

Appendix

Mapping the Interface Between Translation Studies and Imagology: A Bibliographic Review, 1940–2025

Wenjing Li ^a *

^a School of International Studies, Zhengzhou University, No.100 Kexue Road, Gaoxin District, Zhengzhou City, Henan Province 450000, China

Corresponding author Email: xuewuhen1st@163.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54392/ajir2619>

Received: 02-09-2025; Revised: 28-02-2026; Accepted: 08-03-2026; Published: 16-03-2026



Appendix A. BITRA Search Strategy

The corpus was assembled from *BITRA* (*Bibliography of Interpreting and Translation*) in two temporally distinct search waves: a baseline search covering 1940–2019 and an update search covering 2020–2025. The baseline search was conducted on [insert exact date] and the update search on 20 February 2026, using the same search logic, temporal filtering rules, and screening protocol.

To maximize retrieval precision, the search was anchored in a set of National Image Cluster (NIC) marker phrases rather than in isolated single words. The following six search strings were used in the English-language *BITRA* interface:

- "national image"
- "country image"
- "state image"
- "national identity"
- "national character"
- "national stereotype"

Each marker was searched separately through *BITRA*'s searchable bibliographic metadata interface, which interrogates the fields made available by the database for retrieval (notably titles, abstracts, keywords/subject descriptors, and related record metadata where present). No language restriction was applied at the retrieval stage. This decision was necessary because *BITRA* is multilingual and frequently provides English metadata for publications originally issued in other languages. The retrieval procedure therefore privileged conceptual relevance over publication language.

Temporal boundaries were imposed directly at the database stage. For the baseline corpus, the publication-year filter was set to 1940–2019; for the update corpus, it was set to 2020–2025. The two resulting retrieval sets were subsequently merged into a master file for deduplication and relevance screening.

Plural or morphological variants were not entered as separate primary search strings. Instead, the six singular marker phrases functioned as high-precision retrieval anchors, while variant forms (e.g., identities, stereotypes) were taken into account during the manual screening and coding stages whenever they appeared in the retrieved records' metadata. This procedure was adopted in order to avoid excessive retrieval noise while still preserving conceptual inclusiveness at the classification stage.

The initial retrieval yielded [N =628] records for the 1940–2019 search window and [N = 184] additional records for the 2020–2025 update window. After deduplication and conceptual-relevance screening, the final dataset comprised [N =502] baseline records and [N =153] update records, for a combined corpus of [N = 653]publications.

Appendix B. Screening and Exclusion Workflow

After export and consolidation of the search outputs, the file was screened in two successive stages: (1) deduplication and (2) conceptual relevance screening.

B.1 Deduplication

The first stage removed repeated bibliographic entries generated by overlap across the six NIC search strings or by metadata variants within the export. Deduplication was carried out through a combination of automatic and manual procedures. First, records were normalized by author, year, and title string in Microsoft Excel. Exact duplicates were then identified on the basis of identical or near-identical combinations of author–title–year. Second, records flagged as potential duplicates but showing minor metadata differences (e.g., punctuation differences, capitalization differences, translated vs. original-language title variants, abbreviated author names, or repeated export entries) were inspected manually. A record was treated as a duplicate when it clearly referred to the same intellectual item and differed only in metadata formatting, export repetition, or closely related bibliographic variation.

B.2 Conceptual Relevance Screening

The second stage assessed whether the retrieved record actually linked translation and/or interpreting to a national-representation construct within the scope of the study. Screening was conducted on the basis of the metadata available in *BITRA*, with priority given to the title, abstract, and keywords/subject descriptors. When these were insufficient for a reliable decision, the full *BITRA* record was consulted.

A publication was retained only if the metadata made it possible to establish an explicit connection between translation/interpreting and at least one NIC-related construct in a national or cross-national representational sense. Records were excluded as conceptually irrelevant when NIC-related terms were used in ways unrelated to national representation. Typical exclusion cases included the following:

1. Identity used only in a professional or personal sense (e.g., translator identity, interpreter identity, professional identity), with no national referent.
2. Image used only in a technical, visual, or intersemiotic sense, with no link to national or cultural representation.
3. Publications whose subject matter was translation or interpreting but whose metadata contained no explicit national-image-related referent after closer inspection.
4. Borderline records in which a national dimension was merely implicit rather than explicit in the searchable metadata.

Screening was conducted by the author in two full passes. In the first pass, all records were coded as retain, exclude, or borderline. In the second pass, all borderline cases, and all excluded cases whose relevance could plausibly be disputed, were rechecked against the original *BITRA* record before the corpus was finalized. Because the dataset was constructed through explicit phrase-based retrieval and rule-governed screening, the procedure emphasizes traceable inclusion/exclusion criteria rather

than interpretive expansion. No formal inter-coder reliability statistic was calculated; this limitation is acknowledged in the main text.

Table B1. Corpus-construction workflow

Stage	Records remaining
Initial merged retrieval (1940–2019)	[N = 628]
Final baseline corpus (1940–2019) (After deduplication and excluded as conceptually irrelevant)	[N = 502]
Initial merged retrieval (2020–2025)	[N = 184]
Final update corpus (2020–2025) (After deduplication and excluded as conceptually irrelevant)	[N = 151]
Final combined corpus	[N = 653]

If no additional exclusion category was used beyond duplicates and conceptual irrelevance, the “other reasons” row may be omitted.

Appendix C. Coding Framework

After screening, each retained record was coded manually at the record level using a structured coding scheme designed to connect the conceptual framework of the National Image Cluster (NIC) to the descriptive bibliometric analysis. Coding was based on the metadata available in *BITRA*, especially title, abstract, keywords/subject descriptors, publication type, and source/outlet information. Coding was non-exclusive where analytically necessary: a record could receive more than one NIC code and more than one domain tag if this was justified by the metadata.

C.1 NIC Construct Coding

The first dimension captured the specific NIC component addressed by each publication. The purpose of this stage was not to impose a rigid theoretical uniformity on the corpus, but to make visible which kinds of national-representation construct were explicitly foregrounded in the literature.

The core coding categories were:

- NIC–Image: assigned when the record explicitly addressed national image, country image, state image, or equivalent formulations referring to the perception of a country and/or its people.
- NIC–Identity: assigned when the record explicitly addressed national identity or closely related formulations foregrounding national self-definition or collective identification.
- NIC–Character: assigned when the record explicitly used national character or an equivalent expression referring to a culturally attributed moral, behavioral, or motivational profile.
- NIC–Stereotype: assigned when the record explicitly foregrounded national stereotype or closely related discursive codings of nationhood.

In addition, the following auxiliary image-related labels were noted qualitatively when they appeared explicitly in the metadata, even though they were not used as primary retrieval anchors: cliché, prejudice, auto-image, hetero-image, representation of the Other, and related imagological formulations. These labels were used descriptively in the interpretation of thematic patterns but were not treated as separate retrieval classes because they would have substantially lowered search precision.

C.2 Domain and Medium Coding

The second dimension identified the principal empirical domain or communicative medium in which national-image-related issues were examined. This step linked the NIC framework to the substantive areas of Translation Studies in which national representation is most frequently negotiated.

The domain categories used in the study were:

- Literature / literary circulation
- Journalism / news / media discourse
- Audiovisual translation / subtitling / dubbing / multimodality
- Institutional / policy / legal / governmental translation
- Tourism / travel / destination discourse
- Interpreting contexts (where interpreting, rather than translation, was central)
- Other / mixed / unspecified

Where the metadata clearly indicated more than one domain, more than one domain tag was assigned. For example, a record could be simultaneously coded as journalism/media and institutional/policy if it dealt with translated public discourse in a governmental media setting.

C.3 Publication-Type Coding

Publication type was harmonized manually from *BITRA* metadata into the following categories:

- Journal article
- Book chapter / chapter in edited volume
- Authored book / monograph
- Dissertation / thesis
- Special issue / journal monograph / edited issue
- Other

Where *BITRA* metadata were incomplete or inconsistent, classification was resolved by consulting the outlet/publisher field and the bibliographic description. This harmonization was necessary because *BITRA* contains records from different bibliographic traditions and periods, which do not always encode publication type uniformly.

C.4 Period Coding

For longitudinal analysis, records were assigned to time periods in two ways:

1. Decade bins (1940s, 1950s, 1960s, etc.) for historical trend reporting.
2. A distinct update period (2020–2025) for the post-2019 comparison.

The update period was treated separately rather than as a complete decade because it functions in this study as a currency check rather than as a finished historical interval.

C.5 Auxiliary Theory/Method Tags

Where abstracts and keywords were sufficiently informative, records were also given a descriptive auxiliary tag indicating an explicit theoretical or methodological emphasis. These tags were

not used as mutually exclusive variables, but rather as an aid to qualitative interpretation. The most common auxiliary tags were:

- Imagology / national image theory
- Narrative / framing / ideology
- Discourse analysis / critical discourse analysis
- Polysystem / Descriptive Translation Studies
- Reception / sociology / paratext
- Multimodality / audiovisual translation
- Corpus / bibliometric / mapping approach
- Other / not explicit in metadata

These auxiliary tags were used cautiously because metadata richness is uneven across decades and publication types. Their purpose was therefore descriptive and interpretive, not inferential.

Table C1 summarizes the principal coding dimensions and decision rules.

Table C1. Summary of coding dimensions and rules

Coding dimension	Category	Assignment rule
NIC construct	NIC–Image	Assign when national/country/state image is explicit in metadata
NIC construct	NIC–Identity	Assign when national identity/identities is explicit in metadata
NIC construct	NIC–Character	Assign when national character is explicit in metadata
NIC construct	NIC–Stereotype	Assign when national stereotype or equivalent explicit discursive coding is present
Domain/medium	Literature	Assign when literary translation/circulation is the main empirical site
Domain/medium	Journalism / media	Assign when translated news, journalism, or media discourse is central
Domain/medium	Audiovisual / multimodal	Assign when subtitling, dubbing, audiovisual translation, or multimodality is central
Domain/medium	Institutional / policy	Assign when government, legal, institutional, or policy translation is central
Domain/medium	Tourism / travel	Assign when tourism or destination representation is central
Publication type	Journal article / chapter / book / dissertation / etc.	Assign from harmonized <i>BITRA</i> bibliographic metadata
Period	Decade / update period	Assign from year of publication