

Steps in the Development of a Translation Market for Migrant Communities

CARMEN VALERO –GARCÉS

University of Alcalá, Madrid, Spain

Abstract

The production of texts for migrant communities which are differentiated both culturally and linguistically is a necessary market in countries with a rapid growing rate of migrant population. This paper will explore the characteristics of translated materials from the reader's perspective in a specific country, Spain, where the rate of migrant population has increased considerably in the last 10 years. In previous studies (Valero-Garcés 2002, Valero and Sales 2007), a tentative classification of the types of texts typically translated for the Spanish market was analyzed as were some of the characteristics of the translated materials. The main conclusions suggested that there were two main differentiated bodies producing translated material (TM); on the one hand, the government administration and public institutions, and, on the other hand NGOs, immigrant associations and trade unions. Following this research, a recent study has been conducted in 2007 among readers of the translated texts in order to check if the previous conclusions were still valid or if there had been some sort of evolution. The results show an increasing number of translated texts accompanied by a growing awareness about the migration phenomenon and the need to build a new multicultural society. This is made more evident in the rising number of conferences, seminars, decrees and regional immigration plans. All these elements favor the development of a multilingual and translation market, which still offers some positive and negative aspects.

Résumé

La production de textes à l'attention des collectifs d'immigrants, dénotant des différences à la fois culturelles et linguistiques, est un marché nécessaire dans les pays qui connaissent un fort taux de croissance de la population de migrants.

Cet article analysera les caractéristiques de ces matériels traduits depuis la perspective des lecteurs d'un pays en particulier, l'Espagne, où la proportion de la population d'immigrant a connu une augmentation considérable depuis ces dix dernières années. Lors d'études précédentes, (Valero-Garcés, 2002; Valero y Sales, 2007) une tentative de classification des textes habituellement traduits pour le marché espagnol avait été effectué, et quelques caractéristiques de ces matériels traduits avaient été relevé. Les conclusions générales signalaient l'existence de deux principaux organismes à la tête des matériels traduits (MT); d'un côté, l'administration gouvernementale et les institutions publiques puis d'un autre côté, les ONGs, les associations d'immigrants et les syndicats.

Dans cette même lignée, en 2007, une étude récente a été menée à bien entre les lecteurs de textes traduits, afin de vérifier si les conclusions tirées précédemment se maintenaient encore ou si la situation avait suivie une certaine évolution. Les résultats alors obtenus, ont indiqué une augmentation du nombre de textes traduits et ont dévoilé une inquiétude croissante pour le phénomène de la migration et les besoins de construire une société multiculturelle. Cette inquiétude se traduit d'ailleurs par une augmentation du nombre de conférences, de séminaires, de décrets et de plans régionaux sur l'immigration. Tous ces éléments favorisent le développement d'un marché multilingue et de traduction, tout en offrant encore des aspects positif et négatif.

1.0 Introduction. The purpose of this study

During the last decades the foreign population has increased considerably in most countries in the EU, especially in the southern countries (Italy, Spain, Portugal, Greece) with people coming from Africa and Eastern European countries as well as from Asia. This paper will concentrate on Spain, one of the most popular tourist destinations in the world, but also the EU country that has been receiving the highest number of immigrants in the last decade. In Madrid, for example, in 1996 the immigrant population represented less than 6% of the total population; in 2007 it represented more than 13 % (<http://www.madrid.org>).

This rapid increase of population with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, most of whom have never had previous contact with the language and culture of the host country, creates new challenges that need to be addressed. Spain, like many countries that have been receiving high numbers of migrants in a short period of time and space, is still struggling to find solutions to this new situation in all spheres of modern society (political, economical, social, educational, religious, etc.). Cultural and linguistic communication with this foreign population affects everyone. However, researchers, trainers and professionals in translation and interpretation, agree that little attention is paid to this issue. There are some valuable initiatives such as the ones on mediation put into practice by organizations like EMSI (*Escuela de Mediadores de la Comunidad de Madrid* ('Mediators' School of the Madrid Regional Government') or SEMSI (*Servicio de Mediación Social Intercultural*, ('Service of Social Intercultural Mediation') supported by official institutions; or those conducted by groups connected to academic bodies like FITISPos at the University of Alcalá, Madrid, or CRIT, at the University of Jaume I, Castelló, or by the different members of the COMUNICA network (See <http://www2.uah.es/traduccion>). Valuable as they may be, however, they are clearly insufficient

and still local or not sufficiently recognized and supported by official institutions. As a result, community interpreting and translating services are still *ad hoc* or almost non-existent.

They are, however, quickly growing as I will try to show in the following pages through the analysis of a very specific topic: Production and reception of texts for migrant minority communities which are culturally and linguistically differentiated.

For this purpose, two different sources have been considered:

1. A corpus of texts in different languages other than Spanish found in public services which have been produced and/or translated for the migrant communities.
2. A questionnaire developed to check the informants' perception of the quality of translated materials and texts in other languages. The same questionnaire was used for two different projects developed at a different time: the first one in 2004 and the second one in 2007. The total number of questionnaires analyzed was 45: 15 informants in 2004 and 30 informants in 2007.

2.0 A review of previous research: Commissioners and types of texts

The main point of departure for this research was a previous study carried out in 2002 where a first attempt at classification of translated texts into Spanish was made (Valero-Garcés 2002). Due to the rapid increase of immigrant populations in the period 2001-2004 we wanted to check if the situation concerning this topic had changed in the last few years, considering the information available from previous studies. Three main points were analyzed: 1. The nature of translated materials (TM) and their translators; 2. The commissioners of TM or initiators of the process of translation and 3. The characteristics of the texts translated.

2.1. The nature of translated materials (TM) and their translators

Drawing on the conclusions of the previous studies (Valero-Garcés, C. 2002, Valero-Garcés & Sales 2004-5), the results revealed two important facts: (1) that materials in languages other than Spanish were almost non-existent at the beginning of the new millennium, even though Spain had been receiving immigrants since 1986, when Spain became a member of the EU; and (2) that the translations were mostly done by bilingual volunteers.

As for the first point, the studies revealed that a new growing market was emerging. As for the second point mentioned, the bilingual volunteers working as *ad hoc translators* of most of the TM had been living in Spain for a number of years and knew Spanish at an advanced level, though without any formal education in Spanish and sometimes not even in their native language. The majority worked or had worked as volunteers for NGOs or humanitarian organizations, and some of them had also occasionally worked for the government. Their educational backgrounds were diverse, ranging from illiterate people to those with university degrees. They usually helped their family members, friends or people from the same ethnic group as volunteer interpreters, this activity being the main source of their experience. They also translated any sort of document or text when they were asked to do this as part of their job or when hired as *ad hoc* freelance translators at very low rates. Some of these *ad hoc* translators were proficient bilinguals, but others showed strong deficiencies in their use of register, specific vocabulary, and even spelling.

As for the materials in languages other than Spanish, the studies revealed that one of the main difficulties *ad hoc* translators related they had was the lack of resources and tools for translating in the combination of specific pairs of languages, for example, Spanish and Romanian, Arabic, Bulgarian or Chinese, to name but a few. Finding dictionaries, glossaries or parallel texts for the combinations of English and Spanish or French and Spanish in the internet or in paper form was not difficult. However, it was almost impossible in some other

combinations. Some experienced translators said they had to use a third language- generally English or French, but not everybody knew those languages and / or had the resources and access to them. As a consequence, some translated texts showed some deficiencies in their quality.

When asked about the main difficulties translators found in their work, the handling of technical or semi-technical terms received a very high percentage (always over 50%) (75% in a survey conducted in 1998, and 55% in a survey conducted in 2002 (See Valero-Garcés 2004). It is worth mentioning at this point that the meaning of “technical word” may not be the same for a service provider (and/or a translator) as it is for an immigrant customer who has never heard about ‘x-rays’ ‘vaccinations’ or ‘ultrasonography’. I can think about at least three reasons:

- a) These words that can be considered as common terms (“banalizado” (‘banalised’) Cabré 1999) for the former group, can be specialized words for the latter who may need some sort of explanation to know its exact meaning.
- b) The participants may also face a lack of correspondence between the languages (“vacío terminológico” (‘an empty terminological space’) Cabré 2004).
- c) The participants’ relationship may reflect an expert – non-expert situation, (Niska 2003).

Therefore the translator may encounter everything from short, disconnected lists (or ‘laundry lists’ as S. E. Wright and L. D. Wright (1997: 147) call them) to entire books and long conversations in a very specific context. This main factor forces the translator and/or interpreter (T&I) to practice *ad hoc* terminology and often to be creative. As already mentioned above, the non-existence of dictionaries and other terminological tools create further difficulties for these translators.

Most theoretical treatises and translation programs — mainly in specialized translation/interpretation — emphasize the need for and advantages of systematic terminology

management, but they fail to take into account the limitations that are imposed by the conventional translation/interpreting workplace. Wright (1997: 148) clearly outlines some of the disadvantages the translator-terminologists experience:

- They are not subject-field experts.
- They may even have difficulty determining the field the text actually belongs to.
- They work from inadequate research material.
- They lack access to subject-field specialists.
- They lack time to pursue extensive (or even cursory) research activity, due to short delivery deadlines.
- They lack time to create extensive, thoroughly documented terminological entries, even when information is available.

Again these limitations are even greater when interpreting and translating in public services. The public service translator (PST) is often forced to create and rely on *ad hoc* terminology which basically works opposite to the recommendations for systemic work, and rely on strategies such as word-for-word translations, direct loans, omissions or the use of deictic elements and extralinguistic elements. All these strategies may produce nonsense or erroneous texts in the Target Text (TT). (For more information on this topic see Valero-Garcés, C.2005, 75- 96).

Chesher (1994: 38), an expert on translating services in Australia, recommended the translation of technical terms into everyday language or the inclusion of explanatory notes so that the text may be properly communicated to the reader. Downing and Bogoslaw (2003), researchers and I&T trainers at the University of Minnesota, USA, and contributors to the project *Hablamos Juntos* (<http://www.hablamosjuntos.org>) also pointed out that the form of the

translation would be affected by questions of dialect, literacy level, bilingualism, preferred means of communication, and people's attitudes towards their language. They argue that “because it is so important for translations to be accurate and stylistically and culturally appropriate, translation should preferably be done by the best available professional translators, not by bilingual staff members who lack training and the specific skills needed for translation” (Downing & Bogoslaw 2003: 15). Such a recommendation is rarely followed in the case of the Spanish translation market as my research demonstrates.

2.2. The commissioners of the process of translation

Results from these previous studies revealed that the commissioners interested in the production of texts in other languages – mostly translations from an original text (OT) into Spanish, were basically two: (1) government bodies responsible for healthcare, legal, educational or administrative matters, (2) NGOs, trade unions or associations of migrant communities. There were a few private institutions or people (only 2-3) in contact with migrants (e.g. banks, enterprises, farmers) who had produced some sort of TM. The main purpose of the translations was informative, and the texts were mainly translations from an OT in Spanish, with no original texts in other languages.

This situation seems to be changing as the study conducted recently (2006-7) reveals. The results have been compared with the ones from 2002 and 2004 and in the case of the commissioner of the translation some differences have been found:

(1) The official institutions and NGOs, trade unions and immigrant associations are still the bodies who commission the highest numbers of translations or multilingual texts, but

(2) The number of private institutions (banks, insurance companies, food companies, services related to communication companies: TV, internet, cell phones) has considerably increased the production of TT and/or multilingual texts.

(3) New institutions- especially academic bodies - have incorporated this topic into their research and production of TM, for example, the University of Alcalá started in 2006 the innovative program called “Universidad para los inmigrantes” (‘University for migrants’) which includes some free Spanish courses for migrants and the production of multilingual texts by trained translators (See <http://www2.uah.es/traduccion>).

2.3. The types of texts translated

The following is an initial classification of text types in languages other than Spanish (Valero Garcés, 2002):

- Official documents. These were documents published by government bodies whose purpose was generally to provide information to citizens or immigrants on laws or topics which they needed to be familiar with in order to settle in the country or to integrate into the host society.
- Service guides. These documents were generally published by city councils, NGOs and regional governments. Their main aim was to provide useful information about services to help migrants settle in the host community.
- Information brochures. These documents were commissioned by all sorts of institutions: official bodies, NGOs, private companies (telecommunications, banks) or anyone who wanted to communicate with migrant populations in their own language. These documents, like the guides, varied in their origins, objectives and budgets, and this diversity was – and still is –reflected in the end-product.

These three types of texts were also found in the survey of 2006/7. However there were some obvious changes. The official documents and application forms available in different languages (usually, English, French, Arabic, Romanian, Russian, Bulgarian, Chinese, Polish) now cover a wider variety of subjects offering more services by both public and private institutions.

In the case of the guides, more specific guides than just services guides are now made available, with financial backing now extending to other sources such as pharmaceutical or insurance companies. This is the case of the recently published *Guía multilingüe de hábitos saludables en la atención al menor* ('Multilingual Guide about healthy habits for migrant minors') (2007) in eight languages, Spanish, English, French, Arabic, Bulgarian, Romanian, Russian, Polish, addressed to parents with children between 0-18 years, financed by the international pharmaceutical company Pfizer. Other examples of TM are the *Multilingual Pocket Guide about Healthcare for Immigrants* (2006) in nine languages or the *Guide for Pregnant Women* and *Guide for Paediatricians* (2007) in 8 languages, and financed by a regional government.

Recently some useful multilingual software have also appeared in the market (such an example is the *Universal Doctor Speaks*, partially financed by SEMFYC (*Sociedad Española de Medicina de Familia y Comunitaria* ('Spanish Society of Family and Community Medicine')). However, their effectiveness has not yet been tested.

Information brochures have undergone a considerable increase in number and topics. Almost every day a new advertisement or a multilingual leaflet/brochure is seen in banks, supermarkets, the local press, the tube station walls, or in telephone booths. For example, in March 2007, the free daily paper *QUE* included a piece of news entitled "banks - the businesses

most interested in migrants”. The IBERCAJA bank offers three new services in Spanish, Arabic, English, Romanian and Russia: a) the *Multicountry Card*, a card used to send money to any part of the world, b) *IB-Bravo envíos*, a service that allows migrants to regularly send money to their relatives, and c) the *Multicountry transfers*, a new service with a flat rate for sending money abroad.

In sum, an increasingly varied ethnic market announcing any sort of articles and services is easily observable- from a special brand of bleach, or refreshments for Moroccans or Ecuadorians, to advertisements announcing how to get your driving licence in Chinese, or how to phone abroad at the cheapest rate.

III. - Quality in TM from the informants’ perception. An empirical study

After a review of the state of affairs in 2002/4 and 2006/7, an analysis of the informants’ perceptions of the quality of TM was conducted. The data were collected through a questionnaire which included questions related to the informants’ perception about the use of language, the content, the role of the translator and the commissioner of the translation. The same questionnaire was used for the two periods. The total of questionnaires analyzed was 45: 15 informants in 2004 and 30 informants in 2007. The informants included: immigrants, Spanish born people from the general public, civil servants, NGO workers, and students of the Community Interpreting Program at the University of Alcalá (UAH).

3.1 The informants’ perception about language in TM.

Section 1 related to the use of language in TM and it included three questions:

1. Do you consider the use of language adequate for the content?

2. What is, in your opinion, their target audience?

3. Are translated texts or material (TM) intended for users with a medium/ high/ low educational level?

The analysis of the data showed that, in the 2002/4 survey, most respondents (90%) indicated that the language was understandable, although some informants added that TM was not always suitable for the intended audience, especially when referring to texts translated into Arabic. Some comments are illustrative:

Comment 1: “There is a high percentage of Moroccan people in the Madrid area. Many of them are illiterate or with a low educational level, and they can’t read the information” (Informant 1 in 2004).

Comment 2: (...) It depends on a lot of things. They’re always intended for immigrants with problems, people who need help at some moment in their lives. I think it depends on the user’s educational level (...). Less educated people won’t get the message: don’t forget that we Arabic speakers talk dialect but study classical Arabic, and they’re very different. (Informant 2 in 2002).

However when referring to texts in other languages, most respondents (90%) agreed that the TM was addressed to the general public, or public service clients, and that it was intended for users with a medium educational level (80%). Only 1 person said that the level was too high and one other that it was too low.

When we compare these results to the 2006/7 survey, the percentages are similar. Most agree that the TM are difficult to translate and that they are intended for the general public. The

results also highlighted larger body of TM currently available, covering a greater variety of topics, with often more specialized terminology. This last factor still poses a problem for the translator due mostly to the lack of resources and adequate training. The respondents also reported that the most common translation strategies used are word-for-word translations, and loan translations which sometimes make the term difficult to understand, even though the context (text and images) usually help to get the intended meaning across. The use of explanations, footnotes, or the translation of technical terms in everyday language are strategies also used in an increasing number of TM.

3.2 The informants' perception about content in TM.

Section 2 was related to the content and it also included three questions:

1. Do you consider the TM (translated materials) to be culturally adequate regarding their content and the intended audience?
2. Have you found anything difficult to understand?
3. Have you found anything that has surprised /offended you when reading them?

The results indicate that all the informants agree with the adequacy of the content. This fact could be interpreted as the general acceptance of TM, or- in other words- the need for TM. When asked about the use /understanding of terms, concepts or expressions related to socio-cultural aspects (e.g. eating, religious or any type of habits, or administrative procedures that may pose some difficulties for the audience, in 2002/4, no difficulties were related. In 2006/7 some comments related to difficulties with words and expressions referred to documents needed, services offered or institutional names and their equivalents used in (semi) official documents when the term has no equivalent in the other language and the translator has to show his/her

ability to make it understandable to the new audience mentioned. For example, the expression “célula de habitabilidad,” a sort of certificate that says a house can be inhabited.

Nevertheless, the informants find no problems of this kind with the rising number of informative texts produced by NGOs or advertisements produced by public or private enterprises.

As for the 3rd question related to the use of elements which could be considered offensive or surprising due to cultural differences, in both studies 90% said they have not found anything offensive. Only 10 % pointed out some problems as illustrated by Imad’s comment. Imad is a Moroccan student of Medicine at the University of Alcalá and occasionally an NGO volunteer. He says:

‘Indeed the texts translated into minority languages are less sensitive to the specific culture. For example, they do not take into account the differences that exist between standard Arabic, which is official for Moroccans, and the *amazight* (Berber) dialect of Rif, or the *Dariddyya* language spoken by most of the Moroccan people.

Institutions do not make these differences and the work they produce is 100% in standard Arabic, because the other dialects do not have written representation. Therefore, all these texts are not going to be understood by the population they are targeting.

Most times, organizations tend to inform orally in their headquarters, arranging meetings also in small towns, where there is often a bar where people tend to go to have a drink or a coffee and be helped, listened to, oriented in aspects they need. This free work is usually more effective in order to communicate with an illiterate audience, or speakers of languages and dialects that don’t have written representation. Also, regarding texts, those produced by organizations usually are more respectful to cultural aspects, and more adapted to the socio-cultural reality’ (our translation).

3.3. The informants' perception about the role of the translator

Section 3 was related to the translator's role and included the three following questions:

1. Who do you think are the translators of the TM?
2. Have you found any difference in register, style, vocabulary?
3. Do you think that the translator knows the target culture well?

The results show that in the first survey (2002/4) the informants considered that the translators were mostly NGO volunteers, and bilinguals without any specific training, especially in languages such as Bulgarian, Russian, Polish, or Romanian, languages that were not usually taught in Spain, and were neither included as languages in the translation nor applied linguistics programs at university level.

At this point a comment about Arabic may help to understand the reality. There are several universities in Spain that have traditionally offered a degree in Arabic Studies. Most students were Spanish native speakers with very little or no command of Arabic when starting their studies at university. Besides, the main emphasis was- and I dare say it still is- put on Arabic literature and culture. As a result, after 5 year- study, the students did not usually get the necessary level to translate, and the translators were mainly immigrants. These *ad hoc* Arabic translators had not often received any linguistic formal education or translation instruction neither in their countries nor in Spain and they often mixed registers, and had problems with specific terms in both languages and showed certain tendency to produce literal translations and /or omissions (See Taibi & Valero 2005).

In the 2006/7 survey, the situation seems similar when referring to bilinguals working for NGOs or local governments which are asked to translate anything they need. Nevertheless there

is an increasing number of experienced translators working for the government, or from translation agencies and freelance translators with some experience who are hired to translate specific texts. At the same time informants point out that these translators produce more linguistically homogeneous and culturally sensitive texts.

When the informants are asked if they think that the translator knows the target culture well, in both surveys, 90 % agree, and only two informants in the first survey added that sometimes the language is understood but not the culture, a comment that was also repeated in the second survey when referring to Arabic culture, and which is quite similar to the ones previously mentioned.

3.5. The informants' perception about the role of the TM commissioner

Section 4 related to the commissioner's role and the questionnaire included just one question: Do you think that there is any difference (topic, content, quality, linguistic competence, etc) between the materials translated by the administration and those translated by NGOs or other entities?

As it has already been explained, the reason for this question was based on the results from previous research (Valero Garcés 2002a, and Valero-Garcés and Sales (2006)) about the existence of the two tendencies mentioned in the translated materials, that is: (1) a more literal, less culturally sensitive, more expensive TM commissioned by the government bodies responsible for healthcare, legal, educational or administrative matters, (2) a more adapted, more culturally sensitive, and less expensive TM promoted by NGOs, trade unions or associations of migrant communities, or private institutions in contact with migrants.

The results show that 70 % of the informants from the 2002/4 period admitted some differences and the rest (30 %) said all texts had similar characteristics. Some comments on the differences clearly illustrate this point:

Comment 1: “Yes, the material from the administration is usually more expensively-produced texts with translations that are rather literal and not so culturally sensitive.”

Comment 2. “NGOs and other bodies tend to produce texts which are better adapted to the users' socio-cultural background.”

Comment 3. “I think the administration is more interested in politics than in communicating with immigrants. They spend lots of money on brochures, guides and so on, and sometimes the result can be quite offensive” (religion, traditions, linguistic mistakes...)”.

Comment 4. “The administration more often use people who are qualified but aren't in contact with immigrants; they are just translators doing their job. NGOs tend to use people who know two or three languages and are often involved with and committed to the target community”.

Informants from the second period (2006/7), still perceive some differences between the official bodies, on the one side, and NGOs and private institutions and businesses on the other side. However the percentage is relatively lower (60%), although still significant. This change may also indicate an attitude change by the administration. Some answers by the informants that justify these differences follow:

1. In the case of the TM commissioned by NGOs and Trade Unions, the informants comment that they think these organizations have a tighter budget but they have a highly motivated staff, and that the translations are frequently done by freelance translators and experienced volunteers,

who very often were part of the staff; they also think that NGOs produce TM addressed to very specific groups and needs.

2. In the case of TM commissioned by official bodies, the informants point out that they consider that the administration is slowly changing and they give some reasons: (1) they dedicate a higher budget than the NGOs or non-official institutions, (2) they are also gradually increasing this budget every year, and (3) the staff are also becoming more motivated than in previous years.

Informants also perceive that the administration authorities are becoming more and more aware of the importance of quality and comprehensibility of the TM. Thus some official institutions - e.g. the regional Madrid Health Institute or some town halls- are looking for a more socio-cultural approach to asking for adapted texts for the specific ethnic groups, and taking into account the complaints or comments made by some immigrants when they complain that the translated texts (or parts of them) made no sense or was difficult to understand. Some commissioners have even admitted that they have literally thrown out hundreds of booklets after finding that the text contained spelling or content mistakes.

New initiatives come up almost every day: web pages which contain multilingual materials (OFRIM), multilingual phone service (e.g. toll free numbers in different languages, Madrid: 012), new multilingual resources (applications forms for school, police forms), rise in telephone interpreting and software programs, videos in different languages, pictograms and so on. Results from our research show that, even if this new market is not large enough, it is still actively growing.

4.0 Conclusions: Steps in a growing translation market

A global view in 2007 offers some positive and negative points. The positive points include:

1. An increasing, albeit slow awareness on the part of society and institutions of the need for TM.
2. An increasing production of TM.
3. An increasing interest in the adequacy – but also – acceptability of TM.

The negative points include:

1. Not specific – or little- budget dedicated to TM in most institutions.
2. Production of ephemeral TM.
3. Limited distribution.
4. No reprints.
5. No (or small, uncompleted, lack of uniformity) data bases.
6. Differences in TM: Use of low-budget, poor quality materials, but highly effective TM (posters, notes on the underground walls and telephone booths) in contrast with good quality and expensive TM produced as the result of very specific campaigns.

In general, a growing awareness about the migration phenomenon and the need to build a new multicultural society is felt in the increasing number of conferences, seminars, decrees and regional immigration plans. All these elements favor the development of a multilingual and translation market.

This is however, still not enough. As the COMUNICA Network explained in the poster presented at the Conference Critical Link 5 held in Sydney, Australia in April 2007, the reasons are quite obvious: (1) little or no mention of (or provision for) solutions to communication problems still existing; (2) *ad hoc* solutions, volunteer workers, intercultural mediators who act as interpreters and translators without having received any specific training or students developing practical training still used; (3) insufficient production of multilingual resources is obvious when compared with other countries like USA, Australia or the UK; (4) frequent low

pay and no accreditation or training required to be hired by the government; (5) recruitment is often made through the national employment agency which gives priority to length of time unemployed over experience.

There is still a long way to go, but the first steps have been taken. For example, (1) the development of training courses including topics of terminology, ethics, or translation strategies (University of Alcalá, University Jaume I, University of Vic, University of Granada), (2) the intensive cooperative research of networks (COMUNICA, FITISPos, CRIT, GRETI (See <http://www2.uah.es/traduccion>), or (3) the exchanging of experiences and TM in seminars, workshops and specific conferences are all good initiatives. A further step should imply: (1) More cooperation from the stakeholders: Academic bodies – Administration – NGOs - Public Services as well as private business; and (2) more research and specific training programs.

References

- Cabré, T. 1999. "Traducción y terminología: un espacio de encuentro ineludible". In Cabré, T. *La terminología. Representación y comunicación. Elementos para una teoría de base comunicativa y toros artículos*. Barcelona: IULA: 177-201
- Cabré, T. 2004. "La terminología en la traducción especializada". In Gonzalo García, C. & García Yebra, V. (eds.). *Manual de documentación y terminología para la traducción especializada*. Madrid: Arcos/Libros S. L. 89-125.
- Chesher, T. 1994. "Translation for Public Education". In *Koiné, IV*: 35-47.
- Chesher, T. 1997. "Rhetoric and reality: Two decades of community interpreting and translating in Australia". In Carr, S. E., et al. *The Critical Link: Interpreters in the Community*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins: 277-289.
- Downing, B. & Bogoslaw, L. (2003). "Effective Patient-Provider Communication. Across Language Barriers: A Focus on Methods of Translation", paper prepared for *Hablamos Juntos*: 18. [http://www.hablamosjuntos.org/sm/default.common_translation_errors.asp].
- Niska, H. 2003. "Cuando fracasan las palabras. Los métodos y las herramientas del trabajo terminológico para intérpretes sociales". In Valero Garcés, C. (ed.) *Traducción e interpretación en los servicios públicos. Contextualización, actualidad y futuro*. Granada: Comares: 91-124.
- Taibi, M. & Valero-Garcés, C. 2005. "Miscommunication in Institutional Interaction Through Non-Qualified Interpreters". In *Turjumān, Revista de Traducción e Interpretación de la Escuela Superior de Traducción "Roi Fahd"*, Tánger, Marruecos, vol 14, nº 2: 27- 53.
- Valero-Garcés, C. 2002. "Traducir de y para los que llegan: Una incipiente realidad". In Valero-Garcés, C. & Mancho Barés, G. (eds). *Traducción e Interpretación en los Servicios Públicos: Nuevas necesidades para nuevas realidades/ New Needs for New Realities*. Alcalá de Henares: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad: 61-70.
- Valero-Garcés, C. 2003. "Responding to Communication Needs: Current Issues and Challenges in Community Interpreting and Translating in Spain". In Brunette *et al.* 2003, *Critical Link 3*. Amsterdam: Benjamins: 177-192.
- Valero-Garcés, C. 2004. "Barreras lingüísticas en la comunicación intercultural. Datos y acciones". *OFRIM, Revista especializada de inmigración. Suplementos II*. June 2004: 17-36.
- Valero-Garcés, C. 2005. "Terminology and Ad hoc Interpreters in Public Services. An Empirical Study". In *JOSTRANS, The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 3, 75- 96, <http://www.jostrans.org/issue03/issue03toc.htm>.
- Valero-Garcés, C. & Sales, D. 2007. "Translating for new multicultural realities: The complex nature of Translating as a socio-cultural practice", paper read at International Conference:

Translating and Interpreting as a Social Practice, held at the University of Graz, Austria, May 2005, a revised and adapted version published in *JOSTRANS*, 7,
<http://www.jostrans.org/issue07/issue07toc.htm>

Wright, S. & L. D. Wright 1997. "Descriptive Terminology". In Wright, S. & Gerhard, B. (Eds) *Handbook of Terminology Management*. (vol1) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.