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

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

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

Swabey and Nicodemus (p. 1-4) open the volume by introducing the need for research into sign language interpreting. They also explain what motivated them to undertake the book, namely that interpreting professionals show keen interest in doing empirical studies but “lack a schema for incorporating this research” (p. 1-2). In other words, the growing profession of interpreting requires scientific research, and when SLI community researchers share ideas and initiate research,
from 2004 to 2009. The qualitative and quantitative approaches were divided about equally. The case study was the dominant method and focused mainly on interpreters’ roles. The authorship section features a wide range of academic backgrounds in IS scholars.

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

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

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

Leeson (p. 153-176) examines the assessment of sign language interpreters, specifically practitioners and student interpreters. Evaluating the performance of students in a training program is one thing – assessing their level of competence in becoming a professional is quite another. Since testing is a complex process and a mere sample of what student interpreters (future professionals) may do in the future, it is difficult to standardize...
the assessment process. Even ‘raters’ are subjective, and training individuals in rating is ‘an intractably subjective process’ (p. 160). However, we can still improve the validity and reliability of proficiency tests. Leeson gives us guidelines to do so. This chapter also looks at training student interpreters. Leeson suggests using guided self-assessments among students and giving them self-analytic toolkits and a meta-language for self-reflection.

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

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

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

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

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