEL, Jesús. (2006) *La incorporación de la realidad profesional a la formación de intérpretes de conferencias mediante las nuevas tecnologías y la investigación-acción.* Granada: Universidad de Granada.

DEAN, Robyn K. & Robert Q. Pollard. (2011) "Context-based Ethical Reasoning in Interpreting." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 5:1, pp. 155-182.

DIRIKER, Ebru. (2004) *De-/re-contextualizing conference interpreting: interpreters in the ivory tower?* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

ERASMUS, Mabel. (1999) *Liaison Interpreting in the Community*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

GARZONE, Giulana. (2000) "Quality and norms in interpretation." In: Garzone, Giuliana & Maurizio Viezzi (eds.) (2000) *The critical link 2: Interpreting in the 21st century.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 107-119.

GIAMBRUNO, Cynthia. (2008) "The role of the interpreter in the governance of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spanish colonies in the 'New World': Lessons from the past to the present." In: Valero Garcés, Carmen & Anne Martin (eds.) 2008. *Crossing Borders in Community Interpreting: Definitions and Dilemmas*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 24-49.

GILE, Daniel. (1985) "Le modèle d'efforts et l'équilibre d'interprétation en interprétation simultanée." *Meta* 30:1, pp. 44-54.

GILE, Daniel. (2009) "Interpreting Studies: A Critical View from Within." In: Vidal, África y Javier Franco (eds.) 2009. *A (Self)-Critical Perspective of Translation Theories. MonTI* 1, pp. 135-156. Electronic version available at: http://rua.ua.es/dspace/handle/10045/13040

GILE, Daniel. (2013) "Institutional, Social and Policy Aspects of Research into Conference Interpreting." In: García Becerra, Olalla; E. Macarena Pradas Macías & Rafael Barranco-Droege (eds.) 2013. *Quality in interpreting: widening the scope.* Granada: Comares, pp. 9-31.

GRAN, Laura & Franco Fabbro. (1988) "The role of neuroscience in the teaching of interpretation." *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 1, pp. 23-41.

GUO, Yijun. (2013) "Towards a model for evaluating meaning transfer quality in consecutive interpreting." In: García Becerra, Olalla; Esperanza Macarena Pradas Macías & Rafael Barranco-Droege (eds.) (2013) *Quality in interpreting: widening the scope. Vol. 1*. Granada: Comares, pp. 57-84.

HALE, Sandra. (2004) *The Discourse of Court Interpreting: Discourse practices of the law, the witness and the interpreter*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

HALE, Sandra. (2008) "Controversies over the role of the court interpreter." In: Valero Garcés, Carmen & Anne Martin (eds.) (2008) *Crossing Borders in Community Interpreting: Definitions and dilemmas*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 99-122.

HARRIS, Brian. (1981) "Observations on a Cause Célèbre: Court Interpreting at the Lischka Trial." In: Roberts, Roda (ed.) 1981. *L'Interprétation auprès des tribunaux*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa.

HARRIS, Brian. (2003) "The need for several standards of conference interpretation." In: Collados Aís, Ángela & José Antonio Sabio Pinilla (eds.) 2003. *Avances en la investigación sobre interpretación*. Granada: Comares, pp. 3-16.

HLAVAC, Jim. (2013) "Interpreting in one's own and in closely related languages: Negotiation of linguistic varieties amongst interpreters of Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian languages." *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 15:1, pp. 94-125.

HUNT GÓMEZ, Coral Ivy. (forthcoming) "Real-based Court Interpreting Didactic Material Using New Technologies." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 9, pp. 321-326.

IGLESIAS, Emilia. (2007) *La didáctica de la interpretación de conferencias: teoría y práctica*. Granada: Comares.

INGHILLERI, Moira. (2004) "Aligning Macro- and Micro-Dimensions in Interpreting Research." In: Schäffner, Christina (ed.) 2004. *Translation Research and Interpreting Research*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 71-76.

JIMÉNEZ IVARS, Amparo. (1999) *La traducción a la vista: un análisis descriptivo*. Castellón: Universitat Jaume I. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Electronic version available at: <http://goo.gl/dESykk>

KIM, Young Yun. (2001) *Becoming Intercultural. An integrative theory of communication and cross-cultural adaptation*. London: Sage.

KROUGLOV, Alexander. (1999) "Police Interpreting. Politeness and Sociocultural Context." In: Mason, Ian (ed.) 1999. *Dialogue Interpreting. The Translator - Special Issue* 5:2, pp. 285-302.

LANG, Ranier. (1976) "Interpreters in Local Courts in Papua New Guinea." In: O'Barr, William M. & Jean F. O'Barr (eds.) 1976. *Language and Politics*. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 327-365.

Lang, Ranier. (1978) "Behavioural Aspects of Liaison Interpreters in Papua New Guinea: Some Preliminary Observations." In: Gerver, David & Wallace H. Sinaiko (eds.) 1978. *Language Interpretation and Communication*. New York: Plenum Press, pp. 231-244.

Martin, Anne & Mustapha Taibi. (2012) "Complexities of high profile interpreting: the case of the Madrid train bomb trial." *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 14:2, pp. 145-164.

Martin, Anne & Juan Miguel Ortega Herráez. (2014) "From invisible machines to visible experts: Views on interpreter role and performance during the Madrid train bomb trial." In: Schäffner, Christina; Krysztof Kredens & Yvonne Fowler (eds.) 2014. *Interpreting in a Changing Landscape*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 101-115.

Martínez-Gómez, Aída. (2011) *La interpretación en instituciones penitenciarias. La relevancia del componente interpersonal en la calidad de la actuación de intérpretes naturales*. Alicante: Universidad de Alicante. Tesis doctoral inédita.

Martínez Navarro, Emilio. (2010) *Ética profesional de los profesores*. Bilbao: Desclée De Brouwer.

Mason, Ian. (1999) "Introduction." En Mason, Ian (ed.) 1999. *Dialogue Interpreting. The Translator - Special Issue* 5:2, pp. 147-160.

Mason, Ian (ed.) (2001) *Triadic Exchanges: Studies in Dialogue Interpreting*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Mason, Ian. (2004) "Conduits, Mediators, Spokespersons: Investigating Translator/Interpreter Behaviour." In: Schäffner, Christina (ed.) 2004. *Translation Research and Interpreting Research. Traditions, Gaps and Synergies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 88-97.

Meulemank, Chris & Fred Van Besien. (2009) "Coping with extreme speech conditions in simultaneous interpreting." *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 11:1, pp. 20-34.

Meyer, Bernd. (2001) "How Untrained Interpreters Handle Medical Terms." In: Mason, Ian (ed.) 2001. *Triadic Exchanges: Studies in Dialogue Interpreting*. Manchester: St. Jerome, pp. 87-106.

Miguélez, Cynthia. (1997) *Language mediation in the judicial system: the role of the court interpreter*. Alicante: Universidad de Alicante. Ph.D. thesis.

Mikkelson, Holly. (1996) "Community Interpreting: An Emerging Profession." *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 1:1, pp. 125-129.

Monacelli, Claudia. (2009) *Self-preservation in Simultaneous Interpreting: Surviving the Role*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ortega Herráez, Juan Miguel. (2006) *Análisis de la práctica de la interpretación judicial en España: el intérprete frente a su papel profesional*. Granada: Universidad de Granada.

Ortega Herráez, Juan Miguel & Ana Isabel Foulquié Rubio. (2008) "Interpreting in Police Settings in Spain: Service Providers' and Interpreters' Perspectives." In: Valero Garcés, Carmen & Anne Martin (eds.) 2008. *Crossing Borders in Community Interpreting: Definitions and Dilemmas*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 123-146.

Opdenhoff, Jan. (2011) *Estudio sobre la direccionalidad en interpretación de conferencias: de las teorías a la práctica.* Granada: Universidad de Granada.

Ozolins, Uldis. (1999) "Communication Needs and Interpreting in Multilingual Settings: the International Spectrum of Response." In: Roberts, Roda P.; Silvana Ester Carr; Diana Abraham & Aideen Dufour (eds.) 1999. *The Critical Link 2. Interpreters in the Community. Selected Papers from the Second International Conference on Interpreting in Legal, Health and Social Service Settings.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 21-33.

Padilla, Presentación. (1995) *Memoria y atención en la interpretación de lenguas.* Granada: Universidad de Granada. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis.

Padilla, Presentación. (2002) "Los estudios de interpretación y la investigación en España." *Puentes: hacia nuevas investigaciones en la mediación intercultural* 1, pp. 71-80.

Pöchhacker, Franz. (2008) "Interpreting as mediation." In: Valero Garcés, Carmen & Anne Martin (eds.) 2008. *Crossing Borders in Community Interpreting. Definitions and Dilemmas*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 9-26.

Pöchhacker, Franz. (2007) "Critical linking up: Kinship and convergence in interpreting studies." In: Wadensjö, Cecilia; Birgitta Englud Dimitrova & Anna-Lena Nilsson (eds.) 2007. *The Critical Link 4: Professionalisation of interpreting in the community*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 11-23.

Pöchhacker, Franz & Miriam Shlesinger (eds.) (2002) *The Interpreting Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.

Pym, Anthony. (1999) "'Nicole Slapped Michelle': Interpreters and Theories of Interpreting at the O.J. Simpson Trial." In: Mason, Ian (ed.) 1999. *Dialogue Interpreting. The Translator - Special Issue* 5:2, pp. 265-284.

Reddy, Michael. (1979) "The Conduit Metaphor: A Case of Frame Conflict in our Language about Language." In: Ortony, Andrew (ed.) 1979. *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 284-324.

Roberts, Roda P. (2002) "Community Interpreting: A Profession in Search of its Identity." In: Hung, Eva (ed.) 2002. *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 4 – Building Bridges*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 157-175.

Roy, Cynthia. (1990) "Interpreters, their Role and Metaphorical Language Use." In: Wilson, Leslie (ed.) 1990. *Looking Ahead: Proceedings of the 31st Annual Conference of the American Translators Association*. Medford, NJ: Learned Information, pp. 76-86.

Sarmiento Pérez, Marcos. (2011) "The role of interpreters in the conquest and acculturation of the Canary Archipelago." *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 13:2, pp. 155-175.

Sawyer, David B. (2004) *Fundamental Aspects of Interpreter Education*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schaffner, Christina. (2004) "Researching Translation and Interpreting." In: Schäffner, Christina (ed.) 2004. *Translation Research and Interpreting Research. Traditions, Gaps and Synergies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 1-9.

Seeber, Kilian G. (2011) "Cognitive load in simultaneous interpreting: Existing theories – new models." *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 13:2, pp. 176-204.

Seeber, Kilian G. (2013) "Cognitive load in simultaneous interpreting: Measures & Methods." *Target* 25:1, pp. 18-32.

Seleskovitch, Danica y Marianne Lederer. (1989) *Pédagogie Raisonnée de l'Interprétation*. Bruselas: Didier Érudition.

Straniero Sergio, Francesco. (1999) "The Interpreter on the (Talk) Show. Interaction and Participation Frameworks." In: Mason, Ian (ed.) 1999. *Dialogue Interpreting. The Translator - Special Issue* 5:2, pp. 221-246.

Tao, Hongyin. (1996) *Units in Mandarin conversation: prosody, discourse and grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tebble, Helen. (1999) "The Tenor of Consultant Physicians. Implications for Medical Interpreting." In: Mason, Ian (ed.) 1999. *Dialogue Interpreting. The Translator - Special Issue* 5:2, pp. 179-200.

Timarová, Šárka; Ivana Čeňková; Reine Meylaerts; Erik Hertog; Arnaud Szmalec & Wouter Duyck. (2014) "Simultaneous interpreting and working memory executive control." *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 16:2, pp. 139-168.

Tipton, Rebecca. (2011) "Relationships of Learning between Military Personnel and Interpreters in Situations of Violent Conflict." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 5:1, pp. 15-40.

Valdeón, Roberto A. (2013). "Doña Marina/La Malinche: A historiographical approach to the interpreter/traitor." *Target* 25:2, pp. 157-179.

Wadensjö. Cecilia. (1998) *Interpreting as Interaction*. Londres: Longman.

Wolf, Michaela. (2013) "'German speakers, step forward!': Surviving through interpreting in Nazi concentration camps." *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 8:1, pp. 1-22.

Zang, Cheng. (2012) "Mediation through personal pronoun shifts in dialogue interpreting of political meetings." *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 14:2, pp. 192-216.

Quine, Willard Von Ormand. (1960) "Translation and Meaning." In: Venuti, Lawrence (ed.) 2000. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Londres: Routledge, pp. 26-33.

Snell-Hornby, Mary. (1988) *Translation Studies. An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Cited in the Spanish translation by Ana Sofía Ramírez: *Estudios de traducción: hacia una perspectiva integradora*. Madrid: Almar, 1999.

Sun, Xue Fen. (2000) *La traduction juridique du français vers le chinois, éléments de réflexion*. París: Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis.

Toury, Gideon. (1986) "Natural Translation and the Making of a Native Translator." *TextContext* 1:1, pp. 11-29.

Various authors. (s.d.) CIRIN: An International Information Network on Conference Interpreting Research. *CIRIN Bulletin*. Electronic version available at: http://cirinandgile.com/earlier_bulletins.htm

Various authors (Instituto de Investigación Pedagógica). (1987) *Los estudios de traducción e intérprete*. Madrid: Fundación Universidad y Empresa.

Various authors (International Standards Organisation - ISO) (2014). *ISO/FDIS 13611 Interpreting –Guidelines for Community Interpreting*. [personal reference].

Various authors (International Standards Organisation - ISO) (2014). *New work item proposal "Guidelines for language services in judicial settings"*. [personal reference]

BIONOTES

Juan Miguel Ortega Herráez, holds a Ph.D. in Translation and Interpreting from the University of Granada, where he presented his dissertation on court interpreting in Spain and the role of the interpreter. He has been a staff interpreter for the Madrid Regional High Court of Justice and the National Police Service in Alicante. He currently lectures at the University of Alicante (Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies). He is member of the GRETI research group based at the University of Granada and has also been actively involved in various EU-funded projects on procedural rights in multicultural and multilingual criminal proceedings. The most recent projects he has been engaged in are: Qualitas (Ensuring LIT Quality through Testing and Certification), SOS-VICS (Speak out for Support) and AVIDICUS 3 (Assessment of Video-Mediated Interpreting in the Criminal Justice System). He has published in legal translation, court interpreting and

the role of interpreters and has recently authored *Interpretar para la Justicia* [Interpreting for Justice] (Comares, 2010). He is founding member and president of the Spanish Professional Association of Court and Sworn Translators and Interpreters (APTIJ).

CATALINA ILIESCU GHEORGHIU holds a BA in Spanish and English (1989) from the University of Bucharest and a PhD (2002) on Relevance Theory and theatrical translation from the University of Alicante, where she is a professor. She is the author of *Introducción a la Interpretación. La modalidad consecutiva* (2000, 2005, 2006, 2009), *Traducerea textului dramatic* (2009) and *Miniaturas de tiempos venideros* (Vaso Roto 2013), a bilingual anthology of contemporary Romanian poets, and she is the editor of LAIC Special Issue (2007, 7:2) *Intercultural Approaches to the Integration of Migrating Minorities* (Routledge) and co-editor of *Universe-Cities as Problematic Global Villages: Continuities and Shifts in Our Academic Worlds* (PGET/UFSC) together with Jose Lambert. She has coordinated EU projects on Intercultural Communication (2002-2005), a machine translation project financed by the Romanian Government (TRAUTOROM) and she has organized International Symposia (Univer-cities, (2008); Translation and Diasporic Identities, 2009 and 2010; among others). She is a conference interpreter and a sworn translator (1995), she chairs ARIPI (2005), a cultural association, and she is the Head of the Summer Courses at her university.