

--> See the **erratum** for this article

NICODEMUS, Brenda and SWABEY, Laurie, eds. (2011): *Advances in Interpreting Research: Inquiry in Action*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 264 p.

Jiehai Liu and Zhijie Chen

Volume 61, Number 1, May 2016

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1036995ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1036995ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal

ISSN

0026-0452 (print)

1492-1421 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this review

Liu, J. & Chen, Z. (2016). Review of [NICODEMUS, Brenda and SWABEY, Laurie, eds. (2011): *Advances in Interpreting Research: Inquiry in Action*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 264 p.] *Meta*, 61(1), 242–244. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1036995ar>

porte à croire que les professionnels se contentent de fournir une révision des traductions amateurs, sans même se donner la peine de le reconnaître (p. 95). Là encore, l'affirmation n'est aucunement soutenue... et n'aidera certainement pas les professionnels à s'inspirer des stratégies des amateurs, ce qu'elle juge pourtant souhaitable.

En conclusion, si l'ouvrage paraissait promoteur de prime abord, sa méthodologie douteuse, son plan illogique, les nombreuses affirmations non soutenues et les conclusions contradictoires pousseront tout chercheur expérimenté à s'interroger sur sa pertinence et feront certainement pousser des hauts cris aux professionnels.

VALÉRIE FLORENTIN  
Université de Hearst, Hearst, Canada

#### NOTES

1. Le texte de la convention est disponible en français à <[www.wipo.int/treaties/fr/text.jsp?file\\_id=283699](http://www.wipo.int/treaties/fr/text.jsp?file_id=283699)>.
2. Le texte de la loi est disponible en français à <<http://lois.justice.gc.ca/fra/lois/C-42>>.
3. Le texte de la loi est disponible en français à <[www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichCode.do?cidTexte=LEGITEXT00000609414](http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichCode.do?cidTexte=LEGITEXT00000609414)>.

#### RÉFÉRENCES

- CHESTERMAN, Andrew (1993): From 'is' to 'ought': Laws, Norms and Strategies in Translation Studies. *Target*. 5:1-27.
- CHESTERMAN, Andrew (1997): *Memes of translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- CHESTERMAN, Andrew (1998): Description, Explanation, Prediction. A Response to Gideon Toury and Theo Hermans. In: Joseph F. GRAHAM, dir. *Difference in Translation*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 31-62.
- CHIARO, Delia (2009): Issues in audiovisual translation. In: Jeremy Munday, dir. *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*. Londres: Routledge, 141-165.
- GAMBIER, Yves (2002): Les censures dans la traduction audiovisuelle. *TTR*. 15(2):203-221.
- GAMBIER, Yves (2003): Screen Transadaptation: Perception and Reception. *The Translator*. 9(2):171-189.
- GAMBIER, Yves (2004): La traduction audiovisuelle: Un genre en expansion. *Meta*. 49(1):1-11.
- GARTZONIKA, Olga et SERBAN, Adriana (2009): Greek soldiers on the screen: Politeness, fluency and audience design in subtitling. In: Jorge DIAZ-CINTAS, dir. *New trends in audiovisual translation*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 239-250.
- LEWIS, Philip E. (1985): The Measure of Translation Effects. In: Christina SCHÄFFNER, dir. *Translation and Norms*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 91-98.
- MAILHAC, Jean-Pierre (2000): Subtitling and dubbing, for better or worse? The English video versions of Gazon Maudit. In: Myriam SALAMA-CARR, dir. *On translating French literature and film II*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi, 129-154.
- NORNES, Markus (1999): For an Abusive Subtitling. *Film Quarterly*. 52(3):17-33.
- SCHLEIERMACHER, Friedrich (1813): *On the Different Methods of Translating*. Berlin.
- SERBAN, Adriana (2008): Les aspects linguistiques du sous-titrage. In: Jean-Marc LAVAUR et Adriana SERBAN, dir. *La traduction audiovisuelle: Approche interdisciplinaire du sous-titrage*. Bruxelles: De Boeck, 85-97.
- TOURY, Gideon (1995): *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- VENUTI, Lawrence (2008): *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Londres/New York: Routledge.
- NICODEMUS, Brenda and SWABEY, Laurie, eds. (2011): *Advances in Interpreting Research: Inquiry in Action*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 264 p.

This volume is a collection of twelve articles written by conference interpreters (that is, 'practise-researchers', defined as trainers and practitioners). It aims to help graduate students, interpreters, and researchers in their work. According to Gile in the preface, this is the first such work to bring together authors of both sign and spoken languages in examining their profession. Among the authors, three with conference interpreting and research backgrounds are especially prominent, and the remaining eight are from the sign language interpreting (SLI) community. The contributions fall into roughly five groups. In the first, Pochhacker, Moser-Mercer, and Liu discuss paradigms and methodologies for general interpreting research. In the second, Russell and Napier offer practical information for newcomers to the field. Next, Metzger and Roy report on current advances and challenges, and in the fourth group, Hessman *et al.*, Leeson and Nicodemus, and Swabey look at training and the professionalization of interpreting. Finally, Peterson, Adam and Stone discuss some of the more disparate topics within SLI communities.

Swabey and Nicodemus (p. 1-4) open the volume by introducing the need for research into sign language interpreting. They also explain what motivated them to undertake the book, namely that interpreting professionals show keen interest in doing empirical studies but "lack a schema for incorporating this research" (p. 1-2). In other words, the growing profession of interpreting requires scientific research, and when SLI community researchers share ideas and initiate research,

“new knowledge is cultivated” (p.1). Swabey and Nicodemus state that “it is in that spirit that we offer this new volume” (p. 1). It will serve as a guide for those just starting out or already engaged in interpretation research, while also fostering their enthusiasm and dedication in doing research.

Pochhacker (p. 5-25) regards interpreting studies (IS) as “an empirical-interpretive discipline” (p. 15). This is based on his reflections on the purpose and use of interpreting research as well as his descriptions of current, multiple paradigms and methodological choices. He argues against the deliberate gap between the ‘liberal arts’ and ‘empirical science’ approaches, instead seeing data in IS (as for other social sciences), as “essentially qualitative empirical data” (p. 15). Nonetheless, data analysis generally requires an interpretive process. Pochhacker rejects ‘exclusive’ paradigms and promotes an eclectic approach to research that reconciles diversified methods. This clearly shows that interdisciplinary approaches and mixed-method designs can transcend quantitative-qualitative boundaries.

Based on Shneider’s (2009) identification of the four-stage development pattern of scientific disciplines, Moser-Mercer (p. 47-58) sees IS as approaching the third stage in becoming a scientific discipline. He also suggests that IS is more than a ‘soft’ science. Shneider, citing Kuhn (1962), shows how “the new paradigm transforms a group into an accepted discipline” (p. 55). As a potential stage-three scientific discipline, IS therefore requires us (interpreters and trainers) to train young researchers (Masters students) in scientific methods, to refine objects of research, and to implement and learn to “speak the language of neighboring disciplines” (p. 57). Interpreting studies face “simultaneous challenges,” because research paradigms and methodological paradigms occasionally compete and overlap. Moser-Mercer is confident in stating that “interpreting as a discipline has great potential to contribute to our understanding” (p. 57) of human cognition and communication.

Liu (p. 85-119) reviewed the methodological issues present in 48 evidence-based articles published in *Interpreting* from 2004 to 2009. The appendix and its analysis employ bibliometrics, making it essential reading for researchers. For each article, Liu examined and evaluated the data collection methods, data analysis, data presentation, and methods as a whole (qualitative or quantitative). She admits that the mixed-method trends in social sciences make it difficult to separate qualitative and quantitative approaches. She sees current research as “less quantitative versus qualitative” while noting “how research practices lie somewhere on a continuum between the two”

(Creswell 2003: 4). In the 48 studies reviewed by Liu, the qualitative and quantitative approaches were divided about equally. The case study was the dominant method and focused mainly on interpreters’ roles. The authorship section features a wide range of academic backgrounds in IS scholars.

Russell (p. 27-46) offers a step-by-step introduction to designing a research project for both novice and experienced researchers. He stresses the correlation between methodology and research questions and the need to develop sound research questions right from the beginning. And while methodology is obviously key, Russell strongly emphasizes flexibility. However, in the section ‘The art of being flexible’, he also highlights the feasibility factor. Maintaining a balance between feasibility and flexibility can be tricky for novices and mature researchers alike. He asserts that even with the right questions, it may be impossible to “undertake the research to adequately address them” (p. 45) because the necessary skills and resources are lacking. Drawing on examples from two of his own studies, Russell also offers practical information such as suggestions for appropriate software to use.

Napier (p. 121-152) highlights the merits and necessity of publishing by parodying the philosophical notion of a tree falling in a forest. She remarks that if you wish to be heard you must “make a noise” (p. 121). In her “5W1H” model of successful publishing, the “W” stands for “why.” This chapter takes potential researchers through “an effective publication strategy” (p. 123). The strategy is illustrated in another “4W1H” format: who should publish, what to publish, how to publish, and when and where to publish. She answers each question by providing explicit instructions.

The title of Metzger and Roy’s chapter (p. 59-84) denotes a dilemma: that building a corpus of naturalistic data takes both time and money. Investigative research can be slow going. With inadequate funds and limited time, we are hard-pressed to obtain naturalistic data for research, let alone the mass of data inherent to actual live encounters. The result is fewer case studies of this type. While lamenting these problems, the authors nonetheless offer many useful tips to help make the “small grant-supported project,” more effective, including training and tools.

Leeson (p. 153-176) examines the assessment of sign language interpreters, specifically practitioners and student interpreters. Evaluating the performance of students in a training program is one thing – assessing their level of competence in becoming a professional is quite another. Since testing is a complex process and a mere sample of what student interpreters (future professionals) may do in the future, it is difficult to standardize

the assessment process. Even 'raters' are subjective, and training individuals in rating is "an intractably subjective process" (p. 160). However, we can still improve the validity and reliability of proficiency tests. Leeson gives us guidelines to do so. This chapter also looks at training student interpreters. Leeson suggests using guided self-assessments among students and giving them self-analytic toolkits and a meta-language for self-reflection.

Hessmann *et al.* (p. 177-198) advertises the European Master's Sign Language Interpreting (EUMASLI) project, emphasizing the importance of building an interpreting research community. The authors state that the relationship between research and professional training must be reconceptualized to overcome the limitations of the previous Masters-level training program. A current limitation is lack of engagement with the research. Hessmann *et al.* propose that "the best way to engage with research is by doing research" (p. 178), and the project offers this possibility. A main focus of the EUMASLI program is to provide sign language interpreting practitioners with theoretical support and conceptual tools "to allow for a research-oriented approach to the professional field" (p. 178). The project's European background has served to diversify and enrich international cooperation, offering an opportunity to cross-fertilize within the multilingual interpreting research pool. Passionate and optimistic about the project, the authors stress that input from people is a key factor in achieving its goals.

Swabey and Nicodemus (p. 241-258) call attention to the urgent investigations required in "bimodal (sign language/spoken language) interpreting" in US healthcare systems. The authors first signal the conspicuous lack of research on interpreted discourse in healthcare settings and present an overview of the demand for bimodal interpreting from various perspectives. They conclude that the development of SLI healthcare specialization within bimodal interpreting can benefit the "propagation of research in this domain" (p. 254).

Peterson (p. 199-223) is a sign language interpreter with 40 years of experience. He argues that the work of Video Relay Service (VRS) (an SLI video call service) does not qualify as a form of interpreting. He began his VRS work in 2003 and has since witnessed what he sees as the depressing and dehumanized state of the profession. He concludes that these interpreters should be excluded from the interpreting profession and they should also accept the FCC's rebranding of video interpreters as Communication Assistants. Peterson's argument reflects the embarrassing situation of the interpreting industry, and his complaint is reinforced by his dedication to this profession.

To give us insight into the deaf community, Adam and Stone (p. 225-239) describe the development of this community from a historical perspective. The histories of interpreters are largely unknown because few records exist and references are poor. The authors worked diligently to uncover a past story that was essentially lost. They describe the history of interpreting and deaf interpreters with examples ranging from 18th-century Europe to the interesting case of Martha's Vineyard in the United States. Adam and Stone argue that the history of deaf interpreters helps us understand our present situation and this historical approach also lets us rediscover and foresee new aspects of interpreting and deaf interpreters.

This volume provides readers with papers from a single conference that addressed comprehensive topics. It demonstrates the research advancements and progress made in the professionalization of the SLI community. The chapters together express a consensus: that there is a need to emphasize and reinforce research, refine methodological approaches, and engage in professional training. *Advances in Interpreting Research: Inquiry in Action* is an excellent collection that discusses why we should research the field of interpreting and what we can do with the research. Many exciting challenges and opportunities co-exist in this field.

JIEHAI LIU

ZHIJIE CHEN

Nanjing University of Information  
Science & Technology, Nanjing China

#### REFERENCES

- CRESWELL, John W. (2003): *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- KUHN, Thomas. (1962): *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- SHNEIDER, Alexander M. (2009): Four stages of a scientific discipline: Four types of scientists. *Trends in Biochemical Sciences*. 34 (5):217-223.
- SILVA-SANTISTEBAN, Ricardo (2013): *Breve historia de la traducción en el Perú*. Lima: Instituto Bibliográfico del Perú, 117 p.
- Ricardo Silva-Santisteban (1941) is a Peruvian poet, essayist and translator with a long history in the literary editorial field in his country. Additionally, he is a professor of comparative literature at the Pontifical Catholic University of Peru and current President of the Academia Peruana de la Lengua (Peruvian Language Academy). His