



The inclusion of international tourists: developing the translator-client relationship

by Robin Cranmer

ABSTRACT: Recent interdisciplinary research bridging Translation and Tourism Studies has often noted that a source text written for domestic tourists may well, if just closely translated, not meet the needs of an international tourist audience. As a result translators may prefer to depart from the source text in order to produce a target text which includes its international audience. This implies a shift in the translator's role from someone who facilitates communication on a client's behalf to someone who in part defines the communication. But even if clients are committed to inclusion, the need for this shift may not be evident to them, especially when their level of cultural and linguistic awareness is weaker than that of the translator. Such gaps in awareness create challenges for translators. This article clarifies these challenges and describes intercultural skills to help meet them. These can be divided into three broad areas—skills in delivering intercultural education, communication skills for arriving at informed consent for a translation/adaptation strategy and skills in context-relevant ethical reasoning. Such skills, it is argued, can be incorporated into translator training programmes, especially those with courses on specialist discourses like tourism discourse. Developing such competences, it is argued, can empower translators to produce more inclusive texts using bold adaptation or translation strategies knowing they have negotiated with clients ethically.

KEY WORDS: tourism discourse; international tourism; inclusion; translator ethics; intercultural



INTRODUCTION

Amongst the aims which some working in Translation Studies set themselves is to identify what abilities a translator may need in order to be professionally competent. These abilities are, naturally, not confined to the complex processes involved in producing translated texts—they include skills translators can need when interacting with those who commission translations.

One of the areas in which translators frequently work is, of course, with tourism discourse. But recent research across Translation, Tourism and Visitor Studies has often noted that a source text intended to meet the needs of domestic tourists may well, when ‘faithfully’ translated, not meet the needs of, and therefore fully *include*, its target audience. The source text may, for example, assume background cultural knowledge—a tourist office webpage written for domestic visitors to an ancient city might, quite appropriately, refer to familiar divisions into historical eras, but in other languages such terms will lack near equivalents and require a careful translation or communication strategy if the overall effect is not to be marginalising. Equally, where structure is concerned, it may be normal in the source language to organise information about an art gallery around descriptions of displays whilst it is more normal in the target language to structure it around key works so that if source text structure is transferred the effect can feel strangely hybrid. In both such cases a ‘faithfully’ translated text can have some degree of marginalising effect whether the target language is the audience’s first language or a *lingua franca*.

A range of options exist for managing these complexities inclusively which involve the translator ‘departing’ significantly from the source text, even ‘recreating’ aspects of it. In some clients’ eyes this may, however, imply a modification to their perception of the role of the translator as someone who ‘facilitates’ communication for clients towards a role which involves partly ‘defining’ that communication. The case for this may not be evident to them and can generate tensions given that translator and client will commonly have different levels of *cultural* as well as linguistic awareness. In order to deal with such interactions effectively and ethically a translator may need context-specific communication skills and, arguably, students likely to regularly encounter such situations need training in them.

The core aims of this article are, then, twofold—firstly, to clarify challenges translators can meet in communicating with clients in tourist-related contexts where there is commitment on both sides to inclusion but a divide in cultural awareness; secondly, to respond to these challenges by articulating what skills might be needed to cope with them. In what follows the challenges potentially generated by relevant professional and theoretical trends will be examined—namely, within tourist sectors, the growing prominence of talk of ‘visitor-centeredness’ and ‘inclusion’ and, within translation sectors, of talk of ‘cultural sensitivity,’ ‘localisation’ and ‘mediation.’ An attempt will then be made to describe skills needed to meet those challenges drawing on outcomes of a major knowledge-transfer project and existing strands of interdisciplinary research, and, finally, possible implications for future research and translator training will be highlighted.



THE INCLUSION OF INTERNATIONAL TOURISTS. RELATED TRENDS IN TOURIST AND TRANSLATION SECTORS

Recent decades have seen major growth in international tourism. Another relevant trend is the increasing sense in some quarters that visitors should be at the centre of what is offered (Samis and Michaelson). A final trend is the concern to ensure visitor attractions are inclusive, a trend evidenced by the existence of peer-reviewed journals like *The International Journal of the Inclusive Museum*. Taken together, these trends could be expected to imply that relevant sectors of the tourist industry would want to ensure that communication with their many international visitors centres on their needs and ensures their inclusion.

At the same time there are trends within Translation stressing the importance of acknowledging cultural differences between source and target audiences. Many commercial organisations now offer ‘culturally sensitive’ translation, or ‘translation and localization,’ rather than just translation. And whilst ‘culturally sensitive’ translations may make relatively minor ‘adjustments’ to source texts, ‘localisation’ may involve more radical ‘departures’ because content, communicative style or format seem inappropriate. In Translation Studies and translator training cultural differences between audiences have for some time received attention as well as options for responding to them. Some have examined the intercultural complexities of the translator’s ‘mediating’ or “third-space” roles (Katan *Translating Cultures*; House); in bridge areas between Translation Studies, Contrastive Linguistics and Tourism Studies, cultural differences—whether in communicative style, narrative, representation, values or beyond—have been closely explored together with possible translation approaches (Agorni; Katan “Translating the tourist gaze” 15; Manca); and special issues of journals have recognised the importance of intercultural skills to translator training (see Tomozeiu *et al.*). These developments suggest that many translators will be well aware of international tourists’ needs in cultural domains and of options which foster their inclusion. Amongst these may be ‘translations’ which are *not* always ‘faithful’ to source texts, possibly “domesticating” them, in Venuti’s sense, at least in certain aspects of communicative style to increase accessibility, whilst in other domains finding non-marginalising, creative ways to maintain the presence and allure of the ‘foreign’ even if, as Agorni (23) acknowledges, there are risks associated with such creative strategies.

There are, therefore, important trends in sectors of both tourism and translation which import risk into certain encounters—encounters between someone working in tourism committed to ‘including’ international visitors, but with a limited vision of what may marginalise them, and a translator with a more far-reaching vision of what may marginalise them and of how to ‘include.’ Such conflict is most likely to arise where the translator has a higher level of cultural as well as linguistic awareness than the client.



DIFFERENCES IN CLIENT AND TRANSLATOR VISION

Before trying to identify certain types of challenge to translators that such encounters can involve, it is probably useful to clarify potential differences in clients' and translators' levels of awareness, or vision, of culture, language and translation. Robinson (6) terms the client's perspective "external," seeing it as product-orientated, and the translator's "internal," seeing it as process-orientated in various ways. Robinson also invokes Bennett's "developmental model of intercultural sensitivity" (195) which specifies six levels of cultural awareness, with ethnocentric levels at the bottom and relativistic ones towards the top, usefully suggesting that this model can be extended to more general awareness of translation processes. At Bennett's lowest level of awareness, "denial," individuals lack a sense of the potential for difference, assume "similarity rather than difference" across cultures (Jandt 2001: 52) and tend to assume the universality or 'naturalness' of what is actually culturally specific. Many clients working in the tourist sector will be much higher than this on Bennett's scale, but if they are working at the lower levels they may at times struggle to understand when a translator points out the existence of different cultural tendencies between audiences for source and target texts. A translator might, perhaps, see that the domestically-orientated source text gives more information on the nature of a visitor attraction itself than information on the facilities it has or access to it, when the latter corresponds more closely to what a particular target audience might be more used to or prefer. A translator might also see that the visual layout of the source text—for example, the frequency or positioning of images—if just transferred into the target language text would give a visual layout that was unusual in that language, making it harder for its audience to process. In such cases a translator may find client receptivity limited.

It is against this background that I have so far referred, in scare quotes, to 'fidelity to' and various forms of opposite like 'departure from' and 'recreating' the source text. It is, though, important to be clear from whose perspective, in the current context, these terms are to be understood. This is not in any of the many refined senses that discussions within Translation Studies often give these terms or as translators discussing professional practice may do—they are to be understood in the everyday ways a *client* might understand them, a client often with limited cultural awareness, since the main thrust of this article is how translators are to relate to clients in this position. As such they may commonly assume, to use Jandt's phrase again, "similarity rather than difference" in matters cultural as well as linguistic. For them, there may be just as good reasons to assume a translation can be faithful to its source where many aspects of culture are concerned as there are reasons to assume a translation can be linguistically faithful to its source by always containing exact lexical, grammatical or pragmatic equivalences. It may also mean that what, in some instances, to the translator is a form of inclusive intercultural mediation is not what the client, even allowing for deference to the professional, would term 'translation' and not what they perceive themselves to have commissioned. The challenges with which we will now be concerned are all generated by differences in awareness of these kinds.



CHALLENGES FOR THE TRANSLATOR

A tourist professional might well, if their cultural awareness is limited, see the commissioning of translations as in itself a perfectly sufficient gesture of inclusion. In addition, such commissions will often not fall into a category in which, as Robinson (26) points out, the client would normally expect, and give explicit permission for, 'distortions' of the source text, as might happen in advertising contexts. The translator(s) they commission might, however, see clearly the extent to which the domestically-orientated source text, when faithfully translated, as the *client* understands this, will fail to meet the needs of the target group and include them. Such a scenario is in certain respects a classic one—it involves a form of expert being called in to perform a task on behalf of an individual having a lay understanding of what they want. The expert views the task with far deeper understanding seeing complexities, problems and options where the lay person sees none. Amongst the core challenges to the expert can be, firstly, which aspects of that complexity can viably be shared with the lay person and how such limited 'education' is best achieved; secondly, how the expert, given the different levels of understanding which remain, is to manage dialogue with the lay person in such a way as to leave that person with a contextually adequate sense of ownership whilst leaving themselves with a clear course of action on their behalf; and, thirdly, how the expert is to manage all of this ethically. There are, of course, amongst these challenges aspects which are specific to translation generally, and to the translation of specialist discourses in particular, but many of the core challenges are generic.

Challenges of broadly these three kinds emerged vividly in a knowledge-transfer project, in which the author of this article participated, which lasted formally from 2007-2009 and then informally for several years afterwards, and the key results of which are reported in Robertson ("What Can We See?") and Cranmer ("Welcoming," "Communicating"). The project, funded by a UK research council, involved leading London museums and galleries working with translators, with professional experience, who were also academic members of the Department of Modern Languages and Cultures at London's University of Westminster, aiming to improve their communication with international visitors and to start to articulate some principles for good practice in this area. The project started from the idea that faithful translations of source texts aimed at domestic audiences were inadequate to meet the needs of, and thereby fully include, their international audiences and aimed to provide what was lacking. Staff in the Visitor Services sections of six museums and galleries were paired with translators each with a different language specialism—Chinese, Russian, Arabic, Spanish, German and French. The translators worked with native speaker focus groups to examine the appropriateness of what was provided and were tasked with suggesting improvements. New, recreated texts were then produced by the translators with various forms of consultation with Visitor Services staff. Although identifying the challenges the translators faced in dealing with staff, and how they were or might be met, was not a primary aim of the project and is not much focused on in previous published reports on



this project, certain challenges were clearly observable and recurrent. Amongst these were many of the generic ones described above:

1. The challenge of coping with the limited receptiveness of some Visitor Services staff, from their 'external' standpoint, to the idea that source texts might, in the cultural domain, need to be recreated significantly for international audiences—the level of receptivity varied often as a function, unsurprisingly, of staffs' foreign language competence and cultural awareness.
2. The challenge of managing dialogue across the divide in cultural awareness which always to some degree remained—some translators succeeded in building in forms of consultation or in creating trust, others struggled.
3. The challenge of feeling hampered in producing target language texts by concerns about the ethicality of employing creative translation or cultural adaptation strategies—at times translators felt it was unclear that consent had been fully obtained.

The translators in question had, arguably, dream conditions in which to work—weeks of time and funding to pay for time spent interacting with clients. Yet they did not always fully succeed, and, given that their professional competence was undoubtedly adequate for the usual range of translation briefs, this raised the question whether they all possessed the full breadth of competences required for working, with inclusion in mind, on briefs in this specialist domain.

SKILLS FOR MANAGING THESE CHALLENGES

In the previous section three areas of potential challenge were identified for translators who are relating to clients who have commissioned them to carry out briefs in the area of Tourism Discourse where both aim to include but function at different levels of awareness. The three areas identified are not intended to be exhaustive or the only way in which relevant challenges could be categorised, but they do provide a framework for analysing the kind of competences translators might need in order to meet them. In trying to identify such competences it is perhaps natural to ask what existing competence frameworks may already offer and to focus on such frameworks in the intercultural realm whether they are general or more vocationally orientated like those aimed at translator training. But there are at least two reasons why looking in these domains may offer little.

In the first place, as I have argued elsewhere, the challenges of communication, intercultural or otherwise, where one participant has a higher level of cultural awareness than the other have received relatively little attention in comparison with, for example, the challenges posed by cultural difference, essentialism and of functioning in intermediary/'third space' roles (Cranmer "Intercultural Communication"). As a result it is not generally to be expected that existing intercultural competence frameworks will offer much in relation to the challenges identified in the previous section since the competences articulated tend to be designed to meet *other* kinds of challenge.



Secondly, the types of challenge identified above, whilst by no means peculiar either to translator-client interaction generally or to translator-client reactions involving *tourist* discourse in particular, are relatively specific. Much intercultural activity does not involve a commission and not all areas of discourse are as likely as tourism discourse to generate a need to recreate a source text when translating it if marginalisation on cultural grounds is to be avoided. So again it will be unsurprising if existing competence frameworks offer only a limited amount in helping us hypothesise what competences might be needed to meet the challenges which are our focus here.

Nonetheless, recent work in translation pedagogy, which has included attempts to articulate the specific intercultural competences needed by translators and to create fully-fledged competence frameworks, has often moved beyond a simple focus on intercultural aspects of the processes of *producing translated texts*. They frequently emphasise in varying ways the importance of looking at the *translator* and not just translation processes. One strand of this involves acknowledging the full range of tasks a translator may need to perform in their professional life requiring intercultural competence and this includes identifying the intercultural competences they need in *interaction with clients and colleagues* (Tomozeiu *et al.*). This strand is very evident in, for example, the PICT intercultural competence framework, produced as part of an EU funded project designed to improve the teaching of intercultural competence to translators, and in related research publications (Tomozeiu and Kumpulainen; Koskinen). But it is also to a degree true of the competence framework produced by Yarosh (164) who considers 'Professional identity and values' as one 'factor' in translator intercultural competence. As such, even if such competence frameworks do not help specifically in identifying competences to meet the challenges considered in this article, they represent a directional shift which recognises intercultural challenges not just in text-production but also in interaction with clients and sees it as appropriate to reflect this in student learning objectives.

In hypothesising what kinds of skill might allow translators to meet these challenges rather than drawing on existing intercultural competence frameworks for translators, I will, therefore, tend to draw more widely on elements of relevant interdisciplinary research literature as well as on successful strategies which at times emerged in the knowledge-transfer project referred to in the last section.

In table 1 below I have proposed skill areas corresponding to the types of challenge identified above which might help translators in these challenging contexts.



CHALLENGE TO TRANSLATOR	AREA OF SKILL DEVELOPMENT TO MEET CHALLENGE
1. Limited receptivity on client's part to the idea that the target language text will, on cultural grounds, if merely a faithful version of the source text, not fully include its international audience	<i>A. Capacity to improve client's cultural as well as linguistic awareness—mastery of a range of short-term, contextualised, 'educational' techniques for developing cultural awareness</i>
2. Establishing and maintaining client trust and an agreed basis for producing an inclusion-oriented interpretation of the brief in spite of the partial understanding on the client's part of the cultural grounds for recreating aspects of the source text	<i>B. Capacity to exercise a wide range of interpersonal skills across the divide in cultural and linguistic awareness, leading to the establishing of trust and agreement over the creation of an inclusion-orientated version of the brief—e.g. mastery of techniques for confidence-building, for giving guidance on client options, for balancing client sense of control and translator independence</i>
3. The need to know that they have, in spite of the gap in cultural awareness, an appropriate level of client consent when interpreting and fulfilling the brief in a way which genuinely includes the target audience	<i>C. Capacity to establish and work according to a reasoned ethical stance, whilst pursuing an inclusion-oriented strategy, a stance which respects loyalties to the client, to themselves and to relevant professional ethical codes and contractual commitments; and to ensure that their ethicality is visible to the client</i>

Table 1. Challenges to translators negotiating with clients in tourist sector together with suggested competences needed to manage this successfully.

I will now try to briefly explain what each capacity involves, identifying sub-skills in the process, and where appropriate, suggesting mastery of specific strategies which might be associated with it.

A. CAPACITY TO IMPROVE CLIENT'S CULTURAL AS WELL AS LINGUISTIC AWARENESS

It is perhaps natural to think that meeting many of these challenges will involve essentially "educating the client," to use Weschke's phrase. But we need to be clear precisely what form of education this involves and what can realistically be achieved. It is not education in the mechanics of service provision, about timeframes, sequences, rates of pay, editing, quality assurance, or the basics of semantic non-equivalence, crucial issues with which authors like Weschke are very legitimately concerned. Such knowledge—and it is *knowledge* more than awareness—is both important for the client and relatively quickly learnable. What we are concerned with is education in *cultural awareness* and there is wide consensus that this tends to be very slowly acquired even under optimal learning conditions which the client will rarely possess (Robinson 9; Byram). Moreover, such learning can carry a significant element of disorientating personal threat, because it often involves demonstrating the relative nature of



principles, practices, interpretations which are deeply internalised for the client, which they may hold dear and frequently perceive as universal. Some may even question how far such educational attempts are worth pushing (Robinson 9).

Nonetheless, the translator will need to possess, albeit in a modest degree, the key pedagogical skills which anyone working in intercultural education needs. These will often include setting clear and realisable goals of obvious relevance to the client, an ability to motivate the client to engage in learning, the nurturing skills important in any educational relationship especially where personal vulnerability is particularly apparent, and specific contextual teaching strategies and techniques. The techniques it will make sense to use will vary hugely, but the literature giving techniques and resources for intercultural awareness development in translation contexts and beyond is extensive (cfr. Lustig and Koester) and many techniques will parallel what translators are often used to employing when explaining forms of linguistic non-equivalence. Where format or layout issues are concerned, as the project at times showed, the use of target language 'model texts' can contribute a great deal as differences are often visually apparent (e.g. in the balance of text and image) even if the client has no mastery of the target language. And, in the domain of variation of content linked to underlying cultural variance, the use again of relevant target language model texts translated in places back into the source language can allow the client to see something of the shift in focus and priority. Nonetheless, there are real limits to how far, given the contextual limits on time, cost and motivation, such 'education' can go, which is one reason why competence B below can also be of considerable importance.

B. CAPACITY TO EXERCISE A WIDE RANGE OF INTERPERSONAL SKILLS ACROSS THE DIVIDE IN CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC AWARENESS

Whatever quality of 'education' the translator provides, a gap in awareness between translator and client will often remain. The client will, therefore, be likely to continue encountering new areas where they expect cultural universality only for the translator to confront them with difference, perhaps expressing disquiet over aspects of the target language text which, when back-translated, are some distance from paralleling the source. This then creates a situation in which there can be departures from the source text which the translator thinks best serve all parties' desire for inclusion, but for which it is difficult to get the client's consent—difficult either because they lack the requisite awareness or because constantly interrupting the process of producing the target language text in order to consult or 'educate' is too disruptive, time-consuming and financially costly for client and translator. The translator may, therefore, need some of the following interpersonal skills, although the precise skills required will reflect local norms regarding both the translation profession and client-translator relationships.

The translator will almost certainly need at times to be able to revert to 'educator' mode either to develop awareness in relation to specific aspects of the brief or because the client has moments of 'relapse.' They will need to develop client trust using a variety of techniques, well-rehearsed in other professional domains, like working initially to build confidence by achieving success on easier, more conventional aspects of the brief,



before confronting problematic issues of inclusion. They will need, as the project described earlier again showed, to find ways to respect client desire to maintain control of what is being communicated whilst ensuring they as translators retain a viable degree of freedom. More generally, although the extent of this may depend on the local context, they will need forms of guidance or counselling skills so that clients can be made clear of their options and enabled to give or confirm specific instructions on a basis of 'informed consent.' Such guidance will include making clients aware of the forms of inclusion that will result from creative translation or more radical recreation strategies, and of the financial and ideological implications associated with them (cf. Pym 144-149; Gouadec 66; Cranmer "Communicating"). Generally, the translator will also need negotiation skills to achieve agreement with the client *before* text production begins, on the parameters of recreating the source text and of consultation relating to that process—in some cases, in the project described earlier, no such sufficiently clear, prior agreement was negotiated and this undoubtedly hampered the translator's work and affected the quality of the client-translator relationship.

C. CAPACITY TO ESTABLISH AND WORK ACCORDING TO A REASONED ETHICAL STANCE

Most briefs that translators undertake do not require them to engage in careful ethical reflection, not because they are in any sense ethically "neutral" (Pym 176-178), but because the briefs lie sufficiently within norms for which translators' training, experience, professionalism and professional codes provide an established framework for conduct. But, where there is a background agenda for inclusion, briefs in the tourist sector can prove very different. This is because when a significant gap in cultural awareness exists between client and translator, the translator may well feel they have a better sense of what lies in the client's best interest than the client. This, then, raises familiar professional ethical issues—namely, the right of professionals to 'act in the best interest' of clients and subject to what conditions, especially if it remains the case that what the translator recommends is not what the client sees as being in their best interest (Gouadec 236-238). Such ethical concerns have, of course, often been formally addressed in professional contexts like health settings generating institutionally formulated 'decision aids,' protocols for gaining consent and closely formulated guidelines embodied in professional codes of practice, all of which reduce the burden of ethical reasoning for the individual. But in the absence of such formalised practices or guidelines the translator must work within the framework they have which, even where it includes relevant general clauses in codes or contracts, is unlikely to remove the need to possess some skill in ethical reasoning specific to the context in which they are working.

As such they will need the complex skills to establish, through their own reasoning, an ethical stance informed by the requirements of relevant professional codes and contracts such as they are, by their responsibilities towards the client and by their shared commitment to inclusion, even though client and translator may differ in what they think this entails. But their ethical stance will also need to be informed by their own right to earn a living as a translator, their own beliefs and their more general



ideology. Dealing with such a wide range of factors and interested parties may not always be fully familiar to the translator, nor may be the integration of their ethical stance into the obtaining of informed consent. Finally, translators may also need to be able to ensure that they are *seen* to be behaving openly and ethically, either as that manifests itself implicitly in their text production or interactions with the client or by making their ethical stance verbally explicit.

No claim is being made here that these three competence areas are sufficient or exhaustive nor that they would be appropriate to all contexts—professional contexts are too varied as are expectations of role within translator-client relations. Nonetheless, in cases where someone working in the tourist sector who is committed to inclusion gives a commission to a translator, and where a significant gap in cultural awareness between them exists, competences of these kinds may well be needed. It also looks likely that had the translators involved in the project described above more consistently possessed high levels of competence in these areas the project would have been more successful.

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND TRANSLATOR TRAINING

Future research could usefully, of course, take many directions. In the first place, the three areas of competence cited in the previous sections have the status purely of hypotheses. Clearly it would be desirable to test them empirically to see whether their exercise actually does impact positively both on the client-translator relationship and on international visitors. Secondly, it might be felt that there are better ways to generate hypothesised competences by, for example, using qualitative interviewing methods with translators with experience of work in these contexts. Hypotheses might also be generated by looking to professions where these forms of audience-centred communication, including the adaptation of domestically-targeted communication to suit international audiences, have greater currency than in certain sections of the tourist industry, examples of which would be cross-cultural advertising and software localisation. Potentially useful too is the extensive experience of other professional contexts where major gaps of understanding or awareness exist between specialists and clients carrying with them ethical challenges which have long generated detailed regulatory practice and training provision. But however hypotheses as to the required competences are generated, the need to test their actual impact empirically, and to refine them following analysis of results, remains. Empirically-based, client-focused research would also be valuable aimed at establishing more clearly what forms of translators' intercultural mediation can risk pushing the boundaries of what clients consider themselves to be commissioning, research with undoubted implications for how translators may need to dialogue with them.



Important too would be to consider the inclusion of such competences into translator training programmes having some focus on Tourism Discourse or on other areas of specialist discourse in which similar issues of fidelity to, or recreation of, source texts arise. The competence areas would undoubtedly need to be adapted to the wide potential variety of local professional contexts including likely scenarios trainee translators might encounter. The competence areas also need to be worked out in greater detail so as to include more specific sub-skills and strategies which can be built into course learning aims, content and assessment practices as well as being adapted to the relevant educational context.

CONCLUSION

The first aim of this article was to clarify the challenges translators can meet in communicating with clients in tourist-related contexts where there is mutual commitment to inclusion but a divide in cultural awareness. This divide, I have argued, can leave the client unaware of the marginalisation involved in translating faithfully. One way in which inclusion can be increased involves the translator recreating aspects of the source text, modifying it or translating 'boldly.' But pursuing such strategies can raise ethical issues of informed consent for the translator requiring mastery of a range of interpersonal skills beyond those required for more conventional briefs.

The core of the article has, though, been to hypothesise the competence areas translators might need if they are to develop the client-translator relationship positively when working on tourist briefs along lines that would allow them, without ethical concerns, to pursue their translation or recreation strategies uninhibited. As a result, there are grounds for saying that, in addition to developing techniques for producing high quality translated or recreated texts, translator training programmes which include a focus on tourist discourse need to include training in certain other skill areas. In addition to certain forms of educational skill, it has been suggested that these skills are either interpersonal or concern consent-related, ethical reasoning. Only when competent in areas of these kinds are translators likely to be able to confidently maximise the level of inclusion for international tourists in the texts they produce whilst fulfilling their ethical obligations towards clients.

WORKS CITED

Agorni, Mirella. "Tourism across languages and cultures: Accessibility through translation." *Cultus*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2016, pp. 13-27.

Bennett, Milton J. "Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity." *Education for the Intercultural Experience*. 2nd ed., edited by R. Michael Paige, Intercultural Press, 1993, pp. 21-71.

Byram, Michael. *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Multilingual Matters, 1997.



- Cranmer Robin "Communicating with International Visitors – the Case of Museums and Galleries." *Cultus*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2016, pp. 91-105.
- . "Intercultural Communication: a further challenge." *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 21, no. 4, 2017, pp. 870-884.
- . "Welcoming International Visitors – Communication and Culture." *Transcultural Visions*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2013, pp. 3-10.
- Gouadec, Daniel. *Translation as a Profession*. John Benjamins, 2007.
- House, Juliane. "Translation as re-contextualization and a Third Space phenomenon with some implications for translator education." *Foreign Language Education Research*, vol. 13, 2010, pp. 25-42.
- Jandt, Fred E. *Intercultural Communication: an Introduction*. 3rd ed., Sage, 2001.
- Katan, David. *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*. St. Jerome Publishing, 1999.
- . "Translating the tourist gaze: from heritage and 'culture' to actual encounter." *Pasos*, vol. 10, no. 4, 2012, pp. 83-95.
- Koskinen, Kaisa. "Training Translators for a Superdiverse World. Translators' Intercultural Competence and Translation as Affective Work." *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 19, no. 4, 2015, pp. 175-184.
- Lustig, Myron W., and Jolene Koester. *Intercultural Competence: Interpersonal Communication Across Cultures*. 4th ed., Pearson, 2003.
- Manca, Elena, 2013. "Describing through the five senses. A contrastive socio-cultural and linguistic analysis of Italian and British tourist websites." *Tourism and Tourist Promotion around the World: a Linguistic and Socio-cultural Perspective*, edited by Elena Manca and Francesca Bianchi, Università del Salento, pp. 109-224.
- "PICT – Promoting intercultural communication in translators." *Intercultural Competence Curriculum Framework*, 2012, www.pictllp.eu/en/curriculum-framework. Accessed 24 Feb. 2019.
- Pym, Anthony. *The Moving Text: Localisation, Translation, and Distribution*. John Benjamins, 2004.
- Robertson, P. "What Can We See? London's Museums and Galleries and the International Visitor Experience." *Liaison Magazine*, vol. 2, 2009, pp. 22-27.
- Robinson, Douglas. *Becoming a Translator*. Routledge, 1997.
- Samis, Peter, and Mimi Michaelson. *Creating the Visitor-centred Museum*. Routledge, 2017.
- Tomozeiu, Daniel, et al. "Teaching intercultural competence in translator training." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, vol. 10, no. 3, 2016, pp. 251-267.
- Tomozeiu, Daniel, and Kumpulainen Minna. "Operationalising intercultural competence for translation pedagogy." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, vol. 10, no. 3, 2016, pp. 268-284.
- Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, Routledge, 2008.



Weschke, Lucas. "Educating the Client." *The Translator's Handbook*. 2nd ed., edited by Rachel Owens, Aslib, 1996, pp. 149-172.

Yarosh, Maria. "Translator Intercultural Competence: A Model, Learning Objectives and Level Indicators." *Handbook of Research on Teaching Methods in Language Translation and Interpretation*, edited by Ying Cui and Wei Zhao, IGI Global, 2015, pp. 160-178.

Robin Cranmer was formerly Senior Lecturer in Linguistics at the University of Westminster in London, working in Language Education and Intercultural Communication. He jointly co-ordinated an EU project 'Promoting Intercultural Competence in Translators' (PICT) and worked with London museums on the intercultural challenges of translating for international visitors. His publications focus on intercultural aspects of Translation, translating Tourism Discourse and on Intercultural Pragmatics.

robincranmer@yahoo.co.uk