

Translation Policy: A Tool to Digitally Empower or to Digitally Disempower Migrant Communities?

Las políticas de traducción: ¿Una herramienta para empoderar o desempoderar a los migrantes en el contexto digital?

ELENA RUIZ-CORTÉS
eruizc@ugr.es
Universidad de Granada

Fecha de recepción: 16/03/2021
Fecha de aceptación: 28/07/2021

Abstract: Digitally mediated communication in the public sector has changed how citizens and authorities communicate. Within this digital context, it has been identified that language problems may be an underlying cause of social exclusion for migrant groups (see Khorshed and Imran, 2015, p. 347), which seems to indicate that the lack of language proficiency in the host country's language may give rise to new forms of digital divides in migratory contexts. Bearing this in mind, here we claim that, for migrants with language barriers, access to key digital services within the public sector can happen through translation provision, which may be used as a tool to digitally empower them. Thus, based on this logic, in this paper the digital empowerment (Mäkinen, 2006) of migrant communities is explored assessing to what extent the implementation of translation policy empowers migrants' digital communication with the host country's authorities within the public services. To this end, we will focus on a case study in which the methodological concept of domain will be used to investigate the translation policy implemented in the case of the digital communication between the Spanish Ministry for Inclusion, Social Security and Migration and migrants in two immigration procedures. Our initial findings suggest that the translation policy implemented by this Spanish Ministry results in diametrically opposed levels of migrants' digital empowerment in our case study. Thus, arguably, even if translation policy could be used as a tool to digitally empower all migrants in our case study, it seems to be used as a tool to empower only some of them; the most powerful migrant communities.

Keywords: Translation policy; Digital empowerment; E-government; Immigration procedures; Spain.

Resumen: La introducción de la comunicación digital en el sector público ha cambiado la forma en la que los ciudadanos y la Administración se comunican. En este contexto digital, las barreras lingüísticas se han identificado como una causa de exclusión social para los migrantes (ver Khorshed e Imran, 2015, p. 347), lo que parece indicar que la falta de dominio del idioma del país de acogida puede dar lugar a nuevas brechas digitales en contextos migratorios. Tomando este hecho en consideración, aquí sostenemos que, en el caso de los migrantes que experimentan barreras lingüísticas, la provisión de traducción puede darles acceso a servicios digitales claves dentro del sector público, y por tanto, que la traducción puede emplearse como una herramienta para empoderar a este colectivo digitalmente. Con esta lógica, aquí exploramos el empoderamiento digital (Mäkinen, 2006) de los migrantes analizando en qué medida las políticas de traducción implementadas favorecen la comunicación digital entre los migrantes y la Administración de acogida en los servicios públicos. Para ello, nos centraremos en un estudio de caso, el que emplearemos el concepto metodológico de dominio para analizar las políticas de traducción implementadas por el Ministerio de Inclusión, Seguridad Social y Migraciones español para comunicarse digitalmente con los migrantes en el caso de dos procedimientos de extranjería. Nuestros resultados iniciales sugieren que la política de traducción implementada por este ministerio tiene como resultado un empoderamiento digital diametralmente opuesto de las comunidades migrantes involucradas en nuestro estudio de caso. Por consiguiente, se podría argumentar que, aunque la implementación de las políticas de traducción podría usarse como una herramienta para empoderar digitalmente a todos los migrantes por igual, en nuestro estudio, parece emplearse como una herramienta para empoderar exclusivamente a algunos; a aquellos más poderosos.

Palabras clave: Política de traducción; Empoderamiento digital; Gobierno electrónico; Procedimientos de extranjería; España.

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays technology permeates our everyday lives as individuals and as citizens. In fact, the public sector has been profoundly influenced by the digital era giving rise to the so-called E-government. According to Longford (2002, p. 1) the concept of E-government refers to «using new information and communications technologies [...] to improve government services, streamline internal administrative processes, and enhance opportunities for citizens to engage with government». However, although E-government is supposed to provide a more «efficient, affordable and convenient citizen-centred service» (Longford, 2002, p. 2), Loveluck (2015, p. 93) rightly argues that online procedures introduce «new layers of complexity» for certain groups. This is the case «for individuals who may already have a limited knowledge of the host country's language» (Loveluck, 2015, p. 93), as may be the case for migrants. In fact, in these cases, «far from making things more easy [sic] and efficient, [...] online administration can be a strong filter, which prevents many individuals entitled to welfare benefits [...] from actually receiving them» (Loveluck, 2015, p. 93).

Undeniably, this fact is generally connected to the so-called digital divide¹, and particularly to the «second-level digital divide» (Hargittai 2001 in Loveluck 2015, p. 93), that takes into account «many other socioeconomic factors and more subtle forms of resource inequalities such as experience and abilities, social capital, autonomy of use, or availability of social support» (Loveluck 2015, p. 93). Arguably, these socioeconomic factors within the second digital divide go beyond the first-level digital division of the «haves and have not» in terms of material access, and it gives rise to more elaborate forms of digital divisions². Going one step further, other researchers contend that digital literacy has arisen as a third-level digital divide where different skill levels create new inequalities related to the knowledge gap (see Khorshed and Imran, 2015, p. 347). If digital literacy is generally understood as «having the skills you need to live, learn, and work in a society where communication and access to information is increasingly through digital technologies»³ it is evident that, currently, a variety of skills

¹ Mäkinen (2006, pp. 383-384) believes that digital exclusion describes the inequality suffered in this context better than digital division: «The excluded people of the information society are the ones who could increase their welfare and prospects by using the information technology, but who don't have the chance or ability to use it».

² See Khorshed and Imran (2015, pp. 346-347) to revise how the notion of digital divide has evolved over time.

³https://www.westernsydney.edu.au/studysmart/home/study_skills_guides/digital_literacy/what_is_digital_literacy

may influence the adoption of digital technology; including languages skills (Khorshed and Imran, 2015, p. 347).

Zooming in on the public sector, the above implies that language skills, or the lack thereof, may influence how digital communication between citizens and authorities actually occurs. Arguably, this is an aspect worth exploring given that language problems have been identified as a underlying cause of social exclusion for migrant groups in digital contexts (see Khorshed and Imran, 2015, p. 347), which seems to indicate that the lack of language proficiency in the host country's language (Loveluck, 2015, p. 93; Khorshed and Imran, 2015, p. 347) may play a major role in the aforementioned digital divides or digital exclusions (Mäkinen, 2006). In fact, this seems to have been corroborated by previous studies that reported that language barriers may impede migrants from accessing digital and non-digital services that others readily access within the public sector (Codó Olsina, 2008; González Núñez, 2016; Ruiz-Cortés, 2020a). In our view, access to these digital services can happen through translation, which may be used as a tool to digitally empower migrants with language barriers. Here «empowerment» is not merely a buzzword, but it is understood as «the process of gaining freedom and power to do what you want or to control what happens to you» (Cambridge Dictionary)⁴. What, then, does digital empowerment exactly refer to?

Drawing on Mäkinen (2006, p. 381), in this study digital empowerment is understood as «a multi-phased process [...] to increase the competence of individuals and communities to act as influential participants in the information society». Specifically, the author (Mäkinen, 2006, pp. 391-392) argues that digital empowerment is an «enabling process», which proceeds like a spiral from the prerequisites for digital empowerment (first phase) — such as awareness or motivation— to the improvements in skills and knowledge (second phase) —such as being connected to widening social networks or learning new ways to act and participate by using information technology— to psychological changes that lead to digital empowerment (third phase)⁵. In this paper, we contend that, in migratory contexts, translation provision is a necessary prerequisite of the first phase of the process of digital empowerment (Mäkinen, 2006, pp. 391-392). This is so since, for migrants with language barriers, translation will allow for a vital

⁴ <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/empowerment>

⁵ Mäkinen (2006, p. 392) argues: «The changes in competence (1.1.) could lead to changes in self-confidence (1.2.). The changes in participation (2.1.) could lead to changes in becoming more aware of one's social role and surroundings (2.2.). The changes in making choices and influence (3) could lead to changes in freedom (3.2.), so that a person could think, choose and act more freely. And the changes in control over things and situations (4.1.) could lead to changes in control over one's life (4.2.)». For a thorough description see Mäkinen (2006).

understanding of the digital context in question that, in turn, enables them to develop the other prerequisites connected to this first phase (such as motivation to use digital technologies) and, hence, to move towards the following phases of the process.

Thus, with the understanding that «translation policy ultimately is about deciding how people communicate, or even if they do it at all» (González Núñez, 2017, p.152), here we will explore digital empowerment of migrant communities within the public services, assessing to what extent the implementation of translation policy (González Núñez, 2016, p. 42) empowers migrants' digital communication with the host country' authorities (our goal). To this end, we will focus on a case study, the translation policy implemented in digital communication throughout immigration procedures in the Spanish context, which has been chosen for the purpose of this research for two main reasons. Firstly, because it is relevant to reveal how information and communication technologies affect certain «administrative dimensions of citizenship» such as «accessing and maintaining social rights» (Loveluck, 2015, p. 92), in this case the right to freedom of movement and residence in Spain. And, secondly, because language and cultural barriers seem to play an important role in hindering migrants' access to digital information throughout immigration procedures in Spain (see Ruiz-Cortés, 2020b). Therefore, considering the impracticability of analysing how digital communication occurs in all immigration procedures in Spain, we have chosen two specific groups of procedures to be presented here. On the one hand, we will address the case of the immigration procedures derived from the *Ley 14/2013, de 27 de septiembre, de apoyo a los emprendedores y su internacionalización*, which allows investors, entrepreneurs, highly qualified migrants and relevant researchers (and their families) to apply for residence in Spain (hereinafter the *Ley 14/2013* immigration procedures). On the other hand, we will study the case of the immigration procedures that allow EU nationals and their family members to apply for residence in Spain (hereinafter the EU immigration procedures)⁶.

In short, this paper reports on the first stage of an on-going project, in which digital empowerment is approached from a descriptive stance through the lens of translation policy⁷. Consequently, this is a first exploratory

⁶ This choice was informed by the findings of our doctoral thesis (Ruiz-Cortés, 2020b). There, it was identified that these two specific groups of procedures presented considerable differences in terms of *digital empowerment*, which makes them a pertinent choice to compare in this paper. It should be noted that the «*Ley 14/2013* immigration procedures» are national law immigration procedures (only applicable to third country nationals) while the «EU immigration procedures» are immigration procedures within EU law (only applicable to EU nationals and their families).

⁷ We hope to perform future empirical studies based on the findings of this descriptive study.

analysis framed within Descriptive Translation Studies (Toury, 2012), in which following the descriptive standpoint of González Núñez (2016, p. 42) to study translation policy, the collection of our data will be organised via the methodological concept of «domain». A domain is a sociolinguistic context that can be identified in terms of three criteria: location (the Spanish public sector), topic (the implementation of translation policy in the immigration procedures chosen) and participants (the Spanish public bodies in charge of these procedures and the migrants involved). Thus, in order to meet our goal, we will first present an overview of how Spanish authorities generally communicate with migrants in our case study (our participants) paying special attention to the provision of translation within this context. Secondly, this overview will lead us to address the provision of translation in the digital context studied (our topic) within the Spanish public sector (our location). Thirdly, after analysing our preliminary findings, a reflection on digital empowerment in our case study will be presented, and finally, our main conclusions will be summarised.

1. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN SPANISH AUTHORITIES AND MIGRANT COMMUNITIES IN OUR CASE STUDY: AN OVERVIEW

Language rights of migrant minorities have been traditionally politicised in our society, triggering very heated debates such as when, how and to whom these language rights should be granted within the public services (González Núñez, 2016). Issues that repeatedly arise in these debates are the practicality and costs of granting language rights, the scarce public resources to do so, or even, their (detrimental) impact on the acquisition of the language of the host country in question. Given the link between language rights and translation, translation tends to be present amid all these debates, either overtly or covertly. Whichever the position defended might be, in the end, as contended by Meylaerts (2011, p. 744): «There is no language policy without translation policy»⁸. Notwithstanding this, since State obligations to translate are rather limited in international law, González Núñez (2016) argues that States have a lot of discretion to implement translation policies at the national level, especially in the case of migrant languages. In other words, as suggested by Monzó-Nebot (2020, p. 18), issues related to translation policy are still unresolved in most legal

⁸ Sandrini (2016, p. 55) argues: «we may say that there is no translation policy without a digital translation policy». According to him, translation policy is «a term which may be paraphrased as a translation technology policy stating the matters of principle on how to deal with translation in a digital environment and what is to be done and by whom» (Sandrini, 2016, p. 55). However, the focus of Sandrini seems to be on the use of translation technology in the production of translations rather than on who decides and when and how it is decided which translations are made available digitally. Perhaps this last aspect could be integrated in his proposal.

systems, with attempts to regulate linguistic access mostly in criminal proceedings (see Orlando, 2016). This is exactly the case in the Spanish context studied, which implies that communication with migrant communities within the Spanish public services will hinge on the decision of whether or not to provide public service translation (PST)⁹ by Spanish authorities. PST is a field characterised by its social mission (Taibi and Ozolins, 2016, p. 11), which intends to promote the civic integration of disempowered social groups and to empower them enabling their communication in different social contexts within the public services¹⁰. Therefore, PST promotes citizens having «equitable access to public service information» (Taibi, 2018, p. 2) in a variety of public services' settings, such as the immigration setting studied here (see Ruiz-Cortés, 2021). However, even with this key social role, PST has a generally low social status as a professional activity. This may be due to the fact that it «is closely concerned with migrants, refugees and local languages minorities», and then «as these groups usually fall into low socio-economic strata and lack of social, economic and political power, community translation itself has been perceived as a non-priority service» (Taibi and Ozolins, 2016, p. 19). It is against this background that translation policy is implemented in the Spanish migratory context explored below.

In Spain the ministry in charge of immigration procedures nationally is the *Ministerio de Inclusión, Seguridad Social y Migraciones* (Ministry for Inclusion, Social Security and Migration, hereinafter the Ministry)¹¹. Even if this Ministry provides an array of digital information concerning immigration procedures for migrants (section 2), generally, the submission and the subsequent processing of immigration applications are done locally in the Immigration Offices. In fact, recently, this has been changed in the case of the *Ley 14/2013* procedures, whose applicants are now supposed to apply for residence exclusively online (see section 2). However, until this recent change, in order to initiate any immigration procedure, all migrants in Spain were required to go to the local Immigration Office in person to complete the corresponding application form and to provide the necessary complementary documentation (this is still the case for the applicants of the EU procedures involved in this study).

Even though Spanish Immigration Offices are bureaucratic agencies «of key symbolic and material significance for migrants' insertion into a host society» (Sabaté Dalmau, Garrido Sardà and Codó Olsina, 2017, p. 561),

⁹ Also known as Community Translation (Taibi and Ozolins, 2016).

¹⁰ Our understanding of PST foregrounds its use as a tool for social inclusion, against the narratives that perceive it as a social and economic burden for society (see Ruiz-Cortés, 2020a, p. 221).

¹¹ <https://www.inclusion.gob.es/>.

and whilst they are almost exclusively dedicated to migrants, neither translation or interpreting services are offered nor are their officials required to have foreign language skills (Codó Olsina, 2008, p. 200)¹². Furthermore, empirical studies have shown that, even if its officials very often witness the considerable language barriers that migrants experience in these offices, these public officials are unaware of the role that translators and interpreters could play in this multilingual setting (Acuyo Verdejo, 2009, pp. 236-237). This occurs in a bureaucratic context where there is an asymmetrical relationship between the participants involved, with migrants being in a subordinate position to the authorities or, as Sarangi and Slembrouck (2013, p. 59) put it, with «an examinee supplying information to an examiner, who, in his/her turn, is also mandated to doubt, challenge and probe into any aspects of the applicant's life that he/she may deem relevant to the procedure». As is to be expected, this sociolinguistic environment does not favour migrants' understanding of immigration procedures in these offices, as confirmed by Codó Olsina (2008) in her ethnographic study in the Immigration Office in Barcelona¹³:

Spanish was constructed as the only legitimate language of frontline communication. Failure by clients to know the language was taken to index their unwillingness to «integrate» into Spanish society. [...] Other languages, mostly English, were employed in actual communication, but they were categorized as exceptional linguistic resources. [...] This restricted migrants' possibilities of comprehending the progress/fate of their applications and sent clear messages to them about the practical and symbolic value of Spanish in the state administration (Sabaté Dalmau, et al. 2017, pp. 562-563).

Consequently, it could be argued that migrants' language barriers are not addressed in face-to-face communication in these offices in Spain, even if «The clients of the immigration offices are mostly foreigners, newcomers who strive to make sense of the bureaucratic realities they encounter» (Codó Olsina, 2008, p. 10).

In our case study, the migrant communities involved are rather heterogeneous. On the one hand, the applicants for the EU procedures have heterogeneous profiles that differ in age, nationality, language, culture,

¹²There may be some exceptions to this rule across Spain.

¹³ The communicative practices that take place in these offices have been under-researched in the Spanish context. A few exceptions to this trend are, on the one hand, the ethnographic study performed by Codó Olsina (2008) in the Immigration Office of Barcelona (Catalonia) and the field study performed by Acuyo Verdejo (2009) in the Immigration Offices of the Autonomous Region of Andalusia.

socio-economic situations or educational backgrounds¹⁴. On the other hand, given the profiles of the applicants for the *Ley 13/2014* (big investors, entrepreneurs, highly qualified migrants or researchers), they may be rather heterogeneous in all of the abovementioned traits except their common generally good socio-economic situations and educational backgrounds; factors which have a direct impact on digital divisions (Loveluck, 2015, p.93). Notwithstanding this, all the applicants involved in this study share a common denominator: they are all migrants. Precisely, due to this fact, previous studies indicate that they will generally share their initial misunderstanding not only of Spanish bureaucracy (Codó Olsina, 2008), but also of the implications that their statements may have on the final administrative decision on their granting of legal residence (Sarangi and Slembrouck, 2013). In other words, whatever their profile might be, the communication divide between Spanish authorities and migrants generally stays; the main difference would be how these migrants may bridge it. Especially for those who do not have the means to pay for private translators and interpreters, this communication divide may be addressed by other social actors in Spain. However, previous research seems to suggest that some of these actors may prioritise other institutional goals, as reported by Codó Olsina (2013, pp. 36- 37) in the case of Barcelona:

Beyond informing, counselling and assisting migrants with paperwork, trade unions and NGOs act as gatekeepers of the legalisation process (in lieu of the state). It is they who decide who is a legitimate applicant –that is, who meets the requirements, and who does not– and therefore, it is in that sense that they (rather than the state) regulate the bodies that get a chance of being allowed into the country. Although decision making is the sole responsibility of the state, [...] migrant applicants' selection process is *de facto* carried out by the labour and non-governmental agencies that assist them. This is so because these advice agencies refuse to file those applications that do not fulfil the requirements set by the government. Although one could think that efficacy/success criteria would explain this policy, the data reveal how these organisations' strict control over who gets to apply for legalisation is connected to the specific arrangements they have with state authorities.

Consequently, this partnership seems to have resulted in these organisations having «a great deal of bureaucratic, linguistic and moral control over migrant advice seekers» (Codó Olsina, 2013, p. 26), to the point that they are the ones that decide which cases are to be presented in the

¹⁴ See the section *Estadísticas* of the *Portal de Inmigración* of the abovementioned ministry: <https://extranjeros.inclusion.gob.es/es/estadisticas/index.html>

Barcelona Immigration Office. Similarly, Sarangi and Slembrouck (2013, p. 152), addressing social workers' roles in the British migratory context, suggest that «their actions are only remedial and do not have the effect of fundamentally challenging the communicative divide»¹⁵. Unquestionably these situations highlight the importance of migrants' understanding of the immigration procedure in order to assess, for instance, if this kind of filter can be applied by these mediating institutions. Beyond this, understanding the immigration procedure will allow migrants to identify what information they are required to provide in order to pass the administrative scrutiny they are facing, while allowing them to construct their narratives properly during the application process (see Ruiz-Cortés, 2020a)¹⁶. However, even if this were the ideal situation, as highlighted above, this understanding is generally neglected for migrants with language barriers in face-to-face communication with Spanish authorities in Immigration Offices (this also applies to the *Ley 14/2013* applicants since they may go to these offices to gather information concerning their procedure).

In sum, the sociolinguistic environment succinctly described above foregrounds the relevant role that digital communication may play in bridging the existing communicative divide in the context studied. In other words, considering the high price that migrants may pay for miscommunication in this migration context— i.e. not being granted legal residence in Spain—for those who lack Spanish language skills, this key understanding could happen through the translation of the instantly available digital information concerning their procedures provided by this Ministry. Based on this logic, in the next section, the extent to which translation is used in the digital context studied to bridge this communicative divide will be explored (section 2), in order to later assess if these decisions favour migrants' digital empowerment in this case study (section 3).

2. DIGITAL COMMUNICATION WITH MIGRANT COMMUNITIES IN OUR CASE STUDY

Before delving into our description of how digitally mediated communication actually occurs in our case study, a succinct explanation of how this description will be approached is required. In this section, the webpages of the «*Portal de Inmigración*» of the Spanish Ministry involved

¹⁵ This does not mean that we do not acknowledge the crucial role, and in most cases beneficial role, that all these actors play within the migration context. However, at the same time, these previous findings highlight the important role translators and interpreters could have in these contexts, in which the other actors involved lack the training to bridge this communicative divide.

¹⁶ As suggested in Ruiz-Cortés (2020a, p. 222): «Migrants' narratives [...] can be defined as the 'basic mode of understanding and sharing of experience' (De Fina and Tseng, 2017: 381) on the part of migrants when communicating their situation to the authorities.»

(hereinafter the Immigration Portal) concerning the immigration procedures studied will be analysed. Considering that when analysing webpages an array of «modes» (Kress, 2010, p.79)¹⁷ should be brought into the equation, such as «linguistic elements, images, colour, layout, animations, voice, music, etc.», our description will be approached as follows. On the one hand, the array of semiotic elements included in these webpages and how their interplay contributes to the construction of meaning in them will be addressed. On the other hand, the extent to which translation is provided to make this digital information available to its multilingual audience will be assessed.

2.1. *Ley 13/2014 immigration procedures*

In the Immigration Portal, this Spanish Ministry has created a specific webpage exclusively dedicated to the procedures regulated under the *Ley 13/2014* (see Annex 1). In this webpage, applicants not only find most of the digital information concerning these procedures, but also the pertinent links to access the rest of the relevant information available. Thus, in terms of access to these procedures' digital information, unlike the applicants of other immigration procedures in Spain (Ruiz-Cortés, 2020b), these applicants do not need to navigate through the different webpages of this Ministry in order to find this information, since it has been gathered for them in a fairly straightforward webpage which is easily accessible.

As can be observed in Annex 1, on the left hand side of the webpage, a grey vertical column, in the form of an index of the Immigration Portal, can be found. Horizontally, Annex 1 is divided into three main sections. The upper section comprises: (1) the emblem of the Spanish government; (2) the names of the different institutions involved (Spanish government, the Ministry involved and the department responsible for immigration within this Ministry); (3) the Immigration Portal reference and (4) a navigation bar for information search. Apart from having the function of clearly situating the webpage in the Spanish institutional context, it is worth highlighting that the colour blue selected for this upper section is quite revealing. This is the case since, as suggested by empirical studies, «'stability' and 'trustworthiness' are traditionally associated with blue» (Hynes, 2009, p.551); two attributes public sector's institutions may want to foreground in this context. As for the central section of Annex 1, a visual image of a face-to-face interaction between authorities and citizens is shown. Even if it is not clear if these citizens may be migrants, this image seems to represent the interaction between Spanish

¹⁷ According to Kress, a mode is «a socially shaped and culturally given semiotic resource for making meaning» (2010, p. 79).

authorities and migrants in Spanish Immigration Offices, possibly with the aim to convey that a similar immigration service is also been provided in this webpage. This makes sense bearing in mind that, currently, these applicants are supposed to apply for residence strictly online, which means that, to some extent, this webpage replaces the face-to-face interaction in Immigration Offices in the case of these procedures. Lastly, in the lowest section of Annex 1, the actual digital information and documents available concerning these immigration procedures are found. As follows, all these digital resources will be described following a top-down approach.

Firstly, the full name of the Spanish law that regulates these procedures (the *Ley 14/2013*) appears as the title of this webpage. Secondly, in the section «*Autorizaciones*» a variety of leaflets can be found in Spanish and also in English, Russian, Chinese and Portuguese. It is worth noting that the title chosen for this second section, «Permits», may be misleading considering that it only contains the abovementioned leaflets. Thirdly, in the section «*Modelo de solicitud*» a link to a subpage to access the relevant application forms is provided (see Annex 2)¹⁸. As can be observed in Annex 2, the distribution of this webpage is the same as the one presented in Annex 1, except the image chosen for the horizontal middle section; a mountain in this case. Interestingly, this image of a mountain appears in all the webpages of this portal presenting immigration forms, however, it remains a mystery to us if its selection may have a specific meaning for Spanish authorities. As for the documents included in Annex 2, it should be noted that the application forms for each procedure are not only provided in Spanish, but they are also translated into six foreign languages in this case. Furthermore, in the case of these forms, this Spanish Ministry provides a justification of its decision to translate them: «In order to help applicants with the completion of the application forms derived from Law 14/2013, the applications forms have been translated into English, Russian, Chinese, French, German and Portuguese for informative purposes»¹⁹. However, in the same webpage, there are another four documents (such as an affidavit) that are only made available in Spanish. Fourthly, and resuming the information in Annex 1, in the section «*Presentación de solicitudes*», Spanish authorities provide a link to a subpage for applicants to submit their forms online, and subsequently, in the section «*Buzón de consultas*», an email address is provided for these applicants to contact the authorities if

¹⁸We have decided to present the two main webpages related to these procedures in the Immigration Portal as Annexes. Due to space constraints, the access to other relevant subpages will be provided in a link hereinafter. In this paper, the specific information included in the complementary digital documents mentioned will not be analysed.

¹⁹https://extranjeros.inclusion.gob.es/es/ModelosSolicitudes/ley_14_2013/index.html Our translation.

problems arise. Lastly, in Annex 1, these applicants are presented with an array of complementary documents. On the one hand, in the section «*Documentación*» they can find a summary of the relevant sections of the *Ley 14/2013* law in Spanish, a summary that has also been translated into English, and also a report on the implementation of the *Ley 14/2013* in Spanish, which has also been translated into English. On the other hand, in the section «*Apoyo al solicitante*», these applicants find: (1) a frequently asked questions (FAQ) document in Spanish translated into English; (2) a link to a subpage in Spanish with nine documents in Spanish summarising the documentation to be submitted during these procedures also translated into English²⁰; and (3) a link to a subpage in Spanish where the residence card fee form required can be found²¹.

In the light of the description above, several aspects are worth highlighting in relation to the linguistic dimension of these decisions. Firstly, even if «websites are a crucial point of entry for many citizens seeking services» (González Núñez, 2017, p. 163), the content of the webpages analysed are not translated into any foreign language²². Secondly, while this Ministry has decided to translate both the application forms and the leaflets related to these procedures into different foreign languages, the languages into which these documents have been translated differ. Specifically, both types of documents are translated into English, Russian and Chinese, while the forms are also translated into French, German and Arabic, and the leaflets are also translated into Portuguese. These decisions are rather surprising and lead to several questions: Why translate the leaflets into Portuguese and not the application forms? Why provide French, German and Arabic translations of the forms without providing the complementary leaflets in the same languages? Thirdly, even if it seems clear that all of the above languages seem to have been used as a *lingua franca*, at the same time, this Ministry's choice of which languages to translate both types of documents into (English, Russian and Chinese) is also revealing. On the one hand, unquestionably, English is used because of its condition as the global *lingua franca*. However, on the other hand, choosing Russian and Chinese seems to be linked to economic reasons, and particularly to the so-

²⁰https://extranjeros.inclusion.gob.es/es/UnidadGrandesEmpresas/ley14_2013/documentacion/index.html

²¹https://sede.inclusion.gob.es/es/sede_electronica/tramites/tasa-038/index.htm

²² This ministry has only translated the information of its initial webpage into Catalan, Basque, Galician, English and French. However, no webpages of the Immigration Portal are translated.

called *golden visas* granted for applicants under *Ley 14/2013*, that according to *El País*, have proved popular with Russian and Chinese migrants²³.

Lastly, from a multimodal perspective, it is worth mentioning that while there seems to be a connection between the content of Annex 1 and the meaning given to the image used there, this does not seem to be the case with the image of the mountain in Annex 2. Furthermore, it is worth analysing the multimodal decision to use flags to visually represent the languages available for each document. As can be observed in Annexes 1 and 2, and in the links provided throughout section 2.1., on the one hand, the Spanish flag has been used to mark the digital information that has been made available in Spanish. Even if Spanish is not only spoken in Spain, and Spanish-speaking migrants worldwide are the end users of these documents, the logic of this decision may be understandable since Spain is the country from which all these immigration documents originate. However, on the other hand, the situation is far more complicated in the case of the flags used to visually represent the languages chosen for translation. This is so since specific country's flags have been used to represent a language that is spoken in several of the potential translations users' countries. Specifically, the British flag has been used for the English translations, the French flag for the French translation, the German flag for the German translation, the flag of Saudi Arabia for the Arabic translation and the Portuguese flag for the Portuguese translation. Even if, generally, these visual images may be understood across cultures to convey a language in this context, it they may also mislead some applicants, who may believe that these translations are specifically applicable to the nationals of the countries of the flag in question. With or without misunderstanding, an evident Eurocentric perspective seems to underlie these multimodal decisions of the Spanish authorities. Interestingly, this Eurocentrism certainly contrasts with the decisions that will be highlighted below concerning how digital communication is approached in the case of the EU immigration procedures.

2.2. EU immigration procedures

In the case of the EU immigration procedures analysed, several similarities and differences may be found if compared with the procedures above. Firstly, as far as access to the relevant digital information is concerned, unlike the case presented above, these applicants do need to navigate through the different webpages of this Ministry in order to find all the scattered digital information concerning their procedures. Specifically, this information can be found consulting several sections of the vertical index

²³<https://elpais.com/economia/2020-05-18/espana-bate-por-septima-vez-el-record-de-visados-dorados-entrego-mas-de-8000-en-2019.html>

of the Immigration Portal previously mentioned²⁴. On the one hand, in the «*Estudiar, trabajar y residir. Hojas informativas*» section, and after navigating through several intermediate webpages, these applicants find two relevant documents for their procedures: the «*Hoja informativa*» for both procedures²⁵, which is an extended leaflet roughly explaining the procedure, and the actual leaflet applicable to these procedures (see Annex 3). In both cases, this digital information is only made available in Spanish. This is especially surprising in the case of these last leaflets, since, as can be observed in Annex 3, the other leaflets included in this webpage (applicable to third country migrants not studied here) have been translated into English and French. Furthermore, for comparison purposes, it is also worth highlighting the differences in the languages chosen for the leaflets shown in Annex 3 (English and French) compared to the languages chosen for the leaflets in Annex 1 (English, Russian, Chinese and Portuguese). Notwithstanding this, the most relevant aspect for this study is that neither the extended leaflets nor the leaflets related to these EU procedures are actually translated into any foreign languages by the Spanish authorities. On the other hand, the other relevant documents available for the EU procedures can be found in the «*Modelos de solicitud*» section of the vertical index. There, after once again navigating through several webpages, these applicants will find the application forms applicable to these procedures (see *modelo EX-18* and *EX-19* in the link provided)²⁶. Surprisingly, these application forms are not translated either.

The situation described above implies that the applicants of the EU procedures studied do not have access to any multilingual digital information concerning their procedures on this institutional website. Furthermore, as occurred in the case presented in section 2.1., the content of the webpages included in this section have not been translated either. As for the multimodal features included in this case, apart from the ones already discussed in section 2.1., a new visual horizontal image has been used in Annex 3 to accompany the information concerning the leaflets (also in the case of the extended leaflets, as can be seen in the link provided above). In this case, the Spanish authorities have opted for an image in which people, mostly young people, can be seen studying in a library. This image is certainly intriguing, since even if it seems to depict EU migration as mostly

²⁴ All the information included in section 2.1., concerning the general vertical and horizontal layout of this Immigration Portal, is also applicable to this section, except a visual image that will be mentioned later.

²⁵<https://extranjeros.inclusion.gob.es/es/InformacionInteres/InformacionProcedimientos/CiudadanosComunitarios/index.html>

²⁶ https://extranjeros.inclusion.gob.es/es/ModelosSolicitudes/Mod_solicitudes2/index.html. As can be seen, the mountain image is maintained in this webpage dedicated to application forms.

students in Spain, in 2020 *La Vanguardia* reported that Spain was the third EU country to receive the most EU workers²⁷. Whatever the logic may be, once again, this multimodal decision calls into question whether a lot of effort has been put into analysing how to reconcile texts and images in the Immigration Portal.

2.3. Digital (multilingual?) communication in our case study: A brief comparison

After the descriptions presented in sections 2.1. and 2.2., a summary is presented in Table 1. In this table we will mark when the digital resource in question is provided by this Ministry for the procedures studied with an X, while we will specify in writing if it is translated or not for each case. The result is the following table:

DIGITAL RESOURCE	LEY 14/2013 IMMIGRATION PROCEDURES	EU IMMIGRATION PROCEDURES
Webpage content concerning the procedure	X No translation provided	X No translation provided
Application forms	X Translated into English, Russian, Chinese, French, German and Portuguese	X No translation provided
Leaflets (extended or not)	X Translated into English, Russian, Chinese and Portuguese	X No translation provided
Relevant legal instruments information	X Translated into English	—
Related reports	X Translated into English	—
FAQ	X Translated into English	—
Required documentation	X Translated into English	X ²⁸

Table 1: Comparison of the Digital Resources Provided for the Immigration Procedures Studied

Source: The Author.

²⁷<https://www.lavanguardia.com/politica/20200130/473221459259/espana-tercero-de-ue-con-mas-trabajadores-procedentes-de-otro-estado-miembro.html>

²⁸ Partially addressed in the «Hojas informativas» of these procedures.

As can be observed in Table 1, the only common denominator in terms of digital communication is that the applicants of both groups of procedures will find the content of the webpages consulted only available in Spanish. Beyond that, only differences can be inferred from the table above. Firstly, there is a clear imbalance between the digital documents provided in Spanish for the immigration procedures under study, which results in the applicants of the *Ley 14/2013* clearly benefitting from this in terms of the digital information made available in the portal. Secondly, as for the provision of PST in this digital context, while most of the digital documents concerning the *Ley14/2013* procedures are translated (at least into one foreign language), the documents concerning the EU procedures are not made available in any foreign language. In short, it is evident that the situation described throughout section 2 clearly situates migrants under the *Ley 14/2013* in a more advantageous position in terms of provision of multilingual digital resources in our case study. Based on these exploratory findings, we will address the implementation of translation policy in our case study in section 3, with the aim to later assess whether it favours these migrants' process of digital empowerment.

3. TRANSLATION POLICY: A TOOL TO DIGITALLY EMPOWER OR DIGITALLY DISEMPOWER?

As highlighted in the Introduction, our goal is to explore digital empowerment assessing to what extent the implementation of translation policy (González Núñez, 2016) empowers migrants' digital communication with Spanish authorities in our case study.

Given the divergent translation decisions described in section 2, we contacted the Spanish Ministry involved to understand the rationale behind these decisions and, then, the rationale of its translation policy. Since, unlike other Spanish ministries, this ministerial body does not have a translation department itself, our main questions concerning its translation policy were: who translated the immigration documents uploaded to its website (and if it was done in-house in other ministries, or were they outsourced) and how the decisions of which documents to translate and into which languages were made and by whom. Despite their initial reluctance to disclose information, its officials finally confirmed that the last time translations were outsourced by the Ministry was in 2013 to a human resources company called Adecco²⁹. The fact that these translations were outsourced to a private company was not surprising; however, the fact that Adecco was the company hired to translate them certainly was. Effectively, De las Heras (2017, pp. 63-64)

²⁹ <https://www.adecco.es/> This was confirmed in several emails and telephone conversations with the *Dirección General de Migraciones* of this Ministry in 2019.

highlights the low threshold required by Adecco's recruitment in terms of training and qualifications: knowledge of a foreign language or being a native speaker of the language are sufficient to consider applicants as qualified for translator positions³⁰. Furthermore, the fact that the *Ley 14/2013* was created in 2013, which was confirmed as the last year this Ministry outsourced translations, may indicate that all or some of the abovementioned documents related to this law may have been translated by Adecco. As for the translation of the content of this Ministry's website, we found that, in July 2019, this ministerial body published a tender offer to translate part of its website into several languages³¹. However, it remains an enigma whether the webpages related to the Immigration division of this Ministry will be translated or not. Until 2021, no translations have been provided in the case of these webpages, as highlighted in section 2.

In the light of the above, and considering that translation policy encompasses «translation management, translation practice and translation beliefs» (González Núñez, 2016, p. 42), we will use these three parameters to describe translation policy in our case study. Firstly, if translation management «refers to the decisions regarding translation made by people in authority to decide a domain's use or non-use of translations» (González Núñez, 2016, p. 54), it seems that translation management is quite inconsistent in our case study. That is, process and logic that this Ministry uses to determine which immigration procedures will (or will not) be supported by translations are not clear, nor have they been clarified by the Ministry upon enquiry. Undeniably, this reveals poor translation management on the part of this Ministry, which leaves the procuring of translation of public documents for some citizens while providing it free of charge for others. This poor translation management can also be inferred from its decision not to translate its whole website, but only the initial webpage, which results in a significant part of the population it serves —migrants with language barriers seeking digital immigration services— not being able to access this public information. Arguably, this Ministry's decision of not to translate its whole website has also impacted on the multimodal features analysed in section 2. In other words, little thought seems to have been given to which images to include in the webpages analysed (such as the case of the mountain), and to how certain images, such as the flags discussed in section 2.1., could actually be interpreted by a heterogeneous migrant population. Thus, translation of this whole website could have improved the selection of these

³⁰ Some examples of actual Adecco job offers can be consulted in Annex 9 of Ruiz-Cortés (2020b).

³¹https://www.boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-B-2019-41374. This tender was won by Moretto Group SRL.

multimodal features, since translators are trained to know how the synergy of an array of semiotic signs, such as images and texts, create meaning and how this synergy may impact on the understanding of their end users.

Secondly, if translation practice «involves questions such as what texts get translated [...] into and out of what languages, and where it takes place» (González Núñez, 2016, p. 55), arguably translation practice within this Ministry also behaves inconsistently in our case study. In other words, (1) why only the initial page of this Ministry's website is currently translated and not the webpages concerning the immigration procedures studied; and (2) why some documents concerning the immigration procedures studied are translated (and into and out which languages) and why some other documents are not, seems to remain an enigma in this institutional context. Interestingly, the only aspect that has been disclosed by this Ministry concerning translation practice seems to suggest that Adecco was the company that translated the digital multilingual documents highlighted in section 2, which may be worrying given Adecco's commissioning process in the recruitment of translators (see De las Heras Caba, 2017). Whatever the case may be, our description certainly shows that, in the case study presented, Spanish authorities only address communication problems in the case of the immigration procedures regulated by the *Ley 14/2013* and that no common strategy to deal with and to solve communication problems with migrant communities seem to exist.

And, thirdly, behind translation management and practice, there seem to lie specific «translation beliefs» or «beliefs that members of a community hold about the value of translation» (González Núñez, 2016, p. 55). Arguably, this Ministry's justification of why translations are provided in the case of the forms of the *Ley 14/2013* («to help applicants with the completion of the application forms», see section 2.1.), suggests this institution is aware of the positive value of translation in this multilingual context; however, both its translation management and its translation practice prevent all migrant groups from benefiting from it equally. As for the translation beliefs that lurk beneath this, linking the situation described strictly to the beliefs concerning the high costs of offering PST to migrant communities or the scarce public resources to do so, would be rather naive. In other words, if budgetary constraints were the problem, and effective communication with migrant communities the goal to be achieved, translation would not be provided for the most powerful group of migrants who, in most cases, will be able to pay for translation services (if needed). Furthermore, if it may be argued that providing digital translation services for the *Ley 14/2013* applicants may respond to the fact that, currently, these immigration procedures are initiated exclusively online, then for the EU

applicants to be in an equal position, translation should be also provided in Spanish Immigration Offices. Since this is not the case (see section 1), with this decision to provide translation services exclusively to the *Ley 14/2013* applicants in this digital context, this Ministry clearly seeks to secure this lucrative migration in particular. Thus, arguably, our description shows that, instead of using translation as a tool for the digital inclusion of migrants who lack Spanish language skills, in our case study it seems to be used as a tool for further marginalising the most vulnerable groups of migrants; those with the lowest literacy levels and those who lack the means to pay for multilingual information in order to access public services³². Therefore, even if our description does not account for every translation case in this Spanish migratory context, it seems to reveal some typical features of translation policy in this specific domain (González Núñez, 2016) that may be considered troublesome, to say the least.

What does all of the above imply in terms of digital empowerment then? Broadly speaking, our descriptive analysis reveals considerable differences in how the Spanish authorities support, or fail to support, migrants digitally throughout these procedures in terms of both the amount of digital materials available in Spanish and, especially, the digital translated materials available. In other words, our analysis shows that, in our case study, migrants have unequal access to (multilingual) digital information, depending on the kind of immigration procedure in which they are involved. Thus, arguably, the translation policy implemented by this Spanish Ministry results in diametrically opposed levels of migrants' digital empowerment in the immigration procedures studied, with only the most powerful group of migrants being linguistically empowered through translation to act as influential participants in the information society. This fact has three direct implications. Firstly, it highlights that Spanish authorities act as gatekeepers in this digital context, since they exert control not only over the flow of the digital information provided to access this social right (Vuorinen, 1997, p. 161), but also over the multilingual digital resources facilitated to achieve it. Secondly, it foregrounds that the migrants under *Ley 14/2013* will be more likely to overcome language barriers, which in turn will «increase their welfare and prospects» (Mäkinen, 2006, p. 384) during the application process for residence documentation. Thus, thirdly, our analysis brings to the fore that, paradoxically, the imbalance described results in citizens who are supposed to have preferential immigration treatment in Spain (EU

³² However, not only translation is used to this end, since as shown in section 2, the digital information concerning the *Ley14/2013* immigration procedures is easier to access than the digital information concerning the EU immigration procedures. This may be regarded as another digital filter to access public services for applicants of the EU procedures.

nationals and their families) being at a distinct disadvantage in this migratory context for, possibly, economic reasons.

In sum, our findings show that the translation policy implemented by this Ministry neglects the potential of translation in the context of digital empowerment to allow all migrants «to grow as competent subjects who have control over their lives and surroundings» (Mäkinen, 2006, p. 381). Therefore, this translation policy seems to neglect their chance of having a participative role rather than a passive role in this digital context, and it certainly reinforces the subordinate position of migrants to the authorities within this already asymmetrical administrative context.

CONCLUSIONS: TOWARDS *LINGUISTIC DIGITAL EMPOWERMENT* THROUGH TRANSLATION POLICY?

Digitally mediated communication in the public sector has changed how citizens and authorities interact and communicate. Although E-government's goal is to provide «greater access to information regarding government services and programs» (Longford, 2002, p. 2), this descriptive study highlights that digital communication may be impaired by language barriers, which may prevent access to key social rights in migratory contexts. Specifically, our findings seem to indicate that translation provision is a prerequisite of the first phase of the digital empowerment process in the context studied. This is the case, since translation provision is an essential element for digital communication to actually occur for migrants with language barriers in this context and, hence, for them to move towards the following phases of the digital empowerment process.

As for the implementation of translation policy in our case study, two main conclusions are worth highlighting. Firstly, our analysis brings to the fore that, the implementation of translation policy within the digital context not only impacts how citizens' exercise their rights, but it may also disguise elaborate forms of digital marginalisation (Mäkinen, 2006, p. 383) based on linguistic grounds. This is so since, ultimately, when the inability to communicate in the dominant language prevents citizens from accessing digital (and non-digital) services that others readily access, exclusion takes place. Secondly, given that miscommunication in this migratory context may lead to an unsuccessful immigration decision (Sarangi and Slembruck, 2013), through the implementation of this specific translation policy, which only favours multilingual communication with a specific group of migrants, Spanish authorities seem to camouflage new forms of immigration control.

In the light of the preliminary conclusions highlighted above, in this first descriptive analysis we have identified future lines of research to further this study. Firstly, whether the translation policy implemented in our case

study affects other immigration procedures in the Spanish context needs to be analysed. Secondly, the justifications behind the inconsistent translation policy of this Spanish Ministry should be further examined considering that «arguments about practicability [of the provision of translation] are neither neutral nor innocent, but function to advance dominant groups and disadvantage others» (Mowbray, 2017, p. 39). In this specific context, these arguments seem to be closely connected with the great deal of discretion Spanish authorities have to implement a specific translation policy within the public services. Thus, this foregrounds the need to approach issues related to translation policy through legislation in the future, at least if we seek to avoid providing a legal framework that gives rise to policies of «translation as marginalisation» (Mowbray, 2017)³³. Thirdly, after this descriptive analysis, the extent to which the implementation of translation policy actually impacts on migrants' digital empowerment needs to be empirically tackled. This may be approached through a pilot study with the applicants, with and without Spanish proficiency, which explores (1) the impact of this translation policy on the success of immigration procedures in both scenarios and also (2) the functionality of the translations already made available by this Ministry. These lines of research will contribute to explore the extent to which digital literacy has arisen as a «third-level digital divide» (Khorshed and Imran, 2015, p. 347) in which language proficiency in the host country's language impacts on migrants' digital participation in the host society. Fourthly, the beneficial role that translators may play as advisers in this institutional context should be addressed. This is relevant since our analysis suggests that translators may be of use not only in translating this institutional website and its digital documents, but also in advising on how to make them more functional. Lastly, similar studies on the digital empowerment of migrant communities may be performed in other domains (González Núñez, 2016) within the Spanish context, or in an array of international contexts (see Ruiz-Cortés, 2020a).

In short, even if translation policy should be used as a tool to linguistically empower migrants in the digital context, this paper shows that it can also be used as a tool to disempower them. Bearing this in mind, future studies should strive to foreground the potential of translation policy as a tool for *linguistic digital empowerment*³⁴, which may be broadly understood as the extent to which the implementation of translation policy enables citizens «to grow as competent subjects who have control over their lives and

³³ As is to be expected, in order to explore the aforementioned justifications, several of the unanswered questions concerning translation management and translation practice within this Ministry will need to be further addressed.

³⁴ This term has been coined by the author.

surroundings» (Mäkinen, 2006, p. 381) when using digital technologies. In our view, assessing to what extent online administration can be a filter (Loveluk, 2015, p. 93) for citizens has become even more pressing after COVID-19, which has evinced that the Public Administration needs to be ready to provide functional digital services. Then, addressing these lines of research will not only promote an inclusive digital society, but they will also foster citizens exercising their rights on an equal footing in a society that is becoming more and more digital by the minute.

REFERENCES

- Acuyo Verdejo, M. C. (2009). El idioma como elemento de integración de la población inmigrante en Andalucía: Visión práctica de la Administración Pública. In S. Sánchez Lorenzo (Ed.), *La integración de los extranjeros: Un análisis transversal desde Andalucía* (pp. 215-240). Granada, Spain: Atelier, Libros Jurídicos.
- Codó Olsina, E. (2008). *Immigration and Bureaucratic Control: Language Practices in Public Administration*. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
- Codó Olsina, E. (2013). Trade Unions and NGOs under Neoliberalism: Between Regimenting Migrants and Subverting the State. In A. Duchêne, M. Moyer and C. Roberts (Eds.), *Language, Migration and Social Inequalities* (pp. 25-55). Bristol, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- De Fina, A. and Tseng, A. (2017). Narrative in the Study of Migrants. In S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Migration and Language* (pp. 381-396). New York, United States: Routledge.
- De las Heras Caba, M. (2017). La profesión de traductor jurídico en España: titulación y conocimientos exigidos para su ejercicio a raíz de la creación del título universitario de Licenciado en traducción e interpretación en 1991. *FITISPos International Journal: Public Service Interpreting and Translation*, 4, 49-68. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37536/FITISPos-IJ.2017.4.0.123>
- González Núñez, G. (2016). *Translating in Linguistically Diverse Societies: Translation Policy in the United Kingdom*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- González Núñez, G (2017). Law and Translation at the U.S.-Mexico Border: Translation Policy in a Diglossic Setting. In G. González Núñez and R. Meylaerts (Eds.), *Translation and Public Policy: Interdisciplinary*

- Perspectives and Case Studies (pp. 152-170). New York, United States: Routledge.
- Hargittai, E. (2001). Second-level Digital Divide: Mapping Differences in People's Online Skills. *First Monday*, 7(4). Retrieved from: <https://firstmonday.org/article/view/942/864>
- Hynes, N. (2009). Colour and Meaning in Corporate Logos: An Empirical Study. *Journal of Brand Management*, 16, 545-555. Retrieved from: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/bm.2008.5>
- Khorshed, A. and Imran, S. (2015). The Digital Divide and Social Inclusion among Refugee Migrants. *Information Technology & People*, 28(2), 344-365. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-04-2014-0083>
- Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality. A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Longford, G. (February, 2002). Rethinking E-Government: Dilemmas of Public Service, Citizenship and Democracy in the Digital Age, Presentation in the Workshop on Public Sector Innovation, Ottawa, Canada. Retrieved from: <http://www.innovation.cc/news/innovation-conference/longford.pdf>
- Loveluck, B. (2015). Digital Citizenship and Social Inclusion: Uses of ICTs by Migrant Populations and Minority Groups. In A. Alietti, M. Olivera and V. Riniolo (Eds.), *Virtual Citizenship? Roma communities, Inclusion Policies, Participation and ICT Tools* (pp. 89-96). Milan, Italy: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Mäkinen, M. (2006). Digital Empowerment as a Process for Enhancing Citizens' Participation, *E-Learning*, 3(3), 381-395. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2304/elea.2006.3.3.381>
- Meylaerts, R. (2011). Translational Justice in a Multilingual World. *Meta*, 56(4), 743-757. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1011250ar>
- Monzó-Nebot, E. (2020). Translation, Power, Ethics. Challenging Injustice in Cross-Cultural Understanding and Cooperation, *Linguapax Review*, 8, 13-31. Retrieved from: <https://www.linguapax.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/LinguapaxReview2020-1.pdf>
- Mowbray, J. (2017). Translation as Marginalisation? *International Law, Translation and the Status of Linguistic Minorities*. In G. González Núñez and R. Meylaerts (Eds.), *Translation and Public Policy: Interdisciplinary Perspectives and Case Studies* (pp. 32-57). New York, United States: Routledge.

- Orlando, D. (2016). Legal Translation as a Human Right: Ensuring a Fair Trial through Translation Quality and Training, *New Voices in Translation Studies*, 14, 23-45. Retrieved from: <https://www.iatis.org/index.php/new-voices-in-translation-studies/item/1336-issue14-2016>
- Ruiz-Cortés, E. (2020a). To Translate or not To Translate: Narratives and Translation in the UK Home Office. *CULTUS: The Journal of Intercultural Mediation and Communication*, 13, 220-238. Retrieved from: <http://www.cultusjournal.com/files/Archives/Ruiz-Cortez.pdf>
- Ruiz-Cortés, E. (2020b). Investigación-acción en traducción e inmigración: la utilidad del estudio pretraductológico para el análisis crítico de la libre circulación en España y en el Reino Unido (un estudio de caso) (Doctoral dissertation). University of Granada, Granada.
- Ruiz-Cortés, E. (2021). A Pre-translation Framework for Public Service Translation: A Sociological Approach to Enhance Translation Effectiveness. *The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research*, 13(2), 164-182. DOI: 10.12807/ti.113202.2021.a09
- Sabaté Dalmau, M., Garrido Sardà, R. and Codó Olsina, E. (2017). Language Services for Migrants: Top-down Monolingualist Nation-State Policies and Bottom-up Multilingual Practices. In S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Migration and Language* (pp. 558-576). London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Sandrini, P. (2016). Towards a Digital Translation Policy. In D. Dejjica, G. Hansen, P. Sandrini and I. Para (Eds.), *Language in the Digital Era. Challenges and Perspectives* (pp. 50-59). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Open.
- Sarangi, S., and Slembrouck S. (2013). *Language, Bureaucracy, and Social Control*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Taibi, M. and Ozolins, U. (2016). *Community Translation*. London, United Kingdom: Bloomsbury.
- Taibi, M. (Ed.). (2018). *Translating for the Community*. Bristol, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Toury, G. (2012). *Descriptive Translation Studies—and Beyond*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Vuorinen, E. (1997). News Translation as a Gatekeeping. In M. Snell-Hornby, Z. Jettmarová and K. Kaindl (Eds.), *Translation as*

Intercultural Communication: Selected papers from the EST Congress Prague 1995 (pp. 161-172). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Annex 1.

PORTAL DE INMIGRACIÓN

Introduzca texto

Estudiar, residir y trabajar. Hojas informativas

Modelos de solicitud

Unidad de Grandes Empresas

Programas de Integración

Atención Humanitaria

Protección Internacional y Asilo

Retorno Voluntario

Fondos europeos

Inicio | Normativa | Estadísticas | Subvenciones | Publicaciones | Prensa

Inicio > Unidad de Grandes Empresas y Colectivos Estratégicos > Ley 14/2013

Ley 14/2013, de 27 de septiembre, de apoyo a los emprendedores y su internacionalización.

Los documentos y enlaces de esta página se encuentran en proceso de revisión, disculpen las molestias.

Autorizaciones:

- ▶ **Inversores:**
 - español | inglés | ruso | chino | portugués
- ▶ **Emprendedores:**
 - español | inglés | ruso | chino | portugués
- ▶ **Profesionales altamente cualificados:**
 - español | inglés | ruso | chino | portugués
- ▶ **Investigadores:**
 - español | inglés | ruso | chino | portugués
- ▶ **Trabajadores que realicen movimientos intraempresariales dentro de la misma empresa o grupo de empresas:**
 - español | inglés | ruso | chino | portugués
- ▶ Familiares de los supuestos anteriores.

Modelo de solicitud del titular y, en su caso, de los familiares.

- ▶ Modelo de solicitud.

Presentación de solicitudes:

- ▶ Las solicitudes de autorizaciones reguladas por la Ley 14/2013 debe realizarse por medios electrónicos, a través de la sede electrónica del Ministerio de Inclusion, Seguridad Social y Migraciones.

Presentación de Solicitudes

- ▶ Información sobre certificados digitales para presentar solicitudes a través de la sede electrónica.

Buzón de consultas:

- ▶ movilidad.internacional@meyss.es

Documentación

- ▶ Normativa
- ▶ Traducción al inglés de los artículos 61 al 76 de la Ley 14/2013, versión consolidada
- ▶ Informe de evaluación de la sección de movilidad internacional de la Ley 14/2013 español | inglés

Apoyo al solicitante:

- ▶ Preguntas frecuentes sobre la Ley 14/2013 [español](#) | [inglés](#)
- ▶ Documentación, que de forma orientativa, puede presentarse para acreditar los requisitos de las autorizaciones previstas en la Ley 14/2013.
- ▶ Descargar e imprimir la tasa 038, para las autorizaciones tramitadas por la Unidad de Grandes Empresas y Colectivos Estratégicos.

Annex 2.

PORTAL DE INMIGRACIÓN

Introduzca texto

Estudiar, residir y trabajar. Hojas informativas

Modelos de solicitud

Modelos generales

Modelos de solicitudes de la Ley 14/2013

Contrataciones en origen

Modelos de comunicaciones

Unidad de Grandes Empresas

Programas de Integración

Atención Humanitaria

Protección Internacional y Asilo

Retorno Voluntario

Fondos europeos

Inicio | Normativa | Estadísticas | Subvenciones | Publicaciones | Prensa

Inicio > Modelos de Solicitudes > Modelos solicitudes ley 14/2013

Modelos solicitudes ley 14/2013

En esta sección se pueden descargar los modelos oficiales para el inicio de procedimientos regulados en la ley 14/2013 de apoyo a los emprendedores y su internacionalización.

- ▶ Modelo de solicitud de autorización residencia titulares. MI-T
- ▶ Modelo de solicitud de la Tarjeta de Identidad de Extranjero. MI-TIE
- ▶ Modelo de solicitud de autorización de familiares. MI-F
- ▶ Modelo de comunicación de desplazamiento para investigación UE
- ▶ Modelo de comunicación de desplazamiento por traslado intraempresarial ICT UE
- ▶ Modelo de declaración jurada de mantenimiento del vínculo familiar
- ▶ Modelo de declaración responsable de suficiencia de recursos

Con el fin de ayudar a cumplimentar los modelos de solicitudes de la Ley 14/2013 de apoyo a los emprendedores y su internacionalización, se han traducido a los idiomas inglés, francés, alemán, ruso, chino y árabe, con carácter meramente informativo.

- ▶ Modelo de solicitud de autorización residencia titulares. MI-T
 - Versión en inglés
 - Versión en francés
 - Versión en alemán
 - Versión en ruso
 - Versión en chino
 - Versión en árabe
- ▶ Modelo de solicitud de la Tarjeta de Identidad de Extranjero. MI-TIE
 - Versión en inglés
 - Versión en francés
 - Versión en alemán
 - Versión en ruso
 - Versión en chino
 - Versión en árabe
- ▶ Modelo de solicitud de autorización de familiares. MI-F
 - Versión en inglés
 - Versión en francés
 - Versión en alemán
 - Versión en ruso
 - Versión en chino
 - Versión en árabe

NOTA: La descarga de los formularios en formato PDF editable no funciona con todas las versiones de los navegadores. Si tiene problemas para la descarga le sugerimos las siguientes alternativas:

- ▶ Actualizar la versión de su navegador
- ▶ Acceder desde otro navegador (Internet explorer, Firefox, Chrome, etc).

Adicionalmente, ponemos a su disposición los modelos de solicitud en versión no editable para que los pueda imprimir y rellenar por usted mismo.

- ▶ Modelo de solicitud de autorización de residencia titulares MI-T
- ▶ Modelo de solicitud de la tarjeta de identidad de Extranjero MI-TIE
- ▶ Modelo de solicitud de autorización de familiares

Accesibilidad | Aviso legal y privacidad | Mapa web | Web del Ministerio | Quejas y sugerencias

Annex 3.

The screenshot displays the official website of the Spanish Ministry of Inclusion, Social Security, and Migration. The header includes the national coat of arms and the text 'GOBIERNO DE ESPAÑA', 'MINISTERIO DE INCLUSIÓN, SEGURIDAD SOCIAL Y MIGRACIONES', and 'SECRETARÍA DE ESTADO DE MIGRACIONES'. The main title is 'PORTAL DE INMIGRACIÓN' with a search bar. A navigation menu includes 'Inicio', 'Normativa', 'Estadísticas', 'Subvenciones', 'Publicaciones', and 'Prensa'. The left sidebar contains various service categories such as 'Estudiar, residir y trabajar', 'Trámites y procedimientos', 'Trámites por Internet', 'Folletos informativos', 'Informes de CCAA y Entidades Locales', 'Oficinas de extranjería', 'Otra información en Internet', 'Tiempos de tramitación de procedimientos (CORA)', 'Modelos de solicitud', 'Unidad de Grandes Empresas', 'Programas de Integración', 'Atención Humanitaria', 'Protección Internacional y Asilo', 'Retorno Voluntario', and 'Fondos europeos'. The main content area is titled 'Folletos informativos' and lists several informational brochures with language options (español, inglés, francés):

- ▶ **Contratación de trabajadores extranjeros en España:**
 - español | inglés | francés
- ▶ **La reagrupación de los extranjeros en España:**
 - español | inglés | francés
- ▶ **Estancia por estudios, investigación o formación, movilidad de alumnos, prácticas no laborales y voluntariado de extranjeros:**
 - español | inglés | francés
- ▶ **Trabajo de profesionales extranjeros altamente cualificados (tarjeta azul UE):**
 - español | inglés | francés
- ▶ **Residencia temporal y trabajo para investigadores extranjeros en España:**
 - español | inglés | francés
- ▶ **La contratación de trabajadores extranjeros no comunitarios a través de la gestión colectiva de contrataciones en origen:**
 - español | inglés | francés
- ▶ **Ciudadanos de la Unión Europea, el Espacio Económico Europeo y Suiza: Residir y trabajar en España:**
 - español
- ▶ Folletos sobre Movilidad Internacional (Ley 14/2013, de apoyo a los emprendedores y su internacionalización)