Artigos

DOI: 10.14393/DL32-v11n5a2017-2

Traditions and innovation in Interpreting Studies: a personal analysis for 2016[1]

Tradição e inovação nos Estudos da Interpretação: uma análise pessoal para 2016

Daniel Gile[*]

RESUMO: In line with this issue's main theme, traditions and innovation, the present review of Interpreting Studies (IS) focuses on what can be considered traditions in this very young (sub-)discipline, and attempts to identify trends which mark changes in them. Since this reviewer's training and experience have been centered around conference interpreting, conference interpreting is the natural vantage point for his analysis. The data available for the analysis are probably rather representative for conference interpreting and make it possible to make some claims – the reviewer has been compiling conference interpreting data systematically for over 25 years[2] – but the degree to which they are representative as regards other forms of interpreting is uncertain, which makes it difficult to make quantitative assessments of trends.

KEYWORDS: Interpreting Studies. Conference Interpreting. Traditions and Innovation.

ABSTRACT: Em consonância com o tema principal deste número, Tradição e Inovação, esta revisão dos Estudos da Interpretação trata do que pode ser considerado como tradição nesta jovem (sub)disciplina e tenta identificar tendências que marcam as mudanças na área. Uma vez que a formação e experiência deste pesquisador estão centradas em torno da interpretação de conferências, esta é o ponto de vista natural para a sua análise. Os dados disponíveis para a análise podem ser considerados representativos do trabalho de interpretação de conferências e permite fazer algumas reivindicações. O pesquisador tem compilado dados sobre a interpretação de conferências sistematicamente por mais de 25 anos, mas não é possível determinar até que ponto os dados são representativos para outras formas de interpretação, o que dificulta a avaliação quantitativa de tendências gerais nos Estudos da Interpretação.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Estudos da Interpretação. Interpretação de Conferências. Tradição e Inovação.

1. The beginning of IS: conference interpreting

What seems clear is that IS as such did start with conference interpreting. Until the 1960s, there was virtually no research into interpreting at all. A few practical and didactic

[1] This paper was first presented at a conference given during the 12th National Translation Forum and 6th International Translation Forum – ENTRAD/2016 –, organized by the Languages and Linguistics Institute of the Federal University of Uberlandia, and the Brazilian Association of Translation Researchers – ABRAPT.

[*] Professor Emeritus, Université Paris 3 (Sorbonne Nouvelle). Email: daniel.gile@yahoo.com

[2] See www.cirinandgile.com.

textbooks and papers were written by interpreter trainers (typically HERBERT, 1952; ROZAN, 1956, but also FUKUII; ASANO, 1961 in Japan), but they did not claim to report research or propose theories in the academic sense of the word. In the 1960s, a few psychologists became interested in the cognition of simultaneous interpreting, mostly in connection with the question of how simultaneous interpreters managed to listen and speak "at the same time" against the background of interest in the limitations of cognitive resources in humans, in particular as regards the processing of verbal information. In the early 1970s, in parallel with, but separately from the efforts of comparative literature scholars to set up a discipline devoted to translation[3], conference interpreters and interpreter trainers Danica Seleskovitch in Paris and Ghelly Chernov in Moscow started to conduct systematic research into interpreting. Chernov worked with scholars from other disciplines, but Seleskovitch did not, and was apparently the only one who set her sight on creating a research discipline around interpreting. Seleskovitch's drive and work gave the initial impetus to the discipline and dominated it for over a decade, starting in the 1970s.

In terms of traditions and innovation, it is noteworthy that the theory developed by Seleskovitch – the 'Theory of Sense', aka 'Interpretive Theory' (IT) – as well as the training methods associated with it, including the primacy of meaning over form and the primacy of consecutive, were anchored in a young conference interpreting tradition established by high-level conference interpreters starting after World War I and especially after World War II as 'institutionalized' by AIIC, the International Association of Conference Interpreters which was set up in 1953. This is important, as it explains why IS started out with an exclusive focus on conference interpreting, and an idealized view at that: interpreters were seen as linguistically and intellectually highly gifted bi- or multi-linguals capable of understanding complex speeches and of reformulating them in a linguistically impeccable, intellectually articulate form. IT's focus was on the interpreter's intellectual processing of speech. Language issues were considered non-relevant as long as interpreters mastered fully their working languages, which was a prerequisite. Linguistic research was therefore dismissed from research into interpreting. Interestingly enough, publications from cognitive psychology and psycholinguistics were also ignored in spite of IT's focus on interpreting cognition. Criticism was leveled at the lack of validity of experimental methods used by psychologists and psycholinguists who showed

[3] See Holmes, 1972/2000.

interest in interpreting, and Seleskovitch and her followers claimed only interpreters could do valid research into interpreting. Actually, according to Marianne Lederer, widely viewed as the co-founder of IT, Seleskovitch seems to have made more use of psychological theory than her occasional references to Piaget and Barbizet suggest (personal communication). The concept of *deverbalization*, which became the linchpin of Interpretive Theory, may well have been borrowed from psychology[4] without overt acknowledgment[5].

The main application of the theory was interpreter training, with a focus on cognition, interpreting practice and training methods, always in the conference interpreting environment. Conference interpreting was viewed as the highest form of interpreting. Other forms of interpreting were considered 'lower', and virtually no consideration was given to the social environments in which community interpreting and signed language interpreting were conducted.

This initial paradigm was rapidly adopted in major conference interpreter training programs in Europe and extended beyond, in particular to North America, China and Korea, as students from those parts of the world were trained at ESIT either as interpreters or in the framework of its doctoral program and returned home to spread the message and the methods.

2. Drivers of evolution

Starting in the late 1980s, IS began to experience a significant evolution. Six factors and their combined effect can be identified as important drivers of this mutation:

2.1 Geopolitical changes and their implications

The disappearance of barriers between Eastern and Western Europe, as symbolized by the collapse of the Berlin Wall, generated a need for more translators and interpreters, and new interpreter training programs were set up in countries where conditions for the ESIT-AIIC model – including the existence of sufficient candidates with the required language mastery in their native language and foreign languages and of experienced conference interpreters as trainers – were not met. Moreover, the universities where such programs were set up had their

[4] See Sachs, 1967, for instance.
[5] See an analysis in Gile, 1995.

own academic traditions, generally associated with the study of foreign languages and not related to AIIC and its traditions.

2.2 Academization of interpreter training

The fact that training programs in these 'new' countries were set up in academic environments, whereas many programs in the 'West' were autonomous 'schools' and did not necessarily have to comply with the usual academic norms – especially as regards the teaching of theory and the production of research – shifted the balance towards academia. So did the fact that in Spain, the government decided to academize existing training programs, and made research and a PhD mandatory for tenure track positions. These mostly non-AIIC environments opened up interpreter training and interpreting research to other views and traditions.

2.3 The development of community interpreting

With the intensification of population movements, and in particular migration, community interpreting developed strongly in countries such as Australia, Canada, Nordic European countries and the USA in connection with the provision of health, legal and other services to individuals and communities with insufficient command of the local language, before spreading to other European and Asian countries. This brought about interest in training and in research into community interpreting, including signed language interpreting for the Deaf. A doctoral dissertation by Cecilia Wadensjö on dialogue interpreting (1992) is often seen as a milestone in this development. Another important indicator of the progress is the series of *Critical Link* publications by the well-known international publisher John Benjamins, proceedings of conferences devoted specifically to community interpreting. The first Critical Link conference took place in 1995. Ever since, the operation has been renewed periodically and is gaining momentum; Critical Link 8 was held at Heriot Watt University in Edinburgh in 2016.

2.4 The development of Internet and digital technologies

As Internet became widely available throughout the world, not only direct communication and access to relevant research publications, but also effective collaboration on research projects across borders became possible. This had a deep effect on Interpreting Studies, which was sparsely populated, with sometimes less than a handful of researchers in individual

countries. In the past, in such small isolated environments, there was little stimulation and not much opportunity for personal development in the field. With internet, the obstacle became much less formidable, as almost instantaneous interaction at virtually no cost became possible. As a result, international cooperation has become a matter of routine, be it for research supervision, co-writing of papers, journal editing, the management of learned societies and international committees, and there is free online access to many documentary resources such as TS journals, theses and dissertations and even monographs and collective volumes on translation and interpreting.

2.5 The development of a sense of disciplinary TS identity

In the 1990s, TS in general started developing a strong sense of disciplinary identity. One important driver was the CERA doctoral summer school (now CETRA) which was set up by José Lambert at KUL Leuven in 1989[6]. Every year, for a couple of weeks, about 20 to 30 doctoral students were admitted to the program, attended lectures and seminars by the relevant year's CE(T)RA professor and up to ten or more experienced researchers specialized in translation or interpreting and had tutorials with them. After more than 25 years of existence, several hundred students have attended, and the list of CE(T)RA professors includes most prominent Western translation and interpreting scholars. Going through this program, with a large core of permanent staff members, did a lot to generate a sense of cohesion within Translation Studies.

When EST, the European Society of Translation Studies, was set up in 1992, most CE(T)RA staff members and professors and many CE(T)RA alumni joined, which added to the sense of disciplinary cohesion. This was also helped by the setting up of more and more dedicated Translation (translation and interpreting) journals since the 1990s. There are also a few scholarly interpreting journals – as opposed to professional interpreting journals – starting with the *Interpreters' Newsletter* (the University of Trieste, Italy) *Interpreting* (John Benjamins) and *Interpreting Research* (通訳理論研究 - Tokyo), which recently added written translation to its scope and is now known as *Interpreting and Translation Studies* (通訳翻訳研究). Note that the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf in the USA had its own *Journal of*

[6] See https://www.arts.kuleuven.be/cetra.

Interpretation as early as 1981, but research into signed language interpreting in the USA developed independently with hardly any links with IS in Europe and elsewhere until recent years[7]. A more recent scholarly journal from within the signed language interpreting community with an international editorial board and links with IS as a whole is the *International Journal of Interpreter Education* of the Conference of Interpreter Trainers, also based in the USA.

Interpreting Studies benefited from that evolution as its researchers were integrated into CE(T)RA (Gile, Shlesinger and Pöchhacker were CE(T)RA professors), the EST Executive Board (Gile was EST president and Pöchhacker was EST secretary general) and the editorial boards of Translation journals early on.

2.6 The personal drive of influential researchers

After Danica Seleskovitch's pioneering but ultimately self-limiting action, Laura Gran (Trieste, Italy) gave the first impulse to actual interdisciplinary cooperation with neurolinguists, and in particular with Franco Fabbro, in the second half of the 1980s. Barbara Moser (now Moser-Mercer) pushed towards interdisciplinary cooperation, mostly with cognitive scientists. So did Daniel Gile, and later Miriam Shlesinger and Franz Pöchhacker. In the field of community interpreting, Roda Roberts from Canada, Helge Niska from Stockholm and Erik Hertog from Antwerp were precursors, and conference interpreting researchers Shlesinger and Pöchhacker also showed keen interest in the development of research into community interpreting. Many of these authors are among the most often cited authors in IS, which is an indicator of their influence[8].

3. Features of the evolution of IS over the past 20 years

3.1 Growth

In the CIRIN database[9], which covers conference interpreting and broadcast interpreting, the total number of entries (publications and unpublished theses and dissertations) for the 1980s is about 320, while it is about 1,400 for the 1990s and around 1,700 for the years 2000 to 2009. The actual production volume is probably much larger, because many MA theses

[7] See later in this paper.
[8] See GAO; CHAI 2014 [2010].
[9] See www.cirinandgile.com.

are not advertised, posted on the web or turned into articles, and in East-Asian countries, many papers are published in local conference proceedings and in journals in Chinese, Japanese and Korean only. Analysts from other countries are not aware of them. The case of China is particularly meaningful: ever since the Chinese government set up BTI and MTI degrees (Bachelor and Master in Translation and Interpreting respectively) in many universities, hundreds of students write theses every year, many of which address interpreting-related topics[10].

This analyst does not have the data required to assess the volume of research done on community interpreting and on signed language interpreting, but judging by publications, including monographs, collective volumes, papers in mainstream interpreting journals and from information on theses and doctoral dissertations over the past two decades, such research is lively.

Interpreting Studies has now grown to the point where it has enough 'mass' in terms of research and researchers for some authors to claim for it the status of a discipline within a discipline[11].

3.2 More inclusiveness

One big difference between the IS of the 21st century and the IS of the second half of the 20th century is that the discipline has become much more inclusive. No longer is IS limited to conference interpreting and conference interpreters. Other forms of interpreting have gained at least equal status as foci of research interest. Demonstrating this evolution quantitatively through bibliometric data is beyond the scope of this paper, but taking just one example, in the journal *Interpreting*, which was set up by a conference interpreter in 1996 and has been chief-edited by conference interpreters ever since, out of 164 papers published from its first issue to the end of 2015, 31% were devoted to community interpreting, 10% to signed language interpreting and 10% to cross-cutting issues relevant to all forms of interpreting, as opposed to 43% devoted to conference interpreting. Actually, from 2005 to 2015, papers on community interpreting have outnumbered papers on conference interpreting, and an increasing number of papers on signed language interpreting have been included (3 from 2005 to 2009 and 10 from

[10] See information contributed by XU Ziyun and YU Dewei in recent issues of the *CIRIN Bulletin.*
[11] See Pöchhacker, 2015.

2010 to 2015). Also note that Issue 7:2 (2005) of *Interpreting* was devoted to health interpreting and Issue 10:1 (2008) to court interpreting.

Since community interpreting, including signed language interpreting in its usual settings, is associated with social, psychological and ethical issues which are virtually non-existent in conference interpreting, this inclusiveness has generated interest in such topics, including the interpreters' role, quality components beyond fidelity and linguistic parameters, the social status of interpreters, their protection in armed conflict zones, and even ideology[12]. The discussion about the interpreter's role, in particular, which was taken for granted in conference interpreting, had been discussed extensively in the field of signed language interpreting and is now salient in spoken language interpreting as well, especially when discussing court interpreting, where the interpreter's role can make a difference, or interpreting in connection with asylum requests, where political issues become relevant.

This also means that in contrast with cognitive theories, which dominated the discipline in the 20th century, sociological theories are becoming very popular in IS research.

In practical terms, this inclusiveness also means that training issues no longer concern the sole acquisition of interpreting techniques and some language skills enhancement by trainees with a high level of education and existing skills in academic programs over one to several years, but also initial acquisition of basic awareness and skills by less educated bilinguals and multilinguals in short courses.

3.3 Different geographic distribution of research

While in the first two to three decades of its existence, most of the IS production came from Western Europe, the geo-productive scene has changed radically. IS authors are now located in many parts of the world, including North America (especially as regards signed language interpreting and court interpreting), Asia (China has become the largest producer of IS research), Australia and South Africa.

This also has implications on the distribution of research themes. In many of these countries, the separation between conference interpreters and other types of interpreters is fuzzy, and the same people interpret in different settings. While this has always been the case

[12] See Martin, 2016, for instance.

for signed language interpreting, it was not for spoken language interpreting. The greater weight of such countries in IS also strengthens the inclusiveness trend.

While there is more IS research in more parts of the world, IS is not fully 'globalized' because of language barriers. Interestingly, in TS and IS, the prevalence of English as a lingua franca is perhaps not as strong as in most other academic disciplines. In Japan, Korea and China, TS and IS researchers often publish in their respective national languages, and their publications are not accessible to Western readers. In the West, many authors also publish in French, German, Italian or Spanish, but many of them also publish in English and many TS and IS researchers from other countries can read their publications. Thus, while citation scores are certainly lower for such texts, they are far more available to the IS community at large than texts in Chinese, Japanese or Korean.

3.4 The evolution of IS from prescriptive to exploratory

The initial form of IS as it developed around the elitist tradition of conference interpreting as seen by AIIC was largely prescriptive, with postulates about the interpreting process and cognitive and linguistic requirements from interpreters. The exploratory studies by psychologists and psycholinguists were rejected, and other exploratory studies by interpreters were ignored. In the late 1980s, the voice of those 'practisearchers' (interpreters cum researchers) who pushed for more open and more 'scientific' exploration of reality (more in line with the fundamental norms and methods of scientific investigation) began to be heard. This meant not only that researchers began to look systematically for theories from cognate disciplines, but also that a growing number of empirical studies began to be conducted and published, partly to test ideas that had been presented previously as postulates validated by professional experience, such as ideas about directionality, the language in which consecutive notes should be taken, or ideas about interpreting quality, but also to develop new theories and test new ideas.

3.5 Better research competence

Many pioneering practisearchers who became influential during the first two decades of IS started doing research without having been trained in research methods – as opposed to a few who were trained (e.g. Ingrid Pinter Kurz) but whose voice was hardly heard. When they started supervising research by their own students, they could not offer much research

competence. Things improved gradually as research production increased, IS opened up to more 'scientific' research, and practisearchers became more aware of the literature, theories and methods of cognate disciplines.

Over the past two decades or so, there has been a marked improvement in the general level of research competence within IS. Young researchers read more about research methods, and some training is given more systematically. The merits and limitations of different methods are discussed with reference to the experience and opinions of experts from cognate disciplines, a few collective volumes devoted to research methodology within TS in general (e.g. HERMANS, 2002; SALDANHA; O'BRIEN, 2014; ANGELELLI; BAER, 2016) and IS in particular (GILE et al., 2001; NICODEMUS; SWABEY, 2011; HALE; NAPIER, 2013; BENDAZZOLI; MONACELLI, 2016) have been published, and both qualitative and quantitative methods, including rather sophisticated statistical and other quantitative methods are being used in empirical research. Interestingly, some fundamental weaknesses such as faulty logic, misunderstandings about basic statistical concepts and overgeneralization are still relatively frequent even when the methods themselves are advanced, which suggests that more efforts are required to help young researchers acquire a true 'scientific' mindset when doing empirical research, but the overall level of scholarship in IS has come a long way among practisearchers since the 1970s.

4. Traditions? The 1970s vs. the 2010s

As explained earlier, when IS took off, it was mainly interested in conference interpreting cognition and training and was informed by postulates and traditions associated with particular historical circumstances and the wish to establish interpreting as a high-level intellectual profession. IS pioneers constructed an attractive theoretical framework – Interpretive Theory – which became a quasi-universal reference for interpreters in spite of a weak theoretical and empirical basis. Both the framework and the associated training methods have remained influential as regards conference interpreting, but have lost their virtually unchallenged authority of the 1970s and 1980s. Over the past forty years, the field has opened up to new foci and new approaches, clearly more suited to interpreting settings other than conference rooms of international organizations. Cards were reshuffled, and while traditions largely persist as regards the practice of, training in and research into conference interpreting –

which is probably a good thing in spite of their weaknesses – in the case of community interpreting, to which they are not necessarily suited, there is no single dominant paradigm.

The overall situation also differs considerably from what it was in the 1960s and 1970s, at the very beginning of IS, in other aspects. The most fundamental change is that a large body of thousands of people all over the world, including interpreting practitioners and trainers but also an increasing number of academic publishers and researchers from cognate disciplines, view translation in general and interpreting in particular as worthy objects of research. They accept the idea of an autonomous academic discipline dedicated to T & I and the relevance of such research by translators and interpreters as opposed to linguists, psychologists, literature scholars etc. This is evidenced inter alia by the existence of many journals, monographs and collective volumes published/established within universities and by well-known national and international publishers such as John Benjamins and Routledge. There is no longer a feeling that IS needs to protect itself from a potential takeover by other disciplines, which may have been one of the reasons why Seleskovitch opted for a 'closed'/protectionist policy in the 1970s. IS investigators now feel encouraged to look for theories and research methods in cognate disciplines, which has resulted in improvements in IS scholarship. Another interesting feature of IS is that it is not (yet) constrained by the formalities of old academic traditions. In particular, authors of essays or empirical research reports need not be holders of a PhD or have an academic affiliation in order to be taken seriously or be published. This opens up possibilities for interesting contributions.

5. Prospects for the future

The situation is therefore very favorable, perhaps more favorable than ever, to the development of an open, diversified IS. Opportunities are clearly good for exploratory research into uncharted and under-researched settings of community interpreting and signed language interpreting. This entails inter alia simple experiments, ethnographic studies, surveys, questionnaires, focus groups and the like as opposed to complex methods which require much technical knowledge and knowhow.

However, their technical (relative) simplicity also entails the risk of amateurism: questionnaires and interviews, especially, are valuable tools which need to be handled with much preparation and care, and incorrect sampling and the lack of awareness of potential ambiguities in questions and of factors which cause respondents to give inaccurate or incorrect

information can have very damaging effects on the value of the relevant investigations. This is why it is important, whenever possible, to seek advice or even training from colleagues from departments of sociology or ethnology. Another possibility is to organize methodological seminars by TS and IS scholars with training and experience in such research and awareness of the pitfalls.

Incidentally, the caution and awareness of potential pitfalls mentioned above in connection with behavioral science methods is actually required across the board in scientific investigation, and unawareness and/or lack of caution jeopardize severely the value of research, regardless of how technically sophisticated the methods are. Moreover, reading about methodology is one thing; being able to act in effective compliance with its norms is another, which generally requires hands-on-training with guidance from experienced researchers over some time. Such guidance is available when working closely with a conscientious and available supervisor, or through courses in research methods with multiple exercises, but severe flaws found in unpublished and even published research shows that trusting one's sole intelligence and motivation to translate texts on methodology into effective research is risky.

Another challenge for IS in some countries is linguistic. English has become the lingua franca in TS and IS, and it is difficult to keep up-to-date with the literature for those who cannot read it in English. Neither is it easy for them to have their work known and acknowledged internationally if they cannot publish in English. A career can start with publications in a national language even when its geographic reach is small (e.g. Italian as opposed to French or Spanish), and some TS and IS authors have built their academic career without publishing in a language other than their own, especially in East Asia, but it has clearly become an advantage for both the discipline as a whole and for individual researchers to have publications in English on their CV in spite of the losses that this also entails.

The geographic remoteness of Brazil from Europe and the fact that reading skills in Portuguese are not widespread in the international TS community has not prevented Brazilian TS from being active and productive, though the internationally best known Brazilian TS researchers are those who also publish in English. Basically, the same should apply to Brazilian IS, though a higher proportion of authors in community interpreting and signed language interpreting than in TS may find it difficult to write in English and perhaps even read complex texts in English. And yet, their contribution could be particularly valuable because there is

probably a lot to explore and discuss with respect to particular settings, issues and solutions involving Brazil, Portuguese and Brazilian sign language.

A few recommendations can be made for national IS communities which are in the first stages of their development or wish to accelerate their development, as might be the case in Brazil:

1. In most countries, possibly with the exception of China and Japan, TS has a far larger population of researchers in academia and more resources than IS. Since there is a large common ground between various forms of translation and interpreting, including institutional and methodological challenges and common themes (suffice it to mention training, language-specific issues, roles, cognitive processes during translation and interpreting, the history of translation and interpreting or quality perception and assessment), it makes sense to pool together the resources of both and cooperate with the national TS community, in particular as regards conferences, workshops, journals and other publications, as well as efforts to gain academic and social recognition. Another point is that there is a high potential for cross-fertilization between research into spoken language interpreting and signed language interpreting, which are similar and yet different and could therefore offer revealing stereoscopic insights into various aspects of interpreter-mediated communication, including linguistic and socio-linguistic factors and quality expectations and perception.

2. Interdisciplinarity is of course critical to the development of IS (and of TS), but blind compliance with operational norms from cognate disciplines can be counterproductive when the environment of interpreting differs too much from the environment of the disciplines where the norms were developed. This is particularly relevant when borrowing methods from cognitive psychology, because the gold standard of hypothesis-testing experiments against which empirical research is often assessed as 'science' loses much of its power in an environment where demographics make it difficult to recruit participants for experiments and to hope for many replications when studying phenomena where intra-individual, and especially inter-individual variability, is very high. By contrast, sociological, ethnological and historical methods can be implemented more easily. This does not mean that experiments should not be conducted in IS – far from that, but the methods and criteria need to be adapted on the basis of a sound understanding of the merits and drawbacks of each. In particular, simple experiments with small samples can in the long term be as powerful as canonical experiments which, by the way, are also case studies as regards experimental conditions (they generally compare a very

small number of experimental conditions and one combination of parameters). If replicated a sufficient number of times, the convergence of results – or the lack thereof – can be very instructive. In this respect, the example of clinical (medical) research in which meta-analysis of findings from studies on non-random samples is often conducted is a reference worth studying.

3. Against this background, fostering replication by students for their graduation thesis is a good way to make such simple, small sample size research useful to the IS community by generating cumulative data. It is also a way of facilitating entry into research to students by having them look carefully at previous research, explaining it to them and letting them discover through their own experience some nuts and bolts of actual design implementation without going through an often lengthy and difficult process of topic selection and research design. Those who are really interested in research can then move on to more advanced research.

4. Simple research is not tantamount to second-rate research. Whatever the methodology, be it naturalistic or experimental, qualitative or quantitative (or mixed), systematic and rigorous thinking, acting and reporting are what makes research scientific. Training and raising the awareness of IS and TS researchers in this respect is definitely important for the development of the discipline. While it may not be realistic to include full research methods courses in interpreter training curricula with a professional orientation (as opposed to an academic orientation), supervisors of graduation theses should benefit from such training. Attending undergraduate research methods courses in cognate disciplines is one good option, provided more than one research paradigm is studied, to give supervisors a wide view of research, as opposed to a restrictive, self-limiting one[13]. Peer reviewing for collective volumes and TS and IS journals should also be strict, not only as part of the quality control required in any discipline, but also as part of hands-on training, as peer reviewers' input is a good opportunity to become aware of one's weaknesses and to improve one's level of scholarship.

5. While being able to publish in English has become necessary to gain international recognition – which is particularly important in IS because of its very small size in any individual country except China – starting out in one's native language (if it is not English) has two advantages. Firstly, it allows peer reviewers and supervisors to guide authors into being

[13] See the analysis earlier in this text.

linguistically rigorous when reporting their research. This attention to rigorous writing, which is presumably more efficient when dealing with a native language than with an acquired one, can reasonably be expected to lead to more rigorous thinking and acting in one's research as well. Secondly, publishing one's first texts in one's native language, perhaps in national journals and/or collective volumes, leaves young researchers less exposed internationally. When their skills have improved, they can move on to international publication vehicles in English.

To sum up, developments over the past decades have opened up possibilities for IS, so that remoteness and the lack of financial means are no longer a serious obstacle for the development of serious research. With motivation, determination to be rigorous and willingness to work, virtually any practicing interpreter and interpreting teacher can become a valuable member of the international IS community.

References

ANGELELLI, C. V.; BAER, B. J. (Ed.). **Researching Translation and Interpreting**. London; New York: Routledge, 2016.

BENDAZZOLI, C.; MONACELLI, C. (Ed.). **Addressing Methodological Challenges in Interpreting Studies Research**. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2016.

FUKUII, H.; ASANO, T. **Eigotsuuyaku no jissai (An English Interpreter's Manual)**. Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1961.

GAO, B.; CHAI, M. J. A Citation Analysis of Simultaneous Interpreting Studies in China. **East Journal of Translation**, Shangai, Special Issue, p. 16-23, 2014. English translation of the same paper published in Chinese in the **Chinese Translators Journal**, Shangai, n. 4, p. 15-20, 2010.

GILE, D. **Regards sur la recherche en interprétation de conférence**. Lille: Presses Universitaires de Lille, 1995.

GILE, D.; DAM, H ; DUBSLAFF, F.; MARTINSEN, B.; SCHOLDAGER, A. (Ed.). **Getting Started in Interpreting Research**, Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.33

HALE, S.; NAPIER, J. **Research Methods in Interpreting**. London; New York: Bloombury, 2013.

HERBERT, J. **Le manuel de l'interprète**. Genève: Georg, 1952.

HERMANS, T. **Crosscultural Transgressions**: Research Methods in Translation Studies II. Manchester: St. Jerome, 2002.

HOLMES, J. The name and nature of translation studies. In: VENUTI, L. (Ed.) **The Translation Studies Reader**. London; New York: Routledge, 2000 [1972], p. 172-185.

MARTIN, A. Interpreting and Ideology: Research Trends and Methods. In: BENDAZZOLI, C.; MONACELLI, C. (Ed.). **Addressing Methodological Challenges in Interpreting Studies Research**. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, p. 225-244, 2016.

NICODEMUS, B.; SWABEY, L. (Ed). **Advances in Interpreting Research**: Inquiry in Action. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2011. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.99

PÖCHHACKER, F. Interpreting Studies. In: _____. (Ed.). **Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies**. London; New York: Routledge, 2015, p. 201-206.

ROZAN, J. F. **La prise de notes en interprétation consécutive**. Genève: Georg, 1956.

SACHS, J.S. Recognition memory for syntactic and semantic aspects of connected discourse. **Perception and psychophysics**, Madison, v. 2, n. 9, p. 437-442, 1967. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03208784

SALDANHA, G.; O'BRIEN, S. **Research Methodologies in Translation Studies**. Manchester: St. Jerome, 2014.

WADENSJÖ, C. **Interpreting as Interaction**: On Dialogue Interpreting in Immigration Hearings and Medical Encounters. Linköping: Linköping University, 1992.

Artigo recebido em: 09.01.2017 Artigo aprovado em: 03.06.2017