

*Book Reviews*

**New Sign Language Interpreting Book Offers Promise**

Marschark, M., Peterson, R., & Winston, E. A. (Eds.). (2005). *Interpreting and Interpreter Education: Directions for Research and Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press. 328 pages. Hardcover. \$59.95.

This book includes 12 chapters on sign language interpreting, its history, education, research, and practice in educational settings—in the United States, Australia, and Great Britain. Editors Marschark, Peterson, and Winston attempted, in their compilation of diverse works, to represent what must have been an exciting 2004 workshop bearing the same name. I completed my reading with hopes that the National Science Foundation will sponsor a 2009 workshop, where these 22 authors will revisit their research, attitudes, and recommendations for a 5-year update.

My review has mixed reactions, most very favorable but some burdened by a tone of negativity. Dennis Cokely's introductory chapter has a begrudging and patronizing tone that simply does not fit a retelling of the history of interpreting; history is what it is. Graham Turner's Chapter 2 addresses the history of British Sign Language and the growth of interpreters who "choose" (I like this theme of "choice-making") to "negotiate meaning" (p. 49). His call for "evidence-based" research to motivate curriculum for educating interpreters and for improving access for deaf students is consistent with Robert Lee's (Chapter 6) call for classes in American Sign Language (ASL) to inspire deaf students' metalinguistic skills.

Betsy Winston's (Chapter 9) call for improving the education of educators who educate educational interpreters has less appeal than some of the others. Does anyone NOT support critical thinking in educators? David Quinto-Pozos' (Chapter 7) work on ASL's grammatical features and Christine Monikowski and Rico Peterson's (Chapter 8) work in service learning suggest tremendous critical thinking possibilities in higher education. Jemina Napier's Chapter 4 includes an Australia university program where several research seeds are being planted: comparing deaf instructors' and educational interpreters' linguistic features, analyzing interpreter omissions under different discourse conditions,

and investigating the correlation between interpreters' knowledge of content and effectiveness in interpreting content. Jeffrey Davis' (Chapter 5) educational interpreting choices, including code-mixing and code-switching, represent more critical thinking for cross-linguistic and cross-modality research.

Chapter 3 (Marschark, Sapere, Convertino, & Seewgen) reads like a good debate. For every point, there's a provocative counterpoint. Their research is clearly and commendably focused on student consumers and how, or if, interpreters can meet their communication needs. I am intrigued by their findings and hopeful that similar investigations will occur in high schools. The sometimes negative tone and unintentional implication that interpreters have a higher obligation for students' comprehension than teachers and students (Laurene Gallimore, where's your three-legged stool reference when I need it?) inspire more thinking. Would single-subject research reveal more about student comprehension of what interpreters interpret? Does what works for individuals at the high end of the distribution contrast with what does not work for those at the low end?

Eileen Forestal's Chapter 10 on deaf interpreters and Robyn Dean and Robert Pollard's Chapter 11 on consumers support previous authors in promoting deaf individuals in teaching, interpreting, and researching interpreting and education; they also call for "equitable distribution of power. . . [between] interpreters and consumers. . ." (p. 270).

Patricia Sapere, Doni LaRock, Carol Convertino, Laurene Gallimore, and Patricia Lessard authored the "Afterword," a lovely (and positive) review of the 2004 workshop.

Brenda C. Seal  
James Madison University