

Gyde Hansen, Andrew Chesterman & Heidrun Gerzymisch-Arbogast (eds) 2008. *Efforts and Models in Interpreting and Translation Research. A tribute to Daniel Gile*. Benjamins Translation Library, Vol. 80. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, ix + 302 pages. ISBN 978 90 272 1689 2

According to the editors of this volume, the authors wish to honour Daniel Gile for “his tireless efforts in Interpreting & Translation Research” (vi). The selection of work presented has thus been “inspired or promoted” by Daniel Gile or is “closely connected with some of his main research interest” (vi). No further presentation of Daniel Gile is given, nor required. This formidable researcher whose impressive list of publications spans 30 years and whose many writings have been of immense benefit to researchers, teachers, students and professionals is well-known by anyone remotely connected with the field. In fact, his *Effort Models* (1995) of the cognitive processes involved in (simultaneous) interpreting have not only inspired or promoted research, but have also been a valuable tool in the training of (simultaneous) interpreters, a fact to which this reviewer can testify.

The volume contains 14 articles, which are initiated by a Preface and followed by a list of Publications by Daniel Gile, and which have been grouped under four headings: **Scientometrics and history**, **Conceptual analysis**, **Research skills**, and **Empirical studies**. Two of the articles were written in French and Spanish, respectively, with which this reviewer is not familiar. Consequently, neither of these articles has been included in this review.

Part 1, **Scientometrics and history**, contains two articles. In “An author-centred scientometric analysis of Daniel Gile’s oeuvre”, Nadja Grbić and Sonja Pöllabauer present a quantitative scientometric study of Daniel Gile’s published work, focusing on the diachronic development of his writings and other aspects of his scientific oeuvre, such as publication types, media and language of publication, contents, and co-authorship. Finally, the insights from the scientometric study were subjected to a citation analysis. The authors admit the limitation of their study, stressing the need for more data and more computer programmes, but argue that their combination of different approaches is capable of providing a both interesting and relevant overview of the field of study. However, researchers should expect no more, the authors warn us, because results and indices may vary, which makes citation and scientometric analysis inadequate “for determining the quality of publications or deciding on the allocation of funds” (p. 21).

In the second article “The turns of Interpreting Studies”, Franz Pöchhacker reviews the development of Interpreting Studies, explaining that this has always “been a dominant concern in Daniel Gile’s impressive career” (p. 25). Borrowing from Mary Snell-Hornby (2006) the author examines Interpreting Studies for “turns”, that is, shifts or milestones that has marked the history of the discipline. He explains that his aim is to enrich our view of Interpreting Studies, while simultaneously exploring conceptual relations, such as the connection between periods and paradigms, and between paradigms and turns, and the way turns in the history of research are connected with sociological factors, “shaped as much by personalities and their activities as by new memes and history” (p. 26). He then presents an overview of the various personalities and activities and concludes that Daniel Gile “deserves to be addressed as the field’s master” (p. 33). Finally, discussing periods, paradigms and turns, the author argues that a turn can be characterized as “a change in conceptual focus” (p. 36) and then proceeds to identify three turns in the history of Interpreting Studies: the empirical turn, the social turn and the qualitative turn.

In the first of the three articles in Part 2, **Conceptual analysis**, “The status of interpretive hypothesis”, Andrew Chesterman aims to clarify this status, showing how interpretive hypotheses compare to other kinds of hypotheses. The author explains that interpretive hypotheses are conjectures about what something means, and that their general relevance to translators and interpreters has been “neatly illustrated” (p. 50) in Daniel Gile’s Sequential Model of Translation (e.g. 2005: 102). Further explaining that interpretive hypotheses have their root in hermeneutics, he defines

and assesses such hypotheses, building on the findings of Norwegian Philosopher Dagfinn Føllesdal (1979). Finally, having compared interpretive hypotheses to the standard empirical types of hypotheses, the author concludes that, though interpretive hypotheses are not falsifiable, the method of generating and testing them is similar to those of traditional empirical science.

The second article in Part 2, “Stratégies et tactiques en traduction et interpretation”, by Yves Gambier, was not included in the review (see above). In the third article, “On omission in simultaneous interpreting. Risk analysis of a hidden effort”, Anthony Pym addresses the long-standing debate in research on simultaneous interpreting among those who see interpreters’ performances as being conditioned by context and those who analyze their performance in terms of cognitive constraints, and explains that he will attempt to situate this debate “on some kind of common ground” (p. 85). The author argues that Daniel Gile’s Effort Models focus on cognitive aspects, but that modelling of the resources used when interpreters make omissions suggest that cognitive management may actively respond to contextual factors. An analysis of data from one of Daniel Gile’s experiments (1999) in a context-sensitive way, focusing on omissions, revealed that the interpreters’ cognitive management of omissions seemed to be highly variable and to be related to context-dependent strategies. Subsequently the author raises the question whether low-risk omissions, as distinct from high-risk ones, should continue to be automatically categorized as errors. He concludes, however, that his findings are compatible with the Effort Models and argues in favour of applying this basic model to all linguistic mediation.

Part 3, **Research skills**, contains three articles. The first is “Doctoral training programmes. Research skills needed for the discipline or career management skills?” by Christina Schäffner who sees doctoral training as a collective responsibility of universities. Specifically, the author addresses the issue of skills training from the perspective of the United Kingdom where doctoral students are expected to demonstrate not only research skills and techniques specific to their field, but also an understanding of the research environment (including funding procedures), the ability to manage their research, personal effectiveness, communication skills, networking and team working skills, and the ability to manage their career. The author discusses these skills and outlines proposals for achieving them. She concludes that they are all relevant to a doctoral training student but calls for flexibility, arguing that a rigorous course structure is less important than “the quality of the research environment” (p. 125). Finally, she points to the link between formal training and a more resistant research quality, reminding us of Daniel Gile’s repeated claim that weaknesses in research expertise in Translation Studies are the result of a lack of research training (Gile and Hansen 2004: 304), as well as the lack of quality control in the field.

In her article, “Getting started. Writing communicative abstracts” Heidrun Gerzymisch-Arbogast presents an overview of formulae for writing abstracts as a basic research skill for young researchers. The author explains that the article related to a PhD School which she taught with Daniel Gile in 2007, and, reflecting on his comments on the topic, she suggests that writing abstracts for conferences needs to take into account theoretical as well as factual dimensions. Thus, following a presentation of available resources on abstract writing, she presents and discusses the principles of the “four tongues” of the speaker and the “four ears” of the listener, as well as the interplay of these dimensions, illustrating how one may communicate one’s ideas effectively in an abstract.

Finally, Barbara Moser-Mercer argues in her article “Construct-ing quality” that survey research of quality in conference interpreting needs more methodological rigour and also needs more comparable studies of the perception of quality. The author attempts to remedy this problem by developing a succinct, yet comprehensive guide to questionnaire design for quality research in conference interpreting, covering important concepts such as validity, reliability, construct design and ethical dimensions. Pointing out that conference interpreters still have to fight on an every-day basis for the most fundamental ingredients of good interpreting performance, such as an advance copy of the speaker’s manuscript of sufficient light and oxygen in the interpreting booth, she stresses the need for producing “quality studies of the highest methodological standard” (p. 154) to obtain

convincing evidence of the aforesaid ingredients that make up good interpreting performance and of how to guarantee such performance.

Part 4, **Empirical studies**, contains six articles. The first article “How do experts interpret? Implications from research in Interpreting Studies and cognitive science” by Minhua Liu presents an overview of empirical research on expertise in simultaneous interpreting. The author defines expertise as the result of well-practiced strategies in each of the three processes involved in simultaneous interpreting, comprehension, translation and production, as well as their interaction. She explains that this interaction is allowed to act in sync because of the interpreters’ ability to manage their mental resources efficiently, especially as regards attention. Then she examines expert-novice differences comparing skills and sub-skills, by analyzing underlying cognitive abilities thought to be related to expertise in interpreting and by providing evidence and counter-evidence from Interpreting Studies and cognitive science. She concludes that, despite the complexity of the interpreting task, current knowledge and new findings in other fields, such as cognitive science, are quite compatible with findings in Interpreting Studies and with Daniel Gile’s Effort Models, whereas the challenge lies in producing “more well-designed empirical studies” (p. 174) guided by research questions that are relevant to the current knowledge of human cognition.

The second article “The impact of non-native English on students’ interpreting performance” addresses the fact that interpreters of English are increasingly confronted with source texts delivered by non-native speakers whose accent can impose an extra cognitive load. Simultaneous interpreting is a complex cognitive activity which involves intensive information processing, but interpreters’ processing capacity has its limits. Reporting on an empirical study of the performance of students of simultaneous interpreting, conducted at the University of Vienna, the author discusses a hypothesis derived from Daniel Gile’s Effort Models: that “even experienced interpreters need to devote additional processing capacity to speech comprehension” (p. 190) when the speaker has a strong, unusual or unfamiliar accent. She argues that the empirical study clearly confirms this hypothesis, and that the findings have a number of interesting didactic implications, since students need to develop strategies that will help them cope with this particular problem.

The third article in Part 4, “Envaluación de la calidad en interpretación simultánea. Contrastes de exposición e inferencias emocionales. Evaluación de la evaluación”, by Angela Collados Ais, was not included in the review (see above). The fourth article “Linguistic interference in simultaneous interpreting with text. A case study” by Heike Lamberger-Felber & Julia Schneider discusses a phenomenon that many have written about but few investigated. Attempting to remedy this, the authors conducted a case study at the University of Graz which involved 12 professional conference interpreters and which aimed to show types of interference and test hypotheses about frequency. The results indicated a high incidence of interference in professional interpreters’ output as well as a high variability in both frequency and type of interference among the 12 interpreters. The authors admit that these results can only offer tentative insight into the phenomenon due to the limited amount of data and the high variability among interpretations. Nevertheless, they argue that the sheer frequency of interference in the interpreters’ output seems to warrant further investigation into linguistic interference and its possible impact “on quality evaluation by different groups” (p. 235).

In the fifth article “Towards a definition of *Interpretese*. An intermodal, corpus-based study” Miriam Shlesinger follows Daniel Gile’s (2004: 30) appeal for “translation research and interpreting research to work together” (p. 238), explaining that she agrees with his conclusion that researchers whose work touches upon both modalities, a category to which both she and Daniel Gile belongs, should “develop reliable and replicable ways of looking for similarities, as well as differences” (p. 238). Consequently, the author conducted an empirical study that compared interpreted discourse to its written (translated) counterpart. Subjecting oral and written outputs of professional translators and interpreters to computer analysis, automatically tagging them, she found prominent differences between the two corpora. However, she also found that, similar to translated discourse, interpreted

discourse seems to display a phenomenon, which Translation Studies refer to as *translationese*, i.e. features which set the discourse apart from (spontaneous) original discourse and which may thus be referred to as *interpretese*.

Finally, in “The speck in your brother’s eye – the beam in your own. Quality management in translation and revision” Gyde Hansen reports on two empirical longitudinal studies which involved both students and professionals and which examined the relationship between translation competence and revision competence. Referring to Daniel Gile’s (e.g. 1994, 2005) writings on quality assessment in translation and interpreting and on the difficulty of perceiving errors and omissions, which can make revision a truly frustrating process, the author explains that such frustration led her to start revision courses for translation students and prompted the aforementioned studies. The research question asked was whether good translators are also good revisers. The findings clearly indicate that “translation competence cannot automatically be equated with revision competence” (p. 274), and that revisers seem to need “additional skills, abilities and attitudes, and/or enhanced levels of competence in certain areas” (p. 274).

As promised by the editors, the articles under review all pay tribute to Daniel Gile, stressing his impressive list of publications, his important contribution to the development of Interpreting Studies as a discipline in its own right, his valuable models, and his significant influence on the training of researchers and of professional translators and interpreters. However, the research and models presented in the reviewed articles are no less significant. The volume therefore provides valuable insights into interpreting and translation research which makes it both relevant and interesting to researchers of translation and interpreting as well as to teachers, students and professionals.

References

- Føllesdal, Dagfinn 1979: Hermeneutics and the Hypothetico-Deductive Method. In *Dialectica* 33(3-4), 319-336.
- Gile, Daniel 1994: Methodological aspects of interpretation and translation research. In Lambert, Sylvia/Moser-Mercer, Barbara (eds.), *Bridging the Gap*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 39-56.
- Gile, Daniel 1999: Testing the Effort Models’ tightrope hypothesis in simultaneous interpreting – a contribution. In *Hermes* 23, 153-172.
- Gile, Daniel 2004: Translation Research versus Interpreting Research: Kinship, differences and prospects for partnership. In Schäffner, Christina (ed.), *Translation Research and Interpreting Research. Traditions, Gaps and Synergies*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 10-34.
- Gile, Daniel 2005: *La traduction. La comprendre, l’appréhender*. Paris: Presses Universitaires.
- Gile, Daniel/Hansen, Gyde 2004: The editorial process through the looking glass. In Hansen, Gyde/Malmkjær, Kirsten/Gile, Daniel (eds.), *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 297-306.
- Snell, Hornby, Mary 2006: *The Turns of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bente Jacobsen