

Translator training

Anthony Pym (2009)

Pre-print text written for the *Oxford Companion to Translation Studies*. Many thanks for the comments and input from Heloisa Pezza Cintrão (repeatedly), Costanza Perverati, Cristopher Scott-Tennent, Diane Howard, Volga Yılmaz-Gümüş and Ting-ting Hui.

1. Introduction

Just as everyone can sing, be it badly or well, so everyone who knows more than one language can translate, to some degree. However, not everyone is paid to sing opera, and not all translators are at the pinnacle of the translation profession. The difference between the various levels may partly be due to training – we train people not just to translate, which they can already do, but to translate *well*, perhaps for a specific purpose, market or technological environment.

Translator training can take many forms. A great deal is learnt on the job, from superiors, colleagues, reviewers and clients, or otherwise through trial and error. The vast majority of professional translators in the world have probably had no training in translation beyond such experience, and the value of experience is thus not to be underestimated. That would be the most primary level of training. At a next level, there is an increasing number of short-term training courses, both in-house and on the open market, that offer translators the skills they require to move from one professional niche to another. Such courses might involve new translation technologies, area-restricted terminology, project management or specific communication skills, especially in the various kinds of interpreting. Finally, there are long-term training programmes offered by institutions of various kinds, increasingly by universities at BA or MA levels. Long-term university-level training is a relatively recent phenomenon, mostly dating from the second half of the twentieth century and rising sharply in the late 1980s and early 1990s. That late development is why most practitioners, and indeed most translator trainers, have probably not received formal training of this kind. The development, principles and main debates of university-level training, which will be the main focus of this article, must thus be understood in terms of its antecedents and alternatives.

2. Historical development

Translator training of some kind has almost certainly existed at key moments in expansive empires, mostly in the form of controlled master-apprentice relations. One might seek the origins of more extensive training programmes in the elaborate Chinese institutions for the translation of Buddhist texts, from the fourth to the ninth centuries, in the ‘House of Wisdom’ in ninth-century Baghdad, in cathedral chapters as in twelfth-century Toledo, or with court scholarship from the thirteenth century. The great European colonizations were also associated with rudimentary translator training based on the capture and training of natives. Translator training was carried out on the fringe of empires or at the points where civilizations met, as seen in the training of French interpreters partly in Constantinople

from 1669 or the Oriental Academy for diplomats founded by Empress Maria Theresa in Vienna in 1754. At the same time, European expansion led to reactions in other parts of the world: the large Egyptian translation school now known as Al-Asun was established in 1835; in China, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, a group of government officials dealing with Foreign Affairs created institutions for the training of translators in areas like shipbuilding and weapons manufacture. From 1896 Yan Fu, at that time principal of the Northern Chinese Naval Academy, supervised several translation schools operating under central and local government authorities.

In all these situations, training was institutionalized not just to ensure a certain quality of performance but also to control the allegiance of the translators. Intercultural mediators might always be working for the other side; one way to make sure they are yours is consciously to select and educate them as your own. In some situations this guarantee of loyalty can become more important than the quality of renditions. For example, Spanish diplomats and translators destined to work in the protectorate of Morocco would traditionally receive their training in Beirut. The Arabic they mastered was thus quite unlike the spoken varieties of Morocco, but they were less likely to be identifying with the Moroccan cultural other. State-controlled training can thus be seen as selecting and privileging members of the community that are going to be exposed to close contact with other communities.

While state-controlled instruction in translation was carried out in Europe for the training of diplomats, in Spanish America it was more commonly associated with sworn translation, in keeping with the juridical regime through which the colonies were controlled (in Hispanic tradition, a translated document has full legal effects – so sworn translators are in effect officers of the state). A translation programme was offered at the Law Faculty at the University of Uruguay from 1885, and many of the university programmes in Spanish America continue to deliver the degree of ‘sworn translator’ (*traductor público*). The Comparative Law Institute at Université de Paris 2 has offered a programme in legal translation since 1931. This special association with legal institutions has continued in parts of the world where court translation is an important social demand, particularly in the United States.

The Second World War provided further impetus for the institutionalization of training. The German-speaking world was bordered by the translation schools founded in Heidelberg in 1930, Geneva in 1941 and Vienna in 1943. Following the war, the victors had an interest in retrieving technical information from the German language (to make bombs and rockets), and the Nuremberg trials seemed to indicate the role of translators and interpreters in the future of international institutions. Independent university-level institutions were established in the border regions of the Third Reich: Graz and Innsbruck in 1946, Germersheim 1947 and Saarbrücken in 1948. With the same post-war impetus, a translation school was established at Georgetown University in the United States in 1949. The now traditional French institutions, the ESIT and the ISIT, would follow in 1957, at which stage the process of European unification was becoming a powerful motivating factor.

By the 1960s, western Europe had developed a string of specialized institutions. Elsewhere, as at the Moscow Linguistic University (where the translation programme dates from 1930), translator training was more explicitly integrated into independent foreign-language institutes, a model that still pertains in Russia and some central-European countries.

The specialized western institutions offered high-level training in conference interpreting as well as translation. All became members of the CIUTI (Conférence Internationale Permanente d'Instituts Universitaires de Traducteurs et Interprètes), which officially dates from 1964. This international association now has some 30 members and seeks to ensure the public image of the training they offer. In the meantime, however, the number of university-based centres specializing in translation has risen to about 300 in the world, which means that the CIUTI represents about 10% of the institutionalized training of translators.

The initial European leadership in translator training is challenged by figures that show the creation of non-European centres rising quickly in the 1960s and actually outweighing that of west-European programmes in the 1970s (see Caminade and Pym 1995). Indeed, while western Europe may have developed translator training in a series of responses to the stop-start process of European unification, the non-European rise indicates a smoother response to economic globalization. Underlying both streams are general reforms that have changed the nature of university education, progressively allowing more emphasis on vocational objectives and steadily integrating translator training into university structures. This process has been particularly pronounced in Europe: one such reform took Spain from just four translator-training institutions in 1992 to some 23 in 1997. The process has been less drastic in other parts of the world, particularly in the United States, which further accounts for the smoother rise of the non-European curves.

It would be rash to assume that training programmes have developed in direct response to social demands for translators. In many cases youth unemployment has also played a role, creating student demand for vocationally oriented instruction programmes even in the absence of rising market demands for well-paid full-time translators and interpreters. Another stake-holder in training programmes can be the education system itself. In situations where tenured staff in departments of languages-other-than-English are losing students, translation programmes can provide continued employment for those teachers to the extent that translation students are required to develop more than one foreign language. There is also an important political dimension involved in the languages selected, especially in situations where translation policies are associated with the defence and development of minority languages. For example, official programmes with double 'A languages' can be found not only in Ireland, Catalonia and Galicia, but also in post-Apartheid South Africa. In some countries there is thus a regular over-production of trained translators, as indicated by graduate-employment surveys where the number of students who actually find full-time work tends to be less than 30% (in Spain, Germany and Italy, with numbers even lower reported for Hong Kong). In such situations, the rationale for many programmes can be expected to shift away from supplying the translation professions. For example, arguments can be made that translator training maintains the community's stock of language competence and provides communication skills that are useful in a wide range of professional situations. Graduates are thus sometimes called by other names, such as the 'linguistic mediators' produced by three-year BA programmes in Italy.

In other countries, the social demand for quality translators far exceeds the capacities of education systems that have traditionally side-lined translation. There has been a rapid creation of translator-training programs in China, and something similar might be predicted for India. The United States, on the other hand, took a long time to become aware of the need for quality translators of 'national security' languages as well as for major home

languages like Spanish, and the number of training programmes still remains comparatively low (except in the field of court interpreting and defence services). On the general international scene, one might hope for more attention to community interpreting (here covering interpreting for the courts, health services, immigration departments, etc.), so far mostly developed in paraprofessional programmes in 'immigrant' countries like Canada, the United States, Australia and Sweden, where there has been rising awareness of domestic language needs. In Europe, where training has been centred on the universities, comparatively little has been done to adopt 'real needs' approaches of this kind.

Students of translation are predominantly women in many countries, although Caminade and Pym (1995) estimated that only 35% of programme directors were women.

3. Types of university training programmes

Translation courses are offered as part of most degree programmes in foreign languages. Although traditionally used as a way of checking language acquisition, translation tasks have increasingly been seen as training activities in themselves, imparting skills that are specific to translation as a mode of communication (for traces of this change, see the volumes edited by Sewell and Higgins 1996, Malmkjær 1998, Baer and Koby 2003, Malmkjær 2004, Tennent 2005, Kearns 2008). Perhaps one of the more interesting aspects of non-European developments is the way translator-training programmes have been set up between various university departments. In most cases this involves one language-specific department (say, English or Chinese) running the programme with participation from teaching staff from other language-specific departments. Sometimes the parent body is a department of Linguistics; in a few cases the actual running of the programme is carried out by an interdepartmental committee. Although the ideal may be to have a full-fledged specialised translation department, many other practical structures can be found. Despite those changes, since the 1990s there have been strong arguments in favour of moving translator training away from general modern-language programmes, in many cases resulting in independent programmes exclusively for the training of translators and/or interpreters.

With reference to these independent programmes, university-level training can be divided into full long-term training (BA plus MA, usually adding up to five years of training) and Masters-level programs (which may be for one year but are more normally for two). In some European countries, programmes are traditionally in accordance with the first model (Germany, Austria and Spain, for example); in others the Masters model is more predominant (France, the United States, the United Kingdom). In Turkey there are four-year BA programs. Beyond Europe, the need to adapt to existing local structures, coupled with required language learning at university level, has led to a clear predominance of programmes at Masters level. These distinctions have far-reaching consequences for who is trained, what the training consists of, how translation competence is conceptualized, and how the training process relates to professionalization.

In the long-term model, students are usually required to complete solid training in language and communication skills, then specialize in their final years (normally deciding between written translation or interpreting). In some countries they must work from at least two foreign languages, and a great deal of their time in the initial years is spent developing language skills. The programmes can be quite rich and diverse, offering training in computer skills, new technologies, business skills, a range of specialized translation areas,

translation theory, perhaps translation history, and general humanistic courses available in the institutions. The ideal product of these programs would be a professional with a very rich skill set. The dominant models of translation competence are correspondingly rich and complex. This can be seen in Germanic theorization from Wilss (1996) to Kautz (2000), or the PACTE proposal from the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (see e.g. Beeby 2000), which has a broad range of six sub-competencies and is well suited to a five-year programme. Other models of competence are nevertheless available (cf. Schäffner and Adab 2000).

Independent Masters-level programmes, on the other hand, can be more focused on the skills actually used by translators and/or interpreters. They might thus be expected to cater to specific market niches or skill sets such as audiovisual translation, literary translation or localization. In practice, however, these programmes still tend to offer general approaches to translation, albeit without the language training that is offered in the first years of the full programmes. This ‘general Masters’ approach has been proposed as a model for a European Masters in Translation.

Within Europe, the Bologna process is supposed to separate the BA from the MA levels. In many cases this has meant that the previous four-year or five-year programmes have been cut into two parts, with the Masters level offering more or less the specializations that existed previously. There is little evidence of a more radical distinction between the BA and MA levels, of the kind that would allow graduates to be employed in the translation industry after their BA degree and would then see them taking up MA studies in order to acquire advanced specialized professional skills, ideally adapted to specific market niches.

A marginal trend has been to offer Masters programmes in ‘translation studies’, where the term tends to be used in two associated senses: 1) as studies that can make the student a (better) translator, and 2) as academic research on translation (i.e. ‘translation science’ or ‘translatology’). Although there must be doubt about the extent to which academic research can directly enhance translation skills, such courses do find a market and enjoy the luxury of not dealing with specific language pairs – translation can be studied in just one language, usually English. The term ‘cultural translation’ is sometimes used in a similar way to cater to the more literary versions of the same conflation, the general suggestion being that the engaged theories of Cultural Studies can enhance some kind of literary translation skills.

Both within and around this trend, university-level training courses have become one of the main ways in which academic research might hope to speak to the translation professions, perhaps helping to inform their future. It is nevertheless difficult to claim that any such influence has so far been exerted. If anything, the influences have been working the other way, from professional practice to academic training.

4. Types of training situations

The institutional separation of translator training from modern-language programmes has mobilized a series of debatable *idées reçues*. One of these, usually formulated from within independent programmes, is that the ‘traditional’ translation class is entirely unprofessional. For example, we are told that the traditional ‘didactic translation’ model involves students producing texts only for the teacher to read, such that the translation is evaluated positively only when it corresponds to the way the teacher translates, or indeed to the (usually literalist, source-text oriented) model translation that the teacher has prepared beforehand.

If the teacher is not a professional translator, so the argument goes, the training exercise cannot possibly result in the acquisition of professional skills; it can merely reproduce, at best, the concepts and skills of the teacher.

An associated idea, more general in scope, is that university training in general does not serve the needs of the market (Bowker 2004, Chesterman and Wagner 2004, Gouadec 2007), not just because the teachers are often not professional translators but because the programmes themselves cater to the internal needs and formats of the educational institutions. The arguments around this point are as numerous as they are superficial and under-informed. A fairly common discourse among professional translators is that the formal training programmes are inefficient, misleading, too theoretical, irremediably out of touch with market developments, and in some instances saturating the labour market with graduates. Partly justified retorts might point to the number of teachers who are indeed also professional translators (or have been for long periods) or to the more recent translation theories that do indeed incorporate market criteria (notably in *Skopos* theory and localization, see 1.8.2 and 1.8.5). Some of the steps being taken to bring training closer to the market include inviting professionals into the classroom, assessing of students on the basis of portfolios of their completed translations, using real-world ('authentic') translation tasks with explicit instructions from a client, and generally modelling competencies and skill sets in ways that can match up with market demands, such that an employer might ideally search a database of graduates for the kind of translator they are looking for (rather like a customer ordering a new car with the desired colour and a series of extras). It might be that professional organizations are delighted to enter the classroom, reluctant to employ anyone on the basis of a portfolio alone, and resigned to the fact that many of the skills they need will inevitably be developed in-house rather than at university. Further, 'the market' is an increasingly fragmented entity, rarely with the clear general principles that many trainers would like to attach to it.

In many cases, these debates take place within the training institutions themselves, where one tends to find a range of teaching situations. The one programme might include a professional technical translator who instructs close to a master-apprentice model, then anything through to the academic translation theorist convinced that mysteries from Borges and Benjamin will illuminate young minds. Debates between such extremes can also be traced in the lists of competencies (as in the various working versions of the 'European Masters in Translation'), where the 'theory' components tend to come and go according to the background of the person drawing up the list.

The more important side of these debates concerns the way translation classes are actually organized. The professional and the theorist can equally be addicted to full-frontal teacher-centred methodologies, in which knowledge moves from teacher to student. There are, however, several other models available.

4.1. Translator training vs. translator education

The wide range of training situations might explain why there are several competing approaches to what should happen in the translation classroom. One useful if polemical distinction is the one made by Kiraly (2000) between 'translation competence' and 'translator competence', developed by Bernadini (2004) as a broad difference between 'translator training' and 'translator education'. 'Training' is thus associated with the (mostly linguistic) skills needed to produce an acceptable translation ('translation

competence'), the acquisition of which will always be a combination of instruction and practice. Such training is the stuff that professional translators tend to insist on. 'Translator education', on the other hand, recognizes the need for students to acquire a wide range of interpersonal skills and attitudes ('translator competence'), in addition to the purely technical skills. Students must learn how to work interactively not just with other translators, but with terminologists, project managers and end-clients. They do not simply absorb linguistic information; they have to be taught how to locate and evaluate information for themselves. Similarly, they should not just absorb professional norms from seeing their translations corrected; they should be able to *discover* the norms and ethical principles, mostly through work on 'authentic' professional tasks or while on work placements, contributing to debates on these issues as they go along. From the perspective of such translator education, the institution must allow young professionals to develop as multifaceted citizens, rather than just as bearers of industrial skills. They must be taught not just how to do things; they must become members of the various overlapping professional communities engaged in the production of translations. This approach is eminently suited to long-term training programmes.

Kiraly's most important contribution (in Kiraly 2000) has been to frame this distinction in terms of constructivist philosophy, understood as the general view whereby individuals actively construct knowledge about the world. Kiraly actually insists on 'social constructivism', emphasizing that people construct knowledge interactively with each other, and that this is how things should happen in the classroom. This is opposed to 'transmissionism', which would see the individual as a passive receptacle for knowledge received either directly from perception or from the authority of a teacher of some kind. For constructivism, the teacher is a 'facilitator', opening spaces where students themselves can pursue their learning processes, collectively deciding on their learning objectives and which texts to translate, and participating in the final evaluation of their activities. For transmissionism, says Kiraly, the teacher remains the authority, deciding what should be learned, what should be translated, and how successful training should be evaluated.

Kiraly maps this distinction onto to different views of translation. For the constructivist, the translator actively construes an interpretation of the source text, adapting it to various possible target-side purposes. For the transmissionist, on the other hand, the translator follows the instructions in the source text, mapping information from one text to the other. The two teaching methodologies would thus correspond to two quite different views of what translation is. For Kiraly, along with most contemporary theorists, the transmissionist model is, or should be, a thing of the past, in terms of both pedagogical practice and translation theory.

Kiraly's grand dichotomies can be questioned on several fronts. The categories do not always line up, since the learning of a narrow set of skills can be as constructivist as any interactive education, and non-transmissionist translation principles can be conveyed in a lecture. Further, there are many different ways of applying constructivism in the classroom, and not every non-transmissionist teacher will go so far as to allow students to choose their own source texts and methods of evaluation. As for peer collaboration as a work ethic, it matches poorly with the many professional situations based on hierarchies. More generally, the student-centred approach of social constructivism belongs to an educational philosophy of the 1960s, making it standard fare in some countries and putting it on a collision course with the current ideologies of planned competence-based teaching. The constructivist teacher will ideally allow students to participate in the definition of their

learning objectives, and any standard teaching handbook will insist on an initial needs analysis and then some kind of learning contract with the group. All that is hard to do if the competencies have been defined and calculated in a pre-established blueprint, as if humanistic teaching could operate like a Stalinist five-year plan.

4.2. Types of in-class activities

Thanks in part to these debates, much has been done to diversify classroom activities. The basic model might be to have individual students translate a text then read out their translations and have them evaluated, either directly by the teacher or by other students, who can propose alternatives. Nord (1996) proposes diversifying this through different combinations of the translation instructions (*Auftrag*), partial/complete translation, small group work, guided translation exercises, use of parallel texts, sight translation, simulated interpreting situations, 'gist' translation, documentation and reviewing (the list is translated in Kiraly 2000: 55-57, cf. Nord 2005). House (1986, 2000) points out the benefits of having students translate in pairs or small groups ('translation in and as interaction'). Vienne (1994) proposes focusing squarely on social and discursive contexts (a pedagogy of 'translation in situation'). Ulrych (1996) and Nord (1997) insist on an analysis of both the source-text situation and the intended situation of the translation itself, and many authors have since underscored the importance of having students analyze communicative purposes as well as texts, and that this activity is qualitatively different from just having students learn by doing a lot of translating (Hönig 1988). Kiraly (2000) and more especially Gouadec (2007) recommend that these considerations be packaged into large translation projects on which students should work as small groups, often with diversified roles (translator, reviewer, terminologist, project manager). Others, starting from Nord (1988, 1996), are more concerned with issues of pedagogical progression, arguing that simpler, analytical and declarative tasks should precede the more complex procedural projects.

At the earlier stages, many kinds of quite different activities can be brought across from language-acquisition classes, including such things as bilingual crossword puzzles, terminology searches. González Davies (2004, 2005) offers numerous possibilities in this regard, most usefully insisting on discussion forums and the acting-out of communicative situations. Perhaps the most important aspect of pedagogical progression concerns the use of oral translation situations. Since the early 1990s there have been numerous opinions in favour of having students dramatize translation situations, giving primacy to the oral over the written, since the greater context-dependence of spoken language makes translation purposes all the more obvious. However, this view contradicts the conventional wisdom that, since conference interpreting is ostensibly more difficult than written translation, the spoken forms should be learnt later than the written. That doctrine is happily being challenged, thanks in part to the greater attention being paid to the various forms of dialogue interpreting.

5. Contributions from research

As in most fields of Translation Studies, there has been a steady growth in research on translator training. Perhaps the most useful contributions indicate the ways current training is failing. For example, the questionnaires conducted by Li (2001, 2002), on the changing translation industry and the learning needs perceived by students, highlight the desirability

of authentic tasks in the classroom, the need for continued language training (despite the supposed separation of translation from modern-language faculties) and the demand for theory to be better applied to practice. On all these points, data from further questionnaires might help reorient current training methods.

In many cases, however, the nature of the research design tends to restrict the institutional impact of the findings, since there is little direct comparison of one teaching methodology with another. Many studies discover that specific lessons on the theory and practice of skill X result in enhanced performance involving skill X, which would seem to be fairly obvious. The findings are nevertheless more interesting in cases where the correlation is *not* found, perhaps for a particular group of students or learning/translating style (e.g. Scott-Tennent and González Davies 2008). Other studies make appeals to action research and the politics of empowerment only to offer evidence that their teaching approaches are successful – students love the classes, but are rarely asked if they are as enthusiastic about seriously alternative kinds of classes. Similarly limited would seem to be product-based empirical research to test or justify the lists of competencies, since there is no guarantee that the one product (a recurrent translation error, for example) always results from just one process or combination of processes. One should thus not be surprised to see the lists changing in accordance with researchers' institutional situations. Waddington (2000: 135) lists three doubts on this score: 1) it is hard to know exactly how many components should be a part of translation competence, 2) the definitions tend to concern *ideal* competence, and are thus incomplete without a model of the learning process, and 3) there is a dearth of empirical evidence for most of the available models.

Training should be able to benefit from empirical studies on translation *processes* (rather than products), using think-aloud protocols, keystroke logging, screen recording and eye tracking. Since students are relatively easy to muster as experiment subjects, there is a growing body of data on how they compare with professionals. In principle, the differences should give a developmental view of translation competence, thus mapping out the skills that translators need to be trained in (for useful overviews, see Jääskeläinen 2002, Göpferich 2008). The findings generally suggest that the more experienced translators tend to 1) use more paraphrase and less literalism as coping strategies (Kussmaul 1995, Lörcher 1991, Jensen 1999), 2) process larger translation units (Toury 1986, Lörcher 1991, Tirkkonen-Condit 1992), 3) spend longer reviewing their work at the post-drafting phase but make fewer changes when reviewing (Jensen and Jakobsen 2000, Jakobsen 2002, Englund Dimitrova 2005), 4) read texts faster and spend proportionally more time looking at the target text than at the source text (Jakobsen and Jensen 2008), 5) use top-down processing (macro-strategies) and refer more to the translation purpose (Fraser 1996, Jonasson 1998, Künzli 2001, 2004, Séguinot 1989, Tirkkonen-Condit 1992, Göpferich 2009), 6) rely more on encyclopaedic knowledge (Tirkkonen-Condit 1989), 7) express more principles and personal theories (Tirkkonen-Condit 1989, 1997, Jääskeläinen 1999), 8) incorporate the client into the risk-management processes (Künzli 2004), 9) automatize some complex tasks but also shift between automatized routine tasks and conscious problem-solving (Krings 1988, Jääskeläinen and Tirkkonen-Condit 1991, Englund Dimitrova 2005), and 10) display more realism, confidence and critical attitudes in their decision-making (Künzli 2004). Once again, however, it is precarious to jump from these findings to actual pedagogical practice. This is not just because the experiment groups are small, the findings overlap and in some cases contradict each other, and the methodologies may affect the cognitive processes. The more substantial problem for trainers should be that

many of the skills that apparently define experts may ensue from normal processes of repetition, resulting from many hours of practice rather than from the application of any clear-cut teachable principles – just keep translating, and you will get there in the end, with or without a teacher and a classroom. That is, trainers still have to identify the principles and activities that can speed up the training process, and the straight application of expertise theory may not be enough. Further, with respect to think-aloud data, years in any market will give anyone a small arsenal of things to say for the purposes of self-justification, and it seems far-fetched to equate quick pronouncements by professionals with declarative principles, full-blown courses in translation theory or indeed with wholly thought-through risk-management strategies. There should be similar doubts about the way all process data is interpreted. For instance, Jensen (2001) finds that expert translators engage in less problem-solving, goal-setting and re-analyzing than do non-professionals (their behaviour is broadly classified as ‘knowledge telling’, as opposed to ‘knowledge transforming’). That is, they generally pose *fewer* questions about the text, and operate in a more *linear* way than do novices, who tend to problematize myriad details. On the accepted view, this would indicate that experts are overcoming trivial difficulties in an automatized way, reserving their ‘knowledge transforming’ cognition for the really significant problems. We might thus continue to hypothesize, as does Göpferich, that the more expert subjects “visualize themselves as text designers than as text reproducers” (2009: 34), which would otherwise appear to contradict what Jensen found. It could be, however, that the professionals really do ask fewer questions about the material they handle, since an apparently automatized cognitive process might also be a non-existent one. That is, they might tend to accept text as it comes, without undue attention to the communicative situations, clients’ instructions, and unrewarded redesigning that most researchers tend to want to find, justify, and use as evaluation criteria. At least marginal reservations should remain about what the data are saying.

Process-based research nevertheless picks up several aspects that are rarely foregrounded in the pedagogical models based on products. These include speed, the capacity to distribute effort in terms of risk, the use of external resources (both written and human), and the key role of reviewing. One way of making advanced students aware of such aspects is to have them screen-record and analyze their own translating (or their peers’), in fact making process research a classroom activity. The empirical studies can also question a few *idées reçues*. It has not been confirmed, for example, that professionals translate faster than novices (the above tendencies concern the *distribution* of tasks, not the total time taken). Or again, Künzli (2001) finds that the use of bilingual resources has no correlation with translation quality, which flies in the face of all the communicative-approach teachers who try to prohibit such resources.

6. Current challenges

Translator training faces several current challenges that concern pedagogical practice, curriculum design and the possible contributions of research.

First among these challenges must be the impact of translation memories, data-based machine translation and content management systems (here we exclude concordance tools, which are for linguists, not professional translators). These technologies are having a profound impact on the way translators work, particularly in the localization industry. They can no longer be seen as mere ‘tools’ that help the translator; they actually change the

nature of translating itself, obliging professionals to work not from continuous texts but from pre-translated discontinuous chunks and data bases, and thus increasing the importance of review processes. Mossop is undoubtedly right when he says that '[i]f you can't translate with pencil and paper, then you can't translate with the latest information technology' (2003: 20), but the sense of the verb 'to translate' may not be the same on both sides of that equation.

An associated challenge is the need to develop highly specialized programmes, at Masters level or as advanced short-term courses, that cater for areas such as localization, audiovisual translation, applied terminology, and the various kinds of interpreting. This might be accompanied by a reduction in courses that are specialized according to language directionality, especially as student groups become more linguistically mixed (thanks in part to exchange programmes) and as work into the translator's L2 becomes a permanent feature of professional practice in many countries. The response to changes in the market thus requires considerable rethinking of curricula.

The use of electronic communication for class interaction and learning materials of all kinds ('e-learning') is now a feature of many programmes, but much remains to be discovered about how it can intermesh with the professional use of the same technologies. Distance learning is becoming easier to organize and presents many advantages (notably mixed-language groups for tandem learning, and greater student catchment areas for highly specialized courses), although we still know very little about how it affects basic pedagogical practices in this field.

Finally, evaluation will remain a problematic issue for as long as internal criteria ('accomplishment of learning aims') fail to connect with diversified professional practice. In many countries professional certification is quite independent from educational degrees, a situation that might suggest the degrees are not trusted by employer groups. National authorities of various kinds may be responsible for exams (e.g. the Institute of Linguists in Britain, or the American Translators Association), for giving official rankings to the various translator-training institutions (e.g. the NAATI in Australia), or for acting in an advisory capacity (e.g. the government-appointed *Tolk- och översättarinstitutet* in Sweden).

7. Further reading and relevant resources

Discussions of translator training appear with respectable frequency in the main Translation Studies journals and in collective volumes on the topic. The articles usually offer not just empirical data but also ideas for class activities, syllabus design and curriculum development, since they constitute one of the ways in which teacher-researchers discuss these issues with teacher-researchers. One should nevertheless be aware of the different institutional contexts within which the authors write, since the assumptions made for specialized Masters programmes, for example, do not always apply to beginner translation students or to language-studies students who just take a course or two on translation.

The publications of the 1980s and 1990s are marked by frequent calls for more professional views of translation, and that debate can now be considered won. Kiraly (2000) remains a landmark statement, since his application of constructivism has raised voices both for and against. González Davies (2004) is a valuable source of ideas for the translation class, although proposals for more varied, dynamic, interactive, oral and dramatized class activities, sometimes usefully including the production of source texts, can be found in earlier work by House (1986) and Nord (e.g. 1995). Some suggestions for

product-based activities are in Hatim and Munday (2004); proposed activities for the teaching of translation theory are in Pym (2009). Additional inspiration can be found in short-term training seminars organized by the Consortium for Training Translation Teachers and at the University of Vic.

Research on translation processes is revisiting some of the suppositions made by standard product-based evaluations, and this should be expected eventually to modify the lists of competencies and learning objectives. The research is not always easy to find, but useful summaries such as Jääskeläinen (2002) appear in the main journals.

Baer, Brian James, and Geoffrey S. Koby, eds. (2003), *Beyond the Ivory Tower. Rethinking Translation Pedagogy*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Beeby, Allison (2000), 'Choosing an Empirical-Experimental Model for Investigating Translation Competence: The PACTE Model' in Maeve Olohan (ed.) *Intercultural Faultlines. Research Models in Translation Studies I. Textual and Cognitive Aspects* (Manchester: St Jerome).

Bernardini, Silvia (2004), 'The theory behind the practice. Translator training or translator education?' in Kirsten Malmkjær (ed.) *Translation in Undergraduate Degree Programmes* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins).

Bowker, Lynne (2004), 'What does it take to work in the translation profession in Canada in the 21st century? Exploring a database of job advertisements', *Meta* 49 (1): 960-972.

Caminade, Monique, & Anthony Pym (1995), *Annuaire mondiale des formations en traduction et en interprétation* (Special issue of *Traduire*) (Paris: Société des Traducteurs Français).

Chesterman, Andrew, & Emma Wagner (2004), *Can Theory Help Translators? A dialogue between the ivory tower and the wordface* (Manchester: St Jerome).

Englund Dimitrova, Birgitta (2005), *Expertise and Explicitation in the Translation Process* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins).

Fraser, Janet (1996), 'Professional versus Student Behaviour' in Cay Dollerup & Vibeke Appel (eds.) *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 3. New Horizons* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins).

González Davies, Maria (2004), *Multiple Voices in the Translation Classroom. Activities, Tasks and Projects* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins).

González Davies, María (2005), 'Minding the process, improving the product: Alternatives to traditional translator training' in Martha Tennent (ed.) *Training for the New Millennium. Pedagogies for Translation and Interpreting* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins).

Göpferich, Susanne (2008), *Translationsprozessforschung: Stand – Methoden – Perspektiven* (Tübingen: Narr).

Göpferich, Susanne (2009), 'Towards a model of translational competence and its acquisition: the longitudinal study TransComp' in Susanne Göpferich et al. (eds) *Behind the mind. Methods, models and results in translation process research* (Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur).

Gouadec, Daniel (2007), *Translation as a Profession* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins).

Hatim, Basil, & Jeremy Munday (2004), *Translation. An advanced resource book* (London and New York: Routledge).

Hönig, Hans G. (1988), 'Übersetzen lernt man nicht durch Übersetzen: Ein Pladoyer für eine Propädeutik des Übersetzens' *Fremdsprachen lehren und lernen* 17: 154–167.

House, Juliane (1986), 'Acquiring Translational Competence in Interaction' in Juliane House & Shoshana Blum-Kulka (eds) *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication*. (Tübingen: Narr).

House, Juliane (2000), 'Consciousness and the Strategic Use of Aids in Translation' in Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit & Riitta Jääskeläinen (eds) *Tapping and Mapping the Processes of Translation and Interpreting: Outlooks on Empirical Research* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins).

Jääskeläinen, Riitta. (1999), *Tapping the Process: An Exploratory Study of the Cognitive and Affective Factors Involved in Translating* (Joensuu: University of Joensuu Publications in the Humanities).

Jääskeläinen, Riitta (2002), 'Think-aloud protocol studies into translation. An annotated bibliography' *Target* 14 (1): 107–136.

Jääskeläinen, Riitta., & Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit (1991), 'Automatised Processes in Professional vs. Non-Professional Translation: A Think-aloud Protocol Study', in Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit (ed.) *Empirical Research in Translation and Intercultural Studies* (Tübingen: Narr).

Jakobsen, Arnt Lykke (2002), 'Translation drafting by professional translators and by translation students', in Gyde Hansen (ed.) *Empirical Translation Studies: Process and Product* (Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur).

Jakobsen, Arnt Lykke, & Kristian T. H. Jensen (2008), 'Eye movement behaviour across four different types of reading task', in Susanne Göpferich et al. (eds) *Looking at Eyes. Eye-Tracking Studies of Reading and Translation Processing* (Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur).

Jensen, Astrid (1999), "Time Pressure in Translation", in Gyde Hansen (ed.) *Probing the process in translation: methods and results* (Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur).

Jensen, Astrid, & Arnt Lykke Jakobsen (2000), 'Translating under Time Pressure: An Empirical Investigation of Problem-solving Activity and Translation Strategies by Non-professional and Professional Translators'. Andrew Chesterman, Natividad Gallardo San Salvador and Yves Gambier, eds. *Translation in Context* (Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins).

Jonasson, Kerstin (1998), 'Degree of Text Awareness in Professional vs. Non-Professional Translators', in Ann Beylard-Ozeroff, Jana Králová, Barbara Moser-Mercer (eds.) *Translators' Strategies and Creativity* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins).

Kautz, Ulrich (2000), *Handbuch Didaktik des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens* (Munich: Iudicum, Goethe-Institut).

Kearns, John (ed.) (2008), *Translator and Interpreter Training. Issues, Methods and Debates* (London: Continuum).

Kiraly, Donald (2000), *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education. Empowerment from Theory to Practice* (Manchester: St. Jerome).

Krings, Hans Peter (1988), 'Blick in die "Black Box" – eine Fallstudie zum Übersetzungsprozeß bei Berufsübersetzern', in Reiner Arntz (ed.) *Textlinguistik und Fachsprache* (Hildesheim: Olms).

Künzli, Alexander (2001), 'Experts versus novices: l'utilisation de sources d'information pendant le processus de traduction', *Meta* 46 (3): 507-523.

Künzli, Alexander (2004), 'Risk taking: trainee translators vs. professional translators. A case study', *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 2: 34-49.

Kussmaul, Paul (1995), *Training the Translator* (Amsterdam: Benjamins).

Li, Defeng (2001), 'Needs Assessment in Translation Teaching: Making Translator Training More Responsive to Social Needs' *Babel* 46 (4): 289-299.

Li, Defeng (2002), 'Translator Training: What Translation Students Have To Say', *Meta* 47 (4): 513-531.

Lörscher, Wolfgang (1991), *Translation Performance, Translation Process, and Translation Strategies. A Psycholinguistic Investigation* (Tübingen: Narr).

Malmkjær, Kirsten (ed.) (1998), *Translation and Language Teaching. Language Teaching and Translation* (Manchester: St. Jerome).

Malmkjær, Kirsten (ed.) (2004), *Translation in Undergraduate Degree Programmes* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins).

Mossop, Brian (2003), 'What should be taught at translation schools?', in Anthony Pym et al. (eds.) *Innovation and E-learning in Translator Training* (Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group).

Nord, Christiane (1988), *Textanalyse und Übersetzen* (Heidelberg: Julius Groos).

Nord, Christiane (1996), 'Wer nimmt mal den ersten Satz? Überlegungen zu neuen Arbeitsformen im Übersetzungsunterricht', in Angelika Lauer et al. (eds) *Übersetzungswissenschaft im Umbruch* (Tübingen: Narr).

Nord, Christiane (1997), *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained* (Manchester: St. Jerome).

Nord, Christiane (2005), 'Training Functional Translators', in Martha Tennynt (ed.) *Training for the New Millennium. Pedagogies for Translation and Interpreting* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins).

Pym, Anthony (2009), *Exploring Translation Theories* (London and New York: Routledge).

Schäffner, Christina & Beverly Adab (eds) (2000) *Developing Translation Competence* (Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins).

Scott-Tennynt, Cristóbal, & María González Davies (2008), 'Effects of specific training on the ability to deal with cultural referents in translation' *Meta* 53 (4): 782-797.

Séguinot, Candace (1989), 'The Translation Process: An Experimental Study', in Candace Séguinot (ed.) *The Translation Process* (Toronto: HG Publications).

Sewell, Penelope, & Ian Higgins (eds) (1996), *Teaching Translation in Universities. Present and Future Perspectives* (London: AFLS and CILT).

Tennynt, Martha (ed.) (2005), *Training for the New Millennium. Pedagogies for Translation and Interpreting* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins).

Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja (1989), 'Professional versus Non-professional Translation: A Think-aloud Protocol Study', in Candace Séguinot (ed.) *The Translation Process* (Toronto: HG Publications).

Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja (1992), 'The Interaction of World Knowledge and Linguistic Knowledge in the Processes of Translation: A Think-aloud Protocol Study' in Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk & Marcel Thelen (eds) *Translation and Meaning, Part 2* (Maastricht: Rijkshogeschool Maastricht).

Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja (1997), 'Who Verbalises What: A Linguistic Analysis of TAP Texts' *Target* 9(1): 69–84.

Toury, Gideon (1986), 'Monitoring discourse transfer: a text-case for a developmental model of translation' in Juliane House & Shoshana Blum-Kulka (eds) *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication*. (Tübingen: Narr).

Ulrych, Margherita (1996), 'Real-world Criteria in Translator Pedagogy' in Cay Dollerup & Vibeke Appel (eds) *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 3. New Horizons* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins).

Vienne, Jean (1994), 'Towards a Pedagogy of "Translation in Situation"', *Perspectives* 2 (1): 51–59.

Waddington, Christopher (2000), *Estudio comparativo de diferentes métodos de evaluación de traducción general (inglés-español)* (Madrid: Publicaciones de la Universidad Pontificia Comillas).

Wilss, Wolfram (1996), *Übersetzungsunterricht. Eine Einführung* (Tübingen: Narr).