Meta
Journal des traducteurs
Translators' Journal

META

RISKU, Hanna, ROGL, Regina and MILOSEVIC, Jelena, eds. (2019): *Translation Practice in the Field. Current research on socio-cognitive processes*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 184 p.

Anna Kuźnik

See table of contents

Explore this journal

Cite this review

la lecture de la majorité des articles qu'il s'agit de communications qui ont été retravaillées pour publication, en effet de nombreuses interventions sont relativement courtes (10 pages), laissant le lectorat avec le désir d'en savoir davantage sur les thématiques explorées. D'ailleurs, nous croyons que le public cible de l'ouvrage est large, tant les étudiantes et les étudiants des cycles supérieurs que les traductologues d'expérience y trouveront leur compte. Seule mise en garde : les autrices et les auteurs supposent parfois non seulement une connaissance des travaux de Michel Ballard, mais aussi du bagage théorique et historique entourant leur problématique précise.

Alexandra Hillinger
Université Laval, Québec, Canada

Risku, Hanna, Rogl, Regina and Milosevic, Jelena, eds. (2019): *Translation Practice in the Field. Current research on socio-cognitive processes.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 184 p.

Translation Practice in the Field encompasses oral communications presented in December 2016 at the University of Graz during the Fifth Translation Process Research Workshop (TPRW5), except for the chapter by Hokkanen (p. 61-77). All the texts were previously published in 2017 in the special issue of *Translation Spaces* 6(1) by the same publishing house. Another part of the communications presented during the TPRW5 have been collected in the thematic section devoted to "Expertise and Behaviour: Aspects of Cognitive Translation Studies" guest-edited by Petra Klimant, Michael Tieber and Hanna Risku, published in 2018 in the number 57 of the Danish journal *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication in Business* (for the preliminaries to this thematic section, see Klimant, Tieber, *et al.* 2018). As the book as a whole has been already commented by the most prominent Translation Studies scholars (Kaisa Koskinen, Gregory M. Shreve, Riitta Jääskeläinen, Arnt Lykke Jakobsen), who all expressed highly positive, although very brief opinions on its content, in what follows, I will focus on several methodological aspects of the empirical studies described and discussed in the *Translation Practice in the Field*, establishing in this way a kind of dialogue between the volume's authors and those of the thematic section of *Hermes*, as an echo of the meeting of the TPRW5 community celebrated in Graz in 2016.

Before this, let me remind the reader that the TPRWs started in 2009. The very first TPRW was organised by Suzanne Göpferich at the University of Graz – interestingly, the same university that

hosted the TPRW5. At that moment, Göpferich had no intention to make of the TPRWs a serial event. She then organised a second one in 2012, after moving to the Justus Liebig University Giessen. These two initial workshops were conceived by Göpferich as research project disseminating activities. After this Central European birth and early childhood, the TPRWs migrated to Spanish Canary Islands, namely to the Grand Canary Island: the TPRW3 and TPRW4 were organised by the PETRA Research group and led by Ricardo Muñoz in Puerto de Mogán and in Las Palmas, respectively. The next TPRW (5) came back to Graz, thanks to Hanna Risku. The, let say, Spanish adolescence of TPRWs was then continued by Ana Rojo, a member of PETRA Research group (extinguished today) who offered the TPRW6 in her University of Murcia. Probably, the TPRWs will live their mature age somewhere between an Italian village Bertinoro, next to the University of Bologna, Forlì campus. This will be a steady site but will alternate with other hosts every other year. Bertinoro sessions will cover core issues of Cognitive Translation and Interpreting Studies, whereas meetings elsewhere will focus on a certain topic or research strand. The structure and ways, however, will remain unaltered (Muñoz, personal communication, 12 May 2020).

Coming back to the book under review, it comprises an introductory paper authored by the three co-editors (the only paper without abstract nor keywords), and seven papers divided into three sections: (1) new insights into work-related processes in different translation/interpreting settings; (2) workplace, technology and ergonomics; and (3) translation expertise and knowledge in practice. This division into three thematic sections and its rationale are presented only in the introductory paper, and not in the table of contents opening the book, which, in my opinion, is quite regrettable. A subject index is presented at the end of the book (p. 183-184), where key concepts are listed in alphabetical order, with corresponding pages. All the authors are affiliated to European universities, except for one representative of the Kent State University in USA, Erik Angelone.

While presenting the general scope of the book and its core content, the co-editors state in their introductory chapter that: "This volume focuses on recent research that studies translators, interpreters and translation project managers in their authentic work situations and environments, i.e., as embedded in a specific temporal and spatial context" (p. 1). As a consequence of the methodological choice – aimed at directing the researcher's view on "authentic work situations" and capturing the whole image of this situation in a kind of workplace photography (for the concept of

methodological photography, see: Kuznik and Verd 2010: 37-38, Kuznik 2016: 11) – an ethnographic approach is obviously needed and, therefore, highlighted (p. 1):

> In this project [*Extended Translation: Socio-Cognitive Translation Processes in the Workplace* (ExTra) financed by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF)], as in the articles in this volume, we have studied the translation process while taking account of the technological and social embeddedness of translators in their real working environments. Our primary objective is to contribute to expanding the established tradition of experimental translation process research (TPR) with an ethnographic approach that permits insights into the diversity and complexity of translation practice, aspects that cannot really be reconstructed in a laboratory setting.

The general content of the book can also be defined according to the keywords used by the authors. While analysing the 45 keywords of the seven papers, we obtain the following map of topics addressed in the volume: (1) fields and subfields of knowledge and research: cognitive translatology, sociology of translation, practice theory, workplace research, workplace studies, translation process research; cognitive ergonomics, organizational ergonomics; (2) methods of inquiry applied: ethnography, autoethnography, eye tracking; (3) components of translation practices spotted: translation practice, deliberate practice, translation process, workplace, translation constraints, terminology search; (4) types of translation discussed: literary translation, transcreation, advertising, simultaneous interpreting, church interpreting; (5) people at work surveyed: professional translators, project managers; (6) focal points of human brain chosen: cognition, situatedness, situated cognition, embedded knowing, embodied knowing, knowing-in-practice, expertise, human-computer interaction; (7) human identity and agency under scrutiny: affect, interpreter involvement, detachment, interpreter's role, voice; and (8) issues of technical environment highlighted: translation technology, CAT tools, memoQ, socio-technical systems.

As it emerges from the very various, rich, complex, complementary and interdisciplinary studies of the volume, all these concepts are crucial for current, partially applied, research on socio-cognitive processes in translation practice. Moreover, as they address authentic work situations of translators, interpreters, project managers, translation companies or translation departments, the fundamental issue of productivity is always present between the lines. The co-editors rightly point out that: "Workplace research can also connect academic translation research with the language industry. […] In this way, translation research remains grounded and tuned in to the developments in the field […]" (p. 15).

The book opens with a thorough conceptual and methodological introduction by Risku, Rogl and Milosevic (p. 1-24), very well documented (including as much as 137 bibliographical references!), addressing the questions of the derivation and diversification of translation process research viewed from a diachronic and synchronic perspective; the genesis, topics, scopes, methods and features of workplace research and Workplace Studies; theoretical frameworks underlying research on the translation practice in the field and issues tackled by this kind of research; and – after this contextualisation – a detailed presentation of the book structure and all the contributions.

In the first section of the book, Kolb examines five freelance literary translators working from home. She highlights differences in their working routines, supporting by this – in a certain way – Halverson's claim that "[…] variation across individuals must be accounted for in studies of translational cognition" (Halverson 2018: 21). What I especially appreciate in Kolb's contribution is the fact that many interesting methodological problems, doubts and constraints are honestly reported. On the other hand, the author states that "the research design combined quantitive and qualitative methods […]" (p. 26); however, in my opinion, the method used is not 'really quantitive' because it consists of a qualitative categorisation (into three phases) of quantitive data (duration of phases), and of a descriptive quantification (sums or frequencies) of occurrences of qualitative data (days, time spans, revisions). While quantifications of qualitative data are widely performed, the opposite, i.e. a qualitative analysis of quantitive data seems to be rare (Kuznik, Verd, *et al.* 2016), and Kolb's analysis is a good example of this case.

Pedersen addresses issues related to an advertising transcreation service process, focusing on the creative side of the translational activity – a view shared with Rojo and Meseguer (2018). He observes authentic workers (transcreation manager, copywriters, copyeditors and clients) working on an authentic transcreational brief in an authentic work situation. However, some methodological details are lacking in his report, such as the exact source of collected data and the data collection technique.

Hokkanen analyses the subjective self-experienced role of a simultaneous, volunteer interpreter in a church setting, i.e. her feeling of involvement and detachment. While the scope and conclusions seem to me rather obvious (I cannot imagine a volunteer interpreter interpreting in

his/her "home church" – a Pentecostal Church featured as "spontaneous," where "experientiality" and "display of emotion" are basic traits, p. 69 – and for his/her "home religious community" not being emotionally involved is such a task), the topic undertaken by Hokkanen is highly interesting and rarely discussed in the field of Interpreting Studies. Curiously, the topic of simultaneous interpreting itself (but not in a church context) is also addressed in a paper by Tiselius, as "SL [sign language] interpreters almost always work in simultaneous mode, even when interpreting dialogues" (Tiselius 2018: 50).

In the second section, Teixeira and O'Brian explore, using a complex, triangulated methodology, the interaction between 10 translators and technology – a computer-aided translation (CAT) tool, memoQ, with a special research interest in cognitive ergonomics. Their study provide insights on the following aspects: use of tools, consultation of information resources (for types of searches and resources consulted, see also Kuznik 2017), use of screens, gaze behaviour, productivity, and quality.

Ehrensberger-Dow and Massey discuss the constraints of translators' agency and issues related to organizational ergonomics, using two very complete sets of data collected during two research projects. In this paper, I especially appreciate that the authors show a kind of "systemic complexity," in Shreve's wording (Shreve 2018: 98), visible in their interpretation of results coming from interviews carried out during the ErgoTrans project (p. 115-117). These results are really balanced and demonstrate the interesting compensation of positive and negative aspects involved in the professional translation practice.

The third section is devoted to translation expertise and knowledge in practice. While Whyatt (2018) approaches the topic of translation expertise from an 'etic' viewpoint, discussing its indicators as they have been conceived by scholars in the field of Translation Studies, Angelone and Marín explore translation expertise from an 'emic' viewpoint, collecting translators' and project managers' perceptions and opinions on their conceptualisations of expertise and its acquisition through deliberate practice. The authors give and explain an excellent example of final reduction of qualitative data collected in their survey in the results of their qualitative, content-based, thematic analysis (table 3, p. 144).

When reading Olohan's paper one may once again recognise a very close relationship between the theoretical construct, the methodological paradigm used, and consequently, its impact on the results obtained (the same relationship is recognised by Muñoz and Martín de León 2018, but in a much lower 'micro' level, where the measure-

ment is expressed in milliseconds). Based on a practice-theoretical perspective, Olohan enters the translation department of a large research organisation and observes three translators and an administrative coordinator. The author shows "how [their] situated and embodied knowing transpires in translation practice, and sheds light on the materially and discursively mediated nature of that knowing-in-practice" (p. 162). If the conceptual framework of "practice theory" itself seems to me highly relevant and bringing fresh ideas and insights to Translation Studies, I feel that a basic clarity in the sources of data used in the study (e.g. artefacts) and a more structured, analytical presentation of results – to which we are all so accustomed in this kind of research – are lacking here. As Olohan admits in her paper: "The subsections focus on different characteristics of knowing-in-practice for analytical expediency, but it should be stressed that knowing-in-practice is often all of these at once" (p. 168).

As in many cases, these studies have been already reported in previous publications, data collected and results obtained may be already outdated. One methodological weakness is really striking to me: in papers included in the volume, the year of collection of data presented in the results section of these papers is not provided, except in Hokkanen's paper. In the other papers in this volume, the reader cannot read the year of data collection without consulting previous publications or funded projects websites. This is also true for the self-standing study (Olohan) and initial stages of larger research projects (Angelone and Marín, Teixeira and O'Brian).

All the studies presented in papers in the volume under review follow a descriptive (qualitative and quantitive), inductive approach. The research report directly mentions this inductive reasoning in the text (Pedersen, p. 49) or the study appears to be inductive given the lack of explicitly formulated research hypothesis to be proved (e.g. Ehrensberger-Dow and Massey's contribution). Moreover, within the inductive logic, the authors refer to the methodological concepts of 'exploration' (Kolb's study is "exploratory in nature," p. 26; Angelone and Marín's inquiry is "an extension of initial explorations in this area," p. 126), 'introduction' (Teixeira and O'Brian), or 'piloting' (Angelone and Marín present "a small-scale pilot study," p. 130). These studies are geared towards "providing the research community with the kinds of questions that need to be asked and, at a much broader level, developing a validated instrument for surveying translation expertise and generating preliminary data that might warrant more in-depth exploration" (Angelone and Marín, p. 132). Some authors already have in mind next steps, much closer to an

experimental design: "These results will inform the design of a more controlled study in the second stage, where we plan to experiment with specific tool features in order to identify how tools can be made to better facilitate cognitive processing" (Teixeira and O'Brian, p. 99).

One additional methodological aspect should be mentioned as a positive point. Angelone and Marín's paper is followed by two appendixes: the questionnaires used for the group of translators and for the group of project managers (p. 148-160), and Teixeira and O'Brian's contribution includes, as an appendix, two tables: one with demographic data about the surveyed translators, and another with a list of all terms and expressions searched for per translator (p. 101-103). Sharing with the scientific community instruments used for data collection and expanding information given in a publication on subjects' profiles and detailed results are most likely to allow a better comparison between different empirical studies and their outputs, especially when samples are not statistically representative of the whole population or the whole group under scrutiny and, thus, have severe limitations in their potential of generalisation, which is undoubtedly the case here.

Anna Kuźnik
Uniwersytet Wrocławski, Wrocław, Poland

REFERENCES

Halverson, Sandra L. (2018): Metalinguistic Knowledge/Awareness/Ability in Cognitive Translation Studies. Some Questions. *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication in Business*. 57:11-28.

Klimant, Petra, Tieber, Michael, and Risku, Hanna (2018): Introduction to the Thematic Section: Expertise and Behaviour: Aspects of Cognitive Translation Studies. *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication in Business*. 57:7-9.

Kuznik, Anna (2016): La traduction comme travail: perspectives croisées en ergonomie, sociologie et traductologie. *ILCEA [En ligne]*. 27:16 p. Visited on 24 June 2020, <http://ilcea.revues.org/4036>.

Kuznik, Anna (2017): Use of Instrumental Resources. *In*: Amparo Hurtado Albir, ed. *Researching Translation Competence. PACTE Group*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 219-242.

Kuznik, Anna and Verd, Joan Miquel (2010): Investigating Real Work Situations in Translation Agencies. Work Content and its Components. *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication Studies*. 44:25-43.

Kuznik, Anna, Verd, Joan Miquel and Olalla-Soler, Christian (2016): Mixed methods, mixed tools. The use of computer software for integrated qualitative and quantitative analy-sis. *Journal of Research Design and Statistics in Linguistics and Communication Science* [JRDS]. 3(1):76-109.

Muñoz Martín, Ricardo and Martín de León, Celia (2018): Fascinatin' Rhythm – and Pauses in Translators' Cognitive Processes. *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication in Business*. 57:29-47.

Rojo, Ana and Meseguer, Purificación (2018): Creativity and Translation Quality: Opposing Enemies or Friendly Allies? *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication in Business*. 57:79-96. Visited on 24 June 2020, <https://tidsskrift.dk/her/article/view/106202/155203>.

Shreve, Gregory M. (2018): Levels of Explanation and Translation Expertise. *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication in Business*. 57:97-108.

Tiselius, Elisabet (2018): Exploring Cognitive Aspects of Competence in Sign Language Interpreting of Dialogues: First Impressions. *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication in Business*. 57:49-61.

Whyatt, Bogusława (2018): Testing Indicators of Translation Expertise in an Intralingual Task. *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication in Business*. 57:63-78.

Baldo de Brébisson, Sabrina et Genty, Stephanie (2019): *L'intraduisible: les méandres de la traduction*. Arras: Artois Presses Université, 448 p.

Même si l'intraduisible comme axiome avait longtemps été au cœur des débats traductologiques, l'«objection préjudicielle» à la traduction, pour employer l'expression de Jean-René Ladmiral, semblait avoir été répondue depuis longtemps: les mauvaises traductions ont ceci d'utile qu'elles donnent l'image de meilleures traductions à venir. Et pourtant, tant du point de vue linguistique que de celui de l'interculturalité, des doutes subsistent sur la nature de l'intraduisibilité. Ces doutes nous forcent à penser. C'est à cet objectif que répond le très gros ouvrage collectif *L'intraduisible: les méandres de la traduction*, sous la direction de Sabrina Baldo de Brébisson et Stephanie Genty, qui fait suite à un colloque tenu à l'Université d'Évry-Val d'Essonne les 3 et 4 décembre 2015.

L'ouvrage visait large: la qualité des contributions, certes indéniable, est proportionnelle à la très grande diversité des objets étudiés. Les traductologues s'y perdront peut-être, ou au contraire y découvriront des chemins qu'ils ne pensaient jamais emprunter. Si l'on voulait faire l'effort de systématiser les contributions, on pourrait les catégoriser comme suit: les traductions historiques (y compris des textes sacrés), les traductions techniques (en incluant le droit) et les traductions litté-