

Recibido / Received: 15/11/2018

Para enlazar con este artículo / To link to this article:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.6035/MonTI.2019.11.1>

Para citar este artículo / To cite this article:

Tolosa Igualada, Miguel & Álvaro Echeverri. (2019) "Because something should change. Translator and interpreter training: Past, present and future." In: Tolosa Igualada, Miguel & Álvaro Echeverri (eds.) 2019. *Porque algo tiene que cambiar. La formación de traductores e intérpretes: Presente & futuro / Because something should change: Present & Future Training of Translators and Interpreters. MonTI 11*, pp. 29-46.

## BECAUSE SOMETHING SHOULD CHANGE. TRANSLATOR AND INTERPRETER TRAINING: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

Miguel Tolosa Igualada

Miguel.tolosa@ua.es  
Universidad de Alicante

Álvaro Echeverri

a.echeverri@umontreal.ca  
Universidad de Montreal

### Abstract

Interpreter and translator training has undergone important changes. Methodologies centred on the teacher (i.e. "apprenticeship approach", in interpreting or the method "who takes the next sentence?", in translation) have slowly given way to situated approaches which foster higher cognitive processes in authentic situations. The advances in the pedagogy of translation and interpreting have led to the progress of two communities looking for the consolidation of strong investigative traditions. The aim of this paper is to propose a retrospective of the development of interpreters and translators training and to propose some ideas to adapt that training to the "digital natives" ways of learning.

### Resumen

La formación de intérpretes y traductores ha experimentado cambios importantes. De las metodologías centradas en el profesor como el "apprenticeship approach", en interpretación o el método de "¿quién lee la siguiente frase?", en traducción se ha ido pasando lentamente a enfoques situados que privilegian procesos cognitivos superiores en situaciones auténticas. Los avances del discurso sobre la pedagogía de la traducción y los progresos logrados en materia de investigación en interpretación han permitido la consolidación de dos comunidades con una fuerte intensidad investigativa. El objetivo de este artículo es proponer una retrospectiva del desarrollo de la formación de intérpretes y de traductores y proponer algunas ideas para adaptar la formación a la forma de aprender de los "nativos digitales".

**Keywords:** Pedagogy. Translation and interpreting. ICT. (Meta)cognition. Social constructivism.

**Palabras clave:** Pedagogía. Traducción e interpretación. TIC. (Meta)cognición. Socio-constructivismo.

## 1. Introduction

Translation and interpretation pedagogy has evolved ever since the 1950s and has consolidated and broadened its object of study paralleling the institutionalization of Translation Studies. Different didactic approaches have also been adapted in translator and interpreter training. The classical humanistic didactics of translation and the contrastive approaches of the mid-twentieth century yielded to the learning by objectives approach proposed by Jean Delisle in the 1980s. In the 1990s, Amparo Hurtado Albir proposed a task-based approach for translator training, and recently formulated a competence-based approach that has been instrumental in adhering to the EHEA' demands. Concerning the actors in the pedagogical process, we have also witnessed a clear evolution. The traditional teacher-centred model was replaced by apprenticeship models in which learners, with the guidance of the teacher, became the protagonists and constructors of their own knowledge and learning. The cognitive-behavioural and socio-constructivist models coexist with metacognitive models and are redefining the roles played by the main actors in pedagogical environments.

Despite these important evolutions, it becomes necessary to reflect on the “I-here-now” that occurs in any training project, especially in a world that is transforming faster than ever. However, from a pedagogical point of view, it would not be sound to concentrate uniquely on the present. Translator and interpreter trainers must have one eye put on the present and the other continually scrutinizing the future, although the future is increasingly uncertain. In the following lines, we offer a general overview of the evolution of translation and interpretation pedagogy.

## 2. About the pedagogy of interpretation

The birth of interpretation as a profession, as we know it today, took place at the end of the First World War. At the Peace Conference in Paris (1919), English and French were recognized as official languages. Consequently, the presence of interpreters to facilitate communication between conference attendees became essential. In the first days of the profession, interpreters worked in consecutive interpretation. The “primitive booths” used for simultaneous interpretation

did not become a reality until the end of the 1920s (Baigorri 2000). That said, the consolidation and generalization of simultaneous interpreting came at the Nuremberg Trials (1945-1946). It was then demonstrated, despite the doubts that had been aroused, that it was technically and humanly possible to carry out this type of interpretation. The years 1919 and 1945 became therefore two seminal dates in the structuring and professional consolidation of conference interpreting. During the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the need to train competent interpreters capable of dealing with the historical challenges of their time was strongly felt. In order to respond to these challenges, the first schools<sup>1</sup> of interpreters (and translators) were created in Europe. If we recall some of the main historical events that happened during the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century—the signing of the Versailles Peace Treaty and the creation of the League of Nations (1919), the Nuremberg Trials (1945-1946), the founding of the UN (1945), the creation of the ECSC (1951), EURATOM and the EEC (1957)—and we look at the years in which the first schools of interpreters opened their doors or offered interpretation programs for the first time, it is not difficult to establish a causal link between some of those historical milestones and the subsequent academic-formative offerings.

For several decades, the instructors in the first schools of interpreters were language teachers who came directly from the professional (institutional) market, among other things, because this was required by AIIC, the International Association of Conference Interpreters, created in 1953. Excellent interpreters, no doubt, but teachers who, given the circumstances and the historical events of their time, could hardly rely on any previous interpreting training to structure and carry out their own pedagogies. This partly explains why, for many decades, the first generations of teachers developed their pedagogy on what Franz Pöchhacker (2016) calls the “apprenticeship approach”, consisting on “learning by imitating the teacher”.

After the first cohorts (40-60s) of conference interpreters from some specific programs had gained some professional experience, the first comprehensive pedagogical approach to interpreting was proposed. Danica Seleskovitch and Marianne Lederer came up with and applied their “Theory of Sense” to the training of future interpreters and translators during the 60s and 70s. Informed on previous reflections and experiences, training became

---

1. *Institut für Übersetzen und Dolmetschen* (Heidelberg, 1930), ETI (Geneva, 1941), Pedagogical State University (Moscow, 1942), University of Vienna (1943), University of Graz (1946), University of Innsbruck (1946), University of Garmersheim (1947), University of Saarbrücken (1948), *École de hautes études commerciales* (Paris, 1948), University of Trieste (1954), ESIT and ISIT (Paris, 1957), ISTI (Brussels, 1958).

less intuitive. Notwithstanding, their pedagogical methodology was still very similar to that of previous decades: a markedly prescriptive teacher-centred approach in which the teacher was the “holder of knowledge” and the model to follow. The verticality of “teacher-student” relationships was maintained with students aiming at “imitating the teacher”. Pedagogical frameworks were structured exclusively around the needs of the interpretation market (specially the institutional market). For decades, Seleskovitch and Lederer’s teaching proposal enjoyed great popularity. Their book *Pédagogie raisonnée de l’interprétation*, published in 1989 and corrected and enlarged in 2002, became one of the most influential works in the history of conference interpreter training.

From the 1980s onwards, the theoretical grounds of Seleskovitch and Lederer’s approach became under intense scrutiny, particularly for its limited explanatory power in dealing with the processes and skills required to interpret and for its accentuated prescriptivism. At the time, researchers interested in the cognitive process of interpretation such as Daniel Gile, Barbara Moser-Mercer and Sylvie Lambert tried to foster greater scientific rigour in research carried out in the field and, in particular, in the pedagogy of interpretation. To this end, they endorsed an empirical approach intended to generate models that could explain the phenomenon of conference interpreting. Gile’s (1995) *Efforts models* is a product of such endeavours. These models have been applied to the training of interpreters in order to isolate the (cognitive) subjacent processes of interpretation. The breaking down of such processes was expected to provide the basics of a didactics of interpretation, that is, interpretative skills, strategies and tactics of interpretation, the management of processing capacity and the development of expertise in interpretation.

The influence of the psycho-cognitive approach to the training of conference interpreters has been noticeable since the 90s, a decade in which humanities and social sciences were being transformed by the so-called *social turn*. This led to an increased interest in interpretation in public services within the scientific community. The effect of the *social turn* on the pedagogy of interpretation was immediate because it made professional interpreters aware of the “social situatedness” of interpretation. In the last decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the study of interpreters’ working environments and interpreters’ interactions became as important as the cognitive aspects underlying the interpretative activity.

Once training was established and with the first cohorts of trained interpreters already integrated into the labour market (first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century), the time was ripe to investigate and to reflect on past, current and future interpreter training practices and, most of all, to reflect on what was required

to improve such training programs (from the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century to our days).

The first research initiatives on conference interpreting were carried out by the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. The “researchers” of the time published didactic manuals based on their professional experience and without any scientific pretence. Starting in the 60s and 70s, specialists from other disciplines interested in and researching about the interpretation phenomenon “in a more scientific way” entered the scene. Some of them were linguists, but most of them were psychologists and psycholinguists engaged in interpreting research initiatives. Today, more and more doubts are cast on the validity, on the methodologies employed and on the scope of their results. Leaving behind the hardships of the first research efforts, the discipline entered its academic-scientific period. It is worth noting that in the 60s, interpretation (as well as translation) was becoming an autonomous discipline, independent from other related disciplines. It was in this context that the “first schools” (schools of thought) emerged. That being said, the real bases of academic structures were not laid until the 70s and the 80s. This was the time of the *practisearchers*, as Daniel Gile (1994) calls them. They were professional interpreters that also did some research. Best known among this group were Danica Seleskovitch, Marianne Lederer and Karla Déjean le Féal. Seleskovitch and Lederer deserve a special mention because they proposed the previously cited “Theory of sense” and because they were the leading figures of the Paris School, whose members declared themselves against experimental empirical research and against contributions from other disciplines because those contributions were seen as irrelevant both for the profession, and for the interpreters training. In their desire to set the bases for translation studies research, they created the first doctorate programs in the field. In the period from 1960 to 1990, the discipline was in search of institutional recognition and one important step in this direction was “The Venice Symposium” organized by David Gerver and H. Wallace Sinaiko in 1977. The papers presented in that conference were published a year later under the title *Language Interpretation and Communication*.

In the 80s and 90s, research on interpretation explored new possibilities. New scholars came into the field distancing themselves from the prescriptive and autarkical ideas of the past and opened research to interdisciplinarity. This new perspective generated research initiatives that were more inclusive and richer. Besides, clearly positioning themselves against ideas of the previous decades, they insisted on the importance and on the need to carry out research that was empirical and scientifically sound to study interpretation from new perspectives. Beyond the above-mentioned reorientation, in these decades,

researchers in the field looked at new and diverse environments, modalities and genres. They started to study, initially in Canada and in the United States, interpretation in public services and interpretation in sign language. These new environments required the use of innovative methodologies and the exploration of different research paradigms that widen and diversify the traditional objects of analysis.

Nine years after the Venice Symposium, the discipline reached another seminal milestone, *The First International Symposium on Conference Interpreting* (1986). This conference held in Trieste had a huge impact on interpretation pedagogy research. In 1989, Laura Gran and John Dodds published the book *The theoretical and practical aspects of teaching conference interpreting*, which included the papers presented at the conference. The same year, 1989, the inauguration of CETRA (Center for Translation Studies) at the KU Leuven Faculty of Arts, Belgium, took place. And the first, and very much still alive today, scholarly journal dedicated exclusively to interpretation, *The Interpreter's Newsletter*, was launched in 1998 in Trieste (Italy) by SSLMIT (Sezione di Studi di Lingue Moderne per Interpreti e Traduttori) of the Università degli Studi di Trieste.

The last decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was the time of consolidation and integration of interpretation research. This period saw the strengthening of *Interpreting Studies* as an interdiscipline and its integration into Translation Studies without giving up its identity. The number of scientific papers and the collaboration among researchers increased exponentially. There was also the emergence of platforms for the exchange of information about interpretation research such as IRTIN/CIRIN, created by Daniel Gile. In 1996, the journal *Interpreting: international journal of research and practice in interpreting* was created and rapidly became the most prestigious scientific monographic journal dedicated to interpreting. Additionally, because of the already mentioned *social turn*, the scientific community became deeply interested in community interpreting. In the footsteps of previous initiatives, research became increasingly interdisciplinary and methodologically diverse.

21<sup>st</sup> century. It was known for a long time that interpretation in public services was not only a social necessity. It was an obligation for the protection of certain fundamental human rights. This does not mean that conference interpreting has become less important. Quite simply, the professional spectrum has broadened and will broaden even further. This is already happening in the field of research. According to Gile (2017), between 2005 and 2015 the number of works published in the field of PSI surpassed that of contributions dedicated to conference interpreting. Additionally, the rapid evolution and development

of new technologies, unimaginable only a couple of decades ago, is having a direct impact on the current configuration of the profession, on training and on research. Distance interpretation is not something new, but the technologies that make it possible today are.<sup>2</sup> In fact, these technologies are being used by professionals on a daily basis both in conference interpreting and in ISPs. For instance, in healthcare settings, telephone interpreting has become a common practice thanks to the development of new dedicated applications. New technologies also play a decisive role in the thematic and terminological preparation of simultaneous interpreting assignments. Pieces of software such as Interplex, InterpretBank, LookUp, TERMINUS, InterpretersHelp or GlossaryAssistant make the documentation management much more efficient outside the booth and make it possible to carry out quick queries into the booth. Technological innovations offer the possibility of exploring and developing new interpretation forms such as simultaneous-consecutive, *respeaking*, speech to text interpretation or automatic interpretation (Pöchhacker 2016: 188, 189).

Bearing this in mind, it is logical to ask whether or not interpreter training is adapting to the social and technological changes that are taking place. What is being done in interpreter training centres to meet new professional needs? The answer to this question can be found in the title of the call for papers for the issue of MonTI: “Because something should change”. We believe that universities and those responsible for interpreters’ training must be aware of societal demands, of what is needed, and adapt as swiftly as possible in order to guarantee that their educational offerings remain relevant. It is a professional, social and human demand. At the same time, it is important to keep an open mind towards ICT. The (new) technologies, although not perfect, constitute, if used correctly, the master key to open new pedagogical doors. It should be remembered that as early as the mid-1990s, interpreter trainers started using technology, mainly information technology, to improve teaching practices, as well as the self-training of budding interpreters (Sandrelli 2016). Major technological advances of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, in general, and information technology in particular, favour the creation of new tools for interpreter training that we can separate in two groups: 1) those based on web resources; online repositories, mainly, and 2) virtual environments for the teaching-learning of interpretation (also known as Course Management Systems, CMS, or Virtual learning environments, VLE).

---

2. See in this regard the terminology proposed by Andrew Constable: [https://www.isit-paris.fr/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/ISIT-DGINTER\\_Synthese\\_juillet2015.pdf](https://www.isit-paris.fr/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/ISIT-DGINTER_Synthese_juillet2015.pdf) Retrieved in November 2018.



In the light of what we have discussed so far, and according to our conception of interpretation as a psycho-cognitive and socially situated activity, we consider that traditional teaching has become pedagogically unfit for the training of professional interpreters. In this sense and for some time now, in our teaching practice we have been adapting and applying a situated apprenticeship approach for interpreter training. In situated learning environments, students are faced with authentic learning situations in which they will be actively engaged in the construction of their own knowledge. They are also constantly using strategies that lead them to the resolution of naturally occurring problems. Additionally, instead of trying to solve problems individually or in isolation, students learn to consider the social environment (that is, actors in the situation, spaces and times) in which the student will have to intervene. Learning activities are performed purposely, that is they must respond to the details included in a project *brief*. In short, situated learning will mean to adapt thought and action in response to a specific space at a particular moment (this is fundamental as we know that interpretation laboratories create, *a priori*, artificial situations). Situated learning means including other students and the environment in activities that are “meaningful”. It is well known that learning has better chances to occur when we are able to generate meaning in authentic situations. Situatedness also means to appropriate the process of thought and action carried out by experts and to perform tasks requiring the display of knowledge, of know-how and knowledge about how to behave as a member of a professional community in a particular environment or situation. Therefore, applying situated learning means considering the basic elements, i.e. content, context, community and participation. Referring to content, situated learning underlines the need to apply actions related to higher cognitive processes in authentic situations. However, those actions should be carefully chosen according to the profile of the learners in question. Regarding learning in context, this approach favours the creation of a learning environment adequate to the tasks students must perform in order to achieve established objectives. When speaking of context, one can also think of knowing how to behave according to the values and the norms established by a social community, in the broad sense. Through the community, students interpret, create and structure meaning. Finally, participation involves an exchange of ideas in the resolution of problems as well as an active commitment on the part of the student towards their peers.

Interpretation, in the same way as translation, is not carried out by resorting to preconceived solutions. Neither is its pedagogy. The pedagogy of interpretation does not have to be prescriptive, static or hierarchically vertical. The

alternative, essentially descriptive, dynamic and hierarchically horizontal, is inspired by a descriptive-constructivist pedagogy that constitutes a direct route towards learners' metacognition. In short, it is a matter of students discovering and constructing their own knowledge and drawing their own conclusions. All this helps them to become professionals and, above all, integral human beings, always ready to learn about themselves both as professionals and as human beings in a constant quest for improvement.

### 3. About the pedagogy of translation

As we stated above, interpretation and translation are among the professions that have been critically transformed in the last fifty years thanks to advances in translation technologies and, of course, to the spread of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT). For many interpreters and translators, knowing how to use the technological tools frequently used within their respective fields, has become essential for them to become members of their professional communities. Several of the articles included in this issue shed new light on this discussion.

Educational structures adapt to technological development as a way to guarantee the relevance of their educational offerings. Technological advances associated with machine translation (MT), computer-assisted translation (CAT) tools and artificial intelligence (AI) applications have certainly transformed interpreting and translation. These technologies, however, are still far from sending the two professions to the list of endangered occupations. Interpreting and translation will not disappear, but they will certainly change in the coming years. The post-editing phenomenon provides a clear example of this transformation.

Machine translation functionalities have been integrated into industrial translation processes in order to respond to an increased demand for translations as a result of globalization (Gambier 2014). Some major players in the translation market around the world, such as the Directorate General for Translation of the European Commission and Canada's Translation Bureau, have seen machine translation software as a solution to the challenges posed by the need to translate larger numbers of documents in shorter periods of time. Large translation service providers around the world have also adopted these technologies provoking substantial changes in the lives of many a professional translator. The work of a good number of translators is transforming into that of proof-readers or post-editors of texts produced by automatic translation programs. Translators are also asked to work on chunks of texts pre-translated with translation memories. The consequences of these transformations

in terms of translation quality are still to be studied. This reality affects a part of the translation market and provides us with a look into the industry that will employ future translators. Those responsible for educating translators<sup>3</sup> must constantly monitor the evolution of the translation industry in order to progressively adapt to changes.

Education in general is going through a process of transformation similar to the one seen in the world of translators and interpreters because of technological advances. In the case of education, however, the role of teachers appears to be one that will require significant adjustments in the near future. As young generations of students enjoy greater, larger, and easier access to information, their learning habits, patterns and structures of learning will logically change.

The generation of the so-called “digital natives” (Prensky 2001), people who were born in a world where ICT and especially the Internet already existed, has developed its own way of learning. Digital natives’ learning preferences and habits represent an enormous challenge for educators. Today’s students had gotten used to manipulate their physical world and they might expect to be fully involved in whatever they are participating in. Students must be fully engaged in their learning process for learning to have a lasting effect. Neurological studies applied to learning show that, as human beings, we can only focus on one thing at a time and our abilities to split our attention among several activities depends on our capacity to direct our focus of attention from one activity to another quickly and effectively while making connections between the key points of the activity or activities we are performing (Bresciani 2016: 10).

Therefore, the role of teachers, as in the past, will face major challenges and educational structures will undoubtedly adapt to the characteristics of digital natives. Teachers will progressively pass from being an intermediary between students and the knowledge, and skills they must acquire into roles related to guide students into being knowledgeable and critical consumers of information. Today’s technologies allow students to interact directly with the knowledge that will be essential to their profession, and teachers, as they have always done, will adapt their teaching to their students’ learning patterns and preferences. For this to happen, we will need information on the way students conceive and face learning. Translator education will not escape this reality. Pedagogical models in which learning is programmed to take place in a specific place, at certain time, and in environments where students are asked to disconnect from their interconnected world for periods of one, two or three

---

3. See Widdowson’s (1984) and Bernardini’s (2004: 19-20) works on training and education.

hours will sooner than later adapt to the social changes that are taking place in other social environments.

Since the 90s, higher education in general has been experiencing a shift from a teacher-centred and teaching-oriented educational model to a student-centred and learning-centred training model (Barr & Tagg 1995). The education of translators has also undergone this change. As confirmed by Yves Gambier (2012: 163) “[...] we can notice a shift in many places from a teacher-oriented approach to a learner-centred approach, or rather a mixture of approaches.” As we will see below, some of the most important transformations translator education has undergone in the last twenty years have something in common: they are focused on learning and on students.

Making the student the centre of educational efforts is a complex phenomenon and for that complexity to be preserved the phenomenon should be studied from many perspectives and that requires researchers working in different directions. One of these perspectives would be to focus on the active role each student must play in learning activities. Active learning consists of cognitively involving students in activities that incorporate some kind of cognitive “manipulation” of course content. When learning activities are organized in a truly student-centred approach, they should engage students in higher cognitive processes such as synthesis, analysis, evaluation, or critique.

Amparo Hurtado Albir was one of the first translation studies scholars to propose a didactic and pedagogical structure that would provide an appropriate framework for the application of the principles of active learning to translator education. At the end of the 1990s, Hurtado Albir adapted the principles of task-based learning to translator education. A key aspect of Hurtado’s contribution to the education of translators is to have enriched the didactics and the pedagogy of translation with ideas and concepts specific to the sciences of education.

Other authors took similar paths. With the publication of his book *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education* (2000), Donald Kiraly made another important contribution to translator education when he proposed a learning approach to translation. Kiraly’s theoretical stand relies on the project-based learning approach as a means of putting this theory into practice. The great change Kiraly introduced to translator education was the need to structure teaching proposals according to the precepts of a theory of learning and to propose a pedagogical formula for its practical application.

Before Kiraly, the only author who had supported his didactic proposal in a theory of learning was Jean Delisle. In 1980, Delisle proposed a method of teaching translation based on the behavioural theory of learning. The

didactic application of behaviourism is the learning by objectives approach. This approach involves the segmentation of the course contents in small units so that the students acquire them progressively. Each small unit of content is considered as a learning objective. Assessment at the end of an academic period functions as an integrating element that allows students to re-establish existing relationships between content segments that were fragmented into learning objectives. Delisle (1981: 10) proposed a series of exercises as well to overcome what he called “collective translations” or in Kiraly’s terms, the method of “who takes the next sentence?”.

In our opinion, the didactic and pedagogical proposals of Hurtado Albir, Kiraly and Delisle have, among many other motivations, the desire to overcome the “who reads the next sentence?”. The idea of chasing the “who reads the next sentence?” method has become a cliché, a truism among those of us interested in translator education. Hence the title of the call for papers for this issue of *MonTI* and the title of this article “Because something should change”. Nowadays, educators aware of the state of the art in translation teaching know that they can rely on numerous resources to support their teaching activities on shared knowledge and not just on instinctive or experiential knowledge.

Efforts to train translator trainers (Kelly 2005) are having an impact on the way translation is taught. Knowledge about translator education has progressed considerably over the last forty years. These advances have been possible thanks to the consolidation of a community of researchers who have chosen the education of interpreters and translators as a research area. Today it is possible to speak of long-lasting research efforts that have resulted in advanced levels of knowledge in some particular subjects. And translation competence is maybe the best example of such subjects.

For the purpose of our discussion, we limit ourselves by referring to some of the most important works on the subject. They demonstrate that research efforts on translator competence have been constant during the last four decades (Wilss 1982; Roberts 1984; Krings 1986; Lörscher 1991; Toury 1995; Pym 2003). The studies we referred to, in parentheses, can be characterized as products of expert knowledge. That is, the authors who proposed them used their knowledge on the subject to propose their idea of translation competence. Expert knowledge is opposed to knowledge that we can call “shared”, because it is the one that is produced within a research program and is validated by a scientific community in which the authors are immersed.

Expert knowledge is characterised by being punctual and not being part of a systematic research programme. Thus, for example, the minimalist approach to translation competence proposed by Anthony Pym in 2003 is a type of expert

knowledge of great value within the scientific community but which does not compare to the shared knowledge generated by a systematic research initiative such as the one carried out by the PACTE group (Process to acquire competence in translation and translation evaluation) of the Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona from 1997 until today. The work of PACTE epitomizes more than 20 years of research efforts that provides the entire translation community with a solid epistemological when considering the translation competence subject. At the same time, PACTE's work on translation competence fosters an epistemological dialogue in which other researchers or experts would take a stand either for or against the shared knowledge on the subject and this gives rise to what Imre Lakatos (1978) called a scientific research program. In it, both critical and parallel positions are necessary for the advancement of the discipline.

Donald Kiraly (2000: 13), for example, understands the concept of translation competence as the acquisition of specific skills that allow a translator to produce a text in one language inspired in an existing text in another language. It is clear that Kiraly is using the same term that other authors have used before and after him. However, it is also clear that he is not referring to the same concept. This can easily be seen by comparing Kiraly's definition to the one given by Amparo Hurtado Albir (2008: 27) and idea of translator competence:

[...] The underlying system of declarative and essentially operational knowledge, necessary to translate, with some particularities: (1) it is an expert knowledge not possessed by all bilingual people; (2) it is essentially operational and not declarative knowledge; (3) it is composed of several interconnected sub-competences, (4) strategic competence, as is the case for all operational knowledge, plays a determining role [Our translation].

These types of conceptual differences expose the complexity of a key concept in translation teaching and enrich the discourse on translator education. We have taken the instances of two concepts, *translation competence* and *translator competence*, to highlight the impact shared knowledge can have on the development of an area of study such as translator education. Hurtado and Kiraly are interested in a similar phenomenon but conceive it from two different epistemological perspectives. The work of PACTE and that of Hurtado proceed from an analytical perspective interested in the decomposition of the translation competence system into its constituent elements. Theirs is a top-down approach starting with the whole until revealing its parts. Kiraly, instead, uses a perspective of totality. From this perspective, decomposing the whole into its separate elements does not always guarantee the functionality of the system. If we restrict our study to the totalizing perspective, in turn, it would deprive us of knowing the elements of the system, since it only allows a systemic external

view of the whole and its functions. Complexity theory supports the dialectic relation between opposite epistemological perspectives and proposes to see them as antagonistic, contradictory and, at the same time, complementary (Morin 2005: 72). Ideally, other topics related to interpreter and translator education, such as motivation, evaluation, feedback, classroom research, the role of ICT in translator education, among many others, could be the object of continuous discussion and prolonged research efforts, as Amparo Hurtado Albir and the PACTE group have done in the case of translation competence.

On another note, we consider that part of the research efforts should concentrate on students as the principal agents of their own education. Among the papers presented at the 4<sup>th</sup> DidTRAD conference, held in Barcelona in June 2018, some were related to concepts such as *self-efficacy*, *translation learning strategies*, *motivation*, and *reflective practice*, among others. To this set of concepts, we would have to add the concept of *metacognition*. Metacognition as the knowledge we have of our own cognitive abilities and as the control we can exercise over cognitive processes. For example, being aware of the limits of our ability to retain some kinds of information (numbers, faces, places, words, names of people, names of places) is a good example of metacognitive knowledge. When we are reading and realize that we are not concentrated, we are exerting control over the reading process, and therefore, comprehension. These concepts constitute the kind of knowledge that educators must share with students so that they can exercise better control over their own learning.

Learning to learn and learning for life have become two key buzzwords of education. Unfortunately, some educators do not have the conceptual tools necessary to introduce them in their everyday teaching practice. Finding a space within the learning activities for students to become familiar with concepts such as metacognition, motivation, self-efficacy and learning strategies provides an interesting research topic in interpreter and translator education. Student-centred education begins by directing students towards themselves as learners so that they exert a better control over their learning. In addition to learning to translate and learning about translation, the future translator, as any student in any field, must learn about learning and learn to learn.

#### 4. Final remarks

As we have discussed throughout this article, the evolution of interpreter and translator training has been, and continues to be, particularly dynamic. Two seem to have been the driving forces behind this dynamism from the 1940s to the present day. On the one hand, the political, social, cultural and economic events that characterized the history of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries and, on the

other, the development and spread of certain information and communication technologies. As we have seen, professional requirements have led to the creation of centres specialising in translator and interpreter training and education. Initially, training in these centres was, as could not be otherwise given the circumstances, very intuitive, and progressively become more sophisticated as it built up on the development of intense pedagogical research. Thus, from a teacher-centred pedagogy hierarchically vertical, passive and static, we keep transitioning into a student-centred pedagogy in which learners as the decisive agents of any learning project become responsible for their own learning. The pedagogical act becomes then a horizontal, active and dynamic event in which teachers no longer “teach”, but “moderate” and become “facilitators of learning”. They provide students with the necessary cognitive and material tools to build their own knowledge so that they can embark with confidence their journey towards self-knowledge as professionals and as human beings.

Research has changed the face of interpreter and translator education in the last two decades and it has been fundamental and inspirational for translation pedagogy. We hope readers could find the spark that would ignite their research endeavours in the research articles of this issue of *MonTI*. These contributions shed new light on the past, present and above all the future of interpretation and translation pedagogy because nothing could stay the same forever, something should change.

## References

- BAIGORRI, Jesús. (2000) *La interpretación de conferencias: el nacimiento de una profesión, de París a Núremberg*. Granada: Comares.
- BARR, Robert & John Tagg. (1995) “From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education.” *Change* 27:6, pp. 12-25.
- BERNARDINI, Silvia. (2004) “The theory behind the practice: Translator training or translator education?” In: Malmkjaer, Kirsten (ed.) 2004. *Translation in undergraduate degree programmes*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 17-29.
- BRESCIANI, Marilee. (2016) “Introduction: Rethinking how we design, deliver, and evaluate higher education.” In: Bresciani, Marilee (ed.) 2016. *The neuroscience of learning and development: enhancing creativity, compassion, critical thinking, and peace in higher education*. Sterling (VA): Stylus Publishing/ACPA, pp. 1-26.
- DELISLE, Jean. (1980) *L'analyse du discours comme méthode de traduction*. Ottawa: Presses Universitaires d'Ottawa.
- GAMBIER, Yves. (2012) “Teaching Translation/Training Translators.” In: Gambier, Yves & Luc van Doorslaer (eds.) 2012. *Handbook of Translation Studies 3*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 163-171.



- GAMBIER, Yves. (2014) "Changing landscape in translation." *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language* 2:2, pp. 1-12.
- GILE, Daniel. (1994) "Opening up in Interpretation Studies." In: Snell-Hornby, Mary, Franz Pöchhacker & Klaus Kaindl (eds.) 1994. *Translation Studies: An interdisciplinary*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 149-158.
- GILE, Daniel. (1995) *Regards sur la Recherche en Interprétation Simultanée*. Lille: Presses Universitaires de Lille.
- GILE, Daniel. (2017) "Traditions and innovation in Interpreting Studies: a personal analysis for 2016." *Domínios de Linguagem* 11: 5, pp. 1424-1439.
- HURTADO ALBIR, Amparo. (1996) "La enseñanza de la traducción directa 'general'. Objetivos de aprendizaje y metodología." In: Hurtado Albir, Amparo (coord.) 1996. *La enseñanza de la traducción*. Castelló de La Plana: Servei de Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I, pp. 31-56.
- HURTADO ALBIR, Amparo. (dir.) (1999) *Enseñar a traducir. Metodología en la formación de traductores e intérpretes*. Madrid: Edelsa.
- HURTADO ALBIR, Amparo. (2008) "Compétence en traduction et formation par compétences." *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction* 21:1, pp. 17-64.
- KELLY, Dorothy. (2005) *A Handbook for Translator Trainers*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- KIRALY, Donald. (2000) *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- KRINGS, Hans P. (1986) "Translation problems and translation strategies of advanced German learners of French (L2)." In: House, Juliane & Shoshana Blum-Kulka (dirs.) 1986. *Interlingual and intercultural communication*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, pp. 263-275.
- LAKATOS, Imre. (1978) *The methodology of scientific research programmes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LÖRSCHER, Wolfgang. (1991) *Translation performance, translation process, and translation strategies: A psycholinguistic investigation*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- MORIN, Edgar. (2005) *Introduction à la pensée complexe*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- PÖCHHACKER, Franz. (2016) *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London & New York: Routledge.
- PRENSKY, Marc. (2001) "Digital Natives, Digitale Immigrants. Part 1." *On the Horizon* 9:5, pp. 1-6.
- PYM, Anthony. (2003) "Redefining translation competence in an electronic age." *Meta* 48:4, pp. 481-497.
- ROBERTS, Roda. (1984) "Compétence du nouveau diplômé en traduction, traduction et qualité de langue." In: *Actes du Colloque, Société des Traducteurs du Québec/Conseil de la langue française*. Québec: Éditeur officiel du Québec, pp. 172-184.
- SANDRELLI, Annalisa. (2016) "Becoming an interpreter: The role of computer technology." *MonTI Special Issue 2*, pp. 111-138.

- TOURY, Gideon. (1995) *Descriptive translation studies - and beyond*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- WIDDOWSON, Henry. (1984) *Explorations in applied linguistics 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- WILSS, Wolfram. (1996) *Knowledge and skills in translator behavior*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

#### NOTA BIOGRÁFICA / BIONOTE

MIGUEL TOLOSA IGUALADA holds a PhD in Translation Studies (2009), Master's in Translation Studies (2004) and bachelor's degree in Translation and Interpreting (2001), University of Alicante (Spain). He is a sworn translator (French-Spanish/Spanish-French) since 2002. His main research interests are: the translation and the interpreting activities analysed as cognitive processes and the link with difficulty solving and commission of errors; the translation and the interpreting didactics; the translation and interpreting activities within the International Organizations and in the private market. He teaches translation and interpretation at the University of Alicante since 2005. He has been a professional translator and interpreter since 2001. He teaches general and specialized translation, consecutive and simultaneous interpretation (Bachelor's Degree in Translation and Interpreting, UA), Interpreting in International Organizations (Master's Degree in Institutional Translation, UA) and a doctoral course on translation and interpreting empirical research (Doctorado en Traductología, traducción profesional y audiovisual).

ÁLVARO ECHEVERRI holds a Ph.D. in Translation Studies (2008) from the Université de Montréal, a M.A. in Translation (2001) from Kent State University (USA) and a B.A. in Modern Languages (1994) from the Universidad de Antioquia (Colombia). His main research interest areas are translation pedagogy, translation of translation studies' seminal texts, and the history of translation in Latin America. Concerning the pedagogy of translation his research is based on student-centred approaches to learning, active learning, in particular the metacognitive dimension of translation. His interests in the history of translation hover around the translation of political texts at the time of Independence. He teaches documentary research for translator, translation methodology, theoretical approaches to translation and a seminar on Translator trainers.