

Integrated monolingualism and audism governing Spanish Sign-Language users' self-determination in the legal system

Esther Monzó-Nebot and Rayco H. González-Montesino
Universitat Jaume I | Universidad Rey Juan Carlos

Many legal systems have begun to adjust their social and linguistic practices to accommodate non-dominant social groups. However, linguistic diversity is often framed as an exception, and interpreters are viewed as a service to address these exceptions rather than as part of broader structural changes to enable access to justice. This article explores the access to and participation in the Spanish legal system of Spanish Sign-Language users (SSLUs) who are deaf or heard of hearing. Through semi-structured interviews with SSLUs, the article elicits their perceptions of the legal field. These data are analyzed from the perspective of self-determination theory (Deci and Ryan 1985) to identify how SSLUs' psychological needs of competence, autonomy, and relatedness are linked to the social, cultural, and economic capital invested and distributed through social practices. The goal is to clarify how SSLUs' habitus sustains or resists monolingual and audist ideologies establishing hierarchies between language communities.

Keywords: social practice, self-determination theory, capital, habitus, monolingualism, audism

Introduction: The law as cooperation and oppression

The law is all-embracing and largely invisible. As the set of binding rules and processes created by our society, the law in large part aligns with our behavior and values (Varner and Varner 2014), establishing what is legitimate, its enforcement, and how deviances are to be corrected or embraced. The law has been defined as “governmental social control” (Black 1976: 2) to ensure specific behaviors prosper while others are discouraged. The court and law-enforcement systems are obvious forms of control, with their agents wielding explicit rules and processes that can

clearly impact individual freedoms (constraining our bodies) and resources (e.g., imposing fines).

Modern conceptualizations of governmental control extend beyond direct and visible enforcement, and legal systems are no longer perceived as written rules and decisions but rather as cultural institutions to exert social control (Friedman and Hayden 2017). Rules are obeyed without direct imposition. Thus, routinely, societies are built so that some can make the most of their environment, entailing the willful or inadvertent exploitation of non-dominant groups. In doing so, this social practice oppressively places restrictions on non-dominant groups as a result of dominant values and norms that ignore or misrepresent them. Sociologists have sought to explain such mechanisms of control, with different and sometimes complementary views. Whereas Marx (1867) and Althusser (2014) emphasize the role of institutional and economic mechanisms in reconstructing and maintaining dominant social positions, Gramsci (1999), Foucault (1975), and Bourdieu (1972) stress the role of the individuals in sustaining structural and personal inequalities. Following this latter strand in the study of oppression, we will explore how the dominant language ideologies instill the 'right' rules and processes to follow in deaf and hard-of-hearing Spanish Sign-Language users (SSLUs),¹ controlling their behavior to support a structure that places them in subordinate positions.

The role subaltern communities play in supporting the structures that uphold their own oppression has been widely discussed (see, e.g., Bourdieu 1998, discussing how women perpetuate patriarchy; and King 1998, on racial minorities). Humphries' (1975) essay on audism sustains that deaf individuals place the same demands on other deaf individuals than they do on hearing people, resulting in oppressive practices for other deaf individuals. The barriers deaf individuals enforce on other deaf individuals but also themselves have been learned in a society with particular dominant ideologies. Drawing on race studies, Gertz (2008) discusses dysconscious audism as the uncritical way of thinking about inequities, implicitly accepting normalized hierarchies between dominant and subaltern (219). However, our knowledge of how oppression governs SSLUs to reproduce their own (and their communities') subaltern positions is still limited, which hampers our ability to provide tools for emancipation. This study will explore whether such dysconscious audism is compounded by and can be further studied

1. This article uses deaf and hard-of-hearing without capitalization, following Kusters, De Meulder, and O'Brien (2017), the practices of Spanish associations for deaf people, and the views of their representatives, particularly, the Centre for the Language Normalization of the Spanish Sign Language, <https://cnlse.es/en>.

as language ideologies that are integrated in the value system of SSLUs, resulting in internalized (integrated or introjected) monolingualism and audism.

This study provides a situated answer regarding the way a sample of SSLUs perceive, interpret, and act in the legal system they inhabit reinforcing their subalternity. Specifically, we explore if SSLUs' initiative to interact (their self-determination) in that context is guided by the prevalent hierarchies between cultural and linguistic communities. We discuss whether those hierarchies are ingrained in their own value systems (integration) or accepted but not aligned with their own beliefs (introjection). Ultimately, we are interested in self-oppressive practices and their relation to specific language ideologies, monolingualism and audism.

The article summarizes the linguistic ideologies affecting the opportunities of SSLUs within legal systems and particularly in Spain. Then, it explores a combination of perspectives to analyze the internalization of controlling mechanisms sustaining the oppression of SSLUs, resulting in self-oppression understood as a lack of initiative to disrupt the micro-level oppressive practices when interacting (or having the opportunity to interact) with legal systems. The semi-structured interviews used in this study are then described, followed by a discussion of the results to identify how SSLU practices align with ideologies that protect power differentials between language groups within the legal system.

Monolingualism and audism as oppressive ideologies in the Spanish legal system

Signed languages across the world have historically undergone several forms of oppression (e.g., Bauman 2004). Advocacy, scholarly advances, and institutional efforts have led to profound changes (e.g., Lucas 2002; Ladd 2007), translated in many countries by enacting rules and regulations to make sign-language interpreting (SLI) services available to social agents who need to communicate with sign-language users. One such case is Act 27/2007, which recognizes Spanish sign languages and grants deaf and hard-of-hearing communities using Spanish and Catalan signed languages the right to access interpreting services in Spain, especially in education and legal settings (Bao 2012). However, more recent scholarship suggests that the provision of sign language interpreters has concealed the need of additional measures and changes to include SSLUs and that it has been regulated without considering the particularities of deaf individuals (De Meulder and Hualand 2022). This neglect of deaf individuals' experience extends to their collective knowledge of interpreting, which is removed from interpreter training, research, and policy-making institutions (Napier 2004). Writing about the US

legal system, Brunson (2008: 90) argues that deaf people should be able to choose “whether an interpreter should be provided but also which interpreter,” so that their own criteria can be heard and prevail.

The identified issues indicate critical dissonances between the institutionalized views on signed languages and their users and the actual views and needs of their communities. How this Spanish act is framed is revealing in this respect. On the one hand, interpreters are framed as enabling SSLUs to communicate and participate, rather than stressing the need for the institutions to serve the population regardless of their languages. On the other, ‘integration’ of deaf individuals into the predominantly hearing society is the established goal, pointing to the higher value and legitimacy of the mainstream hearing culture.² Only educative spaces are explicitly expected to be made ‘inclusive’ of diversities (Article 7). Other studies that look at the deaf community have highlighted this assimilationist perspective in predominantly hearing societies (e.g., Baker 1999; Barberà, Cedillo, and Frigola 2019).

A second framing within that legal text forwards a phonocentric and auditory focus, characteristic of hearing cultures (e.g., Bauman 2004; Loeffler 2014). This phonocentrism is stressed by the Act portraying the history of Spanish Sign Language (SSL) as created by a hearing monk educating deaf children, rather than foregrounding the history of signed languages (for instance, using the classical Plato’s *Cratylus* dialogue, see Torres Rangel 2009). In the same vein, users of Catalan Sign Language are portrayed as having chosen that language over other options, rather than having been born to its specific cultural environment, and silencing phonocentric influences (see further nuances in Quer 2012; Jarque, Bosch-Baliarda, and González 2019). Those issues reveal traces of the underlying language ideologies that still loom large on the Spanish society, establish hierarchies, and laden real access to public services in all non-dominant languages, particularly signed languages.

Modern states have long relied on a projected homogeneity of their populations to ensure their continuance, that of their structures, and of the prevailing assumptions on which collective decisions are taken (see Gogolin 1994 on educational institutions). European nation-states were built on the idea that language was the unifying element of nations and monolingual linguistic policies have favored a moral panic vis-à-vis the non-dominant languages (Jaffe 1999). Rather than seeing the foundational nature of multilingualism, monolingual ideologies present diversity as a cost to society (Gazzola and Grin 2013). Any non-dominant language has seen their needs portrayed in similar terms in socially dominant discourses, supporting monolingual legal systems which at best “manage the effects

2. See Marín Perabá (2019) on the differences between integration and inclusion.

of linguistic plurality in ways that do not aggrieve the underlying monolingualism of the state” (Gramling 2022). The resulting *ius linguarum* (‘right of language,’ by which citizenship is earned through language) assumes the possibilities for individuals to use the dominant language even if they also use a different one (Gramling 2016:185ff).

Regarding signed languages, monolingualism is compounded by other ideologies (see Turner 2009; Krausneker 2015). Not long ago, the Regional Director of the World Health Organization Eastern Mediterranean Region described ‘deafness’ as follows:

Hearing impairment and deafness are serious disabilities than can impose a heavy social and economic burden on individuals, families, communities and countries. [...] The cost of special education and lost employment due to hearing impairment can also impose a substantial economic burden on countries.

(Gezairy 2007)

In this quote, diversity is portrayed as a disability of the individual and a burden for society, rather than a need (or unmet and silenced needs) for the collective. As world values continue to move from privileging normalcy and rejecting outsiders toward appreciating diversity (Inglehart 2018), such statements may trigger more public opposition than support in an increasing number of contexts. Even though not openly held, however, audism continues to prevail shaping structures and practices (Bauman 2004). Audism is defined as “[t]he notion that one is superior based on one’s ability to hear or behave in the manner of one who hears” (Humphries 1977: 26). It refers to the ideology governing the perception of and interaction with the deaf and hard of hearing, and it affects the development of material and intellectual resources, by considering hearing loss abnormal, the loss or lack of the capacity of being and communicating normally. As a corollary of audism, societies have developed phonocentrism, the historically laden idea that speech is the most fully when not the only human form of language (Bienvenu 2016). The result of both audism and monolingualism (compounded by other domination ideologies, such as sexism, racism, and ableism) is that non-dominant groups (sometimes referred to as minorities) are portrayed as burdens. Meanwhile the resources invested in benefitting the dominant identities are portrayed as natural social activities pursuing collective progress, thus building comfort and entitlement for what is considered the ‘human being by default.’ Using and promoting the dominant language for and in any social endeavors is seen as “linguistic normalcy” (Gogolin 2006).

In an era in which the lack of representation of the non-dominant has become visible and problematized, naming symbolic violence and symbolically violent practices has allowed daily aggressions and microaggressions to be understood as

orchestrated rather than isolated, and to point out the commonalities of oppression across the features that ingroup some and outgroup most. Against this background, how can we understand the survival of ideologies that continue to confer privileged positions to some while condemning most to subordination? While this article cannot solve that issue, it does address part of that problem, namely, the enactment of oppressive ideologies by the oppressed who are socialized in spaces shaped by and for the dominant. We analyze how SSLUs perceive, interpret, and interact in a world where their culture and language are hierarchically subordinated to the dominant and spoken Spanish language and culture.

Power and self-determination in exploring self-oppression

This article addresses how the dominant ideology can curtail individuals' will to initiate actions within the legal system, especially when using the legal system may entail benefits. We want to identify traces of how and to what extent the socially dominant linguistic ideologies are internalized self-regulating those holding subordinate positions, and in this article, we focus on SSLUs. The goal is shaped by modern conceptualizations of power (Bourdieu 1972), wherein power structures and asymmetries are sustained by disciplining behavior rather than by the ability of an individual or group to (physically) subdue others. The study focuses on when and why deaf individuals use the legal system to their advantage, but also when and why their initiative to do so is curtailed.

Deci and Ryan's self-determination theory (1985) provides insight regarding the will to initiate action. Self-determination theory contends that contexts in which we feel autonomous, competent, and related to other humans, fuel our energy to act and interact because we are driven toward actions that fulfill basic psychological needs (Vansteenkiste, Ryan, and Soenens 2020). In those contexts, intrinsic motivation works because our volition is engaged by our own interests and our very being is nourished and flourishes. In addition, we are most functional because three basic needs are supported: competence, relatedness, and autonomy. The feeling of competence results from an ability to engage with our environment successfully manipulating and negotiating our contexts, and the resulting sense of effectance and self-efficacy in the relevant context (Deci and Ryan 1985:112). Relatedness represents our need for connection to and belonging with others, for strong emotional bonds that make us feel cared for. Finally, autonomy is our need to feel that we act willingly, based on our decisions, having a choice, and in accord with abiding values and interests. Autonomy does not refer to acting without the help of others, and as such, this concept should not be conflated with independence. As a construct in this model, autonomy refers to

our endorsement of our own actions, even when these are cooperating in someone else's tasks or asking for and accepting the help of others. An action that fulfills these needs, in a context that supports them, provides the energy to engage while nurturing the individual's "growth, health and integrity" (Ryan 1995: 421). The more satisfying our actions within a field are, the more energized our behavior becomes (Deci and Ryan 2012: 101).

Some actions satisfy basic human needs and feel inherently motivating. When this intrinsic motivation is absent, however, external regulations may similarly nurture basic psychological needs if they are internalized. This internalization is a continuum where some external values and regulations for conduct may become part of an individual's core values and therefore able to engender self-determination. In this continuum, an *integrated* regulation would represent highly autonomous or self-determined types of behavior whereas an *introjected* regulation would be the closest to an external regulation, that is, one the individual understands that needs to be complied with but is not necessarily agreed with (Ryan and Deci 2017: 197ff). This opens interesting avenues for understanding behavior that fails to rebel against disadvantageous conditions and that perpetuates beliefs against an individual's own values and identities.

We contend that, to understand the self-determination of non-dominant groups self-determination theory needs to be backed by constructs that allow for the inviting contexts as identified by Deci and Ryan to be critically reviewed against historical and ideological discourses. Contexts that are laden with social hierarchies and asymmetries may not avail members of such groups the same energy to initiate action they provide to members of dominant groups. For instance, when those identifying with normalcy make assumptions as to what SSLUs need, they are led by prevalent ideas, which may misalign with those of SSLUs. A deconstruction of the assumptions would require a negotiation of their bases at every interaction, which is only rarely possible. Thus, SSLUs' sense of competence may be undermined as they cannot operate according to their own will and expertise (see Sheneman and Robinson 2021). Such dynamics are backed by structural ideologies and reproduced in individual behavior across contexts. We suggest that Bourdieu's constructs (especially *habitus* and *capital*) can clarify the experience of non-dominant groups in contexts that limit the energy and possibilities available to subaltern groups, by either integrating or introjecting language hierarchies and ideologies. Focusing on experiences with the legal system, we aim at a better understanding of how self-determination is shaped for SSLUs and what possibilities are availed.

Bourdieu devised a conceptual system to explain how individual action is engendered and coordinated within social fields. To describe the constant process of social reproduction, of domination and subjugation, Bourdieu developed a

toolbox to explain the complexities of our interactions in social spaces. In his theory of social practice, power is distributed and can be located in specific places, agents, and processes. Agents are socialized in the rules of the social spaces (fields) they enter, experience, and exploit, and this experience shapes their understanding of how to behave and what to want by creating a basic frame of dispositions, habits, and skills for action (*habitus*) that allow the field in its current state to be seen as worthwhile and legitimate (*illusio*). This latter notion, *illusio*, refers to how fields enchant individuals to be taken in by the game, serving as an interface between the bounded agency of their *habitus* and the structures present in the fields where they operate.

Agents occupy different positions in the field that afford them different quantities and types of capitals (social, cultural, and economic), which define their possibilities to invest in order to attain their goals (and more diverse forms of capital). To summarily exemplify the different types of capital, we can think of how being born to money (economic capital) usually guarantees access to good education (cultural capital), but also to friends with influence (social capital) that can help us to achieve our goals, even to gain knowledge of and influence over legal regulations, social policies, and opportunities, and the very rules of the interaction (*doxa*), including the rules referred to our physical position or accent (*hexis*).

A further classification of social capital will allow for nuances in our analysis. Three types of social capital have been identified: bonding, bridging, and linking social capital (Coleman 1990). Bonding social capital establishes relationships within groups or between relatively homogeneous groups, such as family and friends. Bridging social capital relates relatively heterogeneous groups and has the potential to offer resources beyond what is possible to accrue with bonds. Finally, linking social capital allows for relationships to be created between people or groups at different hierarchical levels and opens the door to power and authority.

Method

To study how self-determination is influenced by the underlying ideologies, interviews were conducted with sign-language users who use Spanish Sign Language ('*lengua de signos española*,' hereinafter SSL). Interviews (Böser 2016) are a powerful way to reveal thinking, reasoning, framing, and socialized discourses. Participants were recruited through personal contacts and social networks, and snowball sampling augmented the potential interview pool. Thirty-three (33) SSLU participants registered for the interview, with 17 identifying as female and 16 as male. Additional demographic information (e.g., age, occupations, educational

background, and involvement with the deaf community) will be provided when salient in the discussion.

The interview protocol was developed with the goal to “grasp subjection in its material instance” (Foucault 1980: 97), to understand how self-determination is shaped and governed in a monolingual and audist field –i.e., the Spanish legal system. Specifically, the perception and social practices, particularly capital investment strategies and opportunities taken to initiate action vis-à-vis the legal field were explored to understand whether discourses encourage SSLUs to govern their own subjectivity to exclude themselves from the legal system. After the study was granted ethical clearance by Universitat Jaume I’s review board, one of the co-authors (RHGM), hearing, with native fluency in SSL, and a sign-language interpreter and interpreting trainer, conducted 90- to 120-minute video-recorded semi-structured open-ended interviews in SSL. Participants were informed about this study’s purpose in SSL and written Spanish.

Measures to mitigate the influence of the authors’ positionality in designing the study and interpreting the results (Mellinger 2020) were needed on a minimum of three counts. First, both authors are hearing. Second, the concept and design of the study was developed by one author (EMN) with no competence in SSL. She is a speaker of a spoken non-dominant language, has an academic interest in oppression of linguistic communities, but only academic links as a supervisor with representatives of the deaf community and SSL interpreters. Third, SSL interpreters have commonly reported the need to make cultural adaptations because of deaf individuals’ lack of familiarity with the legal field (Pérez Senra 2019). We contacted deaf individuals with representation and communication roles in deaf-communities’ associations to report on the goals and bases of the research and the structure of the interview designed. These members (Nizar Kasmi Ismail, Gemma Piriz Gómez, and Iván Vázquez Villar) discussed rewording and resigning with the authors until a culture-appropriate final formulation in both written Spanish and SSL was reached.

The interviews were conducted in SSL, and one author (RHGM) interpreted the interviews into spoken Spanish and recorded the interpretation for the second author to transcribe (EMN). Participants’ names were pseudonymized at this point and each individual participant was further on identified with a code (“U” for ‘user’ and a sequential number). The interpretation was verified by a different SSL native interpreter. The interviews were coded using NVivo and descriptive coding to capture participants’ thoughts and identify major themes in relation to self-determination (competence, autonomy, relatedness) and social practice (mainly social, cultural, and economic capital). Authors coded the interviews individually, then compared and discussed codes until they reached agreement. Patterns and themes were identified through this iterative process. Finally, results

were shared with participants for member-checking, an opportunity for them to respond to findings and build study credibility. Excerpts for this article were translated into English by the corresponding author.

Results and discussion

The interview data revealed several themes affecting access to and accumulation of capital. The ensuing discussion will introduce the interviewee's voices alongside our interpretations based on the framework outlined in the previous pages. The comments are structured following the basic typology of capital (cultural, social, economic) and how SSLUs' habitus impact the components of self-determination (autonomy, competence, and relatedness) in the legal field.

Cultural capital governing the self-determined habitus

The most salient theme across the interviews was the consideration of hearing cultural capital as superior to deaf cultural capital. This theme took several forms, and some interviewees made the assumption explicit, referring to their younger selves as believing they were inferior ("I assumed hearing people were better" [U17]). This sentiment changed later in life, shifting the characterization to one of hearing culture being dominant rather than it being considered 'better.' In other cases, however, the social hierarchy between hearing and deaf 'types' was implicit and ingrained in their responses, especially when representing their possibilities in the legal field – "I believe it is difficult for a deaf person to become a police agent. [...] It is only logical. I would not be able to practice these [law-related] occupations because it is what it is." In this excerpt, U15 made it clear that she shared the views of the hearing as more capable in a world seen as given, rather than seeing the field as constructed around the cultural capital of the hearing. And yet, the same person later stated, "We deaf people can do anything and everything." This shows how the empowerment discourse is socially present and yet the legal field succeeds at establishing a hierarchy between cultural capitals in its very doxa, using individuals to reproduce audist and monolingual ideologies. As a result, SSLUs inhabit both discourses and their efforts to reproduce resistance are limited by their integrating the dominant discourse.

Usually, the dominant language ideologies were present at home and education centers, and had become ingrained in SSLUs' habitus, making it easier for them to integrate and reproduce traces of that ideology later in life. Some cases are particularly illustrative. U3 refers to his family using witchcraft for him to become hearing and U4 relates her mother suffered from depression after learn-

ing her daughter was deaf. The families of most of the SSLUs participating in our study invested economic resources in speech therapy, which was generally a frustrating experience for the interviewees. Conversely, investment in SSL classes was low and some participants (U₃, U₁₁, U₂₂) spent years using a sign system developed at home or barely communicating because of the stigma attached to SSL and their hexis: “My parents believed SSL was ugly,” “SSL was banned at my school,” and “My husband’s parents feel annoyed by SSL” [U₁₀, whose husband is also deaf]. These comments show how audist ideology is integrated in their habitus and misrecognized as the truth. It is the dominant doxa and creates a self-image of inadequate competence against normative models of success. The feelings of accomplishment were generally represented successfully operating with hearing people, and objectified capital becomes key in this success: “I am successful because of the [cochlear] implant” [U₁₃].

Beyond impairing communication, this symbolic hierarchy between capitals reduces the choices of SSLUs to pursue vocations, and the *illusio* so created impacts their autonomy, personally and collectively, as opportunities to direct cooperative action are misrecognized and they exclude themselves from the legal field, one with an impact on the future of all social spaces. In some cases, self-restriction plays an important role in not pursuing a law-related career. Other times, it is access to teachers’ attention and time or to specific courses that precludes access to broader cultural capital that can lead to university studies. U₃, for instance, realized his training in a hearing school had been poor when accessing a school for deaf students, where he spent four years to complete the last two years of secondary education. One hard-of-hearing SSLU who migrated to Spain in search for better opportunities referred to being excluded from English classes:

In Venezuela, for example, I used to be good at English and, here in Spain, I was told I was exempt from the English course in secondary education. I asked why and they told me that here in Spain the teachers must speak in English [by law] in English classes and, then, of course, I may miss what was being said and so I was waived... that was the reason. I told them that I understood English, and they told me: “Well, don’t worry anyways. You don’t have to worry about this course and use the time to study something else, or you can look for a support teacher to better your sign language.” [U₁₂]

U₁₂ was denied the competence and autonomy he had so far felt in similar contexts (English classes) and deprived of the possibility to increase his competence in a socially influential language. Providing no structure to use the time other pupils would spend in English classes further deprived U₁₂ of a basic psychological need to thrive in this context, autonomy. Instances such as these show how, by reducing their chances to increase competences while integrating low self-

perceptions against normative success, SSLUs have been governed not to access opportunities for power. Furthermore, U12 was removed from a context he could share with other individuals to establish personal bonds which may be leveraged later in life to invest and accrue bonding social capital.

The possibility of interviewees becoming or having become lawyers or judges was prompted to elicit reactions. Only one accepted the hypothesis, “I could be a lawyer for the disabilities court, but not otherwise” [U8]. No interviewee claimed that having SSLUs across the legal field was necessary for the sake of the legal field. Even if the interviewees generally knew of specific SSLUs having studied law, it was not problematized that these hold low-status positions, and it was never mentioned that it is the field that needs to work on its biases to interact with SSLUs. Rather, SLI were represented as serving SSLUs rather than the institutions and some would volitionally take the burden of ensuring a SLI was present in the interactions: “At the end of the day, it is my responsibility” [U3]. “Deaf people need interpreters” was repeatedly stressed and the legislation granting the right to an interpreter was seen as a highly valuable item of SSLUs’ objectified cultural capital, which signals the hierarchy of linguistic capitals representing audist and monolingual ideologies.

Regarding embodied cultural capital, a common appreciation for ‘human values’ was generally shared. When referring to interactions with hearing individuals, deaf SSLUs expressed feelings of rejection as children and of weariness as adults, and pinpointed cases where specific individuals would focus on them and allow them to read on one set of lips at a time as ‘good people.’ As for agents in the legal field, they were assessed as ‘good professionals’ or ‘good people’ when they were aware of SSLUs’ needs and tried to understand and be understood, and distinguished from those people “you find everywhere, not only among police agents” [U1] who would not make the effort or who would “behave disrespectfully” [U4]. One individual [U12] would recall a time where he went to a precinct to report vandalism and the police agent told him to go back the next morning when a SLI would be available. The next morning, a different agent told U12 that video interpreters were available 24 hours a day. U12 understood this as ‘innocent’ unawareness and did not take any additional action.

These excerpts provide insights as to how the habitus of the participating SSLUs has been shaped to interpret the opportunities available to them depending on personal good (or bad) will rather than looking for structural responsibilities, which controls their need for system-based change and allows the audist ideology to continue. This integrated disempowerment results in a lack of energy to initiate action in a situation that can increase the deaf cultural capital of a hearing individual, further supporting the idea that SSLUs’ illu^sio of the legal field normalizes the lack of interest to invest in cultural capital relevant to SSLUs.

That same illusion is illustrated by a story a participant learned in his past role as a treasurer of a SSLU association. This participant showed ample knowledge about the legal field, based on his own interest and this past role. In the story, a doctor reported the parents of a deaf child who refused to approve a cochlear implant for their son and the case was heard in court. U3 said the judge had no idea about the issues involved because “well, he was a judge, and they know nothing about us.” “Luckily” the parents were acquitted, but no comment was made as to how the case reached the trial stage. The legal field, especially those agents holding higher authority, such as judges, is excused when the deaf cultural capital is conspicuously absent, attesting to the success of monolingual and audist ideologies. The Spanish Organic Law on the Judiciary, among other legal instruments, establishes that Spanish is the default language of the courts and that all court officials must use Spanish (Article 231).

Overall, actions that may be taken to counter the ideologies prevailing in the legal field are widely overlooked. Low self-perception of the value of SSLUs’ culture for the field compounds feelings of inferiority vis-à-vis normative success and inadequacy in normative contexts, curbing relatedness to the field. The legal field is seen as belonging to the hearing culture, a perception that heavily restricts the opportunity to accumulate capital relevant to the legal field. Although a general trend, the work on identity shows a clear potential for improving the situation. U17 stated his having assumed the hearing culture was better and then realizing his misrecognition only after engaging in a SSLU association. After valuing his features as SSLU, he went through a stage of rejection against hearing people, seen as a threat to his own opportunities. Now, even though U17 does not engage in changing structural inadequacies, he shows great energy for action regarding his right to an interpreter in legal contexts and has filed numerous complaints when such right was not respected. Compared to other participants, the higher value he attaches to his social identity has rendered clear benefits for himself and for SSLUs as a social group. According to our sample, however, that the system needs to overcome its biases has been absent from SSLUs’ habitus.

Social capital governing self-determination

Earning social capital

Associations are places where the social circles of individuals intersect (Simmel 1955[2014]), as they are likely to recruit resource-rich people with different social backgrounds that nevertheless endorse and pursue collective interests (Putman 2000). They are also places where individuals interact and are likely to exchange social resources. The involvement of SSLUs in associations has the potential to

significantly increase their social capital. The experiences described in this study with SLLU associations varied, ranging from revealing [U18] to deceiving [U13], and includes experiences of gender-based discrimination (“People in the association were trashing me because I wasn’t married” [U10, female]) and lack of relevant support, especially when interacting with the legal field (“I was fired because a hearing person blamed me for something he had done and they did nothing. There is no solidarity” [U19]). Even though all interviewees showed some connection with SSLU associations, their involvement was mostly superficial and strong only in interviewees with short training routes (primary education). This lack of involvement attests to a certain degree of dispersal (Campbell 2008) and social isolation (see Hauland 2014). In terms of social capital, the circumstances reduce opportunities to accrue community-relevant bridging and linking social capital, which has the potential to impact the prevailing ideologies in the field. In addition, isolation also contributes to a lack of exposure to the values of deaf cultural capital by the dominant language community, which increases adherence to normative culture and to the understanding of success in normative terms. Overall, isolation reduces knowledge of the deaf culture.

Few interviewees see SSL as a defining feature of their identities and they would not identify as SSLU. However, the interviews revealed a dominant ingroup tendency with closest friends and partners being SSLUs. Some interviewees stated they would not feel comfortable at all dating hearing individuals [U10, U19, both female]. An illisio that establishes closure vis-à-vis other social groups limits their opportunities to accrue social capital across groups (bridging social capital) and it also restricts the variety of contexts where they can feel they belong with, that is, the contexts that may provide relatedness as a basic ingredient of self-determination. The weakened investment in social capital beyond the ingroup becomes especially relevant in the case of the legal field, typically prone to social closure (Teubner 1989), where bridging capital can become linking capital.

U8 would explain her lack of engagement with more hearing individuals because it was demanding – “I need some happiness too,” what would seem a reference to the “deaf tax” (Aldalur, Hall, and DeAndrea-Lazarus 2022), that is, the additional effort demanded from SSLUs to navigate a society designed by and for a different dominant identity. U3 would specifically refer to the lack of autonomy he feels when experiencing society with hearing individuals: “I am too independent, and with hearing people I would have to be dependent.” However, some interviewees showed a preference for conversations with hearing individuals focusing on their views – “because they have a different mindset” and present different perspectives on personal issues [U12]. This was not a dominant trend and situations involving hearing individuals were mostly presented as burdensome. In this respect, SLIs were presented as game changers in the legal field: “I would not be

able to do without SLI” [U17], “Writing things down [for police agents] solves some 5% of my needs” [U11], “I always make sure they [public services] are going to have interpreters called in” [U16]. The availability of SLI is understood as opening the possibilities for SSLUs to become judges: “They [sic] can [be judges] now because there is SLI” [U10]. There seems to be a representation of SLI services as key in accruing cultural and social capital, as status enhancers. We need to further examine whether this representation impacts SSLUs’ ideologies or if monolingual and audist ideologies govern (and curb) their use.

SLI services in capital investment and ideology construction

Successful in triggering feelings of autonomy, the provision of interpreters in the Spanish legal field seems to entail symbolic violence. “Interpreters are usually mediocre” is a comment generally shared by the interviewees. Available SLIs were described as overwhelmingly “too young,” inexperienced, and lacking knowledge of the deaf culture. However, SSLUs’ lack of opportunities to appoint or confirm the interpreters appointed (as advocated by Brunson 2008:90) is “understood” and acquiesced to: “Judges need to make sure they [SLI] are neutral” [U12], “You cannot just call out bad interpreters. If life gives you lemons, you know” [U15]. These remarks point to an integration of the values of the legal field (notoriously, neutrality) in SSLUs’ habitus, which prevail over their needs for autonomy (through choice) and negatively affect self-determination, specifically that of demanding corrections. No interviewee placed the responsibility on the appointment process, although most quickly identified the issues involved in quality interpreting: idiomatic signing, terminology mastering, topic-specific knowledge, adherence to ethical codes, and the ability to adapt to the communicative needs of the SSLU. Focusing on the individuals participating in the interaction and condoning the system that provides them with these individuals both reveals and reinforces how the lack of (investment in) linking social capital avails restricted self-determination.

The main issue identified with interpreters in the legal field was their lack of linguistic competence in SSL but, second to that, their going beyond interpreting, such as commenting on similar cases and revealing private information. “I do not care about their opinions” [U10]. Commenting on legal issues may be seen as toxic behavior by interpreters (Sheneman and Robinson 2021), even though the information provided on how the legal field operates or on how specific judges behave was seen as positive in the informal interactions with the interpreters rarely reported by the participants. No interviewee had asked any SLI to interpret informal interactions in legal settings, nor were they generally seen as a source of information. U3 expressively reacted to asking the interpreter about something he did not understand properly in a legal situation: “No way!”

All of the interviewees are aware of and support the discourse that defines the role of interpreters as not extending beyond language translation. In this sense, the Spanish system has two professional profiles, SLI and communicative mediators. This distinction is generally welcomed and even wanted as a sign of empowerment, competence, and autonomy: “I solve my issues and the interpreter translates” [U5]. However, interviewees say that differences among SSLUs and how limited education opportunities justify a necessary communicative adaptation. Lack of education in SSL was posed by U10, who complained that her competence in SSL was not good enough to understand interpreters all the time; however, they refused to repeat the message when she did not understand. She also complained that SLIs did not explain the words she did not understand in written legal Spanish. The focus on interpreters for the system’s lack of good SLI or adjustment to their needs seems the rule. One exception: one interviewee framed the responsibility in structural terms: “It may well be that a communicative mediator rather than an interpreter is needed” [U17].

Here, we will not address interpreters’ role; rather, we discuss how the prevailing doxa on role impacts strategies to mobilize, invest, and accrue capital. The symbolic capital attached to SLIs as individual agents is low, even though SLI is highly valued when objectified as their tool. Only two interviewees reported ever engaging directly with an interpreter or feeling curious about them as individuals. Considering that the micro-, meso-, and macro sources of social capital work together in dynamic relationships (Halpern 2005), this attitude and behavior restricts SSLUs’ opportunities for gaining cultural capital and bridging social capital directly or indirectly from or using SLI to engage with passersby, individuals waiting for a coffee, or simply sitting around, especially for SSLUs who do not communicate in the dominant language. Self-restricting interactions restricts, in turn, the support given by this context to SSLUs’ feelings of competence and relatedness. Claims have been made for interpretation services to be chosen by SSLUs (Brunson 2008), addressing the need for autonomy, and potentially relatedness and competence. The question is whether that choosing may positively influence their views on and use of SLI leading to a volitional use of SLI (that is, increased autonomy). This may contribute to deaf individuals self-determinedly engaging in more widely, investing and accruing both cultural and social capital (especially linking social capital) to increase the possibilities for the legal field to support SSLUs’ feelings of competence.

The explored issues compound a situation where SSLUs’ autonomy and relatedness are damaged. Even though feelings of autonomy may be increased by having the law incontrovertibly recognizing the right to SLI services, the available choices for social interactions are limited and restricted to formal situations by both the institution and SSLUs. Even in those formal situations, quality SLI is

rarely guaranteed. These issues impact the support for competence and autonomy offered and affect relatedness since they also impact SSLUs' opportunities for bonding, bridging, and linking. Indeed, participant SSLUs showed a tendency not to seek the help of others, or to seek the help of only close relatives, a self-regulated behavior generally stressed by a perceived lack of social support and acceptability. Even reporting a phone stolen was sometimes seen as irresponsible, as "it is on you to make sure your things are not stolen" [U14].

Linking, bonding, and bridging in the legal field

Socialized and integrated discourses, reduced structures and opportunities to communicate, particularly in informal legal situations, and reduced representation of SSLUs in the legal field compound a situation where linking networks become unreachable and opportunities to invest social capital to accrue social, cultural, and economic capital are severely limited. Interpreters are provided and used for interactions in formal contexts, including hearings, meetings with attorneys, and interviews with police agents. However, sociolegal interactions extend beyond these formal contexts. SSLUs miss information that may be said in passing, waiting for a coffee at a coffee machine, or information they may ask court staff outside of on-the-record legal proceedings if they had the chance –or the initiative. Some have incorporated in their illusion that they cannot engage in conversations with hearing individuals in the legal field unless the field so provides: "I would not dare. I wait for my turn" [U10]. Thus, opportunities for accruing social capital within the legal field are scarce and bonded to a minimal use of SLI. Even though interpreters are seen as insiders by SSLUs, their position in the social geography of the legal field shows little authority (Brunson 2018). Power does not flow fluently toward interpreters' hands in a system that portrays them as interchangeable, "warm bodies" (Winston 2005) whose capital is "only" linguistic where the authorized linguistic capital is both as central as it is monolingual –the power to "say the law" (Bourdieu 1986: 4) in the language of the nation.

This panorama supports the view of SLI as a superficial solution that does not challenge the underlying ideologies in the legal field. Applying the logic of monolingualism (Derrida 1998; Angermeyer 2014) or standard language ideology (Lippi-Green 1994), compounded by audism resulting in an ableist perception of accessibility needs (Reagan 2010), SSLUs are assigned an interpreter for specified formal legal interactions. The measure allows the field to reassure itself, assuming that the discourse on equal rights is satisfied by providing for SSLUs to experience their legal interactions as normative dominant-language speakers would. However, the measure fails to include SSLUs, signaling them as a non-normative linguistic group and affecting their self-determination. In this context, interpreters are "signifiers of disability" (Young, Napier, and Oram 2020: 350), but

of the disability of SSLUs rather than the disability of the legal system to cater to its structural needs. SSLUs are members of the indigenous population and present structural needs. Spanish social services in general and legal services in particular have yet to embrace that it is institutions that need interpreters and translators to fulfill their mandates (Wallace and Monzó-Nebot 2019: 4).

Economic capital governing self-determination

Regarding economic capital, interviewees overwhelmingly attached low value to economic capital, usually mentioned using negative terms. A concern for money by other SSLUs was generally given as a motive to abandon associations and the reason to mistrust lawmakers and law-enforcing agents (“they are all corrupt and there for the money” [U17], “judges help politicians in corruption cases” [U4]). While difficult to determine if these comments hold in the larger SSLU population or if they are restricted to the sample, the remarks may also be attributable to a slippery slope of logic, in which restricted access to cultural and social capital results in a lack of capital to invest in job hunting, thereby resulting in a lack of economic capital to change material conditions (see also Dickinson and Turner 2008: 233).

The participants in our study have trouble accessing the labor market, and eventually accruing economic capital. Some interviewees were unemployed at the time of the interview (6 out of 33) and others were constantly moving between jobs (5 participants). The rest had predominantly low-paying jobs. This circumstance was present in the childhood of some participants. For U12, money was the reason to have one instead of two hearing aids, and some prelocutive SSLUs did not seek professional help to learn to use the hearing population’s language and had to rely on family support instead [U15, U17].

A slightly different habitus is seen in U3, who showed some interest in economic capital, had training in trade, and was self-trained in stock exchange operations. At the time of the interview, he was teaching other SSLUs as a freelancer, but with few students. He complained there are no training opportunities, and when asked if there are any for SSLUs he seemed to assume the answer was self-evident: “No way!” [U3]. And yet, as most of the interviewees, he seemed to place little emphasis on material objects when asked what he would do in a hypothetical robbery. He showed concern when the presented scenarios implied cultural and social capital: “I have everything in my cellphone.” This reaction was shared by other interviewees, who referred to their depending on social networks to be up to date with the news or to know about events happening in the neighborhood thank to their cell phones: “When something happens in my quarter, I know because my friends WhatsApp me” [U4].

Overall, interviewees perceived economic and social capital as opposed to each other and preferred social and cultural capital, even though the value of expensive treatment (in particular, cochlear implants) was generally integrated. The internalization of low appreciation for economic capital may be seen as governed acquiescence to social classes, especially to non-normalcy belonging with the lower positions of the social ladder. Further exploration would be required to investigate how integrated classicism compounds monolingual and audist ideologies and becomes an important obstacle for SSLUs to achieve material changes and create new opportunities to invest in cultural and social capital.

At any rate, and as a result of self-restricted investment in economic capital, fewer social and cultural opportunities become available. Jobs in the legal field were seen as “above me” [U15], perceived as sought on the basis of personal interests opposing collective values. Some interviewees would refer to specific SSLU individuals they knew personally. Their stories were strikingly similar: having succeeded in demanding training routes, they were finally employed in either SSLU associations or positions with decreased access to economic capital (such as clerks). This allows the higher-paying jobs and the technologies used in the legal field to be designed as requiring audition. For as long as SSLU stories can be framed as exceptions at the margins, the legal field may elude change.

Having (self-)restricted opportunities and decreased choices to accrue the economic capital that can be gained in high-paying positions in the legal field stresses power imbalances and may trigger reduced feelings of autonomy due to a lack of economic capital to pay for professional services (e.g., better and more trusted SLIs for a wider range of situations) and reduced feelings of competence against normative economic success. Further, the lack of interest in economic capital restricts access to individuals with opportunities to invest and accrue economic capital, and the linkage with sites of economic power for SSLUs as a community.

Concluding remarks

We have argued that the legal system has provided SLI as a way for SSLUs to participate in the legal field without upsetting its monolingual and audist foundation, without acknowledging that the marginal position of the non-dominant identities is the product of the barriers imposed by the dominant that see themselves as universal. Normalcy is enforced by the dominant and underprivilege is operated by the privileged. Their features are those of the human ‘by default.’ Structures have been created and sustained for millennia to meet the needs of the dominant, hoarding opportunities to thrive while creating oppression to ensure need

satisfaction. The system operates self-regulatory mechanisms to shape social practices to ensure consensus and complacency with the dominant's dominance while maintaining the dominated conveniently oppressed, and cooperative. One of the most powerful technologies is the misrecognition of dominant discourses as 'logical' truths, leaving the doxas sustaining oppression unchallenged and reinforced.

The interviews in our study have shown how the dominant have established doxas that discipline SSLUs' subjectivities to reproduce social structures, including the social classifications that present SSLUs as an exception. Mainly by governing their capital investment strategies to disempower their self-determination to challenge dominant positions, they are disciplined to value the opportunities given through SLI as 'the' way to engage with the system. This shows how their doxa and *illutio* have been shaped to acquiesce to and perpetuate their positions and the very value of the stakes being played in the field. The study has shown that SSLUs have generally integrated the dominant monolingual and audist doxa, which results in a limited use of the measures provided by the institution, particularly SLI but also mechanisms to claim rights and complain against violations. They share an *illutio* in which deaf capital has no interest in the legal field. Meanwhile their energy is unproblematically diverted in striving for normative success in a world that prioritizes a singular linguistic cultural capital rather than validating multiple.

Providing interpreting services rather than embracing difference and non-normalcy through further material and discursive adjustments (Haualand 2012), providing access rather than making accessible (De Meulder and Haualand 2022), frames SSLUs as circumstantially requiring contact rather than being legitimate members of the same social field. So entrapped in an ephemeral role, measures cater to temporary needs for relatedness with specific agents within the system rather than offering a space that allows for relatedness and linkage to be developed with society at large, competence to be exercised and self-defined, and autonomy to be achieved and perceived beyond the normative limits. Self-determination is arguably at stake in a system not linked to SSLUs. Within the existing framework of interpreting services for SSLUs, integrated by SSLUs, "capital primarily operates to entrench privilege" (Li, Savage, and Warde 2008: 407) and preserves the linguistic and structural status quo of the modern monolingual nation-states that represent cultural diversity as a construction (May 2012: 27).

Perhaps SLIs actually allow normative individuals in the legal field to see themselves as offering opportunities to SSLUs. There is a need to understand multilingualism as a foundational and not derivative practice and to discursively and materially transform the Spanish legal system to embrace a new stage as a translated and translating institution (see Koskinen 2008). By understanding how barriers to access are maintained to (self-)regulate access we can ensure actions

are aimed at the societies at large, for it is societies that need to become aware of the normativity they impose on their members to understand how they are missing their needs. Signed languages are indigenous across nations, pose structural needs, and require participated systems that can go above and beyond oppressive ideologies. For our societies to reach a postmonolingual and postaudist stage, proactive translation and interpreting policies are required that ingrain translation in our social practices and relations. The framework used in this article has allowed us to listen to SSLUs' voices and silences and to open paths for future policies.

Funding

The research for this article was funded by Universitat Jaume I (grant UJI-B2019-32). This article was made Open Access under a CC BY-NC 4.0 license through payment of an APC by or on behalf of the authors.




References

- Aldalur, Aileen, Wyatt C. Hall, and Ian A. DeAndrea-Lazarus. 2022. "No taxation without representation: Addressing the "deaf tax" in academic medicine." *Academic Medicine* 97(8): 1123–1127.
- Althusser, Louis. 2014. *On the Reproduction of Capitalism*. Trans. by Geoffrey M. Goshgarian. London: Verso.
- Angermeyer, Philipp Sebastian. 2014. "Monolingual ideologies and multilingual practices in small claims court: The case of Spanish-speaking arbitrators." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 11(4): 430–448.
- Baker, Colin. 1999. "Sign language and the deaf community." In *Handbook of Language & Ethnic Identity*, ed. by Joshua A. Fishman, 122–139. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bao, María. 2012. "La interpretación educativa: ¿Algo más que interpretar?" [Educational interpreting: More than just interpreting?]. *Revista de la Fundación Canaria para el Sordo (Funcasor)* 4: 10–23.
- Barberà, Gemma, Pepita Cedillo, and Santiago Frigola. 2019. "Sign languages as resilient endangered languages." In *Transmissions: estudis sobre la transmissió lingüística*, ed. by Mónica Barrieras and Carla Ferrerós, 79–100. Vic: Eumo.
- Bauman, H-Dirksen L. 2004. "Audism: Exploring the metaphysics of oppression." *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education* 9(2): 239–246.
- Bienvenu, Martina J. 2016. "Phonocentrism." In *The Sage Deaf Studies Encyclopedia*, ed. by Genie Gertz and Patrick Boudreault, 283–284. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Black, Donald. 1976. *The Behavior of Law*. New York: Academic Press.
- Böser, Ursula. 2016. "Interviews and focus groups." In *Researching Translation and Interpreting*, ed. by Claudia Angelelli and Brian Baer, 236–246. London: Routledge.

- [doi](#) Bourdieu, Pierre. 1972. *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique, précédée de trois études d'ethnographie kabyle* [Outline of a theory of practice, preceded by three studies of Kabyle ethnography]. Geneva: Droz.
- [doi](#) Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. "La force du droit. Eléments pour une sociologie du champ juridique" [The force of law. Elements for a sociology of the legal field]. *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 64: 3–19.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1998. *La domination masculine* [Masculine domination]. Paris: Seuil.
- [doi](#) Brunson, Jeremy L. 2008. "Your case will now be heard: Sign language interpreters as problematic accommodations in legal interactions." *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education* 13(1): 77–91.
- [doi](#) Brunson, Jeremy L. 2018. "Consumers, colleagues, and certification. Exploring the politics of interpreting." In *Interpreting and the Politics of Recognition*, ed. by Christopher Stone and Lorraine Leeson, 99–115. New York: Routledge.
- [doi](#) Campbell, Fiona A. Kumari. 2008. "Exploring internalized ableism using critical race theory." *Disability & Society* 23(2): 151–162.
- Coleman, James S. 1990. *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press.
- [doi](#) De Meulder, Maartje and Hilde Haualand. 2022. "Sign language interpreting services. A quick fix for inclusion?" *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 16(1): 19–40.
- [doi](#) Deci, Edward L. and Richard M. Ryan. 1985. *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Springer.
- [doi](#) Deci, Edward L. and Richard M. Ryan. 2012. "Motivation, personality, and development within embedded social contexts: An overview of self-determination theory." In *The Oxford Handbook of Human Motivation*, ed. by Richard M. Ryan, 85–110. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1998. *Monolingualism of the Other*. Trans. by Patrick Mensah. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- [doi](#) Dickinson, Jules and Graham H. Turner. 2008. "Sign language interpreters and role conflict in the workplace." In *Crossing Borders in Community Interpreting: Definitions and Dilemmas*, ed. by Carmen Valero-Garcés and Anne Martin, 231–244. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Foucault, Michel. 1975. *Surveiller et punir: naissance de la prison* [Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison]. Paris: Gallimard.
- Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*. Ed. and trans. by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books.
- [doi](#) Friedman, Lawrence M. and Grant M. Hayden. 2017. *American Law. An Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [doi](#) Gazzola, Michele and François Grin. 2013. "Is ELF more effective and fair than translation? An evaluation of the EU's multilingual regime." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 23(1): 93–107.
- Gertz, Genie. 2008. "Dysconscious audism: A theoretical proposition." In *Open Your Eyes. Deaf Studies Talking*, ed. by H-Dirksen L. Bauman, 219–234. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gezairy, Hussein A. 2007. *Address to the Regional Consultation on Establishing Regional Guidelines on Management and Care of Hearing Loss*. World Health Organization Eastern Mediterranean Region (Cairo).

- Gogolin, Ingrid. 1994. *Der monolinguale Habitus der multilingualen Schule* [The monolingual habitus of the multilingual school]. Münster: Waxmann.
-  Gogolin, Ingrid. 2006. "Linguistic habitus." In *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, ed. by Keith Brown, 194–196. Boston: Elsevier.
- Gramling, David. 2016. *The Invention of Monolingualism*. New York: Bloomsbury.
-  Gramling, David. 2022. "On reelecting monolingualism: Fortification, fragility, and stamina." *Applied Linguistics Review* 13(1): 1–18.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1999. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Trans. by Quentin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. London: ElecBook.
- Halpern, David. 2005. *Social Capital*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.
-  Haualand, Hilde. 2012. "Video interpreting services: Calls for inclusion or redialling exclusion?" *Ethnos* 79(2): 287–305.
-  Haualand, Hilde. 2014. "Punished and isolated: Disabled prisoners in Norway." *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research* 17(sup 1): 74–87.
- Humphries, Tom. 1975. "Audism: The making of a word." Unpublished essay. <https://cnlse.es/es/recursos/biblioteca/audism-making-word>
- Humphries, Tom. 1977. "Communicating across cultures (deaf/hearing) and language learning." Unpublished PhD, Union Graduate School.
-  Inglehart, Ronald. 2018. *Cultural Evolution: People's Motivations Are Changing, and Reshaping the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
-  Jaffe, Alexandra. 1999. "Locating power: Corsican translators and their critics." In *Language Ideological Debates*, ed. by Jan Blommaert, 39–66. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
-  Jarque, Maria Josep, Marta Bosch-Baliarda, and Menchu González. 2019. "Legal recognition and regulation of Catalan Sign Language." In *The Legal Recognition of Sign Languages*, ed. by Maartje De Meulder, Joseph J. Murray, and Rachel L. McKee, 268–283. Multilingual Matters.
- King, Joyce. 1998. "Dysconscious racism: The cultural politics of critiquing ideology and identity." In *Critical White Studies: Looking Behind the Mirror*, ed. by Richard Delegado and Jean Stefancic, 128–132. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Koskinen, Kaisa. 2008. *Translating Institutions: An Ethnographic Study of EU Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
-  Krausneker, Verena. 2015. "Ideologies and attitudes toward sign languages: An approximation." *Sign Language Studies* 15(4): 411–431.
- Kusters, Annelies, Maartje De Meulder, and Dai O'Brien. 2017. "Innovations in Deaf Studies: Critically mapping the field." In *Innovations in Deaf Studies*, ed. by Annelies Kusters, Maartje De Meulder, and Dai O'Brien, 1–53. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
-  Ladd, Paddy. 2007. "Hearing-impaired or British Sign Language users? Social policies and the deaf community." *Disability, Handicap & Society* 3(2): 195–199.
-  Li, Yaojun, Mike Savage, and Alan Warde. 2008. "Social mobility and social capital in contemporary Britain." *British Journal of Sociology* 59(3): 391–411.
-  Lippi-Green, Rosina. 1994. "Accent, standard language ideology, and discriminatory pretext in courts." *Language in Society* 23(2): 163–198.

- Loeffler, Summer. 2014. "Deaf music: Embodying language and rhythm." In *Deaf Gain: Raising the Stakes for Human Diversity*, ed. by H-Dirksen L. Bauman and Joseph J. Murray, 436–456. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lucas, Ceil. 2002. *The Sociolinguistics of Sign Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marín Perabá, Cristina. 2019. "Enfoques educativos de la concepción de integración e inclusión" [Educational approaches to the concept of integration and inclusion]. *Revista Internacional de Apoyo a la Inclusión, Logopedia, Sociedad y Multiculturalidad* 5(1): 115–124.
- Marx, Karl. 1867. *Das Kapital*. Hamburg: Otto Meissner.
- May, Stephen. 2012. *Language and Minority Rights. Ethnicity, Nationalism and the Politics of Language*. 2nd Ed. New York: Routledge.
- Mellinger, Christopher D. 2020. "Positionality in public service interpreting research." *FITISPos* 7: 92–109.
- Napier, Jemina. 2004. "Sign language interpreter training, testing, and accreditation: An international comparison." *American Annals of the Deaf* 149(4): 350–359.
- Pérez Senra, Belén. 2019. "La interpretación en lengua de signos: una cuestión de rol" [Court interpreting in sign language: A question of role]. *Revista de Llengua i Dret* 71: 73–87.
- Putman, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone – The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Quer, Josep. 2012. "Legal pathways to the recognition of Sign Languages: A comparison of the Catalan and Spanish Sign Language Acts." *Sign Language Studies* 12(4): 565–582.
- Reagan, Timothy G. 2010. *Language Policy and Planning for Sign Languages*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Ryan, Richard M. 1995. "Psychological needs and the facilitation of integrative processes." *Journal of Personality* 63: 397–427.
- Ryan, Richard M. and Edward L. Deci. 2017. *Self-Determination Theory: Basic Psychological Needs in Motivation, Development, and Wellness*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Sheneman, Naomi and Octavian E. Robinson. 2021. "Helpers, professional authority, and pathologized bodies: Ableism in interpretation and translation." In *Translating Asymmetry / Rewriting Power*, ed. by Ovidi Carbonell i Cortés and Esther Monzó-Nebot, 55–76. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Simmel, Georg. 1955[2014]. *Conflict and the Web of Group Affiliations*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Teubner, Gunther. 1989. *Recht als autopoietisches System* [Law as an autopoietic system]. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp-Verlag.
- Torres Rangel, Moraima. 2009. "El proceso de la escritura en estudiantes adolescentes sordos" [The writing process in deaf adolescent students]. *Revista Latinoamericana de Educación Inclusiva* 3(1): 113–131.
- Turner, Graham H. 2009. "Sign language planning: Pragmatism, pessimism and principles." *Current Issues in Language Planning* 10(3): 243–254.
- Vansteenkiste, Maarten, Richard M. Ryan, and Bart Soenens. 2020. "Basic psychological need theory: Advancements, critical themes, and future directions." *Motivation and Emotion* 44(1): 1–31.


- Varner, Iris I. and Katrin Varner. 2014. "The relationship between culture and legal systems and the impact on intercultural business communication." *Global Advances in Business Communication* 3(1): Article 3.
-  Wallace, Melissa and Esther Monzó-Nebot. 2019. "Legal translation and interpreting in public services: Defining key issues, re-examining policies, and locating the public in public service interpreting and translation." *Revista de Llengua i Dret* 71: 1–12.
-  Winston, Elizabeth A. 2005. "Designing a curriculum for American Sign Language/English interpreting educators." In *Educational Interpreting and Interpreting Education*, ed. by Marc Marschark, Rico Peterson, and Elizabeth A. Winston, 208–233. New York: Oxford University Press.
-  Young, Alys, Jemina Napier, and Rosemary Oram. 2020. "The translated deaf self, ontological (in)security and deaf culture." *The Translator* 25(4): 349–368.

Address for correspondence


Esther Monzó-Nebot
 Dept. of Translation and Communication Studies
 Universitat Jaume I
 Av. Sos Baynat s/n
 E-12071 Castelló de la Plana
 Spain
 monzo@uji.es

Biographical notes

Esther Monzó-Nebot is an Associate Professor in Translation and Interpreting Studies at Universitat Jaume I. She is involved in conducting research and activism in the area of language rights and the uses of translation and interpreting in managing diversity, including an emphasis on gender and intergroup bias.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5658-9967>

Rayco H. González-Montesino is a Lecturer at the Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, training interpreters in the Spanish Sign Language and Deaf Community Degree. He earned his Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics from the University of Vigo and has been a Spanish Sign Language interpreter and interpreter trainer for almost two decades.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6830-3951>

Publication history

Date received: 15 March 2021

Date accepted: 2 February 2023

Published online: 6 March 2023