



A Study of Interpreting English Political Items into Arabic in Terms of Pierre Bourdieusian Habitus-Motivated/ Oriented Decision Ideology

Asst. Prof. Zeineb Sami Hawel

Noor Hameed Mzaiel

Dept. of Translation-College of Arts

University of Basra

Abstract

News channels have strong and fixed rules. They expect their employees to follow these standards and work accordingly. Interpreters in these channels face a multiple pressure. On the one hand, they are required to follow these rules to keep their jobs; and on the other hand, they seek to respect neutrality as it is a basic ethic in the *field*. Translation, the umbrella term of interpretation, as a process, is a complex activity. It is not limited to a single aspect of human behavior. Rather, it entails different and complicated inclinations. Although many scholars argue that neutrality is an essential requirement of translation, it is nearly impossible to obtain. In order to explain the reasons behind this difficulty, this study adopts the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's theory in which he explains the human action by bringing the concepts *field*, *capital*, and *habitus*. These three concepts work as pillars to analyze humans' actions. The theory is applied to samples of interpreted extracts taken from different news channels to study the sociological behavior of the interpreters in these channels. The news channels will be treated as the *field* where interpreters practice their social activity. It will also be used to see which conventions control this *field* and what affects the exercises of the interpreters. The main focus of this study is the influence of these factors on the interpreters' *habitus* and how they interact to work in accordance with what is imposed upon them.

1. Introduction

There is no doubt that politics plays a crucial role in the daily life of people. It has become the manipulative power that controls the lives of millions of people. Common people, for this reason, follow politics on a daily basis. The mass media, on the one hand, helps people to follow politics more thoroughly, and on the other hand, provides a greater chance for political institutions to manipulate people according to their adopted ideologies. In addition, mass media and globalization expose people to news and political topics in other languages than their mother tongue. This does not include ordinary people alone, but local news agencies depend greatly on global news agencies



to track news and events. Therefore, recruiting translators and interpreters becomes a necessity. However, these translators/ interpreters play a decisive role in manipulating the political discourse of the news whether they are acquainted with the agencies' ideologies or not. What is agreed upon is that their translation or interpretation performs a particular function that manipulates people.

The function translation/interpretation constitutes the subject matter of this study; it is most suitable to adopt a framework that belongs to the cultural turn in translation studies. Schäffner (1998: 235) declares that the increasing attention towards the cultural and sociological turn in the *field* of translation studies has obliged scholars to adopt new theoretical frameworks from other disciplines such as (sociology, psychology, anthropology, etc.) to study the wide range of factors that play a fundamental role in the process of translation. This turn in translation studies is communicative-based which looks at translation as a form of communication. The most important element in this turn is the interest in the function of the translation in relation to the status of the translator as an agent and his/her relationship with the readership. However, Wolf (2007: 131-2) postulates that since the sixties, the field of translation studies witnessed the emergence of several approaches that took into account the cultural factors in translation. Nevertheless, these approaches neglect the cultural and social circumstances that shape the inner behavior of the translator and shape it which, for sure, affect the process and the product of translation. Therefore, new trends in translation studies appeared to look deeply in the incorporated set of relations which is considered the force factor in translation. Translation, in the light of this approach, is considered a form of social practice wherein translator, institutions, publishers, etc. play the role of social agents.

The sociological turn in translation studies began when translation and interpreting were initially treated as form and part of the social practice. In the light of this turn in translation studies, translators, their behavior, and their agencies became the core of focus in the discipline. The interest entailed the factors that stimulate them and their practice of translation and the reasons behind their response to these factors. In other words, translation studies experienced a divergent from the linguistic and semiotic studies (Inghilleri, 2005:126). The translator/interpreter here is treated as an agent who is affected by the field of translation and affects the structure of the *field* at the same time. These objectives make the adaptation of the sociological framework most suitable to achieve the proposed objectives.

The details above lead us to say that it is important to investigate the behavior of the translator/interpreter, to shed light on the sources of his/her choices during the process of translating/ interpreting, and to highlight the factors that shape their attitude after their entering to the field of translation. The translator is treated as an agent who applies his/her practices to the *field* of translation wherein translation is treated as a social practice. In this study, interpreting in news agencies is examined from a socio-political angle. For these reasons, a sociological framework will satisfy the purpose of the research. Most precisely, the theory of "social practice" by Pierre Bourdieu will be adopted. His sociology is built on a number of concepts that he calls "thinking tools" to

analyze and study the field of translation as the *field* of social struggle. His basic notion of "*habitus*" is employed in translation studies to tackle the decisions made by the translators and further it provides an explanatory background of the decision-making process.

2. The Aims of the Study

The study aims at investigating the reasons behind the political items interpreters' intervention in the original ones or extracts by changing, deleting or adding parts to change some directions and/or implicit ideas of the original texts to meet their own ideologies or the body that they are affiliated to.

3. The Hypothesis

The researcher hypothesizes that interpreters in news channels are obliged to follow the standards and the rules of the channel. This entails that s/he gives up her/his beliefs acquired during her/his life to keep her/his job and sustain a position in the *field*. A number of news materials and speeches will be examined to shed light on the pitfalls included in their outcome of these texts.

4. The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu

Pierre Bourdieu, the French sociologist who is best known for his theory of social practice in sociology, is one of the most influential theorists in social science whose theories attracted vast debate and considerations of many scholars in different *fields* (Swartz, 1997: 11). In his works, he rejects the trendiest philosophical approaches at the time, subjectivism and objectivism. Subjectivism postulates that an individual is entirely free and consciousness plays a firm role in the social practice. On the contrary, objectivism looks at the world as a structure of reality where agents develop a conscious understanding to work effectively in the structure. In order to build a theory based on the two approaches, Bourdieu stresses that social agents are not merely followers of cultural or social norms, rather they "act strategically" to participate in the social reality where different agents and groups project their practices (Bourdieu, 1984: 483). While his work came to be a reaction against these approaches, he attempted to bridge the two concepts and surpass the opposition between subjectivism and objectivism. The main aim of Bourdieu's theory is to clarify the relationship between the individual's experience "subjectivism" and the social reality "objectivism" (Johnson, 1993: 3).

Bourdieu (1977: 8-9) suggests a framework that neither treats human behavior as determined by chance nor results in it. His framework is structured to establish the social practices by explaining the nature of social reality. He believes that human beings have the freedom to choose and behave consciously in circumstances out of their will. Although they are unable to change these circumstances, they are completely aware and able to react according to their will. He refers to this "the feel of the game" which he thinks expresses the relationship between *field* and *habitus*.

The basic notion for Bourdieu is practice. He created his theory, "the theory of practice", to work as an analyzing system of practices that overcome individuals, groups, institutions and organizations (Friedland, 2009: 887). In short, it is possible to say that



he constructed his theory to understand and assess the practices of social agents, how social reality contributes to building their *habitus* and how they engage in building the social reality in return. He proposes that the individual's *habitus* and *capital* affect the *field* that governs practices. Thus, the relationship of the *field*, *habitus*, and *capital* constructs the basic pillars of Bourdieu's social framework.

Bourdieu thinks that language and linguistic practice can be fully understood if they were placed on an equal parameter with other social practices and habits such as eating, working, dressing, etc. (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992: 149). That makes his framework favorable to be applied to this study. Thus, his model has been widely used in the *fields* of cultural production, translation is included. His "thinking tools" have been used to study the translation of poetry, novel, political-Islamic discourse, and news translation. However, the concept "*habitus*" has not been used for a detailed study and exploration of interpreting in news agencies. In addition, *field*, *capital* and *habitus* will be primarily employed.

4.1. Field

Bourdieu first used the term *field* in 1966 in an article entitled "Champ intellectuel et projet créateur" to discuss a philosophical dispute between two French scholars. It is an important key concept in Bourdieu's work which he used when he applied his theory to study the different branches of social life such as education, art, sport, television, literature, etc. (Thomson, 2008:68). Bourdieu developed the concept in order to use it to examine and explain the relations in social reality and how they affect the process of cultural production (Hanna, 2006: 42, cited in Alkhawaja, 2014:67).

The simplest definition for *field* is the space of struggle over resources. Each *field* is recognized by its resources that are idiomatically known as stakes. These stakes may take the form of cultural goods or the lifestyle, social class, education, employment, social or political status, etc. (Jenkins, 1992: 52). *Field* in Bourdieu's sociology is composed of positions to be occupied by agents. Each *field* contains resources which he refers to as "stakes" that are available to the agents to compete over. *Field* is characterized by unique structures and logic which are considered the producers of the agents' *habitus* and also the product of *habitus* (Jenkins, 1992:84). Bourdieu (1996: 234) states that individuals or institutions struggle to occupy the positions and powers structuring in the *field*. He calls this struggle "position taking". Eventually, the struggle will cause changes and transformations in the structure of the *field*.

Bourdieu defines *field* as the social space that contains specific resources and characteristics and consists of a system of social structures where individuals practice their *habitus*. The competition between individuals over the *field's* resources or positions within it generates struggles and innovations (Grenfell & James, 1998: 17).

Bourdieu (1996: 231-2) remarks that the structure of any *field* consists of positions. Two important factors control the position in the *field*, i.e. the relationship with other positions in the *field*, and the specific properties that define and distinguish it from other positions. Moreover, these special properties of each position work as a meter to determine the nature of the relationship between positions. The agents within a certain



position are required to adopt the properties of the position which eventually identify the situation and occupation of the agent in the structure of the *field*. However, the situation of any position in the structure of the *field* -whether it is a powerful position or not- depends on the *capital* and resources within the position. Agents in every position face a number of choices to make or overcome in what is known "position taking". The struggle among agents in a certain position causes changes and variety in positions and position taking which is the natural result of the struggle among the agents over the resources. He (1996:226) highlights that the process of entering any *field* is achieved by following one of two ways which he calls "degree of codification". The higher degree of confederation depends on holding a formal competence or qualification, such as obtaining a degree in translation or finishing a training course in translation for instance. The other way which he refers to "weak degree of codification" is done when an agent works on possessing and adopting the properties and boundaries that limit and distinguish each one. Although entering a *field* is a flexible process; however, it requires adjustments to the boundaries imposed on agents.

Despite the limitations and boundaries, the *field* imposes on the agents; the change in its structure is still possible. The newcomers to the *field*, who mostly are young, bring with them massive changes to the structure and the process of "position taking". Normally, they lack any *capital*, that's arguing them to challenge and express their difference. Their challenging to the fixed norms makes their name known and recognized as the adventurous who set new norms and modes. No matter how simple the change is, it entails the whole structure of the *field* and causes a difference in positions and "position taking" (Bourdieu and Johnson, 1993: 58). The change in the *field* results from the struggle between the established norms and the newcomers who try to modify it. The aim of this is to occupy a position in the *field* even though they lack the necessary *capitals*. Eventually, the struggle and constant modification keep *fields* dynamic. Besides, the modification produces a process of substitution. So, a dominant agent is replaced by newcomers who make the change in the *field*. The agent, individual or institution, becomes the new dominant agent with new modified rules to the position struggled over (Wolf, 2007: 135).

4.2. Capital

The competition between agents in any *field* is done for gaining a position. The position can be gained and secured if agents have the required *capital*. The relationship between any position and *capital* is of mutual interests. On the one hand, *capital* facilitates gaining a position in a particular *field* and the position, on the other hand, increases that *capital*. *Capital* can be defined as powers and forces that individuals have in every *field*. These *capitals* are acquired by individuals in the *field*. It is the *capital* that determines each individual's position and also it motivates competition within the *field* between individuals (Jenkins, 1992: 84). In other words, *capital* is both the force that agents struggle to possess and the force they gain after securing their position. It is both the price and the prize for agents in any kind of *fields*.

Bourdieu classifies *capital* into materialistic and symbolic. Thus, it includes social



relations, positions, titles, prestige, status, etc. (Jenkins, 1992: 84). However, Thomson (2008: 71-2) summarizes *capitals* in four main types: the first type is the economic *capital* which refers to the money, positions, properties and assets acquired by an individual. It is the easiest type of a capital to manage, transmit, and keep. Besides, this type of *capital* is the source of all *capitals*. Other types of *capitals* are derived from this one. The second one is the social *capital* that includes connections, relations and titles an agent acquires throughout his journey in the *field*. It is affected by the amount and size of the agent's relationships with other agents in the *field*. The third is the cultural *capital* which is acquired by education and socialization. Bourdieu (1985: 724) declares that the cultural *capital* is the embodied form of power within *field*. When an agent possesses a cultural *capital*, his/her perception of the social reality will increase. This entails an advanced awareness to the nature and necessity of competition in the *field* to gain other forms of powers. However, Swartz (1997: 76-7) mentions that Bourdieu classifies the cultural *capital* into three types. The first is the “embodied cultural capital” which is stored dispositions in the mind. They are integrated into the agents by socialization or through education. The second one is the objectified form of cultural *capital*. It refers to the knowledge and experiences that result from possessing certain types of materials which require special knowledge to use such as musical instruments, scientific tools, cultural abilities like writing or painting, etc. The third form is the institutionalized cultural *capital* which refers to the educational certificates or diploma. Bourdieu considers this form as the legal guardian to the value of cultural *capital*. It guarantees the agent who possesses it the due recognition and respect in the *field*. Almann (2015:56) declares that translation/interpreting fall in the second type of cultural *capital*; objectified cultural *capital*. He illustrates that translators/ interpreters tend to enroll in the process even if it pays nothing. Their ultimate goal is to increase their cultural *capital* which may bring them symbolic status and prestige.

The last is the symbolic *capital* which is mainly the statue of the individual in the social reality. Bourdieu (1985: 731) illustrates that this form of *capital* is simply any *capital* an agent possesses. It is the result of recognition the agent gets in the social *field*. The symbolic *capital* may be a title, prestige, an honour, a reputation, etc.

4.3. Habitus-Motivated Ideology

The term *habitus* has Latin origins in the works of Aristotle's works and then been widely used by different European scholars and philosophers such as Hegel, Husserl, Weber, Durkheim and Mauss (Farnell, 2000: 399). The French sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu, has many contributions to the *field* of sociology. He brought up different concepts to explain the struggle in societies. The main concepts that Bourdieu brought to the *field* are *field*, *capital*, and *habitus*. Originally, it is a Latin word that refers to the typical condition or appearance. For Bourdieu, it is a term that refers to the individuals' norms and habits which have been acquired unconsciously. It performs as a bridge between individual's behavior and his/her decision-making, or in other words, it is a bridge between subjectivism and objectivism. He emphasizes that it appears when individuals interact with one another. The term was first used in Bourdieu's work in

1967 in an appendix of his translation into French of Panofsky's *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism*. It is reserved in the individual's mind and behavior. Bourdieu explains that it is either embodied in the agent's mind only, or it is expressed throughout the agent's practices and interactions with others. The latter type of embodiment is the most concert form (Jenkins, 1992: 45- 6).

Bourdieu (1993:46) defines the term as a system of dispositions or tendencies which result from the personal experience and it is the feature that distinguishes each individual. Thus, it differs from one to another and there is no identical *habitus* of two different individuals. It is historically collected to react effectively to the motivations that produce it. He further elucidates that, it as a permanent disposition, is acquired by an individual. It differs from habit in the sense that the latter is mechanical, repeated, and automatic, while *habitus* is the result of the individual's history. It works unconsciously to produce our sociological state, and it is reflected in the individual's practices, choices, and behavior (Bourdieu, 1993: 86-7). He (1990: 94-5) insists that *habitus* which is an obtained particular quality works on simplifying the individual's reactions to solve different types of problems and situations. The construction of the structure of social relations forms *habitus*.

Bourdieu (1991) explicitly describes *habitus* as:

The term is a very old one, of Aristotelian and scholastic origins, but Bourdieu uses it in a distinctive and quite specific way. The *habitus* is a set of *dispositions* which incline agents to act and react in certain ways. The dispositions generate practices, perceptions and attitudes which are 'regular' without being consciously co-ordinated or governed by any 'rule'. The dispositions which constitute the *habitus* are inculcated, structured, durable, generative and transposable - features that each deserve a brief explanation. (P. 12)

In addition to that, he (1991: 12-13) states that practices are generated from the dispositions that make the agent act or respond in a certain way depending on the nature of these dispositions. Furthermore, this system of dispositions is structured in the mind. The practices produced from these dispositions reflect the social and cultural background of the agent. He further mentions some of the *habitus* features. First, it is acquired during childhood throughout a process of inculcation that includes a huge number of processes of training and learning. Second, it is structured within an individual to reflect past experiences and dispositions. Third, the individuals who share the same background will to some extent have similar *habitus*. It can be used interchangeably, i.e. a certain *habitus* gained from a particular *field* can be used effectively in another one. In this regard, Reed-Danahay (2005:22) argues that *habitus* is a construction of intellectual and educational experiences, which in turn, are also affected by the social class and the *field*. Accordingly, he sees that in the light of Bourdieu's concept, people do not enjoy free will as their actions and behavior are determined by this set of structured dispositions.

The core notion of the term is a dynamic and an effective structure that goes between objectivity and subjectivity. The function of this structure is to represent the human knowledge and experience in the social situation. This structure provokes dispositions. Thus, individuals act according to the nature of *habitus*. The term "*habitus*"



appeared in the first works of Pierre Bourdieu in the 1970s, but it referred to the habit of social life. It was not until the publication of *Outline of a Theory of Practice* where he used the term as it is known today (Grenfell & James, 1998: 15-16). Sullivan (2002: 149) postulates that *habitus* is a messy concept and it is difficult to define, but generally it consists of attitudes and values wherein we can find a dominant *habitus* depending on the competence in a certain social setting.

Nash (1990: 433) states that "*Habitus* in Bourdieu's work refers to a system of embodied dispositions which generate practice in accordance with the structural principles of the social world." Bourdieu introduces the concept *habitus* to explain how a social structure affects the individual practices. Thus, the structural conditions generate a system of embodied dispositions that is known as *habitus*. However, these dispositions continue to appear and become a part of the individual history even if the conditions that caused the *habitus* disappear. For Bourdieu, *habitus* organizes the social practices and the strategic behavior (Nash, 1990:434).

Bourdieu justifies the use of the term disposition by providing three reasons, saying that it refers to organized actions. Moreover, disposition clearly refers to regular practices an individual used to do. Finally, he assures that the term is suitable to express tendencies and inclinations in the behavior (Bourdieu, 1977: 214).

Bourdieu explains the aim of *habitus* saying that he created it as a social framework to analyze and explain the logic of practice simply without any relation to subjectivism and objectivism. He also adds that the other function of *habitus* is to clear that practice is a product of constructed knowledge, not a recorded one. These dispositions direct practices (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992: 120-1). He assures the fact that it is an open system and exposed to changes and modifications throughout different experiences. Although such a term is not everlasting, the changes may be peripheral. The reason behind this is that the circumstances people encounter are similar to that have shaped their *habitus* (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992: 133).

He brought the concept *habitus* to explain the patterned human behavior and actions. He postulates that it is built on "structured structures" acquired at the early childhood to plan reactions and to provide the individual with a social competence. The term develops and increases throughout participating in different life experiences that form self-realization. Thus, individual's *habitus* reflect the experiences of early childhood and of later life experiences (Swartz 2002: 63).

Wolfreys (2000) states that *habitus* passes from generation to another through education, cultural and social behavior. These dispositions or *habitus* become embodied within the individual's mind. As a result, s/he will become unconsciously aware of how to react to different situations and become enrolled in the social scene. One of the advantages of *habitus* is that it links ideas to behavior wherein the ideas become an explanation of this behavior. On these bases, the concept provides understanding of ideas and beliefs that cause the behavior or attitudes. Bourdieu believes that the most significant values of culture or society are structured in the mind to constitute *habitus* that may appear in different forms of behavior such as thinking, speaking, dressing,

standing, etc.

Bourdieu (1998:8) mentions one of the most important functions of *habitus* which is: Providing unity of thinking and choices to the practices of the individual. In other words, he means that *habitus* gives the individual a specific lifestyle. Thus, it can be seen as a tool of differentiation between different individuals, classes, institutions, and cultures. For him, it is more like a "sense of the game" which means for him the social circumstances an individual participates in. So, *habitus* directs the individual to act according to the norms and rules of that society (Bourdieu, 1998:25).

Bourdieu tries to explain the mechanism of practices by forming an equation to summarize the network of relationships which are responsible for producing these practices:

$$[(\textit{habitus})(\textit{capital})] + \textit{field} = \textit{practice}$$

Clearly, the equation remarks that practice results from the relationship between an individual's *habitus* and the position occupied by the same individual in a certain *field*. Bourdieu tends to explain that not only *habitus* are responsible for practices, but rather it is a correlated process of the "thinking tools" which are *habitus*, *field* and *capital* (Grenfell, 2008: 51). As for the field of translation, it is considered a subfield of the cultural *field* which Webb, Schirato, and Danaher (2002) define as:

A cultural field can be defined as a series of institutions, rules, rituals, conventions, categories, designations, appointments and titles which constitute an objective hierarchy, and which produce and authorise certain discourses and activities. But it is also constituted by, or out of, the conflict which is involved when groups or individuals attempt to determine what constitutes capital within that field, and how that capital is to be distributed (P. 21-2).

The interrelation between *field* and *habitus* is inescapable as each notion depends on the other to function in the social reality. In order to be functional in any *field*, individuals or institutions must develop *habitus* to cope with the structure of that field and struggle over its *capitals*. Together, the agent's practices and experiences in the *field* result in developing the agent's *habitus*. Ultimately this helps in establishing the *field's* structures and developing it by introducing new norms and conventions.

4.4. Habitus – Oriented Ideology

Ideology is a decisive factor in translation process which can be defined as “a belief or a set of ideas, especially the political beliefs on which people, parties, or countries base their actions” (Collins Cobuilds.v., quoted in Calzada-Pérez, 2003: 3). Calzada-Pérez states that ideology has always been viewed from a negative perspective and regarded as a power of manipulation. It is used by different political parties (especially Marxist) as an equal to domination. That is why it has negative connotations. However, she assures that ideology has got rid of the political connotations related to it (Collins Cobuilds.v., quoted in Calzada-Pérez, 2003:5). Fascism and Communism of the 20th century used ideology to promote their political agendas. These agendas which later proved to be devastating made ideology a bad word. The major aim of political ideology is to mobilize the mobs towards the attitudes of certain political beliefs and make them



adopt it. Hence, it is possible, as Schwarzmantel (2008:26) states that “a political ideology is a set of ideas which is normative, setting out an ideal, aiming at arousing support on a mass basis for those ideas, seeking to agitate in their favour”.

The first to introduce the concept was Destutt de Tracy, the French philosopher, who considers it nothing more than studying how we think and behave. Depending on his writings, he treats ideology as the science of studying the ideas of groups whether they are religious, political or social. This science of ideas is nowadays known as psychology. The ideas include different tendencies that range from negative to positive. The nature of these ideas depends on the perception and point of view of the group of people who examine them (Azodi, 2015: 164). The term 'ideology' covers a wide range of disciplines; that is why most scholars cannot give an adequate definition to it. There are different definitions of the term; however, Eagleton (1991:2-3) observes that these definitions cannot be treated as concrete ones. This is attributed to the following reasons: first, each definition given to ideology is different from others and does not coincide with them. Even if any set of definitions are compatible with each other then they serve different purposes. Some of ideology's definitions give the impression that the term is entirely bad and dangerous which means that these definitions lack neutrality. Some definitions are entirely based on an epistemological concept trying to ask questions about the world which tries to construct our knowledge about it. Despite that, he (1991: 30) tries to give a general definition of ideology, a definition that covers different disciplines and scopes. In his definition, he tries to avoid the negative political connotations of the term and to keep it as wide as possible so it can include different disciplines. He defines ideology as “ideas and beliefs which help to legitimate the interests of a ruling group or class specifically by distortion and dissimulation.” However, he (1991: 156-7) tries to explain Bourdieu's insight to the concept of ideology. He affirms that it is not a central concept within his theory but rather it belongs to the objective structure of the social reality that an individual takes part in. He considers accepting and adopting the ideology of the *field* of practice necessary to involve in the competition within the *field*. The flexible nature of the individual's *habitus* is crucial in the process of adopting a certain ideology. Moreover, he strongly believes that adopting the *field's* ideology is necessary to be part of this *field* and to have the legitimacy to compete over its *capitals*.

All in all, translation is full of ideology. It is initially a process of negotiation between different parts, or parts and texts. The type of the process gives it the political stamp and marks it with a social effect, which is ideological. For this reason, translation institutions, even if they are irrelevant to translation, use it as a tool to promote certain ideologies (Tahir-Gürçağlar, 2003: 114). However, the new theories in translation studies opened a room for considering and accepting as an ideological process and to treat the process as an important part of it. During or after the translation, ideology is inescapable whether it is the translator's ideology or the institution's ideology. In order to achieve the main goal of translation, which is bridging two cultures, ideology must exist to serve this goal and further to achieve it (Claramonte, 2003:85).



Schäffner (2003:23-4) proposes that every act of translation is ideological and describes translators as agents serving a certain ideology. According to her, this is evident from the first stages of choosing the text to the final stages of translation. It can be seen most vividly on the linguistic level and the grammatical level such as in avoiding certain lexical expressions or grammatical pattern to avoid ideological consequences. As a matter of fact, translators and interpreters, especially of political discourse are more subject to such a context. These translators play the role of mediators between different political and cultural ideologies which may even be contradicted. They serve the ideology of their clients. Thus, their ideological choices are reflected in the target text (henceforth TT). The key issue in ideology is to decide whether it is part of the structure of language or it is just a consequence of events. Fairclough (1995: 71) thinks both presuppositions are true and possible. In one way or another, the structure of language and the events caused or resulted around language are not separated from ideology for they are constrained by social, political, or religious conventions. Eventually, meaning is nothing more than an ideology which is prone to different interpretations and that is why ideology cannot be excluded from any discourse.

Tymoczko (2010:215-16) thinks that ideology in translation is both presented in the content and the various speech acts the translator presents to the audience. These speech acts should be relevant to the receptor audience. The ideology in translation is reflected in the attitude of the translator in the TT because each translator differs from others even if they translate the same text. More importantly, ideologies differ even in the translation of the same source. The reason is that translation is a complex process of choices which entails every aspect of the source text (henceforth ST). Each translator tries to represent the text according to the way he/she receives it which eventually influenced by the ideologies of the translator.

Translation is not a simple process of transferring a text from one language into another. It is rather a process of connecting two different cultures. If the process of translation contains any manipulation then it will turn into a dangerous process. Thus, it is important to realize the consequences of replacing any single word. This realization will lead to understanding the ideology underlies any text. Therefore, ideology will underlay the translation as well. The ideology in translation can be revealed by the translator's choices, what has s/he added or deleted, how s/he selected words and what sort of avoidance exists in translation and what it implies. All these are evident in the ideology the translator adopts which can be viewed as a reflection of his own culture. These ideologies, whether their ideologies or of the institutions they work for, are like constraints. The translators become bound to what is expected from them and what the demands of the institutions or readers (Álvarez& Vidal, 1996: 5).

Translators in general and interpreters in particular are under pressure, not by the ST alone but by other forces. Interpreters are subject to two ideological forces. They have to meet the requirements of the dominant group or power and they also seek to satisfy the (popular culture). These two forces work both as constraints and motivations for the interpreter to meet these requirements. According to these ideological forces, the



interpreter's work is being judged upon whether s/he satisfies the ideology of the power or institution s/he works for and at the same time follows the popular culture (Katan&Straniero- Sergio, 2003: 131-2).

As far as the ideology in media institutions is concerned, Hall (1982: 65) asserts that ideology in media is both the goal and the tool, i.e. media institutions strive to establish a certain ideology in their receptor by focusing on a particular event that includes it. Based on the adopted ideology, which is usually a political one, the media institution tends to exaggerate and widens the focus on those particular events. As a matter of fact, this process is entirely beyond of neutrality as it is deeply rooted in ideological orientation both in choosing to focus on that certain topic and in promoting the institution's ideology by focusing on it. Thus, according to (Sjøvaag, 2011: 68), it is important to realize and accept the fact that media institutions are system sustainers. Media production is eventually a business that is why they try to promote to their adopted ideologies in order to sustain their position. Furthermore, they promote their ideology to root it in the social reality and hence they gain domination in their field. The production of news in media institutions then is designed to protect and sustain the business by protecting the political position of that institution.

Van Dijk (1986:188) criticizes media for pretending to be neutral. He believes that media institutions try to convince the audience that they seek and search for enlightening them. However, he confirms that they are ideologically motivated; their main interest is to assert the political position they adopt or follow. In this way, media is a major player in promoting and sustaining the dominant ideologies. He considers the reason behind this contradiction is because of that media, especially news production, is business above all. Media institutions adopt the most dominant ideology because it helps this institution to achieve the aimed economic *capital* and further it protects the institution and sustains its circulation (Cited in Sjøvaag, 2011: 71).

Deuze (2005: 446) sees adopting ideology in media institution as a way to have the social legitimation and acceptance. Media institutions especially the ones that produce news tend to adopt a certain political ideology, normally the most dominant, to win validity to their product and dominate the audience. Moreover, the institutions resort to applying and force their ideology on the workers within the institution. They are forced to accept, adopt and work by it in order to produce a rather natural material that qualifies the institution stand.

The dominant ideology is absolute social and cultural construction. It is imposed by the dominant power, group, or political force on the whole spectrum of social life. For increasing the establishment to their ideology, these powers resort and employ media institutions to declare and publicize their ideology. Consequently, the media institution adopts this ideology to be their approach and producing their material depending on it. This will be reflected in the language, the programs, and their translated material (Herman, 1996: 36).

5. The Interrelation between *Habitus* and the *Field* of Translation

All the works mentioned earlier deal with the concept *habitus* from an

anthropological, economic, sociological, and linguistic point of view. The concept was first introduced into translation studies by Daniel Simeoni when he published his article "The pivotal status of the translator's *habitus*" in 1998. Simeoni contributed effectively in the new approach in translation studies which is based on studying translation from a sociological perspective (Munday, 2008). He tried to reintroduce the Polysystem theory by embodying the term *habitus* into the emerging theory. Simeoni insists that the concept *habitus* is more extensive one than norms in describing socio- cultural restriction. Furthermore, it is based on the structural structure that explains the individual's practices (Gouanvic, 2005: 149).

In 2005, The Translator journal published a special issue dedicated to Pierre Bourdieu. This issue includes several articles dealing with the main concepts of Bourdieus' theories. Among these articles is Moira Inghilleri's "The Sociology of Bourdieu and the Construction of the 'Object' in Translation and Interpreting Studies". Inghilleri discusses Bourdieu's key concepts – *habitus*, *field*, and *capital* - and how these concepts contribute to shaping the translator's practice. She also explores the effect of the agencies on the translators' practices and how these agencies generate certain *habitus* (Inghilleri, 2005: 125). She emphasizes that *habitus* explains the strategies of establishing behavior. These strategies are built upon the historical social knowledge of the agent. In this sense, *habitus* becomes the tool that these agents use to look at the world and know unconsciously and take it as granted (Inghilleri, 2005: 135).

Another important article in this issue is Gouanvic's "A Bourdieusian Theory of Translation, or the Coincidence of Practical Instances". Here, Gouanvic claims that the practice of translation is similar to any other practice wherein Bourdieu's theory is applied. He states that the practice of translation is governed by two factors: the constraints of the *field* (which is the field of translation) and the individual's *habitus*. Moreover, he explores other terms in Bourdieu's theory such as *Field*, *Capital* and *'Illusio* and how they contradict with *habitus* (Gouanvic, 2005: 147).

Gouanvic (2010: 121) states that Bourdieu's theory did not include translation among *fields* of practice. However, he thinks that it can be included and the theory can be applied to translation studies. Gouanvic (2010: 125) claims that competition and struggles between different agents such as (translators, publishers, and managers, literary agents, editors, critics, etc.) form the translation *field*. The competition imposes certain practices and norms on translators. The acquisition of these practices in addition to the personal history establishes the translators' *habitus*.

Habitus of an individual is shaped by different social *fields* such as (family, school, friends, work, etc.). Besides, the individuals' practices, behaviors, and attitudes, besides their intercultural interacting which are a product of *habitus* play a dynamic role in supporting the *field*. In translation field, the translation institutions are rarely marked and distinguished by specific characteristics. Thus, the translator's *habitus* consists mainly of his/ her individual historical dispositions (Meylaerts, 2008:94). Bourdieu shows the deep relationship between *habitus* and role. Any *field* whether it's literary, legal, scientific, political, or religious etc. develops constantly by the *habitus* of its agents as those agents



place and use their *habitus* to be a part of the *field*. On the other hand, it is changed and reshaped when the agent invests his/her *habitus* in the *field* (Vorderobermeie, 2014: 12). *Field* is the social setting or space where the social positions of the agents. It results from the interaction between the agent's *habitus* and *capital*. The *field* is composed of certain rules that govern the agents' practices. It is the place of competition, struggle, and tension between agents or institutions. Unlike any literary or artistic field, the field of translation is built on an already existed work. There are four factors or elements that play role in the field of translation; they are the ST and the factors that determine it, the TT and the factors that determine it, the translator and its subjective aims, and the translator and his history in the *field*. In this sense, the recent translation studies focus on analyzing the relationship between the agent's *habitus* whether it was a translator, translation institution or publisher and the factors that determine how the target *field* precepts the translation. The relationship between the translator's *habitus* and the field of translation can explain the motives behind translation choices. Every choice made by the translator during the process of transferring the ST to the TT or is not entirely conscious; rather it is led by the translator's *habitus*. Any *field* among the social scheme, including the field of translation, is based on rules that regulate the work of agents, organizations, institutions, etc. to preserve the continuity of the norms of the *field* (Liu, 2012:1169-72).

Gouanvic (2014:32) postulates that translators have two types of *habitus*. The first is the one which is formed before entering the field of translation and known as "*primaryhabitus*" or "*original habitus*". This works as a *habitus* of individual without being an agent of this specific *field* even if s/he is bilingual. At this stage, there is no "*translator's habitus*". Translator's *habitus* or what is known as "*specific habitus*" is formed after practicing the bilingual ability in the field of translation. This specific *habitus* is generated by studies, training, seminars, and specializing in a certain type of translation. Specializing in a certain type of translation highly affects the specific *habitus* and how it's expressed throughout the translator's practice in the *field*. However, he (2014: 37) assures that both *habitus* are inseparable. The "*primary habitus*" especially continues to affect the special *habitus* and this can be noticed obviously in the translator's choices. These choices to some extent reflect the "*primary habitus*". On the other hand, the "*specific habitus*" plays an essential role in reshaping and modifying the "*primaryhabitus*". Sela-Sheffy (2014: 52) suggests that the early *habitus* or the "*primary habitus*" such as (the acquisition of a foreign language at an early age, education, and multicultural experiences) may work on shaping the "*specific habitus*" which makes the translator's choices remarkable. Subsequently, these distinct choices will make the translator be greatly distinguished from others in the *field*. In this regard, Sela-Sheffy (2005:14) presents her idea about the formation of translator's *habitus* which is referred to earlier as "*specific habitus*". She illustrates that when translators enter the field of translation they apply their personal *habitus* in the *field*. Later on they use to form tendencies towards certain practices which in result construct as "*specific habitus*" in the profession. She (2005: 5) mentions that some translators tend to take revolutionary choices in their practicing translation in order to break the norms and get rid of the



established norms. Those translators who she calls "revolutionary" are armed with their *habitus* that drives them to have a distinguished position in the *field*. As translators will compete to be more revolutionary than others, completion in the *field* will rise as a result of these revolutionary actions. She (2005: 7) highly stresses that this depends on the diversity of personal dispositions of translators. At the same time, it cannot be examined without paying attention to so many different factors, such as the position of translation within the cultural aspect, the position the translators occupy within the *field*, and the cultural attitude towards the translated materials.

The *habitus* and *field* seem to be run in such a circle as the translator constructs the dispositions of his/her *habitus* from the surrounding social structure. As a result, translators tend to reproduce it as s/he interacts with the same surrounding. But this is not the case; translators are exposed to different cultural *fields* related to translation in order to be qualified translators in literary *field*, academic *field*, and journalistic *field*, etc. As these *fields* are necessary to develop the translator intellectually, their significant value sets in the fact they contribute to the translator's *habitus*. When the translator acts and participates in these different *fields*, s/he at the same time acquires new dispositions from each one of them. The new dispositions change the "*specific habitus*" and reshape it. Most importantly, they make each translator's *habitus* distinguished by unique and different dispositions. In result, the outcome will be to get rid of the circular production of practices. Hence, this will be reflected in the translators' choices whether it is textual or linguistic (Hanna, 2014: 66-7).

Pasmatz (2014:80-1) mentions an important case wherein the translator finds himself/herself forced to adopt temporal *habitus* to meet the expectations put forward. She describes this *habitus* as "appropriate *habitus*". She declares that the translator resorts to this type of *habitus* unconsciously especially when s/he translates for a world-recognized figure in one of the complicated *fields* such as philosophy or politics. In this case, the translator is guided by the author's *habitus*, and this is likely done to honor the author. This action may be in reverse, i.e. translating in a manner suits the readership. Here, the translator tends to adopt the collective *habitus* of a whole group which may differ from his individual *habitus*. This "appropriate" *habitus* is known in translation as orientation. Usually, translators adopt this type of *habitus* because they are aware of the disputes, competition, and tensions in the field of translation. They also try to gain prominence statue in the *field* when they go along with the popular tendencies even if that means excluding their own *habitus* which eventually means their specific identity.

Bourdieu pays an extensive attention to media and journalism. He highlights the differences between television and print media and distinguishes between their discourses in his book *On Television*. However, he treats different mediums of delivery as one and tries to picture the different mediums of media as factors belonging to a larger *field*, i.e. the *field* of cultural production (Benson and Neveu, 2010:8). Regardless of the similarities and differences between media mediums, news on television is stated to be the most trustworthy source of information to people around the world. For the majority of people, news on television is more reliable than news on other media

mediums such as newspapers, online news, and websites. Perhaps it is due to the accessibility and availability of news on television around 24 hours (McNair, 1999:19).

He explores the journalistic field and applies his *field* theory to a better understanding of its structure and its relation to the agency in the light of his theory. He also uses his tools, *field*, *habitus*, and *capital* to analyze the works of institutions and individuals and how they are influenced and affected by the social structure. Notably, Benson and Neveu (2010:5) demonstrate that Bourdieu locates the journalistic field in a medium position between the cultural *field* and the economic one. They justify their assumption by proclaiming that journalistic field is to a certain degree related to the *economic field* because it engages, and may be even established by those who occupy powerful positions in the social structure. They mean, of course, the agents who hold economic *capital*. At the same time, journalistic field aims at cultural production. Eventually, they go in favor of the latter. They clarify that although the *field* of power has an impact on the journalistic *field*; the cultural *field* is inescapable and continues to dominate. Either its production is aimed directly at their audience or to other journalistic and cultural agencies. In both cases, it produces a cultural *capital* that is fund by the economic one. In our modern world in which media is another way of enrolling to the field of power, it is not out of the ordinary to invest the cultural production of the journalistic *field* to increase the cultural *capital*. In this regard, Benson and Neveu (2010:5) classify the production of journalism as a “restricted cultural production”. With all the constraints from different forms of *fields*, it is difficult for Bourdieu to consider the journalistic *field* as an independent *field* of cultural production. Nonetheless, he conceives it as a system within a larger system that somewhat enjoys its autonomy regardless of the powers imposed on it. Depending on his perspective, the journalistic *field* occupies a middle position between the *fields* of power wherein it plays the role of the bridge between them all. As a result, it is more influenced by the changes of other *fields*.

Despite all these facts, for Bourdieu, the *field* of cultural production, the journalistic field in specific, is one of the most stable *fields* within the social structure. It tends to reproduce itself throughout time with a greatdeal of stability. There is a chance of change to the *habitus* of this *field*, yet, it is difficult. It requires strong shocks to shake this stability and bring the change. Such shocks are caused by political changes or a change in the institutional and legal environment. It can also happen when agents with specific *habitus* enter the *field* with determination to impose their *habitus* and their *capitals* on it. Usually, these are the agents who enjoy and hold very strong economic and cultural background *capitals* (Benson and Neveu, 2010:6).

6. Interpreting Political Items in News Channels

Interpreting has been an important medium of communication since the early stages of multi-linguistic communication. Interpreters throughout time were similar to the bridge between different cultures, languages, and countries. So, they have always been the facilitators of communication between different tongues.

Interpreting as an activity cannot be specified by the oral transferring of linguistic

units. Unlike translation, interpreting depends on an essential factor which is immediacy, i.e. interpreters have to process as soon as the activity takes place in a certain time once and permanently. At the same time, it is important not to consider interpreting as being entirely evolved around oral rendering. Other aspects of interpreting, although they are not oral, are considered as its subtypes such as sign language interpreting, sight translation, live subtitling, on-line (written) translation of internet chats, etc. (Pöchhacker, 2004: 10).

Kade (1968, cited in Pöchhacker(2004: 10), defines interpreting as the type of translation that occurs at once in a particular time in which the SL text is transferred to the target language (henceforth TL) text without editing, reviewing or an opportunity to change. The most prominent feature of interpreting is immediacy of production. Besides, it is usually done under intense circumstances like the limited time and lacking the chance for correction and refinement. Nevertheless, Pöchhacker (2004: 10) prefers using the terms 'utterance', 'discourse', or 'message' instead of the term 'text' used by Kade to refer to the product of interpreting activity. For Pöchhacker (2004:10) interpreting is a form of translation that is achieved exclusively orally. Thus, it is not accurate to use the term 'text' to describe the interpreted linguistic units or signs.

The strategies that interpreters follow are usually generated from their *habitus*. They operate in regular behaviors according to their *habitus* that in the successive time turns to be established as strategies. As an agent's *habitus* is not of a fixed nature, they change and respond according to the situated state. *Habitus* do not predict how to respond in a certain situation because it is not an action determined scheme. The individual's awareness and feel of the game, his/her realization of the necessity of gaining *capital* in order to occupy a position in the *field* make them respond differently even in similar situations. Therefore, the adopted strategies by interpreters in such situations differ depending on the social circumstances. Their behavior and production can vary upon the requirements of that situation. For Bourdieu, the different adaptation is necessary for the constancy of the competition which eventually preserves the norms of the *field* (Inghilleri, 2005: 137).

Grbić (2014: 101-2) proclaims that interpreters working within agencies, especially news agencies tend to obtain and possess the ideologies and orientations that are imposed as criteria of work. Motivated by the intention to be part of the *field* at first, and then the increasing competition within this *field*, interpreters obtain and add these criteria to their specific *habitus*. Nonetheless, this integration of *habitus* is not an easy process. The new *habitus* clashes with the primary *habitus* which is already integrated within the interpreter's cognitive system and also it clashes with the experiences, practices and expectations the interpreter holds before enrolling in the agency. It is important to assert that the degree of acquiring the agency's criteria and adopting it to be part of the interpreter's *habitus* differ depending on the *habitus* variety. She (2014: 101-2) asserts that those interpreters who have specific knowledge and experience in the *field*, as the case here political interpreting specifically, are more likely to adapt and integrate the agency criteria into their *specific habitus*. These are mostly professionals

who realize the importance of incorporating the dispositions of the *field* in order to occupy a position in it. It becomes crucial for the interpreters to adopt the ideologies and the orientations even if they are contradictory to their own because it is the only way to compete in such a competitive *field*.

Interestingly, Kumiko (2014:143) says that it is the *primary habitus* that influences and shapes interpreter's performance. The interpreter's work is of now-and-here nature which means that it depends on an instant reaction that lies out of awareness. The unconscious production, according to her, is affected by the *primary habitus*, and slightly by the specific one. This is evident in the interpreter's lexical choices during interpreting. More importantly, she (2014: 144) advocates that at the time the *primary habitus* is the core player in the interpreter's performance; it supports and participates in reshaping the *specific habitus*. The experience and practice in the *field* are added to improve and develop the specific *habitus*. After reaching a certain degree of experience and being qualified enough, this *specific habitus* is transformed into another form that works in the same *field*.

Media institutions are of different relatedness whether it is national, political, ideological, commercial, or economic. Each one tries to represent and promote its inclination throughout its materials. In news institutions, the role of interpreter is a mediator and facilitator to spread the public news. Unlike the journalist, the interpreter is not expected to show and project a certain ideology. This includes not only the institution's ideology but also his/her ideology from his/her background. Therefore, sometimes the fact that the interpreter might intervene or change the news is overlooked (Palmer, 2007: 15). It is important not to neglect that the interpreter is an individual who belongs to the people s/he tries to communicate. This puts the interpreters on a trajectory position wherein they might have to compensate their loyalties in order to achieve their duties. Yet, sometimes, their loyalties may be a motive to intervene their interpreting, which can happen unconsciously (Palmer, 2007:14).

Although cold professionalism is possible to gain, it is difficult to operate with the existence of *habitus* that is highly affected by the society. For this reason, it is rare for interpreters to produce a mere neutral performance or at least that matches exactly with their agency's tendencies (Dragovic-Drouet, 2007:36).

In the sense of unity or agreement, institutions have their own rules and norms that are expected to be followed. Furthermore, the acceptance and working according to these rules are listed as part of accepting employees. Bourdieu sees these rules as a type of *habitus* in the institution as it eventually integrates to the individual's *habitus*. These rules form the *capital* that agents try to possess. As Bourdieu considers any individual part of the society who tries to accept the rules in order to involve in the social game, interpreters who enroll in any news agency or translation institution try to have a certain degree of agreement with the rules and tendencies of this agency. However, even if the interpreter obtains and accustoms herself/himself with the linguistic *capital* demanded by the news agency, there is still the problem of collision between the *primary habitus* and the *specific habitus* if his/her *habitus* belongs to a different orientation from that of

the agency . Because of this collision, the interpreter either interprets in a way that runs against his/her own *habitus*, or his orientation appears on the surface during interpreting unconsciously. Only professionalization saves the interpreter from such a blunder (Angelelli, 2004:39).

Interpreters in news channels usually deal with political discourse. De Landtsheer (1998: 3-4) states that political discourse is a matter of negotiation between two parts or more, usually the governing state and its people. This negotiation is done by using compensation throughout political discourse. In order to convince the people, its language tends to be argumentative or controversial. Van Dijk (2002: 225) states that political discourse owes its significance to its function. It is a language between two parties that aim to communicate. Accordingly, the function of the language is a priority over style, and form.

Despite the globalization tendencies, political discourse is a cultural bound. Historically and culturally, it addresses a particular audience that shares similar heritage and background. Therefore, it must contain a cultural specificity to serve the proposed ideology or propaganda. This cultural specificity is highlighted by the use of cultural abbreviations, political parties' names, constitutional terms, political and governmental institutions, cultural and historical events, etc. Political discourse is also characterized by being highly diplomatic. This is obvious in the ideological choices and the choice and the structure of words and phrases. Therefore, the political discourse -if it is meant to be addressed to ascertain audience- should contain a specific political language that suits the governmental system of the country. Another important feature of the political discourse is its ritual conventions. Political discourse is usually highly conventional to achieve its aim. It belongs to limited numbers of text types, generally argumentative or authoritative text type. The aim of adopting such types of texts is to address the audience and convince them politically. Eventually, the political discourse of any political institution shows specific stylistic features on the linguistic and rhetorical level (Schäffner and Wiesemann, 2001: 133-5).

According to Schäffner (2007: 142), globalization includes every aspect of modern life and politics is at the core of this phenomenon. The political discourse is available to all people and cultures; it goes from the local sphere to a more universal sphere. This increases the demand for translators and interpreters to spread the political discourse beyond the local borders and communicate with other cultures with more ease. The political translation demands great awareness from the interpreter side as it is a highly sensitive material to be translated or interpreted. Many translation scholars paid attention to this phenomenon and studied it from different angles. Some of them focused on the lexical aspects of political translation such as Newmark (1991:148), for instance, who focuses on the specificity of political concepts and their significance to the process of translation. He sees that most of the political concepts are culture-bound and here the difficulty arises. These concepts seem to be independent and have a unique political identity. They have a cultural glamorous entity that empowers them to perform out of context. Due to that, interpreters sometimes are mistaken to treat these concepts as easy



translations. Although, as words, they have simple direct meaning, their political performance entails special knowledge to their references. They tend to have an unclear meaning unless the interpreter has the required knowledge to translate them well. A socio-cultural perspective has been used by other scholars to study translating political discourse. In such cases, the different cultural, ideological, historical and psychological factors come to the core as they that participate and affect the process (Schäffner, 2007: 144).

The above mentioned characteristics and features of political discourse draw attention to several problems and obstacles that the interpreter should be aware about especially if s/he is working for an agency with a certain ideology. First of all, even if the political discourse in the SL has an argumentative or persuasive tone, the interpreter should transfer it to the target audience with an informative tone. In this light, it is obvious how challenging interpreters the political discourse. A major difficulty in interpreting oral political discourse is that it follows the intonation of the speaker. The meaning of the oral political discourse is not fully complete without the intonation that works on conveying the attitude, feelings, and intention of the speaker. Politicians are the most capable people to control their *habitus* because they are aware of a fact which states that what they say and how they behave and act represent whole groups of people. Therefore, they manage to separate themselves in a way allow them to control their *habitus*. As a result, they try to provide an idealistic self-image of themselves. This process resembles wearing a mask to perform a certain role. Politicians depend on their behavior, attitude and talk to resemble the worldwide bureaucratic behavior. Among the different methods the politicians resort to maintain such an attitude they acquire as regards behavior, believe in them, and use them separately from their won *habitus*. Moreover, they tend to dramatize their speeches and behavior to leave the desired impact on their audience. Thus, they maximize the usage of figures of speech such as signs and metaphoric expressions. Hence, the challenge rises to face interpreters. The non-specific *habitus* used by politicians argue interpreters to first: understanding and comprehending this diplomatic one in order to interpret it, and second: to change the interpreted discourse to suit their agency and its ideology. In between, there is the challenge that the interpreter has to overcome and suppress his own *habitus*. The difficulty of interpreting political discourse results from the need to pass these layers of differences in *habitus*. In this genre of interpreting, the interpreter has to be highly professional and try to avoid resorting to his own *habitus*. However, there is no escape from following the agency's *habitus* in order to achieve success in the *field*. Regardless of the difficulties interpreters may face in such an interpretation, they are forced to submit to the agency's *habitus* when working with them (Wodak, 2011:7-8).

7. Data Analysis

This section analyzes the data in the light of Pierre Bourdieu's theory to investigate the effect of *field* and *habitus* on the performance of interpreters. The data are extracts which have been chosen from political conferences taken from different news agencies. The choices of these extracts have concerned the hypothesis of the study. Each agency



has different ideological and political orientations. Thus, the *fields* of practice vary depending on this. The interpretations of these conferences are different due to this factor. Besides, these data show how involving in such a competitive *field* can change the *specific habitus* of the interpreters in order to establish their position in the *field* and to acquire more *capital*. The following are some samples that include interpreted political extracts in terms of Pierre Bourdieusian's Habitus-Motivated vs. Habitus-Oriented ideology. The samples gathered from five videos; each of which contains a number of interpreted extracts related to a political matter. One interpreted extract will be analyzed from each video since each one of these videos contains more than one extract which double this study in size if they are all analyzed. The interpretations of each of these extracts vary in number and it had been stated according to the obtainable news agencies. In other words, the political conferences or news materials related to these extracts had been interpreted by three agencies, others by two, while the rest by one.

7.1. Video 1: Al-Jazeera, RT Arabic and On T.V. Channels Interpretations of American President Barack Obama's Speech

In the 27th of December 2015, President Barack Obama delivered a speech at the Opening Session of the 70th United Nations General Assembly at the United Nations Headquarters in New York City. He tackled several global issues and problems and declared his country's position towards these issues. For its importance and significance, the speech received a wide cover from the international news agencies in all its forms. Arabic speaking news agencies provided an alive coverage to the speech along with simultaneous interpreting.

The samples of interpreting Obama's speech are taken from Al Jazeera, RT Arabic, and On T.V. The Analysis of the three interpretations shows how the interpreters depend on the political position of the agency they work for while interpreting some parts of the speech that reflects the differences in the agencies *habitus*. From their performance, it is obvious that they have integrated the agency's *primary habitus* into their *specific habitus*. The three news agencies are well known and familiar to the Arabic viewer. However, each one of them belongs to a different country and supports an opposite political position on several global issues. These different positions are most obvious in interpreting Obama's speech at the session mentioned above. The three interpretations reflect vividly each agency's attitude towards specific issues raised by Obama in his speech. The following are seven extracts in which each agency interpreted differently. The difference among the three agencies is most obvious from the changes that the interpreters exercise on the original speech. This can be identified by the word choices, omissions, changings and additions they perform.

Extract 1:

Obama: *We're told that such retrenchment is required to beat back disorder; that it's the only way to stamp out terrorism, or prevent foreign meddling. In accordance with this logic, we should support tyrants like Bashar al-Assad, who drops barrel bombs to massacre innocent children, because the alternative is surely worse.*

Table -1-

Al- Jazeera,RT Arabicand On T.V. Interpretations of the Extract of Obama's Speech

Al- Jazeera Interpreter	RT Arabic Interpreter	On T.V. Interpreter
يقال لنا إن هذا مطلب لكي نكافح الإرهاب و لكي نحول دون تدخل الدول الأجنبية. و وفقاً لهذا المنطق ينبغي علينا أن ندعم الطاغية بشار الأسد الذي يرمى بالبراميل المتفجرة على رؤوس المدنيين لأن البديل هو أسوء.	هم يقولون إن ذلك أمر مهم ولازم للقضاء على الإرهاب والفوضى. فهم أيضا يدعون إلى الحيلولة دون تدخل الأطراف الجانبيه، فبالإعتماد على هذا المنطق يمكن أن ندعم الديكتاتوريين مثل بشار الأسد الذي يقذف شعبه بالبراميل المتفجرة.	ويقال إن هذا التقهقر ضروري من أجل وضع حد للفوضى ومن أجل القضاء على الإرهاب أو منع التدخل الأجنبي. وعلى هذا الأساس يقال إنه ينبغي أن ندعمالمستبدين كبشار الأسد الذي يلقي ببراميل متفجرة لقتل الأطفال الأبرياء لأن البديل هو الأسوء.

Analysis:

The extracts of the above three channels reveal clearly the interpreters' choices of words as regards the agencies' ideologies and orientations. Obama here talks about the retreating power of the global laws and how this affects negatively the whole world. He asserts the dreadful results of such a retreat. To emphasize his assumption, he talks about the Syrian conflict as an example of this weakness the global law witnesses. Furthermore, he condemns this weakness as it requires them to support "tyrants" to whom "Bashar al-Assad" belongs, and who kills his people. Although Obama talks about Al-Assad in a severe manner and considers him to be a "tyrant", he does not restrict to him exclusively but rather includes him in the whole group of "tyrants".

The first interpretation is taken from Al-Jazeera channel. Al- Jazeera Satellite Channel is owned by the Qatari ruling family. It receives funds and utility from Qatari government since its launching. In return, Al-Jazeera backs and advocates what ideologies the Qatari government represents even if such an act leads to interfering in the internal affairs of neighboring countries. Thus, it has been known by its fierce ideologies in certain political issues. In such a situation, it wastes no effort insupporting what confirms its tendency (Sabbagh, 2012). As far as the Syrian conflict is concerned, since its beginning, Al- Jazeera shows no deviation to support any country, party, organization, or army that stands against Al-Assad's regime. This tendency is best reflected in interpreting the extract from Obama's speech. Despite the fact that president Obama does not specify and include Al-Assad as the one and only "tyrant", the interpreter transferred it as "الطاغية بشار الأسد" which is unmistakably much harsher and condemned expression. By doing so, the interpreter specifies this action to Al-Assad alone and intensifies his actions as being dreadful and unforgivable. He also confirms this by interpreting the rest of the statement literally to condense the effect the agency aims to deliver. This interpretation reflects what Al- Jazeera stands for.

The second interpretation is taken from RT Arabic. RT or Russia Today is a news

channel located in Russia. It is a part of the Russian Novosti News agency (<https://www.rt.com/about-us/>). RT Arabic represents the Russian political view. The news material they produce perfectly reflects the official Russian attitude towards the conflicts and crisis in the Middle East and around the world. Since the beginning of the Syrian conflict, Russia showed an enormous support to Al-Assad's regime. The support was not exclusive to arms and political stands, but media was recruited to serve this purpose. The Russian stand is clearly obvious in interpreting Obama' speech. In interpreting this extract, the interpreter tries as much as possible to be faithful to the original speech. However, the agency's *habitus* plainly imposes itself. Unlike Al-Jazeera's interpreter, RT's interpreter interprets Obama's words exactly as they were said, "الديكتاتوريين مثل بشار الأسد". His interpretation only considers Al-Assad to be one of the many "tyrants" which does not emphasize the aimed dreadful effect as the case in Al-Jazeera's interpretation. Moreover, in the final part of the sentence, he tries to interpret it faithfully but in a restricted way to meet the conventions of the agency. The interpreter interprets "*who drops barrel bombs to massacre innocent children*" into الذي يقذف شعبه "باليراميل المتفجرة". He alters "*to massacre innocent children*" to be only "يقذف شعبه". In such a case, the struggle between the interpreter's instincts to be faithful "his *habitus*" struggles with the conventions and rules of the agency "the *field* and its *capital*".

The third interpretation is from ON T.V. channel. ON T.V. is an Egyptian independent channel that adopts a neutral and objective stance regarding the issues and conflicts in neighboring countries. The channel tries to follow an objective path as far as the Arabic crisis is concerned, because its main focus is on the internal Egyptian situation. In interpreting the mentioned part of the speech, the interpreter conveys Obama's words accurately without any kind of addition, omission, or alteration. She interprets the sentence "*we should support tyrants like Bashar al-Assad*" to ينبغي أن ندعم "المستبدين كبشار الأسد". She continues in her faithful interpreting to represent the second part of the extract to interpret it as it is uttered by Obama. Thus, she interprets "*who drops barrel bombs to massacre innocent children*" to الذي يلقي ببراميل متفجرة لقتل الأطفال الأبرياء. This faithful interpreting indicates that the interpreter works harmoniously with the agency's conventions which go along with her *habitus*. The *field* which she struggles provides her with a space of freedom to express her *private habitus* and achieve a faithful job as the interpreter's ethics require.

7.2. Video 2: Israel in Arabic and RT Arabic Channels Interpretations of the Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's Speech in New York

In the 29th of December 2015, the Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu addressed the 70th UN General Assembly in New York. He devoted a great part of his speech to discussing Iran and the signing of the nuclear agreement. He emphasized his rejection of the nuclear agreement and warned world nations from the Iranian anger that would entail them consequently as they submitted to the Iranian desires. He also talked

about the continuous conflict with Palestine responded to the Palestinian demands for statehood.

The samples of interpreting Netanyahu's speech are taken from Israel in Arabic and RT Arabic channels. Israel in Arabic is an online Israeli based channel oriented in the Arabic language. It provides materials that concern Israeli matter directed to Arab audience (<http://www.israelinarabic.com/about/>). The interpreter used a harsh language to express his position towards the nuclear agreement. The two channels have different attitudes towards the Israeli government. On the one hand, Israel in Arabic advocates Israel policies to the Arab world and tries to attract more audience from the Arab countries to promote the Israeli's ideologies. Thus, their materials strongly support the Israeli attitude and try to shed light on it. This aims at explaining their policies and justifying their political actions to Arab audience especially with their long history of dispute with most Arab nations. RT Arabic, on the other hand, represents the Russian government's view. Although Russia and Israel have strong relations based on military, economic and scientific corporation, their policies have reached a critical point after the outbreak of the Syrian conflict. Russia supports Iran, which is Israel's bitter enemy. The two interpretations differ in several parts especially that concern the Iranian matter. The difference is most obvious in the language and words choice of the two interpreters as is explained in the following extracts.

Extract 2:

Netanyahu: Iran boosted its supply of devastating weapons to Syria. Iran sent more soldiers of its Revolutionary Guard into Syria. Iran sent thousands of Afghani and Pakistani Shi'ite fighters to Syria. Iran did all this to prop up Assad's brutal regime. Iran also shipped tons of weapons and ammunitions to the Houthis rebels in Yemen, including another shipment just two days ago.

Table -2-
Israel in Arabic and RT Arabic Interpretations of the Extract of Netanyahu's Speech

Israel in Arabic Interpreter	RT Arabic Interpreter
لقد عززت إيران من تمديدها لسوريا بالأسلحة المدمرة . لقد قامت إيران بإرسال المزيد من جنود حرسها الثوري إلى سوريا. لقد أرسلت إيران الآلاف من المقاتلين الشيعة الأفغان والسوريين إلى سوريا، وقامت بذلك لتدعيم نظام الأسد. كما أرسلت إيران الأطنان من الأسلحة والذخائر إلى المتمردين الحوثيين في اليمن بما في ذلك شحنة وصلت قبل يومين.	قد ازداد دعم إيران لسوريا ووجهت إيران قواتها المسلحة إلى سوريا وكذلك عملت إيران كل ذلك من أجل دعم نظام الأسد القاسي. وعلاوة على ذلك فقد وجهت إيران كمياتها من الذخيرة والأسلحة للثوار السوريين وقبل فترة كانت هناك دفعة جديدة من الأسلحة التي وجهت إلى لبنان.

Analysis:

The extract above shows that Netanyahu warns the world nations from the Iranian



danger. He highlights some of the incidents that Iran has a hand in to convince his listeners and talks about how Iran sends weapons to Syria to support Al-Assad regime. This also includes sending soldiers and fighters to engage in ground battles. He, Netanyahu, specifies these soldiers to "*Shi'ite*" as it is the sect that rules in Iran. The military supports entail Yemen in which Iran directs its effort to support "*Houthi rebels*" which he considers Iran's follower ideologically. His tone is harsh and critical as he tries to convince the world's leaders of his proclamation.

Israel in Arabic stands with the official Israeli policy. Furthermore, they advocate their ideologies. The interpreter well realizes this fact and interprets accordingly. Her agency combats Iran and treats it as an enemy in their produced material. Therefore, she interprets this part word by word without spelling or altering any part of it. Netanyahu's words themselves serve the ideology she promotes, so her work is confined to conveying them literally. She interprets "*Iran boosted its supply of devastating weapons to Syria*" to "لقد عززت إيران من تمديدتها لسوريا بالأسلحة المدمرة" and specifies the aid Iran provides to Syria to military supply which is identical to Netanyahu's statement. Besides, she interprets "*devastating*" as "*دمرة*" which is also the most suitable equivalent to Netanyahu's word. When the Prime Minister says "*Iran sent more soldiers of its Revolutionary Guard into Syria. Iran sent thousands of Afghani and Pakistani Shi'ite fighters to Syria*"; the interpreter conveys it to "لقد أرسلت إيران الآلاف من المقاتلين الشيعة الأفغان" والسوريين إلى سوريا". Again, she finds no difficulty in interpreting the words as they were uttered. She does not pay attention to the fact that this statement offends a wide number of Arab viewers. Netanyahu here states that Iran sends "*Shi'ite fighters*" to fight in Syria. His words contain an accusation to Shi'a as if they were responsible for the Syrian conflict. As for the sentence "*Iran also shipped tons of weapons and ammunitions to the Houthi rebels in Yemen*", Netanyahu touches a critical subject which is accusing Iran of sending arms to the Houthis. This is a problematic subject because the struggle in Yemen is an internal one that states have different positions towards. However, he interprets it literally to "أرسلت إيران الأطنان من الأسلحة والذخائر إلى المتمردين الحوثيين".

Although RT Arabic interpreter tries to convey the words of the speech as faithfully as he can, he encounters the problem of using a harsh language against their ally Iran. He interprets "*Iran boosted its supply of devastating weapons to Syria*" to "قد ازداد دعم إيران لسوريا". Netanyahu literally describes the weapons sent by Iran to Syria as *devastating* which refers to his rejection and sentiment. However, the interpreter alters the sentence and he interprets the obvious military support Netanyahu refers to, to be just "*دعم*". The word "*دعم*" is too general and can refer to moral or political support. The Russian government approves this Iranian support to Al-Assad's regime which explains his words. He also does this when Netanyahu speaks about sending Iran "*Revolutionary Guard*" and "*Afghani and Pakistani Shi'ite fighters*" to Syria. The sentence used by Netanyahu is full of accusation. Not only it condemns Iranian policies in other countries, but also specifies this intervention to "*Shi'ite*". Netanyahu here hits a sensitive case for Iran which is criticizing the majority ruling sect and treats it to be a hostile sect. The interpreter cannot interpret this sentence as it is because of his agencies policies which

he adopts to take a position in the *field*. He interprets this sentence to "وجهت إيران قواتها المسلحة إلى سوريا". Again, he uses a general term which is "قواتها المسلحة" to avoid conveying the critical words of Netanyahu. He excludes the exclusiveness of PM's words and, thus, he removes any chance of insulting their ally.

7.3. Video 3: Al-Jazeera and CBC Extra Interpretations of the Iraqi Prime Minister Haider Al-Abadi's Speech at Munich Security Conference

On February 12, 2016, the Iraqi Prime Minister Haider Al-Abadi attended Munich Security Conference. It was the 51st Munich Security Conference which took place from 6 to 8 February, 2016. Over 400 politicians and decision makers from around the world participated in the events of this conference to discuss global policies and crises. Those include German Federal Chancellor, NATO Secretary General, UN Secretary General, heads of states, ministers, and high-ranking officials (<https://www.securityconference.de/en/activities/munich-security-conference/msc-2015/>).

Munich Security Conference was launched in 1963 to engage transatlantic debate. However, the developments of the last decade brought middle-eastern politicians to this venue for policymaking (<https://www.securityconference.de/en/about/history/>).

Al Abadi discusses several issues concerning Iraq, focusing basically on the battle against Da'esh showing the victories Iraqi forces achieve on the ground. He talks also about the drop in oil prices and the ultimate effect on Iraq and gulf countries economics. Al-Abadi talked about the refugee's crisis and asked the European countries for collaboration to prevent smugglers from deceiving families and depriving their money. He further stressed the importance of reconstructing the liberated areas –Ramadi and Tikrit- to help civilians return to their homes and restart their jobs. In order to achieve this, he asked for help from Europe and US to provide help and assistance to the Iraqi government. He finally emphasized that the Public Mobilization Force is a part of the official Iraqi military forces.

The conference was covered by two channels, Al- Jazeera and CBC Extra. CBC Extra is an Egyptian private channel that was launched in June 2011. It covers wide political subjects and adopts a stance against terrorism and all the countries supporting it. As far as other Arab countries are concerned, the agency tends to take a neutral position respecting the internal affairs of these countries (<http://www.cbc-eg.com/about>).

Significantly, in the whole speech Al Abadi uses the term "Da'esh" to refer to ISIS. It may look a simple matter to use any name to refer to this terrorist body, but the fact is not as simple as that. BBC has published a report on December 2nd, 2015 explaining the significant implications of each name used to refer to this body. According to this report, the term "Dae'sh" is an Arabic acronym for the name "Islamic State in Iraq and Al-Sham". The members and supporters of this body use the whole name when speaking about it or they shorten it to "the Islamic State". Yet, the Arabic language speakers who

oppose the organization created the term "Dae'sh". The Arabic language is not very familiar with the use of acronyms; however, the users of the term tend to minimize the effect of the original name. It is said as well that it is created to deny that there is such a state belonging to Islam especially that the organization openly declares itself as Islamic. The term "Dae'sh" annoys the head of the organization and they punish anyone using it. The report concludes that "Dae'sh" is being used worldwide by politicians and heads of states as they realize its negative impact on its members (Irshaid, 2016).

Another report suggests that this acronym is adopted because it sounds similar to the Arabic verb "Das" "داس" which means trample down, or crush. People used the acronym after the defeats of the organization in compacting Iraqi forces, and that is probably the source of their hate to the term (Doré, 2016).

Along the speech, Al Abadi uses the term "Dae'sh" when speaking about the organization as in *We have succeeded in our combating Da'eshon ground", "now, we have almost all cities liberated from Dae'sh, apart from two locations. We intend, this year, to make it the final year, and the last year for the existing of Da'esh in Iraq", "the whole thing has changed, which means that Da'esh is losing ground", etc.*

The two channels differ in interpreting the term. Al-Jazeera interpreter conveys it as "تنظيم الدولة الإسلامية" while CBC Extra interpreter uses "داعش". This difference in using the different names of this terrorist organization results from complex ideological and political reasons that operate each agency. The organization did not start as an independent strong body as it is today. It got stronger after the rising of the Syrian conflict when some opposition groups declared their loyalty to the "Islamic State in Iraq and Al-Sham", most prominently is Al-Nusra group. Al-Jazeera's propaganda dealt with Al-Nusra group as a legitimate opposition to Al-Assad's regime whom the agency stands against. Besides, Al-Jazeera always declares itself as a supporter of movements that fight any foreign occupation. Despite the terrorist and horrific actions led by different terrorist groups in Iraq, their materials did not condemn or held a discountenance stance. The agency always acts as unbiased in such matters even if this means supporting or opposing a terrorist group. And as long as Al- Jazeera supports the opposition in the Syrian conflict, it is safer to use the official name the group uses.

Contrary to Al- Jazeera's policy, CBC Extra opposes any sort of radical jihadist terrorism or organizations. The agency supports the official Egyptian government stance in this regards. The Egyptian government, Al-Sissi as its head, fight various kinds of radicalism in order to prevent Al Ikhwan al Muslimin from holding control over the country. Thus, the interpreter uses the term "داعش" to refer to it as his agency holds a strongly opposite stance from this body.

Extract 3:

Al-Abadi: *At the moment, a lot of people may look at Da'esh as an internal Iraqi problem, but it is not. We have many foreign fighters, a lot of them from the Gulf States.*

Table -3-

Al- Jazeera and CBC Extra Interpretations of the Extract of the Iraqi Prime Minister Haider Al-Abadi's Speech

Al- Jazeera Interpreter	CBC Extra Interpreter
حالياً قد ينظر البعض الى تنظيم الدولة الإسلامية على أنه مشكلة عراقية داخلية هذا ليس الواقع. فتتظلم الدولة الإسلامية يضم الكثير من المقاتلين الأجانب وكثير من المقاتلين من دول المنطقة.	العديد من الدول الخليجية تدعم مواجهتنا لداعش.

Analysis:

The interpretations of the two channels are inadequate and unfaithful to the original. Al- Jazeera interpreting is faithful to the message and idea of Al-Abadi's words but there are differences in the terms used. Al Abadi explains that "*Da'esh*" is not an Iraqi problem but then an international problem that threatens the entire world. He asserts that ISIS includes many fighters coming from other states especially the Gulf ones.

Al- Jazeera interpreter uses terms that coincide with the agency's policy. He interprets "*Da'esh*" to "تنظيم الدولة الإسلامية". Besides, when speaking about ISIS fighters coming from gulf countries saying "*We have many foreign fighters, a lot of them from the Gulf States*" he interprets it as "فتتظلم الدولة الإسلامية يضم الكثير من المقاتلين الأجانب وكثير من المقاتلين من دول المنطقة". As it has been mentioned before, Al- Jazeera was founded, supported and located in Qatar which is one of the Gulf States that has always been accused by international organizations and governments to support terrorism. Al Abadi's statement is a straight accusation of the Gulf States; Qatar included, having hand in heightening the struggling situation in Iraq. However, it is inconvenient for Al- Jazeera to convey such a statement. Thus, the interpreter interprets it as "دول المنطقة". He does not locate the source of terrorism as Al-Abadi. Instead, he denies any accusation of the Gulf States in order to protect his agency that represents Qatar's policies.

CBC Extra interpreting is more problematic. Although the interpreter uses the same terms used by the Iraqi Prime Minister, he alters the meaning of the original statement. He interprets the words as they are uttered. However, when he realizes the accusation of the Gulf States, he changes the meaning. This sentence is preceded by a statement declaring that many states support the organization, among which are the Gulf States. A look at CBC Extra interpretation reveals that the interpreter conveys what Al Abadi says; however, he realized that this is an accusation to countries that Egypt tries to build strong relations with and such a statement is a frank condemnation of their policies. Therefore, he prefers altering what has been said to "العديد من الدول الخليجية تدعم مواجهتنا لداعش". In the middle of the conflicts rising in the Middle East, Egyptian government chose to support the Gulf States and their policies. Perhaps Egypt adopts this position to achieve the political stability; which has been missing since 2011 or to encourage the economic investment in the Gulf States in Egypt (Abbas: 2016). Although CBC is a private agency, it supports the official government. The performance of the interpreter is an evidence of the pressure to work in accordance with the set of policies. His re-

shaping of his *habitus* is to perform in a way that satisfies these policies.

7.4. Video 4: Al-Jazeera Interpretation of the American Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's Speech in the Council of Foreign Relations

On November 19, 2015, the American Secretary of State Hillary Clinton delivered a speech in the Council of Foreign Relations (CFR) wherein she discussed issues of U.S. foreign policy and national security in the aftermath of the Paris attacks, Islamic State in Iraq and Al- Sham (ISIS), International Coalition against ISIS, Saudi Arabia's role and No-fly Zone over Syria. CFR is an independent, nonpartisan membership organization. Each of these functions makes CFR an indispensable resource in a complex world (<http://www.cfr.org/radicalization-and-extremism/hillary-clinton-national-security-islamic-state/p37266>). This sample is covered by Al-Jazeera live channel with a simultaneous interpretation. At some parts of the sample, Al-Jazeera's ideology surface is very well reflected by the interpreter's performance.

Extract 4:

Table -4-
Al- Jazeera Interpretation of the Extract of Hillary Clinton's Speech

Hillary Clinton	Al-Jazeera Interpreter
<i>In September I laid out a comprehensive plan to counter Iranian influence across the region and its support for terrorist proxies such as <u>Hezbollah</u> and <u>Hamas</u></i>	وأنا في شهر سبتمبر طرحْتُ خطة شاملة للتصدي لنفوذ إيران والتصدي للمعارك بالوكالة مثل <u>حزب الله</u> و <u>الحوثيين</u> .

Analysis:

In this extract, Clinton speaks about how to help Arab countries to confront the Iranian expansion in the region. She also states that her country will do its best to stand against and stop the activities of the parties allying Iran such as Hezbollah and Hamas. National Counterterrorism Center in America considers both groups terrorist groups (<https://www.nctc.gov/site/index.html>). On the other hand, Arab countries adopt divided positions from these two parties. The Gulf States like Saudi Arabia and Qatar and other Gulf Cooperation Council states consider *Hamasa* representative of a great number of Palestinians. They even support the movement morally and financially. At the same time, the six countries of GCC listed *Hezbollah* as a terrorist organization (Pollock, 2015). The two parties follow a similar ideology which is fighting Israel. Yet, this position is related to the sectarian conflict in the Middle East. *Hezbollah* is a Shi'i political organization with an armed wing that receives support from Iran. This fact alone makes these countries doom this party because they furiously stand against Iran.

Al-Jazeera is known to follow Qatar's policies, thus, it is a supporter of *Hamas*. As for *Hezbollah*, Al-Jazeera has worked against it since the beginning of the Syrian conflict and *Hezbollah* aided Al-Assad's regime openly. Al-Jazeera interpreter here faces a problem in interpreting this especially when Clinton condemns *Hamas*. He does not find any problem in interpreting the accusation Clinton makes against *Hezbollah*.



However, when she includes *Hamas* along with *Hezbollah* in her statement, he changes the statement and substitutes *Hamas* by "*Houthis*" "*الحوثيين*". The interpreter could not refer to *Hamas* as a terrorist group that has proxies with Iran. Therefore, he substitutes the name of their ally "*Hamas*" by the name of a group Qatar and GCC countries fight, *Houthis*. GCC countries started the war against this group in Yemen claiming that it is an Iranian-backed militia that seeks to take over the rule in Yemen from the legitimate government. They oppose *Houthis* and *Hezbollah* for the same reasons; both groups are *Shi'a* and backed by Iran. In other words, it is a part of the sectarian conflict between GCC countries and Iran (Gardner, 2015). The interpreter employs his agency's policy perfectly, especially when considering that he interprets simultaneously. This means that he combined the rules of the game into his *habitus*. This also indicates how strong a convention Al-Jazeera has.

7.5. Video 5: Al-Jazeera Interpretation of the Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu Special Session within the Annual Meeting in Davos

The World Economic Forum is a non-profit private organization that tends to improve the state of the world through public-private cooperation. It is located in Geneva, Switzerland where it held annually in Davos. The meeting includes sessions and discussions with world leaders, international organizations, academic institutions, and public influential figures. The sessions aim at highlighting the highest standards of governance and focusing on the importance of intellectual integrity to make a positive change (<https://www.weforum.org/about/world-economic-forum>).

In 2016, the 46th annual meeting took place from 19th to 23rd January where hundreds of delegates from over 100 countries attended to tackle several issues on the agenda (Wearden, 2015). The following is a special session arranged for meeting the Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. The session is chaired by Fareed Zakaria, an American journalist, and writer. This session took place on Thursday, 21st of January, 2016.

Zakaria discussed with Netanyahu several topics but the main focus was the nuclear deal with Iran, security in the Middle East, and Israel's role in the different conflicts and struggles raging in the region. Netanyahu as well, talked about Israel importance not only to the stability of Middle East but to the whole world politically and economically stressing on the importance of the alliance with Israel government to maintain such peace. The session is streamed and interpreted by Al-Jazeera channel. The following are extracts taken from Al-Jazeera' archive.

Extract 5:

Table -5-

Al-Jazeera Interpretation of the Extract of Netanyahu Meeting in Davos

Fareed Zakaria	Al-Jazeera Interpreter
<i>There is a kind of a tacit alliance between the major, what I call the moderate Arab</i>	أصبح عندكم بعض التحالفات، ربما تحالفات مع دول عربية معتدلة. هل هذا وضع مناسب نظراً إلى إن مثلاً

<p><i>states, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and others with Israel. Is that an awkward situation to be in, given that Saudi Arabia is an Islamic state. It practices many of the forms of Islam that people regard as highly puritanical, quasi-medieval, even medieval. They chop people's heads off; they chop hands off; they have laws about blasphemy and apostasy. Not a lot of churches in Saudi Arabia, certainly no synagogues. How comfortable are you with that tacit alliance?</i></p>	<p>المملكة العربية السعودية دولة إسلامية (أو مملكة إسلامية)..... إلى أي مدى أنت مرتاح؟</p>
--	--

Analysis:

This extract is a question raised by Zakaria. He asks Netanyahu about allying with Arab countries such as Egypt and Saudi Arabia. He wonders how for a country like Israel can ally with a country like Saudi Arabia which is known as a backward Islamic country. He points out to the punishments conducted by the Saudi government. He also reminds Netanyahu of the nonexistence of churches and synagogues in Saudi Arabia. Thus, Zakaria shows the confusion behind such an ally between two contradictory states.

The question insults Saudi Arabia; the most important country in the Gulf Cooperation Council and followed by the Gulf States as regards their policies. Al-Jazeera, sponsored by the Qatari government, would not produce such an insulting material against their ally, even if this material was said on the behalf of others. The interpreter, who adopts the agency's policy, is fully aware of this. In the context of his question, Zakaria says "*Saudi Arabia is an Islamic state. It practices many of the forms of Islam that people regard as highly puritanical, quasi-medieval, even medieval. They chop people's heads off; they chop hands off; they have laws about blasphemy and apostasy. Not a lot of churches in Saudi Arabia, certainly no synagogues*". She interprets it as "المملكة العربية السعودية دولة إسلامية (أو مملكة إسلامية)". She pauses through the question avoiding the details Zakaria mentions about the Saudi regime. She finds it more convenient to stop interpreting rather than conveying such details.

8. Conclusions

According to Pierre Bourdieu the social practice is divided into *fields* where social activities are located. Social agents participate in the *field* to gain different kinds of *capitals* and to do so they employ their own *habitus* in order to dominate the *field*. This may entail modifying or changing their own *habitus* depending on the requirements of the *field*. This study has shown that the *field* of interpretation is not different from other social *fields* described by Bourdieu. Interpreting in news agencies is a tough demanding *field* as these agencies require meeting several requirements to serve their ideologies and tendencies. Interpreters in news agencies play the role of ghosts behind the scenes. They



have to disguise their identity, beliefs and ideologies to occupy a position in the agency. Analyzing the data of the research has proved that interpreters are forced to accept the tendencies of their agencies and work in accordance with their policies; otherwise, they may jeopardize their position in the *field*.

The interpretations samples have proved that the interpreters intervene to change the original marginally; however, these changes alter the message of the original and serve the tendency of the news agency. There are different factors influence interpreters in news agencies that motivate to modify their own *habitus*. These factors include the ideologies of the agency which are the stronger factor that affect the interpreter's performance, the competition between the agents over the positions in the *field*, and the struggle over the *capitals* in the *field*.

In the light of the above-mentioned details, the researcher has concluded the following:

1. The *field* of interpretation in news channels is highly competitive and the struggle over its *capitals* is furious. The struggle demands the participants to invest their *habitus* to gain a position. Moreover, the interpreters are obliged to work in accordance with the conventions of the channel to retain the position in the *field*.
2. The interpreters are forced to adjust according to the channels' ideologies which require adopting these ideologies or tendencies. This process may cause contradiction between the channel's ideology and the interpreter's *habitus*.
3. The strong ideologies and conventions of the news channels urge the interpreters to modify or change their *specific habitus*. Such a modification eases the work of the interpreters and helps them to occupy a position in the *field* and to increase their *capital*.
4. Unlike translators, the interpreters find it difficult to escape the demands of the *field* to modify their *habitus* as the work demands an instant reaction that demolishes any chance of preparing. Thus, they have to change the *habitus*, ideologies, or orientations and adopt what the channel imposes in order to be able to perform perfectly and produce an interpretation agrees with the convention of the channel.
5. The struggle and the inclination to occupy and maintain a position in the *field* drive the interpreters to alter the *specific habitus* according to the channel's demands. The demand of this alteration increases the strength of the conventions and ideologies of the *field*. As a result, neutrality in interpretation is difficult to achieve.

To sum up, it can be stated that *habitus* is an effective factor in the process of interpretation as the product of the process is influenced by the shape of the interpreters' *habitus*. Although the latter consists of their own beliefs and values, they tend to modify it or even neglect these beliefs to be part of the social game. Therefore, it is better to study the interpreter's *habitus* in relation with *field* and *capital*. These three concepts are related to each other. One cannot study *habitus* unless s/he studies its relation with the other two pillars; *field* and *capital*. After analyzing and examining the data in this study, it is obvious that the shape of *habitus* transforms depending on the

demands of the *field* and the value of the *capital*. In news channels, on the one hand, the demands of the *field* of news channels are quite restricted wherein every channel has its set of ideologies and orientations to pass to its viewers. On the other hand, the value of the *capital* is highly desired whether it is money, prestige or both of them. The job of the interpreter is difficult, thus, its *capital* stakes are so valued. Consequently, the interpreters find themselves in the middle of a struggle to restrict themselves to the difficult demands and striving to hold the *field capitals*. They do not have control over the *field* or *capital*, but they have control over their *habitus* which drives them to the process of modifying it to be part of this social game. This proves the dynamic nature of *habitus* and how it can be shaped according to the circumstances that control other factors.

References

- Abbas, Ahmed. "Egypt Supports Bahrain, Other Gulf Countries against Regional Threats: Al-Sisi." *Daily News Egypt (Egypt)*. 27 Apr. 2016. <http://www.dailynewsegypt.com/2016/04/27/egypt-supports-bahrain-gulf-countries-regional-threats-al-sisi/>, 11 June 2016.
- "About RT." RT International. <https://www.rt.com/about-us/>, 27 May 2016.
- "About Us." *اسرائيل بالعربية Israel in Arabic*. 2012. <http://www.israelinarabic.com/about/>, 5 Aug. 2016.
- Aljazeera Mubasher.
"كلمة الرئيس الأمريكى باراك أوباما أمام الجمعية العامة للأمم المتحدة في دورتها السبعين" Online Video
Clip.YouTube. 28 September 2015. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PMSWBuC7gkE>. 5 May 2016.
- "هيلارى كلينتون تتحدث عن السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية بعد هجمات باريس" Online Video
Clip.YouTube. 19 November 2015. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ohOy31Qd6DE>. 3 June 2016.
- "جلسة نقاش مع رئيس الوزراء الإسرائيلى بنيامين نتنياهو يديرها الصحفي فرديز كريا" Online
Video Clip.YouTube. 21 January 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JzxXUVaTaNM>. 23 July 2016.
- "كلمة حيدر العبادى أمام مؤتمر ميونخ للأمن السياسات الدفاعية" Online Video
Clip.YouTube. 12 February 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qZ00LNBIc4>. 20 June 2016.
- Alkhawaja, Linda. "The Role of Social Agents in the Translation into English of the Novels of Naguib Mahfouz." Thesis. Aston University, 2014. Print.
- Almanna, Ali. "Translating News Items between Arabic and English: A Bourdieusian Sociological Perspective." *Turjuman, revue de traduction et d'interprétation = journal of translation studies* 24.2 (2015): 50-94.
- Álvarez, R. and Vidal, M.C. "Translating: A political act." *Translation, power, subversion*, edited by Román Álvarez and M. Carmen África Vidal, Multilingual Matters, 1996, PP. 1-9.

- Angelelli, Claudia. *Revisiting the Interpreter's Role: A Study of Conference, Court, and Medical Interpreters in Canada, Mexico, and the United States*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub., 2004.
- Azodi, Javad. "The Impact of Ideology on Translation of News Stories." *Advances in Language and Literary Studies* 6.1 (2015): 163-172.
- Benson, R. and Neveu, E. "Introduction: Field Theory as a Work in Progress." *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field*, edited by Rodney Benson and Erik Neveu, Polity Press, 2010, PP. 1-25.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge UP, 1977.
- , *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- , "The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups." *Theory and Society* 14.6 (1985): 723-44. Web. 16 Nov. 2015.
- , *The Logic of Practice*. London: Polity Press, 1990.
- , *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.
- , *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Cambridge: Polity P., 1996.
- , *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1998.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Loïc J . D. Wacquant. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: U of Chicago, 1992.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. and Randal Johnson. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Cambridge: Polity, 1993.
- Calzada-Pérez, M. "Introduction." *Apropos of ideology: translation studies on ideology-- ideologies in translation studies*, edited by MaríaCalzada Pérez, St. Jerome, 2003, PP. 1-22.
- Claramonte, Vidal. "MisTranslating Degree Zero Ideology and Conceptual Art." *Apropos of ideology: translation studies on ideology-- ideologies in translation studies*, edited by MaríaCalzada Pérez, St. Jerome, 2003, PP. 71-89.
- Clinton, Hillary. "Hillary Clinton on National Security and the Islamic State." Interview by FareedZakaria. *Council of Foreign Relations*. 19 Nov. 2015. <http://www.cfr.org/radicalization-and-extremism/hillary-clinton-national-security-islamic-state/p37266>, 13 June 2016.
- De Landtsheer, Christ'l. "Introduction to the Study of Political Discourse." *Politically Speaking: A Worldwide Examination of Language Used in the Public Sphere*, edited by Christ'l De Landtsheer and Ofer Feldman, Praeger Publishers, 1998, PP. 1-19.
- Deuze, M. "What Is Journalism?: Professional Identity and Ideology of Journalists Reconsidered." *Journalism* 6.4 (2005): 442-64. <http://jou.sagepub.com/content/6/4/442>.

- Doré, Louis. "Why Isis will hate it if we start calling them Daesh." *The Independent*, 2016.https://www.indy100.com/article/why-isis-will-hate-it-if-we-start-calling-them-daesh--bkC822p_zl, 24 June 2016.
- Dragovic-Drouet, Mila. "The Practice of Translation and Interpreting During the Conflicts in the Former Yugoslavia (1991-1999)." *Translating and Interpreting Conflict*, edited by Myriam Salama-Carr, Rodopi B.V., 2007, PP. 29- 40.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, 1991.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman, 1995.
- Farnell, Brenda. "Getting out of the Habitus: An Alternative Model of Dynamically Embodied Social Action." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 6.6 (2000): 397-418.
- Friedland, R. "The Endless Fields of Pierre Bourdieu." *Organization* 16.6 (2009): 887-917.
- Gardner, Frank. "Yemen Crisis: Why Gulf States Went to War with the Houthis." Online posting. *BBC*. 1 May 2015.<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-32554955>, 19 June 2016.
- Gouanvic, Jean-Marc. "A Bourdieusian Theory of Translation, or the Coincidence of Practical Instances." *The Translator* 11.2 (2005): 147-66.
- ". "Outline of a Sociology of Translation Informed by the Ideas of Pierre Bourdieu." *MonTi: Monografías De Traducción E Interpretación* 2 (2010): 119-29.
- ". "Is *Habitus* as Conceived by Pierre Bourdieu Soluble in Translation Studies?" *Remapping Habitus in Translation Studies*, edited by Gisella Vorderobermeier, Rodopi B.V., 2014, PP. 29-42.
- Grbić, Nadja. "Interpreters in the Making: *Habitus* as a Conceptual Enhancement of Boundary Theory?." *Remapping Habitus in Translation Studies*, edited by Gisella Vorderobermeier, Rodopi B.V., 2014, PP. 93-110.
- Grenfell, Michael (ed). *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*. Stocksfield: Acumen, 2008.
- Grenfell, Michael, and David James. *Bourdieu and Education: Acts of Practical Theory*. London: Taylor & Francis, 1998.
- Hall, Stuart. "The rediscovery of ideology: the return of the repressed in media studies." *Culture, Society and the Media*, edited by Tony Bennett, Michael Gurevitch, and James Curran, Routledge, 1982, PP. 52-87.
- Hanna, Sameh F. "Remapping Habitus: Norms, Habitus and the Theorisation of Agency in Translation Practice and Translation Scholarship." *Remapping Habitus in Translation Studies*, edited by Gisella Vorderobermeier, Rodopi B.V., 2014, PP. 59-72.
- Herman, Theo. "Norms and the Determination of Translation. A Theoretical Framework." *Translation, power, subversion*, edited by Román Álvarez and M. Carmen África Vidal, Multilingual Matters, 1996, PP. 25-50.

- Inghilleri, Moira. "The Sociology of Bourdieu and the Construction of the 'Object' in Translation and Interpreting Studies." *The Translator* 11.2 (2005): 125-45.
- Irshaid, Faisal. "Isis, Isil, IS or Daesh? One Group, Many Names." *BBC News*. 2 Dec. 2016. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-27994277>, 23 June 2016.
- Israel In Arabic. "خطاب دولتر رئيس الحكومة تبنى أمين نتنياهو في الدورة الـ 70 للأمم المتحدة 2015." Online Video Clip. YouTube. 3 October 2015. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bhr9qSBcYS4>. 25 August 2016.
- Jenkins, Richard. *Pierre Bourdieu*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Johnson, R. "Introduction." *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, edited by Pierre Bourdieu, Polity Press, 1993, PP. 1-29.
- Kade, Otto. *Zufall Und Gesetzmässigkeit in Der Übersetzung*. Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1968.
- Katan, David and Straniero- Sergio, Francesco. "Submerged Ideologies in Media Interpreting." *Apropos of ideology: translation studies on ideology-- ideologies in translation studies*, edited by María Calzada Pérez, St. Jerome, 2003, PP. 131-145.
- Kumiko, Torikai. "Oral History as a Research Method to Study Interpreters' Habitus." *Remapping Habitus in Translation Studies*, edited by Gisella Vorderobermeier, Rodopi B.V., 2014, PP. 135-148.
- Liu, Jinyu. "Habitus of Translators as Socialized Individuals: Bourdieu's Account." *TPLS Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 2.6 (2012): 1168-173.
- McNair, Brian. *News and Journalism in the UK*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Meylaerts, Reine. "Translators and (their) norms: Towards a sociological construction of the individual." *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury*, edited by Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger, and Daniel Simeoni, John Benjamins B.V., 2008, PP. 91- 102.
- Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.
- "MSC 2015." - Munich Security Conference. <https://www.securityconference.de/en/activities/munich-security-conference/msc-2015/>, 17 June 2016.
- Nash, R. "Bourdieu on Education and Social and Cultural Reproduction." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 11.4 (1990): 431-447.
- Nctc. "Counterterrorism Guide - National Counterterrorism Center." *Counterterrorism Guide* - National Counterterrorism Center. <https://www.nctc.gov/site/index.html>, 20 June 2016.
- Newmark, Peter. *About Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1991.
- "Our Mission | World Economic Forum." *World Economic Forum*. <https://www.weforum.org/about/world-economic-forum>, 15 July 2016.
- Palmer, Jerry. "Interpreting and Translation for Western Media in Iraq." *Translating and Interpreting Conflict*, edited by Myriam Salama-Carr, Rodopi B.V., 2007, PP.



13-28.

- Pasmatzi, Kalliopi. Translational *Hexis* and Cultural Honour: Translating *Captain Corelli's Mandolin* into Greek." *Remapping Habitus in Translation Studies*, edited by Gisella Vorderobermeier, Rodopi B.V., 2014, PP. 73-92.
- Pöschhacker, Franz. *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Pollock, David. "Hezbollah Labeled Terrorist by GCC States – But What Do Their People Think?" 2015.
<http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/fikraforum/view/hezbollah-labeled-terrorist-by-gcc-states-but-what-do-their-people-think>, 19 June 2016.
- Reed-Danahay, Deborah. *Locating Bourdieu*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2005.
- RT Arabic. "كلمة الرئيس الأمريكيبأوباما أمام الجمعية العامة للأمم المتحدة" Online Video Clip. YouTube. 28 September 2015.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eRDju_0T37k. 5 May 2016.
- "كلمة رئيس الوزراء الإسرائيلي بنيامين نتنياهو أمام الجمعية العامة في دورتها الـ 70" Online Video Clip. YouTube. 1 October 2015.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lxSYOyWvlrc>. 25 August 2016.
- Sabbagh, Dan. "Al-Jazeera's political independence questioned amid Qatar intervention." *The Guardian*, 30 September 2012.
<https://www.theguardian.com/media/2012/sep/30/al-jazeera-independence-questioned-qatar>, 11 May 2016.
- Schäffner, Christina. Skopos Theory." *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, edited by Mona Baker, Routledge, 1998, PP. 235-238.
- "Third ways and new centres: Ideological unity or difference?" *Apropos of ideology: translation studies on ideology-- ideologies in translation studies*, edited by María Calzada Pérez, St. Jerome, 2003, PP. 23-42.
- "Politics and Translation." *A Companion to Translation Studies*, edited by Piotr Kuhiwczak and Karin Littau, Multilingual Matters Ltd., 2007, PP. 133-148.
- Schäffner, Christina, and Uwe Wieseemann. *Annotated Texts for Translation: English-German: Functionalist Approaches Illustrated*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2001.
- Schwarzmantel, John. *Ideology and Politics*. London: SAGE, 2008.
- Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet. "How to Be a (recognized) Translator: Rethinking Habitus, Norms, and the Field of Translation." *Target International Journal of Translation Studies* 17.1 (2005): 1-26.
- Sjøvaag, Helle. *Journalistic Ideology: Professional Strategy, Institutional Authority and Boundary Maintenance in the Digital News Market*. Thesis. 2011. The University of Bergen.
- Sullivan, Alice. "Bourdieu and Education: How Useful is Bourdieu's Theory for Researchers?" *The Netherlands 'Journal of Social Sciences* 38.110 (2002): 144-166.

- Swartz, David. *Culture & Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago: U of Chicago, 1997.
- Tahir-Gürçağlar, Ş. "The translation bureau revisited: Translation as symbol." *Apropos of ideology: translation studies on ideology-- ideologies in translation studies*, edited by MaríaCalzada Pérez, St. Jerome, 2003, PP. 113-130.
- Thomson, Patricia. "Field." *Pierre Bourdieu: key concepts*, edited by Michael Grenfell, Acumen publishing Ltd., 2008, PP. 65-83.
- Tymoczko, M. "Ideology and the position of the translator: In what Sense is a translator 'in between'?" *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*, edited by Mona Baker, Routledge, 2010, PP. 211-229.
- Van Dijk, T. A. *Ideology. A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Saga, 1986.
- . "Political discourse and political cognition." *Politics as Text and Talk Analytic approaches to political discourse*, edited by Paul Chilton and Christina Schäffner, John Benjamins B.V., 2002, PP. 203- 238.
- Vorderobermeier, Gisella M. "Introduction: (Translatorial) *Habitus* – A Concept that Upsets (in Translation Studies)?." *Remapping Habitus in Translation Studies*, edited by GisellaVorderobermeier, Rodopi B.V., 2014, PP. 9-28.
- Webb, Jen, Tony Schirato, and Geoff Danaher. *Understanding Bourdieu*. Australia: Allen &Unwin, 2002.
- Wodak, Ruth. *The Discourse of Politics in Action: Politics as Usual*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. https://books.google.iq/books/about/The_Discourse_of_Politics_in_Action.html?id=GwINAQAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y, 3 Apr. 2016.
- Wolf, Michaela. "Bourdieu's Rules of the Game: an Introspection into Methodological Questions of Translation Sociology." *Matraga*, 14.20 (2007).130-145.
- Wolfreys, J. "In perspective: Pierre Bourdieu." *International Socialism Journal*, 87.2 (2000): *Marxist Internet Archive*. <http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/isj87/wolfreys.htm>, 23 Dec. 2015.
- "عن مجموعة سي بي سي". *Capital Broadcasting Center*. <http://www.cbc-eg.com/about>, 23 June 2016.



دراسة ترجمة النصوص الصحفية السياسية من الانكليزية الى العربية وفق آيدولوجية الهابيتوس المتأصلة / المدفوعة في صنع القرار

الباحث نور حميد مزيعل

الأستاذ المساعد زينب سامي حول

□ قسم الترجمة - كلية الآداب - جامعة البصرة

□

□

المستخلص

تتمتع القنوات التلفزيونية الإخبارية بتقاليد صارمة وتتطلب من العاملين لديها العمل وفقاً لهذه التقاليد. يواجه المترجمون الفوريون في القنوات الإخبارية ضغطاً مضاعفاً، فمن جانب، هم مطالبون باتباع قواعد القناة للحفاظ على وظائفهم ومن جانب آخر يسعون إلى احترام مبدأ الحيادية الأساسي في حقل الترجمة. وما يزيد الموقف صعوبة إن الترجمة\الترجمة الفورية نشاط معقد ولا تقتصر على جانب واحد من جوانب السلوك الاجتماعي. فالترجمة تتم بعمليات معقدة ومختلفة سواء كانت عقلية أو اجتماعية. يصر العديد من الباحثين على إن الحيادية متطلب أساسي في الترجمة لكنها مع هذا صعوبة التحقيق. و لغرض إيضاح سبب هذه الصعوبة، تتبنى هذه الدراسة نظرية عالم الاجتماع الفرنسي بيير بورديو. يشرح بورديو السلوك الإنساني من خلال استحضار ثلاثة مفاهيم: الحقل ورأس المال و الهابيتوس. تعمل هذه المفاهيم الثلاثة كأسس لتفسير النشاط الانساني. وسيتم تطبيق النظرية المذكورة على نماذج للترجمة الفورية أُخذت من قنوات تلفزيونية مختلفة لدراسة السلوك الاجتماعي لهؤلاء المترجمين الفوريين في تلك القنوات. ستعامل القنوات التلفزيونية معاملة الحقول الاجتماعية إذ يمارس المترجمون الفوريون نشاطهم، كما ستستخدم الأعراف التي تتحكم بهذا الحقل وما هو تأثيرها على المترجمين الفوريين. و تركز هذه الدراسة بشكل أساسي على تأثير هذه العوامل على هابيتوس المترجمين الفوريين وكيف يتفاعل المترجمون للعمل وفقاً لما هو مفروض عليهم.