RESEARCHING TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETING

Claudia V. Angelelli
and Brian James Baer

ROUTLEDGE

Researching Translation and Interpreting

This volume offers a comprehensive view of current research directions in Translation and Interpreting Studies, outlining the theoretical concepts underpinning that research and presenting detailed discussions of the various methods used.

Organized around three factors that are responsible for shaping the study of translation and interpreting today—post-structuralist theory, growth of the language industry, and technological innovations—this volume is divided into three parts:

- Part I introduces the basics for conducting translation and interpreting research, emphasizing the importance of grounding studies in contemporary theory and outlining the steps necessary to ensure methodological rigor and validity of results.
- Part II provides a theoretical mapping of current translation and interpreting research, from queer studies to cognitive science.
- Part III explores the key methodological approaches to research in Translation and Interpreting Studies, including corpus-based, longitudinal, observational, and ethnographic studies, as well as survey and focus group-based studies.

The international range of contributors are all leading research experts who use the methodologies in their work. They present the research aims of these methods, as well as their limits and discuss modes of data collection and analysis.

This is an essential reference for all advanced undergraduates, postgraduates, and researchers in Translation and Interpreting Studies.

Claudia V. Angelelli is Chair in Multilingualism and Communication at Heriot-Watt University, UK. Her publications include *Medical Interpreting and Cross-cultural Communication* (2004) and *Re-visiting the Interpreter's Role* (2004). She is the co-editor of *Testing and Assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies* (2009).

Brian James Baer is Professor of Russian and Translation Studies at Kent State University, USA. He is founding editor of the scholarly journal *Translation and Interpreting Studies* and author of the monograph *Translation and the Making of Modern Russian Literature* (2015). He is also the co-editor of *Russian Writers on Translation: An Anthology* (2013).

Researching Translation and Interpreting

Edited by
Claudia V. Angelelli and
Brian James Baer

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2016
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Angelelli, Claudia (Claudia V.) author.
Researching translation and interpreting / by Claudia V. Angelelli and Brian James Baer.
pages cm
Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Translating and interpreting–Research. 2. Sociolinguistics. I. Baer, Brian James. II. Title.
P302.6.A64 2015
418'.02072–dc23
2014044177

ISBN: 978-0-415-73253-6 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-0-415-73254-3 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-1-315-70728-0 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman
by Taylor & Francis Books

Contents

Acknowledgements

We have many people to thank for this volume—first and foremost, the many contributors, who took time out of their busy research and teaching schedules not only to provide a detailed overview of the current state of T&I research but also to contemplate future directions. We would also like to thank the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at Kent State University and the Office of Research and Knowledge Exchange in the School of Management and Languages at Heriot-Watt University for covering the cost of indexing, and Christopher Mellinger for his invaluable help in preparing the manuscript for submission, and Christian Degueldre for his meticulous reading of the proofs.

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders. If any have been inadvertently overlooked, the publishers will be pleased to make the necessary arrangements at the first opportunity.

Notes on Contributors

Claudia V. Angelelli is Professor and Chair of Multilingualism and Communication in the Department of Languages and Intercultural Studies at Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK and Professor Emeritus of Spanish Linguistics at San Diego State University, US. Her research lies at the intersection of sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, and Translation and Interpreting Studies. She is the author of *Medical Interpreting and Cross-cultural Communication* (Cambridge University Press) and *Revisiting the Role of the Interpreter* (John Benjamins), and the co-editor of *Testing and Assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies* (John Benjamins). She is the guest editor of special issues of *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* (Translators and Interpreters: Geographic Displacement and Linguistic Consequences), *Translation and Interpreting Studie*s (The Sociological Turn in Translation and Interpreting), and *Cuadernos de ALDEEU* (Minding the Gaps: Translation and Interpreting Studies in Academia). Her work appears in the *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *The Critical Link*, *Cuadernos de ALDEEU*, *Interpreting*, *META*, *MONTI* (Monografias de Traducción e Interpretación), *The Translator*, *Translation and Interpreting Studies* (TIS), the *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, and numerous edited volumes. She designed the first empirically driven language proficiency and interpreter readiness tests for the California Endowment and Hablamos Juntos (Robert Wood Johnson Foundation). Prof. Angelelli is the president of the American Translation and Interpreting Studies Association and she has served as director of the Consortium of Distinguished Language Centers and the American Translators Association. Currently she is the world project leader for ISO Standards on Community Interpreting.

Erik Angelone is Associate Professor of Translation Studies at Kent State University. He received his Ph.D. in Translation Studies from the University of Heidelberg. His current research interests include process-oriented translator training, cognitive processes in translation, and intercultural communicative competence. He recently co-edited, with Gregory Shreve, the volume titled *Translation and Cognition* (2010).

Edmund Asare is an Assistant Professor of French and African American Studies at Western Illinois University. He holds a Ph.D. in Translation Studies (Informatics) from Kent State University. He currently teaches various language, literature, and culture courses in the departments of Foreign Languages and Literatures and African American Studies at Western Illinois University.

Brian James Baer is Professor of Russian and Translation Studies at Kent State University, where he teaches translation-related courses at the undergraduate, Master's, and doctoral levels. He is founding editor of the journal *Translation and Interpreting Studies* (TIS), general editor of the Kent State Scholarly Monograph Series in Translation Studies, and co-editor of the Bloomsbury series Literatures, Cultures, Translation. He co-edited Volume XII of the ATA Scholarly Monograph Series, *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Rethinking Translation Pedagogy* (2003). His most recent publications include the edited volumes *Contexts, Subtexts, Pretexts: Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia* (2011), *No Good without Reward: The Selected Writings of Liubov Krichevskaya* (2011), *Russian Writers on Translation. An Anthology* (2013), and a translation of Juri Lotman's final book-length work, *The Unpredictable Workings of Culture* (2013). His monograph *Translation and the Making of Modern Russian Literature* is forthcoming.

Mona Baker is Professor of Translation Studies at the Centre for Translation and Intercultural Studies, University of Manchester, UK and is currently leading the Citizen Media at Manchester initiative (www.citizenmedia manchester.wordpress.com). She is author of *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* (Routledge, 1992; second edition 2011) and *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account* (Routledge, 2006); editor of the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (1998, 2001; second edition, co-edited with Gabriela Saldanha, 2009), *Critical Concepts: Translation Studies* (4 volumes, Routledge, 2009), and *Critical Readings in Translation Studies* (Routledge, 2010). Her articles have appeared in a wide range of international journals, including *Social Movement Studies*, *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, *The Translator*, and *Target*. She is founding editor of *The Translator* (St. Jerome Publishing, 1995–2013), former editorial director of St. Jerome Publishing (1995–2013), and founding vice-president of IATIS (International Association for Translation & Intercultural Studies).

Claudio Baraldi is Professor of Sociology of cultural and communicative processes (Department of Studies on Language and Culture, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Italy). His research concerns communication systems and their structural and cultural presuppositions, including intercultural and interlinguistic interactions, adult–children interactions, and organizational meetings. He is interested in the analysis of intervention processes and their results, in particular in the development of techniques for dialogic facilitation of participation and mediation. He has published several papers on dialogue interpreting, in books (John Benjamins, Peter Lang) and international journals. With Laura Gavioli, he has edited the book *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting* (John Benjamins, 2012).

Ursula Böser holds a Ph.D. in Film Studies from Edinburgh University. She is Professor of Intercultural Studies at Heriot-Watt University and a member of the Centre of Translation and Interpreting Studies in Scotland (CTISS) and the Intercultural Research Centre (IRC) in the Department of Languages and Intercultural Research at Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh. Her research in Interpreting Studies focuses on the practice and teaching of face-to-face interpreting in institutional and non-institutional settings. She has contributed extensively to the CTISS research program Provision of Equal Access to Justice in Multilingual Societies through her work on present practice in police interpreting and on interpreting for minors in pre-trial settings. This work also included close cooperation in the context of EU (DG Criminal Justice) funded projects with international researchers and practitioners in the field. Ursula Böser teaches Conference and Public Service Interpreting and Audiovisual Translation at Heriot-Watt University.

Leo Tak-hung Chan is Professor and Head of the Department of Translation, Lingnan University, Hong Kong. His research articles have appeared in *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, *Perspectives*, *Comparative Literature Studies*, *TTR*, *The Translator*, *Babel*, *META*, *Across Languages and Cultures*, *Quaderns*, *Journal of Oriental Studies*, *Linguistica Antverpiensia*, and *Asian Folklore Studies*. His major scholarly publications include: *Readers, Reading and Reception of Translated Prose Fiction in Chinese: Novel Encounters* (St. Jerome, 2010), *Twentieth-Century Chinese Translation Theory: Modes, Issues and Debates* (John Benjamins, 2004), *One into Many: Translation and the Dissemination of Classical Chinese Literature* (Rodopi Editions, 2003), and *The Discourse on Foxes and Ghosts* (University of Hawaii Press, 1998). He is president of the Hong Kong Translation Society and chief editor of *Translation Quarterly*, a leading academic journal on Chinese-English translation available worldwide through EBSCO Host. Areas of interest: reception issues in translation, adaptation, translation, and Global English, and Sino-Japanese translation traditions.

Sonia Colina is Professor of Hispanic Linguistics in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of Arizona. She is the author of *Teaching Translation: From Research to the Classroom* (2003), *Spanish Phonology* (2009), and *Fundamentals of Translation* (2015). In addition to her work in Hispanic Linguistics, she has published in Translation Studies journals such as *Target*, *The Translator*, and *Babel*. She is the vice-president of the American Translation and Interpreting Studies Association (ATISA) and serves on the editorial boards of *Translation and Interpreting Studies* and the *Translator and Interpreter Trainer*.

Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow has a B.A. (Hons) in Psychology from Queen's University as well as an M.Sc. in Psycholinguistics and a Ph.D. in Experimental Linguistics from the University of Alberta, Canada. She is Professor of Translation Studies at the Institute of Translation and Interpreting in the School of Applied Linguistics at the Zurich University of Applied Sciences (ZHAW), Switzerland. Her research interests include cognitive translatology, translation processes, cognitive ergonomics, human-computer interactions, workplace practice, translation didactics, translation in the news, and conceptual transfer. She has been principal investigator of the interdisciplinary research project *Cognitive and Physical Ergonomics of Translation*, a follow-up of the *Capturing Translation Processes* project, and co-investigator of the interdisciplinary project *Overcoming Language Barriers in Homecare Nursing*.

María Manuela Fernández Sánchez is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Translation and Interpreting at the University of Granada, Spain. A teacher of Interpreting Techniques and Translation Theories at both undergraduate and graduate level, she has also taught abroad in Belgium and Mexico. She has published widely in the areas of translation theory and translation and interpreting history. She is currently researching the diplomatic and international situation which required high-level interpreting during the first two decades of the Cold War era.

Laura Gavioli is Professor of English Language and Translation Studies and teaches English Language and Oral Translation at the University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Italy. Her research work includes the study of spoken language, mainly in institutional settings, studies of bilingual corpora for language learning and translation, and the pragmatics of English–Italian interaction in intercultural or multicultural settings. For the last fifteen years, she has been engaged in research exploring authentic data of interpreter-mediated conversations involving speakers (not necessarily native speakers) of English and Italian, mainly in healthcare settings. In collaboration with Claudio Baraldi, she has edited the volume *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting* (John Benjamins, 2012)

Leonardo Giannossa earned a Ph.D. in Translation Studies from Kent State University with a dissertation on a corpus-based approach to the investigation of lexical cohesion in Italian and English. At Kent State, he worked on the building of an electronic bilingual glossary of legal terms and taught several Italian language classes. He also taught Terminology, CAT tools, and other translation-related courses for the Center for Translation Studies at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. His research interests include corpora, terminology, machine translation, paratexts, lexical cohesion, and critical discourse analysis. He authored an entry on "Text-based Approaches to Translation" for the Wiley-Blackwell *Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics.*

Daniel Gile is a conference interpreter for The International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC) conference interpreter and a former technical and scientific translator. He was initially trained in mathematics and went on to also study sociology, Japanese, and conference interpreting. His first Ph.D. focused on translator and interpreter training, and the second on the challenges of conference interpreting. He is the founder of the CIRIN network (www.cirinandgile.com) and one of the founding members of the European Society for Translation Studies. He was CERA Chair Professor in 1993, and he has had a long-standing interest in the development of Translation Studies as a discipline, in research-methodological issues, and in training researchers. He has published widely on these topics.

Miguel A. Jiménez-Crespo is an Associate Professor in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Rutgers University, where he directs the M.A. program in Spanish Translation and Interpreting. He holds a Ph.D. in Translation and Interpreting Studies from the University of Granada, Spain. His research focuses on the intersection of translation theory, translation technology, digital technologies, corpus-based Translation Studies, and translation training. He is the author of *Translation and Web Localization* (Routledge, 2013) and has published extensively in Translation Studies journals such as *Target*, *Perspectives*, *META*, *TIS*, *Linguistica Antverpiensia*, *JoSTrans*, *Translation and Interpreting*, and *Tradumatica*.

Klaus Kaindl is Associate Professor of Translation Studies at the Center for Translation Studies at the University of Vienna. Following his Ph.D. on opera translation (*Die Oper als Textgestalt*, Tübingen, 1995) he devoted his post-doctoral research to general issues of Translation Studies as a discipline and to comics translation (*Übersetzungswissenschaft im interdisziplinären Dialog. Am Beispiel der Comicübersetzung*, Tübingen, 2004). Subsequent projects include studies of popular music under translation and of fictional translators and interpreters (*Transfiction. Research into the Realities of Translation Fiction*, ed. together with Karlheinz Spitzl, Amsterdam/Philadelphia 2014). He is general co-editor, with Franz Pöchhacker, of the book series *Translationswissenschaft* (Gunter Narr) and is a founding member of the European Society for Translation Studies.

Ian Mason is an emeritus professor at Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, and part-time Guest Professor at the University of Sichuan, Chengdu, China. During a long career at Heriot-Watt University, he co-authored two books with Basil Hatim (*Discourse and the Translator*, Longman, 1990; *The Translator as Communicator*, Routledge, 1997) and has published on various aspects of the linguistics and pragmatics of translating and interpreting. He was guest editor of a special issue of *The Translator* (vol. 5, no. 2), entitled *Dialogue Interpreting*, and editor of *Triadic Exchanges. Studies in Dialogue Interpreting* (St. Jerome, 2001). Recent work includes investigation of the role and positioning of participants in interpreter-mediated exchanges and a study of communities of practice in translation and interpreting (in Juliane House (ed.), *Translation: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, Palgrave, 2014).

Françoise Massardier-Kenney is Professor of French and director of the Institute for Applied Linguistics at Kent State University, where she teaches in the graduate program in translation. She is the editor of the American Translators Association Scholarly Series. Her publications include the monograph *Gender in the Fiction of George Sand* (2001); the edited volumes of *Translating Slavery: Gender and Race in French Abolitionist Writing 1780–1830* (1999, 2009), and *Ourika and Its Progeny* (2010) with Doris Kadish; a translation of Madame de Duras' *Ourika* (1999), Sand's *Valvèdre* (2007), Antoine Berman's *Toward a Translation Criticism* (2009); and numerous articles on Sand, nineteenth-century women's writers, and translation. She is the co-editor with Carol Maier of *Literature in Translation* (2010).

Gary Massey received a B.A. in Modern Languages and an M.A. in Comparative Literature from the University of Manchester, UK, and a Ph.D. in German Literature from University College London. He is currently deputy head of the Zurich University of Applied Sciences' Institute of Translation and Interpreting, director of its M.A. program in Applied Linguistics with its Specialization in Professional Translation, and past head of the same university's undergraduate degree programs in translation and applied languages. A co-investigator of two nationally funded research projects on translation workplace processes and on the cognitive and physical ergonomics of translation, his other research and teaching interests focus on translation and e-learning pedagogy, translators' information literacy skills, translation expertise, and translation quality.

Christopher D. Mellinger is Assistant Professor of Spanish at Walsh University, where he teaches medical translation and interpreting as well as courses on Spanish for healthcare. Mellinger holds a Ph.D. in Translation Studies and an M.A. in Translation (Spanish) from Kent State University. Mellinger is an ex-officio board member of the American Translation and Interpreting Studies Association, and the managing editor of *Translation and Interpreting Studies*. His research interests include translation and cognition, translation process research, and translation technology.

Bernd Meyer is a linguist by training and a specialist in the analysis of multilingual communication in institutional settings. He received his Ph.D. from Hamburg University, for his dissertation on interpreter-mediated briefings for informed consent in 2003. Since 2010, he is Professor for Intercultural Communication and Cultural Studies at the Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz (Germany) in the Department for Translation, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies. Having been a full-time researcher and principal investigator at the Research Centre on Multilingualism in Hamburg, he is an expert in the analysis of interpreter-mediated interaction in institutional settings, as well as in the application of such findings to interpreter training. More specifically, he conducted research on ad hoc interpreting in doctor–patient communication, and, together with Kristin Bührig, developed a training module for ad hoc interpreters in clinical settings.

Brenda Nicodemus is Associate Professor in the Department of Interpretation at Gallaudet University and the director of the Interpretation and Translation Research Center. She has worked professionally as an interpreter since 1989 and holds a Ph.D. in Educational Linguistics from the University of New Mexico. Previously she was employed as a research scientist at the Laboratory for Language and Cognitive Neuroscience at San Diego State University, where she studied the cognitive processes of signed language interpreters. Her areas of research include translation asymmetry in bimodal bilinguals, healthcare interpreting, and the use of prosodic markers to indicate utterance boundaries. Her publications include *Prosodic Markers and Utterance Boundaries in American Sign Language Interpreting* (Gallaudet University Press, 2009); with co-editor Laurie Swabey, *Advances in Interpreting Research* (Benjamins, 2011); and with co-editor Melanie Metzger, *Investigations in Healthcare Interpreting* (Gallaudet University Press, 2014).

Rakefet Sela-Sheffy is Associate Professor of Semiotics and Culture Research and Chair of the Unit of Culture Research, Tel-Aviv University. Her research interests and publications include culture theory, professional identity and status, talk and self-representations, diffusion and translation. In recent years she has conducted interview-based research on the identity and status of translators in Israel in semi-professional groups, with Israeli translators as a case in point (Israel Science Foundation 2006–9, with Miriam Shlesinger). Among her publications is *Literarische Dynamik und Kulturbildung: Zur Konstruktion des Repertoires deutscher Literatur im ausgehenden 18. Jahrhundert* (1999); *Identity and Status in the Translational Profession* (co-edited with M. Shlesinger, 2011); and *Culture Contacts and the Making of Cultures: Papers in Homage to Itamar Even-Zohar* (co-edited with Gideon Toury, 2011).

Anna Strowe holds a lectureship in Translation and Interpreting Studies at the University of Manchester (UK). She received her Ph.D. in Comparative Literature from the University of Massachusetts Amherst with a specialization in translation and Translation Studies and a focus on early modern Italian and English literature. She also holds an M.A. in Translation Studies from the University of Warwick (UK).

Sanjun Sun received his Ph.D. in Translation Studies from Kent State University in 2012. He is an Assistant Professor of Translation Studies at Beijing Foreign Studies University, where he teaches translation technology, research methods, and commercial translation. He has co-authored two books in Chinese—*A Translator's Handbook* (2010) and *Research Methods in*

Language Studies (2011)—and has published articles in *Meta*, *Target*, and other journals. His major research interests include translation process research, translation technology, and empirical research methods. He has extensive experience as a translator.

Laurie Swabey is Professor of Interpreting at St. Catherine University and director of the CATIE Center, where she leads a federally funded national initiative on healthcare interpreting. She holds a Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota in Linguistics, and her research interests include healthcare interpreting, relevance theory and interpreting, language access in healthcare settings, and the organization of deaf physician/deaf patient discourse. She has served as a member of the advisory board for the National Council on Interpreting in Healthcare (NCIHC) and the CCHI (Certification Commission for Healthcare Interpreters). Recent publications include Referring Expressions in ASL Discourse (in *Discourse in Signed Languages*, 2011), *Advances in Interpreting Research* (Benjamins, 2011) with co-editor Brenda Nicodemus, and "An Examination of Medical Interview Questions Rendered in American Sign Language by Deaf Physicians and Interpreters" with co-author Brenda Nicodemus (in *Investigations in Healthcare Interpreting*, 2014).

Sergey Tyulenev is Director of the M.A. program in Translation Studies at Durham University, UK. His recent publications include *Applying Luhmann to Translation Studies* (Routledge, 2011), *Translation and the Westernization of Eighteenth-Century Russia* (Frank & Timme, 2012), and *Translation and Society: An Introduction* (Routledge, 2014). His website can be found at www.tyulenev.org.

Luc van Doorslaer is the director of CETRA, the Centre for Translation Studies at the University of Leuven (Belgium), where he works as an Associate Professor in Translation and Journalism Studies. He is also the vice-dean for Research (Antwerp campus). As a Research Fellow he is affiliated with Stellenbosch University (South Africa). Together with Yves Gambier, he is the editor of the online *Translation Studies Bibliography* (10th edition, 2013) and the four volumes of the new *Handbook of Translation Studies* (2010–13). Other recent books edited include *Eurocentrism in Translation Studies* (2013) and *The Known Unknowns of Translation Studies* (2014). His main research interests are journalism and translation, imagology and translation, institutionalization of Translation Studies, and bibliometrics.

Michaela Wolf is Associate Professor at the Department of Translation Studies, University of Graz. Before entering academia, she worked in several projects of development cooperation in Brazil and Central America. Areas of teaching and research interest include translation sociology, cultural studies and translation, translation history, and translation and visual anthropology. She is the author of *Die vielsprachige Seele Kakaniens. Übersetzen und Dolmetschen in der Habsburgermonarchie 1848 bis 1918* (published in 2012) and has extensively published in Translation Studies journals and essay collections. Her present research focus is on interpreting and translating in Nazi concentration camps.

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

Claudia V. Angelelli and Brian James Baer

Although translation and interpreting have been described as the world's "second oldest profession", the scholarly study of translation and interpreting is a fairly recent phenomenon (Shreve 2000: 219). Only in the last 50 years or so have anecdotal and largely prescriptive writings on translation and interpreting given way to empirical research and descriptive studies. Despite its late start, the scholarly study of translation and interpreting has expanded at a rapid pace. Borrowing freely from related disciplines in the humanities and social sciences, such as cultural studies, sociology, anthropology, and applied linguistics, scholars in Translation and Interpreting Studies have also developed their own theoretical and methodological approaches, which should be of use not only for new researchers in departments of Translation and Interpreting Studies, but also for researchers in disciplines across the humanities and social sciences that have begun to focus on what David Damrosch has called the "problematics of translation" (2009: 8), not to mention those who have yet to take the translation turn.

Given the rapid growth of the scholarly field and the appearance of new doctoral and master's degree programs in Translation and Interpreting Studies throughout the world, the time for a book on researching translation and interpreting that explicitly links theoretical concepts with research methodology and includes research paradigms in both Translation and Interpreting Studies is now. There are several works dealing with research methods for translation and interpreting, such as the collections *Intercultural Faultlines: Research Models in Translation Studies II* (2000), edited by Maeve Olohan; *Crosscultural Transgressions: Research Methods in Translation Studies II* (2002), edited by Theo Hermans; *The Map: A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies* (2002), co-authored by Jenny Williams and Andrew Chesterman; *Teaching and Researching Translation* (2001/2013), by Basil Hatim, designed to promote action research; *Research Methods in Interpreting* (2013), by Sandra Hale and Jemina Napier, a practical guide for doctoral students; and, most recently, Gabriela Saldanha and Sharon O'Brien's volume *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies* (2014). The most systematic and comprehensive of these works is undoubtedly Saldanha and O'Brien's, and, as such, shares one of the goals of this volume in promoting greater rigor in research in our field.

That being said, our volume differs from that of Saldanha and O'Brien in several significant ways. First, this volume includes both translation and interpreting, including interpreting of spoken and signed languages. Second, it traces the adoption and adaptation of theories and models developed outside of Translation and Interpreting Studies (TIS) for the study of translation- and interpreting-related phenomena, contributing in this way to the study of how theories travel. Third, it promotes a mutually interrogative relationship between theory, research, and practice. And finally, the volume takes a firm position in advocating a post-structuralist approach to conducting research on translation- and interpreting-related phenomena, as discussed in Part I.

Moreover, while offering a broad and systematic mapping of research in the field, as Williams and Chesterman, and Saldanha and O'Brien do, this volume is decidedly forward-looking. The contributors were asked to speculate, based on their expertise in the field, on future trends in T&I research, suggesting not only where they think research is currently heading but also where it *should* be heading, that is, what important areas are under-studied or what new areas are emerging that deserve the attention of researchers. For example, while issues of gender and sexuality have been broadly and consistently discussed in relation to translation, they remain under-studied in the field of interpreting, which is surprising given the significant body of literature on gender and sexuality in sociolinguistics. On the other hand, while issues of stress and working conditions have been widely discussed in relation to interpreting (e.g., interpreters in war zones or in emergency situations), they deserve more attention in Translation Studies. Our commitment to covering research in both Translation and Interpreting Studies brings such imbalances to light. Moreover, whereas Saldanha and O'Brien decided not to cover translation history as an object of study, we have included it, as recent historical studies of translation and interpreting are perhaps the greatest caution against the tendency to universalize findings across cultures and time periods.

Overall, this volume is meant to buck the increasing diversification of the field by offering a synthetic view, uniting those aspects of the discipline that are often separated: pure and applied research, Tanslation and Interpreting Studies, empirical and theoretical research, and qualitative and quantitative paradigms. This integrated view of the field is meant to remind us of our shared theoretical foundations, and to encourage collaboration across fields and the use of mixed methods. As a consequence, this book is meant to highlight and promote the interdisciplinarity that has always been a hallmark of TIS.

This volume is divided into three parts. Part I contains an introductory essay by the editors that discusses the general features of a post-structuralist or post-positivist approach to research of translation- and interpreting-related phenomena, and outlines the basic components of the research journey. Part II provides a conceptual mapping of current translation and interpreting research, discussing the theoretical models and concepts underlying it, often borrowed and adopted and/or adapted from other fields. Our mapping of translation and interpreting research in Part II, that is, our selection and naming of the various chapters, as well as our guidance to the contributors, was largely shaped by three factors: the spread of post-structuralist theoretical approaches, the pace of globalization, and rapid developments in technology.

Underlying most translation- and interpreting-related research today, post-structuralist approaches are characterized by a rejection of essentialist claims, traditional positivist concepts, such as equivalence and fidelity, and the stasis of earlier linguistic-based models. These new approaches assume translation and interpreting to be highly dynamic, socially constructed endeavors, and translators and interpreters to be agents and cultural mediators, co-creators of meaning instead of transparent vessels, thoroughly imbedded in a specific cultural context. These theoretical precepts call for a reflective research practice that acknowledges that language can never be an entirely neutral instrument for communication.

The increasing communication demands in a rapidly globalizing world and the growing consensus that access to translation and interpreting services in legal and medical settings is a human right have highlighted the need for high-quality translators and interpreters. At the same time, the rapid diversification of translation- and interpreting-related jobs poses new challenges for translation and interpreting education programs and has made the language industry itself into an object of research. That research explores a variety of issues concerning translator and interpreting education and professional development, the professionalization of translation and interpreting, and the status and self-image of translators and interpreters.

Advances in technology over the last 15 to 20 years have also greatly expanded the objects of translation and interpreting research, which now include such phenomena as crowdsourcing, the use of computer-assisted translation tools, the translation of context-less strings, the post-editing of machine-translation output, and remote interpreting. In addition to generating new objects of research, new technologies have expanded the range of methods and tools available for the study of both product-oriented and process-oriented research, from corpus-based studies to eye-tracking and keystroke logging.

Part III explores the major methodological approaches to research in Translation and Interpreting Studies, including naturalistic, quasi-experimental, and experimental designs, as well as product- and process-oriented methods. Some of the specific methods discussed are corpus-based, observational, and ethnographic studies, as well as survey- and focus group-based studies. Chapter authors range from well-established researchers in the field who have used, and in some cases pioneered, the methods discussed to junior scholars, who will define the research trends of the future.

This book is aimed at advanced undergraduates and graduate students, new scholars in the field of Translation Studies, as well as practitioners interested in contributing to the scholarly study of the field through research. It is also aimed at another readership—doctoral students and scholars in disciplines across the humanities and social sciences who recognize the importance of considering questions of language and translation/interpreting in the generation of knowledge but may not be familiar with the methods for studying those questions that have been developed in the field of Translation and Interpreting Studies.

Overall, the volume should be of interest not only to graduate students and new researchers but also to more seasoned researchers inside TIS, as well as outside it, who are interested in the current and future state of T&I research and in exploring the ways Translation and Interpreting Studies can revitalize, if not revolutionize, ontological, epistemological, and research paradigms across disciplinary boundaries.

References

Damrosch, David. 2009. Introduction. "All the Time in the World." In *Teaching World Literature*, David Damrosch (ed.), 1–11. New York: MLA.

Hale, Sandra, and Jemina Napier. 2013. *Research Methods in Interpreting*. London and New York: Bloomsbury.

Hatim, Basil. 2013. *Teaching and Researching Translation*. Second edition. Harlow, UK: Pearson.

Hermans, Theo (ed.). 2002. *Crosscultural Trangressions: Research Methods in Translation Studies II*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Olohan, Maeve (ed.). 2000. *Intercultural Faultlines: Research Models in Translation Studies II*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Saldanha, Gabriela, and Sharon O'Brien. 2014. *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Shreve, Gregory, M. 2000. "Translation at the Millennium: Prospects for the Evolution of a Profession." In *Paradigmenwechsel in der Translation. Festschrift für Albrecht Neubert zum 70. Gerburtstag, Peter A. Schmitt*. (ed.), 217–34. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.

Williams, Jenny, and Andrew Chesterman. 2002. *The Map: A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Part I

Exploring translation and interpreting

Claudia V. Angelelli and Brian James Baer

What is T&I research?

Research has been defined in various ways according to different paradigms and traditions. The conceptualization of research also varies among different communities of practice and speech communities. Research in Translation and Interpreting Studies has enjoyed an eclectic tradition, in line with its interdisciplinary nature. Researchers in Translation and Interpreting Studies (TIS) come from different paths of life (ranging from cultural studies to computer science and from languages and linguistics to educational or social psychology) and bring their own traditions and methods to the study of phenomena that cut across all areas of society: the rendering of written and verbal/signed communication of values, traditions, and information across time and space. Through the years we have seen research in TIS grow into a body of knowledge in its own right. By borrowing theoretical/conceptual frameworks and research methods from fields in both the humanities and social sciences, as well as by creating their own, researchers in Translation and Interpreting Studies explore phenomena related to communication, culture, and languages through new lenses, posing different and richer questions than were asked before.

For junior scholars and doctoral students in TIS, as well as for researchers coming from other disciplines, it is precisely the interdisciplinarity of our field that presents the greatest challenges and opportunities. Researching TIS today means researching transgression and re-construction, the displacement of texts (oral, written, or signed), as well as of peoples and communities (authors, readers, speakers, audiences, providers and recipients of information, translators, interpreters, and interlocutors), through space and time. Our object of study can be fuzzy and/or neat. Our lenses can be single, multiple, and complex, our paths linear, circular, and everything in between. TIS by its very nature allows us opportunities to study phenomena in more comprehensive and ethically sound ways that until now have been investigated rather narrowly, from a mainstream perspective (e.g., focusing on inaccuracies in communication and overlooking fundamental questions regarding access to communication) and within a traditional, positivist framework.

Given its mixed origins—in Applied Linguistics, Comparative Literature, and Cognitive Psychology—Translation and Interpreting Studies is uniquely positioned to break down the traditional barriers separating the humanities, social sciences, and hard sciences, and to drive the kind of transformation in doctoral education described in the 2010 MLA Report on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature, by promoting interdisciplinarity, digital humanities, and teamwork and collaboration. If, as the authors of the report claim, "All modern scholarship necessarily includes ongoing reflection on the fundamental constitution of the discipline" (2014: 9), then the study of translation and interpreting, which relativizes the language we use to "know" the world, must play a central role in that ongoing reflection in every department and field. Such a transformation can happen, however, only if the research methodologies and theoretical approaches of other fields are not borrowed blindly, but are adapted and infused with a deep sensitivity to language(s). When we acknowledge language as both an object of study as well as the medium for conducting studies and for presenting research results, we blur the boundary established by positivists between ontology (what is) and epistemology (what we know about what is), necessitating a deeply reflexive research practice.

Linking theory, research, and practice

While acknowledging the transformational potential of this interdisciplinarity, it is not without its challenges, as it requires the merging of research paradigms that have traditionally been seen as diametrically opposed—namely, those developed in the hard sciences and social sciences, and those developed in the humanities, specifically in the field of literary studies. Consider, for example, the very different use of theory within these two paradigms. Within the paradigm developed in the hard sciences and social sciences, theory represents a model that is based either on tested hypotheses or on a systematic exploration that requires the collection and analysis of data. In the humanities, literary theory refers to something closer to philosophy, specifically, the philosophy of language, grounded in structural linguistics (Saussure), sociolinguistic critiques of structural linguistic models, and extensions and adaptations of structural linguistic models (i.e., Lacanian psychoanalysis, deconstruction, and semiotics). Merging these paradigms forces us to recognize language both as an object of study and as a vehicle for the cultural and communicative construction of that object, that is, language as a set of observable behaviors and at the same time as a generator and communicator of ideologies.

While post-structuralist approaches compel us to acknowledge the constructedness of our categories of analysis, the provisional and relative nature of the knowledge generated, and the situatedness of the researcher as one who is simultaneously framer and framed, they do not negate the possibility of empirical research. Rather, they call for a reflexive research practice, which encourages researchers to interrogate not only their interpretation of data, but also the very categories they design or borrow to generate that data. This is especially important when dealing with "other" cultures. Indeed, by invoking broad categories for cross-cultural analysis, such as French or Chinese, or male and female, researchers participate, unwittingly or not, in the reification of these identities, often at the expense of sub-national, class, and alternative gender and sexual identifications (to name just a few). Moreover, the reflection promoted by post-structuralist theories and methodologies is especially important today as institutions and governments attempt to measure scholarly output with strictly quantitative tools, which lend an aura of "objectivity," but hide as much as they reveal.

Another key feature of post-structuralist approaches is the call to situate cultural practices within specific social contexts, countering the temptation to universalize findings across languages and cultures, often in tacit or implicit support of hegemonic agendas. In Translation Studies, for example, corpus-based studies increasingly turn away from large language corpora in favor of corpora based on text type. In Interpreting Studies, recent work has emphasized the necessity of studying interpreting within the specific institutions or social contexts in which it is practiced. As Angelelli notes

> The constraints that any institution (be it a hospital, a courthouse or a national/international public/private organization) may pose on the act of interpreting need to be accounted for in a theory of interpreting. Even when medical, community, conference, and court interpreting seem to have strong common grounds (based on a linguistic or information-processing perspective), there are probably more differences than similarities based on the settings where these interpreting events occur and on the participants.
> (Angelelli 2004b: 21)

But while these post-structuralist approaches are increasingly common among researchers, the positivist illusion of capturing the one true meaning of an utterance survives not only in the popular understanding of translation and interpreting, but also in a variety of professional and educational settings. The professional world of translation and interpreting remains dominated by positivist notions of representation, which promote an essentially mimetic model that posits the existence of a priori meaning expressed in one language, which is then transferred, with a greater or lesser degree of fidelity, from that language to another. This conceptualization of the relationship between language and meaning is reflected to some degree in almost every aspect of translation and interpreting practice, from the T&I classroom to the testing industry and professional associations, from the certification of translators and interpreters to the creation of codes of ethics and standards of practice.

The designation made by St. Jerome in the fifth century of two fundamentally different approaches to translation—sense for sense or word for word—remains firmly entrenched today in many institutions. This model is institutionalized, for example, in many legal systems, where the interpretation of sense, or meaning (designated as the purview of lawyers and judges), is separated from the interpretation of words, or language (designated as the purview of the translator or interpreter). As a result, translators and interpreters have frequently been portrayed as neutral conduits of information. We see this positivism reflected, too, in certification exams, which often separate linguistic competence in the source language from all the other competencies required of the professional translator/interpreter. The translator/interpreter's role as "mere" language conduit, in turn, enhances the professional status of the domain expert, be it the diplomat, the judge, or the doctor, while diminishing that of the translator/interpreter, as reflected most blatantly in the salary differential between language and other experts.

The secondary status of the translator/interpreter was reinforced in the Romantic Age, which constructed the translator as the defining other of the "original" writer—a mere imitator. Hence the enormous interest among researchers today in translators and translation in pre-modern Europe (see Kronitiris 1997; Goldberg 1997; White 2011; Uman 2012; and Goodrich 2013), and in cultures outside the West (see Pollard 1998; Hung and Wakabayashi 2005; Hermans 2006; Cheung 2006; Bandia 2008; Kothari and Wakabayashi 2009; Inggs and Meintjes 2009; and Batchelor 2009). And so, the marginal professional status of translators and interpreters today is a valuable object of study insofar as it reflects deep-seated cultural anxieties over who controls meaning. As Rakefet Sela-Sheffy argues in this volume: "It is the contradiction between the potential power of translators and interpreters as cultural mediators (Bandia and Milton 2009), on the one hand, and their obscure professional definition and alleged sense of submissiveness, on the other, that makes them such an intriguing occupational group."

While Roman Jakobson suggested the theoretical untenability of the positivist separation of word and sense in his 1959 article "On Some Linguistic Aspects of Translation," researchers in the field of translation and interpreting over the last 20 years have provided an empirical basis for Jakobson's theoretical claim. Angelelli (2004a), for example, showed that the various roles played by interpreters in medical settings far exceed the prescriptive descriptions of the interpreter's role in the reigning codes of ethics. This disjunction contributes to the interpreter's uncertain self-image, discussed by Rakefet Sela-Sheffy in this volume, by instilling a sense that she is unable to conform to the dictates of the professional codes of conduct (Angelelli 2007). Research holds the key to resolving this situation by providing the kind of empirical evidence that should form the basis of our codes and our assessments, as well as our classroom practice.

For too long the professional field of translation and interpreting has been shaped by anecdote and intuition on the part of experts, or at least professionals—for, as Shreve (2002: 154–55) notes, not all professionals are experts. Nevertheless, resistance to the post-structuralist understanding of the relationship of language to meaning, i.e., that meaning is constructed in the act of interpretation, remains strong. In fact, the tension between the prescription to act as a neutral conduit of stable and fixed meanings and the reality of the translator and interpreter's role as co-constructor of meaning is evident from the very earliest stages in the professionalization of translation and interpreting in the postwar period. For example, in a 1955 article published in the *New York Times Magazine,* titled "Interpreter: Linguist Plus Diplomat," a professional U.N. interpreter is quoted as saying: "You must be absolutely faithful to what the delegate is *trying* to convey" (White 1955: 12; italics added)—not to what the speaker is saying but to what the speaker is *trying* to say, which casts doubt on the ontological status of the source utterance. Moreover, the addition of diplomat to the interpreter's role as language expert as suggested in the article's headline is not a simple add-on insofar as it authorizes the interpreter to consider a host of factors beyond the denotative semantics of the source utterance—it makes her a cultural mediator. As the interpreter interviewed puts it, "Sometimes you interpret *exactly* what he says and then *add* a few words to explain what he means," and later, "You do an editing job as you go along" (White 1955: 12; italics added). The interpreter's words express a fundamental tension within our modern understanding of translation and interpreting, which was especially acute in the 1950s, when the Sapir-Whorf concept of linguistic relativity competed with the promotion of machine translation and a model of translation as linguistic matching. While the former posits the inseparability of words and their meaning, placing limits on translatability and constructing translation as "a complex decision making process," to use Jiří Levý's phrase, the latter posits the separability of words and meaning, promoting an ideal of universal translatability.

The persistence of positivist notions is perhaps more acute in Interpreting Studies, Angelelli (2004b: 21) argues, because unlike Translation Studies "interpreting did not develop into Interpreting Studies with an underlying theory. The theory and research on which interpreting rests has been produced mostly by the field with little influence from other [fields] (even though interpreting is per se an interdisciplinary endeavor)." Hence the importance of breaking the closed circle in which prescriptive codes and anecdotes continue to influence the training and professional identity of interpreters. This situation, Angelelli contends, "leads to a complex field of practice lacking the insights of interdisciplinary research and theory and losing the opportunity to contribute to theory development" (2004b: 24). Creating a mutually interrogative relationship between theory, research, and practice offers the greatest hope of breaking that self-perpetuating circle.

The research journey

While post-structuralist theory challenges many of the positivist pieties of traditional research paradigms, it should not lead us to abandon the traditional research journey. In fact, it calls upon us to show even greater rigor and systematicity in order to reduce bias as much as possible and to validate our findings through the application of mixed methods. Conceptualized as an art and a craft (Booth, Colomb, and Williams 2008), the research journey begins with curiosity, interest in a topic, a hypothesis, a hunch, or a question on the part of the researcher. That being said, the research journey is not undertaken by the researcher alone. Research on cross-cultural communication, on how texts and information travel across space and time, touches the lives of many. It involves not only the researcher but also the authors, the readers, the audiences, the speakers of minority languages, all of whom have a direct or indirect interest in the results of the research. Research in TIS also brings scientific communities closer together as it stands at the intersection of many disciplines. So, the journey is shared.

Also, like a journey, research requires a great deal of effort and rigor. While several studies in T&I have used the methods discussed in this volume, they have not always shown rigor in respecting the integrity of the methods. For example, in the last 15 years we have witnessed a growth of M.A. and doctoral theses in TIS using surveys to measure perceptions, beliefs, qualities, etc. Surveys have become a popular way of gathering data (especially with free software like SurveyMonkey). Very few of the studies using this method, however, discuss the reliability and validity of the survey administered (required for any measurement instrument), simply assuming that the survey measures what the author intended it to measure. Another important point of rigor involves the manipulation and analysis of the data. Many studies do not exhibit the necessary rigor in sampling but, nevertheless, claim to generalize results. In addition, many times authors do not conceptualize a survey as a way of correlating variables and limit their analysis to descriptive statistics. Unlike specialized software designed for technical studies, many beginner software programs do not run correlations. Therefore, authors using this basic free software are not able to take full advantage of the data they have collected. And what is even more problematic is when the software rather than the research question seems to dictate the extension of the analysis.

And so, only when we are equipped with a commitment to rigor and systematicity are we ready to embark on the research journey, which we will describe below in terms of stages. While these stages do not necessarily follow one another in a particular order, some definitely come before others. But this will depend on the approach and the nature of the research. One of the earliest stages is the *statement of the problem*. This should clearly state and define the issue to be studied, its scope and nature, the need for this research, the gaps it will fill, why it merits our attention. Most generally, the statement of the problem culminates with a research question that will address the problem. Depending on the approach or paradigm, the research question can be an exploratory one that will be addressed by the study, a hypothesis to be accepted or rejected, or a hunch (not formulated as a question) to be followed.

The *theoretical framework* refers to the theory/set of theories on which the study will be grounded, the available lenses through which we can examine the problem. A research problem is like any other kind of problem. We can look at it from different perspectives depending on what we can see or what we want to see. Thus, the same data can be discussed differently according to the lens used. When we look at the problem through the lens of history or sociology, literature, feminism or agency, interaction, displacement or hegemony, we are framing the study in a way that will impact the very essence of it. The theoretical framework, therefore, cannot be considered a posteriori or as an add-on.

The *literature review* or *review of the relevant literature* is key to situating our research project in a larger context. Through the literature review, we participate in an ongoing dialogue and become part of a community of discourse. Research contributes to knowledge, to the advancement of a field of study, shedding light on a problem, and sometimes resolving it. It is therefore essential to be familiar with what has been written about the problem we are exploring, or similar ones, for two basic reasons. First, it does not make sense to re-invent the wheel. Second, and more importantly, as researchers we always stand on the shoulders of those who came before us. Acknowledging and citing previous work done in the field, giving credit where credit is due, is, therefore, the proper and ethical thing to do.

The *methods* section is closely linked to the research question and the theoretical framework. The lens we decide to use to look at the issue and the question we ask about it will establish how we will go about answering/exploring the question. It is not the other way around. We will not decide on a method a priori simply because we are more familiar or comfortable with it. Otherwise we will have to find a research question that lends itself to investigation with the method we have chosen. This is a case of the tail wagging the dog. Once the method has been selected, we collect a certain type of data (perceptions, texts, behaviors) that will be analyzed in a specific way, that is, according to the method.

The *data analysis section* is also closely linked to the research question and the method used. We analyze the data we gathered (which depends on the question) based on the method used to gather it. Different types of data allow for different types of analysis. And various research questions can be answered using different types of data (e.g., data resulting from surveys, which are generally quantifiable, or from direct observations). In this section we analyze the data and explain to the reader how we did it. This section does not necessarily present an interpretation of the data, as data may be interpreted in different ways.

The *results section*, also sometimes merged with the discussion section, is where the researcher takes a stand with her/his own interpretation of her/his results. This is, however, not arbitrary as it is bound by the lens used and the data collected, which derived from the method used, which was dictated by the research question. It is, together with the discussion section, one of the most exciting parts of the journey, as we are able here to present our contribution to the field.

The *discussion section*—which may stand alone or be merged with the results section or the call for further research section—links the results of the study to the review of the literature, argues how the results reinforce or differ from findings from other studies, and posits additional questions. The *conclusion section* is the one where the researcher revisits the research question to discuss how it was systematically answered. In so doing, the researcher links all parts of the study, beginning with the lens used (the theoretical framework) to study the issue at hand to recapping the results and their meaning. The *implications section* is also a crucial part of the study. Results of a study can have implications at both the theoretical and practical levels, and the implications may affect different groups or entities. So, this section connects research to the outside, to a community, a group, or a system.

In the process of breaking a whole into its parts to make it more manageable, one may think of a study and its write-up (whether it is a dissertation, a grant report, or a publication) as a collection of pieces (statement of a problem, research question, theoretical framework, review of relevant literature, methods, results, analysis, etc.) that must be present (to meet requirements, for example) just because. The truth is that each piece contributes to the whole in a unique way. There is nothing capricious about the collection of parts and there is nothing arbitrary about the structure. Although some research designs may be more or less flexible than others, depending on the question and the approach, all the parts contribute something unique. For example, while an experimental design imposes something—a treatment—on the participants, and the research question is firm, a naturalistic design does not impose any pre-constructed frame on the participants, and the research question may change to a certain degree. In any case, a question, be it about an individual or a group, a single text or a corpus, asked synchronically or asynchronically, at a macro or micro level, can be answered with confidence when the process (the journey) used to answer it has been systematic and rigorous.

Conclusion

The possible directions research into translation- and interpreting-related phenomena will take are limitless. New research directions will emerge from within Translation and Interpreting Studies proper, as well as any number of other fields that choose to take the translation/interpreting turn. And so, the map of the field provided in Part II, while comprehensive, will continue to evolve, as will the methods and tools presented in Part III. What will remain constant, however, is the necessity of investigating that most fascinating and complex aspect of our lives as human beings—communication across languages and cultures.

References

Angelelli, Claudia V. 2004a. *Medical Interpreting and Cross-cultural Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——2004b. *Re-visiting the Interpreter's Role*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

——2007. "Validating Professional Standards and Codes: Challenges and Opportunities." In *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting* 8(2): 175–93.

Bandia, Paul. 2008. *Translation as Reparation. Writing and Translation in Postcolonial Africa*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Batchelor, Kathryn. 2009. *Decolonizing Translation. Francophone African Novels in English Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Booth, Wayne C., Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams. 2008. *The Craft of Research.* Third edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cheung, Martha. 2006. *An Anthology of Chinese Discourse on Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Goldberg, Jonathan. 1997. *Desiring Women Writing. English Renaissance Examples.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Goodrich, Jaime. 2013. *Faithful Translators. Authorship, Gender and Religion in Early Modern England*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Hermans, Theo (ed.). 2006. *Translating Others*, Vols. 1 and 2. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Hung, Eva, and Judy Wakabayashi (eds.). 2005. *Asian Translation Traditions.* Manchester: St. Jerome.

Inggs, Judith, and Libby Meintjes (eds.). 2009. *Translation Studies in Africa*. Continuum Studies in Translation. London and New York: Continuum.

Kothari, Rita, and Judy Wakabayashi (eds.). 2009. *Decentering Translation Studies: India and Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kronitiris, Tina. 1997. *Oppositional Voices: Women as Writers and Translators in the English Renaissance*. New York and London: Routledge.

Pollard, David E. 1998. *Translation and Creation. Readings of Western Literature in Early Modern China, 1840–1918*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Shreve, Gregory. 2002. "Knowing Translation. Cognitive and Experiential Aspects of Translation Expertise from the Perspective of Expertise Studies." In *Translation Studies: Perspectives on an Emerging Discipline*, Alessandra Riccardi (ed.), 150–71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature. 2007. Report. New York: MLA.

Uman, Deborah. 2012. *Women as Translators in Early Modern Europe*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

White, Micheline (ed.). 2011. *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production, 1500–1625*. Farnham: Ashgate.

White, Peter T. 1955. "Interpreter: Linguist Plus Diplomat." *New York Times Magazine*, November 6, 1955: 12, 30, 32–33.