



EST Congress 2022

Advancing Translation Studies

June 22-24, 2022 - Oslo, Norway

hf.uio.no/est

Panel Themes

The following panels will structure the 10th Congress

1 Crisis Translation (1)	4
2 Crisis Translation (2): Ethical Issues and Training Challenges	6
3 Public Service Interpreting and Translation (PSIT) in the times of a pandemic: the past, the present and the future	8
4 Translation policies and practices in multilingual settings: concepts, methodologies, and case studies	10
5 Migration and translation at a crossroad	12
6 Revisiting trust in high-stakes intercultural mediation: Theoretical and methodological concerns	14
7 Revisiting Descriptive Translation Studies	16
8 Additional Language Teaching in Translation and Interpreting programmes – examining the specificity perspective	18
9 Navigating uncharted waters: towards reframing translator education	20
10 Psycho-affectivity in translator and interpreter education	22
11 Advancing Translation Studies through Language Industry Studies	24
12 Dialogue Interpreter Training Outside the University Context	26
13 Accessibility in Context: Inclusiveness in Specialised Translation and Interpreting	28
14 Extending translatoriality beyond professional contexts	30
15 Non-professional interpreting and translation: advancement and subversion	32

16 Interdisciplinarity and interaction: moving forward with journalistic translation research in the 21st Century	34
17 Interlingual and intralingual translation in science news flows	36
18 Commonalities of and differences between interpreting strands	38
19 Sign Language Interpreting: Research and Global Practices. Bridging Gaps and Linking Worlds	40
20 Video Remote Interpreting in Healthcare	42
21 The virtual shift in conference interpreting practice and research	44
22 Interpreting in Religious Contexts at the Intersection of Disciplines	46
23 Advancing Translation Process Research	48
24 Advancing TS through think-aloud: Showcasing a challenging but unique method	50
25 The Reality of Revision	52
26 Keylogging typing flows in mediated communication	54
27 Past, present and future of speech technologies in translation — life beyond the keyboard	56
28 Advancing Translation Studies by understanding the Labour in Translaboration	58
29 Advancing Translation Studies through task-comparative and hybrid task research into multilectal communication	60
30 Translation and Tourism: Encounters through space and language	62
31 Is Machine Translation Translation?	64
32 Advancing Translation Studies: integrating research on the translational construction of the social world	66
33 The Self-Translation of Knowledge: Scholarship in Migration	68
34 Re-thinking Translation History: Genealogies, Geo-politics, and Counter-hegemonic Approaches	71
35 Crossing minorities in translation history: peripheries, gender and less translated languages	73
36 Literary Translation and Soft Power in the Longue Durée	75

37 Translation and transcultural circulation of memory narratives	77
38 Advancing intradisciplinary research on indirect translation	79
39 Advancing Intralingual Translation	81
40 No Kidding – Translating, Transcreating and Transmediating for Children	83
41 Being a literary translator in the digital age: Agency, identity and ethics	86
42 New Perspectives on Ibsen in Translation	88
43 Song Translation Studies	89
44 Popular music and cultural transfer	91
45A Global Perspective on Translation Flows	93
46 Exploring translation policy in translation publishing	95
47 Between Tradition and Advancement: How Can Translational Hermeneutics Contribute to Contemporary Translation Studies?	97
48 The #namethetranslator Campaign in Perspective	99
49 What cognition does for interpreting - what interpreting does for cognition?	100

1 Crisis Translation (1)

Conveners: Sharon O'Brien, Federico M. Federici, Minako O'Hagan

Even prior to the global Covid-19 pandemic, Translation Studies had turned its attention to the important role of translation and interpreting in mediating emergencies (e.g. Federici and O'Brien, 2020) and, in so doing, started to build bridges with the fields of Disaster Studies (Alexander and Pescaroli 2020) and Crisis Communication (Schwarz et al 2016) and has advanced discussion on policy (O'Brien et al 2018), on citizen translator training (Federici et al 2021), and on the ethical aspects of the field, among other things. The global Covid-19 pandemic has since underlined the need to investigate and lobby for the study and application of translation and interpreting in crisis response, as well as the need to build more bridges and consolidate conversations with other disciplines. To this end, we propose a panel dedicated to a broad variety of topics that touch on the concept of Crisis Translation. The panel organisers welcome proposals that go beyond considering the role of professional translation and interpreting in response to crisis situations to broader topics such as:

- Indigenous languages, minority languages and crisis translation
- Accessibility, sign-language and crisis translation
- Human rights, the law and crisis translation Translation/Interpreting for crisis preparedness
- Translation/Interpreting for crisis recovery
- Multimodal translation for crisis communication
- Intralingual translation for crisis communication (e.g. literacy and plain language)
- Intersemiotic translation for crisis communication (e.g. use of pictograms or with or instead of language)
- Training requirements and innovative training methods for crisis translation
- AI, technology, human and non-human agents and crisis translation
- Trauma and crisis translation
- Collaboration and crisis translation
- Directionality and crisis translation

- Terminology and crisis translation
- Ethics, credibility, accountability and risk in crisis translation.

References

Alexander, David and Gianluca Pescaroli 2020. 'The role of translators and interpreters in cascading crises and disasters: Towards a framework for confronting the challenges', *Disaster Prevention and Management* 29(2): 144-156.

Federici, Federico M. and Sharon O'Brien (eds). 2020. *Translation in Cascading Crises*. Routledge.

Federici, Federico M., Minako O'Hagan, Patrick Cadwell, Jay Marlowe, and Sharon O'Brien. 2021. 'Empowering Communities and Professionals with Crisis Translation Training' In: Minako O'Hagan and Judy Wakabayashi (eds). *Translating and Interpreting in Australia and New Zealand: The Impact of Geocultural Factors*. Routledge.

O'Brien, Sharon, Federico M. Federici, Patrick Cadwell, Jay Marlowe, Brian Gerber. 2018. 'Language translation during disaster: A comparative analysis of five national approaches'. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 31: 627-636.

Schwarz, Andreas, Matthew W. Seeger, and Claudia Auer (eds). 2016. *The Handbook of International Crisis Communication Research*. Wiley.

2 Crisis Translation (2): Ethical Issues and Training Challenges

Conveners: Anna Romagnuolo, Aba Carina Parlog

Humanitarian crises -- including man-made conflicts, environmental disasters, and pandemics, have proved, especially in recent times, that they may not only raise and increase human rights concerns for the affected population, but that their resolution, aid intervention, victims' recovery, policy makers' response and duty-bearers' accountability often depend on clear and efficient communication and adequate and relevant translation. As confirmed in recent studies conducted by Translators without Borders (The Lancet Global Health, 2019), and research funded by European Projects such as H2020 INTERACT, not only scientific collaboration rests on improving language skills and cultural understanding among researchers from different countries, but also and more importantly, survivors of human rights abuses and disaster victims, marginalized and discriminated groups, and people at risk can tell their story and get access to useful, oftentimes life-saving information only when this is available in the language they understand. Medical information in language combinations not easily available on the translation job market, fake news, and infodemics exacerbated by the coronavirus global disease have made even more pressing the long-standing needs of intercultural mediators well versed in human rights protection, which, if properly understood, include a broad range of economic and social rights, and of non-language specific crisis translation training, which can develop the appropriate linguistic skillsets necessary to help medical writers contributing to knowledge translation platforms, disaster relief operators, aid volunteers, social workers and service providers, all dealing with multilingual and multicultural groups. The objective of this panel is that of exploring ethical issues at stake, epistemic injustice risks in time-scarce environment, efficient translation practices, and training challenges faced in preparing language experts involved in communication activities that should support disaster management.

References

Declercq, C., Federici F. M. (Eds.). (2019). *Intercultural Crisis Communication. Translation, Interpreting and Languages in Local Crises*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Federici, F. M., O'Brien, S. (Eds.). (2019). *Translation in Cascading Crisis*. Routledge.

Monzó-Nebot, E., Wallace, M. (Eds.). (2020). *Ethics of Non-Professional Translation and Interpreting*, Special issue of *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 15.1.

Taibi, M. Ozolins, U. 2016. *Community Translation*. Bloomsbury.

Todorova, M., Ruiz Rosendo, L. (Eds.). (2021). *Interpreting Conflict: A Comparative Framework*. Palgrave.

3 Public Service Interpreting and Translation (PSIT) in the times of a pandemic: the past, the present and the future

Conveners: Carmen Valero-Garcés, Nune Ayvazyan

The global pandemic that hit the world in 2019 was unprecedented in that it happened in a world that was used to the highest level of mobility in human history. All of a sudden, the world came to a halt, which has affected (and will possibly reshape) migratory flows, including migration for work and for asylum (European Commission 2020). This situation has again reminded us that in the event of a crisis, the most vulnerable might be at risk of losing their fundamental language, and therefore human rights (United Nations), something impermissible in modern-day democratic societies. During the pandemic, in many countries face-to-face communication has been reduced to a minimum. Where a proficient speaker of a language could communicate freely on the telephone or interact with social services on the Internet, less privileged ones have seen their access to virtually all types of information drastically curtailed. Translation, and in particular interpreting services might have been inaccessible to those vulnerable, even more than before the pandemic. The question is whether the pandemic has also changed the way we will communicate in the “new normal” (for example, possible extended use of remote communication) and how this might affect those at risk of exclusion. The time is ripe for us as a discipline to prepare for the challenges of the future, as our “understanding of the complexities of translation and interpreting practices and their contexts, requirements, and constraints is still developing” (Monzó-Nebot and Wallace 2020: 20). This panel is therefore concerned with identifying the challenges posed by the “new normal” and how public service interpreting and translation (PSIT) has been affected by it. Researchers are invited to submit abstracts related but not limited to topics such as:

- How has the pandemic affected access to public service interpreting and translation?
- Which role does language play as an instrument of communication and integration in pandemic times?
- Which role have languages access played during the health crisis: translated materials and resources for immigrants?
- Which role have languages of lesser diffusion (LLD) played during the pandemic?
- How has technology influenced/helped the provision of remote PSIT during the pandemic?

- What are the challenges posed by a possible change to a more virtual type of communication?
- How can interpreters and translators adapt to the “new normal”?
- What changes should be implemented in the training of public service translators and interpreters?
- What - if any - quality improvements in TISP quality are observed during the pandemic?

References

Corpas Pastor, Gloria and Mahmoud Gaber. 2020. “Remote interpreting in public service settings: technology, perceptions and practice”. In *SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation* 13(2): 58-78.

European Commission. 2020. “How is the coronavirus reshaping migration worldwide?” <https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/news/how-coronavirus-reshaping-migration-worldwide> .

FITISPos IJ. 2020. Special issue. *Research Methods in Public Service Interpreting and Translation (PSIT) / Métodos de investigación en TISP*. Monzó-Nebot, Ester & Melissa Wallace (guest eds.). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37536/FITISPos-IJ.2020.7.1>.

Revista de Llengua i Dret, Journal of Language and Law. 2019. Monographic section. *Legal translation and interpreting in public services*. Wallace, Melissa, & Monzó Nebot, Esther (eds), 2019, 71. <http://revistes.eapc.gencat.cat/index.php/rld/issue/view/n71> .

United Nations. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights..>

Valero Garcés, Carmen (ed). 2020. *Technology at the service of PSIT in crisis situations: Experiences and Perspectives*. Alcalá de Henares: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad.

Valero Garcés, Carmen (ed). 202. *El factor humano en el TISP. Investigación y testimonios de la primavera de 2020 / The Human Factor in PSIT. Research and Testimonials of Spring 2020*. Alcalá de Henares: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad.

4 Translation policies and practices in multilingual settings: concepts, methodologies, and case studies

Conveners: Simo Määttä, Shuang Li, Tanya Escudero

The COVID-19 pandemic has proven the importance of providing information reaching all members of multilingual societies, both in cities characterized by superdiversity and in less-densely populated rural areas. However, the high rates of COVID-19 cases in migrant and minority populations show that many communication strategies have not been successful (Finell et al. 2021). This brings to the fore the topics of community translation (Taibi 2018) and translation policy (González Núñez & Meylaerts 2017), as well as the potential of translation policies and practices in achieving trust relationships and influencing changes in behavior. A burgeoning interest in the connection between translation policy and theories provides insights that benefit Translation Studies (Meylaerts, 2017), and the examination of the intersections among theories, policies and practices needs continued attention. Such analyses could advance Translation Studies by taking into account insights from multilingual and superdiverse settings where translation forms part of everyday life (Inghilleri 2017). At the same time, they could help develop better policies and practices for community and public service translation on local, regional, and national levels. For this panel, we invite theoretical or methodological contributions and case studies addressing the intersections among the policies, theories, and practices of translation in multilingual settings, including the languages of migration and regional or minority languages. Potential topics include, but are not restricted to the following:

- Guidelines for effective translation policies
- Production and itinerary of translated, interpreted and subtitled information • Professional and non-professional translation practices
- Translation policies and inclusive urbanization
- Intersections between public-service translation and interpreting
- Theoretical, methodological, and ethical reflections on the creation and evolution of translation policies and practices
- Rethinking traditional binary oppositions, such as source/target, majority/minority, monolingual/multilingual, local/global, center/periphery, urban/rural, trust/distrust, and agency/structure through the lens of translation policies

- Methodological and theoretical tools offered by adjacent disciplines (such as sociolinguistics, anthropology, sociology, political science, public policy, and legal studies).

This panel has two discussants: Reine Meylaerts, KU Leuven; Mustapha Taibi, Western Sydney University.

References

Finell, E., Tiilikainen, M., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Hasan, N., & Muthana, F. 2021. Lived experience related to the COVID-19 pandemic among Arabic-, Russian- and Somali-speaking migrants in Finland. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18, 2601. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18052601>

González Núñez, G. & Meylaerts, R. 2017. *Translation and Public Policy: Interdisciplinary Perspectives and Case Studies*. London: Routledge. Inghilleri, M. 2017. *Translation and Migration*. New York: Routledge.

Meylaerts, R. (2017). Studying language and translation policies in Belgium: What can we learn from a complexity theory approach? *Parallèles* 29(1), 45–59. doi:10.17462/para.2017.01.05

Taibi, M. (ed.) 2018. *Translating for the Community*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

5 Migration and translation at a crossroad

Conveners: Celia Rico, María del Mar Sánchez

Migration is a complex phenomenon. There are a myriad of circumstances that intervene in the migratory journey, right from route planning at the pre-departure phase, to orientation on arrival, and settling at the final stage. Along this journey, multilingual communication in the written form is essential in the following aspects, to name but a few: a) for accessing information about travel routes, borders and safety issues; b) for identity-verification processes; c) for navigating services on arrival; or d) for finding sustainable solutions in long-term integration. Along the migratory journey, translation is vital not only in facilitating the instrumental access to knowledge but also in establishing relationships of trust, of mutual respect and intercultural understanding. In this context, translators play a key role in enhancing communication, providing access to information and advocating for and on behalf of the people they work with (Tesseur 2018, 5). But migration is essentially about people and, from this perspective, we need to remind ourselves that “it is not only texts that travel” (Polezzi 2012, 347) and, in this respect, migrants can be considered both as agents (self-translators) and objects of translation. For the picture to be complete, we also need to refer to the role of third sector organisations in shaping language mediation in the context of migratory flows in all its forms and characteristics. In acknowledgement of this complex background, and under the framework of the research projects INMIGRA and RECRI (see below) this panel aims at exploring which language practices connected to migration can be linked to translation in a written form, fostering discussions on how translation can contribute to future strategies in migration, and analysing its place in Translation Studies. By identifying gaps in current research, this panel seeks to start mapping translation activities in a sector that has remained somewhat overlooked. Together with practical issues on the access to the written (digital) text along the migratory journey (needs, practices, locations, agents), thorough discussions are expected on the notions of identity and power, research methodologies, and translation as a linguistic activity. The ultimate goal is to lay the ground for a conceptualization of translation and migration as a specific discipline in the framework of Translation Studies, one that recognizes “the increased centrality of migration and of translation (as notions but also as practices) in contemporary society” (Polezzi 2012, 345). Potential topics include (but not restricted to) the following:

- Original and translated representations of migration -Corpus methodologies applied to the representation of migration
- Translation in multilingual humanitarian settings

- Discourse analysis and migration
- Narrative identity and translation in migrant settings
- Translation and political action
- Research methodologies in migration studies
- Translation technology and migration.

This panel is a joint proposal of the following research projects:

- INMIGRA (H2019/HUM-5772) is a research project funded by the autonomous Government of Madrid (Spain) that aims at analysing the migrant population in the region in a multidimensional study.
- RECRI (Original, translated and interpreted representations of the refugee crisis(es): methodological triangulation within corpus-based discourse studies) is a research project funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (Spain).

References

Baker, M. 2020. Rehumanizing the migrant: the translated past as a resource for refashioning the contemporary discourse of the (radical) left. *Palgrave Communications*, 6 (12), 1-16. doi: 6:12 | <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-019-0386>

Inghilleri, M. 2017. *Translation and Migration*. London: Routledge Polezzi. L. 2012. Translation and migration, *Translation Studies*, 5(3), 345-356, DOI: 10.1080/14781700.2012.701943

Rico, C. 2019. Mapping Translation Technology and the Multilingual Needs of NGOs along the Aid Chain, in O'Brien, S. & Federici, F. (eds) *Translation in Cascading Crisis*. London: Routledge, 112-131.

Tesseur, W. 2018. Researching translation and interpreting in Non-Governmental Organisations. *Translation Spaces* 7(1): 1-19. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.00001.tes>

6 Revisiting trust in high-stakes intercultural mediation: Theoretical and methodological concerns

Conveners: Bei Hu, Susana Valdez, Valentina Ragni

Ever since Gideon Toury assembled Descriptive Translation Studies, descriptivists have considered trust one of the central values underlying the translator's observable, norm-informed behaviour (Chesterman 2001). The sociological turn in the late 1990s inspired a growing body of interdisciplinary research that not only focuses on the way in which trust maintains the translator's (and the interpreter's) social status (e.g. Edwards, Temple and Claire 2005) but also investigates how trust is contextualised in various translation forms as social practices (e.g. Pym 2005; Abdallah and Koskinen 2007). Recent views on trust from a historical translator-centred perspective (Rizzi, Lang and Pym 2019) have opened up theoretical reflection towards a more comprehensive model of trust-building, advocating trust's place at the centre of translation history. It is argued that by studying translation with reference to trust from sociological, philosophical, historical and technological dimensions, we can advance a clearer understanding of the translator's textual and cultural decision-making, and hopefully address issues of complex social causation patterns that advance or hinder intercultural communication.

However, the epistemological scope and practical implications of the role of trust remain unclear, at the same time as there is a lack of consensus on methodological apparatuses. These factors tend to limit theoretical discussions, reducing trust to a marginal consideration in wider discussions of translation ethics. In addition, while research on trust typically gives more prominence to translators, the implications for the reception of translations have received very little systematic attention to date, with fewer empirical contributions on the subject (Rossetti, O'Brien and Cadwell 2020).

We suggest that the notion of trust as an epistemological scepticism, advanced object of study, key socio-cultural aim or analytical tool creates opportunities for providing nuanced accounts of the underlying mechanisms of the production and reception of translational practices. This panel thus aims to discuss how trust plays a key role in translation in all its modalities, including orality, textuality, language, sociology, technology and culture. We are particularly interested in tracing the ways in which trust is built and maintained in high-stakes intercultural mediation.

We invite papers contributing to the following suggested topics, among others:

- How does trust shape translational dynamics, power relations between various agents and translation norms?

- Who and what is trusted in translational communication?
- In what sense, or to what extent, can trust (in various kinds) be built or re-built in translational activities?
- Under what conditions does mistrust occur in the translation system? With what implications?
- How does trust affect public health responses in the Covid-19 pandemic?
- Can translation technologies enhance the level of trust in intercultural mediation? If so, how?
- How does trust in translators or translations affect trust between cultures?
- What (empirical) methodological and analytical approaches are best suited for in-depth analyses of trust-based intercultural interactions?

References

- Abdallah, Kristiina and Kaisa Koskinen (2007). Managing Trust: Translating and the Network Economy. *Meta* 52(4): 673-687.
- Chesterman, Andrew (2001). Proposal for a Hieronymic Oath. *The Translator* 7(2): 139–154.
- Edwards, Rosalind, Bogusia Temple and Claire Alexander. (2005). Users' experiences of interpreters: The critical role of trust. *Interpreting* 7(1): 77-95.
- Rizzi, Andrea, Birgit Lang and Anthony Pym (2019). *What is Translation History? A Trust-Based Approach*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rossetti, Alessandra, Sharon O'Brien and Patrick Cadwell (2020). Comprehension and trust in crises: investigating the impact of machine translation and post-editing. In: 22nd Annual Conference of the European Association for Machine Translation (EAMT 2020). <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.eamt-1.2/>
- Pym, Anthony (2005). Propositions on cross-cultural communication and translation. *Target* 16(1), 1–28.

7 Revisiting Descriptive Translation Studies

Conveners: Omri Asscher, Galia Hirsch, Hilla Karas

Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) - in its more restricted sense as the systematic theoretical approach introduced by Gideon Toury (1995/2012), or as an umbrella term for the diverse discourse of descriptive scholarship that developed alongside or following Toury's work (Pym 2014, 62-85) - played a seminal role in the maturation of the discipline of translation studies. Arguably the first attempt to systematically explain translation phenomena in their historical and cultural contexts, DTS brought a sociological sensibility to the discipline which had heretofore been lacking. In recent years, DTS seems to have fallen out of favor. It has been subjected to criticism for importing the goals of the exact sciences, for endorsing an overly dichotomous target-oriented approach, for demonstrating insufficient self-criticism and self-reflexivity, and for not concentrating enough on power relations and ideology, nor on the translator as an agent (Rosa 2010/2016). However, DTS's flexible and highly applicable tools for the study of translation maintain their relevance, and remain foundational for the descriptive analysis of case studies. Moreover, some of the ideological and theoretical critique that DTS drew may have been more indebted to its insights than is often acknowledged. This panel seeks to revisit DTS's major concepts and contributions, by engaging them with contemporary trends in translation theory and reality. Its intention is to suggest the value of approaching new developments in the study of translation - with regards to technology, globalization, history, activism, ecology, emotions, multimodality, interpreting, intralingual translation, adaptation, and other expanding subfields of our discipline - from a distinctly DTS perspective; and to explore how recent developments in these areas can contribute to a better understanding of DTS's theoretical merits and/or shortcomings. Along these lines, we welcome proposals that bring new light to the contributions of DTS, including, but not limited to, its notions of:

- translation norms (initial, preliminary, operational)
- universals and laws
- target-orientedness
- shifts
- assumed translation
- pseudo-translation
- indirect translation

- translation equivalence
- adequacy and acceptability.

References

Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1978/2000. "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem," in: Lawrence Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (New York and London: Routledge), 193-197.

Hermans, Theo. 1999. *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Pym, Anthony. 2014. *Exploring Translation Theories*. London: Routledge.

Rosa, Alexandra Assis. 2016. "Descriptive Translation Studies – DTS." In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, 94–104. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Toury, Gideon. 1995/2012. *Descriptive Translation Studies – and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Weissbrod, Rachel. 2004. "From translation to transfer." *Across languages and cultures* 5.1: 23-41.

8 Additional Language Teaching in Translation and Interpreting programmes – examining the specificity perspective

Conveners: Melita Koletnik, Astrid Schmidhofer, Enrique Cerezo Herrero

Additional language teaching (ALT) in Translation and Interpreting programmes presents itself as a specific teaching approach (see, e.g., Berenguer 1999; Beeby 2004; González Davies 2004, Cruz García and Adams 2008; Clouet 2010; Li 2001, Cerezo Herrero 2019) that lies at the intersection of Translation Studies and Additional Language Teaching. Consequently, its objectives and methods need to be geared to the students' future language use in professional translation and mediation settings. Most scholars who have dedicated their research to ALT in TI programmes would agree that this needs to be different from general language courses. In this context, since the late-1990s, the inherent association between ALT in TI programmes and the tenets of teaching of Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP) has been discussed (see, e.g., Berenguer 1997, Cruz García 2017, Cerezo Herrero 2018, Carrasco Flores, 2019; Koletnik 2021), particularly in terms of curricular considerations and fundamental methodological concerns, such as the primacy of a needs-based and target-oriented approach to language learning and teaching. However, the specificity perspective and the practical applications of adapting such an approach in ALT in TI programmes have received insufficient attention within Translation Studies and evidence, particularly empirical, is limited. The panellist would thus like to invite papers and presentations that reflect on the association between Translation Studies and Additional Language Teaching in Translator and Interpreter programmes. The core topics include, but are not limited to, cross-disciplinary informed ontological considerations and methodological implications, and theoretical and applied pedagogical and didactic insight, particularly in the following areas: syllabus design and language curriculum development, linguistic needs analysis and target identification, expertise and professional language use, bi- and multilingual practices, contrastive perspective, materials development, assessment and testing, teacher and student aspects, and technology-supported and -enabled ALT for future translators and interpreters.

References

SCHMIEDHOFER, Astrid, CEREZO HERRERO, Enrique, KOLETNIK Melita. (forthcoming). Why We Need TI-Oriented Language Learning and Teaching (TILLT). *ELOPE* 18(1).

SCHMIEDHOFER, Astrid, and CEREZO HERRERO, Enrique (eds.) (forthcoming) *Foreign Language Teaching in Translation and Interpreting Programmes*. Berlin: Peter Lang.

KOLETNIK, Melita, and FRÆLIGER, Nicolas (eds.). (2019). Translation and Language Teaching: Continuing the Dialogue. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

SCHMIEDHOFER, Astrid. (2020). Translationsorientierte Fremdsprachenkompetenz: Versuch einer Modellierung. In: Schmidhofer Astrid, and Wußler Annette (eds.): Bausteine translationsorientierter Sprachkompetenz und translatorischer Basiskompetenzen. Innsbruck: University Press, 21-33.

CEREZO HERRERO, Enrique. (2020). La didáctica de lenguas extranjeras en los estudios de Traducción e Interpretación. ¿Qué nos dice la investigación? Hermeneus. Revista de Traducción e Interpretación 22, 41-73.

9 Navigating uncharted waters: towards reframing translator education

Conveners: Elsa Huertas Barros, Nataša Pavlović, Catherine Way

The move of instruction to online environments during the past year due to the covid-19 pandemic has profoundly affected higher education in general, and with it, translator education. The unexpected online transition has involved considerable challenges for translator educators, but it has also forced them to re-examine and adapt their familiar teaching models and try out new ones, often experimenting outside of their comfort zone. After the initial shock of the sudden and unprepared online transition has worn off, the emergency switch to new environments and ways of teaching can now be seen as an opportunity for translator educators to overhaul their practice and emerge from the crisis enriched for the experience. The massive overnight shift of instruction to online environments has also highlighted the shortage of robust and adaptable training-the-trainers programmes and models that could be implemented on short notice and meet the educators' needs in times of emergencies. Although the last few years have witnessed further research into blending teaching and learning methodologies and collaborative multimodal working environments (e.g. Olvera-Lobo, 2009, Secară, Merten & Ramírez (2014), Prieto-Velasco & Luque-Fuentes, 2016), research into areas such as changing and adapting classroom methods and materials for online use and socio affective aspects of virtual training are still understudied areas in translation pedagogy. In this panel we would like to welcome contributions dealing with both of the above aspects of advancing translator education. On the one hand, we would like to invite novel, innovative methods that have proven successful in fully online translation teaching but also those that, being informed by the online experience, can be applied to onsite and hybrid environments. On the other hand, we would like the panel to address the issues related to the training of translator trainers in such new methods and especially those equipping them for future rapid adaptation of instructional design to changing circumstances. Preference will be given to research-based contributions and innovative practical proposals dealing with, but not limited to, the following topics:

- innovative and adaptable methods and materials for onsite, hybrid and/or online translator education
- the impact of the changing professional landscape and new job profiles on translator education as a result of recent global events
- authentic and novel types of assessment for the changing circumstances and changing professional landscape

- socio-affective aspects of translator education in various learning environments
- peer-to-peer and institutional support in times of educational disruption and beyond
- training the trainers
- needs and challenges.

References

Olvera-Lobo, D. (2009). Teleworking and collaborative work environments in translation training. *Babel*, 55(2), pp. 165-180.

Secară, A., Merten, P. & Ramírez, Y. (2014). What's in your blend? Creating blended resources for translator training. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 3(2), pp. 275-294.

Prieto-Velasco, J.A., & Fuentes-Luque, A. (2016). A collaborative multimodal working environment for the development of instrumental and professional competences of student translators: an innovative teaching experience. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 10(1), pp. 76-91.

10 **Psycho-affectivity in translator and interpreter education**

Conveners: Marcin Walczyński, Urszula Paradowska

In modern translation and interpreting studies, more and more attention is paid to the emotional and affective side of the translation/interpreting process. Translation and interpreting scholars have started to put greater emphasis on what happens – in terms of emotions and other psycho-affective factors – while translators translate and interpreters interpret. However, from our perspective, it is equally important to draw attention to various psycho-affective phenomena occurring at different stages of translator and interpreter education. For this reason, we would like to propose a panel devoted to psycho-affectivity in translator and interpreter education. We understand psycho-affectivity quite broadly – as an intricate, continually active complex of various affective phenomena constituting part of each translator's/interpreter's/trainer's/trainee's psychological make-up. We are also of the opinion that the elements of psycho-affectivity (i.e. emotions, affects, psycho-affective factors) can be triggered by nearly all constituents of the translation/interpreting process. Furthermore, they may also affect those aspects, influencing the overall translation/interpreting output quality. The affective is also present in translator and interpreter education, manifesting itself in, for example, trainees' emotions invoked by source texts, trainees' psycho-affective factors (e.g. anxiety, stress) experienced during translation and interpreting tasks, trainees' personality dimensions and their impact on translation/interpreting products, trainees' development of soft skills, trainee's language inhibition resulting from their weak language ego, trainees' self-concept and the resulting approach to translation/interpreting assignments, emotionally burdening translation and interpreting environments, to mention just a few. However, despite this diversity of themes touched upon with reference to psycho-affectivity in translation and interpreting education, this issue can still be considered an under-researched area of inquiry, waiting for new insights from research. The outcomes of such psycho-affectivity-oriented scholarly endeavours could then be applied to translator and interpreter education, thereby enhancing the education process and its results: developing trainees' psycho-affective traits as well as their skills, competences and knowledge to better meet the demands of a more and more competitive labour market. We welcome papers on all aspects related to the psycho-affective side of translator and interpreter education. The topics can include (but are not limited to): trainers' and trainees' psycho-affective factors, soft skills, anxiety and stress, motivation, emotional intelligence, the role of personality dimension, testing trainees' aptitude in terms of their psycho-affective properties, language ego, strategy training, boredom and frustration in a translation/interpreting class, trainees' self-concept, self-efficacy and self-esteem, motivation in a translation/interpreting class, trainees' empathy, trainees' language ego and language inhibition, etc.

References

Hubscher-Davidson, Séverine (2018) *Translation and Emotion. A Psychological Perspective*. New York, Abingdon: Routledge.

Koskinen, Kaisa (2020) *Translation and Affect. Essays on sticky affects and translational affective labour*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Walczyński, Marcin (2019) *Psycho-Affective Factors in Consecutive Interpreting*. Berlin, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

11 Advancing Translation Studies through Language Industry Studies

Conveners: Erik Angelone, Gary Massey, Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow

In recent years, the language industry, defined here as comprising the key elements of globalization (G11n), internationalization (I18n), localization (L10n) and translation (T9n), together with interpreting, consulting, project management and tool design, has undergone unprecedented transformation. Primary drivers of change include technological advancement at breakneck speed, a proliferation of language industry profiles to address both existing and emerging societal needs and an increasingly digitized, multilingual global landscape. While translation and interpreting continue to serve as the two key prototypes in the language industry, the respective roles and positions of each in the broader context of language service provision and multilingual communication are witnessing a sea change. In this panel, we advocate for advancing Translation Studies through explorations in the still incipient, industry-informed field of Language Industry Studies. These explorations, in their broadest sense, encompass various kinds of research on the domains, activities, technologies and stakeholders that shape the multifaceted language industry. Contributions are welcome on any facet of language industry studies, including, but not limited to, the following focal points:

- Translation and interpreting within broader language industry contexts
- Language industry domains beyond translation and interpreting
- Forms of automation and their impact in the language industry
- New competences and roles for language industry professionals
- Education and training for emerging language industry roles
- Mapping the field of language industry studies
- Methods for researching the language industry
- Establishing bridges and promoting dialogue between academia and the language industry.

References

Angelone, Erik, Ehrensberger-Dow, Maureen and Gary Massey (Eds.). (2020). *The Bloomsbury companion to language industry studies*. Bloomsbury Academic Press.

Cid, Clara Ginovart, Carme Colominas and Antoni Oliver. (2020). Language industry views on the profile of the post-editor. *Translation Spaces*, 9(2), 283-313.

Dunne, Keiran J. and Elena S. Dunne (Eds.). (2011). *Translation and localization project management. The art of the possible*. John Benjamins.

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

Schmitt, Peter A. (2019). Translation 4.0 – evolution, revolution, innovation or disruption? *Lebende Sprachen*, 64(2), 193-229. <https://doi.org/10.1515/les-2019-0013>.

12 Dialogue Interpreter Training Outside the University Context

Conveners: Rachel Herring, Carmen Delgado Luchner

Opportunities for formal training in dialogue interpreting have increased in recent decades, hand in hand with the growth of dialogue-interpreting-related research and publications. Scholarly publications on dialogue interpreter training tend to focus on university-level programmes (eg., Cirillo & Niemants, 2017), with less attention given to training initiatives outside this context. However, “most of the learning and teaching of CI {community interpreting}/PSI {public service interpreting} in the world does not occur in a university classroom,” (Angelleli, 2020:126) and many dialogue interpreters would not fulfill the formal requirements to enroll in BA/MA programmes. High-quality training that prepares interpreters to confront the social/interactional, ethical, linguistic, and cognitive challenges inherent in their work should not, however, be reserved for those who are able to access university-level programmes. Effective, high-quality training can be offered outside the academy—however, there is a need for increased attention and research related to such training settings, in order to better leverage the affordances they present. The conveners of this panel invite submissions related to the training of dialogue interpreters outside the context of university-based BA/MA programs—for example, in short courses, vocational settings (e.g., community/technical colleges in the United States, folk high schools in Nordic countries, NGOs in Switzerland), professional development, and on-the-job training (see, for instance, Delgado Luchner & Kherbiche, 2019). We encourage prospective panelists to consider the following areas of particular interest:

- Training approaches:
 - Managing language-neutral (multilingual) training environments
 - Retraining practicing interpreters
 - Leveraging theory and research in training
 - Teaching ethics and ethical decision-making
 - Preparing trainees for traumatic and sensitive situations
 - Capitalizing on trainees’ lived experiences
- Training contexts and course design:
 - Skill acquisition and progression
 - Multi-stakeholder involvement in curriculum design

- Relationships with employers and professional accreditation
- Practicums, internships, and supervision
- Challenges and ethical dilemmas encountered by trainers
- Training the users of interpreters.

References

Angelleli, C. V. (2020). "Community/Public-service interpreting as a communicative event: A call for shifting teaching and learning foci." *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts* 6:2, pp. 114–130.

Cirillo, L., & Niemants, N. (2017). *Teaching Dialogue Interpreting: Research-based Proposals for Higher Education*. John Benjamins Publishing Company

Delgado Luchner, C., & Kherbiche, L. (2019). Ethics Training for Humanitarian Interpreters Working in Conflict and Post-Conflict Settings. *Journal of War and Culture Studies* 12:3, pp. 251–267.

Phelan, M., Rudvin, M., Skaaden, H., & Kermit, P. (2020). *Ethics in public service interpreting*. Routledge.

Tipton, R., & Furmanek, O. (2016). *Dialogue interpreting: a guide to interpreting in public services and the community*. Routledge.

13 Accessibility in Context: Inclusiveness in Specialised Translation and Interpreting

Conveners: Alessandra Rizzo, Cinzia Spinzi, Gian Maria Greco

Against the backdrop of a universalist account of accessibility, where access is fundamental for all and not only for some specific groups, methods, tools, and services supporting human diversity and social inclusion are being constantly developed, promoted, applied and revised. Many of them are massively rooted in practices of translation. The world is becoming more accessible through the use of different forms of translation in a variety of contexts. Although diversity and access have long been familiar concepts in translation studies, they are now acquiring an even more central position in line with the concept of “cultures of accessibility” (Neves 2018). This is particularly evident within the contexts of specialised translation and interpreting in a vast range of scenarios, such as audiovisual products, virtual and immersive environments, live performances, cultural heritage and museums (Spinzi 2020), emergency situations (Rizzo 2020), health care, creative industries, tourism, and legal settings. Within those contexts, the question of access is questioning old assumptions and practices, as well as opening new lines of research and application. As a major consequence, accessibility and diversity are increasingly becoming part of education and training programmes in specialised translation. At the same time, the way that accessibility is included and taught in training and education programmes poses substantial challenges, for it requires a further level of specialisation to be integrated into the competences of the specialised translators and interpreters (Greco 2019). In response to these problems, new training and education programmes are being developed and existing ones are being modified so as to accommodate those challenges (Orero 2019). We welcome contributions that look at access within the various areas of specialised translation from a variety of perspectives that discuss the challenges for specialised translation training and specific case studies of training programmes. Further topics of interest include but are not limited to: the development and use of new translation technologies; context-oriented methods; interdisciplinary studies; collaborative settings.

References

- Greco, G. M. (2019). Towards a pedagogy of accessibility: The need for critical learning spaces in media accessibility education and training. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation* (18), 23-46.
- Neves, J. (2018). Cultures of accessibility. Translation making cultural heritage in museums accessible to people of all abilities. In Sue-Ann Harding

and Ovidi Carbonell Cortés (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Culture*, 415-430.

- Orero, P. (2017). The professional profile of the expert in media accessibility for the scenic arts. *Rivista internazionale di tecnica della traduzione - International Journal of Translation* (19), 143-161.
- Rizzo, A. (2020). The mediation of subtitling in the narrative construction of migrant and/or marginalised stories. *Cultus* (13) (special issue in *Mediating Narratives of Migration*), eds. Raffaella Merlini & Barbara Schäffner, 93-111.
- Spinzi, C. (2019). A cross-cultural study of figurative language in museum audio descriptions. Implications for translation, *Lingue e Linguaggi* (33), 303-316.

14 Extending translatoriality beyond professional contexts

Conveners: Esa Penttilä, Juho Suokas, Erja Vottonen

In the present world, multilingual communication is essentially involved in various jobs that deal with cross-cultural phenomena. They are found, for example, in journalism, academic research, teaching, health care, and social work to mention but a few. The work in these fields inevitably involve translation and interpreting, although it is not the main concern of the job. However, since translation is clearly part of the duties rather than voluntary pursuit, the phenomenon could be regarded as paraprofessional. In addition to prototypical translation, multilingual tasks of paraprofessional translators take varying forms of non-prototypical translation and translanguaging. Some of these are only vaguely related to prototypical translation and could therefore be regarded as translatoriality in a more general sense. Still, they are essentially related to multilingual communication in these contexts and deserve to be studied in more detail in translation studies as well. In translation studies, research has traditionally concentrated on professional translation, but more recently interest has been directed at non-professional interpreting and translation (NPIT) in areas such as fansubbing, crisis situations and child language brokering. Paraprofessional translatorial activities fall somewhere between these realms and have so far increased only little attention. This panel aims to challenge this and we call for papers to discuss the various aspects of translatorial activities in the fields where translation is a (possibly neglected) part of everyday work. The themes addressed include but are not limited to the following:

- In which contexts are paraprofessional translatorial activities conducted and by whom?
- How conscious are people of their own paraprofessional translatorial activities?
- What is the role of paraprofessional translatorial activities in relation to professional and non-professional translation?
- What theoretical and practical contributions can the study of paraprofessional translation suggest to translation studies?
- How can the study of paraprofessional translation contribute to fields beyond translation studies?

References

Antonini, Rachele, Letizia Cirillo, Linda Rossato & Ira Torresi (eds) 2017. Non-professional interpreting and translation: State of the art and future of an emerging field of research. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Halverson, Sandra. 2000. Prototype effects in the “translation” category. In Andrew Chesterman, Natividad Gallardo San Salvador & Yves Gambier (eds) *Translation in Context: Selected Papers from the EST Congress, Granada 1998*. Amsterdam/Philadelphias: John Benjamins. 3–16.

Koskela, Merja, Kaisa Koskinen & Nina Pilke. 2017. Bilingual formal meeting as a context of translatoriality. *Target* 29:3, 464–485.

Lomeña Galiano, María. 2020. Finding hidden populations in the field of translating and interpreting: A methodological model for improving access to non-professional translators and interpreters working in public service settings. *FITISPos–International Journal* 7:1, 72–91.

Schögler, Rafael (ed.). 2019. *Circulation of Academic Thought: Rethinking Translation in the Academic Field*. New York: Peter Lang.

15 **Non-professional interpreting and translation: advancement and subversion**

Conveners: Melissa Wallace, Michelle Pinzl, Aída Martínez-Gómez

Recent scholarship has begun to vigorously examine non-professional interpreting and translation (NPIT) in public services, in the midst of humanitarian crises and mass migrations, and in relation to social responsibility, ethics, and quality. Against this backdrop, this panel aims to challenge reductionist tendencies to automatically place NPIT in a peripheral or inferior position in relationship to the language mediation carried out by sanctioned, certified practitioners, and instead seeks to consider how and if NPIT practitioners advance the field as actors of influence. This panel approaches NPIT from a variety of perspectives in order to (1) critically examine instances of NPIT taking place in under-examined spaces; and (2) interrogate issues of power, identity, social capital, and social change when interpreting and translating actors come from non-traditional or non-professional backgrounds. The conveners welcome proposals exploring the two main goals of the panel, with particular interest in the in-grouping and out-grouping practices in translation and interpreting studies, in the subtopics of power, identity, and ideology, and in the intersection of advancement and subversion. We warmly welcome proposals based on empirical data as well as qualitative, more theoretical interrogations of non-traditional actors in spaces of language mediation. Possible topics can include but are not limited to:

- How NPIT circumvent or subvert established institutions and systems
- How NPIT interact with / challenge the systemic gatekeepers of the translational professions
- How notions of social responsibility and ethics extend to non-professional practitioners
- How NPIT instantiate ethical principles and influence changes in how they are conceived by the field at large
- The role of NPIT as practiced by “invisible” or stigmatized practitioners (farm laborers, sex workers, prisoners, asylum seekers, refugees, children, etc.)
- How the practice of NPIT intersects with issues of identity in a post-monolingual world.

References

Antonini, Rachele., Cirillo, Letizia., Rossato, Linda., & Torresi, Ira. (Eds.). 2017. Non-professional Interpreting and Translation: State of the art and future of an emerging field of research. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.129>

Drugan, Joanna, and Rebecca Tipton. 2017. "Translation, ethics and social responsibility." *The Translator* 23 (2): 119-125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2017.1327008>.

Martínez-Gómez, Aída. 2015. Non-professional interpreters. In *The Routledge handbook of interpreting*: 429-443. Routledge.

Monzó-Nebot, Esther and Melissa Wallace. (Eds). 2020. "Ethics of Non-Professional Translation and Interpreting." Special issue of *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 15 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.15.1>

Pérez-González, Luis, and Şebnem Susam-Saraeva. 2012. Non-professionals translating and interpreting: Participatory and engaged perspectives. *The Translator*, 18(2), 149-165.

16 **Interdisciplinarity and interaction: moving forward with journalistic translation research in the 21st Century**

Conveners: Denise Filmer, Roberto Valdeon

Once considered an emerging subarea of translation studies, news translation has come of age. In the era of convergence (Davier and Conway 2019), journalistic translation research has addressed a kaleidoscope of issues surrounding international news production in globalised, digitalised settings viewed from multiple methodological and theoretical perspectives. Special issues in prestigious TS journals (Conway 2015; Davier, Schäffner, and van Doorslaer 2018; Valdeón 2020, 2021, to list a few), collected volumes, and dedicated monographs attest to the breadth and scope of the research carried out so far. Yet, despite the diversity of language combinations, theoretical slants and methodologies already employed, what unites all the recent literature investigating the crucial role of translation in the circulation of news, is the plea for greater interdisciplinarity. Acknowledging the complexity of the questions at stake, academic dialogue across disciplines such as journalism studies, sociology, journalistic translation, the history of translation, and communication studies are fundamental to advancing the field of study (Valdeón 2021: 328). Methodological triangulations combining linguistic and ethnographic data with audience response, or that scrutinise digital news texts through a multimodal lens incorporating audiovisual translation approaches with multimodal critical discourse analysis are viable future directions (Filmer 2021). It is the cross-fertilisation of methods and ideas, collaborations with scholars from adjacent disciplines, and the development of audience studies that will promote understanding of the nature and impact of news translation in postmodern societies. For this reason, we aim to highlight journalistic translation research that delves into innovative and uncharted areas that include but are not confined to:

- Sociological approaches to journalistic translation
- Ethnographic studies on news production
- Multimodal approaches
- Diachronic perspectives
- Audience and reception studies
- The use of machine translation (such as Google translate) in translation mediated news texts
- Volatile online news texts and issues of censorship

- Imagological perspectives and cultural representation
- Journalism as intercultural communication and/or mediation
- Translation training in journalistic spheres
- The impact of gender and identity in cross-cultural news reporting.

References

Davier, L., & Conway, K. (Eds.). (2019). Journalism and translation in the era of convergence. John Benjamins.

Davier, L., Schäffner, C, & van Doorslaer, L. (Eds.). (2018). The methodological remainder in news translation research. Special Issue, *Across Languages and Cultures* 19 (2), pp. 155–164 (2018) DOI: 10.1556/084.2018.19.2.1

Filmer, D. (2021). Salvini, stereotypes and cultural translation: analysing anglophone news discourse on Italy's 'little Mussolini'. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, Special Issue, 21(3), 335-352 .DOI: 8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2020.1723273>

Valdeon, R. A. (2021). News production and intercultural communication at the crossroads of disciplines. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, Special Issue, 21(3), 323-335.DOI: 8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2020.1723273>

Valdeón, R. A. (2020). Journalistic translation research: Five years on. *Perspectives*, 28(3), 325–338. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2020.1723273>

17 Interlingual and intralingual translation in science news flows

Conveners: Luc van Doorslaer, Jack McMartin, Michaël Opgenhaffen

The past two covid years have put the dissemination of science news at the center of attention, including among researchers. This panel aims at describing, analyzing and interpreting interlingual as well as intralingual processes in the circulation of science news. It is conceived as an explicitly interdisciplinary setting where translation studies (TS) and journalism studies (JS) can exchange approaches and findings on this topic. News translation research has developed into a subfield of TS over the past two decades, referring to specific journalistic practices (see Valdeón 2015) and research methodologies (see Davier, Schäffner and van Doorslaer 2018). Although several types of news and media have been the object of research (for instance political, economic, financial; print, online, radio), science news has remained underinvestigated so far. The covid context has drawn researchers' attention to the troublesome transfer of often difficult and delicate science information. The transfers take place at several levels, in many cases almost simultaneously: at language and content level (both inter- and intralingual translation), but also at platform and media level (remediation – Bolter and Grusin 1999), sometimes co-determined by the specificities of 'interplatform translation' and by the media logic (Welbers and Opgenhaffen 2019). The complementary experience and expertise of JS especially at the latter level can be of high value for further progress in news translation research in general, and for emerging research on science news translation in particular. Therefore, this call invites abstracts that deal with, but are not necessarily limited to, the following topics:

- common conceptual grounds between TS and JS about translation and remediation
- translation and remediation practices in science news production and dissemination
- information disorder in science news communication as a result of translation and remediation
- trajectories and linguistic and social conditions that shape the creation of transformed, distorted or even false information in science news
- analysis of existing translation and/or remediation strategies
- the position of English as a lingua franca in science news production and dissemination

- the position of universities and research institutions in the translation and remediation of science news flows
- the relevant translating and remediating actors in the science news flows
- specific media logics as instigator of inter
- and intralingual information disorder.

References

Bolter, Jay David, and Richard Grusin. 1999. *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Davier, Lucile, Christina Schäffner, and Luc van Doorslaer (eds.). 2018. *Methods in News Translation*. Special issue of *Across Languages and Cultures* 19 (2).

Valdeón, Roberto A. 2015. "Fifteen Years of Journalistic Translation Research and More." *Perspectives* 23 (4), 634–662.

Welbers, Kasper, and Michaël Opgenhaffen. 2019. "Presenting News on Social Media: Media Logic in the Communication Style of Newspapers on Facebook." *Digital Journalism* 7 (1), 45–62.

18 Commonalities of and differences between interpreting strands

Conveners: Elisabet Tiselius, Michaela Albl-Mikasa

Interpreting, regardless of type or strand, shares a common core in terms of skills, knowledge and cognitive resources needed to perform the task. The same modes and techniques are also used across all types. Yet, the performer of interpreting is labelled (and remunerated) according to other, external, factors, such as the setting they work in (conference, community, court), or one of their working languages (signed language), some are even labelled as not being interpreters (ad-hoc, non-professional). Prunč (2011: 22) claims that these labels are rooted in the historical development of interpreting and he also argues that they are outdated in a multicultural and polycentric world. Since Mikkelsen's call in 1999, there has been a growing trend to argue for treating interpreting as the same regardless of interpreting type or strand. Advantages of this would be, among other things, that researchers can interpret results in the light of other types and strands, and that professionals regarded as one group can create a bigger critical mass for push and pull effects on working conditions, remunerations etc. To date, publications about both commonalities and differences, and calls to treat the strands as one have been theoretical and argumentative (Albl-Mikasa 2020; Downie 2020; Pöchhacker 2018) rather than empirical. The commonalities and differences across different interpreting types and strands (conference interpreting, community interpreting, signed language interpreting...) can be investigated from different perspectives (cognitive, sociological, discursive, procedural and so forth). This panel invites contributors to explore commonalities of and differences between the different strands of interpreting empirically. We invite papers with a (socio-) cognitive approach, with the aim to argue and highlight reasons for stressing either commonalities of or differences between different strands. Papers are welcome to contrast several interpreting strands, but can also discuss their results of the specificities of one with a view to whether or not they point to commonalities rather than differences or vice versa.

References

Albl-Mikasa, Michaela 2020. Interpreters' roles and responsibilities. In E. Angelone, M. Ehrensberger-Dow & G. Massey (eds) *The Bloomsbury Companion to Language Industry Studies*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 91–114.

Downie, Jonathan 2020. Interpreting is interpreting: Why we need to leave behind interpreting settings to discover Comparative Interpreting Studies. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*. Online first. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.20006.dow>

Englund Dimitrova, Birgitta & Tiselius, Elisabet 2016. Cognitive aspects of community interpreting: Toward a process model. In R. Muñoz Martín (ed) *Reembedding Translation Process Research*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 195–214.

Mikkelson, Holly 1999. Interpreting is interpreting – Or is it?. Originally presented at the GSTI 30th Anniversary Conference. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/41373508_Interpreting_Is_Interpreting_-_Or_Is_It (Accessed January 10 2021)

Pöchhacker, Franz 2018. Moving Boundaries in Interpreting. In H. V. Dam, M. N. Brøgger & K. K. Zethsen (eds) *Moving Boundaries in Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, 45–63.

19 Sign Language Interpreting: Research and Global Practices. Bridging Gaps and Linking Worlds

Conveners: Riccardo Moratto, Xiaoyan Xiao, Christopher Stone

With the rising need for Deaf people to gain equal access to information and services, sign language interpreting has become an important social factor in the contemporary world. This panel is an opportunity to examine its value for potential users. This panel aims to discuss an array of subjects in this research field which allows researchers to have a comprehensive view of the research themes, theoretical approaches and methodologies as well as specialized sign language interpreting practices. It is also hoped that this panel will further spur governmental agencies and other ad hoc institutional bodies to recognize the fact that sign language interpreters ought to enjoy the same rights as spoken language interpreters. As Sandra Hale (2007, p. 162) rightfully points out: “It is the responsibility of all those involved: the interpreters themselves, the service providers and the service recipients to put pressure on policy-makers to instigate the necessary changes. [...] Research can do much to describe and highlight the issues, demonstrate the needs for training, provide useful information for the improvement of interpreters’ performance; but it needs to be read and considered seriously by the interested parties in order to have any effect.” Sign languages are natural languages, as proven by numerous neurobiological studies. However, in the history of the development of sign language studies around the world, it has taken a lot of efforts by linguists and neurobiologists to give sign(ed) languages their well-deserved status and dignity of natural languages; in some countries and regions, this is still not the case. Although the international scientific community has amply proven that sign languages are on a par with spoken languages, in terms of linguistic accuracy, degree of completeness, and dignity, many sign(ed) language interpreters around the world do not share the same status as their fellow spoken language interpreters, even if the International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC) decided, by an overwhelming majority at the AIIC general assembly held in Buenos Aires in 2012, to open its doors to sign language conference interpreters, as a result of the close cooperation and fruitful discussions between AIIC and WASLI as well as the European Forum of Sign Language Interpreters (EFSLI).

References

- Hale, S. (2007). *Community interpreting*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Moratto, R. (2020). *Taiwan Sign Language Interpreting: Theoretical Aspects and Pragmatic Issues*. New York: Peter Lang

Stone, C. A., & West, D. (2012). Translation, representation and the Deaf 'voice'. *Qualitative Research*, 12(6), 645–665. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794111433087>

Xiao, X., Y. Peng & Y. Deng (2020). Sign language interpreter education: In search of a Chinese Model. *Journal of Foreign Languages*. 43 (5)

Xiao, X., X. Chen & J. Palmer (2015). Chinese Deaf viewers' comprehension of signed language interpreting on television: An experimental study. *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting*.17 (1)

20 Video Remote Interpreting in Healthcare

Convener: Franz Pöchhacker

The delivery of interpreting services via video link was a growing trend even before the covid-19 pandemic but has acquired particular significance in the context of social distancing, travel restrictions and remote work. In public service settings, video remote interpreting (VRI) has been implemented mainly in police and asylum interviews but also in healthcare settings, though empirical research on this novel practice has been relatively slow to emerge. This panel therefore aims to bring together recent and ongoing studies of VRI in healthcare settings undertaken from a variety of disciplinary vantage points, including linguistic and sociological approaches as well as the paradigms of interpreting studies and healthcare communication. The panel will also seek to cover different stakeholder perspectives on the use of VRI, including the concerns of healthcare organizations and institutional interpreting service providers (agencies); the perceptions and experiences of video remote interpreters; the needs and expectations of healthcare service providers using VRI in their professional practice; and, last, but not least, the needs and experiences of patients whose access to quality care is mediated by a video remote interpreter. Within this multitude of relevant research perspectives, thematic focal points may include but are not limited to:

- 1) the organizational and technical implementation of VRI services in healthcare;
- 2) the specific challenges of VRI use in particular healthcare settings;
- 3) the video remote interpreter's workplace and task demands;
- 4) skill requirements and training for VRI;
- 5) VRI users' experiences with the service;
- 6) the constraints and affordances arising from the visuospatial ecology of VRI in clinical encounters; and
- 7) the interactional dynamics of provider–patient communication mediated by a video remote interpreter.

It is expected that research on these and other topics will employ a broad range of methods (and combinations thereof), including quantitative survey research, qualitative interviews, ethnographic observations, and discourse-based analyses of video-recorded interactions.

References

- Azarmina, P., & Wallace, P. (2005). Remote interpretation in medical encounters: A systematic review. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare*, 11, 140–145.
- De Boe, E. (2020). Remote interpreting in healthcare settings, PhD thesis, University of Antwerp, 2020.
- Hansen, J. P. B. (2020). Invisible participants in a visual ecology: Visual space as a resource for organising video-mediated interpreting in hospital encounters. *Social Interaction*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.7146/si.v3i3.122609>
- Koller, M., & Pöchhacker, F. (2018). “The work and skills”: A profile of first-generation video remote interpreters. In J. Napier, R. Skinner & S. Braun (eds), *Here or There? Research on Interpreting via Video Link*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press, 89–110.
- Price, E. L., Pérez-Stable, E. J., Nickleach, D., López, M., & Karliner, L. S. (2012). Interpreter perspectives of in-person, telephonic, and videoconferencing medical interpretation in clinical encounters. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 87, 226–232.

21 The virtual shift in conference interpreting practice and research

Conveners: Agnieszka Chmiel, Nicoletta Spinolo

The coronavirus pandemic has accelerated the adoption of virtual tools in conference interpreting practice and research. Interpreters have been forced to quickly adopt remote interpreting solutions with little or no previous training and work out best practices for efficiently cooperating with boothmates. Professional associations have hurried to create guidelines to ensure safe interpreting conditions. Researchers have had to cope with the issue of ecological validity when collecting data remotely, pushing their creativity limits when replacing lab-based research methods with remotely available ones while profiting from geographically unrestrained remote access to study participants. Remoteness and its consequences on communication also come with a growing complexity in human-computer interaction: interpreters use multiple devices and increasingly sophisticated workstations; researchers face not only remote, but also novel environments in which to collect data, as well as a wealth of new variables to take into account. Thus, the virtual shift triggered by the pandemic has become an unprecedented learning experience for all members of the interpreting community. Despite its numerous challenges and constraints, it has led to important advancements in the practice and research of interpreting. We would like to take stock of these recent developments, discuss limitations and embrace new opportunities that have been created. We welcome presentations related but not limited to the following:

- remote interpreting platforms
- human-computer interaction in interpreting practice and research
- interface design and user experience in interpreting practice and research
- best practices and novel applications in remote interpreting
- online data collection tools
- methodological challenges for research on remote interpreting and remote research on interpreting.

References

AIIC Taskforce on Distance Interpreting. "AIIC Guidelines for Distance Interpreting (Version 1.0)". aiic.net. January 11, 2019. Accessed June 2, 2020.

Braun, S. (2015). Remote interpreting. In Pöchhacker, F. (ed.) 2015. Routledge Encyclopaedia of Interpreting Studies, 346-348. London, New York: Routledge.

Fantinuoli, C. (2018). Interpreting and technology: The upcoming technological turn. In Fantinuoli C. (ed.), Interpreting and technology, 1-12. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Mellinger, C. D.; Hanson, T. A. (2018). Interpreter traits and the relationship with technology and visibility. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 13 (3), 366-392.

Seeber, K. G., Keller, L., Amos, R., & Hengl, S. (2019). Expectations vs. experience: Attitudes towards video remote conference interpreting. *Interpreting*, 21(2), 270-304.

22 Interpreting in Religious Contexts at the Intersection of Disciplines

Conveners: Jonathan Downie, Teresa Parish

Nearly a decade after the first appearance of Interpreting in Religious Contexts (IRC) as a panel at EST Congress (Downie and Karlik, 2012), this panel will ask how understanding of this practice and its effects on religious communities can be enlightened by inter-disciplinary research. IRC is understood as the performance in a signed or spoken language of a representation of what was said or signed in another language within any form of religious practice or religious organisation. New perspectives on this practice are especially timely in view of the changes in religious practice and interpreting delivery brought about by COVID-19 restrictions on in-person gatherings. Researchers have stressed that IRC serves wider purposes, beyond providing access to the semantic content of what was said or signed. Vigouroux (2010) argued that interpreting was the performance of vision of the church and its relationship with the surrounding community. The work of St André (2010) on the translation of Buddhist sutras and van der Louw's (2008) on the preparation of the Septuagint translation of the Jewish Scriptures pointed to the role that interpreting played in the process of sacred text translation and the adaptation of such translations to their cultural environment. This suggests that Balci Tison (2016) was correct to connect IRC with church identity formation. We particularly welcome papers on the following areas:

- Theological accounts of IRC in the light of ecclesiology, homiletics, and hermeneutics,
- Discussions of the social and cultural position and power of IRC using tools, theories and methods from cultural studies, sociology, sociology of religion, performance studies, and social psychology,
- Historical reflections of the links between IRC and religious translation,
- Reflections of the intersection between IRC and research on multi-ethnic religious and inter-religious practice, especially in light of the changes in such practices brought about by COVID-19 restrictions
- Examinations of the place of IRC within Interpreting Studies, especially as regards the theoretical and methodological insights it might offer to research on other forms of interpreting.

References

Balci Tison, A. (2016) The interpreter's involvement in a translated institution: a case study of sermon interpreting. PhD Thesis. Universitat Rovira i Virgili.

Downie, J. and Karlik, J. (2012) Panel 19: Translating and interpreting in religious settings., EST Congress 2012. Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz. Available at: <http://www.fb06.uni-mainz.de/est/63.php> (Accessed: 14 January 2014).

van der Louw, T. (2008) 'The Dictation of the Septuagint Version', *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 39(2), pp. 211–229.

St André, J. (2010) 'Lessons from Chinese history: Translation as a collaborative and multi-stage process', *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, 23(1), pp. 71–94.

Vigouroux, C. B. (2010) 'Double-mouthed discourse: Interpreting, framing, and participant roles', *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 14(3), pp. 341–369.

23 Advancing Translation Process Research

Convener: Fabio Alves

Translation process research has come of age from the first studies which solely used think-aloud protocol data in the mid-1980s to current empirical studies that draw on large data sets and use computational tools. Building on the triangulation paradigm (Alves 2003), translation process research has inquired into user activity data (UAD), investigated segmentation patterns and translation units, and attempted to account for instances of peak performance or to model translation entropy, among several other topics. The development of the database CRITT TPR-DB (Carl, Schaeffer & Bangalore 2016), storing and integrating translation-process data in a large repository, has enabled researchers to use a data pool to compare and extend empirical studies of translation-process data. In parallel with developments in empirical research, the field has also seen the emergence of a research agenda that considers human cognition, and indirectly the act of translating and interpreting, to be situated, embodied, distributed, embedded, and extended (Risku & Rogl 2020), challenging the standard computation-oriented and information-processing views of translation process research and claiming that studies need to be placed in context and consider the act of translating as embodied, embedded and affective action. At the same time, advances in machine translation systems has enhanced the focus on human-computer interaction and contributed to expand the agenda of translation process research in a new direction. The merging of translation memories and machine translation, as well as the advent of adaptive and interactive neural machine translation systems and the use of multimodal input, have had an impact on the process of translation (O'Brien 2020). Advancing translation process research is, therefore, required to understand these new forms of translational activity. Advocating in favour of a complementary approach, Alves & Jakobsen (2020) have insisted that only by integrating them into a coherent whole can cognitive translation studies lay the epistemological, paradigmatic and interdisciplinary foundations for its further development. It should ground itself “in theories of semiosis (meaning-making) and linguistics (language use) and on cognitive science (neurocognition and situated-action cognition)”. For Alves & Jakobsen, cognitive translation studies must incorporate in its research agenda not only features of machine translation and aspects of human-computer interaction, but also enlarge the scope of its theoretical formulations to include situated, distributed and extended aspects of human cognition. In line with these emerging trends, this panel invites contributions seeking to advance translation process research, e.g. (but not necessarily) by suggesting an integrated alternative to the dichotomic separation of computational and non-computational approaches in translation process research or other ways of clarifying the relation between the translation process, the translation product and machine-related activities in

translation. Suggestions for bridging the gap between representational and non-representational views of human cognition or for computationally modelling translating as a dynamic cognitive activity are also welcome. Contributions can be based on any language pairs and translation modes (including oral and signed), and on all kinds of empirical data, as long as the aim is to offer ideas for advancing translation process research, in particular, and to contribute to the development of Translation Studies in general.

References

Alves, Fabio (Ed.) (2003). *Triangulating translation: Perspectives in process oriented research*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Alves, Fabio; Jakobsen, Arnt (2020). *Grounding Cognitive Translation Studies: Goals, commitments and challenges*. In: Fabio Alves; Arnt Lykke Jakobsen. (Eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Cognition*. New York: Routledge, p. 545-554.

Carl, Michael; Schaeffer, Moritz; Bangalore, Srinivas (2016). *The CRITT Translation Process Research Database*. In: Michael Carl, Srinivas Bangalore and Moritz Schaeffer (Eds.) *New Directions in Empirical Translation Process Research - Exploring the CRITT TPR-DB*. London: Springer, p. 13-56.

O'Brien, Sharon (2020). *Translation, human-computer interaction and cognition*. In: Fabio Alves; Arnt Lykke Jakobsen. (Eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Cognition*. New York: Routledge, p. 376-388.

Risku, Hanna; Rogl, Regina (2020). *Translation and situated, embodied, distributed, embedded and extended cognition*. In: Fabio Alves; Arnt Lykke Jakobsen. (Eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Cognition*. New York: Routledge, p. 478-499.

24 Advancing TS through think-aloud: Showcasing a challenging but unique method

Conveners: Claudine Borg, Brita Dorer

In the 1980s and 1990s, Krings, Lörcher, Séguinot and Gerloff were pioneers in using verbal data to study translation processes, with methodological advances employing verbal reports backed by Ericsson and Simon's ground-breaking work. Introspective reports, both concurrent and retrospective, as well as dialogue protocols were the method largely applied to understand what was going on in the translators' "black box", paving the way for what is now known as Cognitive Translation and Interpreting Studies. Since the 1990s, favoured by technological advancements and more powerful statistical tools, new quantitative methods have been added to process-oriented research, such as keystroke logging, eye-tracking, and EEG. The importance of think-aloud decreased, triggered by criticism targeting its validity and reliability, the immense effort required to gather and analyse verbal data in the form of Think-Aloud Protocols (TAPs), and its predominantly qualitative, and thus subjective, nature. However, despite such criticism, think-aloud continues being a powerful and unique method for analysing cognitive processes, particularly in triangulation settings. And technological advances nowadays facilitate data processing and analysis, for instance, transcriptions by using automated speech recognition. As Jakobsen & Alves (2021:4) put it, "[t]he TAP method remains a strong method, as there may not be a better way of getting information about a person's mind than by having the person tell us about it in words". Recent work showing the valuable and unique insights think-aloud provides include Borg (2017), Dorer (2020), Sun et al. (2020) and Vieira (2017). This panel aims to shed light on the strengths, uniqueness and power of think-aloud for TIS. We invite contributions discussing think-aloud in relation (but not limited) to:

- methodological insights and innovation (e.g. approaches to gathering and analysing data, triangulation)
- situated translation
- cognitive aspects (e.g. cognitive load, decision-making)
- psychological phenomena (e.g. emotions, self-confidence, creativity)
- personality (e.g. the effect of personality on think-aloud)
- revision and post-editing processes
- literary translation

- differences in levels of translation experience
- translator training
- professional practices.

References

Borg, C. 2017. 'Decision-making and alternative translation solutions in the literary translation process: A case study'. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 18(2), 279-304.

Dorer, B. 2020. *Advance translation as a means of improving source questionnaire translatability?: Findings from a think-aloud study for French and German*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.

Jakobsen, A.L. & Alves, F. 2021. 'Introduction'. In F. Alves & A.L. Jakobsen (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Cognition*. London: Routledge, 1-20.

Sun, S., Li, T., & Zhou, X. 2020. 'Effects of thinking aloud on cognitive effort in translation'. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies*, 19, 132-151.

Vieira, L. N. 2017. 'Cognitive effort and different task foci in post-editing of machine translation: A think-aloud study'. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 18(1), 79-105.

25 The Reality of Revision

Conveners: Ilse Feinauer, Amanda Lourens

Revisers do not need theory or training to become revisers. And yet they operate as recognized professional revisers. We would like panellists to give account of everyday normal ways of action to make meaning of the terms reviser, revision. Also what does the agent performing revision look like and what is the role of this agent in any specific finished product? In this panel we group all revisionary activities (currently referred to with the terms revision, editing, proofreading, post-editing, fuzzy matching) under revision as the umbrella term. We request panellists to investigate professional practices to advance theoretical approaches regarding revision; in turn practice may draw on these new theoretical perspectives e.g. project managers understanding the complexities of the social networks in which the various agents operate in order to generate a specific product. The research framework used will be data-based, drawing on patterns that emerged from the analysis of real-life data. Panellists will follow a more sociological approach in researching publishing projects, since sociological theories may provide the background against which we can explain the very complex patterns in the actual revisionary activities. At this stage very little is known about the way revision takes place, but empirical data on the actual genesis of published texts will describe the various roles, power, as well as the socio-cognitive aspects operative in revision. The following research questions could for example drive the investigations of panellists:

1. What are the practices of revisionary activities in their situational embeddedness and how can they be described;
2. how do these practices come together in actual processes; and
3. how are all of these eventually played out in networks?

The styles and applications of revisionary activities may vary from project to project, and also from agent to agent, depending on the nature of the text and individual working style and personality of the agent at work. We therefore invite contributions on the following topics:

- workplace revision practices
- revision agents (author, translator, reviser, reader, reviewer) and their agencies (habitus, processes, networks, power relations, gender, post-colonialism)
- revisionary practices in various genres (e.g. literary, technical, academic) generically or in specific publications

- revisionary practices in manuscript development in various genres
- revisionary practices in all types of (sign language) interpreting.

References

Buzelin, H. 2005. Unexpected allies: How Latour's network theory could complement Bourdieusian analyses in Translation Studies. *The Translator*, 11(2):193-219.

Koponen, M., Mossop, B., Robert, I. and Scocchera, G. (eds.). 2021. *Translation Revision and/or Post-Editing*. London, New York: Routledge.

Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies, 14. 2015. On Genetic Translation Studies.

Mossop, Brian (2014) *Revising and editing for translators*. 3rd edition. London & New York: Routledge.

26 Keylogging typing flows in mediated communication

Conveners: Ricardo Muñoz Martín, Erik Angelone, César A. González

Eyetracking and screen recording (e.g., Walker & Federici 2018) have drawn much attention as data collection tools in the last decade. In contrast, the case can be made that keyloggers are now increasingly underused, often relegated to collecting secondary or supportive data in otherwise welcome mixed methods research projects. However, much of what we know of translation processes is based on keylogging studies, even though many were carried out with software that does not record key-moving and typing actions (Couto Vale 2017, 211). Keyloggers yield rich behavioral descriptions of the typing flow that might be exploited in many different ways. Unlike eyetracking technology, which is somewhat expensive, many keylogging tools (e.g., Translog II, Carl 2012; Inputlog, Leitjen & van Waes. 2013) are free, which can further break down financial barriers that might otherwise exist in attempts to advance Translation Studies research. Multilectal mediated communication tasks can be seen as particular instances of language production. Across tasks, the very act of language production tends to be mainly linear, but the processes leading to its unfolding are not necessarily so. Researchers have traditionally formulated and tested hypotheses derived from the interplay between text chunking, various characteristics of the segments resulting from such chunking (e.g., length and grammatical nature, but also mistakes such as false starts and typos), delivery speed, pause types and lengths, and the interleaving of language production with other subtasks, such as listening, reading or viewing, searching the web, online and final revision. This panel seeks to update and relaunch the use of keylogging as the main source of data, on its own and combined with other data-collection tools, to analyze language production tasks as manifest in various forms of mediated communication including, but also transcending translation, at high levels of granularity—mainly with quantitative approaches. Resemblances between tasks, such as revising as a stand-alone activity and revising as a subtask within a translation activity, are obvious, and they extend to research constructs that are often assumed to apply to both of them. However, many analytical insights may pertain to not only translation and writing in their strictest senses, but also audio description, live subtitling, transcription, and other forms of mediated communication, such as simultaneous interpreting, where keylogging the computer use of interpreters may yield additional insights into their mental processes, and consecutive interpreting, when note-taking is performed through digital means (keyboard, pen). Contributions are welcome on topics such as:

- Advances in keylogging indicators, constructs and combinations thereof.

- Applications of time- and chunking-based analyses across a range of mediated communication tasks, such as translation, audio description, live subtitling, transcription, transediting, interpreting.
- Applications of keylogging in writing systems other than those based on the roman alphabet.
- Proposals for multilectal mediated communication task models and standards to be keylogged.
- Strategies and frameworks to analyze typing flow (e.g., the Task Segment Framework, Muñoz & Apfelthaler, in press).

References

- Walker, Callum, & Federico Federici (Eds.) 2018. *Eye Tracking and Multidisciplinary Studies on Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Carl, Michael. 2012. Translog-II: a Program for Recording User Activity Data for Empirical Reading and Writing Research. *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'12)*, pp.4108--4112. http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2012/pdf/614_Paper.pdf
- Couto-Vale, Daniel. 2017. What does a translator do when not writing? In S. Hansen-Schirra, O. Czulo & S. Hofmann, eds. *Empirical modelling of translation and interpreting* (pp. 209–237). Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Leitjen, Mariëlle. & Luuk van Waes. 2013. Keystroke Logging in Writing Research: Using Inputlog to Analyze and Visualize Writing Processes. *Written Communication* 30 (3): 1 –35.
- Muñoz Martín, Ricardo, & Matthias Apfelthaler. [in press]. A Task Segment Framework to study keylogged translation processes. To be published in *Translation & Interpreting*, vol. 14.

27 Past, present and future of speech technologies in translation – life beyond the keyboard

Conveners: Dragoş Ciobanu, Alina Secară, Julián Zapata

The quality of speech technologies is improving so fast for certain languages that the latest report published by the Language in the Human-Machine Era (LITHME) COST action highlights “two imminent changes to human communication [...]: speaking through technology and speaking to technology” (2021:6). In situations where two-way communication is not necessary, however, speech technologies have already been implemented to optimise monolingual and multilingual content production workflows: for over a decade, human-to-machine dictation (automatic speech recognition / speech-to-text) has been the preferred mode of creating content of professional linguists whose technological set-up allowed this kind of enhancement or who work in live contexts, such as broadcasting, where immediate access to the text produced is crucial. In addition, automatic speech synthesis (text-to-speech) has also been gaining ground in recent years. Research has shown that both speech recognition and synthesis can positively influence the output quality, language professionals’ productivity and workspace ergonomics associated with translation, revision and post-editing machine translation (PEMT) processes. Despite these demonstrated benefits, technology providers have been somehow trailing behind in implementing speech technologies into current CAT/PEMT/TEnT environments. Moreover, with the exception of respeaking in accessibility-related scenarios, there is little evidence that speech technologies are finding a place in translation training and research. This panel will focus on the practical, methodological and educational implications of using speech technologies by professional and trainee translators. We invite contributions from industry practitioners and academics that discuss observed advantages and disadvantages of integrating speech technologies into translation, PEMT, audiovisual translation, revision, or review processes; creative ways of achieving such integrations; novel training approaches created for such new integrations; as well as future directions of research, development and training.

References

- Ciobanu, D., Ragni, V., & Secară, A. (2019). Speech Synthesis in the Translation Revision Process: Evidence from Error Analysis, Questionnaire, and Eye-Tracking. *Informatics*, 6(4)(51), Article 4. <https://doi.org/10.3390/informatics6040051>
- Herbig, N., Düwel, T., Pal, S., Meladaki, K., Monshizadeh, M., Krüger, A., & van Genabith, J. (2020). MMPE: A Multi-Modal Interface for Post-Editing Machine Translation. *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 1691–1702. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.1691>

155 LITHME. (2021). The Dawn of the Human-Machine Era. A Forecast of New and Emerging Language Technologies. <https://lithme.eu/2021/05/18/first-publication-forecast-of-future-language-technologies/>

Teixeira, C. S. C., Moorkens, J., Turner, D., Vreeke, J., & Way, A. (2019). Creating a Multimodal Translation Tool and Testing Machine Translation Integration Using Touch and Voice. *Informatics*, 6(1)(13), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.3390/informatics6010013>

Zapata, J., S. Castilho and J. Moorkens (2017) 'Translation Dictation vs. Post-editing with Cloudbased Voice Recognition: A Pilot Experiment', in Proceedings of the MT Summit XVI – The 16th Machine Translation Summit, Nagoya, Japan.

28 Advancing Translation Studies by understanding the Labour in Translaboration

Conveners: Cornelia Zwischenberger, Alexa Alfer

Discussions of ‘translaboration’ have so far focused on the investigative potential of the conceptual blending of ‘translation’ and ‘collaboration’. A further and rather central concept that emerges in/from translaboration is ‘labour’. Labour, as the production of appropriated surplus value, remains, we argue, an under-researched and under-discussed dimension of translation. To advance our understanding of both translation and Translation Studies, and the ways in which both fields of activity intersect with critical areas of human interest, the concept of labour, as distinct from ‘work’ (Narotzky 2018), warrants more sustained engagement. Our focus for this panel is the work/labour dimension of collaborative translation. In online collaborative translation, hundreds or even thousands of mostly non-professional and voluntary translators collaborate in crowdsourced translation drives initiated by and benefitting both profit-oriented companies such as Facebook or Skype and not-for-profit organizations such as Translators Without Borders or Kiva. Are these translation efforts work, labour, or just fun? The same question applies to self-managed online collaborative translation drives such as Wikipedia-translation, and to the various types of fan translation such as fansubbing, fandubbing etc. Digital labour (Fuchs 2010) is a particular pertinent category here, as are concepts such as playbor (Kücklich 2005), fan labour, and affective labour since this type of collaborative translation centrally builds on social relations and consequently affects (Koskinen 2020). But what about the work/labour dimension of collaborative translations in the analogue world? The collaborative translations undertaken in 17th- and 18th-century Germany between women and their male partners as their intellectual equals, for example, were often construed as ‘labours of love’, thus masking their specific constellations of agency, creativity, and gain (Brown 2018). To advance Translation Studies from the vantage point of the labour, we invite panel contributions addressing the work/labour dimension of translation in the following contexts, among others:

- translation crowdsourcing for for-profit and not-for-profit/humanitarian organisations
- self-managed and user-initiated forms of online collaborative translation
- historical or contemporary case studies of analogue collaborative translation
- translation’s relationship with digital labour, fan labour, playbor, or affective labour.

References

Brown, Hillary. 2018. Rethinking agency and creativity: Translation, collaboration and gender in early modern Germany. *Translation Studies* 11 (1), 84-102

Fuchs, Christian. 2010. Labor in Informational Capitalism and on the Internet. *The Information Society* 26 (3), 179-196.

Koskinen, Kaisa. 2020. Translation and affect. Essays on sticky affects and translational affective labour. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kücklich, Julian. 2005. Precarious Playbour: Modders and the Digital Games Industry. *The Fibreculture Journal* (5), n.p.

Narotzky, Susana (2018). Rethinking the concept of labour. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 24, 29-43.

29 **Advancing Translation Studies through task-comparative and hybrid task research into multilectal communication**

Conveners: Iris Schrijver, Pawel Korpala, Isabelle Robert

Over the past decades, Translation Studies has witnessed a growing body of research into emergent forms of mediated communication that surpass the dichotomy of translation versus interpreting, as well as the traditional divide between translation, writing and adaptation. Objects of study are technology-enabled, often multimodal, hybrid modes of practice, such as theatre surtitling, interlingual live subtitling or speech-to-text interpreting through respeaking, simultaneous interpreting with text, sight translation, (live) audiodescription, audio-introduction, audiosubtitling and interlingual summary translation. However, research in which such hybrid forms are studied and compared with their affinitive variants is still limited (but cf., Puerini, 2021; Seeber, Keller & Hervais-Adelman, 2020), even though it would yield insight into the similarities, differences and possible transfer between the tasks that are activated. In turn, these insights would advance Translation Studies as well as neighboring disciplines including Writing Research, Media Accessibility and Cognitive Science. Moreover, they would sketch a more fluid portrait of the communicative skills the human translator/interpreter of the future may need. In support of calls for more comparative research into related multilectal mediation tasks (e.g., Rемаel, 2016; Dam-Jensen, Heine & Schrijver, 2019; Xiao & Muñoz Martín, 2020), this thematic panel aims to provide a framework for converging critical inquiry into such research. Contributors may address a wide range of topics, such as conceptual and theoretical implications (e.g., similarities and differences in cognition and reception between related tasks, their impact on existing process and/or competence models), interdisciplinary issues (e.g., common disciplinary ground or diverging terminology and premises that allow/hinder comparative research), methodological challenges and requirements (e.g., inter-subject vs intra-subject design, matching of stimuli across tasks and/or conditions, measurement of quality and satisfaction), technological aspects (e.g., prerequisites for related tasks, level of impact on cognition and reception), practical and pedagogical aspects (e.g., affinitive tasks used and skills taught in translator training).

References

Dam-Jensen, H., Heine, C., & Schrijver, I. (2019). The nature of text production – Similarities and differences between writing and translation. *Across Languages and Cultures* 20(2), 155–172.

Puerini, S. (2021). Typing your mind away. Comparing keylogged tasks with the Task Segment Framework. Università di Bologna.

Remael, A. (2016). On studying complex interactions: Hybridity in (audiovisual) translation and interpreting. Keynote at TransInt 2016, University of Trieste.

Seeber, K., Keller, L., & Hervais-Adelman, A. (2020). When the ear leads the eye: The use of text during simultaneous interpretation. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 35(10), 1480–1494.

Xiao, K., & Muñoz Martín, R. (2020). Cognitive Translation Studies: Models and methods at the cutting edge. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies* 19, 1–24.

30 Translation and Tourism: Encounters through space and language

Conveners: Sofia Malamatidou, Elena Manca

Tourism is a global phenomenon and one of the largest industries worldwide, which heavily relies on translation to achieve its goals both before and during the visit. Therefore, translation has the capacity to shape how the visitor understands and responds to the destination, attraction, event, activity, etc. and of particular interest are the various ways in which the translation of tourism texts adapts the texts in terms of language, ideology and identity. This panel aims to encourage and advance critical discussion on the important role played by translation in tourism, especially in, but not limited to, the context of the recent pandemic, which has offered an opportunity for reflection on tourism practices, including how destinations are being branded and promoted. This panel recognises tourism translation as an interdisciplinary research area that can draw from a range of fields, e.g. translation studies, tourism studies, discourse studies, narratology, linguistics, intercultural communication. Moreover, tourism texts offer translation researchers a rich source of data to examine how different languages and cultures interact and importantly how identities and ideologies are negotiated through translation. This panel ultimately seeks to open up a collaborative and supportive space for interdisciplinary research on tourism and advance our understanding of how translation mobilises and supports tourism communication. Contributors may address any aspect of tourism translation, but we particularly welcome submissions for the following areas:

- Manifestations (linguistic or other) of adaptation of tourism texts.
- Multimodal analysis of different types of tourism texts.
- The role of the translator in tourism communication.
- The development of new theories, models, and methodologies for the exploration of tourism translation.
- The construction of brand and identity in tourism texts and how these are negotiated in translation.
- Processes (linguistic or other) of destination promotion.
- Negotiation of cross-cultural differences in tourism.
- Ecotourism and its promotion.

References

Dann, Graham. 1996. *The Language of Tourism*. Oxon: CAB International.

Francesconi, Sabrina. 2014. *Reading Tourism Texts: A Multimodal Analysis*. Briston, Tonawanda, and Ontario: Channel View Publications.

Manca, Elena. 2016. *Persuasion in Tourism Discourse: methodologies and models*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishers.

Malamatidou, Sofia. 2018. "A Pretty Village is a Welcome Sight": A Contrastive Study of the Promotion of Physical Space in Official Tourism Websites." *Translation Spaces* 7(2): 304-333.

Urry, John, and Jonas Larsen. 2011. *The Tourist Gaze 3.0*. London: SAGE Publications.

31 Is Machine Translation Translation?

Conveners: Dorothy Kenny, Félix do Carmo, Mary Nurminen

Any contemporary investigation of advances in translation must surely take into account the rise of machine translation (MT), acknowledging improvements in its quality and the many worthy causes it can serve (Nurminen and Koponen 2020). But irenic engagement with the technology does not have to be uncritical (Kenny, Moorkens and do Carmo 2020), and alongside a growing number of empirical, technical, investigations of translation workflows that use MT, translation studies scholars have also begun to interrogate its ethical basis. Some such studies (e.g. do Carmo 2020) touch upon the very definition of translation, its relationship to post-editing, and the material consequences for professional translators of industry's sometimes self-serving construal of these activities. But there are still only rare explorations of how we in translation studies, by embracing MT, are changing our own construal of translation. And studies that reflect on how, by integrating MT into translation studies, we may be reconfiguring our field of inquiry, are even rarer. Against this backdrop, this panel aims to (re-)examine the field of translation studies, and its object of inquiry, in a context in which translation could be conceived of as taking many forms, including forms that culminate in readers accessing raw machine outputs. We thus invite proposals for conceptual papers that address such questions as:

- Is machine translation translation?
- Is there merit in continuing to distinguish between human and machine translation?
- How does our ontological basis affect how we approach these questions?

We also wish to generate debate on the effects of the full integration of MT, and related activities such as post-editing, into translation studies as a multidiscipline, and invite reflection on whether incorporating MT represents an advance for the discipline or an impoverishment (if we think MT constitutes a reduction of translation to automatable transfer). Ultimately, the panel poses a question that goes to the heart of the discipline: could MT be the straw that breaks translation studies' back, under the weight of the ongoing import of knowledge from outside, or could MT be a golden opportunity for translation studies to reveal the value of the knowledge it has already constructed and continues to construct on its object of study?

References

Carl, Michael (forthcoming) Computation and Representation in Cognitive Translation Studies. In Michael Carl (ed) Explorations in Empirical Translation Process Research. Berlin: Springer, 341-355.

do Carmo, Félix (2020) 'Time is Money' and the Value of Translation. In Joss Moorkens, Dorothy Kenny and Félix do Carmo (eds) (2020) Fair MT: Towards ethical, sustainable Machine Translation. Special Issue of Translation Spaces 9(1): 35-57.

Kenny, Dorothy, Joss Moorkens and Félix do Carmo (2020) 'Introduction', Fair MT: Towards ethical, sustainable Machine Translation, Special Issue of Translation Spaces 9(1): 1-11.

Nurminen, Mary and Marit Koponen (2020) Machine translation and fair access to information. In Joss Moorkens, Dorothy Kenny and Félix do Carmo (eds) (2020) Fair MT: Towards ethical, sustainable Machine Translation. Special Issue of Translation Spaces 9(1): 150-169.

Sager, Juan (1994) Language Engineering and Translation: Consequences of automation. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

32 **Advancing Translation Studies: integrating research on the translational construction of the social world**

Conveners: Dilek Dizdar, Tomasz Rozmyslowicz

For quite some time now, Translation Studies has been interested in translation and interpreting as constructive practices from which different types of collectivities emerge. While the focus has mainly been on understanding national or ethnic identities as products of translation processes, other research (also from other disciplines) has indicated that translation and interpreting also play a vital role in the emergence of other collectivities, such as linguistic communities, international organizations, scientific communities, religious gatherings, and social identity groups. However, these various undertakings have not yet been systematically related to each other. The aim of this panel is to bring these research endeavors together and discuss their results as investigations into the translational construction of collectivities. This way, a common frame of reference can be established which allows for comparisons between the different types of collectivities that translation and interpreting practices help to produce and the various ways in which they do this: Are similar mechanisms involved? How does the impact of translation and interpreting on the construction – or deconstruction – of collectivities differ across time and space? What concepts, theories, and methods are adequate for the investigation of such processes? Can we draw from established approaches within Translation Studies or is it necessary to look beyond disciplinary boundaries? The panel invites empirical, methodological or theoretical papers addressing questions related to the various forms and ways in which translation and interpreting practices participate in carving up the social world into collectivities. Possible topics include, but are not limited to:

- translation and interpreting as practices of drawing, redrawing and dissolving borders
- translation and interpreting as mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion
- translation/interpreting and the (de)construction of collectivities
- agents of translational constructions of collectivities: Humans, machines, institutions
- translation/interpreting and (linguistic) belonging.

References

Dizdar, Dilek/Gipper, Andreas/Schreiber, Michael (2015): *Nationenbildung und Übersetzung [Nation Building and Translation]*. Berlin: Frank & Timme (Ost-West-Express 23).

Meylaerts, Reine (2011): “Translational Justice in a Multilingual World: An Overview of Translational Regimes”, in: *Meta: Journal des traducteurs* 56:4, 743–757.

Sakai, Naoki (2009): “How Do We Count a Language? Translation and Discontinuity”, in: *Translation Studies* 2:1, 71–88.

Venuti, Lawrence (2012): “Translation, Community, Utopia”, in: Venuti, L.: *Translation Changes Everything*. London/New York: Routledge, 11-31.

Wolf, Michaela (2015): *The Habsburg Monarchy’s Many-Languaged Soul. Translating and Interpreting, 1848-1918*. Translated by Kate Sturge. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins (BTL 116).

33 The Self-Translation of Knowledge: Scholarship in Migration

Conveners: Spencer Hawkins, Lavinia Heller

Recent surges in conflict and oppression have led to an influx of refugees to Europe, which has in turn prompted us to reexamine traditional associations between nation and identity. These reexaminations have not left Translation Studies unaffected. During the last decade, Translation Studies has devoted new attention to the geographic relocation of human beings as a driving force behind interlinguistic transmission of loan words, exotic concepts, translated texts, and appropriated traditions. Throughout the migrational turn in Translation Studies, literary output has become paradigmatic of migrant cultural ambassadorship. Privileging the literary over other forms of discursive participation, however, risks obscuring the centrality of academic migrants who influence their host cultures through the complex work of self-translation within institutional spaces of knowledge production. For migrants to continue research abroad requires a complex process of translation and self-translation, not only into a new academic language, but also into a new academic and intellectual culture and these self-translations do not leave the host discourses and cultures unaffected. An intellectual history of academic migration has the complex task of investigating why certain self-translations achieve influence by accounting for social, linguistic, discursive, disciplinary, and philosophical mechanisms of adaptation, integration, and advancement. The study of (self-)translated humanistic scholarship promises valuable insight into the extent to which, for example, academics do in fact show consciousness of the conditions for the success of their self-translation. Such research could also reveal what academics in exile consider translatable in their lives and work, for whom those elements are translatable, and which specific rhetorical resources they must mobilize, as well as questioning whether the success or failure of academic self-translation depends on linguistic factors at all, or whether other factors are far more decisive: such as one's social and academic prestige and the suitability of one's work to academic research trends and the political climate within the university culture. We welcome paper proposals that discuss:

- case studies of the emergence of specific texts by voluntary or involuntary migrant scholars in the context of their translated lives
- the challenges and fruits of self-translation or exophonic scholarship for academic discourses
- theorizations of the migrant scholar, like Edward Said's "Reflections on Exile"

- rhetorical habits of academic migrant self-translation: including inventive loan translations and conceptually generative periphrasis, but also losses of complexity through the reliance on more easily mastered cliché and simplified arguments
- the capacity of an academic lingua franca to orient migrant writers' destinations and their deviations from the local languages of their displacement
- the effect of an academic lingua franca on international cooperation
- the asymmetries of scientific internationalism
- the geopolitical center of gravity around anglophone metropolises.

We welcome also papers that mark the dichotomies and methodological (in)compatibilities between:

- forced and voluntary academic migration
- successful and unsuccessful adaptation to new academic languages and cultures
- “hard” sciences and “soft” sciences
- ancient, medieval, and modern cases of academic migration
- migration in eras where one lingua franca predominates in the sciences and migration in eras of “Scientific Babel” (Gordin)
- explicitly migration-related translation theory concepts—like self-translation and exophony—and broader theories of translation—like skopos theory
- migration from the “semi-peripheries” (Bennett) to the metropolises of academia and the opposite movement, especially the migration of native English speakers to Asian educational institutions.

References

Bennett, Karen. *The Semiperiphery of Academic Writing: Discourses, Communities and Practices*. London: Palgrave Macmillan: 2014.

Gordin, Michael. *Scientific Babel*, Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press: 2015.

Inghelleri, Moira, *Translation and Migration*, New York: Routledge, 2017.

Polezzi, Loredana, "Translation and Migration" *Translation Studies* 5(3): 345-356, 2012.

Weigel, Sigrid, "Self-Translation and Its Discontents" *Migrating Histories of Art Self-Translations of a Discipline* ed. Maria Teresa Costa and Hans Christian Hönes, 21-35. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019.

34 **Re-thinking Translation History: Genealogies, Geopolitics, and Counter-hegemonic Approaches**

Conveners: Brian Baer, Philipp Hofeneder

Informed by post-structuralist (White 1987) and postcolonial approaches to historiography (Chakrabarty 2000), this panel aims to interrogate current histories of translation and Translation Studies and to propose new, counter-hegemonic approaches. Post-structuralist historiographers, such as Hayden White (1987, 5), argue that modern history is inseparable from narration, that is to say, the events must be "revealed as possessing a structure, an order of meaning, that they do not possess as mere sequence". Indeed, most of the Romance and Slavic languages acknowledge an etymological connection between historiography and storytelling (*histoire*, *historia*, etc. mean both 'history' and 'story'). At the same time, postcolonial scholars have critiqued dominant historiographical practices, what Chakrabarty terms "western historicism," as promoting and naturalizing developmental thinking, which construes cultures as more or less advanced and posits (Western) modernity as the teleological endpoint of all histories. Histories of historiography have also traced major shifts in the focus of histories, from great men and singular events to the anonymous forces studied by the Annales School (Burke 2015), and in the framing or situating of histories, e.g., from national histories (or Eurocentric) to transnational histories and histories from the margins; from universal, meta-histories to micro-histories; and from histories of humans to histories of commodities (see Kurlansky 2003). In addition, the specific notion of disciplinary histories has been interrogated as a feature of the academic "monocultures" of the Global North that work to exclude epistemologies of the South (Santos 2018). The panel invites theoretical papers and case studies on the history of translation and Translation Studies from these post-structuralist and post-colonial perspectives and using a variety of approaches to interrogate the dominant histories of the practice and the field of translation in order to explore the cultural logic that produces lacunae and historical breaks, to investigate "forgotten" voices and marginalized histories, to trace the influence of politics on translation theory, and to propose non-hegemonic historiographic approaches. Contributors may address but are not limited to the following topics:

- 1) The role of the Cold War, its politics and paranoia, in shaping contemporary histories of translation;
- 2) Bibliometric studies that trace shifting citational patterns as a version of translation historiography or that investigate citational practices as a form of genealogy creation;

- 3) Case studies investigating diverse translational spaces and times. Of interest are not only studies between ideologically, politically, and culturally divergent spaces but also within them (which is the case within the Socialist bloc);
- 4) Comparative historiographic studies, highlighting alternative or competing histories of the practice or field of translation;
- 5) Micro-histories or histories from the margins, i.e., the involvement of translators and interpreters in historical situations of violence and suppression, such as the slave trade or resistance movements;
- 6) Investigations of the historiographic challenges of writing modern or pre-modern histories of the theory and practice of translation;
- 7) Studies that focus on the unpredictable and the contingent in translation history (networks, spaces, and contacts).

References

- Burke, Peter. 2015. *The French historical revolution. The Annales School 1929-2014*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2000. *Provincializing Europe. Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Kurlansky, Mark. 2003. *Salt: A World History*. New York and London: Penguin Books.
- Said, Edward. 1994. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage.
- Santos, Buaventura de Sousa. 2018. *The End of Cognitive Empire: The Coming of Age of Epistemologies of the South*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- White, Hayden. 1987. *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.

35 **Crossing minorities in translation history: peripheries, gender and less translated languages**

Conveners: Maud Gonne, Laura Fóllica,

Despite a growing interest in minor(ized) voices in translation studies, less translated languages, cultures and agents (regional, female) are still kept to the margins of translation and cultural history. Moreover, they are mainly approached in isolation or in relation to dominant models (national, male), rather than in intersection, i.e. in relation to each other (regional-regional, female-female, regional-female, indigenous-regional-female, and so on). And yet, such intersectionalities challenge translation scholars to rethink translation history in the light of complex decentralized, entangled and paradoxical cultural dynamics. Indeed, while translation simultaneously promotes and threatens the very existence of peripheral languages and cultures, it is also a freeing practice for less legitimate agents such as women, allowing their incorporation in the intellectual or publishing fields. With other words, the complex intertwinement of minor(ized) languages, cultures, agents and practices invites us to reassess their role in translation history. We invite theoretical-methodological papers and case studies contributing to this interdisciplinary issue through different perspectives (among others global and literary history, gender studies, postcolonial studies, sociology of translation and digital humanities) without any spatial-temporal limitation. Possible topics include, but are not limited to:

1. Intersectionalities: theoretical perspectives on the crossing of translation and minor(ized) agents, cultures and geographies in translation history, including women (women translator and/or women translated), less translated and regional languages and cultures.
2. Historiographical methods: methodological challenges in the study of (the intersection of) minorities in translation history, among others the promises and pitfalls of biographical studies, prosopography, data mining, social network analysis, geohumanities and feminist and gender approaches.
3. Minorities and activism: the relationships between translation, activism and identity building in minority contexts, among others the function of women in the promotion of less translated cultures and languages.
4. Mapping multiscale dynamics: case studies targeting multiscale (translocal, transregional, transnational) flows and intersections of minor(ized) agents, cultures and geographies.

References

Branchadell, Albert and Lovell Margaret West. 2005. *Less Translated Languages*, John Benjamins.

Flotow, Luise von and Frazaneh Farahzad. 2017. *Translating Women. Different Voices and New Horizons*, Routledge.

Fólica, Laura “The translation of indigenous languages in Latin American avant-garde literary journals of the first half of the 20th century” and Maud Gonne “Translating minorities. Literary translation beliefs and Walloon identity building (1850-1930)”, in Diana Roig Sanz, Elisabet Carbó and Ana Kvirikashvili (eds.). *Special issue of Comparative Literature Studies*, forth. 2022

Lionnet, Françoise and Shu-mei Shih. 2005. *Minor Transnationalism*, Duke University Press.

Roig Sanz, Diana and Reine Meylaerts. 2018. *Literary Translation and Cultural Mediators in 'Peripheral' Cultures*. Palgrave Macmillan.

36 Literary Translation and Soft Power in the *Longue Durée*

Conveners: Diana Roig Sanz, Elisabet Carbó, Lucía Campanella

This panel focuses on the analysis of literary translation and soft power in the *longue durée* within the growing field of global translation history. Much has been written on literary translation and politics (Tymcozko & Gentzler 2002), but the potential of translation in terms of consolidating political formations and soft power has only recently been explicitly addressed (Batchelor 2019). We argue therefore that dialogue with disciplines such as international relations, cultural diplomacy or global history (von Flotow 2018; Carbó and Roig Sanz 2022, *forth.*) offers fertile ground to analyse the role of translation in shaping the ways a given culture is perceived abroad. As a corollary, this panel seeks to push further the interdisciplinary analysis of translation as a form of foreign action in nation-building processes, and historicize it from a *longue durée*, multilingual and decentred perspective. It also proposes to explore the ways literary translation intervenes in the consecration of a given culture/literature, and as a space where power struggles are manifested and renegotiated both on a textual and extratextual level. In this respect, we propose the following topics:

1. Theoretical proposals that can integrate multiple borrowings from other disciplines, from international relations and cultural diplomacy to global history or world literature, to think the ways literary translation can become a form of intervening in the political arena.
2. Methodological challenges in the analysis of literary translation and soft power (Nye 2004) across temporalities and multiple geographies.
3. Case studies from early modern to contemporary periods that can analyse how the Empire or the State intervene in the creation and manipulation of world literature through translation, or how foreign cultural policies promote translations through national institutes, embassies, cultural centres, foreign affairs ministers, or international institutions such as the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation or UNESCO.
4. The role of agents, both individual and collective, in the promotion of translations or as responsible of non-circulation. Reflections on how gender plays in this framework are particularly welcome.

Across these research lines, we also seek to encourage the discussion on the effects and reactions triggered by translations after they are published.

References

Batchelor, Kathryn (2019) “Literary translation and soft power: African literature in Chinese translation”, *The Translator*, 25:4, 401-419

Carbó-Catalan, Elisabet and Diana Roig-Sanz (Eds.) (forth. 2022) *Culture as Soft Power. Bridging Cultural Relations, Intellectual Cooperation and Cultural Diplomacy*. Berlin: De Gruyter. Accepted for publication.

Nye, Joseph S (2004). *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs.

Tymoczko, Maria & Gentzler, Edwin (2002). *Translation and Power*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

von Flotow, Luise (2018). “Translation and cultural diplomacy” in *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Politics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Routledge.

37 Translation and transcultural circulation of memory narratives

Conveners: Geir Uvsløkk, Anneleen Spiessens, Jeroen Vandaele

Despite the recent ‘transcultural’ turn in Memory Studies, which underscores the dynamism of remembering as it travels across time, space, cultures and media, little attention has yet been paid to the specific role of translation in disseminating, retransmitting and understanding memory narratives. Recent publications and initiatives are beginning to fill this knowledge gap — Deane-Cox (2013); Brownlie (2016); Castillo Villanueva & Pintado Gutiérrez (2019); Deane-Cox & Spiessens (forthcoming); and the 2019 conference *Translating Cultural Memory in Fiction and Testimony*, which explicitly promoted dialogue between memory studies and translation studies, thus producing a range of perspectives on translated narratives about traumatic pasts (Jünke & Schyns 2022 [forthcoming]). Inspired by these initiatives, this panel intends to explore the mechanisms and implications of various modes of translation when memories of conflicts from the 20th and 21st centuries travel across languages and cultures, both in fiction and non-fiction, and both in testimonies and postmemorial texts. Relevant topics are: Which strategies do editors, translators and other agents of translation resort to – linguistically, discursively, literarily, historically – to ensure and shape the transmission of conflict memories that are not their own? Which ethical roles and questions are at play in such processes? To what extent are agents of translation invested and involved in texts that are so intimately connected to the authors’ personal or familial experiences, and in which cases can they be considered “secondary witnesses” (Deane-Cox 2013)? Moreover, how are the translations received in the target culture, compared to the original reception? And what do the translated texts themselves reveal about the way memories are received, reinterpreted and re-signified as they cross borders? The panel conveners invite contributions that address memory in translation in relation to 20th and 21st century conflicts.

References

Brownlie, S. (2016). *Mapping Memory in Translation*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Castillo Villanueva, A. & L. Pintado Gutiérrez (eds). 2019. *New Approaches to Translation, Conflict and Memory. Narratives of the Spanish Civil War and the Dictatorship*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Deane-Cox, S. 2013. “The Translator as Secondary Witness: Mediating Memory in Antelme’s *L’espèce humaine*”, *Translation Studies* 6(3): 309-23.

Deane-Cox, S & A. Spiessens (eds.). Forthcoming. Routledge Handbook of Translation and Memory. Routledge.

Jünke, C & D. Schyns (eds.). 2022 [Forthcoming]. Translating Cultural Memory in Fiction and Testimony - Memory Studies and Translation Studies in Dialogue. Routledge.

38 Advancing intradisciplinary research on indirect translation

Conveners: Hanna Pięta, Ester Torres-Simón, Lucile Davier

If indirect translation is understood broadly as a translation of a translation (Gambier 1994), it can take the shape of oral mediation, intralingual, interlingual or intercultural recontextualization, intersemiotic translation, etc. Such practices are the object of research in different branches of Translation Studies, particularly those that often deal with fuzzy source-target-mediating text situations. Most strands of research on indirect translation and similar concepts have been developing separately within specialized subfields, and there has been no productive dialogue between them (see Pięta 2017). This development echoes the fragmentation of the discipline observed by Chesterman (2019). Different research strands call indirect translation different names (e.g., relay interpreting, pivot subtitling, bridge method, multilingual news reporting, cf. Washbourne 2013, Davier and van Doorslaer 2018). They look at this practice by cooperating with specialists from different disciplines (accessibility studies, computer sciences, linguistics, religious studies), resort to distinct conceptual and methodological borrowings and often focus on entirely different research questions. With this panel we aim to promote a more systematic dialogue between different subfields of Translation Studies. We welcome submissions that focus on indirect translation in any translation domain, but particularly those that cut across two or more domains or that stress advances that can be generalized to other domains. The list of topics includes but is not limited to:

- historical developments in indirect translation practices
- ethical issues in the production of indirect translation
- different stakeholders' attitudes towards indirect translation
- indirect translation in crisis situations
- technology in the production of indirect translations
- non-professional indirect translation
- competences needed to efficiently translate from translation or for further translation
- training approaches to indirect translation
- methodological, conceptual or terminological features that connect the different strands of indirect translation research.

The panel organizers intend to start and end this panel with an open discussion, to better connect common threads that emerge from the individual contributions.

References

CHESTERMAN, Andrew. 2019. "Consilience or fragmentation in Translation Studies today?" *Slovo. ru: baltijskij akcent*. 10 (1): 9–20.

DAVIER, Lucile, and Luc van Doorslaer. 2018. Translation without a source text: methodological issues in news translation. *Across Languages and Cultures* 19 (2): 241–257.

GAMBIER, Yves. 1994. "La retraduction, retour et détour." *Meta* 39 (3): 413–417.

PIĘTA, Hanna. 2017. "Theoretical, methodological and terminological issues in researching indirect translation: A critical annotated bibliography." *Translation Studies* 10 (2): 198–216.

WASHBOURNE, Kelly. 2013. "Nonlinear Narratives: Paths of Indirect and Relay Translation." *Meta* 58 (3): 607–625.

39 Advancing Intralingual Translation

Conveners: Karen Korning Zethsen, Linda Pillière, Manuel Moreno Tovar

Over the last fifteen years, research on intralingual translation — roughly defined as translation within the “same language” — has actively contributed to expanding the aim and scope of Translation Studies. Researchers with an interest in this concept have built on its description as “rewording” in Jakobson’s classic typology to challenge reductionist understandings of translation, while also destabilising the very notion of language. Scholarly perspectives on translation today seem to be more inclusive than ever before, and the pervasive focus on interlingual phenomena is countered by initiatives such as the upcoming International Research Workshop “Intralingual Translation: Language, text and beyond” and The Routledge Handbook of Intralingual Translation. In order to further advance intralingual translation as a research priority in Translation Studies, it needs to be understood as a highly diverse set of practices that often requires a very specific set of skills. Analysing the texts resulting from such practices in search of microstrategies and shifts has proven beneficial to describe some of the (dis)similarities between interlingual and intralingual translation, as well as between different subtypes of the latter. Following the panel “Intralingual translation — breaking boundaries” at the EST Congress 2016, this panel aims to serve as a space for empirical contributions and theoretical discussions on intralingual translation, particularly by encouraging original approaches and the study of instances that have thus far received marginal attention. Submissions are welcome in areas including but not limited to:

- conceptualizations of intralingual translation that challenge Eurocentrism in academia
- intralingual interpreting, retranslating, revising and transediting
- intralingual translation across language varieties and text types
- intralingual translation and accessibility
- intralingual translation and agency
- intralingual translation and technology
- intralingual translation, ideology and power
- intralingual translation, language learning and translator training
- intralingual translation research beyond Translation Studies
- methodological aspects of intralingual translation research

- the relationship between intralingual, interlingual and intersemiotic translation.

References

Zethsen, K. K. (2007). Beyond Translation Proper: Extending the field of translation studies. *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction*, 20(1), 281–308. <https://doi.org/10.7202/018506ar>

Zethsen, K. K. (2009). Intralingual translation: an attempt at description. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 54(4), 795–812. <https://doi.org/10.7202/038904ar>

Hill-Madsen, A. & K.K. Zethsen (2016). Intralingual translation and its place within Translation Studies – a theoretical discussion. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 61(3), 692–708. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1039225ar>

Pillièrè, L. (2021). *Intralingual Translation of British Novels: A Multimodal Stylistic Perspective*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Berk Albachten, Ö. & L. Pillièrè (Eds., forthcoming). *The Routledge Handbook of Intralingual Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

40 No Kidding – Translating, Transcreating and Transmediating for Children

Conveners: Joanna Dybiec-Gajer, Riitta Oittinen, Aleksandra Wiczorkiewicz

From a personal perspective, (translated) children's books provide first, intimate and unique encounters with literature. From a TS perspective, studying such texts, i.e. children's literature translation studies, seems the only research domain defined by its primary recipient – the child, which stresses the deeply engrained humanistic concern of the enterprise. The impulse to research translations of children's literature came from the field of literary studies (seminal IRSCS proceedings, Klingberg et al. 1978). Since then the research area has gained academic credibility with an enormous increase in the amount of scholarly and critical writing on the subject, especially during the last twenty years. In line with the conference theme, the goal of this panel is to study new advances in the field, at the planes of both research developments and professionalization of practices in translating, transcreating and transmediating for children. Such terminological choices allow for a broader perspective, moving beyond translation in a prototypical sense and taking into account not only the classical literary genres, but also audio-medial texts and other created and mediated in digital environs. In exploring the latest trends and developments in the field, the questions that this panel will seek to answer are:

- In what directions is the approach to and understanding of translation for children evolving nowadays?
- What areas in literature, culture and society pose major challenges for contemporary translators of texts for children?
- How are technological improvements and market globalisation affecting translation for young audiences?

More specifically, in line with progressing institutionalization of the research area and a shift to investigate transformative and mediating practices such as transcreation, transadaptation and transmediation, this panel welcomes contributions related, but not limited to the following topics:

- transdisciplinarity and new methodologies (participatory research, corpus methods, (auto)ethnography)
- documentation of translated children's literature: texts, contexts, agents (histories, anthologies, dictionaries)
- institutional recognition and reception (literary prizes, curricula)

- changes in child images affecting children's literature and its translation
- evolutions of norms in translating for children
- local/national traditions in translating for children
- translation and identity
- classic and new translation problems and issues: dual address, stereotyping, ideology, gender and racial awareness
- visual literature in translation: comics, graphic novels, picturebooks
- transmediations of children's classics: re-writing, re-illustration and adaptation for other media
- translating for children within the global publishing, distribution and translation industries
- last but not least, the voice of the child recipient.

References

Dybiec-Gajer, Joanna, Agnieszka Gicala (eds), 2021, *Mediating Practices in Translation for Children: Tackling Controversial Topics*, Berlin: Peter Lang.

Dybiec-Gajer, Joanna, Oittinen Riitta (eds), 2020, *Negotiating Translation and Transcreation of Children's Literature*, Singapore: Springer.

Kerchy, Anna, Björn Sundmark (eds), 2020, *Translating and Transmediating Children's Literature*, Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Klingberg, Göte, Øvrig Mary, Stuart Amort, 1978, *Children's Books in Translation*, Lund: CWK Gleerup.

Lathey, Gillian, 2010, *The Role of Translators in Children's Literature: Invisible Storytellers*, New York: Routledge.

Lathey, Gillian, 2016, *Translating Children's Literature*, 2016, London & New York: Routledge.

Oittinen, Riitta, Anne Ketola, Melissa Garavini, 2018, *Translating Picturebooks: Revoicing the Verbal, the Visual and the Aural for a Child Audience*, New York: Routledge.

van Coillie Jan, Jack MacMartin (eds), 2020, *Children's Literature in Translation. Texts and Contexts*, Leuven: Leuven University Press.

41 Being a literary translator in the digital age: Agency, identity and ethics

Conveners: Wenqian Zhang, Motoko Akashi, Peter Jonathan Freeth

In recent years, growing interest in the role and status of literary translators has resulted in the development of what has been called “literary translator studies” (Kaindl et al., 2021). However, while scholars have investigated the agency and ethics behind literary translator’s social and textual acts in various contexts, such as the position of the translator in the literary field (Haddadian-Moghaddam, 2014), the translator’s voice in retranslation (Taivalkoski-Shilov, 2015), and the development of a translator brand (Zhang, 2020), the focus has often remained on historical contexts. By contrast, approaches that focus on contemporary contexts and digital methodologies enable research to show the multifaceted roles that translators can play in the movement of literary texts between cultures and languages that goes well beyond acts of linguistic transfer. For example, by offering translation mentorships, teaching at summer schools and establishing translation prizes (e.g. Daniel Hahn), interacting with readers via social media; and even developing their own fan bases (Akashi, 2018). As such, this panel aims to further advance current understandings of the literary translator’s role by pushing literary translator studies towards the digital, thereby seeking to generate more dialogue and scholarship both across disciplines, and between academia and industry. Contributions are invited on the following and other relevant topics:

- Conceptual and theoretical approaches to the role of literary translators in contemporary contexts
- The influence of digital and social media on the role of literary translators
- The broader sociocultural contexts and power structures in which literary translators work; as well as the agency, identity and ethics of literary translators therein
- Applying methods or frameworks from historical or micro-historical research to contemporary contexts
- Ethical responsibilities and/or dilemmas in translation and publishing processes; ethical principles that inform literary translator’s textual and social acts
- Literary translator training and the dialogue between pedagogy and practice.

References

Akashi, Motoko. 2018. "Translator Celebrity: Investigating Haruki Murakami's Visibility as a Translator." *Celebrity Studies* 9 (2): 271-278.

Haddadian-Moghaddam, Esmaeil. 2014. *Literary Translation in Modern Iran: A Sociological Study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kaindl, Klaus, Waltraud Kolb, and Daniela Schlager. eds. 2021. *Literary Translator Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Taivalkoski-Shilov, Kristiina. 2015. "Friday in Finnish: A character's and (re)translators' voices in six Finnish retranslations of Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*". *Target* 27(1): 58-74.

Zhang, Wenqian. 2020. *Towards a Sociological Construction of the Translator's Brand: The Case of Howard Goldblatt*. PhD thesis, University of Leeds.

42 New Perspectives on Ibsen in Translation

Convener: Giuliano D'Amico

Ever since the German translation of *Brand* (1872), the works of the Norwegian dramatist Henrik Ibsen have circulated widely in both European and extra-European languages. Although his international reception has been an object of study for over a century, relatively few studies have concentrated on his translations, either as literary works or as textual means of reception; Ibsen's stage history has always been the main narrative. The proposed panel aims to contribute to a reversal of this trend.

References

Liyang Xia, *Heart higher than the sky: reinventing Chinese femininity through Ibsen's Hedda Gabler* (2013)

Giuliano D'Amico, *Domesticating Ibsen for Italy* (2013)

Ellen Rees, *Ibsen's Peer Gynt and the Production of Meaning* (2014)

Thor Holt, *Far from home: Ibsen through the camera lens in the Third Reich* (2020)

Cristina Gómez-Baggethun, *Spain in an assembly: fighting for a future through productions of Ibsen's An enemy of the people* (2021)

43 Song Translation Studies

Conveners: Johan Franzon, Annjo Klungervik Greenall

In the bibliography accompanying the introductory chapter of the book *Song Translation: Lyrics in Contexts* (2021, edited by Franzon, Greenall, Kvam & Parianou), 49 academic articles are listed, published since 2010, all dealing with the subject of song translation. This is evidence of a recent increase in interest in this fascinating field which is no less than remarkable. But also timely, since research done within this field can help shed essential light on the process, product and reception of translation in general, especially concerning leading-edge topics such as creativity and voice in translation, non-professional translation, multimodal translation, and translation as a tool for ‘rapprochement’ between cultures (Susam-Saraeva 2015). Seeing as most of the mentioned research comes in the form of relatively disconnected case studies, we wish to dedicate the proposed panel to reflections on the distinctive and shared characteristics of this research topic, as well as possible avenues for research in the future. More specifically, we will invite research on the following topics:

- The relative identity and autonomy of the field of ‘song translation studies’
- Terminological issues: how useful is general translation-studies terminology within the field, and do we need (more) tailor-made terms?
- Strategies in song translation
- Song translation as a creative and multimodal task
- Travelling songs and rapprochement – how song translation works in mediating understanding between cultures
- How song translation may contribute to our understanding of translation in general, and how it connects with and adds insight to neighbouring fields, e.g., adaptation studies and ethnomusicology.

We wish to include both theoretical advancements in the topic as well as further case studies of a descriptive-explanatory nature, e.g. on songs, genres (e.g. pop, rock, art song), modes (folk tradition, theatrical performance, audiovisual services), as well as the skopoi and afterlife of song translations.

References

Franzon, Johan, and Annjo K. Greenall, Sigmund Kvam, Anastasia Parianou (eds.). 2021. *Song Translation: Lyrics in Contexts*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.

Desblache, Lucile. 2019. *Music and Translation: New Mediations in the Digital Age*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Low, Peter. 2016. *Translating Song: Lyrics and Texts*. London/New York: Routledge.

Susam-Saraeva, Şebnem. 2015. *Translation and Popular Music: Transcultural Intimacy in Turkish-Greek Relations*. Oxford: Peter Lang.

Minors, Helen Julia (ed.). 2013. *Music, Text and Translation*. London: Bloomsbury.

44 Popular music and cultural transfer

Conveners: Francis Mus, Pieter Boulogne

The complaint that “translations have by and large been ignored as bastard brats beneath the recognition (let alone concern) of truly serious literary scholars” (Holmes 1978, 69) has functioned more or less as the birth certificate of our discipline, but there are still “bastard brats” around that we ourselves have been overlooking. The translation of popular music, for instance, has not yet received a great deal of attention. When in the 1990s the translation of music grew into a normal object of study, canonical genres (opera, art songs) were privileged. The first studies dealing with translated popular music tended to be carried out by practitioners in the field rather than by scholars. Since two decades or so, song translation is receiving more and more academic coverage. Even so, as Lucile Desblache (2019, 27) denounces, “musical transnationalism, transculturalism and translation in the narrow (translation involving song lyrics or writings about music) or wide (transcreation or mediation of musical styles and genres) senses of the word, remain largely unexplored.” Drawing on insights from both Translation Studies and Cultural Transfer Studies, this panel aims to shed light on the various ways in which popular music, be it in the original form or in translation, spreads around the world, both historically and currently. Clearly, popular music tends to circulate and cross national borders at a very fast pace. When the lyrics are translated, the translation strategies applied to vocal music can greatly differ. In other cases, a full comprehension of the original lyrics is considered of minor importance. Sometimes, the relative inaccessibility of the song text in a given receiving community can even be advantageous to its success. Envisaging a scholarly discussion that goes beyond individual case studies and the multimodal comparison of source texts with corresponding target texts, this panel proposes to focus on the general mechanisms that are brought into play when popular music is transferred to a new cultural environment. Possible subtopics and approaches may include but are not limited to:

- What are the similarities and differences between the transfer of popular music and the transfer of other cultural products, such as poetry?
- What are the motives for the (non-)translation of popular songs?
- What selection mechanisms and translation strategies are adopted for popular music?
- What factors determine whether a translated version of a popular song is received as an autonomous cultural product?

- What is the status of the author/translator/performer in the case of translated popular music?

References

DESBLACHE, Lucile. 2019. *Music and Translation. New Mediations in the Digital Age*. London : Palgrave Macmillan.

FRANZON, Johan. GREENALL, Annjo, K. KVAM, Sigmund. PARIANOU, Anastasia. (eds.) 2021. *Song Translation: Lyrics in Contexts*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.

GORLÉE, Dinda L. (ed.). 2005. *Song and Significance: Virtues and Vices of Vocal Translation*. Amsterdam/New York : Rodopi.

HOLMES, James S. 1978. "Describing Literary Translations: Models and Methods." In *Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies*, edited by James S. Holmes, José Lambert & Raymond van den Broeck, 69-82. Leuven: Acco.

MINORS, Helen. (ed.) 2013. *Music, text and translation*. Camden : Bloomsbury.

SUSAM-SARAJEVA, Sebnem. 2008. *Translation and Music*. Special issue of *The Translator*. 14-2.

45 A Global Perspective on Translation Flows

Conveners: Ondrej Vimr, Diana Roig-Sanz, Julia Miesenböck

Systemic approaches (Zohar, Hermans) or sociology of translation (Heilbron, Sapiro) have sought to understand the historical and contemporary acts of translation as embedded in a wider international context. Yet, the former has been criticised for overlooking the human agent, while the latter has far too often employed a centrist world-systems model and dichotomies of centre vs. periphery or dominated vs. dominating, diverting attention from the distributed (multicentric), multi-layered and non-deterministic nature of intercultural communication, including literary circulation. This panel aims to advance the investigation of translation flows by taking inspiration from Global Studies and focus on concepts that allow fresh investigations while addressing many of the familiar issues of the place of literature in international communication and cultural exchange. We suggest topics falling into three categories: Connectivity, connections, and space. How does connectivity – or the fact that people stay in touch with each other as technology of the time allows – impact the international translation flows both now and from a historical perspective? Translations are results of such connectivity, and they are a form of connections across linguistic and geographical borders. How can we map translation zones and understand the patterns and circuits of connections between multiple regions, literatures, publishers, authors, literary agents, book fairs and festivals, or translators? How does connectivity and connections relate to each other? Scales, layers, and time. A global perspective involves an integration of different scales and layers. How do we approach local acts or regional patterns of translation from a global perspective? What is the interplay between the local, regional, and global scale of translation? How do unforeseen layers of international literary circulation (such as involving specific genres, topics, or repertoires) impact our understanding of translation flows at various scales and different historical epochs? Agency. Literary translation involves many actors, including translators, authors, publishers, literary agents, scouts, diplomats, institutions, or other cultural mediators (Roig Sanz and Meylaerts 2018). Most of them act in multiple capacities, across various scales and layers at the same time. What methods do we have at hand to disentangle the complexity of such relations and explore the impact of individuals or groups of individuals on literary flows at a particular time and place? How does global consciousness and connectivity affect their choices and actions? How do the actions of individuals affect the global? And what role do women play in these global translation flows? We welcome proposals employing all methods, including qualitative and computation (digital humanities) approaches, from all parts of the globe, addressing issues at any scale dating to any historical era as long as a global perspective is employed.

References

James, Paul, and Manfred B. Steger. 2016. 'Globalisation and Global Consciousness: Levels of Connectivity'. In Roland Robertson and Didem Buhari-Gulmez (eds.): *Global Culture: Consciousness and Connectivity*, pp. 5–20. London - New York: Routledge.

Nederveen Pieterse, Jan. 2021. *Connectivity and Global Studies*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Roig-Sanz, Diana, and Reine Meylaerts (eds.) 2018. *Literary Translation and Cultural Mediators in 'Peripheral' Cultures: Customs Officers Or Smugglers?* Palgrave Macmillan.

Vimr, Ondrej. 2022 (forth.): 'Choosing Books for Translation. A Connectivity Perspective on the Current Practice of Translation Publishing' in Diana Roig-Sanz and Neus Rotger (eds.): *Global Literary Studies: Key Concepts*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

46 Exploring translation policy in translation publishing

Conveners: Paola Gentile, Jack McMartin, Reine Meylaerts

This panel seeks to explore translation policy in literary publishing settings. As a concept, translation policy has most recently been used to explore legal, institutional and administrative aspects (Meylaerts 2011), e.g., how translation policy is enacted in the European Union, or how it is used by governments to guarantee or limit citizens' right to understand information and access public services (González Núñez & Meylaerts 2017). However, translation policy also operates in “a wide range of relatively informal situations related to ideology, translators' strategies, publishers' strategies, prizes and scholarships, translator training, etc.” (Meylaerts 2011, 163). In recent years, researchers working at the intersection of translation publishing and the sociology of translation have foregrounded translation policy in the literary sphere by focusing on the transnational processes and institutions involved in the publication of translated works from the ‘periphery’ (McMartin & Gentile 2020), which are often facilitated by state-sponsored institutions with clear strategies for international literary circulation and promotion (Heilbron & Sapiro 2018). This panel seeks to further explore the link between translation policy and the publishing industry, with a special focus on the selection, acquisition, production, and marketing of translated literature, the institutions facilitating the production of translated literature, and the overlapping social spheres (cultural, commercial, political) and scales (local, national, regional, global) that shape how translated literature comes into being in the contemporary, globalized book market. Relevant topics include but are not limited to:

- Theoretical and methodological reflections on translation policy in relation to the publishing industry
- Case studies examining the translation policy of specific publishing houses or governmental institutions, or clusters thereof
- The role of government organizations in literary transfer to and from (peripheral) cultures and languages
- Links between the various institutional actors involved in the publication of a translated book
- Translation policy as it relates to literature in contexts in which censorship is practiced.

References

González Núñez, Gabriel, and Reine Meylaerts. 2017. *Translation and Public Policy. Interdisciplinary Perspectives and Case Studies*. London/New York: Routledge.

Heilbron, Johan and Gisèle Sapiro. 2018. "Politics of Translation: How States Shape Cultural Transfers" In *Literary Translation and Cultural Mediators in 'Peripheral' Cultures*, eds. Diana Roig-Sanz and Reine Meylaerts, Palgrave Macmillan, 183-208.

McMartin, Jack, and Paola Gentile. 2020. "The transnational production and reception of 'a future classic': Stefan Hertmans' *War and Turpentine* in 30 languages". *Translation Studies* 13 (3): 271–90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2020.1735501>

Meylaerts, Reine. 2011. "Translation policy". In *Handbook of Translation Studies - Volume 1*, eds. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, 163–68. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.2.tra10>.

47 **Between Tradition and Advancement: How Can Translational Hermeneutics Contribute to Contemporary Translation Studies?**

Conveners: Beata Piecychna, Larisa Cercel

Translational hermeneutics is a dynamic approach that actively contributes to the advancement of the discipline through conferences (Cologne 2011, 2013, 2016, Saarbrücken 2018, Leipzig 2020), numerous publications (including Stolze 2011, Cercel 2013, Stanley et al. 2018, Venuti 2019, Piecychna 2021, Robinson forthcoming), and the founding of a journal (Yearbook of Translational Hermeneutics). Two specific aspects of this approach have to be mentioned here: (1) Translational hermeneutics is a school of thought that had its theoretically fixed beginning two hundred years ago with Friedrich Schleiermacher, and thus can probably boast the longest tradition in Translation Studies. (2) By focusing on the person of the translator and by its attempt to uncover the basic structures of human translation, this approach presents itself as an advance to a fundamental level of reflection on translation. The similarities with the newly emerged Translator Studies, in which the thesis of the primacy of the translator in the translation process is empirically supported above all by psychology and cognitive science, are unmistakable. The core questions of the panel are thus: How does the hermeneutical heritage contribute to current translational debates? How can hermeneutical thought be mobilized for the further development of translation research? The main objective of this panel is to reflect on the status of contemporary translational hermeneutics, with particular emphasis on how this sub-field can contribute to advancing Translation Studies by uniquely connecting the hermeneutical legacy of the past with the potential of contemporaneity. Possible sub-topics include, but are not limited to:

- The legacy of Friedrich Schleiermacher's, Martin Heidegger's, Hans-Georg Gadamer's and Paul Ricoeur's hermeneutics for the development of Translation Studies
- The interplay between translational hermeneutics and cognitive sciences
- The hermeneutic approach to translation teaching
- The hermeneutic approach to analysing literary and non-literary renderings
- The relationship between hermeneutics and performativity in translation
- The tenets of hermeneutics and their potential use within Genetic Translation Studies

- New theoretical and methodological perspectives on translational hermeneutics.

References

Cerel, L. (2013). *Übersetzungshermeneutik. Historische und systematische Grundlegung*. St. Ingbert: Röhrig Universitätsverlag.

Pieczchna, B. (2021). *The Multidimensionality of Translational Hermeneutics: Theoretical and Methodological Perspectives*. Białystok: Temida2.

Robinson, D. (ed.) (forthcoming). *Cognition and Hermeneutics: Convergences in the Study of Translation* (special issue of the *Yearbook of Translational Hermeneutics* 2, 2022).

Stanley, J., O’Keeffe, B., Stolze, R. and Cerel, L. (eds.). (2018). *Philosophy and Practice in Translational Hermeneutics*. Bucharest: Zeta Books.

Stolze, R. (2011). *The Translator’s Approach: An Introduction to Translational Hermeneutics with Examples from Practice*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.

Venuti, Lawrence (2019). *Contra Instrumentalism. A Translation Polemic*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

48 The #namethetranslator Campaign in Perspective

Convener: Nefise Kahraman

This panel focuses on the #namethetranslator campaign that has been sweeping through social media and asking to redress a decades-old injustice committed against translators by erasing their names from the cover of books. The campaign urges publishers to allow translators to share the limelight with authors and aims to bring greater visibility to translators to make people aware that they are reading a book in translation. The campaign seemingly assumes that all translators would like to gain visibility through the practice of naming. The panel invites papers looking at exceptional cases where we encounter a translator who wishes to remain invisible for various reasons. What could motivate a translator's deliberate invisibility? Can we imagine a translator who is deliberately invisible in the sense that they would rather not be named on the cover or at all? The panel also invites papers relating to the #namethetranslator campaign that explore whether the act of naming a translator carries with it an inherent responsibility for translators to market the book and serve as spokesperson more broadly. Other possible questions to raise may include: Can we think about the #namethetranslator campaign in connection with Translator Studies which reengages with the human translator in the age of AI and puts the human back into Translation Studies? If we are to read a translator's name on the cover as a paratextual cue or a peritext, what could we make of its absence or potential exclusion? Can we detect a different pattern or practice in the act of naming a translator of minoritized languages?

49 What cognition does for interpreting - what interpreting does for cognition?

Conveners: Kilian Seeber, Alexis Hervais-Adelman, Rhona Amos

Interpreting has long been recognized as a complex and demanding cognitive activity. Early accounts of the intellectual requirements for aspiring interpreters, such as "quick-wittedness" and "good memory" Jean Herbert (1952:4), have fuelled a recurring debate about whether interpreters are born or made. In other words, whether a unique cognitive architecture allows interpreters to perform this complex task, or whether it is the execution of the task that engenders changes to the interpreter's cognitive architecture. By analogy with the, admittedly increasingly controversial, bilingual advantage hypothesis, whereby exercising multilingual language control leads to benefits for domain general executive functions, it has been proposed that interpreting expertise may also drive benefits in various cognitive domains, such as predictive processing (Chernov, 1994), attentional control, cognitive flexibility (Yudes, Macizo, & Bajo, 2011), and working memory. Babcock and Vallesi (2017) found that interpreters had an advantage over multilinguals in a subset of skills directly associated with interpreting – working memory and language control. In a longitudinal investigation of trainee interpreters Babcock et al. (2017) found that there was no significant difference in working memory between interpreter trainees and control groups prior to training, but that an advantage developed after training. However, the evidence in favour of the "made" over "born" view remains scant, and there is currently little agreement as to the cognitive domains in which the "interpreter advantage" (García, 2014) can be reliably detected. In this panel we want to revisit the question about the complex relationship between cognitive ability and interpreting expertise. Submissions are welcome in the following areas:

- Meta analyses of studies into a cognitive interpreter advantage
- Longitudinal studies of cognitive effects of interpreter training and expertise
- Cognitive parameters in aptitude and proficiency testing
- Comparative studies of naïve multilinguals and trained interpreters.

References

Babcock, L., Capizzi, M., Arbula, S., & Vallesi, A. (2017). Short-Term Memory Improvement After Simultaneous Interpretation Training. *Journal of Cognitive Enhancement*, 1(3), 254-267. doi:10.1007/s41465-017-0011-x

Babcock, L., & Vallesi, A. (2017). Are simultaneous interpreters expert bilinguals, unique bilinguals, or both? *Bilingualism-Language and Cognition*, 20(2), 403-417. doi:10.1017/S1366728915000735

Chernov, G. V. (2004). *Inference and Anticipation in Simultaneous Interpreting*: John Benjamins Publishing.

García, A. M. (2014). The interpreter advantage hypothesis: Preliminary data patterns and empirically motivated questions. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*. The Journal of the American Translation and Interpreting Studies Association, 9(2), 219-238. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.9.2.04gar>

Yudes, C., Macizo, P., & Bajo, T. (2011). The influence of expertise in simultaneous interpreting on non-verbal executive processes. *Front Psychol*, 2, 309. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00309