

Dictionary of
Education and
Assessment in
Translation and
Interpreting
Studies (TIS)

Vorya Dastyar

Dictionary
of Education
and Assessment
in Translation and
Interpreting Studies
(TIS)

Dictionary of Education and Assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies (TIS)

By

Vorya Dastyar

**Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing**



**Dictionary of Education and Assessment in Translation and Interpreting
Studies (TIS)**

By Vorya Dastyar

This book first published 2019

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2019 by Vorya Dastyar

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-2148-6

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-2148-3

To Franz Pöchhacker

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ix
Introduction	xi
Entries A-Z	1
Bibliography	217

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Dictionary is a project I have completed in more than one year of intense writing. I have had the pleasure of communicating with a number of scholars in Translator & Interpreting Studies (TIS), and this has greatly helped me to broaden my horizons in my explorations into the field. With thought-provoking ideas and great inspirations from such fruitful communications with these distinguished scholars and colleagues, I believe that I had the right mindset to complete this project and have it see the light of day. My sincere thanks go to Franz Pöchhacker, Daniel Gile, Sylvia Kalina, Donald Kiraly, David Sawyer, Christina Schäffner, Cynthia Roy, Elisabeth Winston, Robin Setton, Andrew Dawrant, Elisabeth Tiselius, Catherine Chabasse, Stephanie Kader, Beate Herting, Maren Dingfelder Stone, Winibert Segers, Nadja Grbić, Michaela Albl-Mikasa, Binhua Wang, Veerle Dufloy, John Kearns, Defeng Li, Campbell McDermid, Jemina Napier, Cecilia Wadensjö, Mira Kadrić, Sabine Braun, and of course, Demi Krystallidou.

Also, a warm word of thanks to Cambridge Scholars Publishing for publishing this Dictionary.

I also thank my mother, Farokh, and my sister, Nina, for their great support and encouragement throughout my life and during this project.

VORYA DASTYAR

August 25, 2018

INTRODUCTION

The Rationale for the Present Volume & Its Title

The idea for Dictionary of Education & Assessment in Translation & Interpreting Studies (TIS) began to form in my mind in 2017 after I had published 6 books, 3 of which were dictionaries in the field of Translation and Interpreting Studies (TIS). I, like many others, began to feel that there is a need for a reference book on the topic of training and education in TIS because it is a hot topic, attracts special scholarly attention, and is an issue of growing importance in the field and in today's world. Besides, there is the urgent need for properly trained translators and interpreters, and this can be aided by publishing research monographs, articles, reference books, guidelines, etc. Obviously, training and education is linked with assessment. Training and education needs to be complemented with assessment in order to thrive.

This Dictionary aims to offer an in-depth, comprehensive coverage of key terms and topics with regard to training, educating, and assessing translators and interpreters in academic settings. Academic researchers in the field of TIS, translator and interpreter educators and trainers, (mainly) graduate and postgraduate university students in the field of TIS, practitioners and assessors will find this Dictionary a very useful reference book.

As for the title, in an attempt to choose between *training* and *education*, I opted for the latter to precede *assessment* because I would like this Dictionary to be viewed as the total sum of its parts, i.e. this Dictionary aims to contribute to proper education, rather than training, and assessment of translators and interpreters. Similarly, in trying to make my mind over whether I should choose *evaluation*, *testing*, or *assessment* to follow *education* in the title, I, while being aware that the term *evaluation* is frequently used as a misnomer for *testing*, decided to use *assessment* to enrich the title and the topic of the Dictionary with a term, which implies the objective of developing a multifaceted and, at the same time, clear picture of a phenomenon.

The Organization and Features of the Dictionary

This Dictionary is the fruit of more than a year of labour. First, it explains, in depth, key terms and topics on issues of education and assessment, in general (i.e. within the field(s) where these terms and topics were first introduced). Then, the definitions and the discussions of the terms and topics shift toward the field of TIS. Therefore, the present work adopts an inter-disciplinary approach to translator and interpreter education and assessment. As a crucial part of the development of the present volume, I identified the headwords after I checked the subject indices of many works of various types (dictionaries, encyclopedias, research monographs, journal articles, published and unpublished theses, etc.) on the topic of training, educating and assessing translators and interpreters, and after I checked a list of keywords that occurred to my mind, in the *Benjamins Translation Studies Bibliography*. Finally, I came upon a list of 245 terms. Based on their frequency of appearance and their overall key position in the literature, I decided to write on 116 entries, and leave total 129 entries as blind entries in the Dictionary.

I mention the following main features of the present Dictionary:

- 1) In-depth comprehensive coverage of key terms and topics with regard to training, educating, and assessment of translators and interpreters;
- 2) Cross-referencing and in-text referencing to enhance the integrity and the ease of use of the Dictionary. The in-text referencing has been taken care of by writing the key terms in SMALL CAPITALS wherever they occur for the first time within the text of a given entry;
- 3) Under almost all of the main entries (which are all, in turn, in capitals), several subheadings appear to give the reader a multifaceted coverage of the key terms and topics within TIS. This, however, does not apply to the blind entries.

The Bibliography

I have made every effort to compile one of the most comprehensive and relevant Bibliographies (running to more than 1600 entries) at the end of the present Dictionary, which comprises sources referred to throughout this work. Most of the sources in the Bibliography are in English (for the sake of readers' easy access to the references), but I have also, to some extent, included sources in other languages.

VORYA DASTYAR

August 25, 2018

ENTRIES

ABSOLUTE EXPERTISE → EXPERTISE

ACCREDITATION

Definitions

The verb to accredit, from French *accréditer* meaning 'to credit', refers to the process of officially authorizing or certifying an organization or institution with regard to their level of **COMPETENCE** for the purpose of **QUALITY ASSURANCE**.

Accreditation in TIS

Accreditation is often used interchangeably with the term **CERTIFICATION** (Liu 2015b); however, terminologically speaking, it must be pointed out that, it is organizations (offering translator and interpreter education programs), not individuals (i.e. translators and interpreters), which gain accreditation (Dybiec-Gajer 2014; Mikkelson 2013) as evidence of their compliance with national standards aiming at fully preparing graduates to enter the job market (Witter-Merithew 2018). However, in Australia and some other (mainly) English-speaking countries (e.g. New Zealand), accreditation is used to refer to determining the professional competence of an individual (Budin et al. 2013:144; Melby 2013:1).

Accreditation can be obtained through one of the following channels: passing an exam or qualification by testing, being officially acknowledged by a professional body (or an accrediting authority), or finishing a degree in translation that serves as an accreditation in itself (Šeböková 2010). Accreditation for translators and interpreters, as a benchmark for translator and interpreter competence, with national accreditation standards serving as instruments for quality management, is granted under the auspices of credentialing organizations: one may, by way of example only, mention 1) The National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters (NAATI) in Australia, active for more than twenty years and with its translator accreditation scheme currently consisting of three different levels

of accreditation/competence/credentials as of June 2017: Recognized Practicing Translator, Certified Translator, and Certified Advanced Translator; and with its interpreter accreditation scheme currently consisting of five different levels of accreditation/competence/credentials as of February 2018: Recognized Practicing Interpreter, Certified Provisional Interpreter, Certified Interpreter, Certified Specialist Interpreter-Health or Legal, and Certified Conference Interpreter; 2) Shanghai Interpretation Accreditation (SIA), National Accreditation Examinations for Translators and Interpreters (NAETI) and China Accreditation Test for Translators and Interpreters (CATTI) all in China; 3) the National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators (NAJIT) as the professional organization of state and federal judiciary interpreters and translators; and 4) the United States Federal Court Interpreter Certification Examination (FCICE). One needs to point out, by way of example only, that five modes of gaining accreditation have been proposed by NAATI: direct testing; recognition of overseas qualifications (for conference interpreters); providing evidence of membership of a recognized international professional association of translators or interpreters; approved courses in translation and/or interpreting that conform to NAATI's standards such that an equivalent test is administered at the end of the COURSE; and providing evidence of advanced standing in the translating or interpreting profession (see Gentile 2015; Hlavac 2016). This is complemented by a system of revalidation with its own terms and conditions (Gentile 2015).

Challenges to accreditation in TIS

It is worth noting that not all countries have translator and/or interpreter accreditation systems/procedures, and in the ones which do, accreditation procedures, in general, are influenced by such factors as market requirements and PROFESSIONALIZATION (with the latter, modelled in IS by Tseng 1992, cited in Pöschhacker 2016:80, and being a recurrent theme in Biagini et al. 2017; for discussions on professionalization in TS, see Jääskeläinen et al. 2011; special issue of *InTRALinea* 16, 2014). Apart from that, professional accreditation and certification, the essential requirement for which through translation and interpreting programs is performance(-based) examination (Lee 2009), lacks attention in translator and interpreter TRAINING research, e.g. in Europe (see Yan et al. 2018: 50).

However, as far as NAATI accreditation system is concerned, it has never been the object of a systematic analysis in terms of issues of VALIDITY and RELIABILITY (Campbell & Hale 2003) (see also Eyckmans et al. 2009:73; Roberts-Smith 2009:32; Skaaden 2013:48; Stern

2011b) as two aspects of testing theory essential to performance or quality ASSESSMENT in TIS (Angelelli 2013a), and NAATI criteria for error deduction assessment have been criticized by some authors (e.g. Kim 2009).

What is more, as Hale et al. (2012) observe, currently, no international standard exists as for how credentialing organizations address issues of assessing and awarding certification.

ACCREDITATION TESTING → CERTIFICATION
ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION → MOTIVATION
ACHIEVEMENT TEST → ASSESSMENT

ACTION RESEARCH

Definitions

The term action research, which emerged through the work of social psychologist Kurt Lewin (1946/1948), refers to a participatory enquiry and liberating practices and initiatives among individuals on a specific scale for the purpose of developing new practical knowledge and effective solutions to important enduring problems in their lives and community, and therefore, improving their overall well-being and QUALITY of life in more positive ways (Reason & Bradbury 2008). Action research, which is typically undertaken *with* participants rather than *on* participants (Heron & Reason 2006), is characterized by four key components: equal relationship and adequate preparation among all participants and stakeholders; communication characterized by frequent attentive listening and truthfulness during the process of data gathering and analysis; teamwork and continuous participation; and inclusion of as many pertinent participants and stakeholders as possible (Lamkin & Saleh 2010).

Action research applied to TIS

Action research is common to the field of EDUCATION, and can be thought of as a practice with the potential of influencing issues of teaching and learning in particular, and those of redesigning education in general (see Rowell et al. 2017, pa. 4). Applying action research to student translator classroom is a relatively new phenomenon (Mitchell-Schuitevoerder 2014). In TS, studies classified as action research (e.g. Galán-Mañas & Hurtado Albir 2010) have focused on translator TRAINING and education as the applied branch of TS. More recently, action research has been advocated as a good source of insights, innovation, and change into translator (Crezee &

Burn 2019; Nicodemus & Swabey 2016; Rodríguez de Céspedes 2018) and interpreter (Cirillo & Niemants 2017; Crezee & Burn 2019; Krouse 2010; Napier et al. 2013; Nicodemus & Swabey 2016; Pöchhacker 2010a, 2011b, 2016:194, 217; Slatyer 2015a, 2015b) education and ASSESSMENT.

ADAPTIVE EXPERTISE→ EXPERTISE

ADMISSION TESTING→ APTITUDE TESTING

AMOTIVATION→ MOTIVATION

ANALYTIC SCORING→ RUBRIC

ANTICIPATION

Definitions & typologies

The term anticipation, from Latin *anticipation*(n-), from the verb *anticipare* meaning ‘to have in advance’, is the most widely discussed (coping) STRATEGY of SI. It refers to the process of intelligent prediction of constituents of the original text that are not available to the interpreter yet for the purpose of speech planning, i.e. entire discourse comprehension, message development and delivering good performance (Liontou 2012, 2013, 2015; Yao 2017). Chernov (2004), making anticipation, as a mechanism of probability prediction, the core of his theoretical MODEL of comprehension in SI, highlights linguistic and extralinguistic redundancy of discourse and interpreter’s inferencing ability as key factors leading to the probability of the interpreter’s use of anticipation mechanism, with implications for (simultaneous) interpreter TRAINING (Wilss 1978). Anticipation is of two main types: linguistic anticipation (based on interpreter’s good knowledge of grammatical rules, collocations, and standard phrases) and extralinguistic anticipation (based on interpreter’s good knowledge of interpreting context, including speakers and the topic) (Gile 2009a).

Anticipation & its use in interpreter training

Anticipation, as the skill of predicting what might come next, is not exclusive to simultaneous interpreting, though. Anticipation can, in fact, be important in consecutive interpreting too (Li 2015b:174), as this strategy can be facilitated or accelerated in the source speech comprehension process aided by NOTE-TAKING (Ito 2017). Apart from its use in interpreting modes, anticipation is a widely discussed strategy with regard to conference interpreting and training conference interpreters in particular; however,

since interpreting settings come with more or less clear-cut boundaries, trainers should note that the strategy of anticipation is far from being appropriate e.g. for interpreting asylum interviews due to the critical conditions, under which any of interpreter's incorrect renditions in the target language may jeopardize asylum seeker's asylum request (see Stachl-Peier & Pöllabauer 2017).

APTITUDE

General definitions

With cognitive skills at its core, the term aptitude, from Late Latin *aptitudo*, from *aptus* meaning 'fitness', is the more complex correlate of the term ability, and one component of COMPETENCE. Therefore, as a desirable, however multidimensional and elusive construct, it needs to be approached from all angles. Aptitude has different meanings in different fields of study: for example, Kuncel & Klieger (2008:47-48) define aptitude in three different ways within the broad panorama of the field of educational psychology: the first one is focused on its link with learning outcomes only, and the other two also take the nature of an aptitude into consideration: 1) aptitude, with regard to learning outcomes only, may refer to individual differences as related to subsequent learning at a particular point in time most commonly discussed in reference to cognitive abilities in educational or TRAINING contexts; 2) aptitude may refer to individual differences resulting from innate and environmental factors; and/or 3) aptitude may refer to innate and largely unchanging individual differences within normal circumstances. Aptitude with regard to second language acquisition (SLA) refers to multitude of factors that come into contact with various situational factors and are intended to predict particular phenomena that characterize the success of SLA (Dekeyser 2013; Robinson 2013; VanPatten & Benati 2015).

Aptitude in TIS

Aptitude is rarely discussed in discussions of APTITUDE TESTING in TS (see under *aptitude testing*). In IS, it has been suggested that interpreting aptitude is noticeable particularly in the interpreter's speech restructuring analysis and synthesis skills (Russo & Pippa 2004). However, many authors (Bontempo 2012; Shlesinger & Pöchhacker 2011:1; Yan et al. 2018:155-167) point out that aptitude is an under-researched topic in IS, i.e. it is a gray zone. In fact, very few studies have so far been conducted for the purpose

of providing insights into interpreting aptitude and interpreter training, mainly focused on four interpreting-aptitude-related variables: language background; knowledge background; social-communicative ability; and certain cognitive-affective factors (Yan et al. 2018:127-128), without which, succeeding as an interpreter will be unlikely (Macnamara 2008). Along the same lines, in general, essential components of interpreter aptitude may be itemized as memory; information retrieval; comprehension; analysis; processing; and cognition (see Wallace 2012). One must add the often overlooked interpersonal skills (IPS) to the list (Angelelli 2004; Macnamara 2008). In fact, the important factor of IPS, e.g. emotional stability, has been the focal point of little empirical research on aptitude for interpreting (see Bontempo 2012).

Apart from that, so far, there has rarely been an attempt to develop an aptitude MODEL for the purpose of finding better and more reliable entrance exams for interpreting programs varying greatly in content and scope, and there is a scarcity of tools as far as interpreter ASSESSMENT within the field of signed language interpreting is concerned in particular, and this will have serious challenges (see Macnamara 2008). However, there is, at least so far, one exception to the rule: Chabasse's aptitude model for simultaneous interpreting, as part of her PhD (Chabasse 2009), in which Chabasse was able to follow all the students and to compare the final results of the students who did well in her test and also those who did not. Despite the fact that this model has already been put to test (see Chabasse & Kader 2014), it is, as Catherine Chabasse (personal communication, October 22, 2017) and Stephanie Kader (personal communication, October 4, 2017) acknowledge, the result of an empirical study with 25 students (reference group 8 professionals) but not empirically validated yet as the sample groups were too small to deliver replicable and representative results. In fact, the results of the study were only tentative.

It is worth noting that, in her review of the existing literature on aptitude testing, Russo (2014) concludes that there is a growing trend towards a more clear conceptualization of interpreting aptitude, ranging from holistic assumptions to scientifically sound measurements (e.g. aptitude predictors) (see also Wallace 2012, 2013 on the identification of specific modes of interpreting as potential predictors of successful performance on oral CERTIFICATION examinations for US court interpreters). Also, Pöchhacker (2014) concludes that aptitude for consecutive interpreting may be partly addressed by the so-called *SynCloze test*; he acknowledges, however, that, as for simultaneous interpreting, such a conclusion is to be considered just a hypothesis in need of testing. Issues of training, and those of training and aptitude in translation and interpreting research,

respectively, are usually linked with such important concepts as self-efficacy (Muñoz Martín 2014), the ability to handle anxiety or stress (Bontempo 2012; Cho & Roger 2010; Jiménez Ivars & Pinazo Calatayud 2001; Korpal 2016; Riccardi 2015b; Yan et al. 2018:151), etc.

APTITUDE TESTING

General definitions & important distinctions

In educational psychology, the term APTITUDE test refers to a standardized test (e.g. tests of intelligence) designed to measure, assess, or predict abilities and qualities of individuals to learn or to successfully perform a specific type of task (Christ & Skaar 2008; Miller et al. 2009; Slavin 2018). Aptitude tests do not aim to predict an individual's learning up to a particular point in time, but they do aim to predict learning potential (or preparation to learn) and the knowledge this individual has acquired both inside and outside pedagogical settings (Slavin 2018). One must point out that, in most (if not all) professions, it is past performance that can best predict future performance in the same activity (Ebel & Frisbie 1991). In case of lack of such past performance, or its incomplete, conflicting, or dated nature, aptitude tests, whose purpose is predictive, are administered to individuals in different fields (Ebel & Frisbie 1991). Hence the idea for aptitude testing in general. Despite both aptitude tests and achievement tests measuring learned abilities, the former must be distinguished from the latter in that, it is the former in which, the scope of the test content is broader, and using which, predicting future performance over a wide range of activities becomes possible (Miller et al. 2009). An important distinction must be made between the traditional dominant trend of linguistic aptitude testing (starting in language learning with the work of John Carroll) and the renewed interest in aptitude testing with an explanatory power in second language acquisition (SLA) (Smith & Stansfield 2017).

Aptitude testing in TIS

Aptitude tests are tests used in admission screening procedures, where final decisions must be made as to which (teachable) candidates, based on their performance on the aptitude test, should be admitted to translator and (spoken-and signed-language) interpreter TRAINING programs (Pöchlacker & Liu 2014; Timarová 2015a; Turner 2015). Hence the idea for aptitude testing in TIS. Aptitude testing in TIS context is twofold: it may refer to tests required by a translation company as part of its ASSESSMENT procedure for the purpose of hiring freelance translators, often done

typically by making applicants do a trial translation; or it simply refers to the process of testing whether a candidate is suitable for translating and/or interpreting as study programs at institutes and universities (most germane to this volume), and it normally starts before candidates start their training (Beate Herting, personal communication, October 11, 2017). Interpreter aptitude tests, advocated as an essential component of any interpreter training COURSE (Galindo Almohalla 2013; Skaaden & Wattne 2009), aim to identify the best candidates for training, and this is what some authors (Angelelli 2007; Bontempo 2012; Timarová 2015a) call *interpreter readiness*, alternatively referred to by others (Walker & Shaw 2011) as *interpreter preparedness*. In her doctoral thesis, Wallace (2012) discusses at least two important facts as regards using aptitude tests in IS: firstly, it is twofold: these tests are eliminatory in nature and administered to interpreters in order to decide who should be admitted into interpreter EDUCATION programs and who should not; or they can be used for credentialing or CERTIFICATION purposes. Finally, curiously enough, unlike SIGHT INTERPRETING/TRANSLATION and such precursors to SI as SHADOWING or PARAPHRASING, consecutive mode of interpreting is rarely mentioned in current practices for aptitude testing in interpreter training programs, despite this mode (i.e. consecutive mode), along with sight interpreting/translation, being practiced regularly, e.g. by community interpreters (Roberts 2000).

Mention must be made of the fact that what is common to all interpreter aptitude tests in IS literature is the range of competencies candidates are expected to have, subjectivity in assessment criteria, and the high failure rate (Campbell & Hale 2003). What is more, standardized translation tests are still far from being truly standardized and interpreter aptitude testing is associated with subjectivity due to unavailability of objective tests for the most part (Moser-Mercer 1994; Skaaden 1999). As for interpreter aptitude testing and its PREDICTIVE VALIDITY, one should note that there is a need for empirical research (Macnamara 2008), in the absence of which it is suggested that how objective an interpreter aptitude test can be, depends on showing tendency towards acting on best practices for the purpose of optimizing VALIDITY and RELIABILITY (Setton & Dawrant 2016b) as two aspects of testing theory essential to assessment of performance or QUALITY in TIS (Angelelli 2013a, 2018).

Despite the fact that aptitude alone cannot predict how an interpreter trainee will progress through a program of study and into the profession, knowing what qualities may predict successful performance in interpreting may, in turn, lead to the development of more effective screening tools and objective measurement tools for assessing occupational suitability for

interpreting (Bontempo 2012; Fengxia 2015; Kalina 2000; Macnamara 2008). Keiser (1978) suggests that essential components of interpreter aptitude testing include (but are not limited to) 1) knowledge (perfect mastery of the active language(s)); fully adequate understanding of the passive language(s); solid general background (formal training or equivalent professional experience); and 2) personal qualities and attributes (e.g. the capacity to adapt immediately to subject matter, speakers, audience, and conference situations; and the ability to concentrate). Aptitude testing can be done, e.g. through administering recall tests as one of the key components of interpreter training assessment/testing (Donovan 2003; Gerver et al. 1989; Hiltunen & Vik 2015) as it has been suggested that such tests may create more insights into the online cognitive processes of interpreting (Yu-hsien 2015). Interestingly, Chabasse (2015a) suggests a battery of tests to be used in interpreter aptitude testing: different variations of cloze (in which candidates have to reconstruct the missing words by activating their language proficiency, capturing the inner structure of the text, going through the strategy of ANTICIPATION and coming to a conclusion; see also Andres et al. 2015; Chabasse 2015b); paraphrasing (in which candidates listen to an approximately five-minute long text in their native language and simultaneously paraphrase it in the same language; see also Kader & Seubert 2015; Russo & Pippa 2002); SynCloze (in which candidates have to listen to a text read to them in their native/foreign language at a speed of about 100 wpm with a word missing in every second sentence and they have to complete the missing parts using as many synonyms as possible; see also Pöchhacker 2014); cue-based impromptu speech (in which candidates have to produce a reasonably coherent text by integrating different concrete and abstract terms written on cards and given to them in rapid succession); cognitive shadowing (in which applicants have to answer a series of quick oral questions with yes or no and repeat the same question while they listen to the next question); and personalized cloze (in which candidates listen to a stranger's biography, and then, they have to repeat the text in the same language while replacing the biographical information with their own, i.e. this test is a combination of shadowing and paraphrasing; see also Andres et al. 2015; Chabasse 2015b). Chabasse (2015a:54) concludes that in selection of suitable aptitude tests in interpreting, one decisive factor is pragmatic feasibility, i.e. the challenge of scoring some tests, including anticipation, paraphrasing, etc., which may result in striking a balance between optimal reliability and validity on one hand, and feasibility on the other (see Setton & Dawrant 2016b:137). Another important factor is candidates' fluency in their working languages (see also Mead 2000; Pradas Macías 2015), which is what Skaaden (2013)

discusses under bilingual proficiency both as the standard component in most aptitude tests for interpreter training and as a prerequisite for interpreters' successful performance.

One needs to point out, however, that questions about aptitude testing for interpreting at the time of admission are not resolved yet (Pöchhacker 2010b; Shlesinger & Pöchhacker 2011). This said, it should be added that aptitude tests are not perfect (Johnson 2016; Wu 2010b): reasonable doubts exist over whether admission (or entry-level) tests deserve to be called aptitude tests in IS (see Dodds 1990; Gerver et al. 1989; Sawyer 2004; Timarová 2015a; Timarová & Ungoed-Thomas 2008) due to the former's subjective nature and lack of the predictive power (see Campbell & Hale 2003:212). Reasonably enough, interpreter aptitude tests have been criticized over issues of reliability and validity, and accordingly, there are calls for valid and reliable aptitude tests for admission to interpreter training programs (Arjona-Tseng 1994; Kalina 2000).

Aptitude testing in TS

It is worth noting that aptitude testing for written translation is rarely discussed in the literature (see Campbell & Hale 2003), and therefore, can be said to have been neglected and a largely under-researched topic, at least from a theoretically focused perspective, in this respect. For example, a keyword search on the word 'aptitude' in the Translation Studies Bibliography (TSB) (Gambier & Van Doorslaer 2012) returns at least 76 entries of publications on this topic, with only 1 entry (Vos 1976) on aptitude in written translation, and with the rest on aptitude in interpreting. The important question is "are there aptitude tests for written translation as well?" According to Daniel Gile (personal communication, October 14, 2017), the answer for this lack of discussion of aptitude testing for written translation in the literature probably lies in the perception that conference interpreting requires certain cognitive and linguistic skills to be learned in a short time; otherwise, the whole investment in training may be said to have gone to waste. In written translation, however, since obviously time pressure is not as critical, there is perhaps enough room for revisions and improvement later; therefore, this may explain the existence of aptitude tests for conference interpreting, which let through only those considered capable of taking the training and achieving sufficient performance within the duration of the training (course/program), and rarity (if not non-existence) of aptitude tests for written translation. Along the same lines, David Sawyer (personal communication, October 11, 2017) acknowledges that virtually he is not aware of aptitude tests for written translation that can be

comparable to those for conference interpreting; he reminds us that many institutions (University of Maryland, ESIT, etc.) do have entrance examinations (typically including writing and summarizing tasks) for their degree programs varying greatly in content and scope, but the predictive validity and reliability of these tests, as it happens, have not been researched systematically (Shaw 2018; Stone 2017). He, in line with Angelelli (2018), calls for more research and highlights the need to test assumptions of validity in this area in translation and interpreting, particularly on issues of TEST CONSTRUCT (with regard to the critical issue of test constructs in interpreting, see also Huertas-Barros et al. 2019b; Setton & Dawrant 2016b:110).

However, there may be more to this issue than meets the eye: according to Christina Schäffner (personal communication, October 5, 2017), aptitude testing for written translation has been done over the years, at least in practice, for deciding on admission to a training program (e.g. at German Universities such as Leipzig University or University of Mainz). One very good case example regarding aptitude tests for written translation and for conference interpreting is Leipzig University: Beate Herting (personal communication, October 11, 2017), while discussing in detail the aptitude tests that currently exist for written translation and interpreting for all study programs (BA Translation, MA Conference Interpreting and MA Translatology/Translation) at Leipzig University, points out that such tests at BA Level include a wide range of skills, from comprehensive tests of firstly German, and then, other working language (i.e. English, French, Spanish or Russian) command, including grammar, syntax, register etc., tests of linguistic creativity and a good general knowledge, to writing tasks on given topics, to gap-filling tests, to assignments dealing with grammar, phonetics, vocabulary, situational and cultural knowledge, and finally, to an assignment of short translations English-German; no assignment of writing proper translation is included in the aptitude test as this is something to be covered during the program itself. She adds that a typical MA aptitude test for written translation at Leipzig University includes a translation from one of the above-mentioned languages into German (because German is the A language for everyone in the program) for a two-fold purpose: testing the applicant's ability to understand the source text; and testing the applicant's ability to write good German. This written test is compulsory for the MA in conference interpreting, the success in which is followed by an oral test focused on linguistic and personal qualities, knowledge of the world, memory, etc. However, Beate Herting laments the fact that these tests do not have a sound theoretical framework; they are far too intuitive and not scientific enough to actually have predictive validity. She adds that these

tests, the efficiency of which have been proved by a comparatively low drop-out rates and by the fact that 90 percent of the graduates are in employment one year after graduation (an important fact also echoed by Donovan 2003 concerning entrance exams for interpretation), are based on experience of the staff members who are trained translators themselves and know what is required of a good translator and what to be tested at all.

Material selection in interpreting entrance exams

Now, one must draw attention to the importance of appropriate source material selection for evaluative purposes in entrance exam testing for interpretation (see Donovan 2003) as an essential component of educators'/trainers'/assessors' assessment COMPETENCE: Donovan (ibid) argues that inappropriate source material can cause extreme difficulty in EVALUATION of competencies and abilities, a procedure notoriously difficult per se. Moreover, as far as using written tests and written translation tests in assessing interpreters' skills is concerned, Skaaden (2013) and Skaaden & Wadensjö (2014:21), in line with different authors (Keiser 1978; Moser-Mercer 1994; Seleskovitch 1999), convincingly argue that such tests fall short of testing the essential skills for interpreting (e.g. pronunciation skills, or performance under the time pressure), since speech comprehension and production is different from written text comprehension and production, and therefore, requires a different, but still reliable and valid testing regime. Skaaden & Wadensjö (2014) add two more important reasons for this: existence of differences between written language standards and those of spoken language; and the important fact that one should not expect all languages and all varieties of largely diffused languages to have unified standardized written forms. But one should also consider that some other authors in IS (Setton & Dawrant 2016b:109) recommend using a combination of written tests (consisting of language, basic verbal skills and general knowledge tests, and tests on performance tasks) and oral exams in ADMISSION TESTING for candidates, despite current reasonable doubts over the reliability of admission testing or over if it deserves to be called aptitude testing (Timarová 2015a).

Challenges to aptitude testing in IS

In IS, aptitude testing presents two enormous challenges: the complex nature of aptitude (i.e. what aptitude for interpreting really is and identifying its key elements, e.g. particular disposition constructs/dispositional traits, see e.g. Wallace 2012, 2019); and the difficulties of implementing a test (on

the elementary underlying abilities) under the legal and organizational constraints of a given educational context (Pöchhacker 2014; Timarová & Ungoed-Thomas 2009). Pöchhacker (2014) goes ahead to identify two broad approaches to aptitude testing in IS: a test, or a battery of tests administered at a given point in time; and an extended curricular component, course, or program in which, students' performance will be taken to reflect their aptitude. Now, the important issue is that entry-level testing (i.e. diagnostic testing for selection purposes) must show predictive validity; one good way to achieve this is through conducting systematic research in order to provide a reliable basis for such tests, and therefore, for predicting a candidate's chances of successfully completing a (translation or interpreting) program (Beate Herting, personal communication, October 18, 2017). As for aptitude testing to be captured in its full sense, interestingly, Sawyer (2004) and Beate Herting (personal communication, October 18, 2017) argue for the necessity of providing evidence of predictive validity (as in Moser-Mercer 1984's model applied to interpreter aptitude testing), considered to be the most important feature of aptitude tests (Skaaden 1999; Timarová & Ungoed-Thomas 2009), regarding entry-level diagnostic testing, e.g. through such scientific methods as setting up a score correlation with GPA, intermediate, and/or final exams, etc. in order to find out more about a possible link. Zamirato (2013) adds one good suggestion for the purpose of increasing predictive validity of such tests: to let selection criteria and ideal profile be informed at the local level and not on universal factors. What is more, Russo & Pippa (2002) and Russo & Pippa (2004) recommend paraphrasing as a promising diagnostic tool in interpreter aptitude testing. Other important factors to be considered in aptitude testing in IS include (but are not limited to) the candidates' sensitivity to cultural undertones as a prerequisite for appropriate performance (Arjona-Tseng 1984), a critical issue also echoed by Valero-Garcés & Tan (2017) but regarding dialogue interpreter education; a very good general and specialized knowledge; interest in many subjects; an ability to familiarize oneself with new information quickly; tools skills; self-organization; etc. (Beate Herting, personal communication, October 18, 2017). This very desire to develop oneself and acquire new skills and specialized knowledge has been called *learning orientation* (see Bell & Kozlowski 2002) and is thought to be potentially linked with interpreting aptitude (see Bontempo 2012).

Designing aptitude tests in IS

As far as designing aptitude tests (in interpreting) is concerned, Pöchhacker (2014) mentions grading, and validity with regard to the aptitude or skill

component to be measured (see also Valero-Garcés & Socarrás-Estrada 2012). Yet there is ample room for improvement in general, and consistent researching and validating aptitude tests in particular, as far as aptitude testing in IS is concerned. One neglected area, by way of example only, is the inclusion of soft skills such as MOTIVATION which, while being still an under-researched area in aptitude and aptitude testing in IS (Bontempo 2012; Bontempo & Napier 2011; Russo 2014; Timarová & Salaets 2011; Yan et al. 2018), has been found to be an important, if complementary, contributing factor of interpreting aptitude (Bontempo 2012; Bontempo & Napier 2011; Shaw 2011; Timarová & Salaets 2011). In addition, some authors (Shaw 2018) highlight the importance of the balance between soft and hard skills in predicting interpreting skill acquisition. Apart from that, developing aptitude tests for community interpreting (D'Hayer 2013; Valero-Garcés & Socarrás-Estrada 2012) and signed language interpreting needs scholarly attention (Shaw 2018; Stone 2017).

Admission testing in TIS

Admission testing, seldom discussed in translator education (Kim 2013), is considered part and parcel of interpreter education (mainly in conference interpreter education and training contexts) to maximize the recruitment and retention of suitable candidates (Bontempo 2012; Timarová 2015a) by eliminating those whose bilingual proficiency is not strong enough to enable them to enter training programs and follow the activities. As mentioned earlier in this entry, reasonable doubts exist over the reliability of such tests, or over whether they deserve to be called aptitude tests (Timarová 2015a). It is also worth noting that some liaison interpreting courses must do without admission testing for the purpose of meeting training needs in a variety of languages or to fill classes where minimum language-specific numbers are required (see Zolins 2017).

ASSESSMENT

Definitions & classifications

The term assessment, from Latin *assidere* meaning 'to sit next to/with', can, in pedagogical settings, be broadly defined as the systematic multi-step process of developing and documenting a clear picture of individual and institutional effectiveness through the use of a wide variety of methods and judgment and assessment instruments/tools in order to maximize the QUALITY of learners' academic achievement. The first step for any

assessment/testing program is to articulate goals (Walvoord & Anderson 2010) or to plan assessment, i.e. what to assess, when to assess, and how to assess.

Objectives of assessment in TIS

Prior to any attempt to define assessment in TS and IS, it must be borne in mind that translation and interpreting assessment, underpinning all forms of translator and interpreter TRAINING, is different from language COMPETENCE assessment or language proficiency testing per se. Assessment in TIS may serve the purpose of judging the quality of translation or interpreting output; assessing the appropriateness of a process (localization or videoconferencing); assessing the potential of candidates or products; or decision-making about who should enter or exit a training program, or about who should be hired e.g. by a translation company (Angelelli 2018). It must be added that, like TS, in IS, any assessment of interpreters, in written and oral form, is initially used for selection purposes (Lee 2016b) as part of the traditional doctrine of the standard interpreter training MODEL (Setton & Dawrant 2016b:3), and must be preceded by the identification of various types of language proficiencies or subskills, which is essential in, and related to, any assessment or testing of language knowledge (i.e. DECLARATIVE KNOWLEDGE and PROCEDURAL KNOWLEDGE) (Skaaden & Wadensjö 2014) and must also, as Clifford (2001) points out, determine whether these interpreters have the competence to meet professional standards (a relevant case in point is Riccardi 2002a's typology of assessment criteria, i.e. macrocriteria and microcriteria for professional and student interpreters, respectively, for the purpose of illustrating the interdependent relationship between professional standards and educational assessment). However, one must note that that in no way does language proficiency testing assess interpreting/interpreter competence.

Assessment in TS

Now, one needs to define assessment in TS: the first step in translation assessment is to establish a model of quality and then to transform it into a set of metrics that measure each of the elements of that quality (Khanmohammad & Sanloo 2009). Veiga Díaz & García González (2016:281), while discussing the most common misconceptions in higher EDUCATION assessment, and proposing constructive alignment (i.e. learners embark on constructing their knowledge as assessed through

assessment tasks aligned to what is intended to be learned) as a solid framework in this respect (see also Marais 2013; Pakkala-Weckström 2019), summarize the three mostly-agreed-upon aspects of assessment: 1) the need to consider both the product and the process; 2) the need to adopt a complete assessment approach that relates the COURSE competencies or objectives, the teaching and learning activities performed by students and the assessment methods and tasks used; and 3) the need to incorporate reflective and FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT to maximize learning.

In TS, different classifications exist for major approaches to translation assessment: Colina (2011, 2013), citing Lauscher (2000), divides non-experiential methods into equivalence-based (e.g. based on Nida's formal and dynamic equivalence category) and non-equivalence (e.g. skopos theory) approaches, which have been subject to much criticism (see Colina 2013). Martínez Melis & Hurtado Albir (2001) identify three areas for assessment: assessment of published translations; assessment in professional practice; and assessment in translation teaching. In TS, work on the under-researched area of assessment (Kelly & Martin 2009; Kim 2013), can be categorized as ACCREDITATION and PEDAGOGY, depending on the purpose of assessment (Campbell & Hale 2003), with the former (accreditation), aiming "to certify whether the translator in question has reached a predetermined standard" (Chesterman 2016:135), and with the latter (pedagogy), serving as the main purpose of much of translation assessment in real life (see Chesterman 2016). With regard to the latter, the findings of recent research highlight the need to integrate assessment literacy, i.e. the capacity to develop a high degree of understanding and awareness of academic standards and assessment practices, and the need and criteria for adjustment, through discussion, transparency, and feedback, into translation course design both for staff and students. This is believed to contribute to CONTINUOUS/CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (CPD) (see Huertas-Barros & Vine 2019).

Translation quality assessment (TQA)

In TS, with translation assessment having multiple interpretations depending on the trends and theories translation scholars support in this area (e.g. the concept of norms and its major influence on lateral assessment, and characterizing any mode of translation assessment as normative, see Chesterman 2016:130-131, 138), and having different categories (pragmatic revision; translation quality assessment; quality control; didactic revision; and fresh look/QUALITY ASSURANCE) (Brunette 2000), the overall tendency is to pay attention to translation quality assessment (TQA) mainly

used in employing translators, concluding a contract with freelancers, and/or gaining admittance to professional associations or guilds (Brunette 2000). While emphasizing the three key notions of *quality* (aiming at, according to Al-Qinai 2000, the reception of target text), *ERROR ANALYSIS* (as an essential approach to TQA in the comparative analysis and typically used in both the translation industry and CERTIFICATION testing, and focused on product assessment and criticized for such a limited focus, see O'Brien 2012), and *human or automatic product* (see Moorkens et al. 2018a), TQA is conceptually based on the fundamental notion of equivalence (Dybiec-Gajer 2013; House 2015, 2018; Khosravani & Bastian 2017) and is essential for the purpose of improving the quality of a translated text (Khosravani & Bastian 2017). TQA, to which the empirically-based distinction between overt and covert translation is essential (House 2009, 2013), is associated with such important tools as translation CORPORA as an assessment instrument/tool (Bowker 2001; Buendía-Castro & López Rodríguez 2013; House 2015; Laviosa 2010; Rabadán et al. 2009). TQA is addressed through self-evaluation grids (Pakkala-Weckström 2019) or analytical grids reflecting specific criteria (see Eyckmans & Anckaert 2017; Martínez Melis & Hurtado Albir 2001; Morin et al. 2017; Thelen 2019), such as RELIABILITY, VALIDITY, objectivity and practicality (see Doherty 2017; McAlester 2000), or based on implications teaching norms to trainees have for assessment of translation quality, e.g. teaching trainees to think consciously about the usefulness of appropriate strategies, etc. (see Chesterman 1993/2017, 1996, 2016; Heydarian 2016).

Various approaches to and/or models of TQA have been proposed by TS scholars (e.g. Amman 1990; Al-Qinai 2000; House 1977/1981; Larose 1998; Reiss 1968, 1971, 1973; Van den Broeck 1985, 1986), depending on whether they are quantitative, non-quantitative, or of a different category, e.g. linguistically oriented approaches, the argumentation-centered model proposed by Williams (2004), or quite recently, a computerized model of dynamic assessment of translation quality within a pedagogical context by Alkrami et al. (2018). Also, House (2009, 2013, 2015, 2018), who proposed her functional-pragmatic model of TQA in the late 1970s (see House 1977/1981), summarizes different approaches to TQA in terms of their area of focus: from psychosocial approaches to philosophical and sociocultural, sociopolitical ones. One should note that, in terms of what the EVALUATION should be, TQA can be summative (focused mainly on translation as a product); or formative (mainly focused on translation as a process) (Thelen 2008). In her doctoral thesis, Mitchell-Schuitevoerder (2014:248) draws a fine distinction between TQA in higher education and TQA in the industry: firstly, the former is focused on translator competence

assessment, while the focus of the latter is output quality; secondly, the former follows standards recommended by national or international quality assurance bodies, but the latter faces the challenge of unified standards (see also Castilho et al. 2018; Drugan 2013, 2014; Thelen 2019). Due to such an inherent difference of TQA in academia and in industry, while some TS authors (O'Brien 2012) advocate the move towards a more dynamic quality evaluation model for translation within the translation industry, others (Wu 2017b) have called for both to work in tandem on translator training.

It should be noted that there is a need for improving the methodological rigor of TQA (Doherty 2017) as a hot issue for translation training (Thelen 2008), and that concerns are expressed over the reliability of holistic assessment (as compared to error-based and analytical assessment) of quality in translation and translator assessment (often in the form of impression scoring) because its objectivity in assessment can be questioned unless it is clearly systemized and in conjunction with other methods (Vigier Moreno & Valero-Garcés 2017:13, 21; see also Doherty 2017; Van Egdom et al. 2019), e.g. clear scoring guides and rubrics, and corpora (Bowker 2000, 2001; Zanettin 1998).

Critical review of TQA models

In a critical review of the models above, Karoubi (2016a, 2017), having developed a process-oriented model of TQA (focused on the behavior of assessors during the assessment process), reaches five main conclusions: 1) the crucial role of assessors/human agents in translation assessment process is minimized or even largely ignored in many TQA models; 2) many TQA models are theoretically based on equivalence as a disputable concept, and TQA process, as formulated within these models, is extremely source text-oriented; 3) purpose of assessment is narrowly defined within the framework of many of TQA models; 4) there is a confusion over translation quality assessment and translation competence assessment in many TQA models; and 5) TQA process is handled based on fixed standards/criteria in most TQA models. Other authors (Mellinger 2018a) argue for the editing and revision component, as a subbranch of translation criticism under applied translation studies in Munday's (2016) expansion of Holmes (1972/1988) map of TS, to be included in TQA models.

TQA in TIS

TQA, as Clifford (2004) rightly argues, is able to offer a great deal of insight into the features that determine the quality of translation and interpretation,

as it always focuses on translation or interpretation output, and never the person behind it, but (from Clifford's measurement-based perspective) it cannot offer insight into our understanding of issues such as principles of test content selection (i.e. testing knowhow concerning the nature and type of competencies required of an interpreter in order to provide quality interpreting); objectivity in scoring criteria; and consistency in test administration practices, or into the way such issues can be applied (*mutatis mutandis*) to interpreter assessment (which reflects the view already offered by Sawyer 2000). In other words, Clifford (2004:57) openly, not critically though, discusses two important and urgent matters as related to interpreter assessment that TQA lacks: firstly, a practical way of decision making about the qualities/attributes of test takers/candidates; and secondly, a model of interpreting, which accounts for its multifaceted nature from the perspective of the individual interpreter as someone who performs this skill; he offers evidence of the worth of a discursive approach to interpreter assessment and testing. Here some terminological clarifications need to be made: while the term TQA is obviously exclusive to TS, the term interpreting quality assessment (IQA) has been almost absent in IS, and/or, at least, does not seem to be a standard term in the field yet (for some recent cases of explicit use of this term, see Clifford 2005; García Becerra 2012; Guo 2013; Huertas-Barros et al. (2019b); Iglesias Fernández 2013a).

Assessment in IS

Within the broad panorama of IS field, assessment, which aims to evaluate students' competence and provide FEEDBACK on their progress and the quality of their product (Stem 2011b), according to Lee (2015:82), can serve at least three main purposes: 1) APTITUDE TESTING as a prerequisite for entering a training program (see also Russo 1989); 2) assessment during the course to check students' progress and provide constructive feedback (achievement test); and 3) certification. In her doctoral thesis, Wallace (2012:50), points out that in IS, the importance of assessment (and of course, assessment competence) is twofold: a) screening candidates, a long-standing practice, for entry into educational programs and providing them with feedback and guidance as they progress in their training, or b) testing their knowledge and skills at the end of an educational program on one hand, and its role in interpreter qualifying exams on the other; therefore, interpreting output is, in fact, the focal point of interpreting assessment (Liu 2015a).

Unlike TS, in IS, which is obviously much younger than its sister field, most models are of a descriptive nature (Pöchhacker 2016), and not for

testing, nor specifically for research and training purposes. Admittedly, few models of interpreter assessment have been proposed, e.g. regarding quality assessment in live interlingual subtitling (see Pedersen 2017; Robert & Remael 2017). Two noteworthy models are identified here: one is Wu (2010b, 2013)'s proposed conceptual model of interpreting examinations (IE) designed to describe the test constructs of the interpreting examinations, and to develop a clear picture of assessment criteria as applied to the improvement of assessment instruments/tools and test procedures (Wu 2010). The other is McDermid (2012, 2015)'s multidimensional model of interpreting process based on pragmatics, which was piloted and has been recommended for the purpose of assessing the simultaneous work of ASL-English interpreters. As for the crucial role assessment criteria play in shaping quality performance in different stages of training (Iglesias Fernández 2013:61) and in performance(-based) interpreter assessment, Setton & Dawrant (2016b:424-425) recommend three sets of criteria: general (fidelity, expression, and delivery); mode-specific (e.g. consecutive, simultaneous); and behavioral (e.g. stress management and unflappability).

Performance(-based) assessment & challenges to assessment

In IS, since interpreters are first and foremost required to produce talk, and therefore, oral proficiencies, as it happens, primarily require assessment/testing (Skaaden & Wadensjö 2014), educators, convincingly enough, should rely on performance in order to assess interpreters. Hence the essentiality of performance (Class & Moser-Mercer 2013; Gish 1992; Moser-Mercer 2008) and performance(-based) assessment. Performance(-based) assessment for interpreters is a type of CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTING of increasing importance in testing and assessment contexts, (see e.g. Kubiszyn & Borich 2013, ch.9; Wigglesworth & Frost 2017) in interpreting in pedagogical settings (Clifford 2004; Ortega Herráez et al. 2014; Pöchhacker 2016, ch.12; Van Deemter et al. 2014), which aims to evaluate, not the ability to understand, define or discuss concepts and ideas, but interpreting performance in real or simulated settings (e.g. ROLE PLAY or MOCK CONFERENCE) (Giambruno 2014a) typically with the assessment process being divided into various components. In order to maximize the AUTHENTICITY of a performance(-based) assessment in interpreting, one may mention, by way of example only, performance(-based) assessment complemented with PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT. However, this can pose a challenge to interpreting assessment: as Lewkowicz (2000) points out, not all real-life holistic tasks necessarily lend themselves to test situations which, in turn, can present a challenge to test authenticity.

Interpreting assessment is guided by some common norms also known as *assessment norms* (Lenglet 2015; Wu 2013), and addressed through IQA methods, e.g. the holistic method, often in the form of impression scoring, vs. PROPOSITIONAL ANALYSIS dichotomy (Lydia Ding 2017). This can be problematic as some authors (Liu & Chiu 2011; Wu 2010a, 2010b, 2013) warn that the holistic method affects the consistency of the judgment results due to such rating behaviors as rater bias, which threatens the validity of all forms of language assessment (Elder 2013), but can be reduced by making more raters available per test. Others (Setton & Dawrant 2016:431) consider holistic scoring superior to analytic scoring, especially for the purpose of enhancing INTER-RATER RELIABILITY, but ideally, recommend supplementing the former with the latter for admission exams. Similarly, research (Ackermann et al. 1997) also points to the effectiveness of a holistic approach to interpreting performance assessment. As for the disadvantages of performance(-based) assessment in general, one may point out that it is difficult to design, subject to construct irrelevance and under-representation, subjective in nature, and time-consuming, among others, with difficulty in standardizing and moderating the assessment output (Isaacs et al. 2013). There is a broad consensus among authors that in interpreting assessment, there should be a focus on the process at the early stages followed by a shift towards a focus on the product at later or final stages, and of course, in certification testing (Iglesias Fernández 2011). It should be mentioned that interpreting performance may be influenced by four main types of factors: 1) language abilities; 2) situational factors (e.g. working conditions); 3) cognitive factors; and 4) psycho-affective factors (see Korpala 2016).

Apart from that, Kalina (2002, 2005b) considers limiting interpreter assessment to interpreted output alone inadequate and inefficient, as from such a limited perspective, important issues such as interpreter's appearance and general conduct; booth manners; commitment to preparation (see also Díaz Galaz 2011, 2015; Díaz Galaz et al. 2015; Gile 2009a; Lee 2015:214; Luccarelli 2013); and debriefing (including self-assessment and peer assessment, as two particular forms of assessment as learning (Aal), and feedback) are ignored, as the ability to work effectively as an interpreter goes beyond mere technical EXPERTISE (Bontempo 2012) and extends to what Pöschhacker (1992, 1994, 2015b, 2016) aptly characterizes as *hypertext*, i.e. situational parameters related to the speaker, respective setting, particular audience, noises, equipment, etc. in the communicative context (Hatim & Mason 1997; Li 2015), altogether playing a pivotal role in quality in interpreting (see Behr 2015). Along the same lines, mention must be made of the fact that formal assessment of interpreting performance

in interpreter education, including the critical issue of systematically assessing test constructs and quality criteria in interpreting, is an under-researched area (Huertas-Barros et al. 2019b; Kelly & Martin 2009; Kim 2013; Lee 2009; Wu 2013), in which the challenge(s) lying in quantifying and qualifying good quality must be overcome (Iglesias Fernández 2011:12). One related under-researched area is the use of rating scales consisting of three components: scale categories (identified with assessment criteria); scale bands (used to distinguish a continuum of interpreting performance); and scalar descriptors (intended to capture salient features of interpretations) (Han 2018), and of analytic rating scales (see Han 2017, 2018; Lee 2008; Lee 2015) as an (interpreting) assessment method. Using analytic rating scales has both advantages and disadvantages: as for the former, one may mention that the raters easily grasp what they are expected to do; as for the latter, the approach leaves room for subjectivity and inconsistency of judgments (Skaaden 2013:46-47), which Sawyer (2004:185) describes as the use of *fuzzy* criteria. Another rather neglected issue in interpreting assessment is rater reliability (Liu 2015a).

What is more, in IS, as research on classroom assessment is much more prevalent than research on professional accreditations and certification (Yan et al. 2018:49,71), Weber (2008), Campbell & Hale (2003) and Iglesias Fernández (2011, 2013) describe the test design and assessment criteria for interpreting/interpreter assessment as intuitive, and this is worthy of scholarly attention. In fact, test reliability is what interpreting/interpreter assessment still lacks (Huertas-Barros et al. 2019b; Sawyer 2004). What's more, reaching unified standards appears to be impossible due to differences in expectations among educators and professional interpreters regarding criteria, among educators and students regarding linguistic usage, and among educators and interpreter users in terms of what constitutes an error (Stern 2011b). Assessment in interpreter training within educational contexts requires a multi-situational and multi-perspective approach; as mentioned earlier, it is still in its infancy and an under-researched/unexplored area (Campbell & Hale 2003; Hatim & Mason 1997; Kelly & Martin 2009; Kim 2013; Lee 2009; Pan et al. 2017; Wu 2013; Yan et al. 2018:70-71) in different settings, and of course, in community interpreting (Roberts 2000; Roberts et al. 2000). In fact, assessment in interpreting is a gray zone, and it often lacks the participation of experienced researchers from different countries and from particularly relevant disciplines such as cognitive psychology, mainly due to budgetary restrictions (see Gile 2013). As far as the link between research and assessment is concerned, what is relevant here is that IS currently lacks familiarity with measurement theory and practice which, in turn, hinders the

feasibility of researching psychometric (i.e. based on quantitative measurement) properties of interpreter certification tests (Clifford 2004:35,56) such as knowledge, skills, or personality traits, with the potential of offering insights into interpreter assessment; however, one should note that despite their initial appeal, standardized test instruments for personality traits “have proved of limited use in predicting interpreting proficiency” (Pöchhacker 2016:195). Besides, there have been calls for such a cross-fertilization between second language acquisition (SLA) and testing theory (psychometrics) on one hand, and TIS on the other (Iglesias Fernández 2011), but one should note that its implementation has met considerable resistance in IS literature (Liu 2015a). Apart from that, it is important that assessment should be regarded as an integral part of the interpreter education and training process (i.e. it needs to be based on a process of validation in order to check both the quality of learning outcome and that of teaching) (Han & Slatyer 2016; Liu 2015a; Pöchhacker 2016, ch.12; Wu 2010b), and be accompanied by careful consideration of security issues during its different stages (see Giambruno et al. 2014).

Assessment in general, and performance(-based) assessment in particular, addressed e.g. using tools such as the so-called *assessment grids* in TS (Morin et al. 2017; Thelen 2019) and IS (Ibrahim-González 2013; Riccardi 2003; Schjoldager 1996) and recorded texts or speeches (Ortega Herráez et al. 2014), remains an essential component and a key standard-setting criterion and dominant method in CURRICULUM, testing and evaluation across professions and fields of study, including IS (Arjona-Tseng 1984; Bao 2015; Harris 2016; Wu 2010a), and as Pöchhacker (2016) points out, besides curricular and pedagogic issues, it is closely interdependent with topics such as competence and quality, and of course, as highlighted by Ahrens (2018), with intonation. It needs to be clarified here that performance(-based) assessment, sometimes being the only assessment format allowed in interpreter assessment (e.g. in US court interpreter certification, see Wallace 2012, 2013, 2019), covers those tasks in which learners engage in creation or in problem solving with the help of their knowledge and skills (Ornstein & Hunkins 2017:319). Sawyer (2004), drawing on Bachman (1990), considers performance(-based) assessment, often involving task authenticity as a psychometric testing principle implying quality, to be a direct measure of real-life performance, in which the testing format and procedure attempts to duplicate as closely as possible the setting and operation of the real-life situations and challenges, in which the proficiency is normally demonstrated (see ECOLOGICAL VALIDITY under *validity & role play*). However, as Wu (2010b:55) convincingly argues, it is the quality of performance and fairness of scoring, as crucial

aspects of test validity and reliability, that are of paramount importance, not the test's ability to be replicated and the generalizability of the performance; Wu (ibid:50, citing Gipps 1994) considers generalizability as the link between validity and reliability as two aspects of testing theory essential to performance or quality assessment in TIS (Angelelli 2013a). By the same token, Wu (2010b:49) reminds us that in a mainly performance(-based) skill such as interpreting, the main issue is that both the process of test validation and interpreter performance(-based) assessment suffer from subjectivity, a fact which, in turn, captures the complexity of interpreting and interpreting assessment as such, and implies that the idea of accurate assessment of (academic) achievement, with regard to complex skills in particular, is misleading (Gipps 1994: 71).

Typologies for assessment

In pedagogical settings, including those in translator and interpreter education, there are different typologies for assessment, depending on a) the purposes of the test; b) timing; and c) assessor. As for the first category, assessment is classified into three main distinguished types: ipsative assessment, formative assessment, and summative assessment; as for the second category, assessment is classified into three main types: initial assessment (before the learning process begins), continuous assessment (throughout the teaching and learning process), and final assessment (at the end of the learning process); and as for the last category, one should mention self-assessment, peer assessment, and hetero-assessment (performed by an assessor who is, in terms of knowledge and skills, at a higher level than the one to be assessed) (see Galán-Mañas & Hurtado Albir 2015).

Ipsative assessment

The term ipsative assessment, as one type or mode of assessment aiming to chart learning progress, refers to self-evaluation by a *reflective practitioner* (a term coined by Donald Schön to refer to professionals responding to unexpected problems) or to assessment of current performance against former performance and performance of others leading to a detailed account or description of an individual's personal best (Isaacs et al. 2013; Sawyer 2004). Ipsative assessment can be contrasted in particular with NORM-REFERENCED TESTING (NRT), and also generally with CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTING (CRT) (Isaacs et al. 2013).

Formative assessment

Also known as assessment *for* learning rather than assessment *of* learning (which is the case with summative assessment), formative assessment or evaluation is a new form of assessment in pedagogical settings, which refers to any task or activity, which creates feedback for teaching work (or feedforward) to meet learners' needs, and does not necessarily carry a grade (Black & Wiliam 1998; Heritage 2010; Irons 2008). Formative assessment can be said to have some important characteristics: learners take responsibility for the learning process; learning goals are clearly designed; learning goals go beyond the learning context; learners' knowledge is linked with necessary measures to be taken to reach the clearly-defined learning goals; it focuses on planning as a major step towards the learning goals; learners engage in self-monitoring their own learning progress; assessment is complemented with other types such as self-assessment or peer-assessment in order to move forward with learning goals; learners receive feedback (perhaps in different forms) in order to move forward with learning goals; and learners engage in metacognition-enhancing activities and self-reflection (Cizek 2010).

The importance of formative assessment in pedagogical settings is well-established (see e.g. Andrade & Cizek 2010; Torrance & Pryor 1998). Along the same vein, it is primarily formative assessment, which serves as a basis for translation evaluation in academic settings (Kim 2004), and it is perhaps through formative assessment that interpreters develop their competence (Fowler 2007) and AUTONOMY, as the outcomes of this type of assessment help identify gaps in learning, and also increase trainers' awareness of how best to address such gaps (Turner 2015). However, the effectiveness of this type of assessment in enhancing learning is still in need of empirical support (Slatyer 2015a). Besides, formative assessment is rarely (if ever) used in interpreter certification examinations (see Wallace 2012). There are some techniques associated with formative assessment: student surveys; use of rubrics (Brookhart 2013, ch.10); etc. While often represented as a dichotomous relationship also in TIS literature, the formative/summative distinction could be replaced by this tendency to treat these two concepts as mutually inclusive (see Baer & Bystrova-McIntyre 2009; Slatyer 2015a).

Summative assessment

The term summative assessment in general refers to a form of assessment, which takes place at a particular point in time (usually at the end) in an

educational course or program and aims to chart learner's current knowledge and the level of effectiveness or success of the instructional course or program, e.g. by assigning grades (Cunningham 1998; Fulcher & Davidson 2007; Gipps 1994).

In TIS, seeking a terminal judgment (Arjona-Tseng 1984) by definition and therefore, alternatively called *terminal assessment*, summative assessment, as one type of assessment in pedagogical setting, refers to jury/instructor evaluation not only at the end of (translation/interpreting) courses or programs (Farahzad 1992; Ivanova 1998; Sawyer 2004), or at different times of the year (Veiga Díaz & García González 2016), but also almost always at interpreter certification examinations (Wallace 2012). Within interpreting assessment contexts, despite formative assessment being a very dominant concern, it is summative assessment, rather than formative assessment, in which the issue of (test) reliability needs to be addressed much more properly in order not to damage the credibility of training institutions or certification programs thereof, nor to come up with outcomes that can be challenged (Liu 2015a). In TS, with a strong tendency being shown towards subjectivity in (summative) assessment at the expense of seemingly futile idea of objectivity (see Eyckmans & Anckaert 2017), quite recently some authors (e.g. Hurtado Albir & Pavani 2018) have proposed a multidimensional summative assessment featuring various tasks (from PORTFOLIO and survey to RUBRIC) to replace traditional summative assessment in the didactics of translation teaching as such.

Assessment instruments/tools in TIS

The term assessment instrument/tool refers to an instrument or tool (such as tests), which is used to validly measure the learning (including knowledge and skills) that takes place within a specific educational or practice context. According to Roberts (2000:105), assessment instruments/tools can be used for three primary purposes: a) screening applicants in admission testing; b) charting the academic progress of a training program; and c) accreditation of applicants based on their current knowledge and skills. In TIS, a wide range of assessment tools are used for different purposes (i.e. the test; timing; and the assessor), and of course, for different types of assessment (formative assessment; summative assessment; etc.) Different assessment instruments/tools are applied to translation and interpreting: performance(-based) assessment; corpora; approaches such as error analysis (EA) or methods like back-interpreting/-translation (interpreting/translating a speech/text previously interpreted/translated into another language, *back* to the original language, see e.g. Tyupa 2011, 2013) which, despite being

widely practiced, are nowadays considered obsolete for this purpose, but are argued for as a documentation tool instead (Son 2018); portfolios; rubrics; trainees' notes (see under *NOTE-TAKING*); and of course, various types of exercises and tests (e.g. language proficiency tests or interpreter performance exams), and translator and/or interpreter *INTERNSHIP* programs as one form of professional immersion. One must also mention role play as an effective assessment instrument in interpreter education contexts.

Objectivity vs. subjectivity in assessment in TIS

In TS, due to the complexity of the assessment process, one must be aware of the futile idea of absolute objectivity in quality assessment, and of subjectivity being always a natural part of TQA (Karoubi 2016b). In IS, interestingly, Wu (2010b, 2013), and Setton & Dawrant (2016b:398) refer to such important factors as examiner/rater attention, examiner/rater bias and affective factors, which will be influencing the assessment of interpreters' performance and may cause inconsistency of judgments (see also Mulayim 2012) in criterion-referenced testing (CRT), which Sawyer (2004) describes as the use of *fuzzy* criteria. Wu (2010b) suggests training examiners/raters, and building a consensus among the examiners on the use of assessment criteria as two possible solutions to this problem, but still mentions the impossibility of total elimination of examiner variability. Along the same lines, Lydia Ding (2017:18), while emphasizing the role of consistency in using assessment criteria, suggests using those assessors, who have field-and-domain-specific expertise. Interpreting assessment must be valid, and in essence, a valid interpreting performance assessment must aim at nothing less than the interpreter's quality of performance or his/her current interpreting skills (Lee 2008), as quality is a basic concern in *PROFESSIONALIZATION* of interpreting, and a key concern in interpreter education and certification (Grbić 2015; Pöchhacker 2016). Along the same lines, Sawyer (2004:94), who insists on a more humanistic approach to interpreter education and assessment, in line with Han (2015a) and Han & Slatyer (2016), calls for the empirical establishment and validation of interpreter performance(-based) assessment (IPA) criteria.

Tests in interpreting have been developed mainly with regard to two specific objectives: a) testing individual skills (e.g. memory capacity); and b) testing multiple skills (e.g. interlinguistic recall indicating both foreign language control and memory) (Russo 2014). Furthermore, Sawyer (2004:32) discusses three dominant areas of testing and assessment in interpreter education: a) aptitude in admission testing (i.e. diagnostic testing for gaining admission into training programs); b) formative assessment; and

finally, c) summative assessment. As expert judgment is an inherent part of interpreter performance(-based) assessment, interpreter assessment can be said to have a subjective nature (Sawyer 2004; Wang et al. 2015), and this turns assessment into a very controversial issue not only in translation but also in interpreting (see also Vigier Moreno & Valero-Garcés 2017). Research (Gile 1999) shows that fidelity ratings in interpreting assessment are generally higher when interpretations are assessed as auditorily presented materials rather than as transcriptions, but there is always room for incorporating an element of objectivity into interpreter performance(-based) assessment (IPA) only by “matching the transcription of the test taker’s output against a (subjective) translation of the original speech, thereby eliminating all decision-making i.e. application of the scoring criteria, on the part of the scorer” (Sawyer 2004:103). As mentioned earlier, Wu (2010b), in line with Setton & Dawrant (2016b:120) and Wang et al. (2015), suggests designing examiner/rater training as one aspect of testing theory for the purpose of alleviating concerns of reliability due to subjective judgment in interpreter assessment and certification tests. Along the same lines, discussing issues of rating methodologies in interpreting tests, Van Deemter et al. (2014:33) remind us that, regardless of the adopted approaches and procedures, “appropriate examiner/rater training, standardization of marking, and test review mechanisms must be put in place”. However, the possible link between (regular) rater training and facilitation of inter-rater reliability in interpreting assessment is still in need of further research (Han 2015a, 2015b, 2018).

Self-assessment

The term self-assessment, also called *self-monitoring*, and *self-feedback*, is a type of assessment as learning (Aal), distinguished in terms of assessor, which can be defined in pedagogical settings as the skill of having an accurate evaluation or assessment of, and providing feedback on, one’s level of performance, knowledge and skill efficiencies and deficiencies, with learners awarding scores to themselves on self-assessment sheets usually by applying a rating scale (e.g. poor, good, very good, excellent), or through the use of a rubric or teacher-student feedback (Banta & Palomba 2015; Brown & Harris 2013; Tan 2007; Woods et al. 1988).

Some major challenges to self-assessment in pedagogical settings include issues and assumptions of validity as indicators of learning abilities; those of individual and cultural factors influencing self-assessment; and those of the probable existence of a systematic variation between self-

assessments either in terms of the methods used to derive the self-assessment or the skills being assessed (Luoma 2013).

Self-assessment, which involves learners' thinking about what they learn and how they learn it (Isaacs et al. 2013), refers to one aspect of formative assessment, which plays a crucial role not only in professional translator (Kelly 2005; Kościalkowska-Końska 2015; Robinson et al. 2006) and interpreter (Fowler 2007; Lee 2015; Lee 2016b) training, but also in curriculum development in both fields (Li 2018), as research suggests that it may be the starting point for learners to get involved in the assessment process (Lee 2016b), and that self-assessment has positive WASHBACK associated with learning product (Li 2018). Both translation/interpreting trainees and trainers can engage in self-assessment, as an important component of translation (Hurtado Albir & Pavani 2018; Kelly 2005) and interpreting (Postigo Pinazo 2008) competence or expertise, through (self-) reflection (Fernández Prieto & Sempere Linares 2010; Slatyer 2015a) as encouraged by short questionnaires or scripts provided by the educator (Kelly 2005), and by using reflective blogs (Crezee 2016; Galán-Mañas 2011; Ruiz Mezcuza 2016). It must be mentioned that self-assessment is an under-researched area in TIS (Li 2018).

Peer assessment

Alternatively called *peer evaluation*, *peer review*, *peer conferencing*, or *peer feedback*, the term peer assessment, as a new form/variant of assessment as learning (Aal) and SCAFFOLDING, is a 21st-century method, which requires learners to make an assessment or judgment of the work of their peers on a product, process or performance and based on specific (marking) criteria during a course of study (Falchikov 2007; Isaacs et al. 2013). Peer assessment, focus on which is among the characteristics of many PROBLEM-BASED LEARNING (PBL) courses (Boud 1985), is a type of authentic assessment distinguished in terms of assessor and can be used in the form of rubrics, checklists, etc. both for formative assessment and summative assessment onsite/online. Peer assessment in pedagogical settings comes with some specific challenges: learner preparation in terms of how to provide effective feedback; reliability and/or validity of peer assessment; too much focus on marks rather than on enhancing learning; etc. (Falchikov 2005; Gibbs 2006).

In translator training context, thanks to such a learner-/student-centered and needs-based assessment practice (Hurtado Albir 2018; Schäffner & Adab 2000), learners can be trained in giving and accepting different forms of feedback in classroom; they learn to distinguish between assessment of

their progress and skills, and the perceived emotional, evaluative verdict about them as individuals; and through collaborative interaction, they, while embracing their accountability, learn not only to assess others, but also to develop their own systems of self-evaluation and reflective skills in translation (Fox 2000; Heine 2019; Wang & Han 2013) and interpreting (Hammer & Van den Bogaerde 2017; Slatyer 2015a) which, in turn, can boost their motivation (Lee 2018) and self-confidence (Haro-Soler 2018), and most probably (along with authentic assessment, see under *authenticity*), lead to their **EMPOWERMENT** (Klimkowski & Klimkowska 2012). Kelly (2005), from a didactic perspective, discusses individual vs. group assessment in translation classroom: with respect to the latter, she points to two challenges: a) the problem of giving the same grade to a whole work group where input, effort and learning have probably not been shared out equally by teammates; and b) carrying out individual assessment tasks if all the course work has been carried out in teams.

In interpreter training context, peer assessment refers to one aspect of assessment as learning (Aal), and of formative assessment, which is crucial in professional interpreter training (Fowler 2007), as it, along with self-assessment, another particular form of assessment as learning (Aal), contributes to the development of students' learning (Slatyer 2015a). It should be pointed out that there is a lack of empirical studies in TS (Lisaitė et al. 2016) and IS (Lee 2016a) on the impact of peer assessment on translation and interpreting competence. What is more, one must be aware of the limitations of self-assessment in interpreter training context: since trainees will typically be experiencing problems regarding how to provide peer feedback due to their inability, or unpreparedness, to do so as effectively as trainers do, or due to their unwillingness to critique each other's performance, one is advised against relying too much on peer assessment, and is instead encouraged to count on trainers' and teaching assistants' supervisory skills thereof (Setton & Dawrant 2016b:96).

In a different context in IS, peer assessment or evaluation refers to one level of certification required e.g. by AIIC at which, peers, meaning other interpreters, perform an assessment of one another for the purpose of determining whether their peer has interpreting competence to work in the new language-pair direction in the same institutions or on the market (see Pöchhacker 2016:167; Setton & Dawrant 2016b:587).

Online/web-based assessment in IS

Last but not least, one may draw some attention to the open possibilities, thanks to digital education and new information and communication

technology (ICT), of online/web-based assessment/testing of (perhaps some, if not all) translation and interpreting skills in online/web-based testing platforms and in BLENDED LEARNING, so far implemented by agencies specialized in remote interpreting, (e.g. Language Line, Cyracom) (Connell 2006; Hlavac 2013a). Hence the idea for remote testing in interpreting (see Braun et al. 2014b). This, as it happens, is part of the logistics of test administration: whereas using web-based tests based on pre-recorded video-clips administered to candidates via an internet connection and a PC terminal, to be assessed at a later stage (asynchronously), may work for assessing the interpretation of a monologic speech or SIGHT INTERPRETING/TRANSLATION, it may prove useless or possibly counterproductive (as it can invalidate the assessment procedure) in assessing interpretations involving highly complex dialogic interactions and role plays connected to the subject area, as features related to the interaction (e.g. pauses, eye contact, back-channeling), especially in community interpreting, are largely overlooked or ignored in interpreting assessment (Iglesias Fernández 2011). What is more, important issues such as costs (in time and know-how) and administrative matters such as time difference, when examiners and examinees are in chronologically different places, remain major challenges to online/web-based assessment/testing of translation and interpreting skills in online/web-based testing platforms and in blended learning.

ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS/TOOLS → ASSESSMENT

AUTHENTICITY

Definitions & dimensions

The much debated term authenticity, from the Greek *authentikos* > *authentēs* (*auto* means ‘self’, and therefore a sense of self is integral to this term, and *hentes* means ‘doer’, ‘one doing something by him/herself’), is an elusive concept, for which different typologies in a variety of contexts have been proposed (see Newman & Smith 2016). Authenticity has a very long history dating back to the 16th century, when Descartes, a rationalist, proposed the idea of authenticity as one’s responsibility for thinking and acting under a moral inner voice. Experientialists used this term to describe the attribute of taking responsibility for one’s own experiences and one’s own interpretations towards them in the world. One can also mention Martin Heidegger, who applied authenticity to refer to one’s true self vs. inauthenticity (losing one’s true self) (see Sherman 2009).

While a variety of definitions of the term authenticity with a special focus on the notion of individual decision making and emancipation from (often inner) constraints have been suggested (Kreber et al. 2007), one should note that this term, most importantly, and most relevantly to the present volume, refers to the under-researched phenomenon of authentic learning in EDUCATION and pedagogical settings as such (Cranton & Carusetta 2004; Laur 2013, ch.1; Lewkowicz 2000), i.e. participating and working on real-world-related complex problems in real situations in the search for solutions (Newmann et al. 1996) and that of authentic ASSESSMENT/testing (see e.g. Laur 2013, ch.8; Mousavi 2012:49).

One should raise the question “what is authentic for whom and for what?” In this context, authenticity, considered to be a quality associated with and guaranteed by learners’ appropriate (and pragmatic) response to a piece of communication (Widdowson 1978, 1979) and not a matter of selection but of methodology (Widdowson 1984), is divided into at least four parts (Cranton & Carusetta 2004; Kreber et al. 2007): a) being genuine (see also Brookfield 1997; Cranton 2001); b) showing consistency between values and actions; c) relating to others in such a way as to encourage their authenticity; and d) living a critical life. It is solidly grounded in important theories and approaches to learning and education, e.g. in the SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH. As far as the main features of authentic activities are concerned, Herrington et al. (2003) discuss the following ten: 1) activities are relevant to the real world; 2) tasks have complexity and are ill-defined; 3) tasks need complex problem-solving skills; 4) tasks have been designed to give learners the opportunity to examine them from multiple perspectives; 5) collaboration is central to the tasks; 6) tasks provide learners with the opportunity to engage in self-reflection; 7) tasks engage learners in building knowledge in interdisciplinary areas; 8) tasks are integrated with real world assessment; 9) tasks and task completion lead to a final product valuable per se; and 10) tasks allow multiple solutions and outcomes, rather than a limited perspective.

Authenticity in TIS

Authenticity, as a multifaceted concept, and a traditional concern in translator (Kiraly 2000) and interpreter (Setton & Dawrant 2016a: xxiv) education and TRAINING context, needs to be approached from all angles (see below).

Authentic teaching & training

Authenticity may refer to authentic teaching and training, as advocated by many translation (Dollerup 1994; González Davies 2004; Klaudy 1996; Li 2012; Stachowiak 2016; Ulrych 1996) and interpreting (Angelelli 2007, 2017; Keiser 1978; Niemants & Stokoe 2017; Valero-Garcés 2008, 2011a; Viljanmaa 2015) authors, which may come down into authentic materials/resources, and which corresponds to content-based notions of authenticity in the language teaching CURRICULUM (Mckay 2013): as for translation training, the texts reflect real-world tasks and situations and are an important element of professional realism in translator training (see Biel 2011; Inoue & Candlin 2015); as for interpreter training, the (semi)authentic speeches/materials reflect and represent those tasks interpreters are expected to handle in real-life situations, such as conferences, meetings, hospitals, etc. (Sawyer 2008:274) and are advocated as beneficial data for both pedagogical and scholarly purposes (see Crezee 2015; Ng 2015) despite the fact that legal, ethical, and practical reasons make access to authentic settings where interpreter-mediated encounters are held, difficult, if not impossible; typical examples for interpreter training include (but are not limited to) authentic/near-authentic (audio/video) speeches filled with disfluencies such as hesitations, repairs, repetition, laughter, etc. and preferably by practicing interpreters and experienced interpreter trainers to be interpreted in classroom, a MOCK CONFERENCE, etc. (see Napier 2006) or (notoriously-difficult-to-have-access-to) bilingual dialogue material (see Braun & Slater 2014), subject matter and terminology (which is an element in Don Kiraly's social constructivist approach to translator, and perhaps, to some extent, interpreter, education) (Kiraly 2000).

Authentic performance

Authenticity may refer to authentic performance, which corresponds to *measurement*, the second step in Clifford's description of the cycle for performance-based assessment (Clifford 2001) as an example of authentic assessment/testing. Authenticity is an essential step in RUBRIC development as one aspect of testing theory for the purpose of PERFORMANCE(-BASED) ASSESSMENT in interpreting in pedagogical settings (Jacobson 2009) as it has and continues to be an important QUALITY in language test development (Bachman & Palmer 1996; Lewkowicz 2000; Lynch 1982). Authentic performance can be shown through task authenticity as a psychometric (i.e. based on quantitative measurement) testing principle implying quality, i.e. the test taker's

handling of tasks (based on PROBLEM-BASED LEARNING) (e.g. ROLE PLAY, see Korin & Wilkerson 2011) resembling real-world situations and challenges responded to by translators/interpreters in a holistic multi-dimensional context as they carry out their professional responsibilities (Angelelli 2009; Kiraly 2005a, 2014; Turner 2015; Van Deemter et al. 2014; Wallace 2012).

Authentic environment

Authenticity may refer to authentic (learning/teaching/working) environments, and this corresponds to interaction-based notions of authenticity in the language teaching curriculum (Mckay 2013), the key to which is to include the use of props such as pen, paper, couch, chairs, etc., and of course, elements of PEER ASSESSMENT and SELF-ASSESSMENT (as two different forms of assessment as learning (Aal) in general, and of SCAFFOLDING in particular) aiming at developing learners' analytical and critical skills in translation (Fernández Prieto & Sempere Linares 2010) and interpreting (Ibrahim-González 2013; Sandrelli 2015b).

Authentic assessment

The term authenticity was first introduced into the language testing literature in the 1970s, and has continued to evolve since then. Authenticity, being an important aspect of test RELIABILITY and VALIDITY in the assessment/testing context, refers to authentic assessment/testing/tests, also known as *test authenticity* (the development and administration of which is very expensive), i.e. the degree to which tasks on a test are similar to, and reflective of, a real-world situation, towards which the test is targeted (Angelelli 2007, 2009; Sawyer 2004; Shohamy & Reves 1985; Van Deemter et al. 2014). In other words, authenticity, in this sense, is defined as the degree of similarity between test task characteristics, and those of tasks professionals are expected to handle in real-life situations (Fulcher & Davidson 2007; Laur 2013, ch.8; Mousavi 2012:49), a condition which enhances ECOLOGICAL VALIDITY (Kiraly 2005a). It must be noted that such a definition is challenged by some authors (e.g. Lewkowicz 2000) due to its being perhaps an insufficient condition for authenticity to be discerned. Attention is drawn to the fact that test authenticity is essential to the overall validity of a test because a test with unrealistic testing elements that rarely match testing in real-life situations will lack face validity (Van Deemter et al. 2014). Now, a question well worth asking is "in order to remain a valid test, to what extent do the interpreting examinations need to

simulate (e.g. through role play or mock conferences) the real-life situations for the interpreter examinees to perform the task?" (Wu 2010b:307). It must be borne in mind that rather than aiming for the most comprehensive test in terms of features of communicative contexts, test developers and administrators should, as far as ensuring test authenticity is concerned, try to incorporate as many features as possible (Douglas 2014; Lewkowicz 2000; Shohamy & Reves 1985), or face serious challenges (e.g. more complex language output, too many variables to control).

How to enhance authenticity in TIS

Authenticity as such is considered by some translation scholars (most notably Kiraly 2005a; Risku 2002, 2010, 2016a) to have important implications for translator education and professional assessment in TS, as it enhances ecological validity (Kiraly 2005a). Taking authenticity in typical interpreter training classroom into account, Cynthia Roy (personal communication, August 15, 2017) speaks of such creative activities as authentic role plays connected to the subject area (as a specific structured type of problem-based learning or PBL) including inviting in people who might have an actual need or problem and then a speaker from the other language who might provide guidance or give help (see also Morelli 2017), and also asking actors to perform scripts, asking people involved in something to recreate what happened (see also Kadrić 2017b; Ko 1996). Such activities serve the purpose of providing a more authentic setting. Sometimes, mock learners can be asked to try out activities in real settings. Along the same lines, mention must also be made of educational approaches, e.g. narrative PEDAGOGY (see Nicodemus et al. 2015), or inter-learner-/student-centered processes such as collaborative practice (Krystallidou & Salaets 2016; Krystallidou et al. 2018a, 2018b), which are believed to enhance authenticity in interpreting classroom. It is worth noting that, at one end of the spectrum, in language testing, authenticity is believed to be enhanced by the use of TECHNOLOGY, e.g. in effective test construction, delivery, response, scoring, etc. (Douglas 2014); at the other, however, in TIS, concerns are expressed about the challenges integrating technology, e.g. COMPUTER-AIDED/-ASSISTED TRANSLATION (CAT) TOOLS, and its counterpart COMPUTER-AIDED/-ASSISTED (CAI) TOOLS, into teaching and didactics of translation and interpreting, i.e. digital education, (which obviously goes beyond such issues to include a very broad range of factors) may present and how such challenges may affect (if not necessarily reshape) authenticity in the learning environment as far as giving learners a true picture of the translation and interpreting profession in highly technologized environments is concerned (see Blasco

Mayor & Jiménez Ivars 2007; Kenny 2007; Shuttleworth 2017; see also under *technology*). Sawyer (2004), while emphasizing the necessary balance between standardization of assessment procedures and test authenticity in interpreter testing contexts, an important issue related to the use of technology in the practice of interpreting (see Hlavac 2013a) and its repercussions, points out that performance testing is, among educators and assessors, generally considered to contribute to a higher degree of authenticity in assessment, that is, greater congruence between tasks to be completed in the test situation and in the field, a procedure believed by some authors (e.g. Angelelli 2017) to be the first step toward the EMPOWERMENT of trainees in teaching interpreting.

AUTONOMY

Definitions

The term autonomy, from the Greek *autonomia*, from *autonomous* meaning 'having one's own laws', is not a new concept and has been used in different disciplines such as military science. In pedagogical settings, autonomy refers to learner autonomy, and can be defined as the set of skills and special knowledge that allow students to be willingly responsible for their own learning process, i.e. acting independently through engaging in new tasks in new contexts (Little 1997; Little et al. 2002; Ramírez Espinosa 2015). Autonomy, according to Crabbe (1993), is justified by three arguments: 1) ideological argument (people, including you, are independent in making free choices); 2) psychological argument (the understanding that you are independent in making free choices leads to better learning); and 3) economic argument (people, including you, must make preparations for their own learning needs to acquire knowledge and skills).

Autonomy: definitions & applications in TIS

In TS, autonomy refers to a set of skills and an aspect of professional activity learners develop to perform competently and professionally, independently of the teacher or other learners, to be initiated and developed during the translator TRAINING process (Kelly 2005; Kiraly 2000). It is thought that autonomy, as a key concept in translator training, needs to be fostered in translator (Hui 2013; Kelly 2005; Kiraly 2000, 2005b, 2006, 2012a, 2016b; Symseridou 2018) and interpreter (Horváth 2007; Ibrahim-González 2013; Moser-Mercer 2008) EDUCATION, with learner-/student-centeredness, cooperative learning, learner training and development, and self-access and

out-of-class independent practice being its core components (Horváth 2007, 2016b). Despite the dearth of empirical research into the factors influencing how it can be acquired (for rare research into this topic in translator training, see Chen 2010, 2019), autonomous learning, characterized, in a way, by it being in contradiction with the tenets of the TRANSMISSIONIST APPROACH to translator and interpreter training, is believed to be exercised and/or fostered through using popular COURSE management systems (CMSs) (e.g. Blackboard, Claroline, Moodle) (Santamaría Ciordia 2017; Tymczyńska 2009); BLENDED LEARNING (Galán-Mañas 2011); PROBLEM-BASED LEARNING (PBL) (Inoue 2005); CORPORA (Bale 2015; Rodríguez Inés 2009); FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT (Class 2009); ROLE PLAY (Hui 2013); and recent technological advances, e.g. DIGITAL PEN technology for consecutive interpreting (see Orlando 2010, 2014, 2015), and computer tools combined with autonomous learning and assessment for collaborative learning (as an essential feature of the SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH, possibly involving SMALL GROUP LEARNING) and outside-classroom activities (Varela 2007), among others.

AVIDICUS PROJECT

The term AVIDICUS (ASSESSMENT of Video-Mediated Interpreting (VMI) in the Criminal Justice Services) project (<http://wp.videoconference-interpreting.net>) refers to three ground-breaking comparative studies completed on video-link and remote interpreting (RI) between 2008 and 2016, with AVIDICUS 1 (2008–2011); AVIDICUS 2 (2011–2013); and AVIDICUS 3 (2014–2016) (Braun 2012, 2013; Braun & Taylor 2012, 2015) as a joint project of University of Surrey (UK), Lessius University (BE), Local Police Antwerp (BE), Institut Télécom (FR), Dutch Ministry of Justice (NL), Dutch Legal Aid Board (NL), and Polish Society of Sworn and Specialized Translators TEPIS (PL), with Ann Corsellis as the internal evaluator, and University of Surrey (UK), Lessius University (BE), and TEPIS (PL) as test sites. It is posited that most of the research in videoconference interpreting (VCI), as a subcategory of teleconference interpreting (Braun 2015b), in legal settings and in different set-ups (face-to-face, RI) and/or VCI) in sign and spoken languages was carried out as part of AVIDICUS projects (Braun & Taylor 2012; Devaux 2017a, 2017b). Therefore, their aim is not limited to VCI, as these projects also explore RI (Braun 2015a, 2015b). The AVIDICUS projects, mainly focused on the QUALITY of interpreting in video-mediated communication (Braun 2012, 2015a, 2015b, 2016; Braun & Balogh 2016; Braun et al. 2018; Braun &

Taylor 2012) from an academic and empirical perspective, used simulations of real-life situations (as a special form of ROLE PLAY) carried out for the purpose of addressing/assessing RI in legal proceedings in terms of: identifying the situations where VMI would be considered of maximum efficiency in legal proceedings, (leading to what is called *proximity interpreting*, a term Robert Skinner (in progress) inherits from Jemina Napier and introduces it in relation to British Sign Language and police interpreting in his PhD thesis currently in progress, visit <http://proximityinterpreting.com>); assessing the viability and quality of VMI in such situations from an interpreting point of view, an important issue, over which there is no consensus to date; preparing guidelines for using VMI; and developing and implementing TRAINING modules on VMI, aiming at equity of access of all (European) citizens as to justice regardless of their knowledge of the language used in judicial proceedings (Braun 2012:303).

The key findings of the projects have so far indicated that adaptation and familiarization with VMI as a challenging task per se, is an important one yet to become a reality (perhaps under the influence of training) (see Carl & Braun 2018); the number of interpreting problems is significantly higher; and there is a faster decline of quality of interpreting over time in RI (Braun 2013, 2018) likely to be related to two types of the latest developments: a) high-end solutions (e.g. videoconferencing systems in both HD and 3D formats); and b) low-end solutions (e.g. Skype) (Braun & Davitti 2018; Carl & Braun 2018). Furthermore, in this project, interpreters engage in SELF-ASSESSMENT, a particular form of assessment as learning (Aal), through the so-called 'own image', i.e. access to their own image on the screen (Braun 2012).

BACKWASH → **WASHBACK**

B-LEARNING → **BLENDED LEARNING**

BLENDED LEARNING

Definitions

Alternatively called *b-learning*, *hybrid learning*, or *mixed-mode learning*, the term blended learning, as the buzz phrase of the moment in the world of TRAINING, was coined by Paul Myers of the BBC College of Journalism. Blended learning, which appeared for the first time in the business world, and was later incorporated into higher EDUCATION, is given different meanings by different authors across disciplines (see Kitchenham 2011). It generally refers to a specific type of E-LEARNING as an alternative to

conventional instruction or to an exclusively face-to-face format, creating the need for appropriate support structures to accommodate the new changes in the format. Blended learning, which can occur at different levels (COURSE, program, etc.), according to Driscoll (2002:1), refers to four different concepts: 1) combining modes of web-based TECHNOLOGY for the purpose of accomplishing an educational goal; 2) combining various pedagogical approaches to produce an optimal learning outcome with or without instructional technology; 3) combining any form of instructional technology with face-to-face instruction; and 4) combining instructional technology with real-life tasks for the purpose of creating a harmonious effect of learning and working.

Blended learning in TIS

Interpreter training institutions, especially those responsible for training legal interpreters (see Preziosi & Garwood 2017), have become more and more interested in blended learning (Sandrelli 2015b), which can help interpreter training reach a larger audience. There is a dearth of studies on translator and interpreter training in a blended learning mode (Galán-Mañas & Hurtado Albir 2010). It must be borne in mind, however, that blended learning acts as an important vehicle to combine the best of face-to-face learning and distance learning and to promote active learning, and therefore, it is advocated in and has been increasingly adopted to translator (Galán-Mañas 2011; Galán-Mañas & Hurtado Albir 2010) and interpreter (Blasco Mayor & Jiménez Ivars 2007; Chan 2013b, 2014; Gorjanc et al. 2016; Kajzer-Wietrzny & Tymczyńska 2014; Roberson 2015; Seresi 2016; Skaaden 2017; Wang 2015) training, and to training of interpreter trainers (Class et al. 2004), as it can be developed thanks to the advantage of asynchronicity (i.e. without the need for a specific location), and to the possibility of collaborative learning (Varela 2007). As an essential feature of the SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH, blended learning may also improve learner outcomes and/or save costs (Marsh et al. 2003).

Mention must be made of the fact that as technology, along with appropriate technology infrastructure as an essential requirement for technology-based teaching, becomes increasingly integrated into learning and teaching phenomenon, and extends this phenomenon beyond the classroom, many new possibilities and challenging variables emerge and roles and concepts of teaching and learning must be reconsidered (Brown & Campione 1994; Collis et al. 2000), particularly in translation (Shuttleworth 2017) and interpreting (Blasco Mayor & Jiménez Ivars 2007; Liu 2018; Pöhhacker 2016, ch.11; Seresi 2016). Discussing blended learning as

adopted to translator training, Galán-Mañas (2011), in line with Seresi (2016) who acts likewise regarding interpreter training, considers that some important factors are vital to the success of blended learning as such: a) NEEDS ANALYSIS; b) e-tool literacy; and c) the right combination of class and virtual sessions mainly via Virtual Learning Environments (VLEs) to ensure students' equity of access to the same information and knowledge and to provide them with the opportunity to engage in distance learning (Galán-Mañas & Hurtado Albir 2010) even when faculty and face time are limited. As is the case for other types of instruction, blended learning has important elements: a) lecture (i.e. using a technique such as a learner-/student-centered approach to improving lecturing); b) self-study (i.e. students' requirement to use alternative and/or audio texts instead of textbooks); c) application (i.e. engaging, for instance, in online learning or computer-assisted learning rather than in activities such as writing term papers); d) tutoring (i.e. engaging in collaborate project work and interactive and online learning activities rather than in individualized instruction); e) collaboration (i.e. engaging in such activities as computer-supported cooperative work rather than working in labs); and f) EVALUATION (i.e. showing tendency towards computerized testing, which is very difficult to imagine, but not necessarily impossible) (Marsh et al. 2003).

As far as training interpreters is concerned, there is a need for further development of technology-assisted interpreting and providing practice opportunities through technology-enhanced interpreting/interpreter training platforms. The close link between technology and effective PEDAGOGY is the very essence of blended learning, resulting in the three identified categories (not exclusive to translation or interpreting, though): enabling, enhancing, and transforming (Class 2009). Furthermore, INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY (ICT) has the widely recognized potential to support modern pedagogical approaches, in which learner collaboration as well as self-study, flexibility and AUTONOMY are key (Braun 2006; Braun et al. 2013) and therefore, ICT enables blended learning experiences (Ritsos et al. 2013). However, it must be borne in mind that unlike translation, the effects of technological progress on interpreting have been few and apart (Blasco Mayor & Jiménez Ivars 2007). In IS, ICTs are mostly geared towards conference interpreting and mostly address interpreting students only. It should also be pointed out that blended learning and online learning/instruction have already had a major impact on some programs, e.g. York University (Toronto), New York University, and employer organizations such as EU Commission that offer classes via new technologies such as videoconference to their partner universities (David Sawyer, personal communication, August 15, 2017). Videoconferencing, as

an audio and video delivery channel, is advocated as a channel through which, people can interact live, or through which certain interpreting skills (e.g. conceptual knowledge) can most probably be taught (Donovan 2010) and tested (Braun et al. 2014b), and as a possibly valuable teaching tool in remote interpreting (RI) (see Donovan 2006a; Kalina 2007), and what justifies its use is evident in one basic distinction: primary participants are in different locations, with the interpreter at the main site or with the non-native speaker (i.e. videoconference interpreting or VCI), or they are all in a single location, with the interpreter at a different location (i.e. remote interpreting or RI) (Braun 2012, 2013, 2015a, 2015b). However, research has shown that interpreters are under psychological pressure to some extent when interpreting remotely (Koller & Pöchhacker 2018). What is more, technology may be a double-edged sword for blended learning as adopted to interpreter training: although it can be stated that, in real-life performance, with camera angles playing a role, using videoconference may hinder visualization of the so-called *intimacy cues* (e.g. nonverbal signals and body language), may not allow sight of all the stakeholders (Fowler 2018), may also cause some problems of an interactive nature, e.g. overlapping speeches, or may present challenges of an ethical nature and put restrictions (more of a technological nature) on the interpreter in terms of his/her physical space (Devaux 2017a, 2017b), its absence may have more damaging effects. This links this challenge, in a sense, with the concept of positioning, i.e. how the interpreter is physically positioned in face-to-face interaction, which is of paramount importance in signed language interpreting, where “the interpreter must be visible to the deaf client” (Pokorn 2015:313) (for other challenges posed by videoconferencing in interpreting, see also Mouzourakis 1996). This draws our attention to the possibility of technological constraints, namely the absence of video feed, in some interpreter-mediated events (IMEs) and settings (e.g. telephone interpreting), an important issue to be taken into consideration in (partly or fully) online interpreter training. Devaux (2017a:39) calls for research on the interpreter’s perception of his/her role in case of VCI being used in criminal court settings, another important issue to include in interpreter training/education.

Under the umbrella term ICT, there are different training e-tools, which have been suggested for adopting blended learning to translator and interpreter training as such: Galán-Mañas (2011), while discussing translator and interpreter training at both under-and-post-graduate levels, reviews the following useful e-tools as a complement to face-to-face communication in class: discussion forums; e-mail; text/voice chat; e-tools such as Word, Excel, Power Point, etc. for sharing documents; weblogs; and

Wikis (for a discussion of using wikis in blended learning in translation classrooms, see Varela 2007). Broadly speaking, two major types of technology, both audio and video resources, have been applied to (course and program elements in) teaching interpreting so far (Ko & Chen 2011; Pöschhacker 2016): 1) (three-way) teleconferencing, i.e. allowing, according to Gran et al. (2002), for simultaneous communication with students located in a seat other than that of the teacher, with audio/video support; and 2) satellite-or web-based videoconferencing or videoconference-based services, e.g. video relay service (VRS), not only for *dyadic* but also for *monologic* communication/language access over a distance (Braun 2006). In a blended or hybrid interpreting course, as a specific type of learning environment, which can, interestingly, encourage the development of ADAPTIVE EXPERTISE in interpreting trainees (Moser-Mercer 2008), and that of offline face-to-face classroom learning as well as self-paced or personalized online learning, allowing for carefully-planned practice, (self-)reflection and improvement, can be beneficial to participants, (Bao 2015; Skaaden 2017; Skaaden & Watne 2009). The right combination of traditional and virtual learning is advocated as an essential factor leading to development of many *interpreter* (rather than *interpreting*) competences, including (but not limited to) how to prepare for speeches, and how to research a given topic (Seresi 2016).

Blended learning & TIS curricula

Interestingly enough, in the context of translator and interpreter education, one might raise the question of “how blended learning in general may reshape the CURRICULUM in TIS?” Elisabeth Winston (personal communication, August 18, 2017), a very experienced and foremost interpreter educator, in an attempt to shed some light on this, distinguishes between two types of blended learning: 1) *basic blending*, which is a synchronous teaching session, where there is a combination of traditional lecture style courses and distance learning course on one hand, and 2) *advanced blending* on the other (more or less similar to the pedagogical MODEL of FLIPPED CLASSROOM), where students study information, lectures, etc. online asynchronously, then periodically attend classes for lectures or practice. She considers the latter (i.e. advanced blended classrooms or completely online, perhaps with some synchronous meetings and some asynchronous) to be the best approach to teaching any course, including translation and interpreting, in terms of enhancing learning flexibility and offering multiple learning modalities in one location, provided that both teachers and students believe in the philosophy of active

learning. However, there is this temptation to overuse technology in (translation and interpreting) classes at the expense of adequate, both verbal and visual, human interaction (including timely instructor-student FEEDBACK and student-student interaction) regarding which, Gómez & Weinreb (2002:643), in line with Savin-Baden et al. (2010), Pym (2006) and Bowker & Marshman (2010), on a warning note, point to one important precept of teaching in general, similarly echoed by IS authors (Braun et al. 2013; Class 2009; Santamaría Ciordia 2017): it must be *pedagogy* that drives the *technology* and not vice versa. This refers to the concept of ‘*augmented translator*’ used to describe those translators and interpreters, who work with and use technology to their own advantage. In a similar vein, Ko (2006, 2015), Ko & Chen (2011), Moeketsi & Wallmach (2005) and Sandrelli (2015b) all acknowledge that the major challenge to teaching interpreting online (through blended learning in general, and by distance mode in particular) is to teach interpreting per se (which involves a high level of both verbal and visual human interaction). Apart from all of the aspects considered and discussed above, what is important for us to recognize here is that, as it removes the need for both teacher and learner’s constant simultaneous physical presence, and therefore, overcomes the inflexibility of traditional classroom instruction (Galán-Mañas 2011), blended learning can broaden the spectrum of teaching options to match individual styles, but one must be realistic about the expected benefits (Maren Dingfelder Stone, personal communication, August 24, 2017).

ASSESSMENT in blended learning environments in TIS

As far as assessment in blended learning environments in different fields, including TIS, is concerned, one must draw attention to the critical issue of blended assessment (i.e. both online and onsite assessment) with four main advantages: 1) improving the variety of assessments; 2) increasing the frequency of assessments; 3) focus on AUTHENTICITY of assessments; and 4) enhancing feedback on performance (Stein & Graham 2014).

BRIEF → TRANSLATION BRIEF

CAIT → COMPUTER-AIDED/-ASSISTED INTERPRETER
TRAINING

CAI TOOLS

Definitions, applications & typologies

The term Computer-assisted Interpreting (CAI) tools can be defined as all types of emerging computer programs specifically addressed at interpreters as end users with regard to their needs, i.e. for the purpose of assisting interpreting performance or provision of interpreting service in different interpreting contexts and modes (Costa et al. 2014; Fantinuoli 2018, forthcoming). They can be broadly divided into two categories: 1) *first-generation CAI tools*, e.g. *Interplex*, simply designed, with basic functionalities, to manage terminology in multilingual glossaries similar to MS Word or Excel lists; 2) *second-generation CAI tools*, e.g. *InterpretBank* (Fantinuoli 2009, 2011, 2012, 2016b, 2018) designed, with advanced functionalities, to organize textual material, retrieve information from CORPORA or other sources (both online and offline), etc. (Bilgen 2009; Fantinuoli 2016b, 2018), or *Interpreters' Help* as a cloud-based glossary management tool (see Goldsmith 2018a).

Challenges & future directions

The didactics (i.e. how to teach) of CAI tools and related developments in the E-classroom are an under-researched area. Another neglected, but important, area is interpreting-motivated evaluation of CAI tools. Fantinuoli (2018:170) concludes that the challenges that lie ahead are researching the use and usability of evolving CAI tools; analyzing the strategies interpreters may need to adopt while using CAI tools; and applying the new knowledge to the didactics and TRAINING of interpreters. Unlike CAT TOOLS and their proliferation of use in translation (Bowker 2015; Bowker & Fisher 2010, 2013; Gao & Chiou 2018; Kučič & Seljan 2014; O'Hagan 2013; Sikora 2014) as part of the technological turn in the field (Chan 2017; Kenny 2017b; O'Hagan 2013), the possibilities offered due to the existence of CAI tools are yet to be fully benefited from (Bilgen 2009; Costa et al. 2014; Fantinuoli 2016b). Future proliferation of CAI tools may transform the nature of basic interpreting sub-processes such as conventional terminology management and term extraction as part of preparation for assignments (Fantinuoli 2006, 2017; Pérez-Pérez 2018).

CALIBRATION OF DICHOTOMOUS ITEMS METHOD

Definitions

The calibration of dichotomous items (CDI) method, developed by Eyckmans et al. (2009:73), and implying a rupture with traditional methods of translation ASSESSMENT, is a norm-referenced translation assessment method, in which the quality of translation is judged based on a series of pre-established criteria. In other words, this calibration method is based on test-takers' performance on a particular set of translated segments as determined on the basis of a pre-test procedure (Eyckmans & Anckaert 2017).

Issues of RELIABILITY & VALIDITY of CDI

As far as issues of reliability and validity as related to this method are concerned, one should mention some preliminary conflicting results: on one hand, comparison of CDI and its adapted, practical, pragmatic version (see Eyckmans & Anckaert 2017:43; Kockaert & Segers 2017:150), the so-called THE PRESELECTED ITEMS EVALUATION (PIE) method, on the basis of empirical data suggests that seemingly the former (CDI) is more reliable (and thus more valid) than the latter (PIE) (see Eyckmans & Anckaert 2017:50) in assessment of translation COMPETENCE. Kockaert & Segers (2017:160), on the other, conclude that it is the PIE method that offers the advantage of reliability in the context of translation EVALUATION. Despite all this, as Winibert Segers (personal communication, March 29, 2018) points out, which of these two assessment methods (PIE or CDI) is the more reliable method has never been scientifically researched, nor has their validity (for one rare recent case study on issues of reliability and validity of the PIE method in translation assessment, see Van Egdom et al. 2019).

CDI compared to PIE

What is shared by both PIE method (with its first and second stages called *criterion-referenced*, and its fourth and fifth ones called *norm-referenced*, see Segers & Kockaert 2016:70) and CDI method (as a norm-referenced translation assessment method) is that both are dichotomous methods, distinguishing between right or wrong solutions, but not between levels of error (Kockaert & Segers 2017). The big difference between CDI and PIE assessment methods, according to Winibert Segers (personal communication, March 29, 2018), is the number of items, on which the evaluation is done:

PIE method, not CDI, works with a limited number of preselected items, not to mention the difference that in the former (CDI), the items are selected on the basis of the only docimological dimension, whereas the latter (PIE) calculates, optionally, docimological values on TRANSLATION BRIEF relevant items only (Kockaert & Segers 2017:152). The drawback of CDI is that it is far too labor-intensive, and therefore, unlike PIE method, it cannot be applied in practice (Winibert Segers, personal communication, March 29, 2018). For this and other reasons, there is growing concern over using this method in translator training contexts (see Van Egdom et al. 2019).

CARM → CONVERSATION-ANALYTIC ROLE-PLAY METHOD

CAT TOOLS

The term Computer-aided/-assisted Translation (CAT) tools, being in the applied branch of TS (Munday 2016), falling under the umbrella term natural-language processing tools (Quah 2006), and also known as *CAT systems*, *machine-aided translation tools*, *TM (tools)*, *translator workbenches/workstations*, *translation support tools*, and more recently as *translation environment tools (TEtTs)* (Ábrányi 2016; Bowker & Fisher 2010, 2013; Garcia 2015), typically refers to software coming with a variety of features and functions and specifically designed and developed for the purpose of handling human translation task proper in the form of general-purpose applications, e.g. word processors, spelling checkers, e-mail; Internet search engines and/or more translation-oriented ones, e.g. corpus analysis tools; terminology management systems (Bowker 2002; Bowker & Fisher 2010; O'Hagan 2009). One key characteristic of CAT tools is that they are designed not to replace human translators, but to facilitate translators' taking control of the translation process (O'Hagan 2009). In fact, CAT tools help human translators work more efficiently (Bowker 2002) if TRAINING curricula manage to strike a balance between trainees' theoretical understanding and their practical experience with these tools across a range of applied courses rather than in core courses only (Bowker 2015). CAT tools come with the important distinction between machine-aided human translation (i.e. a human activity requiring CAT tools) and human-aided machine translation (i.e. a computer-driven activity in need of human assistance) (Somers 2003:13). Typical examples include translation memory systems, terminology management, web translation tools, corporate computer-aided translation systems, subtitling tools, etc.

In translation, one must mention CAT tools proliferation of use among translators (Bowker & Fisher 2010, 2013; Kučič & Seljan 2014; O'Hagan 2013; Sikora 2014) as part of the technological turn in the field (Chan 2017; Kenny 2017b; O'Hagan 2013), their still irritating nature in the view of professional translators (O'Brien et al. 2017), and recent attempts to teach cloud-based CAT tools in translator training courses (Rothwell 2017), but that is yet to become a reality for CAI tools in interpreting (Bilgen 2009; Costa et al. 2014; Fantinuoli 2016b).

CERTIFICATION

Definitions

The term certification, from Latin *certificationem*, from Late Latin *certificare* meaning 'to make certain', can be defined in educational and ASSESSMENT settings as a set of formal assessment procedures involved in decision making as to whether an individual, an organization, etc. has the required qualifications, knowledge and skills in order to successfully perform a certain type of activity in a specific context.

Certification in TIS

Generally, three types of interrelated certification must be distinguished: 1) certification of products (focused on the product QUALITY); 2) certification of systems (focused on the process of making a product or service available); and 3) certification of individual persons (focused on translators' and interpreters' knowledge, skills, etc.) (Budin et al. 2013). As far as translators and interpreters are concerned, certification, as one of the crucial elements of PROFESSIONALIZATION (Dybiec-Gajer 2014) and QUALITY ASSURANCE, simply refers to the process of officially or professionally recognizing a translator or an interpreter's ability to perform translation or interpreting, respectively, (Hlavac 2013b; special issue of *Translation & Interpreting* 5 (1), 2013) and such an official or professional recognition, being rarely consistent in terms of criteria for certification in various countries (Melby 2013:1), can be obtained through qualification by testing as the most common method (Liu 2015b), in testing programs by authorities, whether governmental, such as American Translators Association (ATA) (operating a certification system in translation only), the China ACCREDITATION Test for Translators and Interpreters (CATI), and The National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters (NAATI), or independent professional bodies such as Certification

Commission for Healthcare Interpreters (CCHI), an independent national nonprofit organization founded in July 2009 (see also Pöschhacker 2016:167). Certification is a type of credentialing used in professions where there is no perceived risk to a consumer's life. In such professions, governments are not directly involved in setting standards. Instead, professional associations may choose to set and ensure the achievement of standards through certification (Speers 1997, cited in Clifford 2004:258). This said, it must be added that certification of interpreters, which along with consumer needs and the actions of colleagues, is considered what establishes the politics of interpreting (Brunson 2018a), has been addressed in different certification programs/systems such as the widely recognized Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) (for general signed language interpreters) and all type of certifications offered by it (see Stewart et al. 1998:227-231; Witter-Merithew 2018), and in the National Association of the Deaf (NAD) in the United States, and in new ones (see under *QUALITAS PROJECT*).

Clifford (2005), in line with Arjona-Tseng (1994) and Wallace (2019), argues for the appropriateness of a psychometric (i.e. based on quantitative measurement) approach to interpreter certification despite the fact that there has been considerable resistance to the implementation of psychometrically sound assessment procedures in IS in general (Liu 2015a), and such procedures are not generally respected in interpreter EDUCATION and assessment in particular (Timarová 2015b) and undoubtedly suffer from certain limitations "in terms of exactly what they assess" (Wallace 2019).

Certification testing, alternatively called *accreditation testing* in Australia (see Hale et al. 2012), may involve all or some of the following stages: 1) a(n) (initial) screening stage, which, as a long-standing practice, can help identify candidates with a better chance of success on the main test and therefore help simplify the certification procedure, and to which some authors (Domingue & Ingram 1978) advocate an interdisciplinary approach; 2) a TRAINING program; and 3) an interpreting test proper, each with its own components and with the possible support of ICT in recording candidate performances for later reference (Braun et al. 2014b), i.e. using mainly telephone and video-link interpreting (Hlavac 2013a) ultimately for the purpose of quantifying the interpreters' COMPETENCE, i.e. determining whether the candidate is qualified in terms of the knowledge and skills required for a successful interpreting performance (Turner 2015).

The term certification is often used interchangeably with the term accreditation (Liu 2015b); however, it is worth noting that a credentialing body cannot certify or license a performance (e.g. interpreting) because it is essentially a single instance of behavior; instead, certifying bodies certify

or license a person (e.g. an interpreter) after finding enough evidence of the performance being the product of internal quality (see Clifford 2004:55-56; Mikkelsen 2013:66; see also under *accreditation*).

Certification can be full, partial, local/provincial (e.g. for community interpreters in Canada through tests such as CILISAT), national and federal (e.g. for court interpreters in Canada or in the US; or for interpreters in Canada interpreting from English to ASL or vice versa), and might, in a few countries, be followed by post-certification. What's more, there have been some efforts, e.g. by The Brazilian Translators Association, ABRATES (Associação Brasileira de Tradutores), to explore the possibilities of establishing international certification programs (see Stejskal 2001). For the purpose of ensuring that the certification remains valid, it is followed by (periodic) recertification of translators (Budin et al. 2013) and interpreters, e.g. for medical and signed language interpreters in the United States, (Arocha & Joyce 2013; Youdelman 2013) and also, as of January 2018, for all practicing translators and interpreters with NAATI credentials as implemented through its system of revalidation with its own terms and conditions (Gentile 2015).

Challenges to certification in TIS

There are some concerns about issues of reliability and validity in translator and interpreter certification. In IS, some authors (Wallace 2019), while questioning the reliability and validity of court interpreter oral assessment in the United States, have proposed a hybrid MODEL for court interpreter certification in order to address reliability and validity-related challenges. Apart from that, recently some authors (Budin et al. 2013) have advocated the necessity of promoting a transnational system of translator certification with cross-border recognition, a particular challenge that needs to be addressed (Liu 2015b). It should be pointed out that certification has been largely ignored in IS (Clifford 2004) as, e.g. despite the existence of certification for signed language interpreters for over 25 years (Downing & Ruschke 2012; Maroney 2004), there is no nationally based certification for signed language interpreters working in mental health (Crump 2012; Swabey 2018). There might be circumstances, under which certification is not possible or common, or is at least rare, and this can justify the existence of (primary) alternatives to certification of translators and interpreters: Lommel (2013) identifies four categories of such alternatives: 1) academic credentialing (for graduates of academic translation and interpreting programs); 2) company- or organization-specific testing of translation and interpreting professionals (particularly for organizations working in

specialized domains); 3) tiered pricing models (with providers typically offering three quality levels within different price ranges); and 4) signing of work (with translation and interpreting companies signing their work for the purpose of endorsing transparency and increasing potential clients).

CHECKLIST

The term checklist refers to one particular form/method of ASSESSMENT as learning (Aal), PEER ASSESSMENT or SELF-ASSESSMENT, which deals with clarifying criteria and standards for students and learners by constructing a list of items that the teacher will use in grading the paper and that the student or peers can self-check beforehand (Walvoord & Anderson 2010). Checklists can also be used as a simple form of SCAFFOLDING in pedagogical settings (Freeman 1995).

CHUNKING→ SEGMENTATION
CLOSED CURRICULUM→ CURRICULUM

COGNITIVE APPRENTICESHIP

Definitions & distinctions

Cognitive apprenticeship refers to a term Collins et al. (1989) use as a reaction to conventional practices to refer to two phenomena: 1) a dual focus on teaching the processes that experts use to handle complex tasks, and conceptual and factual knowledge situated in the context of its use (i.e. SITUATED LEARNING) (Brown et al. 1989; Resnick 1989); and 2) the fact that the focus of the learning-through-guided-experience is on cognitive and metacognitive, rather than on physical, skills and processes. Collins et al. (1989) differentiate between cognitive apprenticeship and traditional apprenticeship, and remind us that in applying the former, tasks are sequenced to reflect the changing demands of learning, rather than to allow the job demands to select the tasks for students to practice, and also that it is the former, which emphasizes decontextualizing knowledge so that it can be used in many different settings. As far as core principles of cognitive apprenticeship are concerned, one may mention *modeling* (showing an expert handling a task so that students can observe and build a conceptual MODEL of the processes that are required to accomplish the task); *coaching* (observing students while they handle a task and offering guidance, SCAFFOLDING, FEEDBACK, modelling, reminders, and new tasks aimed at bringing their performance closer to expert performance); and

scaffolding (the supports the teacher provides to help the student handle a task), among others (Collins et al. 1989; Järvelä 1995).

Cognitive apprenticeship in TIS

Cognitive apprenticeship, as a component of skills-based TRAINING, is relevant to translator and interpreter EDUCATION, as its underlying principles are AUTHENTICITY, scaffolding, learner AUTONOMY, and modeling (Class & Schneider 2014; Kiraly 2003a; Moser-Mercer 2003; Motta 2016). Cognitive apprenticeship also features among the tenets of Kiraly's SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH. Kiraly (2003a) advocates adopting cognitive apprenticeship to translator education as one of the best-developed methods for teaching based on a social constructivist approach.

COGNITIVE SHADOWING → SHADOWING

COMPETENCE

The somehow controversial and originally linguistic term competence, from the Latin verb *competere* meaning 'to coincide/to meet', generally refers to a set of quality components and skills required in order to perform a certain type of activity. The term competence has been addressed by different disciplines: competence is a dominant perspective in work psychology (branch of behaviorism) and EXPERTISE studies in cognitive psychology (see Shreve 2006). Competence can be generic (not bounded by an occupational category) (Preston 2017), or specific (being about what a competent person can do without implying that he or she is competent beyond the area specifically mentioned) (Eraut 1994). There has been little discussion about these types of competence from the perspective of translation/interpreting competence (but see Sánchez-Gijón et al. 2009:107-108).

Competence in TIS

The term competence was used, in principle, by generative linguists (originally by Chomsky 1965) to refer to an individual's knowledge of language (as a system of rules) totally independent from any considerations of the fairly important notion of performance, as is evident in Chomsky's use of the term *linguistic competence*, which, in turn, (as related to translation) manifests the distinctive perspective adopted by PACTE in their

translation competence MODEL (PACTE 1998, 2000, 2001, 2011). From a similar perspective, and with interpreting included, competence, as used by Harris & Sherwood (1978), was natural translation/interpreting (NT/NI)-oriented as an activity undertaken by bilingual individuals, who have not been trained for it. In TIS, competence is closely intertwined with the concept of expertise (Šeböková 2010; Tiselius & Hild 2017) but quite recently some authors (Shreve et al. 2018) have suggested substituting the former with the latter, as they argue that it is the latter, which is a robust and more enlightening concept, at least in cognitive translology. Competence, as a cognitive construct, may be generally defined as a set of cognitive resources, including abilities and skills, awareness and attitudes (which, Varela 2007, in discussing translation PEDAGOGY, refers to as *identikit* of a professional translator) needed for the purpose of showing high performance in a specific field, the evolution of which in translation and interpreting may be construed as what Sawyer (2004) and Calvo (2009, 2011), in discussing CURRICULUM, call *curriculum as process*. Competence, as a pedagogical construct, refers to abilities and skillsets for EDUCATION and TRAINING purposes. Competence, however, does not lend itself to one precise and/or commonly accepted definition (Šeböková 2010), (perhaps) primarily due to different perspectives adopted by different scholars in different disciplines to this concept (hence its multi-interpretable nature), and secondarily due to the fact that it is an abstract concept and hence, no single definition covers all its facets. The difficulty to exhaustively define the concept of competence in TIS can be interpreted as one of the most serious limitations of this concept (Klimkowski 2015).

With or without a clear definition of competence as a concept, which, at one end of the spectrum, is in connection with testing and ASSESSMENT of translators/interpreters (Sylvia Kalina, personal communication, July 16, 2017), and at the other, has a relationship, to be recognized as one of mutual dependence (see Keams 2006), with important concepts in curriculum and CURRICULUM DESIGN and development in TIS (Keams 2008a; Mahn 2008) such as, by way of example only, NEEDS ANALYSIS, situation analysis, SELF-ASSESSMENT, directionality, expert-novice paradigm (see Moser-Mercer 1997b, 2015b), much-debated issue of EVALUATION (see Šeböková 2010) and of course, different forms of FEEDBACK (Lee 2018; Shreve 1997; Washbourne 2014). It is worth mentioning that, in TS, competence, which dates back at least to Wilss (1976), forms the core of university training programs within the European context today (Angelelli 2013b; Jääskeläinen & Lacruz 2018:6). Various attempts have been made by TS scholars to explore this multifaceted technical term with its essential subcomponents (such as genre literacy and contrastive rhetoric, see Beeby

2004:41; or intercultural competence, see special issue of *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 10 (3), 2016) in what one may call the basic distinction between *translation competence* (competence in mediating texts effectively between languages) and *translator competence* (involving the translator joining various new communities, which have developed as a result of the PROFESSIONALIZATION of the field) (Calvo 2011; Keams 2006). For the former, Neubert (1994), from a functional-linguistic and pragmatic perspective, introduces roughly three types: 1) language competence; 2) subject competence; and 3) transfer competence; for the latter, one must mention the importance it gains in PROJECT-BASED LEARNING (see Balogh & Lesznyák 2018). Later, Neubert (2000:6), from the same perspective, expands the classification and introduces at least 5 sub-competences, including language/linguistic competence; textual competence; subject (area) competence (which, in turn, is an important part of translator competence, see Kiraly 2000); cultural competence; and transfer competence. For the latter, in his own 2006 model, Kiraly (2006, 2013), adopting a much broader perspective, takes 3 clusters of sub-competences into careful consideration: social competences (SC) (see also Krajcso 2011), personal competences (PC), and translation competence.

With translator competence being both the conceptual framework for training (see special issue of *JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialised Translation* 16, 2011) and valid framework to shape the curriculum (Calvo 2011), mention must be made of a shift from the product to the process of translation in the didactics (i.e. how to teach) and assessment practices (Huertas Barros & Vine 2017) and also translators/interpreters' development of proficiency in the use of modern technologies (Bowker & Marshman 2009; Samson 2005). Some authors (Biel 2011) argue against training translator competence at the expense of translation competence because they consider the latter to be absolutely fundamental for translator training (see also Pan et al. 2017:131). However, Kiraly (2013, 2015) expresses his growing belief in the emergence of translator competence most probably due to translator's embodied involvement in what has come to be known as AUTHENTICITY. In line with Kiraly (2003), Fernández Prieto & Sempere Linares (2010), presenting new directions for translator training through advocating the usefulness of a SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH in shifting in focus from translation competence to translator competence, argue that the latter includes the former (as the focal point of traditional approaches to translator training, which are incongruent with learner/translator AUTONOMY and EMPOWERMENT, see Johnson 2003) and both are essential for translator training and should not be dissociated.

Despite the somewhat limited importance placed on the concept of competence in IS to date (Grbić & Pöchhacker 2015; Tiselius 2013c), one may think of the same distinction in the field: *interpreting* and *interpreter* competence which, according to Franz Pöchhacker (personal communication, June 28, 2017; see also Pöchhacker 2000), may come down to a distinction between aspects of the activity (i.e. interpreting) and a focus on personal qualities (of the interpreter), including cognitive, moral and affective aspects: one must mention, by way of example only, interpreters' ability to apply appropriate strategies in this respect (Kalina 2000, 2015e; Li 2015b). Such an important distinction has served as a point of departure for some authors (Wang 2018) to propose a pedagogic transition from interpreting skills to interpreter competence. Apart from that, some authors (Seresi 2016), while advocating BLENDED LEARNING courses in interpreting, believe that there are many interpreter competences, including (but not limited to) how to prepare for speeches, and how to research a given topic, that cannot be developed solely through virtual classes, and thus, the right combination of classroom learning and virtual learning is required for effective interpreter education.

Development of competence in interpreting

Similar to the current situation in TS, development of interpreting/interpreter competence is what interpreter training programs aim at (Angelelli 2013b). As for interpreting competence, it must be pointed out that it was Kalina (2000) who introduced interpreting competence in IS. As far as the development of interpreter competence is concerned, Albl-Mikasa (2013a) refers to a general consensus on its timeline comprising of three phases: general education phase; interpreter training phase; and professional on-the-job phase. In what can be called the most comprehensive account of conference interpreting to date, Setton & Dawrant (2016a), in line with Setton (2010a), analyze the important components of interpreting competence: these authors define interpreting competence as comprising *language, knowledge, skills* and *PROFESSIONALISM* (LKSP) for any setting, and, accordingly, gather the common competences in their LKSP model. According to Andrew Dawrant (personal communication, July 6, 2017), he and his co-author have developed this model primarily for the purpose of training in (conference) interpreting, but also for the purpose of testing/assessment.

Interpreting competence refers to “the congruence between task demands and qualifications” (Pöchhacker 2016:164). From a didactic perspective (also adopted to translator training by Kelly 2005), interpreting

competence is primarily characterized by the interpreter's ability to produce target speech detached from linguistic forms of source input (Setton 2006) (and consisting of such basic sub-competences as NOTE-TAKING, analysis, listening comprehension, and reformulation). Russo (2014) considers general knowledge, command of A and B languages, ability to transfer meaning, specific interpreting-related skills, and personality traits to be the most important characteristics and predictor of interpreting competence, which is also setting-specific (e.g. conference interpreting, community interpreting) (Angelelli 2013b). As it has been suggested by some authors (Korpál 2016; Schwenke 2015), and as research (Bontempo 2012; Bontempo et al. 2014; Fengxia 2015; Macnamara et al. 2011) suggests, personality traits (e.g. extraversion, willingness to take risks, and ambiguity tolerance) to be addressed through personality testing and psychometric tests (based on quantitative measurement) (Timarová 2015b) necessarily administered by board-licensed, or at least trained, professionals (Zamirato 2013), might be useful in ADMISSION TESTING for interpreters, but perhaps not more important than perceptual-motor and cognitive abilities in this respect (see Stone 2017). Braun et al. (2014a) consider interpreting competence to include preparation as a sub-skill (see also Luccarelli 2013), comprehension, production, interaction and monitoring competence. Setton (2006) considers three levels for interpreting competence: 1) *potential competence* (including linguistic and cognitive prerequisites for a novice trainee); 2) *basic competence* (i.e. the level of competence a recent graduate from a basic training program has); and 3) *all-round professional expertise* (developed through experience, self-reflection, etc.).

Role of TECHNOLOGY in translation and interpreting competence

Now, one should draw attention to the increasingly central role technology plays in translation (DeCesaris 1996; Shuttleworth 2017) and interpreting competence (Corpas Pastor & Durán-Muñoz 2018): as for the former (i.e. translation competence), one may mention the introduction of technologies (ranging from translation memories (TM), to CORPORA) into translator training programs for pedagogical purposes, including learner autonomy in e-tool selection in professional contexts (Symseridou 2018; Zaretskaya et al. 2018); as for the latter (i.e. interpreting competence), technology plays an important role in the development of interpreting competence through technology-assisted interpreting and through technology-enhanced interpreting/interpreter training platforms, e.g. in cyberspace (Skaaden &

Watne 2009). Therefore, both fields (i.e. TS & IS) must have a very definite awareness of the importance of the TPACK (Technological Pedagogical and Content Knowledge) competencies, a framework which integrates three core components, i.e. content, pedagogy, and technology, in conference interpreting, both for trainers (i.e. TRAINING OF TRAINERS), actual interpreters (Class & Schneider 2014; Diriker 2010; Orlando 2016) and translators (Angelelli et al. 2013).

Modeling competence in TIS

In TS, there does not seem to be a consensus over modeling translation competence and it has been mapped and defined from different perspectives, and various models have been proposed (only in the 1990s, not before), with some, from a didactic perspective, to be used in and as a basis for curriculum design (Klimkowski 2015; Quinci 2015), and with others, with a view to performance in the job market (with market-relatedness/market standards as a key issue in defining translator competence, see Biel 2011; Ho 2015; Hu 2018:61; Kovács 2016; Pym 2000; Sikora 2014, 2015; but see Klimkowski 2015: 54), or theoretical objectives in order to dig into translators' necessary competences (Hurtado Albir 2017).

In one of the most ambitious, and perhaps most influential, contributions ever made to mapping and researching translation competence, PACTE model defines it as all the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required for successful translating (Hurtado Albir 2017; PACTE 2001, 2003, 2011, 2014, 2015). The common problem in establishing translation competence models in general, is the multiple components and sub-components these models must have to be influential and specific (Pym 2003; Šeböková 2010).

Furthermore, there is not a dearth of models of competence in translation at all; one may mention Alves & Gonçalves (2007); Campbell (1991); Cao (1996); the European Master's in Translation (EMT) (2010); Göpferich (2009)'s model known as the *Transcomp* (the acronym of Translation Competence); Kiraly (2000); Lesznyák (2007); PACTE (2000, 2001, 2003), most of which are of a componential nature (Hurtado Albir 2010) and have been criticized as such, e.g. in Pym (2003)'s minimalist approach to translation competence. When it comes to the empirical testing/validation of models proposed for translation competence (i.e. being based on empirical studies), one has to admit, according to Hurtado Albir (2017:32), that the majority of such models have not been validated empirically, and that the psychological VALIDITY of such descriptive models of

competence, as some authors (Shreve et al. 2018) argue, is questionable. In fact, Shreve et al. (2018:50) voice their concern over this issue by asking this question: “Can empirical work demonstrate that the model and its elements describe mental processes and states?” What is more, while models of translation competence neglect the important role of elements such as soft skills (Hubscher-Davidson 2018a), there is a lack of fully developed models of translation competence acquisition (TCA) in TS (Bergen 2009; Kumpulainen 2016).

One may consider only a few models based on empirical data as exceptions to the rule in TS (Alves & Gonçalves 2007; Gonçalves 2005; Göpferich 2009; Kumpulainen 2016, 2018; PACTE 2000, 2001, 2003, 2011). It is worth noting that a number of challenges faced by many researchers involved in researching translation competence need to be taken into consideration in this respect: a lack of history of research to serve as a basis for translation competence; complex, heterogeneous and diverse nature of translation competence; difficulties regarding the essentially procedural nature of translation competence; and difficulties regarding the inclusion of the process followed in translation competence acquisition in a proposed translation competence model (Hurtado Albir 2017).

Similarly, in interpreting, different authors have proposed various competence models (e.g. Albl-Mikasa 2012, 2013a; Kutz 2010; Pöchhacker 2000; Setton & Dawrant 2016a; Wang 2016), where most (if not all) of the models are based on theoretical reflection, and focus on describing the components that make up interpreting competence.

It is worth pointing out that similarly, IS suffers from this lack of an empirically supported, comprehensive model of interpreter competence (Slatyer 2015a) despite other models (e.g. Albl-Mikasa 2012, 2013a) and different conceptualizations of this type of competence (e.g. see under *INTERPRETING ENACTMENTS*). As far as empirical testing/validation of models of interpreting/interpreter competence is concerned, according to Elisabeth Tiselius (personal communication, July 6, 2017), since IS is a heterogen and less mature field than its older sister field, TS, and even there is not an empirically validated overview of what interpreting/interpreter competence consists of, that does not seem to follow a similar trajectory. This condition may be accounted for in several ways: authors such as Franz Pöchhacker (personal communication, July 2, 2017) and Andrew Dawrant (personal communication, July 6, 2017) rightly argue that a great deal hinges on how one would possibly define the rather elusive concepts of ‘empirical testing/validation’ and ‘model of interpreting competence’ in this specific context. According to Nadja Grbić (personal communication, July 7, 2017), while TS scholars have been working theoretically and empirically

on the topic of competence for quite a long time, IS scholars have focused on individual interpreting skills. In an attempt to explain the possible reason(s) for this different trajectory, Sylvia Kalina (personal communication, July 19, 2017) refers to the innate difficulty of conducting empirical studies in interpreting, and, therefore, to the preference for experimental studies instead.

However, one may note at least four noteworthy exceptions in this respect in IS: possibly being one exception to the rule, Michaela Albl-Mikasa (personal communication, July 13, 2017) points out that her model of interpreter competence (Albl-Mikasa 2012, 2013a) is based on introspective data from professionals, and therefore, can be said to have an empirical basis, although not one in terms of a robust methodological approach. A second possible exception is the model of interpreting competence by Setton & Dawrant (2016a). Andrew Dawrant (personal communication, July 6, 2017) also describes his LKSP model, co-authored with Robin Setton, as “an empirically validated model of interpreting competence” provided that 1) we accept that a model is a simplification of a complex phenomenon (such as interpreting) useful for a given purpose; and 2) we also accept that (empirical) task analysis (on which their model is based) and error attribution (which means many, if not most, defective interpretation performances can be reliably attributed to deficiencies in specific LKSP subcomponents) constitute what is called *empirical validation*. A third possible exception to the rule is the descriptive model of interpreting competence development by Wang (2016). Binhua Wang (personal communication, July 23, 2017), adopting a similar position to that of Albl-Mikasa (see above), argues that since typical approaches to empirical study include not only experimental study, but also observational study, and since the study on which the model is based, is a longitudinal one, it can be regarded as an evidence-based model of interpreting competence, though it calls for further validation with experimental methods. A fourth possible exception to the rule is Veerle Duflou (2016)’s innovative approach to interpreting competence as well as expertise: it is necessary to clarify two points here: firstly, Duflou uses the concept of competence in the broad meaning of the UNESCO definition, based on which competence refers to ‘knowledge, skills and personal characteristics needed to satisfy the special demands or requirements (of a practice or profession) (UNESCO-International Bureau of Education 2007, cited in Duflou 2016:20); secondly, special attention to context is a central concern of her ethnographic study of conference interpreting, which positions it firmly within the ‘social/sociological turn’ in IS (Veerle Duflou 2016:11-12) influencing new pedagogical approaches in interpreter pedagogy and

education, and, in terms of TS taxonomy, it is a classic ethnographic-approach-based study on conference interpreting, which uses field observation and documentary material, and contributes to a 'sociology of translators, rather than of their products' (ibid:13). As a matter of fact, Duflou's work is a rare case, which addresses interpreter expertise from a sociological perspective, which, along with a cognitive perspective, forms the core of gaining expertise (see Sunnari & Hild 2010). Although Duflou, a qualitative researcher on interpreting, describes her aim as similar to that of other qualitative researchers, i.e. looking at a phenomenon from different points of view and offering multiple interpretations, rather than imposing a single true way of seeing/viewing, and therefore, she prefers to avoid using the term 'model' here for her research findings on interpreter competence (Veerle Duflou, personal communication, August 7, 2017). She herself describes her approach as "a context-dependent approach/ conceptualization of interpreting competence" and describes the insights resulting from her ethnographic research as "empirically grounded", rather than "empirically validated using statistical sampling", because, as she (Veerle Duflou, personal communication, August 3, 2017) points out, for many qualitative researchers, including her, the concept of 'validity' is considered inappropriate to evaluate qualitative studies (see, among others, Guba & Lincoln 1994). As clearly shown in the discussion above, compared to what we have in IS, models of translation/translator competence may be said to be better grounded in empirical investigation, and this highlights the importance of this area yet to be explored by researchers in IS.

Professional competence in translation & interpreting

The term professional competence, which has its roots in work psychology (Boyatzis 1982, 1984; McClelland 1973; Spencer et al. 1994), refers to the level of ability certified with regard to qualifications and compliance with technical and professional standards and codes of practice. The development of professional competence in translators and interpreters has already been addressed (see special issue of *TIS* 9 (1), 2014). According to Kiraly (2000), professional competence can be applied to translator's work, and in this sense, can perhaps refer to two separate/distinct but interrelated sub-competencies: expertise and professionalism, an important distinction also made by Sirén & Hakkarainen (2002) regarding translation. In IS, trainers' professional competence is one of the basic tenets of interpreting pedagogy (Sandrelli 2015b). Furthermore, professional competence is one of the assets of interpreters: for instance, in conference interpreting, one may mention interpreter's knowledge about the staff and participants and the

roles they play, their seating arrangements, the purpose the documents related to the assignment serve and the so-called *booth behavior* (i.e. entering the booth and respecting social obligations such as apologizing for being late, or remaining silent when a colleague is on air), which may serve as multiple components of the interpreter's professional competence (Dufrou 2016).

Instrumental competence in translation & interpreting

This term refers to a type of competence consisting of predominantly procedural knowledge of using documentary resources of all kinds and new technologies applied to translation, including, among others, computer-aided/-assisted translation (CAT) tools (see Corpas Pastor & Durán-Muñoz 2018; Plaza Lara 2016) often referred to as *translation memory systems* (e.g. translation memories, terminology management systems (TMS), corpora, web translation tools, corporate computer-aided translation systems, etc.) dictionaries and encyclopedias (Hurtado Albir 2017; Kelly 2005; PACTE 2001, 2003) as well as to interpreting, in the form of computer-assisted interpreting (CAI) tools (see Corpas Pastor & Durán-Muñoz 2018; Plaza Lara 2016), e.g. DIGITAL PEN technology for consecutive interpreting (see Orlando 2010, 2014, 2015, 2017; see also Fantinuoli 2018).

Assessment of competence in TIS

The first important step in the assessment of competence in TIS, as is the case with all other constructs, is to operationalize it in terms of observable skills or sub-competences, e.g. by attempting to simply define it or to model it. Apart from that, assessment of competence in TIS (often used interchangeably with the term quality assessment) may be undertaken through such processes as ACCREDITATION and/or CERTIFICATION. Recent research findings point to the necessity of adopting process-oriented approaches to assessment of translation competence (see Cheng 2019). Accordingly, assessment of competence in translation may be materialized through relying on declarative abilities of tested subjects in the form of frequently discussed methods such as *TAPs* (used in cognitive research and usually accompanied by questionnaires borrowed from sociology); through the so-called *retrospective interviews*; through *real-time observation* of the translation process either directly or through translation protocols (Šeböková 2010). Along the same lines, one must mention recently developed methods of assessment, a subbranch of translator training under applied translation studies in Munday's (2016) expansion of Holmes'

(1972/1988) map of TS, such as the Calibration of Dichotomous Items (CDI) and the Preselected Items Evaluation (PIE) in assessment of translation competence. As for interpreting/interpreter competence, the assessment or certification may be undertaken, according to Robin Setton (personal communication, July 6, 2017), at various levels from potential competence for program admission to advanced, mature professional competence- by a range of methods from intersubjective panel assessment through client testimonials, peer sponsorship (as required e.g. by AIIC, see Liu 2015b; Pöchhacker 2016:167) (see also Setton 2010b:68; Setton & Dawrant 2016b:378), years of experience, etc. There is also the debate about objectivity and subjectivity of competence assessment in TIS: recently some authors (Eyclomans & Anckaert 2017:51) advocate subjectivity in assessment at the expense of the futile idea of objectivity, provided that translation assessment practices fall within a sound methodological framework that suits subjective TRANSLATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT (TQA), “with the measurement error being calculated, expressed and controlled by means of a reliability coefficient”.

COMPETENCE-BASED TRAINING

Definitions

The term COMPETENCE-based TRAINING refers to a new pedagogical approach/MODEL to teaching, learning and ASSESSMENT, which has gained support since the 21st century, and focuses on training one skill after another until the trainee can build and enhance his/her own competences in a training program, regardless of the time needed to complete the program. Competence-based training has been developed for the purpose of ensuring high levels of competence for a successful performance (Eraut 1994).

Competence-based training in TIS

Discussing and proposing its applications to teaching translation and translator training as a process of turning students/trainees into potential translators, Hurtado Albir (2007, 2008, 2015a, 2015b, 2018), in line with many other authors (Bestué & Orozco-Jutorán 2016; Cerezo Merchán 2019; Dungan 2013; Galán-Mañas & Hurtado Albir 2010, 2015; Sánchez Ramos & Vigier Moreno 2016; Way 2008), points out that competence-based training, as a type of learner-/student-centered and process-oriented approach, views competences as the main yardstick for developing guidelines in CURRICULUM DESIGN, and proposes an *integrated* model for

teaching, learning and assessment with a strong focus on **FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT**. Within the framework of competence-based training as applied to translator training, assessment is an essential element of curriculum design directly linked to learning objectives, competences and tasks (De Higes Andino & Cerezo Merchán 2018). Some authors (Sakwe 2017) prefer to use the term competence-based **EDUCATION** instead, and discuss some challenges that lie ahead (in terms of teaching and assessment) and need to be addressed, along with their pedagogical implications for the successful implementation of competence-based curriculum. Competence-based training has also been advocated and applied to interpreter training (see Hammer & Van den Bogaerde 2017), and some authors (Wallace 2019) have proposed a hybrid model of competence-based education and assessment with regard to court interpreter **CERTIFICATION**.

COMPLETION

The term completion refers to a micro-**STRATEGY** in interpreting, using which the interpreter, upon receiving certain bits of information, memorizes and stores them to be retrieved and vocalized later (Kader & Seubert 2015).

COMPLEXITY SCIENCE → COMPLEXITY THEORY

COMPLEXITY THEORY

Alternatively called *complexity science*, or *dynamic systems theory*, or abbreviated as *complexity*, the term complexity theory contributes to a very cogent understanding of ideas of continuity and change through the notion of **EMERGENTISM**, and offers insights into it. It is an essentially descriptive, pragmatic in its philosophical orientations, theory developed principally in physics, biology, chemistry and economics, but somehow unknown in the social sciences. Complexity theory, in general, can be defined as a conceptual framework for the study of complex systems, organizations, etc. and analyzing their behavior and multiple interacting (in a non-linear manner) components (see also Harris 1993).

One of the key concepts which stems from complexity theory is emergentism, based on which learning is a process of emergence within complex theory (Mason 2008b; Morrison 2008). It is worth noting that the relevance of both complexity theory and emergentism to TS is discussed and highlighted by some authors (Marais 2014) and it has been adopted by Kiraly (2013, 2014, 2016b) to translator **EDUCATION** (see also Canfora 2016). In an attempt to give a true picture of the nature of emergentism from

a complexity perspective, Mason (2008a:9), in line with Morrison (2008), points out that it is as a result of these interacting components of complexity theory that through time, things start to emerge.

As far as CURRICULUM is concerned, it is worth noting that a complexity-based curriculum, with a special emphasis on such important concepts as networks, relationships, and FEEDBACK, is dynamic, emergent, rich, relational, autocatalytic, self-organized, open, existentially realized by the participants, connected and recursive, with the teacher assuming the role of a facilitator, co-learner, and co-constructor of meaning, and with the learner exercising AUTONOMY, responsibility, ownership, self-direction and self-reflection (Morrison 2008).

However, complexity theory has its adherents (e.g. Kramersch 2008, 2012; Morin 2005) and its critics; it is not without specific challenges: Morrison (2008) discusses the serious challenges complexity theory may present to the philosophy of education: complexity theory, while offering an explanation for change and evolution, is essentially a post hoc explanation, and therefore, limited in its perspective and elusive, and lacks responsibility or accountability in the long run; unlike education, teaching and learning, complexity theory has been largely silent on justifying values such as commitment and morals, and normative activities (see also Mason 2008a); complexity theory is potentially relativistic as it suggests that what is right at any moment is what works at that time to ensure survival; doubts exist over potential added value of complexity theory for the purpose of analyzing education; complexity theory raises significant challenges to positivism (which is a traditional paradigm aiming to capture one true meaning of an utterance); complexity theory takes the capability of participants and their willingness to experience freedom, autonomy, self-organization, unpredictability and non-linear learning for granted; complexity theory under-theorizes power, or its lack: this, however, is not compatible with traditional instruction with its own rules (e.g. obedience, passivity, unequal power, etc.); unpredictability of learning and teaching in complexity theory raises difficult issues of responsibility; complexity theory lacks clarity regarding whether what it aims for is surviving in an unfriendly world, or simply a call for improved learning; and last but not least, complexity theory advocates holism, autonomy and creativity: in this respect, it lacks clarity regarding the boundaries of the concepts it presents.

COMPRESSION

The term compression refers to a micro-strategy (or meaning-based STRATEGY) in interpreting, using which the interpreter produces a target

text by reducing the information in the source text through rendering only the main ideas or macrostructure of the source text (Kalina 2015c; Setton & Dawrant 2016a). Interestingly, it is possible to hypothesize that using the strategy of compression is linked with directionality in interpreting, i.e. interpreting from A to B usually involves a great deal of compression and generalizing, with the interpreter using less extensive linguistic resources (Jänis 2002). It should be added that the strategy of compression, used in different interpreting settings (except for legal interpreting, where accuracy of information rendered is of utmost importance), and in simultaneous, consecutive and sight interpreting/translation modes (Li 2015b:174), has been advocated as an essential element of interpreter TRAINING (see Cheung 2007; Kalina 2015c).

COMPUTER-AIDED/-ASSISTED TRANSLATION TOOLS→ CAT TOOLS

COMPUTER-AIDED/-ASSISTED INTERPRETER TRAINING

Exemplified by such innovations as IVY project, computer-aided/-assisted interpreter TRAINING (CAIT), as a field of IS on its own, is a representation of using information and communication technology (ICT) in interpreter training (Berber Irabien 2010a, 2010b; Fantinuoli 2018; Gran et al. 2002; Kajzer-Wietrzny & Tymczyńska 2014; Lim 2013; Russo & Alonso-Araguás 2017; Sandrelli 2007, 2015a, 2015b; Sandrelli & de Manuel Jerez 2007; Tripepi Winteringham 2010; see also Pöchhacker 2016:198-199). The pedagogical rationale behind CAIT, developed in the mid-1990s, is the interest in training interpreters online and it being advocated as a useful integration into, not a replacement of, traditional methods of teaching and learning of interpreting (Gran et al. 2002; Jiménez-Crespo 2009; Sandrelli 2007, 2015b; Sandrelli & de Manuel Jerez 2007; see also Moreno et al. 2011). CAIT, the development of which is “influenced by both technological progress (e.g. in audioconferencing and videoconferencing TECHNOLOGY; or in CAI tools such as Black Box, see Costa et al. 2014) and trends in pedagogical theory” (Sandrelli 2015b:113), basically aims to improve the QUALITY of classroom teaching and learning, to contribute to learner AUTONOMY, and to promote SITUATED LEARNING as a key pedagogical MODEL and principle in interpreting PEDAGOGY, through creating a working environment with the aid of technology and as similar to real-life working environments of interpreters as possible (Sandrelli 2015a, 2015b).

In adopting CAIT to teaching interpreting, what is of paramount importance is trainer's key decision about what parts of the training can be best done in person, online synchronously, or online asynchronously, in line with the objectives of the COURSE/program (Santamaría Ciordia 2017): e.g. Lee (2018) asserts that CAIT can be an option to be incorporated in the provision of FEEDBACK. Sandrelli (2015b:118-119) points out that there are several reasons for trends towards teaching interpreting online: technological progress; university budget cuts on interpreter training courses; increasing demand for training in public service interpreting (see Valero-Garcés & Tipton 2017) in terms of the accessibility of qualified trainers and students' preference for BLENDED LEARNING or even a distant learning course (whether stand-alone or series).

CONCURRENT VALIDITY → VALIDITY
CONCURRENT VERBALIZATION → THINK-ALoud
PROTOCOLS

CONDENSING

The term condensing refers to a micro-STRATEGY in interpreting, using which the interpreter attempts to leave some source text information (i.e. redundant information) implicit in the target text (Dam 1993; Kader & Seubert 2015; Sunnari 1995). In other words, using this strategy, the interpreter is not saying it all. Faced with a fast speaker (who may be reading a text fast), the interpreter may try opting for and rendering only the most important messages; this type of condensing is termed *prioritizing* (see Kader & Seubert 2015).

CONDUIT APPROACH → TRANSMISSIONIST APPROACH
CONSECUTIVE PEN → DIGITAL PEN
CONSTRUCT → TEST CONSTRUCT

CONSTRUCTIVISM

Definitions

Presumably dating back to thousands of years ago (Greek times), the term constructivism, as a philosophical perspective and based on transformationist approaches, refers to constructivist ideas sometimes assumed to have been first proposed by Immanuel Kant, who described the mind as an active

organ, which transforms the chaos of experience into orderly thought (see Pritchard & Woollard 2010). In educational psychology, constructivism, as an educational paradigm, is based on the notion that knowledge is actively constructed by learners (see e.g. Prawat 2008). This said, it can be added that the constructivist MODEL of learning, the real development of which can be placed in the 20th century presumably through the pioneering work of Jean Piaget, suggests that constructive learning is an individual matter, with each individual building an idiosyncratic version of reality based partly on identical experiences but shaped by individual experience and, importantly, upon an individual's prior knowledge, understanding and experience (Pritchard & Woollard 2010). Clearly, such a view of learning supports a learner-/student-centered approach to CURRICULUM and SYLLABUS DESIGN, an approach, in turn, encouraged in the current European Higher EDUCATION Area (EHEA) framework (see Presas 2012; Sánchez-Gijón et al. 2009:108).

Constructivism in TS

In TS, it was Don Kiraly who initially adopted a cognitive and psycholinguistic approach to translator TRAINING (see Kiraly 1995), but later developed an approach to translation PEDAGOGY based upon constructivist principles of learning, and first added the 'social' variant to constructivism and systematically developed the so-called *SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH* to translator education in his seminal book (Kiraly 2000). Later, he, while developing his own thinking, moved beyond (but did not discard) this one camp of constructivism. He is currently focusing on EMERGENTISM, argues for an emergentism-based dynamic translator training curriculum (2016b), and is involved in the application of this epistemological trend to translator education (see Kiraly 2013, 2014, 2016b; Kiraly & Piotrowska 2014). Recent research shows that the application of constructivism to translation teaching may be useful (see e.g. Ebrahimi 2013), as, e.g. implemented through constructivism-based education strategies such as PROBLEM-BASED LEARNING (PBL) in translator training (see García González & Veiga Díaz 2015).

CONSTRUCT VALIDITY → VALIDITY

CONTENT VALIDITY → VALIDITY

CONTINUOUS/CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (CPD)

The term continuous/continuing professional development (CPD) generally refers to the process of maintaining, developing and broadening knowledge, skills, experience, and understanding through participation, as a professional and on a formal or informal basis, in TRAINING programs, conferences and beyond, throughout one's professional career.

CPD, with regard to which PROFESSIONALIZATION of interpreting plays a prominent role (Hertog 2013), is considered an increasingly important component of translator (Chan 2013a) and interpreter (Pöchhacker 2016:205; Tipton & Furmanek 2016, ch.1; Webb & Rabadán-Gómez 2016) CERTIFICATION, and teaching of interpreting (Wilson 2013). CPD comes in different forms of programs and courses, seminars and workshops based on specific needs, and can be required for maintaining certification, e.g. by the widely recognized Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID).

CONVERSATION-ANALYTIC ROLE-PLAY METHOD

The term conversation-analytic role-play method (CARM) (www.carmtraining.org) refers to an innovative approach to role playing and the teaching of dialogue interpreting in general developed by Stokoe (2011a, 2011b). CARM, 'based in the empirical study of institutional materials' (Stokoe 2011a), is contrasted with more usual and traditional ROLE PLAY methods. In this method, the first turn of a recorded conversation is played to the audience, and they are expected to discuss it and formulate next turns (see also Niemants & Stokoe 2017).

CORPORA → CORPUS

CORPUS

Definitions

The term corpus (pl. corpora), from Latin *corpus* meaning 'body', refers to a collection of written texts held in electronic form and assembled from electronic resources according to specific design criteria (Kenny 2009; Laviosa 2010). Corpora are the object of study in corpus studies which, adopting a usage-based approach to language studies, present a powerful instrument for analyzing linguistic differences and stylistic norms in an objective way (Baer & Bystrova-McIntyre 2009).

Corpora in TIS

A corpus comes with the necessity of containing authentic data. Hence the idea for authentic corpora (Stubbs 1996) in TS (Kenny 2009) and in IS (sometimes called *authentic interpreting corpora*), i.e. empirical data from performance at real-life events (Setton 2011), research on which can be facilitated because of the availability of transcripts and video recordings which, in turn, can be limited due to such critical issues as confidentiality. The bulk of evidence from translated and interpreted texts in corpus format has contributed to the establishment and development of corpus-based translation studies (CTS) (Baker 1993) and corpus-based interpreting studies (CIS) (Shlesinger 1998), respectively. The development of the latter, now a booming research field (see special issue of *inTRAlinea* 2018), has been less advanced than that of the former since early stages (Bendazzoli & Sandrelli 2009) due to influential factors such as access to authentic data, transcription of spoken language features, and multilingualism, among others (Bendazzoli 2015). Mention must also be made of the emerging paradigms such as corpus-based dialogue interpreting (DI) studies (see the special issue of *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 22, 2017).

It must be pointed out that both CTS and CIS, altogether termed corpus-based translation and interpreting studies (CTIS), are focused on two main corpus typologies differentiated based on languages and text types involved: 1) monolingual comparable corpora (i.e. two collection of texts in the same language similar in all respects but for the existence vs. absence of a constraining source text); and 2) (bilingual) parallel corpora, i.e. (transcripts of) source texts and corresponding target texts (see Bernardini & Russo 2018).

In TS, typical examples of corpora include (but are not limited to) the monolingual Translational English Corpus; the bilingual New Corpus for Ireland; and the parallel Europarl Corpus.

In IS, typical examples include (but are not limited to) EPIC (European Parliament Interpreting Corpus); its extension, EPTIC (European Parliament Translation and Interpreting Corpus) as an informal collaborative project led by University of Bologna; DIRSI (Directionality in Simultaneous Interpreting); FOOTIE (Football in Europe); CECIC (Chinese-English Conference Interpreting); and in dialogue interpreting, AIM (Analysis of Mediated Interaction), and ComInDat (the Community Interpreting Database).

Corpora for research in TIS

A very important and relevant point to be made here is that corpora can be used in descriptive studies (i.e. to assess similarities and differences between translation and other forms of language contact situations) (Fantinuoli & Zanettin 2015; Kenny 2009), a shift of focus (away from prescriptive studies), with implications for translator EDUCATION (Frankenberg-Garcia 2009). This means that they can be used for research purposes in TS (Dastyar 2017:38-40; Mikhailov & Cooper 2016; St. André 2018; Tognini-Bonelli 2001) and IS (Dastyar 2017:38-39). As for research, the focal points in TS, according to Bernardini & Russo (2018), have been search for textual patterning supporting hypotheses about the existence of norms (Kerremans & Temmerman 2016); hypothesized typical features or universals of translation (Frankenberg-Garcia 2009); the analysis of translation shifts (Frankenberg-Garcia 2016); and the identification of stylistic fingerprints left by translators in their work (Li 2017; Mastropiero 2018; Rybicki 2012). The focal points in IS, according to Hu (2016, ch.8), have been linguistic features of interpreted texts, and interpreting norms (Monacelli 2009; Schjoldager 1995), and to a much less extent, collocations and semantic prosody in interpreted texts (Bernardini 2016); interpreting styles (Kajzer-Wietrzny 2013; Straniero Sergio 2012); interpreting strategies and methods (Bertozzi 2018; Ghiselli 2018; Sandrelli 2018; Wang 2012); and teaching of interpreting (Gutiérrez Florido et al. 2016). What is more, simultaneous-interpreting corpora, arguably, may be used for research purposes beyond IS, e.g. in terminology research (see Cabrera 2017).

Corpora for translator & interpreter TRAINING

The idea of the effectiveness of adopting a corpus approach to teaching translation was first introduced in the late 1990s (Fictumová et al. 2017), which has focused on multilingual corpora (both parallel and comparable) in translator training (Bale 2015; Chesterman 2016:166). As far as the role of corpora, ranging from electronic, machine-readable corpora to more traditional datasets analyzed manually, in translator and interpreter training/education is concerned, many authors in TS (Bernardini 2004a; Bowker 1998, 2000; Buendía-Castro & López-Rodríguez 2013; Corpas Pastor & Seghiri 2009; Ferraresi 2016; Frérot 2013; Hu 2016, ch.7; Kübler & Aston 2010; Kunz et al. 2010; Laviosa 2010, 2016; Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2016; Lise Laursen & Arinas Pellón 2012; Marco & Van Lawick 2009; Mitchell-Schuitevoerder 2014; Rodríguez-Inés 2013;

Sánchez Cárdenas & Faber 2016; Sánchez Ramos 2016; Sánchez Ramos & Vigier Moreno 2016; Symseridou 2018; Vieira 2015; Vintar 2008; Wang & Huang 2018; Zanettin 1998; Zanettin et al. 2003) and in its much younger sister field, IS (Aston 2018; Bale 2013, 2015; Bertozzi 2018; Braun & Slater 2014; Cresswell 2018; Lindquist 2002; Spinzi 2017; Vieira 2015) advocate the usefulness of using corpora within the framework of corpus-aided translation and interpretation teaching: Bernardini (2004a) discusses three roles corpora can play in this respect: corpora as translating aids; corpora as sources of learning activities and of knowledge about the language; and most importantly, corpora as a valuable pedagogical aid/tool in CURRICULUM DESIGN, e.g. for the purpose of promoting learner AUTONOMY in interpreter (Bale 2015) and translator training (Beeby et al. 2009b; Marco & Van Lawick 2009; Rodríguez Inés 2009; Symseridou 2018); for the purpose of learner EMPowerMENT in translator and interpreter training (Angelelli et al. 2013; Aston 2009); or for the purpose of DELIBERATE PRACTICE (Wang 2015). For training purposes, corpora can be used as tools to raise students' awareness of what translation involves, e.g. the use of strategies (Angelone 2015; Frankenberg-Garcia 2016; Tsai 2015) and interlinguistic variation (Sánchez Cárdenas & Faber 2016), or to develop teaching materials (Gutiérrez Florido et al. 2016). Recent use of corpus managers in specialized translation work has been emphasized as an important element to be included not only in translator training (Chesterman 2016; Fictumová et al. 2017) but also in translator and interpreter training programs as such (Gutiérrez Florido et al. 2016).

What is more, with regard to the use of corpora in training, mention must be made of two important perspectives: 1) synergy between ICT and electronic corpora (Rodríguez-Inés 2010); 2) corpus-informed translation/interpreting-informed PEDAGOGY and its relevance to training translators and interpreters off line, or online in E-LEARNING with coherent explanations, adapting course materials, motivating instructions, and enhancing meaning in learning practices serving as its four key pillars (Vieira 2015).

In IS, with growing interest in their use for research and training (Corpas Pastor 2008), corpora can be considered as adding a new dimension to the field because they are believed to go beyond anecdotal observations and to provide data regarding e.g. issues of word frequencies, grammatical constructions, discourse patterns, etc. (Bernardini & Russo 2018:344). In IS, so far, corpora, constantly being the tool of choice in research into prosody/prosodic features (Ahrens 2018), have been exploited with the following foci: cognitive load (Defrancq & Plevoets 2018; Plevoets & Defrancq 2016, 2018); interpreter's role (Monacelli 2009); ASSESSMENT

criteria (Pignataro & Velardi 2013); coherence (Dal Fovo 2013); strategies (Bertozzi 2018; Ghiselli 2018; Liontou 2013; Liu & Hale 2017; Monti et al. 2005; Pignataro 2015; Pöllabauer 2017; Tohyama & Matsubara 2006; Wang 2012); norms (Schäffner 2017); norms and ethics (Dal Fovo 2017); discursive construction of interpreters' identity (Diriker 2004); and gender differences (Magnifico & Defrancq 2017); among others, all with implications for training interpreters in different settings.

It is worth noting that corpora present multiple challenges and methodological hurdles to both researchers and trainers: they can be challenging in terms of corpus construction, annotation, analysis (Lu 2014) and transcription of spoken language data (Bernardini & Russo 2018; Dal Fovo 2017; Shlesinger 1998) and corpus manipulation and corpus-specific limited information on metadata about interpreters, including publication dates, intended audience, etc. (Bernardini & Russo 2018; Liontou 2013). As far as translator and interpreter training is concerned (see under *ERROR ANALYSIS*), corpora are open to criticism for being particularly focused on error detection and analysis.

As far as using corpora in TIS is concerned, five important points are worth noting: 1) there is a dearth of interpreting corpora (Bernardini et al. 2018; Defrancq 2016; Hu 2016, ch.8): the two main reasons for this are orality and interlinguistic mediation as two essential features of interpreting (Bernardini et al. 2018; Hu 2016, ch.8); 2) exploiting corpora in interpreter training/education across different modes and settings is still limited (Bale 2015; Bendazzoli 2018; Defrancq & Plevoets 2018); 3), there is a need for more empirical research in order to provide more concrete findings and to demonstrate the use of corpora in pedagogical settings in TIS context (Bale 2015); 4) a relevant distinction here is that which should be made between (time-aligned) *authentic corpora* (sometimes called *authentic interpreting corpora*), i.e. corpora based on performance at real-life events and authentic interpreting contexts as an indispensable source of evidence in the quest to understand and model the cognitive processes and strategies in SI (Setton 2011) on one hand, and what is known as *learner corpora*, i.e. corpora based on trainees' performances at a classroom level (Granger 2013; McCarthy & O'Keeffe 2010) (e.g. Multilingual Student Translation or MUST project led by Université Catholique de Louvain), containing non-standard language with errors and used for training purposes, on the other: both are obviously and necessarily diverse, with the former (authentic corpora), being based on authentic texts or performance at real-life events, and with the latter (learner corpora), as applied to translator education, being an important source for form-focused instruction and data-driven learning (DDL) (Granger 2013; Tsai 2015), and for second and foreign language pedagogy as well as

second language acquisition (SLA) research (e.g. in error analysis in particular, see Bernardini & Russo 2018; Dastyar 2017:79; Tognini-Bonelli 2001) but not a reliable tool to exemplify real-life situations; 5) as Bernardini (2004a) reminds us, corpora alone cannot be relied on as far as shaping language pedagogy is concerned. Therefore, there is reasonable justification for pursuing advances in CTS and CIS through triangulation of qualitative and quantitative approaches, and also through collaboration with related fields such as Natural Language Processing (NLP) in this respect (see Bernardini & Russo 2018).

Corpora for assessment and professional practice in TIS

In addition to research and training, corpora have also been advocated in TS for their potential usefulness in TRANSLATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT (TQA) (Baer & Bystrova-McIntyre 2009; Bowker 2001; Hu 2016, ch.7; Laviosa 2010; Rabadán et al. 2009); and in professional practice of translation as CAT TOOLS for language professionals (Zaretskaya et al. 2016, 2018). In IS, the use of corpora has also been advocated e.g. through the use of CAI tools (such as corpus management tools) for the purpose of improving quality (Gran et al. 2002; Pérez-Pérez 2018); or as a basis for terminological preparation for simultaneous interpreters (Xu 2015, 2018; Xu & Sharoff 2014). However, the use of corpora regarding studying features (Castagnoli & Niemants 2018) and quality assessment (Vargas-Urpi 2012) in community interpreting has been very limited (for a rare recent case of using corpora to improve the quality of interpreting in legal settings, see Spinzi 2017).

CORRECTION

The term correction refers to a micro-STRATEGY in interpreting, using which the interpreter attempts to correct such information as false starts as articulated by the speaker in simultaneous interpreting, or to make corrections as early as he/she starts to take notes in consecutive interpreting (Kader & Seubert 2015; Kalina 1998).

COURSE

The term course, in general, may refer to a constituent element and a form of onsite and/or online delivery of content and materials on a specific topic such as lectures, seminars, etc. in a typical program, often followed by a specific or various types of ASSESSMENT. Courses in TIS context may

range from ad hoc to systematic courses, from traditional (face-to-face) classroom-based courses to short, intensive, BLENDED LEARNING (also called *hybrid*) ones (whether stand-alone or series), from college-type courses, to MOOCs (massive open online courses), to the ones in rare languages, which, in turn, involve a great amount of TECHNOLOGY, with part of the instruction offered onsite and part online, and to elective, or fully/100% online (also called *distance learning*) courses (with a good example of the latter being ASL/English interpreting BA courses in the USA) (see also Carr & Steyn 2000; Sawyer & Roy 2015).

COVERT CURRICULUM→ **HIDDEN CURRICULUM**
CRITERION-REFERENCED ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION→
CRITERION REFERENCED TESTING

CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTING

Definitions & objectives

Alternatively called *criterion-referenced ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION*, the term criterion-referenced testing (CRT), as a well-known concept in educational psychology and language testing, is credited to Glaser (1963). Criterion-referenced testing, which implies using a cut-off score, measures an individual's level of performance based on mastery of a specific set of skills in a specific area without comparing his/her performance to that of the other (Fulcher 2010; Hambleton et al. 2016; Parke 2008; Van der Linden 1982) leading to criterion-referenced tests (CRTs), i.e. tests designed to make comparisons to an absolute standard or QUALITY (Glaser 1963; Kubiszyn & Borich 2013). These tests can be used for different purposes: assessment of learning with regard to the learning objectives; assessment of skill level for entry into a particular COURSE or program; assessment of level of performance; and obtaining FEEDBACK on CURRICULUM DESIGN and assessment for a particular program to determine who is responsible for student learning (Parke 2008). As far as the requirements for measures of language ability or proficiency based on a common yardstick or common metric measure (i.e. minimum competency testing), and the requirements for measures for use in evaluating the relative effectiveness of various approaches to foreign and second language teaching (i.e. language program evaluation) are concerned, language testing scholars (Bachman & Clark 1987; Bachman 1989, 1990) point to the necessity of criterion-referenced testing.

Criterion-referenced testing in TIS

It is worth noting that the fundamental difference of approach between **NORM-REFERENCED TESTING (NRT)** and criterion-referenced testing is considered a major issue in educational measurement as related to translation and interpreting assessment (see Campbell & Hale 2003:205; Eyckmans & Anckaert 2017). Obviously, in TIS, assessors' final decision-making regarding whether they will prefer norm-referenced testing to criterion-referenced testing or vice versa, is influenced by a number of factors, especially in case of impressionistic standards among assessors (Setton & Dawrant 2016b:388), and therefore, difficult to ascertain (Campbell & Hale 2003; Setton & Dawrant 2016b). But it is worth mentioning that translator and interpreter assessment is still largely characterized by criterion-referenced testing (Eyckmans et al. 2009; Kim 2017) as a basic approach advocated by some authors in assessment in translation (McAlester 2000), e.g. in **CERTIFICATION** organizations, where, norm-referenced testing, by definition, proves to be inadequate, or in assessment in interpreting, e.g. in certification of court interpreters (Stansfield & Hewitt 2005). Similarly, criterion-referenced testing can also be suited to grading interpreter performance, especially in certification testing (Liu 2015a). Along the same lines, in interpreting, criterion-referenced testing is advocated by some authors (Angelelli 2007; Lee 2009; Van Deemter et al. 2014) as the more appropriate testing system (compared to norm-referenced testing) to be adopted to testing (medical and legal) interpreters, especially in the form of analytic rating scales shown to be pointing to high **INTER-RATER RELIABILITY** (see Lee 2009) despite the fact that such rating scales have both advantages and disadvantages (see under *assessment*).

It is worth mentioning that criterion-referenced testing, in general, presents three major challenges to assessors: 1) challenges of criterion-referenced scoring and score interpretation (how to establish a relation between test scores and behavioral referents (i.e. the criterion); 2) challenges of criterion-referenced item and test analysis (where this type of testing rarely allows for the variability of scores); and 3) those of mastery decisions (differentiating between subjects in order to select a predetermined number of best performing persons, regardless of their actual level of performance (Van der Linden 1979, 1982). In interpreter assessment, despite its usefulness in placing the candidates in training programs in terms of their ability and assessing them after they have completed the program, criterion-referenced testing does not provide a measure of academic achievement, nor does it provide information about the various social and psychological factors that must be considered along

with language ability and interpreting skills in entrance exams and/or APTITUDE TESTING (Angelelli 2007), as this type of measurement, according to Iglesias Fernández (2011:12), suffers from several specific limitations regarding interpreting/interpreter assessment: 1) it is based on vague conceptualization of traditional quality constructs (e.g. completeness, accuracy) rather than on empirical research; 2) assessors find it hard to focus on more than one quality construct in a complete rendition at the same time, and there is confusion over the exact nature of some vague quality constructs such as pleasant voice (see also Iglesias Fernández 2013a, 2013b, 2015); 3) it is not easy to clearly define the complex concept of interpreting COMPETENCE; 4) it is not easy for raters to reach an agreement over quality criteria; and 5) there is heavy emphasis on lexico-semantic accuracy at the expense of other quality criteria in interpreting assessment.

CURRICULA → CURRICULUM

CURRICULUM

Definitions & typologies

The term *curriculum* (pl. *curricula*), which, in Latin, means a kind of *path* to run in small steps, or *racecourse*, is the object of study in Curriculum Studies. Curriculum presumably first appeared in the work of John Franklin Bobbitt, a professor of educational administration at the University of Chicago (Bobbitt 1918), who intended to turn it into a professional domain. Since curriculum can refer to a broad range of educational components, defining this concept is no easy task and any attempt to provide one single definition aiming to cover all of its aspects in different contexts does not seem, at least, adequate, and may run the risk of being reductionist (see Breault & Marshall 2010). However, Sawyer (2004, 2015) considers a two-fold definition of curriculum as reflected in its psychological and philosophical foundations: 1) curriculum as a plan of action (i.e. curriculum as a process), and 2) curriculum as the learning experiences of the student/learner (i.e. curriculum as interaction). Also, curriculum can be defined, in general, as any educational program or COURSE of study with different formal, informal, and hidden components, and different ASSESSMENT and adjustment procedures in different educational institutions (e.g. schools, universities), which altogether lead to the whole body of knowledge and perhaps skills graduates acquire. In Eisner's (2002) conceptualization of the term curriculum, three major types taught in all schools are distinguished: 1) explicit curriculum, also called

formal/official/planned/written curriculum (which covers publicly explicit goals such as teaching how to read or write); 2) implied curriculum, also called *hidden curriculum* (a term coined by Philip Wesley Jackson 1968) (e.g. teaching social values); and 3) null curriculum (which leaves some elements out of the curriculum). Two other types of curriculum can be added: closed curriculum and open curriculum, with the former, referring to a basic, strictly sequenced MODEL of curriculum (Sawyer 2004), and with the latter, referring to a basic model of curriculum, which emphasizes context as an integral part of EDUCATION (Morgan-Fleming & Phillips 2010) and offers teachers greater AUTONOMY but accompanied by intense assessment (Pinar 2014). Today, any school documents, newspaper articles, or textbooks may be called *curriculum* (Marsh 2009), which must, arguably, aim to facilitate learners' access to curriculum knowledge beyond their pure experiences (Ratta & Barrett 2014), and the key to which is to create a meaningful link between plans, content of course of study, teaching and learning methods, assessment procedures, and of course, learners' personality traits (Cannon & Newble 2000).

Curriculum in TIS

Cannon and Newble's view (above) is what Angelelli (2006) and Setton & Dawrant (2016a, 2016b) relate to 'student learning outcomes' (SLOs) and (reasoned and structured) progression, respectively, as far as successful curriculum design in IS is concerned. Now, it is necessary here to clarify exactly what is meant by curriculum, and what it should include, especially with regard to TIS context. In TS context, ideally aiming to develop the core component of translation COMPETENCE in trainees for the purpose of providing QUALITY output (Magaia 2016), the curriculum (for a specialized course) codifies a recognizable body of knowledge (Venuti 2017), and besides providing important, traditional components (i.e. subjects mainly focused on practical aspects), includes extra components: medical, technological, political, translation, etc. in the field of translation practice, and community, relay, video, telephone interpreting, webcasting (i.e. delivering communicative events live to an audience via the Internet, see Braun 2006), etc. in the field of interpretation (Laet 2010:252).

Now, one should note that although different curriculum guides have appeared for interpreter education in different interpreter training institutions and settings and regarding different issues since the 1970s (e.g. Sternberg et al. 1973; or quite recently *mental health interpreting guidelines for Interpreters* 2017, and *recommendations for practices & protocols for interpreters to follow in mental health interactions* 2017, both at Monash

University), and although a few empirically evaluated models of interpreter education with implications for curriculum development and EVALUATION process have been proposed (e.g. Slatyer 2015a), some authors (Elisabeth Winston, personal communication, August 18, 2017) believe that for signed language interpreting education, there is no *curriculum* yet- just a great deal of practices that are being used, and some, rare and inadequate, evidence-based practice (see also Bentley-Sassaman 2010; de Wit et al. 2012; Swabey & Malcolm 2012b; Swabey & Craft Faber 2012; Winston 2005; but see McDermid 2009:10), which, if adequately documented, can provide important insights into interpreter education (see Cirillo & Niemants 2017; Roy & Winston 2019; Winston 2013). Other authors describe innovative approaches (in terms of structure) to curriculum design (see e.g. Marschark et al. 2005; Napier 2005b) and teaching (see Roy 2000b) in signed language interpreter training first established in the mid-1970s.

Apart from that, the rich history of American Sign Language interpreter education is also largely undocumented (see Ball 2007). The same holds true for healthcare interpreting, where currently there is no comprehensive, evidence-based, standardized curriculum (Hedding & Kaufman 2012; Hsieh 2015; Moreland & Agan 2012). However, mention must be made of recently conducted research at Monash University, which led to preparation of institutional mental health interpreting guidelines for interpreters (2017) and recommendations for practices and protocols for interpreters to follow in mental health interactions (2017).

Curriculum design & its key factors

Alternatively called *curricular design*, the term curriculum design simply refers to the demanding and time-consuming process of structuring, sequencing and assessing goals in an ongoing manner in an educational course/program. A special focus must be placed on the key principle of needs analysis (see below), which relates to such important criteria as level of students, learning objectives, learner's plan and MOTIVATION, class size, etc. for the purpose of supporting, facilitating, and influencing learning as such (see e.g. Nation & Macalister 2010; Thornton 2010).

Curriculum design, according to Nation & Macalister (2010), comprises seven factors: (1) environment analysis (aiming to research both local and wider situational factors, i.e. learners, teachers, and the situation, that will strongly affect the course in terms of goals, the contents, teaching methods, and assessment); (2) needs analysis (which sometimes includes environment analysis); (3) principles (encompassing how learning can be encouraged); (4) goals (often situated at program level and encompassing

knowledge, competences, etc. that can enable graduates to accomplish tasks); (5) content and sequencing (i.e. how the units or lessons of a course fit together in multiple ways); (6) format and presentation (aiming to choose the teaching and learning techniques and design the lesson plans); and (7) monitoring and assessment, and evaluation (aiming to decide what to test and how to test it, and to decide how to check if the course is successful and where it needs to be improved).

Needs analysis

Historically, as a curricular practice, needs analysis emerged in the 1960s as a component in the systems approach to educational development. Needs analysis, alternatively called *needs assessment* and *needs identification*, is simply the study of needs (Ornstein & Hunkins 2017). In other words, needs analysis aims to discover, through different techniques and procedures, what needs to be learned and what the learners want to learn (Nation & Macalister 2010, ch. 3; Nunan 1988).

Needs analysis in TIS

In translator and interpreter education and training, needs analysis poses questions such as “What is the goal of training translators and interpreters?” and “What is it that they are required to know?” (Keams 2006; Kelly 2005) to ensure that the course design addresses their needs (Angelelli 2017; Donovan 2006b) and that detailed information for curriculum development purposes (e.g. required competencies and knowledge sets) is obtained. As an essential component in curriculum and curriculum development across professions (Harris 2016), in language SYLLABUS DESIGN (Munby 1978; Nunan 1988), and in TS (Kelly 2005; Li 2000, 2002; Sikora 2014) and IS (Gile 2009a), needs analysis is an important form of assessment, which, interestingly enough, goes beyond learner needs, and includes, reasonably enough, those of professional staff, school, parents, and community (Ornstein & Hunkins 2017). As far as the proper execution of needs analysis as an important stage in curriculum development in translator (and of course, interpreter) training contexts (Király 1995) is concerned, it has been argued that a holistic approach should be adopted towards the individual learner and the complex and multifaceted nature of the factors involved, including cognitive criteria; social environment; goals and aspirations (Keams 2006) and of course, usability and user-friendliness, and cost-effectiveness of e-tools and resources (Bilgen 2009; Corpas Pastor & Durán-Muñoz 2018), among others.

Curriculum design in TIS

Curriculum design, a subbranch of translator training under applied translation studies in Munday (2016)'s expansion of Holmes' (1972/1988) map of TS, is a process, an essential element to which is how similar or dissimilar translation competence and interpreting competence are (Sawyer 2004). More specifically, other highly influential factors include national policy, institutional strategic plans, and staff EXPERTISE or trainer profile (see Hu 2018). In TS, curriculum design follows a number of stages: from the institutional and social context of training (as its starting point), social and market needs, competence as a learning outcome to student profiles (at various levels), program content, resources, teaching objectives and activities, and finally, to assessment and evaluation (Jääskeläinen et al. 2011; Kelly 2010a).

In a similar vein, but with a special focus on interpreter education programs varying greatly in content and scope, Sawyer (2004:91), who insists on a more humanistic approach to interpreter education and assessment, suggests five steps to effective curriculum design: 1) having a clear picture of educational philosophy and a clear outline of all the instruction objectives; 2) checking and re-checking the objectives, and sequencing skills and building knowledge to meet these objectives; 3) aligning teaching objectives with the aims and goals of the curriculum (i.e. turning students/trainees into potential translators and interpreters); 4) designing suitable forms of delivery of course and/or program content and materials with a serious effort to integrate different types of assessment; and 5) researching the curriculum with regard to issues of modeling (e.g. checking whether it is tailored to the learner/trainee's aptitudes and interests) and of VALIDITY and RELIABILITY of assessment practices (for the latter, see also Han 2015; Han & Slatyer 2016). These five stages can also apply to curriculum design in translator education/training programs.

It is important to bear in mind that one key advantage of curriculum design in translator training is that it gives us a broader perspective of translator training and its general framework (Kearns 2006). However, Kearns calls for working towards an integrated framework for thinking about translator training with a special focus on curriculum design and development. It must be added that the current absence of such thinking can pose certain challenges to translator and interpreter education: in an attempt to explain this, John Kearns (personal communication, October 17, 2017) mentions the disorganization in which translator training appeared to be taking place, with curricular decisions often being based on the whims and caprices of individual instructors or heads of departments. In his foreword

to Roy (2006), Sawyer (2006:viii) considers, in relation to teaching interpreting, a two-fold challenge to curriculum design and development: *curriculum as process* (i.e. teaching and learning in sequence), and *curriculum as interaction* (i.e. teaching and learning as social interaction) (see also Kelly 2007; Sawyer 2004).

Interestingly, as far as current curriculum design tendencies in higher education in TIS are concerned, there are growing recent trends of using ACTION RESEARCH methodologies in interpreter education, especially in curriculum design, development and implementation (Pöschhacker 2016:194; Sawyer 2006, 2015; Slatyer 2006, 2015a, 2015b), and of moving “towards learner-/student-centered learning, outcomes-based planning, and the application of the concept of competences as a basic instrument for curricular design” (Kelly 2007) complemented by other key aspects of the education process (objectives, sequencing, methodology, and assessment) (Hurtado Albir 2018), and of course, growing recent trends towards BLENDED LEARNING and ICT (Gorjanc et al. 2016; Thelen et al. 2016, sect. II). Also, some authors (e.g. Bernardini 2004a; Kennedy 1992; Rodríguez-Inés 2013) have paid particular attention to using CORPORA and CORPUS research (in need of being complemented by other methods and resources) as a valuable pedagogical aid/tool in curriculum design in translator training.

Important & under-researched elements of curricula in TIS

Now, one should draw attention to the fact that the majority of literature on curriculum for interpreters relates to conference interpreter education (Slatyer 2015a), with a lack of in-depth coverage of such important issues as cooperation in the booth or booth behavior (see Dufloy 2016), and also a lack of history in most interpreting curricula (Galindo Almohalla 2013) and a recent shift towards this area in TIS (Ortega Herráez & Iliescu Gheorghiu 2015; special issue of *Translation & Interpreting* on the history of translation & interpreting forthcoming). Furthermore, theory (the application of which to translator training is implicitly based on the ability of the theory to make predictions, see Chesterman & Arrojo 2000/2017) and its incorporation into the curriculum, e.g. through a reflexive approach (Kadiu 2017), is a much-debated topic (Cui & Zhao 2015b); what reflects a general consensus emerging from TIS in this respect (Kim 2013) is that many authors in TS (Angelone 2017; Bartrina 2005; Calzada Pérez 2005; Chesterman 2016; Gentile 1996; Gile 1992, 2009a; Hörmann 1992; Ingo 1992; Kim 2013; Lederer 1996; Lee 2006; Li 2007; Orlando 2016; Pym 2003, 2014; Rahab 2001; Schäffner 2004; Shreve 1995; Shuttleworth 2001;

Snell-Hornby 1992; Tennent 2005b; Yan et al. 2018) and IS (AIIC; Gile 1992, 2005, 2009a; Gustafsson et al. 2012; Hale 2007; Kalina 2015b; Kim 2013; Lederer 1996; Orlando 2016; Pöschhacker 1992; Roy 2000a; Sampaio 2017; Setton & Dawrant 2016b; Stern 2011b; Tennent 2005b; Yan et al. 2018), in line with ‘most curricula focusing on professional practice, and recommendations by AIIC, EMCI, CIT/CCIE and EFSLI,’ (see Sawyer 2015:99), consider theory as an important, or at least helpful, component in the curriculum, and of course, research findings (Cintrão 2010; Gile 2010:255; Ordóñez-López & Agost 2015; Penet 2018) support this general consensus in TIS.

In TS curricula, important training components include (but are not limited to) grammar courses (Mafela 2016); strategies (Shei 2018); ICT (DeCesaris 1996; Flórez & Alcina 2011); and expertise, e.g. in legal translation (see Edelmann 2017). One must also mention under-researched areas of corpora and corpus management tools (Gutiérrez Florido et al. 2016; Symseridou 2018; Zaretskaya et al. 2016); quality management and quality assurance (Thelen 2019); statistical machine translation (MT) (Kenny & Doherty 2014; see also Gao & Chiou 2018:486-487); post-editing in machine translation (Aranda 2016; Doherty et al. 2018; Flanagan & Christensen 2014; Koponen 2015), distance learning (Washbourne 2013); academic applications of TQA (i.e. teaching those skills required for handling various tasks, and familiarity with TQA measures) (Doherty et al. 2018; Moorkens et al. 2018b); and documentation skills (Sánchez-Gijón 2009), among others, as recommended components for inclusion in TS curricula. Summary translation is considered useful for translator training, especially at the beginning stages of expertise (see Chesterman 2016).

Now, the question is raised about possible and useful comments on syllabus/curriculum design and, of course, on necessary curriculum adjustments: Defeng Li (personal communication, August 18, 2017), for instance, comments that in case of talking about a translation training program, or a translation course, one may consider translation theory as an independent course, or as integrated into the syllabus possibly in the form of a few modules, respectively. What is more, Defeng Li highlights the importance of the contents: in case of training professional translators and/or interpreters, only theories for translation (and interpreting) should be taught; if the objective, however, is training TIS experts/researchers, then one should place the emphasis on theories about translation (DTS) and/or Interpreting Studies (IS). Some authors (Chmiel 2015; Napier 2006; Sawyer 2004; Setton 2006), while advocating mock conferences as an essential part of interpreter training, suggest curriculum adjustments in this respect for the purpose of ensuring AUTHENTICITY; however, mention must be made of

the fact that legal, ethical, and practical reasons make access to authentic settings where interpreter-mediated encounters are held, difficult, if not impossible, for educators, trainers, and researchers.

In a similar vein, Pöchhacker (2016:191), while focusing exclusively on curriculum in IS, points out that it guides teaching and assessment practices, and as for its contents in IS only, Pöchhacker (ibid: 193) considers such almost commonly agreed upon components as basic concepts of language and communication; language enhancement (see also Donovan 2003; Setton 2006); area studies; skill training in consecutive (see also Dam 2010; Gile 2001; Griessner et al. 2017; Someya 2017b:172) and simultaneous interpreting; (social responsibility and) professional ethics (see also Baker & Maier 2011; Brander de la Iglesia 2017; Donovan 2011; Kalina 2015a; Ng 2015; Setton 2010b; Valero-Garcés 2017; Witter-Merithew & Stewart 2004) (covered perhaps primarily in formal interpreter education programs or IEPs, see Gajewski Mickelson 2008). Also, another important element, as Mahmoodzadeh (1992), Ballester & Jiménez (1992), and Wu (2017a) argue, and Yenkimaleki & Van Heuven (2013, 2016, 2017), in line with Hale & Gonzalez (2017), show, is memory training to be included in the curriculum of interpreter training programs. One can also mention the importance of training the interpersonal skills (IPS) in the curriculum of community interpreting (Angelelli 2004; Rudvin & Tomassini 2011); signed language interpreting (Hammer & Van den Bogaerde 2017; Marschark et al. 2005); or any other interpreting setting (Angelelli 2004, 2005). The effectiveness of summary training in interpreter training is still a matter of debate (see Cheung 2007).

Contrary to what was posited in the Interpretive Theory (IT) paradigm (also known as *the ESIT model* and sometimes called the *Théorie du sens*) (Kalina 2015e:402; Pöchhacker 2016:69; Salama-Carr 2009; Setton 1999, ch.2) developed by Seleskovitch (1962, 1968), one should be aware of the importance of teaching strategies in translator (Chesterman 1996, 2000, 2016; Heydarian 2016; Shei 2018) and interpreter (Al-Khanji et al. 2000; Arumí Ribas & Vargas-Urpi 2017; Kader & Seubert 2015; Kalina 1994, 2000, 2015e; Li 2013, 2015b; Setton 2006; Setton & Dawrant 2016b:71-73; Vik-Tuovinen 2011) training curricula, and should be careful not to leave them out of the curricula. In interpreting, as recent research shows, interpreters frequently use a variety of time management techniques and strategies embedded within renditions in Video Relay Service (VRS) context (Marks 2018; Warnicke 2018; Warnicke & Plejert 2012), and skill-based and knowledge-based strategies in television interpreting (Pignataro 2011) with pedagogical implications for training. Along the same lines, one can convincingly argue for the inclusion of somehow neglected

psycholinguistic aspects of interpreting (e.g. stress coping strategies) into (mainly conference) interpreting curricula (see Jiménez Ivars & Pinazo Calatayud 2001; Korpala 2016), and of course, for not leaving corpora and corpus management tools (Gutiérrez Florido et al. 2016); CAI tools (Fantinuoli 2018); and simultaneous with text (along with preparation and text annotation as a key task-related factor determining its effectiveness) out of the curricula (Setton 2010b, 2015a).

It is worth noting that the term *curriculum* is more often than not confused with the term *syllabus*; compared to its counterpart syllabus, curriculum, the development of which is to a large extent determined by the goals and objectives of the program, the length of training (Bao 2015) and of course, by the expertise of the curriculum developer, plays a more crucial role in translator and interpreter education and training, as it defines the type of training and assumptions about how interpreters (and translators) are trained (Cynthia Roy, personal communication, August 15, 2017).

Curriculum evaluation

As far as the controversial issue of curriculum evaluation in pedagogical settings in different fields, including TIS, is concerned, one must mention that it varies greatly in content and scope, and that it can be done for different purposes ranging from instructor's informal assessments of students' learning (FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT) to standardized tests given at the termination of a curriculum (SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT) to measure and compare student intended learning outcomes (ILOs), with pedagogical implications for curriculum design, adaptation, revision, policy, etc. (Schoonmaker 2010). Sawyer (2004:6-7), while adopting a holistic view of curriculum and suggesting a framework based on the concepts of *curriculum as process* and *curriculum as interaction*, calls for strengthening the relationships between curriculum and assessment, and points out that having access to an efficient and useful curriculum informed by specific research methodologies requires adopting an integrated approach to issues of curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and assessment, with one feeding back into the other. One important concern for Sawyer (ibid:95) in this respect is validity, as he emphasizes that validity is a crucial element of establishing a close link between curriculum and assessment.

**CURRICULUM/CURRICULAR DESIGN→ CURRICULUM
CUT-OFF SCORE→ CUT SCORE**

CUT SCORE

In language testing, the term cut score, alternatively called *cut-off score*, is a frequently used estimate in CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTING (CRT), and a predefined observed score on a criterion-referenced test that will be used as a minimal criterion for categorizing/correctly classifying test takers in terms of their mastery level, unit of instruction, or possibility to graduate from a language program. In other words, a cut-off score simply differentiates between passing and failing grades (Bachman 1990, 2004; Fulcher 2010; Gipps 1994). One must mention the importance of standard setting in connection with cut scores and professional practices as a basis for standard setting, for which different options exist: 1) to choose an appropriate standard setting method; 2) to choose judges or groups of judges who have a stake in the decisions being made; 3) to clearly describe all performance categories and candidate groups so that they will be suitable for making unambiguous judgments; 4) to judge TRAINING regarding the chosen standard setting method; etc. (see Brown 2013).

DÉCALAGE → TIME LAG

DECLARATIVE KNOWLEDGE

The term declarative knowledge refers to what one needs to know. This term typically appears in the DECLARATIVE KNOWLEDGE/PROCEDURAL KNOWLEDGE distinction as part of the conceptual apparatus of EXPERTISE studies in cognitive psychology, and despite most formal translator TRAINING curricula being oriented towards transmitting this type of knowledge to trainees (Shreve 2002), it is still a disputable issue in translator and interpreter training. As Shreve (2006), in line with PACTE (2003, 2011, 2014, 2015) and from the perspective of expertise studies, points out, translation COMPETENCE (TC) could be, from a cognitive perspective, interpreted as declarative and procedural knowledge available to the expert translator (see also under PACTE MODEL), and thus the distinction between these two types of knowledge is relevant for translation processing and translation PEDAGOGY (Wilss 1996, 2008). Alves (2005) argues in favor of a balanced interaction between the explicit aspect (i.e. declarative knowledge) and the implicit aspect (i.e. procedural knowledge) in translator training. In translation and interpreting, declarative knowledge includes knowledge such as domain-specific concepts and vocabulary.

DELAYING RESPONSE → STALLING

DELIBERATE PRACTICE

Deliberate practice, as an important feature of EXPERTISE studies in general, and as an essential requirement of expertise in particular, in any profession (Anderson 2015, ch.9; Diamond & Shreve 2017; Ericsson 2006; Ericsson et al. 1993, 2006), including translation (Kumpulainen 2016; Shreve 2002, 2006) and interpreting (Hoza 2016, ch.9; Setton & Dawrant 2016a, 2016b; Tiselius 2013b, 2013c), can be defined as practices or activities that have specific targets and are designed and/or planned to improve the current level of performance or excellence in certain skills through repetitive practice (Ericsson et al. 1993; Rousmaniere et al. 2017). Others (Hambrick et al. 2014) have shown that deliberate practice is not sufficient to explain individual differences in expert performance, and other potentially relevant explanatory factors such as heritable traits and task and situational factors must also be taken into consideration in this respect. Deliberate practice is an essential component of the PEDAGOGY of any interpreter TRAINING program, as it contributes to high QUALITY of practice within an organized and planned framework, in the right sequence and with adequate repetition designed to hit specific targets (Bao 2015) and engages learners in self-regulation, and serves the purpose of embedding interpreter's self-training (Chládková 2017). Interestingly, many translation (Kumpulainen 2016; Shreve 2002, 2006; Whyatt 2018) and interpreting (Aldea 2008; Behr 2015; Moser-Mercer 2005a; Moser-Mercer et al. 2005; Motta 2011; Seleskovitch & Lederer 2001) scholars and also researchers in the field of expertise studies interested in interpreting (e.g. Ericsson 2000) believe that translation and interpreting as a highly skilled multi-tasking cognitive activity is acquired through deliberate practice.

Four important points are worth noting here: 1) the idea of teaching deliberate practice believed to contribute to expertise in performing interpreting skills (Motta 2011) has become a prevalent theme at least in interpreting CURRICULUM, as deliberate practice, with educator and/or PEER FEEDBACK on performance as its core (Shreve 1997, 2002; Tiselius 2013c), may facilitate bridging the gap between graduation and CERTIFICATION (see Schafer 2011); 2) research (Tiselius 2013a, 2013b) indicates that experienced interpreters (perhaps except for those aiming towards passing ACCREDITATION tests) do not engage in deliberate practice the same way as other professionals, and accordingly, conditions of deliberate practice may not be as readily realizable within the language industry as they are in academic settings (Angelone & Marín García 2017); 3) to date, the important, elusive concept of deliberate practice has not been given enough importance in translator and interpreter EDUCATION and training (Tiselius 2013c) and its impact on expertise, perhaps through

enhancing learners' meta-reflection level (Alves 2005), has received scant attention in empirical studies in TIS (Tiselius 2013a, 2013b; Tiselius & Hild 2017); 4) Setton & Dawrant (2016b:48, citing Shadrick & Lussier 2009) summarize and adapt the key features of deliberate practice to interpreter training context: repetition; focused feedback; immediacy of performance; deliberate practice within the format of short performances, rather than nonstop activities; deliberate practice with a special focus on difficult aspects of performance; engaging in activities designed and/or planned to help learners overcome their weakness in performing interpreting skill; conscious focus on specific elements in one's performance of interpreting skill in order to enhance quality; engaging in deliberate practice in order to improve one's level of performance in interpreting skill; and deliberate practice must be monitored, assessed and complemented by feedback (perhaps in different forms) from a qualified coach.

DEMAND-CONTROL SCHEMA

The term demand-control schema (DC-S), originally a job analysis method and based on Karasek (1979)'s demand-control theory useful in studies of occupational stress and burnout, refers to Dean & Pollard (2001)'s schema applied to ethical and professional multi-layered decision making in (mainly sign language) interpreter EDUCATION and ASSESSMENT (see Napier & Leeson 2015:379) as well as to other specialized settings such as legal or mental health/medical (see Dean et al. 2004b) as the two major domains falling under the umbrella term *community interpreting* (Hale 2007, 2015b; Mikkelsen 1999). The first keyword *demand*, meaning 'challenge', or 'requirements', 'refers to any factor in the assignment that rises to a level of significance where it impacts interpreting work' (Dean & Pollard 2011:162). Four types of demands are identified and abbreviated as EPI (*environmental; interpersonal*, i.e. arising from interactions between individuals present in the situation; *paralinguistic*; and *intrapersonal*, i.e. arising from within the interpreter). The second keyword *control*, being skills, knowledge, characteristics, abilities, decisions, and any other resources interpreters make use of to respond to job demands (Dean & Pollard 2005:274), is of three types (pre-assignment controls; during assignment controls; and post assignment controls, see Dean & Pollard 2011:163).

Ideally, demand-control schema is the skill of predicting, analyzing, and accurate articulation of four types of demands (see above) and mainly based on experiential learning paradigms. It emphasizes a context-based, dynamic interplay that exists between job demands and control resources interpreters

use (Dean & Pollard 2011:156) through such necessary controls as health literacy (as a key pedagogical tool in healthcare interpreter education, see Crezee 2015), i.e. anatomy and knowledge of medical arrangements, e.g. scheduling appointments; deaf patient's nodding agreeably despite not having understood the doctor's talk, a condition known as *deaf nod* (Hedding & Kaufman 2012). Accordingly, demand-control schema has been advocated as a possible component of interpreter education CURRICULUM and shown to be efficient for preparing and educating (mainly sign language) interpreters for medical and mental health settings (Dean & Pollard 2001, 2011, 2012, 2013; Dean et al. 2004b) as it, along with the OBSERVATION-SUPERVISION APPROACH, looks at interpreting as a practice profession, rather than a technical one (Dean & Pollard 2005, 2011; Dean et al. 2004a). This said, it should be added that demand-control schema, as one method of teaching interpretation, offers some great benefits, including a new look at interpreting (see Bentley-Sassaman 2010), which, it is believed, outweigh challenges such as personnel and programmatic constraints (Dean et al. 2004b).

DEMOTIVATION → MOTIVATION

DIGITAL PEN

The term digital pen, also called *consecutive pen*, is a product of the effect of digitalization on interpreting profession, and a typical example of recent technological advances that Orlando (2010, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017) introduced into IS. These pens, consisting of a microphone, a built-in speaker, 3D recording headsets, and an infrared camera, are simply used to take notes (Orlando 2010). In fact, they are used to facilitate the process of NOTE-TAKING in consecutive interpreting (Ahrens 2015a) and/or in simultaneous consecutive as a technology-assisted hybrid mode of interpreting (Pöchhacker 2015c) pioneered by EU staff interpreter Michele Ferrari in 1999. It is worth mentioning that such a potential to impact the QUALITY of interpreting has already been put to test (see e.g. Hamidi & Pöchhacker 2007), with promising results despite the need for more research. Typical examples include Livescribe Smartpen, Sky Wifi Smartpen, and Echo Smartpen.

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

The term discourse analysis (DA) may be broadly defined as the study of language in use (spoken or written) and how meaning and coherence is

achieved in communication (see e.g. Cook 2011; Trappes-Lomax 2008). Discourse analysis is a qualitative research method in TS in general, and one of the main approaches to signed language interpreting research (Napier & Leeson 2015) in particular, and as Schäffner (2013:51) concludes, this method has been used for pre-translational source text analysis in details; identification of culture-specific genre conventions; source-text and target-text comparison to assess their level of appropriateness and QUALITY, and gathering evidence of attitudes and ideologies translated from the source text into the target text. Accordingly, discourse analysis, which can be considered a shared ground in teaching translation and interpreting (Lang 1992), has been advocated as a tool for translator TRAINING in general, and for developing translation COMPETENCE in particular (Schäffner 2000; Vid & Kučič 2015), which shows that translation and interpreting are activities that are socio-culturally relevant and do not take place in a vacuum. Similarly, discourse analysis and studies have been advocated by some authors (Angelelli 2005; Angelelli et al. 2013) and shown by others (Major et al. 2012; Napier 2004; Tebble 2009; Winston & Monikowski 2000) to benefit the quality of interpreting PEDAGOGY and interpreter EDUCATION (rather than training).

**DOLMETSCHINSZENIERUNGEN--> INTERPRETING
ENACTMENTS
DUAL-TASKING--> SPLIT ATTENTION**

DUAL-TASK TRAINING

The term dual-task TRAINING refers to training an individual to develop the ability to engage in dual-task performance, i.e. performing two or more cognitive (skill-/rule-based) tasks or activities simultaneously, which often involves processing demands such as task coordination (Eysenck & Keane 2010; McLeod 1977). In cognitive psychology, some factors determine dual-task performance: 1) how similar the tasks are; 2) how often the tasks are practiced; and 3) how difficult the tasks are (Eysenck & Keane 2010). Dual-task training refers to training interpreters using the preparatory split attention exercises, in which the interpreter is trained how to comprehend what the speaker says while engaging in another cognitive task, e.g. counting aloud, simultaneously (Déjean le Féal 1997; Lambert 1989; Moser 1978; Moser-Mercer 1984; Pöchhacker 2016). Dual-task training has been advocated in the literature as a suitable form of preparatory practice for the purpose of training students how to *split their attention*, an important skill,

which, in turn, plays a pivotal role in the success of both simultaneous (Andres et al. 2015) and consecutive (Gillies 2013) interpreting.

DYNAMIC SYSTEMS THEORY → COMPLEXITY THEORY
ECOLOGICAL VALIDITY → VALIDITY

EDUCATION

Definitions

The term education, from Latin *educatio(n)*, from *educare* meaning ‘to lead/to guide’, can be defined, in general, as the systematic process of developing knowledge, skills, attitudes and behavior in pedagogical settings. Education can lead to a recognized qualification (formal education); does not necessarily lead to a recognized qualification (non-formal education); and is not structured but involves participants’ intention to learn (informal education). As far as the distinction between education and its counterpart TRAINING is concerned, one must note that these two are different concepts, arguably with the former, aiming at the development of an individual’s intellectuality, attitudes, etc., and with the latter, directed at teaching individuals how to be prepared to react to problems and engage in problem solving (see e.g. Widdowson 1984).

Education in TIS

In TIS, there is a current tension between education and training in universities (Hu 2018, sect. 5.3) despite some authors’ (Bernardini 2010) suggestions for creating a balance between the two to form competent professionals. In TS, Pym (2011) distinguishes translator training from translator education in that, the former is associated with the skills needed to achieve translation COMPETENCE (TC), while the latter is focused on students’ acquisition of a wide range of interpersonal skills (IPS) and attitudes (i.e. translator competence) (see also Washbourne 2013). It should be noted that a similar distinction has already been made in IS, where training is vocationally motivated and market-driven, while education is socially SITUATED LEARNING rooted in theoretical principles (Wilson 2013; see also Patrie 1994). One particular term that can sometimes encompass both education and training is PEDAGOGY. The overall aim of translation education as the applied branch of TS and as a constitutive feature of translation PROFESSIONALISM (Bernardini 2004b) is translation competence (TC) development in learners/trainees (Angelelli

2013b; Hurtado Albir 2017; Magaia 2016; Rodríguez-Inés & Hurtado Albir 2012; Sánchez-Gijón et al. 2009; Šeböková 2010), with a particular focus on AUTHENTICITY (González Davies 2004; Stachowiak 2016); issues of bilingualism (also applied to interpreting) (Angelelli 2013c); TRANSLATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT (TQA) (Castilho et al. 2018; Doherty et al. 2018; Kashirina 2015); and under-researched areas such as community translation (Taibi 2011, 2016b; Taibi & Zolins 2016).

Along the same vein, and also taking interpreting into consideration, Klimkowski (2015:32), citing Lörcher (2005), considers the main objective of translation and interpreting education to be helping trainees how to perform translation/interpreting skills by engaging in applying strategies to problem solving. In IS, currently most courses are focused on *training* interpreters (with regard to the development of interpreting/interpreter competence) rather than *educating* them, and clearly education is more often than not confused with *training* (Angelelli 2005, 2013b). Besides, the critical issue of education of interpreters has remained still relatively unexplored in some settings, e.g. in community interpreting in general (Gehrke 1990; Hale 2011; Lai 2018; Pöschhacker 2013; Pöllabauer 2013; Roberts et al. 2000; Stem 2011b; Taibi 2016b; Vargas-Urpi 2012), and healthcare (Moreland & Agan 2012; Ono 2013; Swabey & Craft Faber 2012; Swabey & Malcolm 2012a; see also Hsieh 2015) and signed language interpreting (Leeson 2009; Marschark et al. 2005; McDermid 2012) in particular, with signed language interpreting differing internationally in terms of stages of PROFESSIONALIZATION; provision of interpreters; and interpreter training (Angelelli et al. 2013). Therefore, the need is felt for further education in these settings. It is worth noting that quite recently, some authors (Wang 2018) have proposed a paradigm shift from interpreting *training* to interpreter *education*.

The fact remains that the one-size-fits-all approach of traditional workshops and education with a sink-or-swim methodology is considered unacceptable as far as educating translators (Kelly 2008) and interpreters (Angelelli 2000; Baxter 2013; Garzone & Viezzi 2002b; Gile 2015; Wiesman 2008) is concerned. This can be one reason for encouraging the adoption of holistic, systemic optics towards translation and interpreting education for all the parties involved (see e.g. Kearns 2008b; Salaets & Balogh 2015a), an idea echoed by Tan (2008), and earlier by González Davies (2004) in her concept of *multiple voices*. It is worth pointing out that the underlying principle for interpreter education has, for a long time, been known as *training by apprenticeship* promoted by AIIC, i.e. one specific form of on-the-job training of certain skills and knowledge transfer (from master to student) with the help of exercises similar to the ones in the

professional world (Pöchhacker 2016; Setton & Dawrant 2016a: 2016b; Stern 2011b; see also under *TRANSMISSI●NIST APPROACH*), an early approach to training described by Gile (1994b) as *pre-scientific*.

In current approaches to education of interpreters, ASSESSMENT/testing, ethics, and TECHNOLOGY are considered its other core principles (Napier 2012). Recently there have been attempts to examine different interpreter education models (see e.g. Wang 2017) and some authors (Taylor 2013) have attempted to offer practical models for interpreter education, while others (Skaaden 2017) have devoted effort to successfully integrating this know-how (i.e. practice) and know-what (i.e. theory) in a BLENDED LEARNING format as adopted to interpreter education in line with calling for a more learner-/student-centered approach (see Shaw et al. 2004). It has been shown that interpreter education may benefit from recent research into corpus-based approaches to language learning and translator training (Bale 2015), and from evidence-based approaches and pedagogy (Cirillo & Niemants 2017; Monikowski 2017; Pöchhacker 2010a; Roy & Winston 2019; special issue of *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 5 (2), 2013).

As far as interpreter education is concerned, some challenges need to be addressed, among others: 1) the challenge of offering efficient online education for interpreters, e.g. in community settings in general, and in healthcare settings in particular, where currently education is in the format of single workshops or courses rather than being part of a comprehensive approach (Bowen-Bailey 2012; Downing & Ruschke 2012), and where there is disagreement over whether community interpreting needs formal training in order to be called a profession, with repercussions on professional status, remuneration levels, and professional identity (Hale 2011); 2) the challenge of formal training of signed language interpreters not being established in many countries to date (Leeson 2009; Napier & Leeson 2015), and that of interpreters as medical specialists being sparse (Moreland & Agan 2012) and lacking a medical component (Hedding & Kaufman 2012); 3) lack of input from the deaf community (Bontempo 2012; Brunson 2018b; Holcomb & Smith 2018) quite recently researched using video technology in the *Insign project* (see Napier et al. 2018a), essentiality of this input (Winston 2005), heterogeneity of deaf community (Stewart et al. 1998), and rarity of storytelling by deaf people (Suggs 2018); 4) QUALITY interpreter mentoring (Pirone et al. 2018) and the peculiarity of the nature of FEEDBACK in signed language interpreter education, which, unlike spoken language interactions, is possible only through visual signals (Del Vecchio et al. 2015).

E-LEARNING

Definitions & key elements

The term e-learning can be defined as one form of learning and teaching that takes place at a distance from formal classroom. The courses are designed and supported by social-networking approaches and web-based technologies (Mason & Rennie 2008; Pachler & Daly 2011). In designing an effective e-learning environment, some key elements should be considered: 1) analyzing various features that the current course has; 2) engaging in team work for the purpose of efficiently designing e-learning courses; 3) basing the design on explicit underlying principles, including (but not limited to) NEEDS ANALYSIS and constant FEEDBACK; and 4) dedicating over a number of years to issues of e-learning COURSE design and implementation (Sharpe & Oliver 2007). E-learning is often interchangeably used with the term *online learning*.

E-learning in TIS

In TS, e-learning is distinguished from online learning in that, the former is defined in broad terms as using both simple and sophisticated technological tools for learning purposes, whereas the latter is simply about exploring teaching and learning only in digital environments (Secara et al. 2009). In adopting an e-learning approach to teaching translation, for some authors (Jiménez-Crespo 2009), learners' cognition and learning requires special consideration. E-learning, in combination with face-to-face instruction, is definitely a promising pedagogical tool in interpreting PEDAGOGY (Ibrahim-González 2011) and TIS pedagogy in general (Kim 2013), and there is a place and purpose for its components in interpreter TRAINING, most especially where the teacher and students are not in the same physical location, or as a means of supplementing face-to-face teaching and learning within the framework of what is called *BLENDED LEARNING* (Ko 2015); or where the automation of subskills is concerned (Maren Dingfelder Stone, personal communication, August 24, 2017). As far as the potential advantages of e-learning are concerned, Braun et al. (2013) mention the following: 1) learning at your favorite time; 2) interaction with other learners; 3) reduced costs of teaching; 4) going beyond, but not against, the traditional classroom settings; and 4) having 24-hour access to the learning environment from distance (when faculty and face time are limited). Using any type of e-learning in interpreter training requires sufficient consideration to needs analysis in training; the technical devices and software to be used; possible constraints and challenges faced by all the

parties involved, including educators, trainers and trainees (Ko 2015; see also Fictumová 2005); use of CORPORA as an online training platform (Vieira 2015); and of course, issues of online grading and feedback as facilitated e.g. through the use of MOODLE (Ibrahim-González 2011).

ELECTRONIC PORTFOLIO → PORTFOLIO

EMERGENTISM

The term emergentism refers to a major epistemological trend in EDUCATION, with a particular focus on the presence of context, which is suggested to go back in intellectual history as far as the ancient Greeks. Emergentism refers to one of the most important insights complexity theory provides. In fact, COMPLEXITY THEORY's key notion of emergence implies that, new properties, attitudes and behaviors start to emerge within an already highly complex environment, and that they are not easily predictable, nor are they 'contained in the essence of the constituent elements'. (Mason 2008b). In reaction to the existing TS approaches to translator COMPETENCE (Piotrowska 2015), emergentism, mainly characterized by unpredictability, self-organization, and self-generation (Kiraly 2015, 2016a; Morrison 2008), which are all, in turn, central pillars of complexity theory, describes Don Kiraly's emerging post-modern approach to translator TRAINING curricula and translator education in general, and emergence of translator competence in particular (Kiraly 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016b; Kiraly & Piotrowska 2014). As it guides his thinking along the lines of moving beyond a SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH to translator education (Kiraly 2014), emergentism, as one major strand of post-positivist educational thought indicating the ever-changing nature of the learning process that is sometimes unpredictable, and activation of learning potential in a non-linear fashion (Piotrowska 2015), is the basis of Kiraly's pedagogical belief system, and is of paramount importance for him in terms of developing translator competence, meaning rather than being built up or acquired bit by bit through the accretion of knowledge, emergentism creates itself through the translator's embodied involvement (*habitus*) and self-reflection in actual translation experiences (Kiraly 2013, 2014). In the context of translator education, Don Kiraly (personal communication, August 17, 2017) discusses how emergentism, stemming from complexity theory, has come to inform a post-modern understanding of learning as a largely autopoietic, i.e. self-initiating-and-perpetuating process of becoming (Kiraly 2016b; Kiraly & Piotrowska 2014), and instead of advocating the view of emergentism being the logical

successor to social constructivist approach in terms of pedagogical epistemology (an issue in need of further exploration), he points out that the former (emergentism) does not replace the latter (social constructivism); it merely expands on it (see also Kiraly 2016b:138).

EMPOWERMENT

The term empowerment, in pedagogical settings, can be defined as the process of creating opportunities for individuals to develop competence, AUTONOMY, self-efficacy, and decision-making. (Fymer et al. 1996; Lightfoot 1986). The term (learner) empowerment, originally proposed by Kiraly (2000) as a tenet of his approach to translator EDUCATION, is his well-known MODEL (which he borrowed from Paolo Freire) and an important precept in translation and interpreting PEDAGOGY (as a sub-field of TIS), as it provides a basis for translator (Kiraly 2000; Pacheco Aguilar 2016) and interpreter education (Bahadir 2011). Empowerment, while resting on the three basic principles of self-reliance, authentic experience, and EXPERTISE (Kiraly 2000, 2003a), is an underlying objective of reflective practice (Sawyer 2004) and can be thought of as what Kiraly gained by combining his social constructivist and transformational approach (Klimkowski 2015). Empowerment refers to learner emancipation, through gaining more and more autonomy and having more participation (e.g. in group FEEDBACK, see Pietrzak 2014), from teacher-centered models of education (Orlando 2016; Palumbo 2009) such as TRANSMISSIONIST APPROACH (which Kiraly 2005a, 2005b also calls *WTNS*, i.e. *who'll take the next sentence*), and his/her move towards full membership in the community of translation practice (Kiraly 2000, 2003a), which is an important objective in a call for CURRICULUM renewal in translator (Kearns 2006) and interpreter (Bahadir 2011; see also under *INTERPRETING ENACTMENTS*) TRAINING. Empowering students in translator training courses is believed to be influenced by their ethical reflections (Abdallah 2011), to which the concept of praxis generally relate (Bach 2010), and by the use of CORPORA in translator and interpreter training (Angelelli et al. 2013; Aston 2009). From a different (beyond-classroom) perspective, empowerment may be perceived by translators and interpreters as they, perhaps due to the influence of phenomena such as PROFESSIONALIZATION, develop a straightforward identity in their consideration of translation phenomena and interpreter-mediated encounters, and gain role perceptions, which may contribute to ensuring QUALITY (see Dam 2017).

E-PORTFOLIO → PORTFOLIO

ERROR ANALYSIS

Definitions & applications

It was the seminal paper by Corder (1967), which prepared the ground for the field of error analysis (EA) in second language acquisition (see Darus 2013). Error analysis is an essential approach to TQA in the comparative analysis, and a commonly used practice and (perhaps) a powerful didactic tool providing valuable FEEDBACK for all participants of the EDUCATION process. Error analysis, as used in second language acquisition (SLA), can be defined as a systematic study of learners' performance through careful examination of their errors, error types, and pedagogical justification of such errors, and accounting for what the consequences of such errors may be. Sikora (2015) considers error analysis to be an important tool and a source of three-directional feedback (i.e. for students, teachers and SYLLABUS designers). Error analysis has traditionally come to do with the investigation of the language of second-language learners, i.e. a type of bilingual comparison (Corder 1971).

Error analysis in TIS

As it has been suggested by some authors (Kiraly 1995; Pym 1992; Sikora 2015), error analysis may be a useful teaching resource in the translation didactic process (i.e. such a tool can have various applications in the education of translators, e.g. improving acquisition of skills or teaching strategies). Error analysis has also been suggested as an important approach to ASSESSMENT in translation (Kivilehto & Salmi 2017; Popović 2018; Vilar et al. 2006; Waddington 2003) and interpreting (Falbo 2002, 2015), and it is commonly used in the industry and academic translator TRAINING programs (Castilho et al. 2018) and on many CERTIFICATION examinations (Hale et al. 2012). However, as Sikora (2015:136-137) points out, adopting error analysis as an assessment instrument/tool to translation has been subjected to considerable criticism: 1) error gravity, i.e. the reason for claiming that this error is worse than that error, is a serious challenge (see Chesterman 2016:136; Johansson 1978), which may culminate in potential problems such as rater bias (Liu 2015a) as a threat to the VALIDITY of all forms of language assessment (Elder 2013), or cause problems regarding error identification; 2) one faces the complexity of cause of error identification; 3) high subjectivity and speculation is

evidenced in error EVALUATION (Kusmaul 1995; Pietrzak 2015; Waddington 2001) since an immediate observation of the translation process is not possible in error analysis; 4) error analysis aims to merely measure the defects in a translation, not to measure its positive aspects (Waddington 2001); and 5) evaluation is based on static criteria (text) rather than on process and pragmatic aspects of translation. As far as adopting error analysis to interpreting assessment is concerned, it can be added that more focus on product assessment in general, and mere emphasis on errors (coming in nearly as many error classification systems as there are empirical studies requiring an overall assessment of source–target correspondence, see Pöchhacker 2016:137) and error counting in particular, can result in misrepresenting interpreting COMPETENCE assessment as mere mathematical calculation, whereby source-target correspondence is simply overlooked or ignored (Salaets & Balogh 2015b), and this is a reminder of traditional negative evaluation of translation and interpreting (Bastin 2000). Therefore, translation and interpreting assessment cannot be undertaken by focusing only on errors (Angelelli 2018). As a possible solution to this problem, research suggests combining error analysis with the assessor's attempt to adopt a multifaceted approach to QUALITY assessment in terms of task completion to achieve more reliable results (Waddington 2001, 2003). Another way of addressing this problem can be propositional analysis: some authors (Bartłomiejczyk 2010) suggest combining error analysis with methods such as PROPOSITIONAL ANALYSIS to achieve more reliable results in interpreting assessment.

EVALUATION

The term evaluation, in general, is defined almost synonymously with the term ASSESSMENT (Ornstein & Hunkins 2017). However, in the literature on EDUCATION, evaluation can be differentiated from assessment in that the former has a subjective component and is about judging according to defined criteria, whereas the latter refers to the process of collecting evidence relative to some known objective or goal (Colina 2011). Similarly, in TS, assessment aims to measure the student's progress, to guide students and to examine the learning process, but the main purpose of evaluation, with ideational and interpersonal components serving as its two functional components (House 2013, 2015, 2018), is to judge the effectiveness of teaching (Choi 2006), and in this sense, it can be termed SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT. It is worth mentioning that Ornstein & Hunkins (2017:291) believe that evaluation in general, and CURRICULUM evaluation in particular, focus on whether it has produced the desired results or not. In IS,

some authors (Slatyer 2015a) call for scholarly attention to this role of evaluation in curriculum development.

EVIVA PROJECT

The term EVIVA (Evaluating The EDUCATION of Interpreters & Their Clients Through Virtual Learning Activities) project is a follow-up to the EU-funded IVY project, and according to its official website, refers to an EU-funded project which, using the features of 3D virtual environment TECHNOLOGY, i.e. 3D virtual worlds, videoconference-based and video-based environments (Braun et al. 2014a), 'supports the acquisition and application of skills required in interpreter-mediated communication' to help promote/foster the acquisition of digital COMPETENCE/literacy in the field of interpreting, and evaluates the education provided by all three types of virtual learning environments (VLEs) above (<http://virtual-interpreting.net>), based on two scenarios: learning individually with prepared content and learning collaboratively through ROLE PLAY (Braun et al. 2014a).

EXERCISE

Definitions

The term exercise, in pedagogical settings, refers to any type of activity, in which learners engage for TRAINING purposes and/or for self-improvement.

Exercises in IS

In IS, exercises come under the broad term pre-interpreting exercises (Pérez-Luzardo 2015; Stern 2011b), and they include (but are not limited to) 1) basic memory exercises (sometimes called *memory enhancement* or *memorization exercises*) to, by consensus, be introduced prior to NOTE-TAKING in teaching consecutive interpreting (Ilg & Lambert 1996); 2) preparatory exercises, e.g. in teaching remote interpreting (González Rodríguez 2018) as one form of technologized interaction; 3) preparatory exercises to teach interpreting strategies (Kalina 1994, 2000; Li 2013, 2015b) such as SHADOWING, PARAPHRASING, SIGHT INTERPRETING/TRANSLATION; 4) exercises targeting voice QUALITY (Flerov & Jacobs 2016; Iglesias Fernández 2015); etc. One specific type of basic memory exercises is consecutive interpreting without

notes, in line with the key principle of *incremental realism* (Setton & Dawrant 2016a:81, 2016b:xxx), in the beginning of a training program: this type of exercise, considered by some (Jin 2018) a key skill in teaching consecutive interpreting, is not, however, considered to be useful for interpreter training by others (e.g. Gile 2005), who believe that it does not reflect the true nature of interpreting, i.e. it goes against the fact that interpreters do work with notes in real-life situations.

EXPANDING

The term expanding refers to a micro-STRATEGY in interpreting, using which the interpreter adds information, content- or culture-related, to what the speaker articulates, and produces and expands the target text for the purpose of facilitating the target audience's understanding (Kader & Seubert 2015).

EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

Definitions

The term experiential learning, which according to *Wikipedia*, as a general concept, dates back to Aristotle, but as a modern educational approach, was developed by Kolb (1984), can be said to be in close connection with EDUCATION strategies such as PROBLEM-BASED LEARNING (PBL) (Savin-Baden & Major 2004:31). It should be noted that one single definition cannot do justice to the complex concept of experiential learning, and various definitions have been proposed for this concept (see Moon 2004, ch.8). Experiential learning, in general, refers to one specific process of learning characterized by learner EMPOWERMENT and knowledge creation through experiencing the learning itself (e.g. on-the-job TRAINING; field experiences; ROLE PLAY; virtual/live storytelling) and through analysis, interpretation, and self-reflection offsite or onsite (Beard & Wilson 2006; Silberman 2007).

Experiential learning in TIS

Experiential learning, as part of the paradigm shift from the TRANSMISSIONIST APPROACH (with the teacher at the center of focus) to learner-/student-centered PEDAGOGY, has been advocated (INSTB 2017) in and adopted to translator (Kiraly et al. 2016) and interpreter (Bentley-Sassaman 2009, 2010; Kiraly et al. 2016) education. In interpreter

training, experiential learning serves as the basis for some educational approaches, including DEMAND-CONTROL SCHEMA (DC-S) (Dean & Pollard 2001; see also Dean 2015); teaching interpreting in cyberspace (Skaaden & Watne 2009); SERVICE LEARNING (Shaw 2013); and ROLE PLAY.

EXPERTISE

Definitions & typologies

Expertise, viewed as the bulk of cognitive resources and skills developed through DELIBERATE PRACTICE (Anderson 2015, ch. 9; Ericsson 2000; Ericsson et al. 1993; Shreve 2006), is the object of study in expertise studies (developed in the last few decades) in cognitive psychology as the science of describing and/or understanding cognition (Anderson 2015; Hoffman & Militello 2008). Expertise refers to the specific expert knowledge developed in a specific domain at different levels and with different dimensions. Expertise has been divided into adaptive expertise and routine expertise; absolute expertise (based on the assumption that greatness or creativity arises from chance and unique innate talent, see Simonton 1977); relative expertise (based on the approach to comparing experts to novices); etc.

Adaptive expertise

Expertise, generally considered to be a multidimensional construct, is more often than not broken down into (but not limited to) *adaptive expertise* and *routine expertise*. Adaptive expertise is a type of expertise defined, from a cognitive perspective, as expert knowledge that can lead to creative flexible problem solving and to mastering novel tasks (Bransford et al 2006; Clark 2008; Ericsson et al. 2006; Hatano & Inagaki 1986). As it is and has been quite frequently compared to routine expertise outside (Clark 2008; Hatano & Inagaki 1986; Smith et al 2007; Sonnentag et al. 2006) and inside TS (Jääskeläinen 2010c; Tiselius & Hild 2017) and IS (Moser-Mercer 2008; Moser-Mercer et al. 2005; Sunnari & Hild 2010; Tiselius & Hild 2017), adaptive expertise is endowed with the distinguishing feature of transferring learning to mastering novel tasks (Hatano & Inagaki 1986) and it is called into play when experts have to move beyond their long-term memory schemas to have dynamically restructured experiences (Clark 2008). From a fairly comprehensive perspective, Smith et al (2007) consider not only *advanced knowledge structures* but also *skills at a conscious, executive level* to be the part and parcel of this type of expertise. Accordingly, seemingly

due to the special information-processing skills they have developed over time, *adaptive experts* are those who are not only efficient performers of certain skills, but are also fully aware of components and nature of these skills (Hatano & Inagaki 1986), those who are superior to others in their performance of domain-specific tasks and skills (Shreve 2002), and those who are able to effectively come up with a range of alternative solutions/strategies whenever they encounter a lack of success (Rubin 2005), with the latter also echoed by authors in IS (see Sunnari & Hild 2010). One important objective of researching expertise and expert performance is to provide (fresh) insights into the nature of expertise development (Muñoz Martín 2014). Therefore, it is worth noting that the key factors, which, arguably, play a key role in the development of adaptive expertise in general, include 1) self-regulatory COMPETENCE (Hild 2014); 2) repeated application of the skill with variations; 3) mindful processing and abstraction (Hatano & Inagaki 1986) and SCAFFOLDING (Nasir et al. 2014); 4) blending and BLENDED LEARNING (Moser-Mercer 2008), and as particularly related to interpreting, 5) development of a specific listening ability for grasping meaning, and cognitive load management (e.g. by using CHUNKING), among others (Bao 2015). What is more, individuals (including translators and interpreters) need to go through two essential learning processes in order to gain/develop adaptive expertise: firstly, developing detailed knowledge about the task domain (facilitating the execution of complex cognitive tasks); and finally, building skills in METACOGNITION (or gaining the so-called *metacognitive skills*) (Clark 2008; Moser-Mercer 2008; Smith et al 2007), to which FEEDBACK is essential (Moser-Mercer 2008; see also Shreve 1997). The concept of adaptive expertise is of such paramount importance in successful learning that Moser-Mercer (2008), a very experienced interpreting scholar, researcher, and trainer, considers it to be the sole displayer of adaptive experts' distinguishing flexibility and creativity in problem solving in interpreting, and Muñoz Martín (2014:9), a translation scholar, claims that it is only adaptive expertise, characterized by the ability to handle domain-specific novel tasks and engage in creative dynamic problem solving, that can be deemed *full translation expertise*, a claim also made by authors in IS (see Sunnari & Hild 2010).

Routine expertise

As it is and has been frequently compared to adaptive expertise outside (Clark 2008; Hatano & Inagaki 1986; Smith et al 2007; Sonnentag et al. 2006) and inside TS (Jääskeläinen 2010c; Tiselius & Hild 2017) and IS

(Moser-Mercer 2008, 2010; Moser-Mercer et al. 2005; Sunnari & Hild 2010; Tiselius & Hild 2017), routine expertise is a type of expertise that is useful for problem solving as long as one deals with fixed solutions (Hatano & Inagaki 1986) and engages in problem solving or performing skills that are commonplace to a special domain (Clark 2008).

Expertise in translation & interpreting

Reviewing its history in TS, one finds that expertise was established as a key term since the mid-1980s through the work of Holz-Mänttari (1984) (not from the perspective of cognitive psychology but implying a sense of expert translator's lack of personal, emotional, or immediately intuitive engagement in the communication process, see Pym 1998:5). Expertise is considered to lie at the core of cognitive translation, as it seeks to improve translation QUALITY, processes, and TRAINING (Muñoz Martín 2010, 2014; special issue of *Hermes—Journal of Language & Communication in Business* 57, 2018), but not, as research shows, to make translation easier as the translator reaches a higher level of experience and expertise (Sirén & Hakkarainen 2002). Tentative results of recent research (Whyatt 2018) indicate that translation expertise has a dual nature: superior performance in general meaning transfer, and in domain knowledge. Translation and interpreting expertise, likely to be developed through such abilities as meta-/self-regulation (Alves 2005; Hild 2014; Shreve 2006) as encouraged by engaging in deliberate practice (Alves 2005; Whyatt 2018), is closely intertwined with the concept of competence (Šeböková 2010), believed to develop out of it and even go beyond it despite the two seemingly (running the risk of) being (considered) equal (Tiselius 2013c), and therefore, the need for one (i.e. competence) to be substituted by the other (i.e. expertise), at least in cognitive translation studies (see Shreve et al. 2018). It should be noted that the difference between translation competence (TC) and expertise can be made explicit through a process-oriented approach to translation (Kumpulainen 2016:196), an approach which mainly characterizes the current state of mainstream empirical research on translation competence (see also under *PACTE MODEL*), with not many studies combining both process-oriented and product-oriented approaches to competence development in TS (see e.g. Quinci 2015, 2017). What is more, what links the development of translation competence with the translation process is still an under-researched area (see Angelone 2019). Finally, as far as translation competence ASSESSMENT is concerned, recent research findings point to the necessity of adopting process-oriented approaches (see Cheng 2019).

Development of expertise in translation

Expertise development, from the perspective illustrated by Kiraly (2013, 2015, 2016a, 2016b)'s multi-vortex MODEL of translator competence development, is an autopoietic process, i.e. a self-perpetuating, self-regulating process that may perhaps lead to learning (see also Kiraly & Hofmann 2016). Expertise, along with competence, has been researched mainly within the so-called *expert-novice paradigm* (Moser-Mercer 1997b, 2015b; Tiselius & Hild 2017; see also Dastyar 2017:53-54) and it is sometimes described in terms of criteria (e.g. years of experience, training publications, membership licensing, SELF-ASSESSMENT) used to identify experts. Such a definition is based on principles of *expert performance* rather than domain-specific traits of experts (Hurtado Albir 2017; Sawyer 2004). Chesterman (2016) is influenced by Dreyfus & Dreyfus (1986)'s five-stage model of progression from novice to expert (novice; advanced beginner; competence; proficiency; expertise) and adopts it to the development of translation competence in TS. The developmental progression of expertise by a variation on the terminology of the craft guilds of the Middle Ages is described by Hoffman (1997), and includes seven categories from the lowest to the highest level of expertise: 1) the naïve or naive (with no knowledge of a specific domain); 2) novice (with some minimal exposure to a specific domain); 3) initiate (with intention to move beyond minimal domain knowledge); 4) apprentice (undergoing instruction beyond the introductory level); 5) journeyman (capable of performing certain skills unsupervised but still under orders); 6) expert (a journeyman with uncommonly accurate and reliable judgments, skillful performance, and efficiently handling novel tough tasks); and 7) master (an expert at the highest level qualified to train others). As far as translator (and interpreter) EDUCATION is concerned, Kiraly (2000), who has adopted the categories presented by Hoffman, suggests that one neglected yet critical implication of expertise studies is the need for collaborative knowledge building (or collaborative learning) in an interactive context within a community of learners and teachers, an important pedagogical issue also echoed by González Davies (2005, 2018).

Interpreting & expertise

Interpreting is, as Class & Schneider (2014:164) point out, a highly complex cognitive skill developed within two key paradigms: *expertise* and *progression*, with the former, being unknown in terms of its primary mediating mechanism (Adams 2017) and going beyond mere technical

expertise (Bontempo 2012), and with the latter, being about respecting skill acquisition principles from the perspective of expertise development and characterized in cognitive psychology as following three stages: 1) cognitive stage (committing skill-rated facts to memory); 2) associative stage (gradual detection and elimination of errors in the initial understanding, and strengthening the connections among the various elements required for successful performance); and 3) autonomous stage (increasing automation and acceleration of the procedure) (Anderson 2015:211-212). Expertise, as Moser-Mercer (2005b) points out, was first introduced (albeit not by name) into IS in the late 1990s by Van Dam (1989) as part of research into analysis of cognitive components, processes and skills of paramount importance in SI within the so-called *expert-novice paradigm* (Riccardi & Russo 2013: VII-VIII). This said, it must be added that seminal articles by Hoffman (1997), Moser-Mercer (1997a) and Ericsson (2000) paved the way for the theory of expertise to enter IS (see Tiselius 2013b, 2015). It must be borne in mind that expert performance in interpreting can be said to be intrinsically related to the domain in which the specific expertise resides (Liu 2001). The so-called *domain-specific* nature of expertise in translation (Shreve 2006) and interpreting (Liu 2001; Setton & Dawrant 2016b:46; Sumari & Hild 2010) is rightly emphasized, but considered insufficient in the field (see Duflou 2016:150). Expertise is not only a cognitive process, but also a social one, during which individuals with minimal knowledge progress and reach the level of highly qualified members of the community of professional practitioners (Sunnari & Hild 2010:41). In IS, expertise may also refer to EXPERT JUDGMENT.

In her doctoral thesis, Johnson (2016) concludes, tentatively though, that mindfulness training (i.e. regular practice at focusing one's attention on the current situation, and observing, rather than falling into the trap of, negative feelings and thoughts, and then, redirecting one's focus back to the current situation) as one form of deliberate practice may facilitate the learning of self-regulation of attention, move towards expertise and improve interpreting performance, as this humanistic approach (i.e. mindfulness) has been suggested to aid interpreters in coping with work-related stress (Crezee et al. 2015a).

Development & achievement of expertise in interpreting

In interpreter training as related to developing expertise in trainees (see Hoza 2016, ch.4), the challenge for trainers is how to modify and adapt the already acquired linguistic skills to meet the demands of consecutive and simultaneous modes of interpreting (Ericsson 2000). Differences between

experts and novices (the reflection on which is encouraged by COGNITIVE APPRENTICESHIP, see Collins et al. 1989) have been found to relate to chunking of information, to reasoning, to speed of processing, and to individuals' knowledge base and its organization (Moser-Mercer et al. 2000). Some authors (Liu 2001) consider that true expertise in simultaneous interpreting, which is related to the ability of being more selective in processing information based on its relevance to the overall structure, the ability of better monitoring of the interpretation output, and the ability of being more flexible and effective in allocating resources, may be gained simply through testing learned skills in the context of the domain, i.e. gaining real world experience exposure to real interpretation situations and settings (courts, conferences, meetings, etc.) and this is one important factor which relates expertise to training interpreters. This said, it must be added that professional experience and expertise is one of the determinants of individual time lag in interpreting (Timarová 2015c). Along the same lines, but as related to consecutive interpreting, Abuiñ González (2012) concludes, tentatively though, that with an increase in interpreters' expertise level, there is a noticeable change in their choice of NOTE-TAKING language, i.e. a shift from the use of the source language towards the use of the target language during note-taking.

As far as the expertise in interpreting and its achievement is concerned, Adams (2017) points to available evidence regarding two predominant, but not mutually exclusive, types of factors: innate factors; and acquired abilities: cognitive processing speed and use of interpreting strategies as important aspects of expertise (Li 2013; Sunari & Hild 2010) are two typical examples for the former and the latter, respectively. Adams (2017) concludes that four types of activities practiced by expert ASL-English can improve interpreting performance: 1) monitoring, awareness and concentration while interpreting; 2) observation of how a natural language is used; 3) engaging in fruitful discussions with colleagues about issues of language, interpreting, ethical decision-making; and 4) receiving constructive feedback. Adams (ibid) adds that among all, monitoring is potentially the most important in terms of its contribution to improvement in interpreting performance. In another study on signed language interpreting, Napier (2017) considers bilingualism and language brokering as influential factors in expertise development of signed language interpreters.

As far as researching expertise is concerned, Muñoz Martín (2014), while building a situated construct of translation expertise comprising five dimensions, including knowledge, adaptive psychophysiological traits, problem-recognition and problem-solving skills (see also Kaiser-Cooke

1994), metacognitive regulatory skills and SELF-CONCEPT, considers that expertise is only interesting if it can be operationalized and related to behavior (see also Shreve 2002). It is important to stress, along the same vein, that in TS, and also in its much younger sister field, IS, many studies on expertise and expert performance have been experimental to date (Sawyer 2004), and therefore, as is often the case with experimental research, ECOLOGICAL VALIDITY is a serious issue because, as it happens, creating comparable variables within translation or interpreting environments is far from easy (Liu 2015c; Tiselius 2015; Tiselius & Hild 2017). More recent studies on expertise aim to explore this concept from professional interpreters' perspective (Riccardi & Russo 2013) within the framework of ethnographic research (see Dufrou 2016). As for research purposes, it is expertise as a robust and more enlightening concept in cognitive translology, not competence (forming the core of university training programs within the European context, see Jääskeläinen & Lacruz 2018:6) that some authors (Shreve et al. 2018) argue for. As for IS, it should be added that finding out specifically about what skills expert interpreters develop in (simultaneous) interpreting awaits further research (Liu 2001). What is also in need of scholarly attention is that no research has been done so far on the professional development or domain-specific activities of expert ASL-English interpreters (Adams 2017).

Testing & assessment expertise in TIS

In testing and assessment, expertise refers to a set of skills regarding issues of RELIABILITY, VALIDITY, and practicality (or feasibility) (Baker 1989) a tester or rater must have to deal with (all) the subtleties and complexities of testing regarding construct design, item selection and different test formats. This can be more appropriately termed *testing expertise*, which is strongly recommended by different authors (Setton & Dawrant 2016b:464) in interpreting assessment and is expected to become the norm rather than the exception not only in translation but also in interpreting assessment (Angelelli 2018).

Staff expertise

Expertise, in a different sense, refers to staff expertise or trainer profile, which shows the specialization of core staff members on any educational program, including translator and interpreter education. Staff expertise, as a type of education resource, is considered crucial in executing the process of COURSE and CURRICULUM DESIGN, availability of relevant

(practical) modules, collaboration between academy and profession, organization of international conferences, and achieving a higher level of PROFESSIONALISM (see Hu 2013).

EXPERT JUDGMENT

The term expert judgment, also called *professional judgment*, refers to EXPERTISE in weighting and combining information for EVALUATION/judgment purposes (Einhorn 1974). Conflicting findings exist over whether expert judgment is a reliable (Ettenson et al. 1987) or unreliable (Goldberg 1968) criteria for evaluation purposes. As related to TIS, expert judgment, widely used in translator and interpreter testing (Liu & Chiu 2011), refers to decision making by an expert in both fields regarding the performance of a translator and/or interpreter in PERFORMANCE(-BASED) ASSESSMENT as a type of assessment instrument/tool in pedagogical settings. Because it is evidence of test validation (i.e. the process of gathering evidence for determining the appropriateness of test inferences) for performance(-based) assessment, expert judgment (of the subject area concerned) is and needs to be considered an important source for developing and validating performance(-based) tests (as a type of CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTING) such as interpreting assessments (Wu 2010b, 2013). However, there are some concerns about subjective expert judgment in translation and interpreting assessment/testing and it is being considered unreliable due to such factors as vague definitions of TEST CONSTRUCT and assessment criteria (Angelelli 2018; Iglesias Fernández 2013; Liu & Chiu 2011; Wu 2010b). Sawyer (2004) considers expert judgment as a necessary but not sufficient criterion to be exclusively relied upon for the purpose of ensuring equity and fairness in interpreting performance testing. Another cause for concern in this respect may be the variations evident in interpreter examiners' expert judgment (Sawyer 2004; Wu 2010b). Instead, Sawyer (2004) calls for applying empirical data to reduce subjectivity in the selection of test content (the appropriateness of which typically is judged by a panel of testing experts) and the development of assessment criteria. Also, Wu (2010b) calls for a standardized procedure for task design for interpreter performance(-based) assessment (IPA) purposes in pedagogical settings. Moreover, rater training, as a rather neglected, but integral component of interpreting assessment, can be a third effective solution to the potential problem of subjective expert judgment in interpreting assessment practices (Han 2015a, 2015b; Liu 2015a; Setton & Dawrant 2016:120) as it aims to facilitate INTER-RATER RELIABILITY (Han 2015a, 2018), and as research (Han

2015a, 2015b) shows, rater training in interpreter assessment can be assisted by the psychometric MODEL of Multifaceted Rasch Measurement (MFRM). However, the possible link between (regular) rater training and facilitation of inter-rater reliability in interpreting assessment is still in need of further research (Han 2015a, 2015b, 2018).

EXPLAINING → PARAPHRASING

EXPLICITATION

Explicitation in translation

The term explicitation refers to a concept Vinay & Darbelnet (1958/1995) introduced in TS. It can generally be defined as a stylistic technique, using which translators frequently render source-text informational units explicitly in the target text (Shuttleworth & Cowie 1997; Vinay & Darbelnet 1958/1995). Klaudy (2009) identifies four types of explicitation: 1) obligatory (dictated by syntactic and semantic differences in languages); 2) optional (dictated by differences in text-building strategies and stylistic preferences between language); 3) pragmatic (dictated by differences between cultural systems); and 4) translation-inherent (due to the nature of the translation process itself). Explicitation also refers to Blum-Kulka (1986)'s Explicitation Theory, which explores explicitation in connection with shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation (see Klaudy 2009), and is further supported by research findings to apply to interpreting as well (see Shlesinger 1995).

Explicitation in interpreting

In IS, explicitation, a phenomenon frequently occurring in interpreting, can be conscious, subconscious, or automatic due to the high cognitive load, under which interpreters typically engage in interpreting (Tang 2018). Recent research (Morselli 2018) offers insights into the nature of explicitation and directionality in simultaneous interpreting, and again recent research (Tang 2018) sheds some light on directionality in consecutive interpreting and how to improve teaching and learning of consecutive interpreting: Tang's findings show, tentatively though, that in consecutive interpreting from A to B language, difficulties interpreters encounter are of a participant-related nature, whereas in consecutive interpreting from B to A language, they tend to be process-related, with pedagogical implications for selection of appropriate exercises for

interpreter TRAINING. In simultaneous interpreting, as research (Gumul 2008) shows, explicitation appears to be dependent on the direction of interpreting to a certain extent and most of explicating shifts in interpreting are not strategic, and thus appear to be largely subconscious and mainly cohesion-related (Gumul 2006), and/or prevalently non-conscious (Gumul 2015).

EXTRINSIC MOTIVATION → MOTIVATION
FACE VALIDITY → VALIDITY

FEEDBACK

Definitions

The term feedback was originally developed in the field of systems engineering to refer to the effect the information generated within the system must have on the system itself (Wiener 1948). Feedback, which belongs to the everyday stuff of educational discourse in pedagogical settings, refers to any statement or opinion, which can serve as an improvement tool on weaknesses and strengths as related to teaching and learning practices.

Feedback in translator & interpreter EDUCATION

Feedback comes in various forms. Pietrzak (2014) identifies four common types of feedback for trainees in translation classroom: 1) no-feedback policy; 2) feedback in the form of annotations and comments on student translation assignments; 3) general discussion to which both the teacher and students contribute; and 4) peer feedback (or PEER ASSESSMENT). Clear, valid, fair, effective, and relevant feedback, while increasing learner's MOTIVATION, plays a key role in the PORTFOLIO assignment in translation classes (Federici 2010). Similarly, recent research (Haro-Soler 2018) shows that constructive feedback, along with work placements, verbal persuasion, theoretical information about the concept or vicarious learning from former students, can make a positive impact on translation trainees' self-confidence on one hand, and facilitate the incorporation of the development of this cognitive and attitudinal resource into translator TRAINING curricula on the other. This said, it should be added that Gile (1994a) argues for the effectiveness of providing translation trainees with feedback in the form of *questions* rather than *criticism*.

In an interpreter training PEDAGOGY, there is a consensus that feedback, and constant feedback in particular, is an essential part of training (Lee 2018; Setton 2010a; Setton & Dawrant 2016a, 2016b; Shreve 1997, 2002) and an important form of ASSESSMENT (Behr 2015). Such a consensus is specifically over FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT as it helps develop a collaborative learning environment where students learn not only from their instructors but also from their peers (Bao 2015; Fowler 2007; Motta 2016; Santamaría Ciordia 2017). Hence the basic categorization of *educator/instructor feedback* (e.g. through the use of rubrics, see Liu 2015a) and *peer/student feedback* on performance, depending on its source, with the former, considered one core component of DELIBERATE PRACTICE (Schafer 2011) and with the latter, believed to be a valuable source in terms of its constructive use in translator (Wang & Han 2013) and interpreter (Takeda 2010) education. Lee (2018) adds a third category: *self-generated feedback*. According to Setton (2010a) and Setton & Dawrant (2016a, 2016b), a qualified instructor should always follow 3D *feedback principles* to maximize training: observation; diagnosis; and treatment, with a special focus on some general principles: 1) the positive, critical and constructive nature of the feedback; 2) chance of self-correction; 3) current intermediate pedagogical objectives as specified in the course progression and made clear to students no later than the beginning of the class; 4) carefully noted feedback both by trainees and trainer; and last but not least, 5) feedback on classroom performance as well as on tests and exams, and after mock conferences and internships. Behr (2015), while discussing issues of QUALITY, assessment and feedback in training interpreters, outlines the most important aspects of good feedback: 1) preparation in terms of learning goals; 2) simplicity in giving feedback; 3) fact-basedness and objectivity regarding assessment of students' performance; 4) clarity of expression in giving feedback; 5) rigor in terms of rechecking the feedback received by the students; 6) comprehensiveness in terms of the feedback received by the students as well as the feedback received from them, including the report of their involvement in self-evaluation and self-reflection; and 7) comprehensiveness in terms of involving the students in the process of performance assessment, especially by encouraging them to give more feedback. What is more, feedback in interpreting can also appear in the form of specific methods and approaches: some authors (Atwood 1987) argue for applying *clinical supervision*, i.e. assessment by interpreter educators or trainers through reflection on trainees' behavior and followed by educators'/trainers' action, modeling and practice, as a useful source of feedback to trainees, and some others (Davis 1987) advocate *team*

interpreting as a useful approach to maximizing the efficiency of feedback to trainees.

Feedback in translator and interpreter education in BLENDED LEARNING environments

As far as distance learning (or E-LEARNING), which falls under the umbrella term blended learning, and use of TECHNOLOGY in interpreter education are concerned, some authors (Lee 2018; Pöschhacker 2016:198-199) suggest that CAIT can be an option. One must also mention the need to further explore the nature and/or quality and quantity of feedback delivered online (as compared to feedback delivered onsite, i.e. face to face). Hence, the online/onsite feedback classification in teaching translation (Lisaitė et al. 2016) and interpreting (Lee 2018; Sawyer & Roy 2015) as facilitated, e.g. through the use of MODLE (Ibrahim-González 2011). Apart from that, some authors (e.g. Lee 2018) aiming for a multidimensional view of the concept of feedback, call for research into the mechanisms relating feedback to learning in interpreter training.

One must not forget to mention a different type of feedback: feedback for educators/trainers. There are different sources for this type of feedback for translator and interpreter educators/trainers: 1) students' translations serving as products; 2) using data elicitation methods such as TAPs and keystroke logging; 3) metacognitive reflection (i.e. students' engaging in reflection on their own learning process) (Pietrzak 2016); 4) translation and interpreting diary; and 5) PORTFOLIO, among others.

FLIPPED CLASSROOM

Definitions & benefits

This term refers to a current flipped classroom approach to EDUCATION (alternatively termed *flipped learning*) pioneered, piloted and led by two educators: Jonathan Bergmann and Aron Sams (2012), although they do not claim to own this term as this approach or pedagogical MODEL (regardless of its name) has been practiced for years prior to being labelled as such (Bates et al. 2017). Flipped classroom, while essentially aiming to facilitate learning using multiple teaching strategies and TECHNOLOGY and to create more learner-/student-centered environments (Bates et al. 2017), is a teaching approach, the seeds of which were sown in the year 2007. Flipped classroom falls within the wide spectrum of BLENDED LEARNING, is used in many primary and secondary schools and is also more likely to be

embraced by many more (Ray & Powell 2015). Its basic idea is that typical traditional class activities are now done at home, and typical homework is completed in classroom (Bergmann & Sams 2012; Reichert & Mouza 2015). In flipped classrooms, we may accomplish objectives which would otherwise be out of reach (Egbert et al. 2015). Obviously, unlike traditional classroom, in a flipped classroom approach to teaching/TRAINING, with the incorporation of technology that supports the resource-rich, teacher-as-guide strategies (Crawford & Senecal 2017; Egbert et al. 2015), students are not engaged in doing homework at home nor are they exposed to exclusive lectures by the teacher/trainer in classroom, except for mainly watching educational video files as the central component of this approach outside of class or sometimes listening to audio files the teacher/trainer, being in more of a facilitator's role, has posted online, e.g. in online homework or mini-lecture format. Flipped classroom is characterized by this implementation of instructional videos known as *screencasting* (Dickenson 2015; Egbert et al. 2015; Nizet & Meyer 2015; Larcara 2015). Instructional videos, as the central component of this approach outside of class, are complemented by discussion in class as its central component in class (Egbert et al. 2015). Later, this traditional flipped classroom model was developed into a flipped-mastery model, in which learners engaged in self-paced learning (Bergmann & Sams 2012), with different students being on different topics at the same time, and literally speaking, ready to flip.

Despite being possibly more frontloaded in preparation than a traditional course (Hussey et al. 2015), flipped classroom clearly comes with many benefits: 1) classroom management and also redirecting the learning in case of students' misunderstanding the content; 2) active learning (e.g. through student-to-student modeling); 3) critical thinking (which is subsumed under the term *soft skill*); 4) maximum use of student-faculty time together; and 5) fine-tuning ASSESSMENT to the COURSE and program objectives, utilizing FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT along the way, and minimizing failure on the SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT (Larcara 2015).

Flipped classroom in translator & interpreter education

It is interesting to debate the extent to which the flipped classroom model, which is grounded both in an 'understanding of the social and intellectual aspects of learning environment and in an appreciation for diverse learning needs (Ray & Powell 2015) and therefore, does not mean learning alone (Nizet & Meyer 2015), might apply, add value to, or perhaps revolutionize instruction in TIS context, which, according to David Sawyer (personal communication, August 15, 2017), has always spent a great deal of time on

procedural skills and activities in the classroom. He argues that in many respects, the notion of flipping the classroom might apply best to content-based instruction, an idea also echoed by Newman et al. (2015). However, research suggests that flipped learning also lends itself to practice-oriented modules (see Kim 2017). In IS, despite initial reluctance to adopt a flipped classroom approach (Kim 2017), there have been attempts to construct a flipped interpreting teaching model (see e.g. Wang & Zhong 2017), and flipped classroom model has already been embraced by EVIVA PROJECT, with flipping applied to situating interpreting practice outside traditional classroom environments (Braun et al. 2014a). Along the same lines, Kim (2017:2) mentions that innovative teleconferencing tools; robust learning management systems (LMSs); and open content for interpreting practice are three innovative aspects of flipped classroom model, which can be of particular interest both to today's digital learners (or the so-called *digital natives*) and to interpreter trainers (see also Taylor 2013).

Challenges to flipped classroom

The idea of flipped classroom, no matter how useful or practical it may prove to be, is subject to certain limitations. For instance, Newman et al. (2015) and Hussey et al. (2015) both refer to the dominant role traditional methods of learning still play in pedagogical settings, and a shift from this paradigm to flipped classrooms requires both teachers and students to start a pedagogical shift themselves (Larcara 2015). As far as the didactic constraints of a flipped classroom in interpreting context are concerned, one may, as Cynthia Roy (personal communication, August 15, 2017) suggests, think of the difficulty of asking students/trainees to interpret in the real world and then bring them back to the classroom to discuss what happened. In a similar vein, Elisabeth Winston (personal communication, August 18, 2017) argues that students in the US have been very resistant to flipped classroom because it requires them to work harder and think outside of class. In general, student expectations of and prior experience with the idea of an appropriate instructional setting, as Newman et al. (2015) show, may impact the acceptance of flipped classroom, as obviously this approach will not necessarily be suitable to meet all diverse learner needs, and is yet to be explored further (Egbert et al. 2015), especially in interpreter training (Kim 2017).

Assessment in flipped classroom

As far as assessing learning in flipped classroom in general is concerned, one may think of varied assessments, including performance-based or product-based rubrics and assessments (Ray & Powell 2015), with a particular focus on aligning the course with important considerations such as student characteristics; out-of-class activities; and in-class activities in both summative and formative assessment (Zappe & Litzinger 2017).

FLIPPED LEARNING→ **FLIPPED CLASSROOM**
FORMAL CURRICULUM→ **CURRICULUM**
FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT→ **ASSESSMENT**
GENERIC COMPETENCE→ **COMPETENCE**

HALO EFFECT

The term halo effect, as a well-known concept in educational psychology and language testing, refers to a (perhaps substantial) rating behavior and cognitive bias in multiple trait rating, which was originally identified as a problem by American psychologist Edward Lee Thorndike (1920) in his research on military superiors' evaluations of officers in TRAINING. In pedagogical settings, the term halo effect refers to one type of rating/rater behavior resulting from an early impression or initial judgment on a learner's attribute and transferring that impression to the same learner's other attributes and showing tendency to overgeneralize ASSESSMENT of his/her diverse attributes and qualities (Fulcher 2010; Mousavi 2012; Rasmussen 2008).

Halo effect, which, along with other rating/rater behavior such as examiner/rater bias (Elder 2013), can cause rater variability in testing and assessment, and therefore, if proven to be substantial, can be particularly threatening to the VALIDITY of test constructs, needs to be guarded against and controlled effectively in interpreter assessment and CERTIFICATION tests: in interpreter assessment, this may be done, as research suggests, by rater training as one aspect of testing theory, or other preliminary steps (Liu 2015a; Setton & Dawrant 2016b; Wu et al. 2013), e.g. defining traits in terms of concrete behavior.

HIDDEN CURRICULUM→ **CURRICULUM**
HOLISTIC SCORING→ **RUBRIC**

HOT POTATO STRATEGY

The term hot potato strategy refers to a STRATEGY Setton (2006) and Setton & Dawrant (2016a) introduce and recommend to interpreters for SI with text. An interpreter who interprets a very difficult text full of highly grammatically complex sentences, may resort to a hot potato strategy by using his/her listening ability, rather than relying on the text, to the maximum, as if he/she had no access to any text (Seton 2006, 2015a).

HYBRID COURSE → **COURSE**

HYBRID LEARNING → **BLENDED LEARNING**

INFERRENCING

The term inferencing refers to a type of knowledge-based STRATEGY in interpreting (Li 2015b; Riccardi 2005) and in simultaneous, consecutive, and SIGHT INTERPRETING/TRANSLATION modes, using which the interpreter tries to recover forgotten or lost information by relying on the source speech text and his/her own extralinguistic background knowledge (Chernov 2004; Li 2015b).

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

Definitions

The term Information and Communication Technology (ICT) generally refers to any type of information technologies used for the purpose of accessing, handling, and transferring information.

ICT in TIS

ICT is an umbrella term to refer to two general types of technologies as originally discussed by Torres del Rey (2005): information TECHNOLOGY; and communications technology, used for both teaching and ASSESSMENT purposes. ICT, as applied to and advocated for translator TRAINING (Flórez & Alcina 2011; Olvera Lobo et al. 2007), typically appears in the form of CAT TOOLS considered an indispensable element of translation training programs (DeCesaris 1996; Sikora 2014); and free and open-source software packages (Bowker et al. 2008; Bowker & Corpas Pastor 2015; Bowker & Fisher 2010; Sikora 2014; Veiga Díaz & García

González 2015) with their specific advantages and disadvantages (Flórez & Alcina 2011).

Various typologies exist for ICT as applied to interpreting: ICT applied to interpreting, comprises three main categories: 1) ICT for machine interpreting (tools to take over a part or the whole of interpreters' work); 2) ICT as transfer tools (devices such as audio devices or headphones which facilitate interpreting); and 3) ICT as interpreting tools (tools interpreters use for the purpose of QUALITY interpreting) (Móricz 2018; Horváth 2016). Vermeiren (2016) distinguishes between ICT for research; ICT for EDUCATION; and ICT for a professional context depending on the purpose. ICT can also be divided into two distinct groups: a) process-oriented technologies as the distinctive element of computer-assisted interpreting (CAI), e.g. terminology management systems (TMS), including Interpretbank (Fantinuoli 2009, 2011, 2012, 2016b, 2018), CORPUS analysis tools, etc.; and b) setting-oriented technologies, comprising ICT tools and software surrounding the interpreting process proper, e.g. booth consoles, remote interpreting (RI) devices, etc. (Fantinuoli 2018; see also Bilgen 2009). Another (rather unclear) distinction, based on the scope of ICT application, is internal ICT (e.g. online dictionaries and search engines used to improve the process, preparation, or function of the product of the interpreter that are available on the computer) and external ICT (e.g. cameras and microphones used to improve the process, preparation or function of the interpreting output that are not available on the computer) (Berber Irabien 2010a).

When discussing the use of ICT in connection with interpreting, and therefore, the idea of technology-assisted interpreting, two different types of interpreting events must be the focus of attention: 1) interpreting in communicative events, in which the primary participants themselves are distributed over different locations (e.g. teleconferencing); and 2) interpreting in communicative events, in which the primary participants are together on site and only the interpreter, while providing language access, is physically disconnected, i.e. he/she works from a different location (e.g. remote interpreting) (Braun 2006).

It should be pointed out that ICT-based educational solutions have remained largely unexplored in interpreter training/education despite the fact that they present novel opportunities for analyzing learning processes and user performance online in the field (Braun et al. 2014a; Fantinuoli 2018, forthcoming; Wang 2015). By the same token, they have been strongly advocated in the context of knowledge development and skillful practices, and in particular, in translator (Carl & Braun 2018; Galán-Mañas & Hurtado Albir 2010; Kučič & Seljan 2014) and interpreter (Carl & Braun

2018; Chan 2014; Kurz 2002; Vermeiren 2016; Wang 2015) education and training. As for the usefulness of ICT-based/supported translator training, Varela (2007) discusses such advantages as the possibility for planning activities for asynchronous working; overcoming time and space barriers; designing new methods and instruments of teaching; tutoring and EVALUATION. ICT has been applied to interpreter training more typically in BLENDED LEARNING (Pöschhacker 2016). Hence, the idea for ICT-based/-supported interpreter training (Carl & Braun 2018; Ritsos et al. 2012, 2013) exemplified by SIMON PROJECT, CAIT, and IVY PROJECT, among others. This type of training serves the purpose of preparing interpreters to work in two established working modes: 1) telephone-based interpreting; and 2) videoconference-based/video-mediated interpreting or VMI (Carl & Braun 2018) as a subcategory of teleconference interpreting (Braun 2015b). Also, Berber Irabien (2010b), while advocating ICT to be used for two major aims, i.e. as a useful pedagogical and also support (i.e. non-pedagogical) tool in conference interpreter training with implications for CURRICULUM DESIGN and COURSE design, discusses three major divisions of ICT as used in conference interpreting: 1) training ICT (which includes tools to practice and develop skills, and tools to be used in professional conference interpreting); 2) interpreting ICT (which includes support tools such as dictionaries and encyclopedias); and 3) mode ICT (which includes remote interpreting (RI), video-conferencing, and telephone interpreting).

As far as the integration of ICT into testing/assessing interpreting skills is concerned, Braun et al. (2014b:110-111) strongly recommend taking the following factors into careful consideration: 1) the nature of test materials (live or recorded); 2) the number of candidates for each language combination to be tested; 3) the logistics of test administration (i.e. whether the candidates are to be tested in the same place with raters or remotely via computer); and 4) the availability of reliable videoconferencing facilities, among others.

ICTs have some drawbacks, however: according to Tripepi Winteringham (2010), ICTs are still considered, at least in the booth, to some extent unnatural as they can be time-consuming, distracting, and of course, an extra effort for interpreters already engaged in interpreting, which requires concentration and fast-paced decoding and delivery.

It must be borne in mind, though, that, from a different, yet more interesting, perspective, in assessing dialogic interactions in testing interpreters, using live speakers participating in simulated interpreting ROLE PLAY (i.e. interacting with their avatars in the 3D environment) is still preferred to using ICT, except in dialogue interpreting involving role

play (typically metaphorized as *pas de trois* (see Cirillo & Radicioni 2017), where interactive ICTs can be more cost-effective (see Braun et al. 2014b). At the other end of the spectrum, ICT-based/-supported interpreter training, in which quality of interpreting is a point of contention (Carl & Braun 2018), poses two key challenges for interpreters and trainers: acquiring the skill of handling remote interpreting as one form of technologized interaction, partly through the acquisition of digital COMPETENCE; and an increased need for multitasking due to engaging in interpreting, a highly cognitive task per se, combined with a technological dimension (Braun et al. 2014a).

IN-HOUSE TRAINING→ TRAINING

IN-SERVICE TRAINING→ SERVICE LEARNING

INSTRUMENTAL COMPETENCE→ COMPETENCE

INTER-CODER RELIABILITY→ INTER-RATER RELIABILITY

INTERNSHIP

The term internship refers to one aspect of (ideal) TRAINING in general, and one pedagogical initiative, in which students/trainees under the supervision and/or mentorship of the other two main participants, i.e. trainers and institutions, are given the opportunity, for the purpose of fulfilling internship requirements, to put into practice what they have learned in classroom, gain experience in real-life situations, and finally write a report about their self-reflections on this specific experience after these translation and interpreting trainees have undertaken a(n) (short/long) internship, e.g. in a company, an internship agency, or a real conference. This internship report, alternatively called *post-internship debriefing report*, is a generally known tool of ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION of COMPETENCE. Internship opportunities, offered by different translation and interpretation programs, in one or several public and private institutions, at the same time or consecutively, as well as on-or-off-site (Valero-Garcés 2011b), are becoming an increasingly popular traineeship component of translator and interpreter training programs (Hu 2018; Wilson 2013). Internship is believed to help students gain some translation and interpretation experience and build up their profile as translators and interpreters, as they, undergoing this form of experiential EDUCATION, grow aware of their own professional identity and capabilities (Brockbank 2000), and in this way, internship opportunities may improve graduates' employability if they are willing to work as translators and/or interpreters (Hu 2018). Internship experience for translation undergraduates, as research shows, is more effective compared to traditional classrooms (Echeverri

2015), and as one form of professional immersion, should develop students' translation skills and language skills (Fung-Ming 2017). Therefore, many translation (Ho 2015; Li 2007; Valero-Garcés 2011b) and interpreting (Ho 2015; Setton & Dawrant 2016a, 2016b; Swabey & Craft Faber 2012; Valero-Garcés 2010, 2011b) authors advocate its incorporation into translation and interpreting programs and curricula varying greatly in content and scope, as it certainly happens, by way of example only, in the postgraduate curriculum for interpreting in China (see Lung 2015), or is at least, recommended, as a good introduction to professional practice or PROFESSIONALIZATION of IS by some authors (Johnston 2007; Setton & Dawrant 2016a, 2016b) under *practica*, which, in turn, is one key feature of a successful conference interpreter training program. It should be added that these authors not only do not limit its usefulness to training conference interpreting, but also consider it one aspect of ideal training in different interpreting settings (see Setton & Dawrant 2016a:45).

Challenges to internships in translator & interpreter education

Discussing internship opportunities in Chinese context, Hu (2018) casts some doubts on whether internship places accommodate all interns, how to guarantee QUALITY, and how to address the imbalance of internship qualities between students.

INTERPRETER'S/INTERPRETING DIARY → TRANSLATION DIARY

INTERPRETING ENACTMENTS

The term interpreting enactments (originally *Dolmetschinszenierungen* in German) is a term introduced by Bahadır (2011, 2017) to refer to a new method within a paradigm for interpreter TRAINING and interpreting PEDAGOGY, regardless of the interpreting setting. The didactic method of interpreting enactments (i.e. simulated interpreted encounters), which is widely based on certain critical approaches in theatre pedagogy, performance studies, theatre anthropology, ethnography and sociology, involves (but is not limited to) theatrical enactments, i.e. action and body (see also Bahadır 2009), is based on the author's perspective that aims to show the dramatic and theatrical structures that are at the background of the interpreting acts, and has been developed primarily (presumably not exclusively though) to teach community interpreting (to the benefit of migrants and refugees), mostly in non-academic training institutions. This

didactic method presents and identifies with the bigger picture of interpreter as performer, as (en)acting body, and as the ethically-charged 'actors of social change', and interpreting as performance, and as ritualistic enactments of interpreting instances, closely connected with participant observation, alternative scripts, and stage settings, and with a new look into three main areas: 1) the conceptualization of interpreter EDUCATION as first starting with a frame scenario: 2) body and action, i.e. nonverbal communication and non-intellectual, pre-rational, emotion-provoking exercises (not neglecting training based on terminology, the contextual knowledge, etc.) and then incorporating brain, different interaction patterns, and of course, ROLE PLAY (see also Bahadir 2017); and 3) the conceptualization of interpreter COMPETENCE as dramatic enactment, and teaching of ethics of interpreting, altogether aiming at learner EMPOWERMENT.

INTER-RATER RELIABILITY→ RELIABILITY

INTRA-CODER RELIABILITY→ INTRA-RATER RELIABILITY

INTRA-RATER RELIABILITY→ RELIABILITY

INTRINSIC MOTIVATION→ MOTIVATION

IPSAIVE ASSESSMENT→ ASSESSMENT

IVY PROJECT

The European Lifelong Learning Project IVY (Interpreting in Virtual Reality) uses one of the most striking types of avatar-based multi-user 3D virtual learning environments (VLEs) known as *Second Life* (developed by Linden Research Inc® and launched in 2003 at www.secondlife.com). It gives users the power (and often requires them) to utilize streaming video and audio media, texted synchronous chat, Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP), to manipulate physical appearances and create virtual objects and other online/web-based multi-modal resources (Savin-Baden et al. 2010; Şahin 2013), and through simulated interpreting practice, offers interpreter trainees and their clients possibilities for learning and interaction (for a comprehensive guide to Second Life and other 3D Virtual Environments, see Hodge et al. 2011). It belongs to the new generation of ICT-based tools and platforms. The EU-funded IVY project, as a typical example of CAIT projects (Sandrelli 2015a), is a joint project of seven universities: University of Surrey (UK); Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza (Poland); University of Cyprus (Cyprus); Steinbeis-Transferzentrum Sprachlemmendien (Germany); University of Bangor (UK-Wales); Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen (Germany); and Bar-Ilan University (Israel).

Virtual worlds have not been adopted in interpreter TRAINING programs so far (see Ritsos et al. 2012), but IVY project is one exception to the rule. The IVY project, focused on business and community interpreting, aims to explore whether 3D environments are capable of providing training initiatives/opportunities for both interpreting trainees and clients (Braun et al. 2013; Ritsos et al. 2012, 2013). In IVY, and in its virtual environment (IVY-VE) which gives support to IVY project goals “by fusing web-based technologies with Second Life” (Ritsos et al. 2012:191), over 30 interpreter training scenarios situated in the 3D virtual world are accessible to users to support interpreting practice in ready-made dialogues and monologues as well as live interactions and other working modes (Ritsos et al. 2012, 2013), i.e. to support SITUATED LEARNING, and to promote the AUTHENTICITY of training as participants can also choose to see the environment through their avatar’s eyes (Braun et al. 2014a; Braun & Slater 2014). Braun et al. (2013) divide the working modes of the IVY environment (i.e. different ways in which the environment can be used) into four categories: 1) interpreting practice mode (in which students can have access to the materials in their favorite language or language pair and participate in the scenario with their avatars and practice interpreting); 2) exploration mode (in which clients of interpreters are given a chance to gain familiarity with interpreting through demo video clips, guidance notes, etc.); 3) learning activity mode (in which clients, in line with exploration mode, and using different learning activities such as preparatory or skills-based activities, focus on how to communicate effectively through an interpreter); 4) and live interaction mode (in which interpreting students and their clients can work and learn together in an interpreter-mediated setting, e.g. healthcare interpreting or business interpreting, without any prepared content and in the form of collaborative practice). These authors conclude that two of the key challenges associated with training in virtual worlds, including IVY project, i.e. *steep learning curve* (the point after which Second Life becomes fun and enjoyable) and *the feeling of being overwhelmed* were not borne out in the initial EVALUATION of the project. They suggest developing IVY further, i.e. enriching the IVY environment with pedagogical materials as a major step towards the pedagogic mediation of the IVY environment.

IVY-VE → IVY PROJECT

METACOGNITION

Definitions

Metacognition, as one of the key guiding cognitive processes during L2 listening comprehension (Vandergrift 2013), other *conscious* (and maybe once conscious and currently non-conscious and automatic) cognitive or affective experiences or knowledge, and as an important component of DELIBERATE PRACTICE (Motta 2011), is a popular term in developmental and educational psychology. Metacognition, i.e. thinking about thinking (Papaleontiou-Louca 2003), is a (perhaps fuzzy) term by a developmental psychologist named Flavell (1978, 1979), and is one learning outcome particularly relevant to building EXPERTISE in general (Muñoz Martín 2014), and ADAPTIVE EXPERTISE in particular (Smith et al. 1997), in individuals, including translators and interpreters. Metacognition has originally been defined as knowledge playing the role of regulator of cognitive tasks (Flavell 1978). Recently, however, the definition of metacognition has been broadened to include, as Papaleontiou-Louca (2003) and Zabrocky & Agler (2008) point out, knowledge of one's knowledge, processes, and cognitive and affective states; and conscious and deliberate monitoring of one's knowledge and such cognitive and affective states (through the development of the so-called *metacognitive skills*), with the latter being the purpose of metacognitive EVALUATION (Choi 2006). Metacognition, which is both a capacity and a skill, according to Paris and Winograd (1990), comes with two essential features: *self-appraisal* and *self-management*. In other words, as illustrated by Goh (2005), metacognition incorporates two key aspects of an individual's thinking: 1) knowledge about cognitive states and processes, and 2) control or executive aspects.

Metacognition in TIS

Shreve (2009) defines metacognition, in relation to translation, as the active, conscious, volitional and strategic control of complex cognitive translation tasks for the purpose of ensuring successful task completion. What is more, metacognition, as one source of formative FEEDBACK for translator and interpreter educators/trainers (Pietrzak 2016), and advocated as one factor facilitating the transition towards student-/learner-centered approaches to translator EDUCATION (Echeverri 2015), is an important component of deliberate practice and skill acquisition, and therefore lays the groundwork of expertise in interpreting (Motta 2016) and in translation (Massey 2017; Shreve 2006). As far as the former (i.e. interpreting) is concerned, for the purpose of dealing with difficulties and the full dimension of problem-

oriented nature of interpreting, interpreters will be able to apply appropriate strategies and coping mechanisms through the essential process of metacognition, i.e. awareness of task difficulty (Macnamara 2008; Napier 2016; Rodríguez Morell 2011). As far as translator and interpreter training is concerned, metacognition, which plays a pivotal role in learners'/trainees' self-reflection and AUTONOMY (Orlando 2012, 2015, 2016) and is, arguably, critical to understanding the translator's complex task (Shreve 2009) and to interpreters' strategic decision-making (Peterson 2000) and accurate interpretation (Macnamara 2008), may be enhanced with practice; ROLEPLAY; self-reflection; SCAFFOLDING (e.g. using a TRANSLATION DIARY or INTERPRETING DIARY) (Papaleontiou-Louca 2003); and of course, with feedback (Moser-Mercer 2008). It is worth pointing out that what connects translation (education) to metacognition awaits further research (Echeverri 2015).

MINDFULNESS TRAINING→ EXPERTISE
MIXED-MODE LEARNING→ BLENDED LEARNING

MOCK CONFERENCE

The term mock conference, alternatively called *simulated/practice conference*, refers to a live TRAINING format, in which all disciplines of translation and interpreting skills as well as techniques can be included, a format which comes with the need for material AUTHENTICITY and a growing awareness of importance of exposure to realistic situations (Donovan 2010; Setton 2006). They are normally used in interpreter training institutions due to the practical impossibility of practicing in real communicative events (Sandrelli 2015b), and they, while laying some basic foundations, also provide experience of ICT in training; however, their systematic design and teaching effects are under-researched (Li 2015a).

In a typical mock conference sometimes organized in two or three institutions simultaneously, different speakers, using different languages included in a COURSE or program, contribute to different topics (economics; law; etc.) and speech formats (seminar; conference; etc.) announced beforehand (e.g. a lecture given by a lawyer on courtroom communication, or a lecture by the police on police interviews with suspects and witnesses), and engage in interactions with the audience. The trainer(s) monitor(s) the mock conference, assess the students' performances, and provide FEEDBACK (perhaps in various forms) (see e.g. Li 2015a) typically using the so-called *feedback sheets*. In fact, this contextualized practice characterized by authenticity is typical of SITUATED LEARNING

(Li 2015a; Miner et al. 2016). Their potential usefulness for incorporating collaborative, learner-/student-centered learning (as an essential feature of the SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH) into interpreter training curricula has been echoed by many authors (Braun et al. 2013; Dingfelder Stone 2016; Goutondji 2014; Laet 2010; Maren Dingfelder Stone, personal communication, August 24, 2017; Miner et al. 2016; Napier 2006; Szabó 2017). Important characteristics that differentiate mock conferences from traditional interpreting classes include their role in 1) reflecting the pragmatic aspects of orality and interlinguistic communication; 2) motivating students to learn interpreting by presenting the real need to overcome linguistic barriers; and 3) the enhancement in coping with psychological pressure (see Li 2015a). Li (ibid) points out that mock conferences as adopted to interpreter training have disadvantages, too: 1) limited chances of practice; 2) too much time and energy investment; 3) difficulty in reproducing some elements of real-life context; and 4) frustration and loss of confidence due to the ill-preparation of mock conferences.

Despite this, it should be added that, according to Maren Dingfelder Stone (personal communication, September 11, 2017), the usefulness of mock conferences in interpreter training will depend mainly on the way they are planned and executed (e.g. they have to be clearly announced beforehand); under the right circumstances, mock conferences can be very useful indeed. In the same vein, Miner et al. (2016) point out that important factors which can lead to the success of a mock conference are 1) use of interpreting scenarios that are realistic, yet safe, low-risk experiences; 2) coordination; 3) recruitment of actors; 4) use of additional props such as pen, paper, chairs, etc.; and 5) feedback.

MODEL

The term model generally refers to a simple representation of a reality, a phenomenon or an idea.

In TS, models are of a linguistic, semiotic, literary, or sociocultural nature (Hermans 2009), and are, traditionally speaking, of three basic types: 1) comparative models (static, product-oriented, and centered on some kind of relation of equivalence); 2) process models (which, while representing translation as a process, introduce the dimension of time and have thus a dynamic nature); and 3) causal models (which allow us to make statements and formulate hypotheses about causes and effects) (Williams & Chesterman 2002). What's more, models in TS have been developed for multiple purposes: models of translation/translator's COMPETENCE (TC)

(see under *COMPETENCE*); models of TRANSLATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT (TQA) (see under *ASSESSMENT*); models of research (see Dastyar 2017:84-85; Hatim 2013, sect. II; Olohan 2000); models of CURRICULUM DESIGN (e.g. Kelly 2005); models of TRAINING (see Gile 2009a), etc.

In IS, models, most of which are of a descriptive nature (Pöchhacker 2016), are divided into social or relational models (which highlight the interaction between interpreters and their principals), and cognitive process models (which focus more on the interpreter's mental processes) (see Setton 2013, 2015b), and they have been introduced for many purposes and in different settings: models of the interpreting process (see Pöchhacker 2016:89-98; Roberson 2018:12-18); interaction models (see Pöchhacker 2016:81-88); models of PROFESSIONALIZATION (see Furmanek 2013) (e.g. Tseng 1992); models of interpreting/interpreter's competence (see under *competence*); models of comprehension in SI (Chemov 2004); models of quality assessment (see under *QUALITY*); models of interpreting/interpreter's APTITUDE (Chabasse 2009; Chabasse & Kader 2014; Macnamara 2008); models of interpreter assessment (McDermid 2012, 2015; see also under *assessment*); models of interpreter CERTIFICATION (see Wallace 2019); models of interpreter EDUCATION/training, e.g. ESIT model (see Gile 2009a; Slatyer 2015a; Taylor 2013; see under *SERVICE LEARNING & training*); models of CONTINUOUS/CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (CPD); models of research (see Mason 2000), etc.

This said, it must be added that some models in IS are intended to fulfill dual or multiple functions: examples include (but are not limited to) Setton & Dawrant's model of interpreter competence (2016a), designed primarily for training (conference) interpreters, but also for testing/assessment purposes; and McDermid (2015)'s cognitive, constructivist model of interpreting process developed for his PhD thesis (McDermid 2012): the latter (i.e. McDermid's model), drawing on several different well-known theories in pragmatics and translation/interpretation-relevance theory, Grice's theory of implicatures, Nida's dynamic equivalence and triggers for expansions, and Blum Kulka's EXPLICITATION hypothesis, was primarily to describe and/or account for interpretation process in signed language interpreting setting, but also to structure teaching interpretation (on three levels, i.e. working from literal to enriched to implicature), to assess (and of course, give and receive feedback on) the simultaneous work of ASL-English interpreters using scripts, and also to look at cognitive processing during interpretation (Campbell McDermid, personal

communication, March 18, 2018), with pedagogical implications for deaf education.

MONOLOGUE PROTOCOLS → THINK-ALLOUD PROTOCOLS

MOODLE

The term Moodle (Modular Object-Oriented Dynamic Learning Environment) is also a verb, which according to its official website, 'describes the process of lazily meandering through something, doing things as it occurs to you to do them, an enjoyable tinkering that often leads to insight and creativity' (www.moodle.org). Moodle, being the best-known online learning platform used in EDUCATION for the purpose of delivering all kinds of courses (Sandrelli 2015a), refers to a popular COURSE management system (CMS) that has arisen to aid in course development and administration (Wilson & Christopher 2008). Moodle, adopted by many translator (Shuttleworth 2017) and interpreter (Tymczyńska 2009) TRAINING programs to support teaching and learning, initially aims "to support students and teachers in the delivery of traditional face-to-face courses and then to explore the idea of delivering interpreter training courses in a BLENDED LEARNING format" (Sandrelli 2015b:118). Tymczyńska (2009), while discussing the adoption of Moodle as an online platform for E-LEARNING activities for the purpose of complementing a face-to-face healthcare interpreting course at Adam Mickiewicz University (AMU) of Poznan, Poland, states that this product adopts the SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH and helps teachers enrich in-class instruction with online learning activities incorporating (new technologies and) multimedia, such as audio and video presentations and animations, to create an effective collaborative learning environment while addressing a variety of learning styles. Tymczyńska (ibid) concludes that systematically integrating Moodle in the in-class and online learning activities can aid teaching interpreting courses (see also Fictumová 2005). However, according to Braun et al. (2013), as far as interpreter training contexts are concerned, CMSs, including Moodle, suffer from shortcomings (also echoed by Sandrelli 2015b) in that their area of focus is communication in written form, with a preference for asynchronous forms of interaction and collaboration. Therefore, Braun et al. (2013), while relying on the findings from the first EVALUATION phase of their IVY PROJECT, suggest that the Ivy environment may address such shortcomings in existing ICT approaches to interpreter training (or ICT-based/-supported interpreter training). Elsewhere, Braun et al. (2014b), while highlighting the fact that

online learning environments, such as Moodle, have not been developed for testing purposes, draw particular attention to security and cost issues to be taken into careful consideration especially when using such environments for testing interpreters. A different type of Moodle is called *Sloodle* (presented by Kemp & Livingstone 2009). The term Sloodle refers to SECOND LIFE fused with Moodle (Hodge et al. 2011:255).

MOTIVATION

Motivation, from the Latin word *movere* meaning 'to move', like other personality traits is subsumed under the general term 'soft skills', and is a cognitive and affective attribute and psychologically a very complex CONSTRUCT in motivation studies, neuroscience, social and personality, and educational psychology. In pedagogical settings, motivation can be defined as a set of important factors, which can give a learner a strong reason and enthusiasm to accomplish academic goals. Fostering healthy motivation is the part and parcel of quality education and NEEDS ANALYSIS in general, and one of the essential components in CURRICULUM and CURRICULUM DESIGN in particular. This said, it should be added that motivation does not simply describe behavior; it explains behavior (Elliot & Zahn 2008). In the field of second language acquisition (SLA), there is a shift from traditional conceptualization of motivation as individual difference variable that is implicated in language learning success, alongside other individual difference variables such as APTITUDE, personality, etc., to the complicated issue of how to integrate the individual and context in the analysis of motivation (Ushioda 2013). Williams & Williams (2011), while considering motivation to be perhaps the most important factor educators should keep in mind in order to improve learning, highlight student, teacher, content, method/process, and environment as five key ingredients as far as the objective above (i.e. improving learning) is concerned, and argue for frequently exposing the learners/trainees to such motivating factors in classroom for the purpose of optimizing motivation, an important perspective highlighting, in turn, the crucial importance of QUALITY of teaching in enhancing motivation. Apart from that, the nature of motivation and how it relates to learning in educational contexts must be highlighted not only in face-to-face learning contexts (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011), but also in online environments (Hartnett 2016) for both instructors and students. Here, the multidimensional, dynamically changing, non-linear MODEL of motivation which, along with cognition and affect, forms the trilogy of the mind, is rightly emphasized (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011). Motivation has been divided, most notably, into intrinsic motivation;

extrinsic motivation; and achievement motivation. The term achievement motivation, formalized in the classic achievement motivation theory by Atkinson, McClelland, and their colleagues (Atkinson 1957; McClelland et al. 1953), explains “how the motive to achieve and the motive to avoid failure influence behavior in a situation where performance is evaluated against some standard of excellence” (Atkinson 1957:371). Elliot et al. (2017) suggest that the term achievement motivation be substituted by the term COMPETENCE motivation.

As for teacher motivation one may think of intrinsic dimension as related to the teacher’s joy of pursuing a meaningful activity of his/her interest in an autonomous manner, and of extrinsic motivation under contextual factors on both macro- and micro-levels (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011).

Demotivation

The term demotivation refers to disinterest inevitably caused by specific external forces that reduce or diminish what motivates a specific type of behavior or action (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011). Important factors which demotivate learners include extremely demanding or challenging tests (Williams & Williams 2011), series of unpleasant experiences (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011), etc. As for teachers, one may, leaving economic issues aside, think of five main demotivating factors: 1) stress as an inherent component of most teaching jobs; 2) reducing teacher AUTONOMY through fixed curricula, standardized tests, etc.; 3) reducing teachers’ level of self-efficacy due to lack of appropriate TRAINING; 4) lack of creativity in material selection for the purpose of training analytical minds; and 5) lack of career structures (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011:168).

Amotivation

The term amotivation refers to a lack of motivation, whether intrinsic or extrinsic, due to having unrealistic outcome expectations (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011).

Extrinsic motivation

The term extrinsic motivation (EM), which encompasses instrumental motivation, refers to a type of motivation, which involves performing a behavior as a means to some specific end, such as receiving rewards or avoiding punishment (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011). According to Dörnyei & Ushioda (2011:24), there are four types of extrinsic motivation: 1) external

regulation (resulting from external source, e.g. rewards); 2) introjected regulation (involving norms accepted by learners); 3) identified regulation (meaning that learners identify with a certain type of activity, and therefore, engage in it); and 4) integrated regulation (meaning that learners engage in a certain type of behavior or activity because it is fully assimilated with their needs, values, and identity. Discussing motivation and its paramount importance in enhancing EDUCATION, Williams & Williams (2011) refer to compliance, recognition, competition, and work avoidance (avoid more work than necessary) as typical extrinsic motivational factors for learners.

Intrinsic motivation

Intrinsic motivation (IM), considered to be a key notion in academic achievement (Cordova & Lepper 1996; Deci et al. 1991) and in empowered, TRANSFORMATIVE LEARNING (Klimkowski & Klimkowska 2012), refers to a type of motivation related to behavior performed for pleasure/satisfaction, discovery or enlightenment purposes. Williams & Williams (2011), while focusing on motivation as perhaps the most important factor to be kept in mind regarding enhancing learners' motivation, highlight involvement, curiosity, challenge, and social interaction as typical intrinsic motivational factors for learners. Now, to develop a clear full picture of the crucial role motivation plays and its appropriateness in education, one may, for instance, think of the SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH to translator education (Király 2000), and also of EMERGENTISM as a post-social constructivist approach to translator training curriculum and translator education (Király 2013, 2016b), in which all of these (intrinsically) motivational factors, particularly student engagement, play a role to accomplish a specific objective.

Motivation in TIS

The key to translation trainees' motivation, according to Slatyer (2015a), is to ensure that these trainees, in the first place, engage in meaningful and valuable activities, e.g. translation contests (Shamma 2015). What is more, trainees' motivation is believed to be enhanced by using (digital) multimedia in translation (Tymczyńska 2009) and interpreting (Seresi 2016) classroom, complementing traditional face-to-face classroom with web-based environments (and therefore, engaging in BLENDED LEARNING), which is thought to be more efficient and much more entertaining (Gorjanc et al. 2016) and accordingly, contribute to more socialization of students (Gómez and Weinreb 2002). In IS, interpreter trainees' motivation is a topic

that has so far remained surprisingly neglected or under-researched, and therefore, is worthy of scholarly attention. One exception is a recent exploratory study by Wu (2016), which addresses the issues of trainee (de)motivation in interpreter training: the author, while emphasizing the need for expanding research agenda concerning motivational behaviors and student perception of demotivating factors during interpreter training, and considering motivation to be dynamic, situated and multifaceted, categorizes research into interpreter trainees' motivation into three main strands: 1) the VALIDITY of motivation as a predictive factor in aptitude tests; b) the reasons why students choose to pursue interpreter training; and 3) the role of motivation in the interpreting PEDAGOGY, the research into which (i.e. the latter) is somehow scant. Wu (ibid) highlights two new measures to encourage and sustain interpreter trainees' motivation: 1) to create a link between all the efforts trainees have made, and their level of competence; and 2) to create opportunities for trainees to see how and/or whether they identify with the interpreting profession. One such meaningful activity, which, as Cirillo & Radicioni (2017) conclude, is likely to increase interpreter trainees' motivation, is ROLE PLAY, a pedagogical technique shown to lead to the EMPOWERMENT of learners in general (see Morales 2008).

MULTITASKING→ SPLIT ATTENTION

NEEDS ANALYSIS→ CURRICULUM

NORM-REFERENCED ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION→ NORM-REFERENCED TESTING

NORM-REFERENCED TESTING

The term norm-referenced testing (NRT), alternatively called *norm-referenced ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION*, as a popular concept in educational psychology and language testing, refers to assessment based on the traditional psychometric (i.e. quantitative measurement) test theory that has dominated research and development in language testing for the past fifty years or so. Norm-referenced testing, which depends on a relative standard (Glaser 1963), measures a learner's performance compared to that of a larger group of same-age learners on the same assessment, leading to a norm-referenced interpretation, and accordingly, norm-referenced tests (NRTs), i.e. tests, the interpretation of results of which is based on the performance shown by a particular group (see e.g. Bachman 1990; Fulcher 2010; Kingston 2008). One should note, however, that the same does not apply to CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTING (CRT). In language

testing, norm-referenced testing is really needed in testing for selection (Van der Linden 1982); however, it is considered to be inadequate as far as the need for measures of language ability based on a common yardstick (i.e. minimum competency testing), and the need for measures for use in evaluating the relative effectiveness of various approaches to foreign and second language teaching (i.e. language program evaluation) is concerned (Bachman & Clark 1987; Bachman 1989, 1990). These authors call for criterion-referenced testing in these situations, instead. In translator TRAINING, some authors (Király (2000) consider norm-referenced testing to be partially unfair due to the labels of levels of achievement and/or failure it imposes on learners. It is worth noting that the fundamental difference of approach between norm-referenced testing and criterion-referenced testing is considered a major issue in educational measurement as related to translation and interpreting assessment (see Campbell & Hale 2003; Eyckmans & Anckaert 2017).

NOTE-TAKING

Definitions

The term note-taking, a STRATEGY traditionally considered a skill central to consecutive interpreting (Stem 2011b), refers to the process or developed system of skillfully writing down some information, not a word-by-word account, of a speech through techniques and often individual styles, e.g. through the use of symbols, abbreviations, emoticons, etc., to aid memory throughout the entire interpreting process.

Golden rules for boosting efficiency in note-taking

Interpreter TRAINING in note-taking should focus on three separate skills in an integrated manner: 1) cognitive skills (i.e. developing a mental cognitive template for information processing); 2) notational skills (i.e. efficient note-taking); and 3) linguistic and pragmatic skills (i.e. skills needed for producing QUALITY interpreting) (Someya 2017b:172). For the purpose of boosting the efficiency of note-taking in consecutive interpreting, and therefore, achieving better quality in interpreting, three important golden rules should be remembered: 1) efficient note-taking is not an objective per se, but a means to provide quality interpreting (Ahrens 2015a; Ito 2017), and pedagogical implications of recent research are about this important point regarding training interpreters in consecutive mode (see Tang 2018); 2) ideas (which according to Gillies 2005, are parts of the

message or the meaning behind the words, typically in subject-verb-and-often object order), not the words themselves, should be taken down (Ahrens 2015a; Dam 2010); 3) note-taking should be introduced as late as possible in interpreter training CURRICULUM (Ilg & Lambert 1996) typically after other exercises have been taught and practiced (Orlando 2010), with the practice of note-taking in the target language at a later training stage (Abuín González 2012).

Note-taking in interpreter training curricula

Teaching note-taking seems to be one of the focal points of training curricula for spoken languages (see under *training*), but less so in signed language interpreter training, as these interpreters seldom engage in note-taking due to the necessity of maintaining direct eye gaze with deaf signers during interpreting (see Napier 2013b), and when working simultaneously, they ‘cannot realistically take notes in order to interpret large consecutive chunks of information because they are using their hands to interpret, regardless of the setting in which they are interpreting (Napier & Leeson 2015:379). But these interpreters can still engage in note-taking when interpreting in consecutive mode, and therefore, here, note-taking can still be taught in the curricula (Jemina Napier, personal communication, March 14, 2018). As far as taking notes in classroom is concerned, trainees are believed to have developed some habits, which can be either useful or harmful: writing down some words while listening, and using familiar symbols and conventional abbreviations belong to the former, whereas verbatim (i.e. word-by-word) note-taking, writing down whole (even short) sentences, and writing down unknown words come under the latter (Ito 2017:54).

Apart from that, note-taking, as a skill to be taught in remote interpreting as one form of technologized interaction, comes with two specific challenges: 1) the challenge of bridging the gap between traditional conceptualization of note-taking in consecutive interpreting and that of note-taking in dialogue or community interpreting; and 2) the challenge of taking notes interpreters have to face when they have only partial access to the multi-sensory inputs found in face-to-face interactions (see Spinolo et al. 2018).

Notes for ASSESSMENT purposes

Trainees’ notes can be and are used for assessment purposes in consecutive interpreting: Orlando (2010) points out that this can be done adopting either

a process-oriented approach (i.e. based on the quality of the interpretation and the final notes), or a process-oriented approach (i.e. observing and assessing trainees' notes being taken live), with recent technological advances such as DIGITAL PEN facilitating the latter.

Note-taking in translator training curricula

In TS, interestingly, teaching note-taking, as research (Sakamoto 2011) shows, might have a positive effect on training translators, especially as far as understanding and reproducing clause relations within the text is concerned.

NULL CURRICULUM→**CURRICULUM**

OBSERVATION-SUPERVISION APPROACH

The term observation-supervision approach refers to a teaching approach to interpreting developed by Dean & Pollard (Dean et al. 2004a), which compliments their DEMAND-CONTROL SCHEMA (DC-S) by looking at interpreting as a practice profession, rather than a technical one (Dean & Pollard 2005, 2011, 2013; Dean et al. 2004a). This approach, borrowed from PROBLEM-BASED LEARNING (PBL), serves the purpose of bridging the gap between classroom environment and fieldwork experiences (Dean et al. 2004b), and aims to create a learning environment, where learners engage in interpreting similar to real-life scenarios (Dean et al. 2004a). In other words, the learners, while adopting demand-control schema, engage in *job-shadowing*, i.e. the process of shadowing a physician, psychologist, etc. in work situations to observe and familiarize themselves with typical dialogues and behaviors in such work environments (Dean et al. 2004a).

OFFICIAL CURRICULUM→**HIDDEN CURRICULUM**

ONLINE LEARNING→**E-LEARNING**

ONLINE PORTFOLIO→**PORTFOLIO**

OPEN CURRICULUM→**CURRICULUM**

PACTE MODEL

PACTE model, anchored on a cognitive-constructivist approach, refers to a holistic dynamic MODEL of translation COMPETENCE originally developed by the PACTE (Process in the Acquisition of Translation Competence and EVALUATION) research group formed in October 1997

as one of the representatives of the process-oriented approach to translation competence, with the ultimate aim of improving CURRICULUM DESIGN, and ASSESSMENT in translator TRAINING institutions (Hurtado Albir 2017). It should be noted that the holistic nature of this model has been challenged by some authors (e.g. Klimkowski 2015:25-26) as it can be argued that the model seemingly takes the important role of personal resources in translator training into consideration. The first version of this multi-componential model first presented in 1988 but originally developed in 1998 (PACTE 1998) was then refined in 2003. PACTE model, firmly based in empirical research and advocated in this respect (see Klimkowski 2015), with research (Llalla-Soler 2015) contributing to its validation, describes translation competence through six inter-related, hierarchical subcomponents, with a special focus on the distinction between DECLARATIVE KNOWLEDGE and PROCEDURAL KNOWLEDGE (Hurtado Albir 2017; PACTE 2003, 2011, 2014, 2015) considered relevant for translation processing and translation PEDAGOGY (Wilss 1996, 2008), and the belief in the initial role being played by procedural knowledge in the training of translators (see also Šeböková 2010): 1) communicative competence (the system of underlying knowledge and skills necessary for linguistic communication); 2) extralinguistic competence (both general world knowledge and domain-specific knowledge); 3) instrumental-professional competence (the knowledge and skills related to using COMPUTER-AIDED/-ASSISTED TRANSLATION (CAT) TOOLS often referred to as translation memory systems), e.g. CORPORA, translation memories (TM), terminology management systems (TMS), documentary sources and information and communication TECHNOLOGY (ICT) applied to translation as part and parcel of the practice of professional translation also researched under the term *information competence* in translation (see Paradowska 2015); 4) psycho-physiological competence (the ability to use all kinds of psychomotor, cognitive and attitudinal resources); 5) transfer competence (the ability to understand the source text and re-express it in the target language taking into account the function of the translation and the characteristics of the receptor); and 6) strategic competence (comprising all individual procedures, conscious and unconscious, verbal and nonverbal, used to solve problems encountered during the translation process) (Hurtado Albir 2017; PACTE 2000, 2001, 2011). Nevertheless, PACTE translation competence model has not escaped criticism from TS scholars: e.g. Kiraly (2013, 2016b), based on his own observations, finds this model to be vague and a 'static-box-like representation' of translation competence, which has failed to communicate any of the complexity of the learning process.

PARAPHRASING

Paraphrasing, sometimes called *explaining*, refers to a micro-STRATEGY (or meaning-based strategy) in interpreting and in simultaneous, consecutive, and SIGHT INTERPRETING/TRANSLATION modes (Li 2015b), using which the meaning of a message is re-expressed using different lexical and syntactic resources (Pérez-Luzardo 2015). Paraphrasing, as a type of pre-interpreting EXERCISE (Pérez-Luzardo 2015) or technique (Stem 2011b), has been suggested by different authors (Chabasse 2015a; Russo & Pippa 2002; Russo & Pippa 2004) as a promising diagnostic tool/test in interpreter APTITUDE TESTING.

PEDAGOGY

Definitions

The term pedagogy, from the ancient Greek word *paidagogos* meaning ‘the slave who led children to school’ (Beetham & Sharpe 2007), can, as an umbrella term to encompass both EDUCATION and TRAINING, be defined as all the processes and phenomena of teaching and learning in educational contexts, with CURRICULUM and SYLLABUS (what is taught) and the methodology (how it is taught) serving as its main components to make sure that instruction is done properly and professionally.

Pedagogy in TIS

Translation pedagogy, being, traditionally speaking, prescriptive and product-oriented in nature (Fox 2000) and mainly based on ERROR ANALYSIS (Kim 2004), is a sub-field of TS. Translation pedagogy is still in its infancy, is in need of substantial theorization and research (Bernardini 2004b; Cui & Zhao 2015a, 2015b; Kiraly 1995; Varela 2007) and, under the influence of the social/sociological turn (Angelelli 2014; Pöschhacker 2006), holds many difficult challenges (see special issue of *InTRALinea* 16, 2014). However, it should be noted that, in her doctoral thesis, Mitchell-Schuitevoerder (2014), while advocating the application of a project-based syllabus to translator training, points out that translation pedagogy must look beyond the product, and to include all the stakeholders, and adapt to the ever-changing world of translation. What is more, as learners are the actual receivers of training and the ultimate goal of any educational program, including translator and interpreter education (Hu 2018),

pedagogy is moving in a somehow different direction, i.e. it, in line with current higher education teaching philosophy in general, and the current European Higher Education Area (EHEA) framework in particular (see Presas 2012), is increasingly adopting a student/learner-centered nature and moves away from traditional teacher-centered instruction in translator (Chen 2019; Echeverri 2015; Fox 2000; Gambier 2012; Kelly 2005; Olivera Lobo et al. 2007; Tennent 2005b) and interpreter (Cox 2013; Tennent 2005b; Wilson 2013) training, a paradigm shift increasingly reflected in significant changes in teaching methodologies and ASSESSMENT procedures (Hurtado Albir 2018), and of course, in technologization of TIS, i.e. TECHNOLOGY-aided/-assisted translation (Bowker & Fisher 2010, 2013; Jiménez-Crespo 2009; Varela 2007; Williams 2003) and interpretation (Ahrens 2015a:286; Orlando 2015; Pöchlhacker 2016:217-219; Ruiz Mezcuca 2016; Tymczyńska 2009; Wang 2015) teaching/performance and use of ICT in TIS, and of course, in digital education in both fields (see also Corpas Pastor & Durán-Muñoz 2018; special issue of the *FITISPos International Journal* 5 (1), 2018). Such a paradigm shift implies a special focus on learner's experiences, talents, personality, social backgrounds and needs on one hand, and using current pedagogical knowledge for the purpose of maximizing didactic efficiency in educational contexts on the other (Echeverri 2015). As Varela (2007), in line with Donovan (2006a), argues, such a strong paradigm shift in learning habits to a more visual culture should lead translation pedagogy to include more visual resources such as videoconferencing, web conferencing, and videostreaming as new technologies. Mention must be made of two relevant points here: firstly, one cannot deny that there are barriers to such a paradigm shift (i.e. from teacher-centered to learner-/student-centered education) mainly due to a lack of awareness on behalf of faculty members; secondly, awareness-raising in this respect requires the support of college administrators and the collaborative efforts of both full-time and adjunct faculty responsible for translator and interpreter education/training (see Cox 2013). Cox (ibid: 225-226) concludes that a paradigm shift from teacher-centered to learner-/student-centered education in interpreter training requires significant changes in five critical domains: 1) role (with teachers as facilitators/educators and learners as active participants); 2) relationship (as a facilitator of learning); 3) locus of control (involving shared power and decision making in classroom and learner accountability for learning); 4) method of instruction (focused on collaborative learning, PEER ASSESSMENT and SELF-ASSESSMENT); and 5) psychological environment (encouraging safety).

In IS, pedagogy, mostly being the product of prescribed rules that in many cases resulted from personal experience, opinions, and anecdotes

(Angelelli 2000) and more often than not focused on discussions of PROBLEM-BASED LEARNING (PBL) (i.e. problem-solving skills/strategies acquisition) (Angelelli 2005, 2017; Riccardi 1996), is still influenced by the Interpretive Theory (IT) paradigm (Lederer 2010; Salama-Carr 2009; Setton 1999, ch.2), also known as *the ESIT MODEL* and sometimes called *the Théorie du sens* developed by Seleskovitch (1962, 1968). In addition, interpreting pedagogy is, of course, influenced by the social/sociological tum characterized by the social agency of interpreters and interdisciplinarity of IS (Angelelli 2014; Niemants & Cirillo 2017; Pöchhacker 2006). Such an influence may result in recent application of various approaches to interpreter pedagogy and education: dialogic pedagogy (Skidmore & Murakami 2016) in teaching dialogue interpreting (see Merlini 2017) with a special focus on ROLE PLAY (Moser-Mercer 2015a); English as a lingua franca (ELF) pedagogy (Albl-Mikasa 2013b, 2015; Albl-Mikasa et al. 2017; special issue of *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 7 (2), 2013); narrative pedagogy (Nicodemus et al. 2015); and interprofessional education (IPE) (Krystallidou & Salaets 2016; Krystallidou et al. 2018a, 2018b). Mention must also be made of an observed growth of evidence-based interpreting pedagogy, i.e. using the available evidence from research to inform teaching interpretation (see Monikowski 2017; Pöchhacker 2010b; Roy & Winston 2019; special issue of *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 5 (2), 2013). In IS, pedagogy can be divided into broad themes of selection; assessment; curriculum; and teaching (Zhan 2014). Along the same lines, Moser-Mercer (2015a) points out that interpreting pedagogy, mainly developed for training conference interpreters to date, refers to instructional practices in a group setting as shaped by a given curriculum and also including the complex issue of assessment, and, according to Kalina (1998), must be based on knowledge of *interpreting-specific* processes and phenomena, rather than *written translation*.

However, it is worth noting here that, since in dialogue interpreter training, interpreters often deal with written texts such as school reports or informed consents to be translated, or with legal/court-related documents to be sight translated or, more aptly, sight interpreted, attention should also be paid to such writing-based tasks in the education of these interpreters and in interpreting pedagogy (see Cirillo & Niemants 2017: 19; Valero-Garcés 2014:4; Weber 1990). Some authors (Angelelli 2000; Phelan 2018) call for the increasing necessity of adopting an interdisciplinary approach to interpreting pedagogy (for a discussion on the pros and cons of interdisciplinarity in TS, see Chesterman 2005/2017). Besides, dialogic interaction is suggested to be a possible pedagogy for teaching dialogue interpreting (see Angelelli 2017). This said, it should be added that what has

received very little attention in the domain of interpreting pedagogy includes (but is not limited to) topics such as *knowledge enhancement* in trainees (Peng 2017); and *approaches*, such as cognitive and psychological approaches (Korpal 2016), to name but a few.

It is worth noting that despite the view that compared to translation, the effects of technological progress on interpreting have been few and apart (Blasco Mayor & Jiménez Ivars 2007), (effective) pedagogy and technology are closely interrelated in interpreter education and training, and of course, in the digital education in the field (Class & Schneider 2014; Corpas Pastor & Durán-Muñoz 2018; Diriker 2010; Moser-Mercer 2015a; Orlando 2016; Pöschhacker 2016, ch.11). SITUATED LEARNING must be added to the list as one of the key pedagogical models and principles in translation (González Davies & Enríquez-Raído 2017; Klimkowski 2015; Taibi 2016b) and interpreting (González Davies & Enríquez-Raído 2017; Klimkowski 2015; Li 2015a; Miner 2016, 2018; Miner et al. 2016; Sandrelli 2015b; Schöffner 2017; Taibi 2016b) pedagogy.

PEER ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION→ ASSESSMENT

PEER CONFERENCING→ PEER ASSESSMENT

PEER FEEDBACK→ ASSESSMENT

PEER REVIEW→ PEER ASSESSMENT

PERFORMANCE(-BASED) ASSESSMENT→ ASSESSMENT

PIE METHOD→ PRESELECTED ITEMS EVALUATION METHOD

PORTFOLIO

Definitions & portfolio development

The term portfolio, originally developed in the fine arts and similar fields, may be a reliable and valid measure for language ASSESSMENT, which, in pedagogical settings, refers to a purposeful collection of work by the same learner completed over time to serve as an assessment tool/instrument of the range and depth of his/her learning, often including SELF-ASSESSMENT and PEER ASSESSMENT (Fulcher 2010; Miller et al. 2009, ch.12; Walvoord & Anderson 2010). Hence the term *portfolio assessment* (Kubiszyn & Borich 2013, ch.10). Portfolios, as a new form of assessment, have become popular in knowledge development and EVALUATION, teaching skill acquisition and reflective practice, and vocational and professional TRAINING (Klenowski 2005, cited in Arumí Ribas 2010:107). Kubiszyn & Borich (2013) suggest 7 stages for the development of portfolio assessments in pedagogical settings: 1) deciding on the purpose

of the portfolio; 2) identifying the cognitive skills and dispositions that are to be assessed; 3) deciding who will plan the portfolio; 4) deciding on the content of the portfolio; 5) building the portfolio rubrics; 6) developing a procedure to aggregate all portfolio ratings (e.g. in a rating form); and 7) determining the logistics (timelines, procedures for turning in and returning portfolios, etc.).

Challenges to the VALIDITY of portfolios

However, one must mention the concerns expressed over the assumption of considering portfolio a more valid or more ethical alternative assessment approach (Fox 2017). Accordingly, some authors (Kubiszyn & Borich 2013:204-205) suggest that, in general, the major challenges to the validity of portfolio assessment that need to be addressed are representativeness; rubrics; and relevance: as for the first challenge, educators need to be clear about the skills and dispositions that are to be assessed, and should require a variety of products that reflect these; as for the second challenge, educators need to develop carefully articulated rubrics; as for the last one, educators must not require learner abilities and skills extraneous to those the instrument is intended to measure.

Portfolios in TIS

In TS, portfolio refers to a generally known, relatively new constructivist learner-/student-centered assessment instrument/tool of COMPETENCE, which, as a key component of project-based (PjB) syllabus (Galán-Mañas & Hurtado Albir 2015; Mitchell-Schuitevoerder 2014), is, in line with the current European Higher EDUCATION Area (EHEA) framework, considered a tool of choice for competence development and assessment (Galán-Mañas 2016; Galán-Mañas & Hurtado Albir 2015). In translator and interpreter training and assessment contexts, a portfolio refers to a set of best (revised) translations or perhaps semester test translations completed using individual and peer group project work over the COURSE of a program of studies (Kelly 2005; Kiraly 2000), and thus, primarily (not exclusively though) serves as a SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT instrument/tool for translation (Johnson 2003) and interpreting (Slatyer 2015a) despite reports of portfolios indicating their being more successful in FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT contexts than in summative assessment ones in general (Fox 2017). Moreover, student portfolios include reports of conclusions reached from discussion of different problems, critical assessment of tools used in doing translations, or sometimes cover statements and reflections

explaining the rationale behind the whole assignment, and are submitted on paper or electronically to be (ideally) assessed by a team (including the course instructor) for the purpose of measuring progress and effectiveness of teaching (Galán-Mañas 2016). Both Kiraly (2000) and Varela (2007) agree that portfolio is a standard feature of formative and summative assessment in translator education, and due to its utility as an assessment instrument/tool for the purpose of summative assessment and self-assessment for learners for the course, a portfolio is a frequently employed tool (complementary or not) in teaching-learning process (see also Hurtado Albir 2007; Kelly 2010a), and according to Calvo (2015), Federici (2010), and Li (2006), it is the main assessment instrument in the translation classroom. Varela (2007), in line with Johnson (2003), discusses important advantages of a (student translation) portfolio: 1) improved student self-confidence and MOTIVATION; 2) facilitation of instructors' assessment task; and 3) improved learners' self-reflection, with the latter being advocated by TS (Kiraly 2014; Kościatkowska-Końska 2015) and IS (Bown 2013; Gustafsson et al. 2012) authors as an essential component of any pedagogical practice (both for trainees and trainers) in general, and as a key element of the development of translation competence in particular.

Apart from that, in her explorations of ways to apply portfolios as an assessment instrument/tool in translation classroom, Johnson (2003), in line with Canfora (2016), concludes that in addition to highly integrating teaching and assessment practices, a portfolio approach to course design provides learners/trainees with a more 'coherent and empowering academic experience', which gives learners authority, confidence, skills, etc. to be able to provide QUALITY translation. It is worth noting that Veiga Díaz & García González (2016) propose that portfolios as assessment formats or tasks, along with questionnaires, projects and exams, are best suited for a constructively aligned assessment (as a solid pedagogical framework) for translator training because, as they argue, portfolios and portfolio assessment allow both students and educator to evaluate progress against a specified set of criteria defined usually by the educator based on CURRICULUM goals and intended learning outcomes (ILOs) (see also Sawyer 2004). These authors conclude that this objective can best be achieved if such tasks can be used diagnostically (detecting strengths and weakness throughout the process of teaching and learning); formatively (enhancing learning by giving continuous effective feedback); and summatively (measuring the level of intended learning outcomes (ILOs) and grading students work).

However, according to Galán-Mañas (2016), using portfolios in translator training has disadvantages too: 1) first-year students find it

difficult to engage in self-reflection; 2) students find creating portfolios confusing; and 3) creating portfolios imposes a high load on both instructors and students. Along the same line, Calvo (2015) adds more disadvantages of using portfolios in translator training and assessment: 4) they are time-consuming; 5) students may use them as propaganda for their assumed progress rather than expressing their problems sincerely; and 6) there are currently no valid grading criteria for portfolios.

Portfolio assessment in interpreting has been advocated by some authors (Arumí Ribas 2010; Hertog 2014; Humphrey 2000; Kalina 2007; Sawyer 2004) as an instrument for rating student progress in process-oriented assessment. Sawyer (2004), while suggesting the need for course and curriculum designers to include process-oriented assessment for interpreter training, e.g. in the form of portfolios, discusses the advantages of using this evaluation tool in interpreter assessment: 1) providing range and depth in assessment; 2) addressing the criticism leveled at interpreter assessment as consisting of one-shot testing and ambiguous rating criteria; and 3) improving reflective practice and self-assessment (for the latter, see also Bown 2013).

However, Sawyer (2004) mentions the challenges to the implementation of portfolios in interpreter assessment: portfolios require a great deal of time to develop; and there is the need for establishing clear criteria and evaluation standards. Furthermore, as Arumí Ribas (2010) suggests, using portfolios may require certain changes to some instructors' teaching approach. Setton & Dawrant (2016b:97), while acknowledging the effectiveness of using portfolios in interpreting assessment, point out that they are not acceptable in credentialing, where candidates are expected to show their best performance on a bad day. Apart from that, Napier (2006), discussing Auslan/English interpreting program delivery in Australia, suggests developing a portfolio of interpretations on videotape. A specifically popular type of portfolio is called *e-portfolio* (alternatively called *electronic* or *online portfolio*), which, as an electronic iteration of this tool in virtual learning environments (VLEs), implies students' comfort with TECHNOLOGY, and facilitates the collection and archiving of extensive samples of student work (Drezek McConnell & Doolittle 2012) considered beneficial to (blended) assessment through reflection and revision as key components of learning (Gillespie et al. 2007, ch.5; Stein & Graham 2014).

PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT → PORTFOLIO PRACTICUM → TRAINING

PRAXIS

The term *praxis*, from the Greek *praxis* meaning ‘practice and/or action’, relates to the transformative possibilities afforded by reflective action, with the potential for empowering students (Bach 2010). Praxis, according to Kiraly & Hofmann (2016), comes with self-reflection capable of improving performance and leading to superior COMPETENCE. Kiraly (2005a) strongly advocates praxis in translator EDUCATION context, and differentiates it from practice in the sense that it is only the former which, if carefully taken into consideration in moving beyond a prescriptive view of translation competence towards an active capability view in classroom, can bring the profession alive.

PREDICTIVE VALIDITY → VALIDITY

PRESELECTED ITEMS EVALUATION METHOD

The Preselected Items EVALUATION (PIE) method, developed by Kockaert & Segers (2014, 2017), as the adapted, practical, pragmatic version of the CALIBRATION OF DICHOTOMOUS ITEMS (CDI) method (Eyckmans & Anckaert 2017:43; Kockaert & Segers 2017:150), refers to an ASSESSMENT method based on test-takers’ performance on a particular set of translated segments as preselected by the translation grader (Eyckmans & Anckaert 2017) (for two case examples of applying PIE method to translation evaluation, see Akbari & Segers 2017; Van Egdom et al. 2019). What is shared by both PIE method (with its first and second stages called *criterion-referenced*, and its fourth and fifth ones being *norm-referenced*, see Segers & Kockaert 2016:70) and CDI method (as a norm-referenced translation assessment method) is that both are dichotomous methods, distinguishing between right or wrong solutions, but not between levels of error (Kockaert & Segers 2017). The big difference between CDI and PIE assessment methods, according to Winibert Segers (personal communication, March 29, 2018), is the number of items on which the evaluation is done: PIE method, not CDI, works with a limited number of preselected items, not to mention the difference that in the former (CDI), the items are selected on the basis of the only docimological dimension, whereas the latter (PIE) calculates, optionally, docimological values on TRANSLATION BRIEF relevant items only (Kockaert & Segers 2017). One drawback of PIE method, according to Segers & Kockaert (2016), is that it is very time-consuming, a problem these authors hope that will be resolved through automation of the method. Other weaknesses associated

with the PIE method are that it still comes with subjective influences in the selection and correction phases (see Van Egdom et al. 2019). Despite these weaknesses, the PIE method saves time; assesses students on the same items; considers an answer either right or wrong (binary logic); and allows for higher INTER-RATER RELIABILITY and INTRA-RATER RELIABILITY (Van Egdom et al. 2019).

PRIORITIZING→CONDENSING

PROBLEM-BASED LEARNING

Definitions

Problem-based learning (PBL), pioneered by Barrows & Tamblyn the 1960s (see Barrows 1996) in the area of medical EDUCATION and popularized by the same authors in the 1980s (see Barrows & Tamblyn 1980), can be generally defined as a total education STRATEGY or pedagogical MODEL based on the principle of using real-world problems to teach learners how to acquire new knowledge in a specific field (Kwan 2009; Savin-Baden & Major 2004; Stanton & McCaffrey 2011). An essential element of problem-based learning is active student engagement, not only as learners, but as agents of change and as a mechanism for the effective integration of diverse stakeholder needs, which can shape problem-based learning curricula and connect it with other institutional learner-/student-centered initiatives (Rourke et al. 2011).

A closely related term is *project-based learning*, which emerged from problem-based approaches in the United States. It refers to a popular instructional strategy within the principles of SMALL GROUP LEARNING, which engages students in authentic learning through project work (Tan & Chapman 2016). In fact, project-based learning encourages authentic-like opportunities but does not require full AUTHENTICITY (Laur 2013).

Challenges to problem-based learning

Poikela & Moore (2011) identify seven key challenges to the idea of teaching learners according to PBL: 1) Reorienting the CURRICULUM around professional competences; 2) shifting roles from a lecturer to a project-based learning tutor; 3) supporting self-directed learning (with students being in an increasing need of guidance with independent studying, especially at early stages of learning); 4) connecting the PEDAGOGY based on problem-based learning to the workplace; 5) facilitating deep learning

(with a particular focus on creative and flexible use of the tutorial process); 6) accessibility of resource requirements; and 7) aligning ASSESSMENT strategies with problem-based learning pedagogy.

Problem-based learning assessment

Macdonald & Savin- Baden (2004) have summarized the foundational principles of problem-based learning assessment: 1) having authenticity; 2) assessing process-based professional activity; 3) reflecting learners' development from novice to expert practitioner; 4) preparing the ground for learners to experience assessment as they would in professional contexts; 5) focusing on student SELF-ASSESSMENT and self-reflection serving as a basis for future self-directed learning and CONTINUOUS/CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (CPD); and 6) being aligned with COURSE objectives.

Problem-based learning in translator & interpreter education

In translator education, problem-based learning is advocated as a student/learner-centered education strategy, which facilitates development and assessment of cross-competences, contributes to enhanced learner MOTIVATION, and to improved social skills and teamwork capabilities despite being very time-consuming, and challenging in terms of lack of experience in teamwork activities and heterogeneity of students as far as their level of interest and engagement in class activities is concerned (García González & Veiga Díaz 2015). Similarly, as research (Balogh & Lesznyák 2018; Li et al. 2015; Mitchell-Schuitevoerder 2013, 2014) shows, and as other TS authors (Hurtado Albir 2018; Inoue 2005; Kerkkä 2009; Mitchell-Schuitevoerder 2011) emphasize, project-based learning, with its advantages (e.g. opportunities to learn cooperation, mutual help, the opportunity to get FEEDBACK) clearly outweighing its disadvantages (e.g. source text difficulty, terminology, time management), can be a promising method in translator education, e.g. in computer-assisted translation pedagogy, where learners engage in solving unique, ill-defined, real-life problems beyond their background knowledge and through engagement, self-reflection and feedback (Mellinger 2018b), or as combined with collaborative learning for virtual translation courses (Pitkäsalo & Ketola 2018). In interpreter education, problem-based learning has been advocated, e.g. in teaching terminology (Sánchez-Gijón et al. 2009) and strategies (Riccardi 1996), and even suggested by some authors (Sánchez-Gijón et al. 2009) to be integrated into translator & interpreter TRAINING curricula.

PROCEDURAL KNOWLEDGE

The term procedural knowledge refers to what one needs to be able to do an activity. This term typically appears in the DECLARATIVE KNOWLEDGE/PROCEDURAL KNOWLEDGE distinction as part of the conceptual apparatus of EXPERTISE studies in cognitive psychology and is a disputable issue in translator and interpreter TRAINING. One should consider that this very distinction between these two types of knowledge is relevant for translation processing and translation PEDAGOGY (Wilss 1996, 2008). As Shreve (2006), in line with PACTE (2003, 2011, 2014, 2015), and from the perspective of expertise studies, points out, translation COMPETENCE (TC) could be, from a cognitive perspective, interpreted as declarative and procedural knowledge available to the expert translator. Alves (2005) argues in favor of a balanced interaction between the explicit aspect (i.e. declarative knowledge) and the implicit aspect (i.e. procedural knowledge) in translator training.

PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE → COMPETENCE
PROFESSIONALISM → PROFESSIONALIZATION

PROFESSIONALIZATION

Definitions & stages

The term professionalization refers to the process of giving a professional identity and/or status, or social position to a profession, occupation, or trade. A closely related term is *professionalism*, which refers to the way practitioners, including translators and interpreters, define the qualities and objectives that characterize the profession they follow in search of their occupational identities and self-interest. According to Wilensky (1964), one may divide the process of professionalization into five stages: 1) full-time engagement in a certain type of profession; 2) establishment of a TRAINING school; 3) establishment of professional associations; 4) persistent political lobbying in order to gain legal protection of the same profession; and 5) establishing a formal code of ethics.

Professionalization & professionalism in TIS

In TIS, professionalization refers to a factor of influence on testing and ASSESSMENT in training (Thelen 2016) (see special issue of *InTRALinea* 16, 2014), with establishment of training programs (Wadensjö 2009);

CERTIFICATION systems (Dybiec-Gajer 2014); INTERNSHIP programs (Johnston 2007); and professional associations and agencies (Dong & Napier 2016; Wadensjö 2009) serving as its crucial elements (see also Angelelli et al. 2013). In TS, professionalization is a phenomenon, in which the role of universities and research, while still being controversial (e.g. due to the great number of highly qualified translators with no specialized training) (Cordero 1994), is emphasized (Salaets 2012) e.g. as a facilitator for continued learning, coordinator of internship programs (Cordero 1994), or that of the so-called *skills lab* (Thelen 2019). It can be approached from two perspectives: from the perspective of translator EDUCATION; and from that of translation profession. According to Dybiec-Gajer (2014), as for the former (i.e. from the perspective of translator education), the field of TS has experienced professionalization in the sense that it has access to a vast body of research, and to developed standards and proposed theoretical solutions along with practical applications; in the sense that, depending on the geographical context, it has started or is starting to consider and implement the implications resulting from the link between training and market needs and/or standards; and finally, in the sense that it aims to raise the status of translation and translators in general, from a still valid call to contribute to translators' visibility to support for various inter-institutional and cross-national initiatives to increase the QUALITY of training. As for the latter (i.e. from the perspective of translation profession), TS has experienced professionalization in the sense that, due to the struggle of translation profession to gain more recognition, there seems to be a proliferation of translation and translation-related standards, introduction or re-design of translator certification programs, revision and extension of codes of ethics, which as a whole impact pedagogical settings.

In IS, professionalization entails a need for both quality interpreting and an increased number of interpreters, highlighting the necessity of interpreter education (Wilson 2013). Professionalization of signed language interpreting began in the 1960s with establishment of professional associations, with the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) leading the way (Ball 2018; Napier & Goswell 2013; Sheneman 2018; Witter-Merithew & Johnson 2004) in this interpreting setting, which differs internationally in terms of stages of professionalization, provision of interpreters, and interpreter training (Angelelli et al. 2013; Napier & Goswell 2013). Different authors highlight the need for a *turn* in the direction of professionalization, particularly in dialogue interpreting (Snell-Hornby 2018) and community settings in general (D'Hayer 2013; Dong & Napier, 2016; Hertog 2013; Kelly & Martin 2009; Meyer 2002; Mikkelsen 2004; Rabadán-Gómez 2016; Roberts 2002; Stern 2011a; Wadensjö et al. 2007),

and interpreting in asylum settings in particular (Iannone et al. 2017), with the need for addressing such key issues as the role of the interpreter; the role of professional associations; provision for the training of interpreters; trainers and end users (or clients); regulation of quality standards and the ethical code; and the legal recognition of the profession (Rabadán-Gómez 2016). However, some authors (Taylor et al. 2018) lament the fact that ensuring professionalization has become a priority at the expense of accountability and transparency of interpreting performance.

Professionalism, in IS, as technical COMPETENCE complemented by a commitment to provide quality interpreting and to follow the code of ethics and norms (Setton & Dawrant 2016a:360), could be considered a *sine qua non* for the attainment of EXPERTISE (Setton & Dawrant 2016a, ch.10; Tiselius & Hild 2017). Professionalism in interpreting, measured against assessment criteria in interpreter certification (Iglesias Fernández 2013), stands on four structural pillars: 1) knowledge and implementation of the code of ethics (see also Setton 2010b; Vargas-Urpi 2012); 2) knowledge of the interpreter's role(s) and interpreting-specific constraints; 3) knowledge of the area of expertise and protocols of the field where the interpretation takes place; and 4) the interpreter's technical expertise, which comprises linguistic, interpreting and coordination competence (Gonzalez 2013, cited in Hale & Gonzalez 2017:204). For Setton & Dawrant (2016a: xxvii, 2016b: xxxiii), professionalism in interpreting is manifest in different facets of craft, ethics and service altogether aiming at quality (assurance).

A closely related term is *e-professionalism* defined as behaviors and attitudes displayed through digital media. Some authors (Best 2016) call for the inclusion of components of e-professionalism into interpreting curricula.

PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT--> EXPERT JUDGMENT
PROJECT-BASED LEARNING--> PROBLEM-BASED LEARNING

PROPOSITIONAL ANALYSIS

Definitions

A proposition is a series of short, abstract statements (Horning 1987), the smallest unit of discourse that contains a predicate (most commonly, not always, a verb) and one or more arguments (subject and object of the verb) and can be evaluated (Farrow 1996). The term propositional analysis, originally developed by Kintsch (1974) for the purpose of exploring the recall of text content, refers to an established technique, in which

propositions are identified by parsing a text sentence by sentence (Farrow 1996).

Propositional analysis in IS

In interpreter ASSESSMENT, propositional analysis, as a method of QUALITY assessment (Liu & Chiu 2011), is often adopted for the purpose of assessing whether the meaning transfer from source language into target language is characterized by fidelity, accuracy and completeness (Guo 2013). As far as interpreting performance assessment is concerned, this method (at the three levels of predicates, modifications and connectives) has been advocated for providing a clear overview of the difficulties students encounter while attempting to comprehend and reproduce texts in interpreting, for facilitating metalinguistic analysis in interpreting (see Lydia Ding 2017), and for overcoming the drawbacks of ERROR ANALYSIS (EA) as adopted to interpreting assessment (Liu 2015a; Tommola & Lindholm 1995). However, in addition to being language-bound and concept-based, propositional analysis ignores expressions of attitude, modality and intentionality (Guo 2013; Pöchhacker 2016; Roy 1987), and as Lydia Ding (2017) herself acknowledges too, it considers only the semantic aspect of interpreting, and sidelines its delivery aspect. Therefore, one must remember that propositional analysis cannot be considered “an all-purpose tool for measuring accuracy in interpreting” (Pöchhacker 2016:137), and therefore, due to such inherent weaknesses, considerable care must be taken when using it for the purpose of interpreting quality assessment, and should, ideally, be combined with other approaches such as error analysis (Bartłomiejczyk 2010:186).

QUALITAS PROJECT

The term Qualitas (Assessing Legal Interpreting QUALITY through Testing and CERTIFICATION) project refers to a new CERTIFICATION system under the auspices of the European Commission and the Directorate General, which recommends that the European Union set uniform quality standards for legal interpreting in order to ensure quality interpreting regarding issues of criminal justice (see e.g. Giambruno 2014).

QUALITY

Definitions

The term quality, in pedagogical settings, refers to the level of standards in teaching and learning, which is expected to be raised in line with the expectations of all the stakeholders, including (but not limited to) learners, teachers, employers, and parents.

Dimensions of quality in translator & interpreter TRAINING

Despite the fact that there is no generally accepted definition of quality in translation (House 2009, 2013, 2015, 2018; Karoubi 2016b) and interpreting (Collados Aís & García Becerra 2015b; Zwischenberger 2013), it, as a multiperspectivist, multireferential, dynamic and social CONSTRUCT in TS (Colina 2009) and IS (Collados Aís & García Becerra 2015a, 2015b; Garzone 2002; Grbić 2008, 2015; Pöchhacker 2011a, 2016), is a central concern in translation training (Thelen 2008) and interpreter EDUCATION and CERTIFICATION (Grbić 2015) and perhaps occurs at the intersection of training and profession (Thelen 2016). Quality in TS has been explored mainly with regard to issues of equivalence (Baker 2018; Nida 1969); function or skopos (Reiss & Vermeer 1984); and less so in terms of the effect of reflective learning (Chen 2019) and personality traits (see Akbari & Segers 2017; Hubscher-Davidson 2009, 2013a, 2013b, 2016, 2018a, 2018b) and in newer forms of translation such as crowdsourcing or crowdsourced translations as one emerging localization framework in applied branch of TS (Jiménez-Crespo 2017, 2018; Munday 2016), among others. Quality in TS, is associated with different levels of translation COMPETENCE (TC) (Dungan 2013; Quinci 2017): from the perspective of those in translation management, it is often associated with processes, work flows and deadlines; from the perspective of professionals, it is a way to link input with efficiency; and from that of academics, quality is often a question of equivalence and language use (Pedersen 2017). In IS, Quality has been explored mainly within conference interpreting context (Collados Aís & García Becerra 2015a; Zwischenberger 2010, 2013) and less so in, e.g. remote interpreting (RI) (Amato et al. 2018; Braun & Taylor 2012, 2015; Napier et al. 2018b) as one form of technologized interaction, and quite recently in interpreting for deaf people (Holcomb & Smith 2018). In fact, quality foregrounds either the interpreting product or interpreting as a professional service performed in a particular context and setting for a given communicative purpose (Pöchhacker 2011a). Quality in interpreting has been modeled at different levels by different scholars (e.g. Kalina 2007;

Pöchhacker 2001b) despite a lack of consensus among scholars in this respect (Koby & Lacruz 2017). One may identify three main focal points of quality as a crucial element in interpreting: 1) the content; 2) the presentation; and 3) the reception (Behr 2015:202). Also Grbić (2008) identifies three dimensions of the multifaceted construct of quality: 1) *quality as exception* (to be attained by the most qualified interpreters only); 2) *quality as perfection* (to be attained under the right circumstances); and 3) *quality as fitness for purpose* (to be attained in line with accepted quality-related standards and user expectations).

Improving quality in translator & interpreter training & ASSESSMENT

As far as improving translation and interpreting quality is concerned, one may think of a focus on the cycle of research-education-practice (Napier 2005a; Setton 2010a; Valero-Garcés 2015) as a crucial aspect of enhancing the quality of interpreting as concerned with many variables in any setting (Major et al. 2012); this important three-way combination must be undertaken if valid assessment/testing is to be attained (Iglesias Fernández 2011). Within the broad panorama of the TIS field, quality is a concept, regarding which there is no consensus (Koby & Lacruz 2017; see also *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies* 16, 2017) and, as Chiaro & Nocella (2004) conclude, improving quality, a concept which implies subjectivity to some extent, requires a special focus on three basic areas: 1) training (with a special focus on quality); 2) specialization in a particular genre or specific setting (see also Hvelplund & Dragsted 2018); and 3) technological innovation, e.g. through the use of CORPUS creation and analysis tools as one type of CAT TOOLS for pedagogical purposes (Fantinuoli 2016a; Kenny 2011), or through the use of translation environment tools (TEnTs) as the most popular and widely marketed translation tools in use today (Bowker & Fisher 2013). Within the broad panorama of the IS field, quality, along with concepts such as RELIABILITY and VALIDITY (as two aspects of testing theory essential to performance or quality assessment in TIS, see Angelelli 2013a; Wallace 2019), has been one focal point of test design, assessment and EVALUATION procedures (Salaets & Balogh 2015b). In other words, it is mostly explored with a major focus on assessing the interpreting output (Grbić 2008) relative to certain quality criteria (Grbić 2015), with concepts such as norms being useful in this specific exploration of translation (Snel Trampus 2002) and interpreting (Garzone 2002), or strategies contributing to its improvement (Crawley 2018; Grbić 2015; Vik-Tuovinen 2011).). In

IS, criteria of quality assessment are very intuitive (Iglesias Fernández 2013) and carry different weights (Collados Aís & García Becerra 2015a, 2015b; Garzone 2002; Gile 2003, 2009a), with sense consistency between the source text and the target text found by some authors (Bühler 1986; Kurz 1993) to play the fundamental role. Among the most important (but under-researched) criteria impacting quality in interpreting are, among others, fluency (Mead 2000; Rennert 2010; Yu & Van Heuven 2017); prosody (Ahrens 2015b, 2018; Collados Aís 1998b; Martellini 2013; Torres Díaz 2017); advance preparation as a sub-skill (Díaz Galaz 2011, 2015; Díaz Galaz et al. 2015; Fantinuoli 2017; Gile 2009a; Kalina 2015d; Scaglioni 2013); corpus-based preparation (Xu 2015, 2018; Xu & Sharoff 2014); and clear accountability and transparency as the missing link in ensuring quality interpreting (Taylor et al. 2018).

It may be due to this relative and elusive nature of quality, and more specifically, due to multiplicity of views about translation, that translation evaluation is characterized by a lack of agreement in how to perform it (Colina 2011, 2013). However, such a traditional quality assurance approach, which is appropriate in the final stages of learning, must be preceded by a focus on the process at the initial stages (Iglesias Fernández 2011). Similarly, some authors (Mellinger 2018a) argue for adopting a process-and-product-oriented approach to quality in translation for the purpose of complementing our understanding of this elusive concept. The same applies to quality in interpreting, a field where there is a shift from traditional models of training (focused on product only) to modern models (focused on interpreting process as well) complemented by research on quality being carried out from both product-oriented and process-oriented perspectives for the purpose of improving quality (Barranco-Droege et al. 2013). Achievement of quality interpreting is subject to interpreters' level of training and level of information, and to the proper equipment available to them (Setton 2010b), which is in line with the holistic approach to quality adopted by AIIC (see e.g. Christensen 2011). However, quality is considered to be, not the sole responsibility of interpreters, but a shared responsibility among all the parties, including speakers, employers, educational institutes, researchers, and interpreters (Fowler et al. 2013; Hale et al. 2009; Jacobs et al. 2010; Morris 2000).

Quality from a functionalist perspective in TIS

In TS, quality, from a functionalist perspective, mostly concerns customer or target audience satisfaction (Chesterman & Wagner 2002:80-84), and this links the concept of quality to functional approaches, most notably, skopos

theory (Calvo 2018; Colina 2008, 2009; Munday 2016, ch. 5; Nord 2010, 2013, 2018; Schäffner 1998, 2009) proposed by Reiss & Vermeer (1984). The authors of skopos theory and others (see Nord 2018, ch.6) claim that it is also applicable to interpreting. However, as research (Pöchhacker 1994a) shows, skopos theory cannot account for the complexity of interpreting due to the sociocultural heterogeneity of the target audience, which makes the whole issue of setting a specific skopos for them a meaningless task (see also Dubsloff 2001; Pöchhacker 2001a).

Quality & user expectations

Quality interpreting is of utmost importance as far as user expectations/perceptions (i.e. clients' beliefs about what or the service one is likely to get, or would like to get, see Pöchhacker 2015a), as part of Chesterman (1993/2017)'s expectancy norms, are concerned (see also Kurz 1993, 2001; Moser 1996; Russo 2005). However, as interpreting clients fail in sense consistency assessment with the original, one can convincingly argue that they are not the best judge of the quality of interpreting (Barranco-Droege et al. 2013; Behr 2015; Bühler 1986; Collados Aís 1998a/2002; Ng 1992; Pöchhacker 2011a), nor do they (i.e. clients), as research shows, seem to consider directionality an important factor as far as quality is concerned (Bartłomiejczyk 2015) despite the latter (i.e. directionality) being discussed in terms of its potential to inform interpreter training (see Seeber 2017). Furthermore, seemingly, research shows that users' mental representations of quality interpreting are not quite consistent with how they actually perceive the quality of a given interpretation (see Barranco-Droege et al. 2013). There is a dire need for a pragmatic perspective on quality (Pöchhacker 2009), i.e. a focus on both information content and of course, aspects of delivery such as cohesion, fluency, and intonation for the purpose of achieving quality interpreting (Pöchhacker 2011a), as there are methodological limitations to user expectation surveys (Pöchhacker 2015a) and quality criteria come with 'considerable variability' and carry different weights in different interpreting settings (see also Ackermann et al. 1997; Collados Aís & García Becerra 2015a, 2015b; Gile 2003, 2009a) altogether forming what Pöchhacker (1994b) calls "quality under the circumstances". Media interpreting is a case in point: it is mainly not the content, but the form (Dal Fovo 2017; Straniero Sergio 2003; Viezzi 2001) and other aspects of delivery such as voice, intonation, rhythm, and fluency (Dal Fovo 2015) that viewers and other stakeholders respond to. For the purpose of developing a comprehensive picture of the concept of quality in interpreting, the criterion of sense consistency is

complemented by other important, however vague, criteria such as “comprehensibility, clarity, style, target language quality in terms of grammatical appropriateness, public speaking skills, interpersonal skills (PS), ethical and professional behavior of the interpreter” (Lee 2009:172). It should also be noted that compared to quality in other settings, quality in remote interpreting (RI) as one form of technologized interaction is an important issue, over which there is no consensus to date (Braun 2015a, 2015b), and for it not to be compromised, challenges posed by this specific modality need to be addressed (Buck 2000; Moser-Mercer 2011). A closely related term to quality is *quality assurance*.

Quality assurance in TIS

The term quality assurance is used with two different meanings in TIS: it basically refers to a type of translation and/or interpreting assessment procedure, in which, to say it with Brunette (2000:172), “the reviser tries to determine how the new text will be received by the target culture” without referring back to the original text except under rare circumstances.

From a different, broader perspective, quality assurance, as an essential component in any ACCREDITATION program/system (Salmi & Kinnunen 2015) or an organization (Thelen 2019), refers to the process of ensuring, through evidence, that all the necessary measures have been taken to achieve a desired level of quality (Kasandrinou 2010; Sawyer & Roy 2015). Therefore, one must point out that objectivity of testing and assessment is one key factor in quality assurance (Thelen 2016).

Little has been done directly as far as quality assurance of translation teaching practice and its implications are concerned (Kelly 2008), and quality assurance does not seem to be a regular part of translator training curricula (Thelen 2019). As far as quality assurance in translator training (i.e. translation quality assurance) is concerned, Kasandrinou (2010) advocates going through assessment issues as the means of quality assurance systematically in three steps: 1) operationalization of the objectives of the training COURSE/program; 2) outlining the necessary activities and functions to be performed (e.g. self-reflection not only for the trainees but also for the trainer); and 3) implementing a control system, in which activities, functions and outcomes can be monitored and revised. Along the same vein, Wu (2010b), in line with Han & Slatyer (2016), advocates going through assessment issues for the quality assurance of interpreting service, which he defines as carefully planned procedures aiming at systematically raising the level of quality to meet the expectations of all the stakeholders involved in interpreting. Also, Wu (2010b) advocates

quality assurance as a valuable source of input and validation evidence for interpreter training programs varying greatly in content and scope, and suggests that it should consider not only the interpreting output, but also the whole communication process, which may influence interpreting quality. This is also echoed by Kalina (2005a, 2015a) when she points out that quality assurance for interpreting requires quality management to be carried out by all the stakeholders, including interpreters themselves, and quality assurance must focus on the whole communication event right from the start, rather than on the processes *during* interpreting only. In terms of prosody and of the pivotal, rather under-researched, role it plays in interpreting quality, and of course, as a feature of EXPERTISE (Martellini 2013), continuous professional training in speaking skills is also advocated as a permanent aspect of quality assurance in interpreting (Ahrens 2015b, 2018). Prosody is believed to play a pivotal role in teaching remote interpreting as a form of technologized interaction (Iglesias Fernández & Russo 2018).

For some authors (Garzone 2002), quality assurance for interpreting is considered to be the sole responsibility of the interpreter, for some (Vuorikoski 2004), it is the product of cooperation between the speaker and the interpreter, and for others (Class & Moser-Mercer 2013) it is the responsibility of program directors to embed its requirements in their curricula. In addition to this obvious lack of consensus over the nature of quality assurance in interpreting, one needs to draw attention to the fact that some important factors such as relying too much on subjective EXPERT JUDGMENT; users' lack of trust in interpreters; and lack of general agreement over accepted quality model applicable to interpreting as such, appear to make quality assurance for interpreting impossible (Kalina 2005a).

QUALITY ASSURANCE → **QUALITY**
REFLECTIVE DIARY → **TRANSLATION DIARY**
RELATIVE EXPERTISE → **EXPERTISE**

RELIABILITY

Definitions

Reliability, also known as *test reliability*, is an important long-standing term in educational psychology and language testing, and a criteria against which a measurement tool can be checked (Bailey & Curtis 2015). Reliability is defined as the desired consistency that the same results could be replicated

if the same test takers were tested again under similar circumstances (Bachman 1990; Crocker & Algina 1986; Lado 1961). In other words, reliability, as one aspect of testing theory that is never absolute, refers to the consistency of test scores and their being free from errors of measurement across facets of the test (Fulcher & Davidson 2007; Miller 2008) and across raters, with the latter being considered one of the most relevant types of reliability for interpreter ASSESSMENT/testing (Sawyer 2004). Thompson (2003) has highlighted the importance of the concept of reliability using the bathroom scale metaphor, according to which one will finally question the integrity of all the scores produced by the scale when they are not consistent at all. Angelelli (2009:17), citing Bachman & Palmer (1996), points out that reliability goes beyond test scores and concerns 'looking at the ways in which the consequences of factors outside of what is actually being tested, have been minimized to the greatest extent possible'. A test's reliability is determined by looking at three areas of generalizability: 1) examiners; 2) test items; and 3) test stability (Salvia & Ysseldyke 1995).

Inter-rater reliability

The term inter-rater reliability, also known as *inter-coder reliability*, refers to one aspect of testing theory, which fits in the traditional exam MODEL, and refers to the agreement between raters or judges on the same assessment task (Fulcher 2010; Gipps 1994). In interpreter assessment, given the inherent subjectivity of interpreter examinations, such performance(-based) tests often lack inter-rater agreement (Wu 2010b). The same situation is considered a major challenge in TRANSLATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT (TQA) (see e.g. Karoubi 2016b). Apart from that, research shows that recently developed methods, such as the PIE METHOD, contribute to higher inter-rater and intra-rater reliability in translation assessment (see Van Egdom et al. 2019). In interpreter assessment, despite the challenges it presents across the large number of languages, and high degree of variability in skill-sets of test-takers across language groups (Hlavac 2016), inter-rater and intra-rater reliability is achievable only through proper rater TRAINING in terms of guidelines, rating scales, etc. (Han 2018; Ortega Herráez et al. 2014; Setton & Dawrant 2016b), with rater training being, as research (Han 2015a, 2015b) shows, assisted by the psychometric model of Multifaceted Rasch Measurement (MFRM).

Intra-rater reliability

The term *intra-rater reliability*, also known as *intra-coder reliability*, refers to one aspect of testing theory, which refers to the extent to which a single rater or judge agrees with him- or herself when rating the same performances on different occasions (Fulcher 2010; Gipps 1994). In assessment, intra-rater and inter-rater reliability is achievable only through proper rater training in terms of guidelines, rating scales, etc. (Ortega Herráez et al. 2014), with rater training being, as research (Han 2015a, 2015b, 2018) shows, assisted by the psychometric model of Multifaceted Rasch Measurement (MFRM).

Reliability in translation & interpreting assessment

Since reliability relates to accuracy of measurement, it is an essential quality of any measurement process, and within the broad panorama of the TIS field, reliability, along with concepts such as VALIDITY or quality, is one focal point of test design, assessment and EVALUATION procedures (Angelelli 2009, 2018; Ortega Herráez et al. 2014; Salaets & Balogh 2015b; Sawyer 2004) that has remained unaddressed (Eyckmans & Anckaert 2017; Eyckmans et al. 2009). However, recently authors in IS (Wallace 2019) have attempted to address the challenge of reliability and validity by proposing a hybrid model of court interpreter CERTIFICATION. Discussing and attempting to foster greater awareness of multiple issues of reliability and validity as related to interpreter EDUCATION programs varying greatly in content and scope, Sawyer (2004), in line with the dominant trend in language testing literature and classical test theory (Bachman 1990; Fulcher & Davidson 2007; but see Moss 1994), and in line with many authors in TS (Eyckmans & Anckaert 2017) and IS (Liu 2015a; Setton & Dawrant 2016b; Wu 2010b), argues for reliability being a prerequisite for validity in testing, i.e. without reliability, any judgment relying on test scores cannot be considered meaningful and useful in translator and interpreter performance assessment, much more so in SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT, rather than in FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT, within translator (Eyckmans & Anckaert 2017) and interpreter (Liu 2015a) assessment contexts. This, as Gipps (1994:76) concludes, is a basic tenet in testing, mainly in “classical test theory”, and in “psychological and standardized testing”. Gipps (ibid) points out that “the move towards performance(-based) assessment and the development of school-based teacher assessment” tends to be a balancing act between reliability and validity. In testing, some factors or conditions can pose a

threat to test reliability; they are called *reliability threats*. These generally include shifts in the design, conduct, location, or rating of the test.

REMOTE TESTING → ASSESSMENT

REPAIR

The term repair refers to a STRATEGY in interpreting and in simultaneous, consecutive, and SIGHT INTERPRETING/TRANSLATION modes, using which the interpreter makes error corrections when he/she detects distortions in the interpretation, finds a better way of achieving appropriateness in terms of precision, disambiguation or coherence in expressing the source speech, or detects contradictions between his/her ANTICIPATION and the incoming discourse (Crawley 2016; Li 2015b; Mead 2015; Pöchhacker 2016:118). It is interesting to note that, in addition to being a type of strategy, repair can be considered one typical disfluency in speeches, and of course, in interpreting. However, the latter (i.e. disfluency) should be prioritized at the expense of fluency when the communicative situation may run the risk of becoming listener-friendly rather than adhering to the principle of fidelity (Mead 2015). Despite this, as research shows, such a prioritization may impact audience perception (see Rennert 2010).

RESTRUCTURING

The term restructuring refers to a STRATEGY in interpreting using which, the interpreter offers a more idiomatic oral translation of the source speech (Li 2013; Riccardi 1996).

RETROSPECTIVE PROTOCOLS

The term retrospective protocols refers to a specific technique used to gather verbal data from interpreters immediately after and through backward or delayed introspection so that one may gain additional insight into their views on reasons for hesitations, pauses, use of specific interpreting strategies, adhering to specific norms and of course, the nature of interpreting/interpreter's COMPETENCE (Hild 2015). IS authors (Hild 2015; Shamy & de Pedro Ricoy 2017) consider retrospective protocols (not TAPs) an effective method to be incorporated into teaching practices as the former is thought to contribute to a better understanding of interpreting/interpreter competence.

ROLE PLAY

Definitions

The term role play, mainly derived from the field of theatre and performance PEDAGOGY, can be traced back to the psychodrama developed by psychologist Moreno (1946). Role play is an EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING approach and pedagogical technique, which can be used in any kind of educational environment (Bolton & Heathcote 1999), including TIS, and it has been shown to lead to the empowerment of learners in general (Morales 2008). In IS, role play, as an integral part of modern interpreting pedagogy and didactics since the intensification of interpreting in public service settings and institutional contexts (Kadrić 2015, 2017a), is a TRAINING activity and a structured type of PROBLEM-BASED LEARNING (PBL), which typically consists of two interlocutors and a student who interprets between them, as they are all guided by a scenario likely to occur in real life situations where interpreting is used.

Role play in translator training

Role play can be applied as an experiential learning approach and pedagogical technique to translator training in order for trainees to gain experience of the complexities of translator-client interactions and market needs and to achieve AUTONOMY (see Hui 2013).

Role play in interpreter training

Role play, for the purpose of training interpreters, suitable for all interpreting settings, modes and combinations of languages, whether spoken or signed (Kadrić 2015), is part and parcel of modern interpreter training (Kadrić 2017b). Role play is embedded in a wider pedagogical setting that includes such activities as preparatory activities, skills-based training (e.g. NOTE-TAKING) and working with prepared content representing likely interpreter situations in different settings, including dialogue interpreting (Cirillo & Niemants 2017); medical/mental health interpreting (Bontempo & Malcolm 2012; Niemants & Stokoe 2017; Thumann & Smith 2013), and signed language interpreting (Metzger 2000) altogether aiming at offering learners insights into a dialogic communication by assuming the roles of various participants (Kadrić 2017a). It depends on the selection and profiles of the participants, and on how the role play is enacted by the participants (Braun et al. 2014a; Braun & Slater 2014).

Moreover, as far as the success of role play as a pedagogical technique in training interpreters is concerned, ●zolins (2017:55) notes that role play, despite some shortcomings, has the most resemblance to real-life interpreting situations, and that one can have role plays with trainees of other professions, an alternative valuable in itself. González Rodríguez & Spinolo (2017) recommend role play as a useful activity for training telephonic dialogue interpreters (see also Cirillo & Niemants 2017 for a detailed research-based account of using role play in teaching interpreting). However, it is worth noting that, as Kadrić (2017a, 2017b) points out, without having clear EVALUATION criteria, the whole role play will be reduced to a game, and therefore, will unfortunately lose its efficiency as a pedagogical and/or ASSESSMENT technique unless it is backed with sound theoretical framework being used as FEEDBACK. So one has to emphasize that evaluation is part and parcel of role play, but Kadrić (ibid: 286) reminds us that ‘the evaluation is not an ERROR ANALYSIS’, with the latter making us blind to the positive aspects of learners’ performance (i.e. interpretation).

Metzger (2000) points out that interpreter educators, who select (interactive) role play as their teaching STRATEGY, should do their best to reach three primary objectives: 1) students should be able to recognize and identify features of interactive discourse; 2) students should understand interpreters’ strategies for coping with interactive discourse; and 3) they should be competent enough to apply strategies for coping with interactive discourse.

Role play in TECHNOLOGY-aided interpreter training

From a technological perspective and based on previous research, Braun et al. (2013) suggest that role play may be an influencing factor in EDUCATION and training of both interpreters and their clients, with technological support as a confidence booster for (remote) interpreting in videoconference environments (Braun et al. 2014a; Carl & Braun 2018). In fact, video camera (being of high QUALITY and having a mobile nature) is a necessary component of the role play activity (Metzger 2000).

Role play may be live (as in IVY PROJECT) with its own evaluative challenges, or video-recorded, with both formats facilitating a microanalysis and raising awareness of the importance and dynamic role of nonverbal behavior and/or visual representations such as gesture, gaze, nodding, smiling, pauses or silences, etc. in interpreter-mediated interaction (quality) (see Collados Aís 1998a/2002; Krystallidou 2017) and in training remote interpreting skills (Amato et al. 2018). Role play has also been advocated

as a tool which allows great efficiency regarding teaching the candidate's dialogue interpreting competencies (Cirillo & Radicioni 2017) and evaluating these competencies (Ortega Herráez et al. 2014) and his/her COMPETENCE on issues of ethics, i.e. understanding and transposition of the ethical principles and choices in interpreting (Hertog 2014; see also under *INTERPRETING ENACTMENTS*).

Preparation of role play in interpreter training

Cecilia Wadensjö (personal communication, September 8, 2017), in line with Metzger (2000), states that the main issue is the preparation and advanced planning of the role play and, not least, of the assessors, and that there are so many ways in which one can introduce, carry out and follow up on role plays in classroom as the instructor announces the role play about one week before the scheduled session, and he/she, together with the role players, can, in order, go through defining the objectives and setting the stage, enacting the role play, and debriefing (see Cirillo & Radicioni 2017). This is what Kadrić (2017a) aptly calls 'to set the rules of the game' finally followed by post-role play discussions and feedback (perhaps in various forms) (Metzger 2000) or what Davitti & Braun (2018) call *post-simulation reflective activity*.

Role play in technology-aided interpreting/interpreter assessment

Interestingly, Cecilia Wadensjö (personal communication, September 8, 2017) goes beyond education and training, and recommends role play not only as an educational tool, but also as an interpreter assessment instrument/tool, i.e. a valid form of interpreter instrument and emphasizes their usefulness in this respect if the aim is to assess candidates' ability to cope with interpreter-mediated interaction as it takes place in interaction, focusing not just on vocabulary issues (see also Wadensjö 2014).

Another issue of paramount importance regarding role play in interpreter training and assessment/testing is how role play, which requires face-to-face human interaction (especially with regard to coordination in dialogue interpreting, see Wadensjö 1998), might be influenced by different learning environments, e.g. in BLENDED LEARNING as adopted to interpreter education and training, i.e. whether it can also be done and tested online or remotely, and still be effective, at least with the same efficiency as it had when done and tested face to face. It is worth noting that there does not seem to be consensus among interpreter educators in this respect: Mira Kadrić

(personal communication, September 8, 2017) believes that role play works only face-to-face (in interpreter training). However, Cecilia Wadensjö (personal communication, September 13, 2017), while emphasizing that platform learning remains to be explored and evaluated with regard to online role play and many other aspects (in TIS), believes that online role play should, in principle, work, given high quality techniques are used on both sides, and also the role plays are well-prepared. Along the same vein, Sabine Braun (personal communication, September 24, 2017) finds this issue interesting, and reminds us of a recent report of the results of the EVIVA PROJECT (Braun et al. 2014a) she coordinated during several stages, in which the authors investigate how learners and interpreter clients use virtual learning environments (VLEs) to engage in collaborative learning through role play.

Typology of role play in interpreter training

Now, attempting to make a distinction between different types of role play, one should ask whether role play should, in terms of format, be scripted (i.e. standardized) or unscripted/improvised (i.e. involving improvisation) for the purpose of higher efficiency in interpreter training, and of course, for the purpose of AUTHENTICITY. Role play can be scripted, either in a closed (completely written out with clear instructions) or an open (with role players and assessors having reached an agreement in advance on key issues and contents) format, (with the former only) to be read aloud (preferably with some divergence from it or some improvisation or variation to ensure authenticity, see Davitti & Braun 2018), or (with both) to be acted out in classroom. An example for the former is legal interpreter training in a mock trial in a moot court where students take turns to play the role of the judge, or the witness, etc. (see Davitti & Braun 2018; Ng 2015). Both types of role plays are used for training purposes. Here, at one end of the spectrum, despite authenticity being considered a crucial aspect of role play (but see Niemants 2013) and despite scripted role plays possibly lacking the same degree of authenticity which exists in natural spoken language (Braun & Slater 2014; Kadrić 2015, 2017a), one, at the other end, should draw some attention to the possible consequences of using scripted role plays in interpreter training and assessment/testing, in which a high degree of test and task authenticity as a psychometric (i.e. based on quantitative measurement) testing principle implying quality may pose serious challenges to the test RELIABILITY. As Van Deemter et al. (2014) convincingly argue, since in spoken interactions, the exchange of talk may quite unexpectedly develop in entirely unexpected directions, the use of

scripted role plays may constitute a reliability threat, an important matter to be a chief concern for trainers and test administrators, among others.

However, some authors (Ortega Herráez et al. 2014:49) strongly advocate the use of fully scripted role plays 'given the risks to the test and to FACE VALIDITY posed by the use of interactional testing methods'. Apart from that, role plays can be scenario-based, which, it is believed, can enhance elements of authenticity, credibility, and diversity of expression, and prepare the ground for co-constructed interaction in pedagogical settings (Kadrić 2015:360).

Criticism & drawbacks of role play

As was briefly mentioned earlier in this entry, role play has been criticized for its lack of authenticity (see Arumí Ribas & Vargas-Urpi 2017; Stokoe 2011b), with this inauthenticity of course materials and classroom activities being a commonly encountered challenge in interpreter education (Wang 2015). However, it should be borne in mind that, as Niemants & Stokoe (2017:294), in line with Widdowson (1978), rightly argue, the authenticity of classroom activities using recordings or transcripts can be guaranteed only if the activity prepares the ground for learners to engage in meaningful classroom interactions, rather than mere word-by-word translation.

Despite its advantages in interpreter training/education and assessment, role play, according to (Braun & Slater 2014), suffers from at least two drawbacks: 1) it is difficult, if not impossible, to have role players enhance and preserve the credibility and challenge of the role play despite their different native languages and the level of preparation and/or EXPERTISE required of them to speak in enough depth; 2) role play does not necessarily help resolve the issue of catering for many language pairs in a systematic way.

ROUTINE EXPERTISE → EXPERTISE

RUBRIC

Definitions, components, applications & typologies

The term rubric, from the Latin word *rubrica*, from *ruber* (red) originally meaning 'heading on a document often in the form of words written in red', was used only in non-academic contexts in the mid-15th century to refer to directions and rules in religious services. It was in the mid-1990s that the term rubric, for the first time, entered the academic context and began to

take on a new meaning. Alternatively called *ASSESSMENT/test rubric*, or *scoring rubric* (US terminology), the term rubric, as an important concept in educational psychology and language testing, and as one particular form of assessment as learning (Aal), refers to a scoring guide/tool and an instructional illuminator in modern academic jargon for subjective assessment. Rubrics can be defined as *ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS/TOOLS*, which divide a certain task or performance into its components and, based on performance criteria, give a detailed account, perhaps by assigning grades, of the level of that performance; the results can be used for *FEEDBACK* and assessment purposes (Larkin 2008a; Stevens & Levi 2005). Rubrics, as one aspect of testing theory, are one of common forms for establishing criteria and standards for grading, and also for portfolios, in which each trait of the student's work (such as evidence, organization, use of graphs) is described using a scale from high to low (Walvoord & Anderson 2010). These authors suggest that rubrics are particularly useful for multiple-choice and short-answer tests 'because they force the teacher to state explicitly what skills and knowledge she expects and to provide students with direct feedback about how well they are achieving course goals'. They include these essential components: evaluative criteria (varying from one rubric to another and used to distinguish acceptable responses from unacceptable ones); *QUALITY* definitions (which describe the way that qualitative differences in students' responses are to be judged or evaluated); and a scoring *STRATEGY* (which yields either a holistic or an analytic rubric, see below) (Popham 1997), or in the words of Sawyer (2004), organization; instructions; and criteria for correctness. Furthermore, rubrics can be analytic or holistic, with the former, describing the work of the students based on each criterion separately, and with the latter, allowing for an overall judgment by evaluating all the criteria simultaneously (Veiga Díaz & García González 2016; Yen & Hynes 2012). Hence the terms *analytic scoring* and *holistic scoring*, respectively (see Larkin 2008a).

Applying rubrics to assessment

Rubrics, a dynamic and flexible tool used in language testing and assessment, are among the important factors, the variation in which can impact, or pose a threat to, test *RELIABILITY*, perhaps through inconsistency in the wording of test instructions; inconsistency in time allotted for the test; lack of *INTRA-RATER RELIABILITY* (also known as *intra-coder reliability*) in scoring; inconsistency in test input; and expected response (i.e. inconsistency in test formats) (Angelelli 2009). This

implies that one of the primary objectives using rubrics for the purpose of assessment and grading pursues is to make grading more consistent and fair (Brookhart 2013, ch. 11; Larkin 2003a; Walvoord & Anderson 2010). What is more, although rubric scoring and grading are not the same, rubrics serve as grading criteria, and grades, in turn, can be derived from rubrics (Walvoord & Anderson 2010). These authors suggest four strategies for using rubrics for grading: 1) constructing a rubric and implementing it through using grade descriptions or checklists; 2) sharing the rubric with students without translating it into a grading instrument, with the actual grading being done holistically and without assigning specific points to items in the rubric; 3) translating the rubric scores into a grade, and basing the final grade on the total points students have gained for all the items; and 4) assigning points rather than a scale (ranging from 5 to 1) on every item, with the final grade based on the total number of points. Furthermore, rubrics are particularly useful because they can be implemented in both FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT (Brookhart 2013) and SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT (Stevens & Levi 2005), and the scales (numerical, levels of achievement, etc.) can be adapted according to the purpose of the rubric. With respect to interpreter assessment in particular, rubrics provide detailed feedback on the particular abilities (or COMPETENCE) of the interpreter, and help to pinpoint where miscommunications may be taking place (Jacobson 2009; Liu 2015a).

Rubric construction

Some important factors exist as far as developing/constructing useful rubrics is concerned: Popham (1997) reminds us that a useful rubric must not overwhelm educators with too many details, i.e. relatively short rubrics must be the rule; and each teachable evaluative criterion must represent a key attribute of the skill being assessed.

Stevens & Levi (2005) outline four key stages in rubric construction: 1) reflecting (on expectations from students, the purpose of the assignment, etc.); 2) listing (the particular details of the assignment and the determined objectives); 3) grouping and labeling (the results of the reflections and expectations); and 4) application of the grouped and labelled dimensions and descriptions, all pointing to two key elements of high-quality rubrics: VALIDITY and reliability (see Larkin 2003a) as two aspects of testing theory essential to performance or quality assessment in TIS (Angelelli 2013a; Wallace 2019).

Rubric construction in interpreting/interpreter assessment

Jacobson (2009) summarizes the three most important factors to be kept in mind as far as the development of an (interpreter) assessment rubric is concerned: 1) selecting theory-grounded competencies to be measured; 2) operationalization of all traits (or competencies) and sub-competencies; and 3) focusing on AUTHENTICITY as part and parcel of testing and assessment, in IS in particular.

Applying rubrics to assessment in TIS

Rubrics have been advocated as adding reliability, validity, and transparency to performance(-based) assessment as one type of assessment instrument/tool in pedagogical settings in general (Jeong 2015), and as a tool for a more objective interpreting assessment (Yeh & Liu 2006), increasing rater reliability in interpreting assessment in particular (Liu 2015a). Similarly, in TS, rubrics have been advocated as particularly useful instruments in translator training settings (Veiga Díaz & García González 2016). In IS, rubrics (based on instructor and student discussion) have been discussed and advocated for the purpose of assisting interpreter EDUCATION and assessment programs as such (Taff-Watson et al. 2008; Wang et al. 2015) and as means of incorporating discourse theory (already used and advocated by Napier 2006; Roy 2000a; and Winston & Monikowski 2000; with the former, adopting a blended approach to interpreter education) into PERFORMANCE(-BASED) ASSESSMENT (Clifford 2001).

This said, it should be added that there are concerns over the arbitrary and subjective nature of criterion weightings in the design of rubrics in interpreter assessment, and this awaits further research (see Wang et al. 2015).

SALAMI TECHNIQUE→ CHUNKING
SAUCISSONNAGE→ CHUNKING

SCAFFOLDING

Definitions, characteristics, forms & pedagogical implications

The term scaffolding (or *scaffolds*), first used and metaphorized in the 1960s by Jerome Bruner, a cognitive psychologist, originates in the sociocultural perspective of Vygotskyan theory and is the commonly used term for *zone*

of proximal development (ZPD) (see below). It refers to the assistance a child or novice receives in addressing problems, completing tasks, or achieving goals towards progress (Larkin 2008b; Wood et al. 1976). In other words, it refers to learning support based on a SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH to face-to-face learning, or as aided by e.g. INFORMATION & COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY (ICT) in BLENDED LEARNING (McLoughlin 2002).

Used to illustrate the nature of the progress of learning and the support systems which may enhance the process (Pritchard & Woollard 2010), scaffolding, according to VanPatten & Benati (2015), is a normal part of (classroom) interactions among both first and second language learners, during which interlocutors may sometimes help to build the conversation or topic by providing crucial bits of language. In their review of the concept of scaffolding, Van de Pol et al. (2010) list three fundamental characteristics: 1) adapting scaffolding to trainees' level; 2) gradually reducing the amount of scaffolding trainees receive as they progress; and 3) gradually giving control of the performance to trainees as they progress.

As scaffolding, as an important concept in cognitive and educational psychology, can take different forms an awareness of which can expand our understanding of scaffolding and its high usefulness in teaching and learning, McLoughlin (2002) outlines nine forms of it provided across different pedagogical settings: 1) orientation: communication of expectation (orienting learners towards learning objectives); 2) coaching (supporting learners via software); 3) eliciting articulation (encouraging learners to have self-expression e.g. through peer communication or peer scaffolding, checklists and rubrics); 4) task support (supporting the learner to perform the task through provision of resources and checklists, see also Clarke et al. 2003; Freeman 1995); 5) expert regulation (providing learners with EXPERTISE); 6) conceptual scaffolding (supporting learners to hone their analytic skills e.g. by presenting parallel scenarios and problems); 7) metacognitive scaffolding (using different cognitive tools e.g. electronic pads to enable students to record their thinking while engaging with an actual problem); 8) procedural scaffolding (supporting learners to hone their INSTRUMENTAL COMPETENCE); and 9) strategic scaffolding (increasing learner's awareness of multiple strategies and courses of action regarding problem solving by e.g. providing them with multiple scenarios or events).

One should consider the pedagogical implications scaffolding has as a facilitator of learners' move to new levels of knowledge and skills, and of independent learning: challenging teachers to hold high expectations of learners while providing them with high levels of scaffolding; and

challenging notions of individual readiness and educational failure, focusing instead on ideas of success of scaffolding frameworks, which contribute to learners' progress (Gibbons 2013).

Zone of proximal development (ZPD)

It was Lev Vygotsky (1978) who identified zone of proximal development (ZPD). The term ZPD, commonly referred to as *scaffolding*, is central to all of a social constructivist approach to learning (Pritchard & Woollard 2010), an important concept in educational psychology and in second and foreign language learning and assessment. It refers to a learner's optimal developmental potential, if assistance that is timely and appropriate is provided by another person (Vygotsky 1978, cited in McLoughlin 2002; see also Ketterer 2008). As a matter of fact, the key to understanding ZPD is Vygotsky's belief in development being preceded by instruction (see Ketterer 2008).

ZPD may be used as a theoretical basis for CHECKLIST development for ASSESSMENT and SELF-ASSESSMENT purposes in general (see e.g. Lee et al. 2016).

In translator and interpreter EDUCATION and TRAINING, ZPD, through the use of which "the intuitive, flexible, interactive nature of e-learning can be scaffolded" (Robinson et al. 2008:122), is at the core of and a crucial point of reference in both Kiraly's (2000) argumentation (see Klimkowski 2015:88) and Angelelli's CURRICULUM DESIGN of translation and interpreting for heritage speakers in secondary education (Angelelli 2010; Angelelli et al. 2002). What is more, ZPD is one of the concepts, through which social constructivism accounts for the foundational processes of learning as such.

Scaffolding in translator & interpreter education

In TIS, scaffolding, and robust scaffolding frameworks, as included in instructional methods of COGNITIVE APPRENTICESHIP (Moser-Mercer 2008), have been advocated in translator (Calvo 2015) and interpreter (Bown 2013) training, especially in dialogue interpreter training (D'Hayer 2013) and for the purpose of helping students, through a social constructivist approach (see Echeverri 2015; Mitchell-Schuitevoerder 2014), facilitate METACOGNITION and develop self-reflection (Fernández Prieto & Sempere Linares 2010; Motta 2016), arguably to the extent that reflective learners, going through the process, can become reflective practitioners (see Bown 2013). It must be borne in mind that the nature of effective

scaffolding is an under-researched topic, especially in TIS (Calvo 2015). Despite this, Wood et al. (1976:96) suggest that the first stage of well-executed scaffolding, representing the supportive role of the educator within the learner's ZPD is to motivate the learner to engage in activities "that produce recognizable-for-him solutions".

SECOND LIFE→ IVY PROJECT

SEGMENTATION

Segmentation, in TS, is defined as a STRATEGY, using which items in the source text (ST), called *segments*, are processed for translation. Research (e.g. Dragsted 2004, 2005) shows that expert and novice translators adopt different segmentation modes, with the former, processing a larger amount of words at a time for translation than the latter. In IS, segmentation, also referred to as *salami technique* (Jones 1998), *saucisonnage* in French, *chunking*, and *sentence splitting* (Kalina 2015e), refers to a key strategy (or language-based strategy) in SI, using which the interpreter recognizes and translates individual units of meaning contained within a source text sentence without adhering to the original sentence structure (Kader & Seubert 2015). Segmentation has been advocated by some scholars (Kalina 1998; Macnamara 2008) as a useful strategy for the purpose of cognitive load management in simultaneous interpreting and SIGHT INTERPRETING/TRANSLATION, i.e. facilitating interpreting by making more mental capacity available for other cognitive tasks such as problem solving, decision making, etc. (Kader & Seubert 2015; Macnamara 2008).

SELF-ASSESSMENT→ ASSESSMENT

SELF-CONCEPT

Definitions

The term self-concept, as a dynamic, multidimensional psychological CONSTRUCT, and as an old object of study in psychological research, refers to the attributes one ascribes to oneself, i.e. self-perception and self-attribution (Hamlyn 1983). In pedagogical settings, self-concept can be defined as a learner's self-perception of competence and how he/she evaluates him/herself in terms of different dimensions of that COMPETENCE as related to learning (Mercer 2011).

Self-concept in translator & interpreter EDUCATION

As far as translator education is concerned, self-concept refers to the psychological identity as a mental construct, which is shaped inside the translator's mind and shapes his/her self-evaluation in terms of translation competence and learning throughout the translation process (Király 2000). In line with Göpferich (2008, 2009) and Ehrensberger-Dow & Massey (2013), Király (1995, 2000) advocates fostering self-concept, through consciousness-raising, as a central focus of his initially psycholinguistic MODEL of the translation process/competence; he, in line with Massey & Wieder (2019) and Muñoz Martín (2014), considers this concept to be a key aim of translator training, which includes translator's purpose for engaging in translation, his/her awareness of the information requirements of the translation task, his/her self-evaluation in terms of translation competence, and translation output monitoring and EVALUATION. As lack of competence can be seriously damaging for the student's self-concept (Dömyei & Ushioda 2011), Muñoz Martín (2014) rightly argues that self-concept (which is broken down into self-awareness, situation awareness and self-efficacy) is essential in any account of translation EXPERTISE because success in task-performance is also related to building contingent, situated selves that are adequate to the task at hand. Self-concept is the fifth overlapping and interacting dimension he suggests, along with knowledge (restricted to declarative and conscious knowledge), adaptive psychophysiological traits (skills as behavioral procedures yielding more efficient performance), regulatory skills (metacognitive skills such as self-reflection/self-control individuals engage in to control and steer their mental activities, including translation and interpreting), and problem-solving skills (goal-oriented mental activities and strategies aiming to cope with novel situations), as a minimal situated concept of general translation expertise as applicable to oral, written, and signed translation behaviors, i.e. to all translation phenomena alike. Apart from that, as one can argue that DELIBERATE PRACTICE is an essential component and a prevalent theme in the PEDAGOGY of any translator (Kumpulainen 2016:196) and interpreter (Setton & Dawrant 2016a, 2016b) training program, teaching this important training component is believed to be complemented by focusing on self-concept (see Tiselius 2013c), a skill that may influence the interpreting performance (Tiselius 2018).

SPLITTING→ SEGMENTATION

SERVICE LEARNING

Despite the fact that there is no generally accepted definition of service learning, as a form of active learning which gained credibility during the 1990s, this concept, alternatively called *in-service training*, can be defined as an educational approach with a special focus on course-based learner's active participation in meaningful activities beneficial to the community and self-reflection (Bringle & Hatcher 1995). Within the broad panorama of TIS field, one may think of doing translation projects or interpreting assignments for nonprofit agencies under supervision as typical components of service learning (Angelelli 2013b). The key concept of *service* in the term service learning should be interpreted as collaborative action embedded in existing interpreting courses, not as helping (see Shaw 2013:6). This, according to Shaw (ibid:48), is "the recommended MODEL for interpreter EDUCATION". Service learning, as a pedagogical STRATEGY to contribute to interpreting students' active participation in services beneficial to their minority communities (Napier 2013a:1), and as the means to create momentum towards interpreter education (Shaw 2013), has been promoted, as a possibly effective approach to situating the deaf community within interpreter education programs (IEPs) through the works of some authors (Monikowski & Peterson 2005; Shaw 2013; Van den Bogaerde 2007) although the latter does not directly use the term service learning. The message of service learning for IEPs, to say it with Shaw (2013:29) as one of the currently leading experts in service learning in interpreter education, is that "reenfranchising the deaf community compels us to be allies, not advocates or crusaders". This said, it should be added that the decision to make CURRICULUM modifications in interpreter education for the purpose of realigning interpreting programs with the deaf community "is in conformance with the same standards we expect of service-learning courses" (Shaw 2013:42). However, as Shaw (ibid:xiv) admits, service learning, which falls under the umbrella term experiential learning as adopted to interpreter education, is still in its infancy in IS, and there is a dearth of empirical evidence available to support its effectiveness as related to teaching interpreting.

SHADOWING

The term shadowing mainly refers to three distinct concepts. Shadowing, originally developed as a research tool in the early days of cognitive psychology by Cherry (1953), refers to a well-known, but quite a controversial, pre-interpreting (or TRAINING) EXERCISE and technique

usually employed at the beginning of interpreter training and in APTITUDE TESTING for the purpose of dual-task skill development in budding interpreters, i.e. listening and speaking simultaneously (Riccardi 2015a). Shadowing has been defined as “a word-for-word repetition, in the same language, parrot-style, of a message presented through headphones” (Lambert 1991:25, 1992:17). Shadowing technique is classified into different types: 1) conventional/same-language shadowing (i.e. repeating exactly what the speaker says in the same language); 2) shadowing while counting (forwards or backwards) followed by a comprehension test; 3) verbatim shadowing (i.e. a word-for-word repetition of the message heard by the interpreter); 4) cognitive shadowing (which includes a phase of cognitive processing before speaking); 5) shadowing with a twist (i.e. the repetition is done after a short pause following the speaker’s utterance, which makes the shadowing more like consecutive interpreting, see Roberts 2014); and 6) smart shadowing, i.e. producing a series of mini-consecutive renditions of successive chunks, with pauses gradually reduced until the exercise blends into SI (Setton 1994, 2006). According to Carsten (2013:14), “the pedagogical value of smart shadowing”, is “in the temporary elimination of certain efforts thus reducing capacity overload”. Shadowing has been advocated for its usefulness in improving interpreter’s active language (see Gillies 2013:79). Besides, different authors (Baxter 2013; de Groot 2000; Kalina 1994; Lambert 1992a, 1992b; Moser 1978; Moser-Mercer 1985; Setton 2006) advocate using this technique for interpreter training on the grounds that it, as an exercise less demanding than simultaneous interpreting, gives learners the opportunity to learn how to listen and speak simultaneously (Andres et al. 2015). It should be added that shadowing has also been suggested for aptitude testing (Schweda-Nicholson 1990a). However, shadowing, both as an interpreter training and aptitude testing device, has its own fierce opponents too (see e.g. Déjean Le Féal 1997; Dodds 1990; Kurz 1992; Seleskovitch & Lederer 1989; Thiéry 1989, 1990). E.g. Déjean Le Féal (1997) considers the shadowing technique a possible source of mindless parroting as the worst possible methodological error in SI.

A different conceptualization of shadowing is to apply it as a style of theatre interpreting in case the need arises, mainly for the purpose of providing deaf and deaf-blind people with access to theatre (see e.g. Kilpatrick & Andrews 2009).

Finally, shadowing can also be conceptualized as a technique applied to healthcare interpreter training to refer to an on-the-job learning opportunity (see Hasbún Avalos et al. 2013; Riccardi 2015a) in approaches to teaching interpretation such as OBSERVATION-SUPERVISION APPROACH.

SHIFT PROJECT

The term **SHIFT** (Shaping Interpreters of the Future & of Today) project refers to a recent initiative by a European Network of universities (University of Bologna, University of Granada, University of Surrey, Pablo de Olavide University), which aims, through the development of **TRAINING** resources (**CORPUS**-based observation and comparison with onsite interpreting), to develop a comprehensive solution and framework for teaching remote interpreting as one form of technologized interaction (see Amato et al. 2018; **SHIFT** Report 2, 2018).

SIGHT INTERPRETING/TRANSLATION

Despite being occasionally called for nowadays in most markets (Setton 2006; Setton & Dawrant 2016a), sight interpreting, a term preferred to the intrinsically inaccurate term *sight translation* due to the real-time processing demands and the essence of this mode of interpreting (see Čeřková 2010, 2015; Lambert 1992b), is both an auxiliary or preparatory **EXERCISE** (Setton 2010a) and a widely taught skill that is regularly practiced by community interpreters in general (Roberts 2000) and is commonly used by asylum interpreters in particular (Stachl-Peier & Pöllabauer 2017). Sight interpreting/translation has been suggested by many authors as a very useful interpreter **TRAINING** (Angelelli 1999; Cirillo & Niemants 2017; Hale & Gonzalez 2017; Ilg & Lambert 1996; Kalina 1994; Setton & Dawrant 2016a, ch.6, 2016b; Thawabteh 2015; Weber 1990) and **APTITUDE TESTING** mode (Čeřková 2010; Lambert 1992b) because, as Arjona-Tseng (1984) argues, its particular usefulness lies in testing idiomatic language, adaptability to levels of language, slang, and other linguistic features that do not lend themselves easily to testing. Donovan (2003:26), while considering sight interpreting/translation to be a very useful test of whether candidates are competent enough to avoid interference between their working languages and can 'focus on ideas rather than words', does not seem to subscribe to the idea of the importance of sight interpreting/translation in aptitude testing, and argues that firstly, in tests on sight interpreting/translation, candidates may be confused as they are asked to explain, not translate, what they are reading; and that secondly, written comprehension is often better than aural understanding. In his Master's thesis, Kim (2001) recommends sight interpreting/translation as an independent **COURSE**. More recent research (Akbari 2017) shows that trainees' sight interpreting/translation skills can be improved by working on reading comprehension, strategies, and skills, and on interpreting strategies

(e.g. DELAYING RESPONSE and COMPRESSION). After having administered an intake test for a short (community) interpreter training course, Hlavac et al. (2012) found that sight interpreting/translation was not rated as a useful component of interpreter training. It should be pointed out, however, that, except in simultaneous with text in the final stage of SI training in the booth (Pöchhacker 2013), little systematic research has been done on the effectiveness of the widely-taught sight interpreting/translation in research, interpreter training and practice; therefore, developing a methodology of teaching sight interpreting/translation still awaits further research (Agrifoglio 2004; Akbari 2017; Čenková 2010; Wallace 2012:94-95). To a lesser extent, sight Interpreting/translation has also been advocated as a core curricular component of process-based early-stage translator training (Angelone 2010).

SIMON PROJECT

The term SIMON (Shared Interpreting Materials Online) project refers to a user-friendly, ICT-based, Web 2.0-type interpreter TRAINING platform/e-learning initiative developed at the Ecole de Traduction et d'Interprétation in Geneva for the purpose of determining whether it is possible to “complement the existing virtual environment with a platform for the creation and exchange of teaching materials for interpreter trainers” (Seeber 2006:2403). As is clear from above, SIMON project is a good example of ICT-based/-supported interpreter training (see Ritsos et al. 2013). The SIMON project, according to Seeber (2006), consists of three conceptual tiers or components: 1) the discussion platform (which allows users to express their needs in terms of materials and exercises for particular levels or progression, difficulties, languages, skills or subskills of the more complex interpreting task); 2) the EXERCISE exchange (containing all interpreting exercises different users suggest); and 3) the material database (which allows the pedagogical materials, i.e. speeches as well as accompanying materials such as glossaries, recommended background readings, etc. to be stored as visual, audio or text files).

SIMULATED CONFERENCE → **MOCK CONFERENCE**
SITUATED COGNITION → **SITUATED LEARNING**

SITUATED LEARNING

The term situated learning, coined by Lave and Wenger (1991), refers to a type of learning and pedagogical MODEL bound to a specific authentic

context, which is embedded in the processes of social engagement, active participation in social practice, and co-participation, not in the heads of individuals; the latter refers to a concept metaphorized, in turn, as *master-apprenticeship* in interpreter TRAINING (see Pöchhacker 2016). Since the early 1990s, many authors have highlighted the importance of situated learning in translator (Gouadec 2002; Kiraly 2000; Klimkowski 2015; Vienne 1994) and interpreter (Klimkowski 2015; Li 2015a; Sachtleben 2015; Sawyer 2004; Schäffner 2017) EDUCATION, and it is considered to be a follow-up to the shift from exclusive reliance on CURRICULUM composed by academics, and towards situating translation and translation (and interpreting) COMPETENCE (González Davies & Enríquez-Raído 2017; Klimkowski 2015; special issue of *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 9 (2), 2017). A closely-related term is *situated cognition*, which refers to a learning paradigm based on the idea that knowledge is situated, being in part a product of the activity, context, and culture in which it is developed and used (Brown et al. 1989). In this theory, a special focus is on activity and perception. Situated cognition, which emphasizes authenticity in learning, has been advocated as an appropriate approach to translator (Calvo 2015; Massey 2017) and interpreter (Blasco Mayor & Jiménez Ivars 2007) training.

As a matter of fact, in translator and interpreter training within the framework of situated learning, there is focus on three levels of situatedness: 1) translation/interpreting; 2) cognition; and 3) curriculum (see Calvo 2015). Along the same lines, different authors have advocated the application of situated learning to translator (Krüger & Serrano Piqueras 2015; Risku 1998, 2002, 2004; Taibi 2016b) and interpreter (Conde & Chouc 2018; Crezee 2015; Miner 2016, 2018; Miner et al. 2016; Taibi 2016b) education through (semi-)authentic action, or the so-called (*semi-*) AUTHENTICITY, e.g. in teaching of computer-aided/-assisted translation (see Bowker & Marshman 2010). Moreover, Risku (1998), while claiming that translation is a situated cognitive activity, supports adopting a post-positivist epistemology to furthering translator education. In IS, situated learning is promoted by CAIT (Sandrelli 2007, 2015a, 2015b; Sandrelli & de Manuel Jerez 2007) thanks to digital education in the field as reflected in videoconferencing TECHNOLOGY and 3D learning environments (see under *IVY PROJECT & EVA PROJECT*), and is promoted by mock conferences (Li 2015a) in different settings, including legal settings (Burn & Crezee 2017); police settings (Perez & Wilson 2011); etc. Dufloy (2016: xxi, 310), while looking at EU interpreters as a professional community of practice representing a gradual shift of emphasis from a skilled individual to a professional community within perceptions of PROFESSIONALISM

and EXPERTISE in conference interpreting (Sunnari & Hild 2010), and at the situatedness of interpreting competence as a differentiating factor between beginners and experienced/fully competent members of the community of practice, advocates situated learning as part and parcel of formal conference interpreter training in that, through this type of learning, EU conference interpreters develop an understanding of the shared repertoires and resources of knowledge and skills they need in order to provide QUALITY interpreting in a community of practice, e.g. by observing, through a situated learning process, more experienced colleagues, trial and error, asking questions, and receiving explanation or FEEDBACK from colleagues. However, as far as interpreter training is concerned, Braun et al. (2014a:5) point to three main limitations of situated learning: 1) trainee interpreters may not always have access to real professional practice, which would provide situatedness; 2) it may not always be efficient to use real-life situations as a way of providing situatedness, especially for beginners; and 3) given the constraints and limitations which traditional face-to-face teaching places on methods of teaching, some obstacles are to be faced in simulating real-life practice.

SITUATIONAL APPROACH → **SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH**
SLOODLE → **MOODLE**

SMALL GROUP LEARNING

The term small group learning refers to a form of PEER CONFERENCEING, in which a group of learners demonstrate three common characteristics: 1) active participation; 2) a specific task; and 3) (self-)reflection (Crosby 1996; Jones 2007). Despite it being criticized, according to Wikipedia, for small group size, reducing learning responsibility and thereby reducing learner motivation, marginalization of learning objectives, and being subject to the free-rider effect in groups that have a few highly skilled members, the usefulness of small group learning has already been advocated by authors in translator and interpreter training (see Chen 2007, 2010; Hu 2018:58; Kelly 2005).

SMART SHADOWING → **SHADOWING**

SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH

Definitions & principles

Considered to be a development, subset, or one camp of constructivist approach to learning, social constructivist theory, while emphasizing the importance of culture and social context in understanding experience and in knowledge construction, has emerged, for the most part, from the work of Piaget, Vygotsky, Bruner and Bandura. It maintains that we invent the properties of the world rather than discover them. Pritchard & Woollard (2010:7) list three aspects/principles of social constructivist thinking: 1) reality is constructed through shared human social activity; 2) knowledge is constructed by social and cultural means; and 3) the learning process has a social nature.

A social constructivist approach to translator EDUCATION

In the context of translator education, it refers to Don Kiraly's pioneering approach to translator education as a major strand of post-positivist educational thought (as expanded through pursuing EMERGENTISM) and as an alternative MODEL to, or more appropriately, as instructional reform of, traditional instruction settings (with the *social* element emphasizing the role of interaction and negotiation between members of a community concerning their efforts to understand the world). This said, it should be added that Kiraly's social constructivist approach, which advances apprenticeship learning as ideal (i.e. educator's attempt to firstly model the practice, and secondly to gradually turn over the control to the learner as he/she progresses, see Prawat 2008), originally drew heavily on the social constructivist thinking of Lev Vygotsky (1994) and John Dewey (1938) (see Kiraly 2000, 2003a, 2005, 2012b, 2014) and was later adopted and followed by other social constructivist authors (González Davies 2003, 2004; La Rocca 2007; Robinson et al. 2008; Wallace 2015) in TS. The underlying epistemology may be social constructivism, but the overriding goal is precisely learner EMPOWERMENT with great emphasis on the importance of social context (Kiraly 2003b, 2005) as it serves as the basis for Kiraly's didactic reflection and collaborative approach to translator education centered on authentic project work (Kiraly 2000, 2014), an approach closely related to the pedagogical model of SITUATED LEARNING and considered part of modern translator TRAINING (see González Davies & Enríquez-Raído 2017; Kelly 2010b). It is worth noting that activities associated with the social constructivist approach to translator education based on descriptive (not prescriptive) translation theories are, by way of

example only, collaborative work, peer editing, real projects for real clients, reflective SELF-ASSESSMENT statements, and student-selected specialization projects (Johnson 2003). It is also worth mentioning that crowdsourcing, as a new form of translation, and relevant collaborative online platforms have been explored as ideal environments, where translators can be trained based on key principles of social constructivist approaches (see Jiménez-Crespo 2017, ch. 9). At the heart of a (social) constructivist epistemology, according to Kiraly (2003a), lies the belief that any meaning in the world is a human creation—“both individually and collectively”. In other words, as echoed by Venuti (2017:206), in social constructivism, knowledge creation does not happen in the mind but rather is a product of learners’ active participation in interaction with others and with the environment. The social constructivist approach to translator education comprises three supporting columns: 1) AUTONOMY; 2) AUTHENTICITY; and 3) EXPERTISE (Kiraly 2000; Kiraly & Hofmann 2016). What is more, Kiraly (2000), in line with Vienne (1994) and Gouadec (2000), advocates a “situational approach” to translator education, where “an entire student group assumes responsibility for an authentic or realistically simulated large-scale translation commission, thus coming across real translation problems in a real or realistic context” (Kelly 2007; see also Kelly 2010b:394). Similarly, Kiraly (2000) advocates a kind of collaborative, authentic-project-based (PjB) PEDAGOGY and a PORTFOLIO approach as a complement to his own approach to translator education through, as Mitchell-Schuitevoerder (2014:12) suggests, linking the situational context with the classroom and with cognitive activities that align with the translation profession and translator ASSESSMENT. The social constructivist approach consists of such important components (briefly mentioned above) as learner autonomy (achieved through learner’s attempt to assume the role of the principle agent in the teaching/learning process), collaborative interaction, non-linear learning as a process of acquisition, and knowing rather than knowledge. Seen from a social constructivist perspective, COMPETENCE (and translator competence in particular), a tentative model of which has been proposed by Kiraly (2015), can be interpreted as whether graduates have the ability to produce translations that can function well within expert communities (Kiraly 2005a:126).

A social constructivist approach to interpreter education

The social constructivist approach, closely related to the pedagogical model of collaborative and situated learning (Chmiel 2015), and exemplified by

the IVY PROJECT focusing on interpreter training in virtual reality (Braun et al. 2013; Chmiel et al. 2012), has been adopted to teaching interpreting (Lee & Choi 2015) and to training of interpreter trainers (Class et al. 2004). Now, interestingly, one should raise the question whether social constructivist approach, which emphasizes meaning making and knowledge building, might be a useful and efficient approach to teaching interpreting as well, with more or less similar success the approach has when adopted in teaching translation, and with more or less similar techniques already proposed for educating translators. As a matter of fact, to date, there is no consensus among IS scholars about the efficiency of applying the social constructivist approach (*mutatis mutandis*) to interpreter education. Many interpreter educators remain skeptical about this (see Sawyer 2004): e.g. Daniel Gile (personal communication, August 16, 2017) considers that, in translation, this approach is highly motivating for students/trainees, both because, during the time available for reading, analysis and discussion, it engages their active contribution and makes them feel more intelligent and more valued; in interpreting, however, it is not the case, and students' performances are individual and there is no real-time task analysis or discussion, and therefore, the social constructivist approach is much less powerful when training interpreters, at least for the practical part. At the other end of the spectrum, we have interpreter educators (e.g. Class & Moser-Mercer 2013; Crezee et al. 2015b; Morelli 2017) who agree with the tenets of this approach, and have adopted it to interpreter education themselves: Elisabet Winston (personal communication, August 18, 2017), while considering it to be, broadly speaking, similar to ideas of active learning and learning-focused curricula, etc., advocates this approach for interpreter education. Tymczyńska (2009) presents and advocates the social constructivist approach to interpreter training, and combines it with MOODLE (a popular COURSE management system). Along the same lines, Dingfelder Stone (2016), while moving beyond traditional classroom and still acknowledging its crucial role in interpreter training, and also advocating the application of Don Kiraly's model of social constructivism to teaching interpreting, discusses training interpreters at Mainz University using two approaches: *Friday conference*, in which learners can have peer, self, and trainer EVALUATION; and *Moodle Online Platform for Self-Study in Interpreting (MOPSI)* that she has developed as a complement to traditional classroom instruction as well as traditional self-study routines in interpreter training for the purpose of engaging the students, due to its very autonomous learner pedagogical approach, in skill training through providing them with the opportunity to correct their individual weaknesses with appropriate practice exercises (see also Dingfelder Stone 2015b).

Although emphasizing that she does not subscribe to a single interpreter training model, and also that she does believe in many of the basic components of Don Kiraly's approach, Maren Dingfelder Stone (personal communication, August 24, 2017) offers an explanation for her approach to interpreter training: i.e. Don Kiraly's start with an initially cognitive and psycholinguistic approach (see Kiraly 1995), and his move from a purely social constructivist viewpoint towards an emergent model of translator expertise with a focus on non-parallel emergence of subskills is primarily the angle that resonates most with her approach in this respect. Don Kiraly (personal communication, August 16, 2017), while strongly advocating the adoption of the social constructivist approach (which he sees as a far more a way of understanding learning) in teaching translation, as well as teaching interpreting, and also showing his keen interest in fomentation, promotion, and encouragement of the learning process in student interpreters, acknowledges, not for the first time though (see Kiraly 2014, 2015, 2016b), that he has moved on beyond the social constructivist approach since the beginning of the year 2000 and is currently focusing on emergentism (which stems from complexity science) as a post-social constructivist approach to translator training CURRICULUM and translator education, still with a major emphasis on *learning* rather than *teaching*. Kiraly (2014) views his evolution of thinking (i.e. moving beyond social constructivism towards emergentism) as a *re-construal* rather than a *rejection*.

SPECIFIC COMPETENCE → COMPETENCE

SPLIT ATTENTION

The term split attention refers to a type of EXERCISE for interpreter TRAINING designed and used for the purpose of, to say it with Mackintosh (1995:126), 'developing a feeling of ease in the booth and freeing the student from slavish adherence to SL syntax and lexis'. This said, it should be added that the split attention exercise can be used as preparation for performance not only in simultaneous but also in consecutive mode (see Gillies 2013:189). Training interpreters based on such an exercise is called *dual-task training*. In this type of pre-interpreting exercise (Pérez-Luzardo 2015), trainees interpreting in simultaneous mode need to listen to the speaker for the purpose of comprehending the exact message while carrying out a different cognitive task, e.g. counting aloud, forwards or backwards; trainees interpreting in the consecutive mode, however, need to write their notes and listen at the same time. So, this ability to listen and speak (in simultaneous mode) or listen and read (in consecutive mode) at the same

time, alternatively termed *dual-tasking* (or rather confusingly, *multitasking*, see Setton & Dawrant 2016a:301-302), is thought by some training schools to improve interpreting performance. However, the usefulness of dual-task exercises has caused much debate among scholars (see Stern 2011b) and that of split attention has been questioned by some authors (see Déjean le Féal 1997; Kalina 1998; Setton & Dawrant 2016b) on the grounds that one cannot expect the performance of cognitively unrelated tasks to approximate the processing demands of SI (Andres et al. 2015:70; Pöchhacker 2016:200).

SPLIT-HALF METHOD

The term split-half method, as an important concept in educational psychology and language testing, refers to a method to measure the consistency of scores in a test by comparing the results of two halves of the same test (Fulcher 2010; Gipps 1994; Miller 2008), and also to measure questionnaire or survey RELIABILITY in TIS research (see e.g. Dastyar 2017:120). Split-half method, more germane to this volume, refers to a method often used for the purpose of estimating a test's internal consistency. In this method, the test is split into two halves to see if there is any consistency between the scores on these two halves. However, Wu (2010b: 52) considers this method inappropriate for interpreter ASSESSMENT; he (citing Campbell & Hale 2003) convincingly argues that when a speech or a text (used for the purpose of assessing interpreter performance) is divided into two parts/halves, it is impossible to keep the two parts/halves independent.

STALLING

Stalling, also known as *waiting*, *delaying response*, or *tailing* (Li 2015b:174), refers to a micro-STRATEGY (or delivery-based strategy) playing the role of a coping strategy in interpreting and in simultaneous, consecutive and SIGHT INTERPRETING/TRANSLATION modes, using which the interpreter attempts to buy more time by either remaining silent, articulating neutral expressions, or repeating facts to fill the pauses while the speaker is speaking (Kader & Seubert 2015; Pöchhacker 2016:118).

STRATEGY

Definitions

The term strategy is used in different fields such as Military Science, Political Science, and Economics. For example, in the military, it refers to a planned procedure or program to achieve a certain goal.

Strategies for translator TRAINING

Despite being defined in many different ways in TS and other fields of study (Jääskeläinen 1993, 2007, 2010b), strategies can be generally defined as ‘potentially conscious, goal-oriented procedures for solving problems’ in TS (Chesterman 1996:68, 2000:82; Gile 2009a; Mackenzie 1998) and IS (Gile 2009a; Kalina 1992; Tang 2018; Vik-Tuovinen 2011), an issue associated with the deployment of *mediation strategies* in TIS (Pym 2018). In TS, different classifications exist for strategies: e.g. naturalizing translation, and alienating translation (Schleiermacher 1813/2012); from a linguistic perspective, direct translation (including borrowing; calque; and literal translation procedures) and oblique translation (including transposition; modulation; equivalence; and adaptation) (Vinay & Darbelnet 1995/2004); from a cognitive perspective, comprehension, equivalent retrieval, equivalent monitoring, decision-making, and reduction strategies (Krings 1986b); translation by a more general word, translation by a more neutral/less expressive word, translation by cultural substitution, translation using a loan word or loan word plus explanation, translation by paraphrase using a related word, translation by paraphrase using an unrelated word, translation by omission, and translation by illustration, to deal with problems of non-equivalence in translation (Baker 2018); from a global perspective and following Schleiermacher, foreignizing and domesticating (Venuti 1995, 2013), and familiarizing and defamiliarizing translation strategies (Carbonell Cortés 1998). Some authors (Chesterman 1996, 2000) identify two different sets of categories of strategies in TS: 1) syntactic (e.g. shifting the word-class), semantic (e.g. shifting the word-class), and pragmatic (e.g. naturalizing or exoticizing) strategies; 2) search (often involving terminological search, e.g. in a dictionary; online search; etc.), creativity (i.e. trying to bring as many creative ideas as possible into one’s own translation work through self-reflection, etc.), and textual strategies (i.e. explicit textual manipulation of units of translation). Use of strategies in translation, as research (Araghian et al. 2018) shows, is influenced by trainees’ self-efficacy, with implications for training translators. What is more, translation strategies, along with accuracy in comprehension of

source text content and appropriacy in production of target language, are highly suggested as one of potentially required criteria in constructing a scale for TRANSLATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT (TQA) (Hanifehzadeh & Farahzad 2016). Strategies have also been advocated as an important component of translator training curricula (Shei 2018).

Strategies for interpreter training

In IS, for strategies, also referred to as *tactics* (Gile 2009a); *techniques* (Jones 1998); or *skills* (Setton 1999), different classifications exist: e.g. comprehension-enhancing strategies, and production-oriented strategies (Kalina 1998); skill-based strategies (which are the result of procedural knowledge and their application is triggered by the recognition of a well-known stimulus within the communicative event; e.g. interpretation of recurrent formula within a text), and knowledge-based strategies (which are the result of conscious analytic processes: examples include ANTICIPATION, COMPRESSION, SEGMENTATION, etc.) (Riccardi 2005); process-oriented strategies, and product-oriented strategies (Pöchhacker 2016:127); online strategies (i.e. mode-specific strategies, e.g. note-taking in consecutive interpreting), and offline strategies (e.g. preparing glossaries) (Pöchhacker 2016:126). Interpreting strategies, as important aspects of interpreting COMPETENCE (Kalina 2000; Li 2013) and EXPERTISE (Li 2013; Sumari & Hild 2010), and as a pervasive topic among advocates of cognitive approaches to the study of interpreting (Kalina 2015e; Seeber 2015) are affected by three main factors: 1) situational factors (including participants, the event, etc.); 2) the interpreter's knowledge and mental potential (including language skills, terminology, etc.); and 3) norms (including aspects of role, discourse, etc.) (Vik-Tuovinen 2011). What is more, research (Fowler 2013) shows that interpreters in face-to-face encounters have typically more strategies available to them than those working online or via video link. Strategies in interpreting are useful in two ways: 1) as a diagnostic tool regarding the reasons for successful or unsuccessful interpretations as they highlight the problems in rendering the source speech into the target speech and their solutions (Crawley 2016; Ghiselli 2018); and 2) as a(n) (recommended) (interpreting-)skill-training tool (Al-Khanji et al. 2000; Gran 1998; Kader & Seubert 2015; Kalina 1994, 2000, 2015e; Li 2013, 2015b; Setton & Dawrant 2016a, 2016b), with the latter coming in different varieties, ranging from prosody-related (Martellini 2013) to preparation strategies (Kalina 1998), from turn management strategies (Marks 2018) to coping

strategies (Gile 2009a; Kalina 2015e; Napier 2016), and to ASL-related strategies in optimal signed language interpreting (Kurz et al. 2018).

SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT → ASSESSMENT

SYLLABUS

Definitions & distinctions

The term syllabus, which is quite common in the British educational system, refers to the contents of a COURSE that need to be taught and followed by ASSESSMENT (Nunan 1988; Stern 1984). The structuring and arranging of syllabus in sequence is called *syllabus design*. Syllabus, which is a European term, and its American counterpart ‘CURRICULUM’ are used somehow interchangeably in EDUCATION literature, with the former (as made by individual educators/trainers) being a descriptive outline of subjects/topics to be taught in an educational course/program over a period of time, and with the latter (as made at state, district or institute levels) falling into a broader prescriptive framework of all kinds of practical purposes. In other words, the distinction between syllabus and curriculum may come down to the former being concerned with a specification of what units will be taught, and to the latter focused on how they will be taught, which is a matter for methodology (Allen 1984).

Syllabus in TIS

Despite the fact that it is more often than not accompanied by a lack of explicitness in TS, specifically with regard to training (Mitchell-Schuitevoerder 2014), and it does not appear to be a frequently used concept in the literature on interpreter education (Franz Pöchhacker, personal communication, August 10, 2017), and also it has been neglected in the context of translation and interpreting education to date (David Sawyer, personal communication, August 12, 2017), syllabus, which in many cases starts with basic training in TIS followed up with specialization in one specific form of the field (Gile 2005), plays a crucial role in, and is inseparable from, assessment in TIS, as both objectives of assessment and what to assess are determined based on the objectives behind the course syllabus (Farahzad 1992:272). As for the contents of syllabus in interpreter training classroom, Taylor (2013:8-9) mentions reflecting clear expectations; encouraging preparation for class activities and class participation; considering rewards for effective learning behaviors and

consequences for passive and ineffective student behaviors. As far as the aforementioned lack of explicitness comes with syllabus (in US academic institutions context), Cynthia Roy (personal communication, August 15, 2017) states two main reasons: firstly, it is simply not required to be more specific in a syllabus-it is meant to give everyone a general idea of the topics to be covered in a specific course and specific requirements for assignments and exams or papers. Secondly, it allows course instructors to make changes if they find the trajectory of the course needs altering, and if they tend to provide their own materials and research when lecturing. It goes without saying that discussion with experts provides a panorama of, and shines new light on, many aspects of a particular topic in a particular field of study: as far as syllabi, their crucial role, and that of its counterpart 'curriculum' in translation and interpreting education are concerned, David Sawyer (personal communication, August 12, 2017), a renowned expert on interpreter education, opens a very interesting discussion, which merits much scholarly attention: a comprehensive discussion of syllabi in translation and interpreting education might illuminate how different (perhaps fairly uniform) approaches to translator and interpreter education are manifested in specific curricula and the role of institutional educational policy in that mix, with the discussion looking at syllabi within one curriculum MODEL, or comparing them in a specific area of instruction across (different) institutions.

SYLLABUS DESIGN→ SYLLABUS
TAILING→ STALLING
TAPS→ THINK-ALoud PROTOCOLS

TASK-BASED INSTRUCTION

Definitions

In the field of language teaching, tasks are units of teaching specifying what the learner needs to complete (Nunan 1988). The concept of task in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) is characterized by: a) a primary focus on (pragmatic) meaning rather than on form (which is a prerequisite for the concept of 'EXERCISE'); b) a special focus on solving communication problems; and c) task AUTHENTICITY (VanPatten & Benati 2015). Ellis (2003) adds a fourth prerequisite: clearly defined, non-linguistic outcome of the task. The term task-based instruction, alternatively called *task-based language teaching (TBLT)* and *task-based learning (TBL)* and developed for foreign language teaching, refers to a pedagogical

approach based in Cognitive Theory, which involves learners' active participation in sharing and exchanging information through problem-solving situations and triggers meaningful use of the target language (Willis 1996; Willis & Willis 2007) in a classroom rich in language use and language analysis (Willis 2015).

Task-based instruction in translator TRAINING

Many authors (Ghaemi 2013; González Davies 2003, 2004; Hurtado Albir 1993, 1995, 1996, 1999; González Davies 2003, 2004; Inoue & Candlin 2015; Koby & Baer 2003; Zeng & Lu-Chen 2002) have applied task-based instruction as a methodological framework to translation teaching and translator EDUCATION. What is more, Hurtado Albir (1993, 1995, 1996, 1999) has proposed a methodological framework based on the task-based approach for teaching translation. Along the same lines, Koby & Baer (2003) advocate incorporating task-based instruction within a translator training CURRICULUM. These two authors, while adopting task-based instruction to translation teaching and focusing on the development of learners' both DECLARATIVE KNOWLEDGE and PROCEDURAL KNOWLEDGE, aim to achieve the following goals: a) learner/student-centered education (involving learner's partial or full accountability for mastery of content); b) incorporating higher-level cognitive processing into the tasks in classroom; and c) connect the tasks with real-world knowledge and situation.

TECHNOLOGY

Definitions

Translation technology can be defined as “a branch of translation studies that specializes in the issues and skills related to the computerization of translation” (Chan 2004:258).

Technology in translator & interpreter TRAINING

In TS, one may think of three general categories of technologies introduced, adopted, and adapted in both academic and professional areas: 1) technologies (e.g. social networking) used by the society, including translators, to handle digital materials; 2) technologies (e.g. SDL Trados) used by translation and localization professionals to aid human translation; and 3) technologies (e.g. Skype) used and adapted by various types of users

for different purposes (Folaron 2018). In TS, technology is present in four main areas: 1) EDUCATION and/or training, typically in the form of COMPUTER-AIDED/-ASSISTED TRANSLATION (CAT) TOOLS (Chan 2015, pa. 1; special issue of *Journal of Translation Studies* 13 (1&2), 2010) often referred to as *translation memory systems* (e.g. translation memories (TM), terminology management systems (TMS), CORPORA, etc.); 2) ASSESSMENT & testing (ICT); 3) research (Mees et al. 2010; see under COMPETENCE & corpora); and 4) professional translation practice (Chan 2004, 2015, 2017).

In IS, technology plays a role in four main areas (see also Kalina & Ziegler 2015): 1) education and/or training through technology-enhanced interpreting/interpreter training platforms (see under AUTHENTICITY; BLENDED LEARNING; competence; CAIT; education; E-LEARNING; EVIVA PROJECT; FLIPPED CLASSROOM; ICT; IVY PROJECT; PEDAGOGY; ROLE PLAY; SIMON PROJECT; SITUATED LEARNING; training; & WEBINAR; see also Pöschhacker 2016, ch.11); 2) assessment and testing (see under assessment; AVDICUS PROJECT; EVIVA project; ICT; QUALITAS PROJECT; & role play); 3) research (see under corpora); and 4) preparation and (interpreting) performance/professional practice (Liu 2018) typically in the form of e-tools, e.g. terminology management systems (TMS) (see Bilgen 2009; Corpas Pastor & Durán-Muñoz 2018; Fantinuoli 2017) generally divided into three categories: standalone, web-based and mobile TMS (Costa et al. 2018), such as Interpretbank (developed by Fantinuoli 2009, 2011, 2012, 2016b, 2018); and in the form of DIGITAL PEN.

The issue of integrating technology in translator and interpreter training programs presents some challenges: 1) TRAINING OF TRAINERS (ToT); 2) accessing relevant resources for use with technologies; 3) addressing the needs of various learners; 4) de-centralization of resources and lack of knowledge transfer; and 5) deciding when to introduce technology into training programs (Bowker & Marshman 2009). It is worth mentioning that quite recently some authors (O'Brien & Conlan 2019) propose that, following the current wide use of digital technologies, the *personalization* of translation technology may be in the best interests of translators themselves.

TERMINAL ASSESSMENT → SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

TEST CONSTRUCT

Definitions & considerations

The term test construct, with the term *construct* originally introduced by MacCorquodale & Meehl (1948), and sometimes called *traits*, is used in different fields such as language testing, and applied linguistics, and refers to the concepts or characteristics purportedly measured by a specific test (Clark 2013; Cronbach & Meehl 1955; Fulcher 2010). In language testing, generally, there are three different approaches to defining constructs: ability-focused; task-focused; and interaction-focused, all based on different sets of values and assumptions (Bachman 2007).

An overriding concern in any testing situation, including translation and interpreting contexts, is to minimize construct irrelevant variance, i.e. any factor that affects test scores, but is unrelated to the construct being measured, and therefore, casts doubts over the VALIDITY of the test (Clark 2013).

Test construct in translation & interpreting ASSESSMENT

In translation assessment/testing, test construct must be viewed in light of the multidimensional nature of translation competence and its measurable operationalized sub-components, issues of QUALITY in translation, issues of test RELIABILITY and validity, and of course specifications of professional organizations (in case of CERTIFICATION), which altogether capture translation in its entirety (Angelelli 2009).

In interpreter assessment/testing, test construct refers to what a test seeks to evaluate in terms of 'identification of suitable subject domains and the underlying interpreting skills and abilities' (Wu 2010b:45) preferably within a coherent theoretical framework. In translation and interpreter assessment/testing, a test construct consists of all the exact skills and subskills that constitute a translator's professional ability and they must be operationalized (Angelelli 2009). In IS, some authors actively involved in training sign language interpreters (e.g. Bontempo 2012; Bontempo & Malcolm 2012) advocate incorporating trait awareness into interpreter training.

Such important factors as vague definitions of test construct and assessment criteria open a door to subjective EXPERT JUDGMENT both in interpreting (Angelelli 2018; Iglesias Fernández 2013; Wu 2010b) and translation (Angelelli 2018) assessment. It is worth noting that, in essence, a valid interpreting performance assessment should aim for nothing other than assessing the quality of interpreting or the level of interpreting skills

(Lee 2008), and, reasonably enough, different authors (Huertas-Barros et al. 2019b; Iglesias Fernández 2011; Sawyer 2004; Setton & Dawrant 2016b:110; Wu 2010b) call for the need for empirical studies in order to validate the test design (clearly including test constructs) using statistical sampling in interpreter assessment/testing.

Apart from that, for interpreter assessment/testing, Kalina (2005a) suggests that her framework for approaching interpreter assessment (also advocated by Wu 2010b), which takes four basic requirements for interpreters into account, namely mental MODEL; knowledge base; linguistic EXPERTISE; and interpreting skills, may be useful for defining the test constructs of interpreting.

TESTING → ASSESSMENT

TEST-RETEST METHOD

The term test-retest method, as an important concept in educational psychology and language testing, refers to a method of measuring reliability, which is used to examine the stability of the trait(s) being measured overtime (Gipps 1994; Miller 2008). This method, as Wu (2010b: 53-54, citing Sawyer 2004) convincingly argues, cannot be used for the purpose of estimating the stability of interpreting tests “because student interpreters would have been familiarized with test materials”.

THINK-ALLOUD PROTOCOLS

Definitions

The term think-aloud protocols (TAPs), alternatively called *monologue protocols*, *concurrent verbalization*, or simply *think-aloud*, refers to a process-oriented research method, first introduced by Hayes & Flower (1980) for the purpose of identifying writing processes. Hayes & Flower (ibid:4) define TAPs as a technique in which “subjects are asked to say aloud everything they think and everything that occurs to them while performing the task, no matter how trivial it may seem”.

TAPs in TIS

In TS, it is translators who are asked to act likewise, and their task performance is recorded in audio or video format to be transcribed; these transcriptions are termed TAPs (Jääskeläinen 2009). TAPs, being (perhaps)

the most popular method to elicit data in the process-oriented approach to EVALUATION (of translation) (Jääskeläinen 2009; Kim 2004), fall under the umbrella term *RETROSPECTIVE PROTOCOLS*; however, this categorization has been challenged by some (e.g. Lörscher 1991; see also Chesterman 2016:133-134) who consider TAPs to be introspective (and to fall under *introspective ASSESSMENT*) rather than retrospective, as subjects engage in verbalization immediately rather than later. Despite all this, TAPs found their way into TS first through the work of Hans Krings (Krings 1986a), Wolfgang Lörscher (Lörscher 1986), and Pamela Gerloff (Gerloff 1986). What draws our attention to TAPs in the context of translator/interpreter EDUCATION and TRAINING is their potential pedagogical usefulness in translator training (Araghian et al. 2018). As far as research is concerned, TAPs, by definition, are considered to be one highly popular way of addressing data collection for the purpose of examining procedural aspects of translation COMPETENCE (TC) in translation (Šeböková 2010) and trainees. However, a controversial and much disputed subject within TIS field has been TAPs and their application to research: it is worth noting that to date there is no consensus about this data elicitation method among TS scholars. Some authors (e.g. Jääskeläinen 2009, 2010a) believe that despite their limitations (e.g. incompleteness of data, or slowing down the translation process, see Munday 2016:103), TAPs can yield interesting results about translation processes and nature of translating. Some (e.g. Pietrzak 2015) suggest, based on the results of questionnaires, that TAPs may be pedagogically useful in teaching translation with implications for CURRICULUM and CURRICULUM DESIGN in TS, whereas, others (e.g. Risku 1998; Kiraly 1995, 2005) argue that while TAPs may help us develop a picture of how translators talk about their translation processes, they may tell us little about such processes themselves. However, it is worth noting that, according to Pietrzak (2015), rather than seeking solutions to translational problems, verbal protocols, including TAPs, as applied to TS, help identify such problems, and lead to trainees' more self-awareness and self-confidence in this respect (for limitations of TAPs in TS in this regard, see e.g. Kussmaul 1995). In IS, however, since interpreting, as it happens, does not allow for concurrent verbalization, immediate retrospective accounts are generally preferred to TAPs (Hild 2015; Shlesinger 2000), with the former contributing to process-oriented research in interpreting pedagogy (Shamy & de Pedro Ricoy 2017). What is more, according to Hild (2015), adaptation of TAPs to interpreting presents specific challenges: the necessity of keeping data collection minimally invasive (for the purpose of preventing VALIDITY and also RELIABILITY from being compromised); and preventing the time

delay between completion of the interpreting task and the beginning of TAPs.

TIME LAG

The term time lag, also known as *décalage*, refers to a delivery-based STRATEGY interpreters use in simultaneous, consecutive, and SIGHT INTERPRETING/TRANSLATION modes for the purpose of managing their processing capacity by extending or narrowing the ear–voice span (EVS) to devote more time to listening (Li 2015; Pöchhacker 2016; Timarová 2015c).

TM (TOOLS) → CAT TOOLS

ToT → TRAINING OF TRAINERS

TQA → ASSESSMENT

TRAINING

Definitions & distinctions

The term training refers to the process of acquiring skills, knowledge, or experience. One needs to remember that training must be distinguished from its counterpart EDUCATION.

Traineeship in TIS

Traineeship in interpreter training programs, or e.g. at the EU institutions schemes, may be described within the framework of a supervised *practicum* (a period of gaining experience in a certain type of work perhaps complemented by a study project to be completed before entering the final year, as a significant part of the final year or following the final year's taught elements as a requirement for obtaining the award); *apprenticeship* (with work experience and taught elements running concurrently throughout the training program); or *INTERNSHIP* (Wilson 2013).

In TIS, depending on who undergoes traineeship, i.e. receives training, in translator and interpreter training programs, training can be divided into six main categories: 1) training of translators; 2) training of interpreters; 3) training of researchers; 4) training of assessors/evaluators/examiners/raters; 5) training of stakeholders; and last but not least, 6) training of trainers (ToT).

Training of translators

Historically, translator training and its position within TS was first addressed by Holmes (1972/1988) in his famous map as a subfield of applied translation studies, which includes teaching methods, testing techniques, and CURRICULUM DESIGN (Munday 2016:19). Similarly, training was also classified within the applied branch of TS by Toury (1995). Later, Holmes's branch of applied translation studies was expanded by Munday (2016). In fact, training emerged in the literature as a hostile reaction to the idea of translators being trained in university environments characterized by curricular ideologies of academic rationalism. Hence the idea for academic/vocational dichotomy (Keams 2006:176). There is the recent trend of advocating the application of approaches common in language teaching such as TASK-BASED INSTRUCTION to translator training.

In TS, most literature about training has focused on processes and activities, and much less has been written on people involved (Kelly 2008). For training of translators, which, according to Pan et al. (2017:130-131), "shows a certain influence from language teaching that is missing in interpreter training due to the earliest trainers being mainly working interpreters", there is a wide range of approaches and perspectives: training, e.g. for PACTE research group, must be firmly grounded on a definition of translation COMPETENCE (Hurtado Albir 2017), which is the goal of translation and interpreting academic programs (Angelelli 2013b). Apart from that, translator training seems to be concerned with text; equivalence; purpose; process; style; specialized topics; dictionary; computer-aided translation still depending on human translators with regard to QUALITY (Bowker & Fisher 2010, 2013); task-/project-based (PjB) approach; and localization, among others (see Pan et al. 2017; for localization in translator training, see also Auster Mühl 2006; Clark et al. 2006).

Williams & Chesterman (2002) propose four main areas of research on translator training: 1) curriculum design; 2) implementation; 3) typical problem areas; and 4) professional dimension. One should note that there does not seem to be a consensus on how to train translators (Sachinis 2011) and interpreters (Setton & Dawrant 2016b:61) while the one-size-fits-all approach of traditional workshops and education with a sink-or-swim methodology is considered to be unacceptable as far as training translators (Kelly 2008) and interpreters (Angelelli 2000; Baxter 2013; Garzone & Viezzi 2002b; Gile 2015; Wiesman 2008) in academia or in training institutions outside academia is concerned. Another relevant issue is the powerful and irreversible movement of institutionalization of TS (Kelly & Martin 2009), a process still facing tensions and contradictions (Gambier

2018), and a phenomenon highly criticized by some authors (Lambert 2013), and encouraged by others (Király 2000; Ulrych 1996) not to remain purely academic, but to relate to translation profession in terms of market needs and/or standards (see also Hu 2018, ch.1), e.g. through engaging students in internship opportunities (Hu 2018). Besides, translator and interpreter training, being still in initial stages (Galán-Mañas & Hurtado Albir 2010; Sachinis 2011), particularly in terms of empirical research (Kelly & Martin 2009), should not and cannot take place in a vacuum, but must reflect the needs of the communities and countries in which it is undertaken.

Generally, one may, according to Thelen (2016:80), consider three areas for translator training institutes to focus on: 1) ways to introduce and implement PROFESSIONALIZATION in the training to enhance post-graduate employability, and to avoid/reduce skills gap between training and actual professional practice; 2) ways to ensure the transparency, RELIABILITY and objectivity of ASSESSMENT criteria and procedures; and 3) implementing a system of QUALITY ASSURANCE to ensure the quality of testing and assessing. In an attempt to widen the scope, one can convincingly argue for considering translator (and interpreter) training within the cultural panorama of each school and nation (see Lee 2006).

Training of interpreters

Interpreter training, profession-oriented and exclusive by nature and characterized by the so-called *master-apprentice* type of learning scenario for more than half a century (Gile 2009b; Moser-Mercer 2008; Pöchhacker 2010a, 2016) has, since the 1950s and 1960s, mainly focused on conference interpreting (Angelelli 2006; Kalina 2013; Pöchhacker 2016; Setton & Dawrant 2016a, 2016b) spearheaded by the Paris School (Seleskovitch & Lederer 1989), and has foregrounded the professional rather than academic aspect of higher education (Gile 2009b; Pöchhacker 2016), a situation characterized by more research on translation/interpreting competence compared to that on translator/interpreter competence (see Yan et al. 2018: 49). Mention must also be made of the need that was felt for ad hoc training courses (which did not last more than three months at the maximum) complemented by mock meetings/trials following the introduction of simultaneous interpreting into conference interpreter training in the late 1920s. But, in much contemporary (university-level) training of interpreters, cognitive (e.g. Daniel Gile's Effort Models) and interactional capacities (e.g. Cecilia Wadensjö 1998's interactionist approach) are foregrounded (see Hlavac 2016). Later, following approaches in signed

language interpreter training, training programs were, to a lesser extent, broadened to include other settings such as community interpreting (Mikkelsen 1996; Pöchhacker 2016; Stern 2011b), typically referred to as interpreting in asymmetrical settings (Berk-Seligson 2004; Hale 2007) and metaphorized as *pas de trois* (Cirillo & Radicioni 2017; Wadensjö 1998), in which ethics of interpreting serves as a core, more salient component and concerns challenges of approaching clients and dealing with the ones who misunderstand the role(s) of the interpreter (Brander de la Iglesia 2017; Gile 2017; Hale 2007; Kalina 2015a; Marzocchi 2003:43; Ng 2015; Vargas-Urpi 2012; see also under *INTERPRETING ENACTMENTS*), and even “beyond clients to include the wider community to which they belong” (Baker & Maier 2011:1). However, in some settings, such as prison settings, which are subsumed under the umbrella term *community interpreting*, there has been little incentive for training due to interpreters’ limited involvement thereof (Martínez-Gómez 2015).

In IS, while many authors (Gile 2005; Mackintosh 1999; Roy 1987; Seleskovitch 1999) state that interpreter training goes far beyond language teaching, the latter is still a basic component of many training programs, especially those for signed language interpreters (Timarová 2015a). Apart from that, there is the trend of advocating the application of approaches common in language teaching to the training of interpreters: some authors (Chen 2001; Horváth 2016b; Krouse 2010) advocate Cooperative Learning (CL) (which has also been advocated for translator training, see Horváth 2016b); others (Szabó 2017) support Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Interpreter training, a constant theme in IS (Ortega Herráez & Iliescu Gheorghiu 2015), along with her pedagogical didactics, is definitely a guild-like and skills-based subject (Skaaden & Watne 2009; Wang 2015), which does not primarily concern language learning, nor is it merely about the transmission and acquisition of a set of techniques. Instead, it is the understanding of interpreter’s social role complemented by the aspects of translation, performance and understanding of professional context that provides the objectives of interpreter training (Zolins 2017:62).

There is a consensus that interpreter training programs generally aim to train interpreters, who have competence required for the market (Sunnari & Hild 2010:44), i.e. interpreting/interpreter’s competence. However, it is more often than not a matter of debate whether it should be only at the postgraduate level in order for expectations to be met and for the training to be distinguished from language learning (Ayob 2010; Donovan 2006b; Peng 2017). Historically, interpreter training, tailored to specific needs in particular contexts, goes back to 1941, when the first, focused on training conference interpreters, was created in Geneva at the *École d’interprètes*

(Class 2009; Class & Moser-Mercer 2013). Current situation of interpreter training is represented by university-based training courses (whether stand-alone or series) throughout the world (Galindo Almohalla 2013), with the inclusion of live training e.g. in the form of mock conferences, classes in mastering the skill of public speaking and rhetoric (Ahrens 2018; Jin 2018; Setton & Dawrant 2016b:153-155), with interpreting as a field within academia, and with students' much more exposure to theory and research in the field than the past (Orlando 2016). This is a situation in recent decades that Pöchhacker (2010a:5, 2010b:160-161, 2013:175; 2016:32) calls *academization* of IS, which, along with identity and standardization components, forms the final stages towards the professionalization of interpreters (Furmanek 2013). This academic recognition is what university curricula are increasingly, in line with the market reality, required to link with professionalization, due to which PEDAGOGY and assessment have evolved in the field (Dewolf 2016; Pöchhacker 2016). Despite this, one must point out that whether and to what extent interpreter educators/trainers use research findings in their job or not is almost unknown (Pöchhacker 2010c:8). It appears that most of the literature on interpreter training, according to Orlando (2016), shows that teaching activities are of three distinct types: 1) consecutive interpreting and NOTE-TAKING techniques (see also Someya 2017a, 2017b) generally taught, in line with both the standard training MODEL (Kelly & Martin 2009; Setton & Dawrant 2016a: xxiv, 2016b: xxx, 82, 518) and the concept of SI *with training wheels* (Déjean le Féal 1997), before moving on to simultaneous interpreting (see also Seleskovitch 1999, 2008; Seleskovitch & Lederer 1989; Setton 2010b; but see Kalina 1994; Keiser 1978; Longley 1978) as informed by the basic tenets of the Interpretive Theory (IT) (see Dam 2010) but still considered a controversial issue of curriculum design (see Pöchhacker 2010b:170, 2013:178), most importantly due to the argument for the need for enough training in SI as the overwhelmingly dominant mode in professional practice (Setton & Dawrant 2016b:85); 2) simultaneous interpreting for international conferences (see also Moser-Mercer 2005b); and 3) dialogue interpreting for community-based situations (see also Cirillo & Niemants 2017). There has also been this recommendation that using consecutive interpreting to facilitate training simultaneous interpreting can be promising (Déjean Le Féal 1997; Luccarelli 2000). What is more, it can be hypothesized that consecutive interpreting will continue to influence interpreter training curriculum as long as different stakeholders' expectations regarding content accuracy and performance skills remain as high as at present (Andres 2015b:87; see also Griessner et al. 2017). One must note, however, that some authors (Gile 2001) argue that good mastery

of interpreting in the consecutive mode should not be considered a prerequisite to simultaneous interpreting, unless there is a specific need for the former in the market.

Main focal points of interpreter training, however, according to Pan et al. (2017:111), seem to be topics such as conference and/or community interpreting; the interpretive approach; cognitive abilities/constraints; short-term memory; note-taking (see also Ahrens 2015a; Chmiel 2010; Dingfelder Stone 2015a; Mead 2017; Orlando 2010, 2015; Schweda Nicholson 1990b; Someya 2017a, 2017b; but see Thiéry 1976, 1981); norms (as a central topic in descriptive translation studies as well, and as a useful element in translator training for the purpose of determining appropriate translational action, see Chesterman 1993/2017, 2005/2017), which depend on source speeches, acquisition during training or developed through professional practice, and different speeches previously heard by the interpreter, see Schjoldager 1995; ethics; and ACCREDITATION.

Training of researchers

As for training of researchers in TS, there should be a strong focus on issues of quality and hermeneutics; theoretical perspectives, research instruments (such as questionnaires), empirical tools and methods taught within training programs accommodated to the local needs of trainees along with research models and approaches based on best practices; issues of data collection and analysis; triangulation; research design and reporting issues, and ethics issues (Marco 2009; Mason 2009; Mellinger & Hanson 2017; Olohan & Baker 2009; Pym 2013; Saldanha & O'Brien 2014; Williams & Chesterman 2002), among others (see also Dastyar 2017; special issue of *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 3 (1), 2009). As for training of researchers in IS, in addition to issues of research design and reporting; empirical tools and methods; data collection and analysis; research instruments and ethics; and triangulation, one must also focus on the effect of technology on professional practice and research training (Hale & Napier 2013; Liu 2018), among others.

Training of assessors/evaluators/examiners/raters

Training of assessors/evaluators/examiners/raters is, as research shows, an important part of assessing speaking in performance(-based) assessment despite the positive effects being short-lived, resulting in rater drift overtime, and in turn, highlighting the need for ongoing training, and more importantly, concern over systematically addressing rater variability

(partially addressed by rater training) (Ginther 2013). Training of assessors is also emphasized in the context of TRANSLATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT (TQA) (Karoubi 2016a, 2016b, 2017). Han (2018) identifies four components of this type of training in interpreting/interpreter assessment: 1) conceptual introduction to- and detailed explanation of- assessment context, TEST CONSTRUCT, test content, assessment criteria and scoring schedule (e.g. rating scales, rubrics, procedures); (2) a practice session, in which raters familiarize with rating procedures by actually assessing interpretation, being coached individually in some cases by test developers or lead raters; (3) a norming session, in which raters familiarize themselves with assessment norms by rating a wide range of sample interpretations; and (4) discussion sessions, in which raters engage in discussions with lead raters about assessment. It can be argued that examination structures in assessment and certification tests will not be efficient unless the appropriate training of assessors has been fully undertaken (Arjona-Tseng 1984; Han 2015a, 2015b; Sunnari & Hild 2010), e.g. in terms of yielding equally reliable ratings regardless of different conditions under which scores are assigned (see Wu et al. 2013), with rater training being assisted by the psychometric model of Multifaceted Rasch Measurement (MFRM) (Han 2015a, 2015b, 2018).

Training of stakeholders

As for training of stakeholders of interpreting (e.g. clients, judges, magistrates, hospital staff, etc.), one needs to mention the important role of critical issues such as raising of awareness about the importance of interpreters (Felberg 2016; Hale 2015a; Karliner et al. 2004; Pöchhacker 2016, sect. 12.5.3); how to use interpreting services (Domingue & Ingram 1978); how to work best with interpreters (Amato 2018; Balogh & Salaets 2018; Conway & Ryan 2018; Corsellis 2008; Fowler 2013, 2018; Hertog 2013; Suggs 2018); issues of ethics regarding how to educate participants to best use interpreters (Stewart et al. 1998); and use of technology (see under *EVIVA PROJECT* and *IVY PROJECT*). Mention must be made of the effectiveness of pedagogical techniques such as *ROLE PLAY* in this respect.

The important issue of training stakeholders in IS may be exemplified by the quite recent Transnational Organised Crime & Translation (TOCAT) Project on training police investigators in how to work with interpreters. In this project, supervised by Dr. Joama Drugan (at the University of East Anglia) and in progress, the police (in the UK and Belgium), translation providers, and researchers will cooperate with one another to address crime-

related issues and challenges. What is interesting and relevant here is that in TOCAT Project, the broadest context of training, from the training room layout to the participants, is the area of focus.

Recent work in interpreter mediated police settings (Perez & Wilson 2011), in need of empirical validation though, supports applying a didactic model, the interlinked approach based on the pedagogical model of SITUATED LEARNING, to go beyond simply training clients and various stakeholders to work with interpreters, and more importantly, through a process of cross-fertilization, to involve service users, service providers and interpreters in interpreter training and to enable them to reflect on the development of the interpreter-mediated interaction they have directly contributed to as ‘themselves’.

Training of trainers

The term training of trainers (ToT), alternatively called *training the (translator/interpreter) trainers* or *training of teachers*, refers to extensive programs and initiatives (e.g. didTRAD at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, or initiatives of the FTI in Geneva) aiming to meet the need for more qualified and efficient translator and interpreter trainers, who must have a) what is termed translator trainer COMPETENCE, i.e. professional translation practice; b) TS as an academic discipline; and c) teaching skills (Kelly 2005, 2008). Eszenyi (2016), following EMT Expert Group (2013), considers five types of competence as the essential components of a modern translator trainer’s profile: 1) field competence (knowledge of the functioning of the translation market and experience of service provision); 2) instructional competence (skill in choosing the appropriate tasks and making a plan of the COURSE); 3) organizational competence (awareness of students’ needs and expectations of the translation program; in a nutshell, needs analysis) as part of the growing paradigm shift from teacher-centered to student-/learner-centered education in translator and interpreter education, to which ToT in terms of such a paradigm shift can be an obstacle (Echeverri 2015); 4) interpersonal competence (establishing a good rapport with students); and 5) ASSESSMENT competence (skill in EVALUATION of the course and the trainer’s best practice both at the micro, i.e. classes and macro, i.e. courses, levels and in issues of FEEDBACK and SELF-ASSESSMENT). Having started with the basic requirement of being a professional in order to teach translation and interpreting, and as one of the essential recent developments in both translator and interpreter training context, ToT is basically an interesting initiative/scheme (complemented by onsite and/or online training/certificate courses; onsite and/or online

workshops; training manuals; etc. for translators and interpreters who want to become trainers) set up in 2003 by the International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC), a professional association that pursues excellence in interpreting practice, and is considered to be essential for the success of translator (Englund Dimitrova 2002) and interpreter (Bao 2015; Luccarelli 2000; Niska 2007; Pöchhacker 2016:205-206; Roberson et al. 2012; Seleskovitch 1999; Setton & Dawrant 2016b:15-16; Sunnari & Hild 2010; Thiéry 2015; Zhan 2014) training programs for both experienced and novice instructors. One must not forget to mention Barbara Moser-Mercer's course in Geneva as another ToT initiative. In TS, for the purpose of addressing the needs of a wide range of learners, ToT is needed across different areas, ranging from trainers' familiarity with CAT TOOLS (Bowker 2015) to complementing peer learning (Washbourne 2013). However, the need for training translator and interpreter trainers remains unmet in translator and interpreter education institutions (Echeverri 2015; Harmer 2000; Kalina 2000; Kelly & Martin 2009; Mackintosh 1995; Pöchhacker 2010a). In IS, ToT initiative can benefit from exposure to research and ideas on course design; testing and grading; the importance of theory in training; handling the proper introduction of materials and pre-interpreting exercises into training in terms of their level of difficulty and usefulness (Mackintosh 1995); and of course, methodical classroom practices, and especially, how to provide '3D' feedback – observation, diagnosis and treatment (Setton & Dawrant 2016b:99), among others. Recently, despite its possible disadvantages, CONVERSATION-ANALYTIC ROLE-PLAY METHOD (CARM) has been recommended to be included in ToT programs, as this method is believed to have the potential to contribute to better communication among different participants reading training and assessment issues (see Wadensjö 2014). In her research study on introducing innovation in a one-year, multicultural and worldwide course for (a small number of) conference interpreter trainers, which, she believes, has contributed to the two domains of learning design and blended training in adult higher education, Class (2009), in line with Class et al. (2004), successfully implemented a socioconstructivist learning design (called *CMS* in education), the effect of which on skill acquisition and knowledge building she found to be significant.

Training in conference interpreting and community interpreting

One distinguishing feature of interpreter training programs, varying greatly in content and scope, is to determine whether the training is for conference

interpreting or for community interpreting (Johnson 2016). Both, with different qualifiers though, “are like twins separated at birth” (Kent 2009:55). The former (i.e. conference interpreting) is no longer considered the central axis around which IS revolves (Gile 2009b) while being the canonized form of interpreting that sets the norms and standards, is still mostly under the influence of *Théorie du Sens* developed by Seleskovitch (1968) and under that of Europe’s long-standing tradition of training in this setting, and is facing future challenges such as spread of English as lingua franca (ELF), advances in the area of remote interpreting (RI) and efforts made towards national and international standardization (Diriker 2015). The latter (i.e. community interpreting) is characterized by at least four main conditions: typically referred to as *interpreting in asymmetrical settings* (Berk-Seligson 2004; Hale 2007) metaphorized as *pas de trois* (Cirillo & Radicioni 2017; Wadensjö 1998); better established in some countries (Australia, Sweden) with Australia at its vanguard (Blewett 1987; Ertl & Pöllabauer 2010; Hlavac 2016) and less established in others (China, Japan) (see Hale 2015b); experiencing a current boom in terms of training and research (Bahadir 2011; Mikkelsen 1996; Ortega Herráez & Iliescu Gheorghiu 2015; Setton & Dawrant 2016b:584; Vargas-Urpi 2012; special issue of *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 4 (2), 2012); and being in need of more (appropriate) education and training (Downing & Tillery 1992; Hale 2011; Munyangayo et al. 2016; Pöschhacker 1999, 2013; Pöllabauer 2013; Roberts 2002; Roberts et al. 2000; Skaaden & Wattne 2009; Stem 2011b; Zimányi 2010). One must not forget to mention a third field, which straddles both of the fields above: signed language interpreting (Wilson 2013), an interpreting setting which differs internationally in terms of stages of professionalization, provision of interpreters, and interpreter training (Angelelli et al. 2013; Napier & Goswell 2013).

At the other side of the spectrum, criticism has been voiced against the exclusive focus the literature in IS has so far given only one aspect of interpreter training, namely *pedagogy* (see Fan 2012), against the intuitive, anecdotal and preconceived nature of interpreter training (see Lindquist 2002), and also against the condition that research on interpreter training has not received as much scholarly attention as research on translator training has (see Yan et al. 2018:69).

Learner-/student-centered and needs-based training in TIS

As learners are the actual receivers of training and the ultimate goal of any educational program, including translator and interpreter education (Hu 2018), training, in line with current higher education teaching philosophy in

general, and the current European Higher Education Area (EHEA) framework in particular (Presas 2012), must always be learner-/student-centered and based on NEEDS ANALYSIS in translation (Gile 2009a; Hurtado Albir 2018; Li 2000; Orlando 2016; Robinson 2012; Sikora 2014) and interpreting (Donovan 2006b, 2010; Gile 2009a; Hurtado Albir 2018; Kalina 2007; Moser-Mercer 2008; Orlando 2015, 2016; Preziosi & Garwood 2017; Sandrelli 2015b; Setton & Dawrant 2016a, 2016b; Shaw et al. 2004), in the sense that both teachers and students are expected to assume active roles in designing and implementing assessment practices (Katz & Gottlieb 2013). For translation, learner-/student-centered, need-based education implies focusing on: fostering translation competence considered to be the pivot of translator training (Kumpulainen 2016; Magaia 2016; Schäffner & Adab 2000); learners' adaptive and elastic competence neglected in translation pedagogy (Zhang 2011), and the acquisition of interpersonal competence through collaborative learning (Huertas Barros 2011); PROBLEM-BASED LEARNING (PBL) (García González & Veiga Díaz 2015; Kerkkä 2009; Mitchell-Schuitevoerder 2011); ethics (Baker & Maier 2011; Donovan 2011; Drugan & Megone 2011; Floros 2011; McAlester 2003); terminology (Gostkowska 2016; Ilhami & Way 2016); ICT tools & TECHNOLOGY (DeCesaris 1996; Flórez & Alcina 2011; Williams 2003); highly crucial component of text selection (Van Egdom 2016); CORPORA and CORPUS management tools (Buendía-Castro & López-Rodríguez 2013; Gutiérrez Florido et al. 2016; Rodríguez Inés 2009; Symseridou 2018; Zaretskaya et al. 2016); CAT TOOLS (Bowker 2015; Scherf 1992; Sikora 2014) and effective terminology management (Bowker & Marshman 2009; Sánchez-Gijón et al. 2009); under-researched area of personality traits (Akbari & Segers 2017; Hubscher-Davidson 2009, 2013a, 2013b, 2016, 2018a, 2018b); affective factors (Walczyński 2017), including (but not limited to) self-confidence (Haro-Soler 2018), SELF-CONCEPT (Ehrensberger-Dow & Massey 2013; Göpferich 2008, 2009; Kiraly 1995), and self-efficacy (Araghian et al. 2018); under-researched area of community translation (Taibi 2011, 2016b; Taibi & Zolins 2016); under-researched area of ergonomics (Ehrensberger-Dow & Jääskeläinen 2019; special issue of *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 12 (2), in progress); stylistics (Rizzato 2015); and of course, FEEDBACK in various forms (Eszenyi 2016; Shreve 1997, 2002; Washbourne 2014), among others.

For interpreting, this learner-/student-centered, need-based shift implies recent trends in research focus on the neglected area of trait awareness and learner factors (e.g. APTITUDE; MOTIVATION; gender; foreign language anxiety) as related to interpreting (see Bontempo 2012; Bontempo & Malcolm 2012; Pan et al. 2017:131; Timarová 2015a; Yan et al. 2010, 2018:

70, 119-120); (semi)AUTHENTICITY of materials and an increasing recognition of the relevance of exposure to realistic situations (Crezee 2015; Donovan 2010: 62); the highly crucial component of text selection (Andres 2015a; Setton & Dawrant 2016b:30-31); ethics in specific interpreting settings (Baker & Maier 2011; Brander de la Iglesia 2017; Ng 2015; Witter-Merithew & Stewart 2004), e.g. on trauma-informed interpreting which requires proper training of interpreters who interpret for trauma survivors (e.g. Bancroft 2017), for training of humanitarian interpreters (Delgado Luchner & Kherbiche forthcoming), or on prison interpreting regarding the behavior of prison staff and interpreters in relation to their respective professional conduct (Baixauli-Ólmos 2013; Valero-Garcés 2017) or simply on how clients can best work with interpreters (Stewart et al. 1998); the psycholinguistic approach to interpreting (Korpál 2016); efficient subject-and-setting-related preparation as a sub-skill (Díaz Galaz 2011, 2015; Díaz Galaz et al. 2015; Gile 2009a; Kalina 2015d; Scaglioni 2013); simultaneous with text (Setton 2010b, 2015a); theatrical training (Cho & Roger 2010); corpora and corpus management tools (Buendía-Castro & López-Rodríguez 2013; Gutiérrez Florido et al. 2016); ICT tools and technology (Şahin 2013; Vermeiren 2016); under-researched area of personality traits as mainly related to APTITUDE TESTING (Macnamara et al. 2011; Zammirato 2013); development of SELF-ASSESSMENT skills (Sandrelli 2007); tutor demonstration (with the trainer serving as a model of quality products for the students) (Altman 1989); PROFESSIONALISM (Setton & Dawrant 2016a); nonverbal communication channel, including gestures, mimics, proxemics, head movements (Amato et al. 2018; Cagle et al. 2018) and prosody/prosodic features (Ahrens 2002, 2004, 2005, 2015b, 2018; Collados Aís 1998a/2002, 1998b; Collados Aís et al. 2004; Iglesias Fernández & Russo 2018; Martellini 2013; Zagar Galvão 2015); professional training (for deaf interpreter training) (Morgan & Adam 2012); stylistics (Rizzato 2015); feedback in various forms (Lee 2018; Setton & Dawrant 2016a, 2016b); the under-researched area of ergonomics (special issue of *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 12 (2), in progress); and that of willingness to communicate (WTC) in interpreter training (see Yan et al. 2018: 153; for a rare study on this topic in interpreting classroom, see Yan et al. 2018: 160-165). It is worth pointing out that these as a whole serve the ultimate goal of improved quality in interpreting.

From a different perspective, one may also think of recent attempts by some authors (Krystallidou & Salaets 2016; Krystallidou et al. 2018a, 2018b) to apply interprofessional education (IPE) to interpreter training as a type of *inter-learner-centered* instruction, in which students from 2 or more disciplines learn from, about, with and on each other through

collaborative practice. Within the broad panorama of IS, this can, in fact, be thought of as being under the influence of the social-sociological turn in IS (Pöschhacker 2006), according to which interpreters are social agents performing in social settings (e.g. healthcare institutions), and the dynamics of which are marked by high interdisciplinarity, which shapes the communicative event itself and are equally shaped by it (Demi Krystallidou, personal communication, June 15, 2018).

Challenges to efficient training of translators & interpreters

Hurtado Albir (2018) highlights 3 specific curriculum-related challenges currently faced by translator and interpreter trainers: 1) the ever-changing nature of translation and interpreting profession; 2) the ever-mobile nature of academia and professions in today's world; and 3) recent pedagogical and technological progress affecting translation and interpreting profession. As for training of interpreters, whereas specialized training is assumed to be the exception rather than the rule (Giambruno 2014b) as "in many parts of the world, most learners join interpreter training programs not with the aim of becoming interpreters but with the aim of improving their language skills and thereby enhance their job prospects" (Yan et al. 2018: 141), three important points must be borne in mind: firstly, interpreting exercises (as a part of interpreting pedagogy) are considered to be pillars of training in all training programs, mainly regarding conference interpreter training (see Baxter 2013; Gile 2005; Kalina 1994, 1998); another fundamental requirement is the availability of proper facilities (e.g. booths, workstations) (Baxter 2014; Ruiz Mezcua 2010); moreover, the interpreting setting requires specific training principles: e.g. Hale (2007:169) discusses three main challenges in community interpreter training: 1) recruiting suitably qualified teaching staff; 2) attracting students with adequate bilingual and bicultural competences; and 3) deciding on the most relevant COURSE content and most efficient teaching methodologies. What logically follows is that challenges need to be addressed: attempting to do this, Corsellis (2005:158) summarizes the main course content for community interpreter training: (1) understanding the working context of the public service; (2) fluency and familiarity with relevant specialist formal and informal terminology in both languages (see also Valero Garcés 2005); (3) interpreting techniques and translation skills; (4) codes of ethics and guidelines to good practice (see also Vargas-Urpi 2012); and (5) continuous personal and professional development (see also Vargas-Urpi 2012). There seems to be a consensus over adopting an interdisciplinary perspective to teaching community interpreting, ideally, leading to CERTIFICATION

procedure accredited by a central authority (Hertog 2010). Mention must be made of the necessity of the under-researched topic of (community interpreters') *strategies* to be included in community interpreting curriculum (see Arumi Ribas & Vargas-Urpi 2017; Hale 2007, ch.3) and in interpreter training regardless of the setting (Al-Khanji et al. 2000; Li 2015b; Vik-Tuovinen 2011).

Process-oriented and product-oriented approaches to training in TIS

As for training of translators as well as interpreters, one, according to Pan et al. (2017: 130), should note that while the former has been found to be concentrating comparatively more on teaching, the latter, while also teaching-oriented, includes "an essential proportion of research from the learning perspective", perhaps due to its long obsession in the cognitive processes interpreters go through, and in such topics as aptitude, EXPERTISE and psychological stress. Today, learning translation is focused on both process and product (Washbourne 2013). With product-oriented approaches still overshadowing process-oriented ones in translator training (Angelone 2012, 2019), Gile (1994a, 2009a), in line with many other authors (Alves 2005; Angelone 2019; Cheng 2019; Delisle 1980/1988; Hurtado Albir 1983; Kim 2004; Kumpulainen 2016; Massey & Ehrensberger-Dow 2011; Sikora 2016) all focusing on translator training only, and others (Kalina 2007; Lee 2016b; Seleskovitch & Lederer 1984, 1989) all focused on interpreter training only, advocates the process-oriented approach (as complemented by such tools as *integrated problem and decision report (IPDR)*, see Gile 2004; Hansen 2006, or promising methods such as *screen recording*, see Angelone 2012, 2013, 2015, 2019) to translator and interpreter training, which focuses on principles, methods and procedures, including an interest in the mental processes that take place when a translator or interpreter is translating or interpreting, rather than on the translation/ interpretation product (see also Andres & Behr 2015 and Gile 2004 on interpreting and translation, respectively, in this respect). Gile (2009a) and Sikora (2016), however, suggest that such a focus on process should be limited to the early stages (perhaps a few weeks to a few months, depending on the total length of the program) of translator and interpreter training followed by a rather long period of focus on product. This important consideration has also been echoed by other authors (Iglesias Fernández 2011) as far as interpreting assessment is concerned (see under *assessment*). It is worth noting that the large proportion of studies on strategies provides evidence of the prevalence of process-oriented translator and interpreter

training (see Angelone 2015; Yan et al. 2018: 49), which has now evolved into a paradigm (Hild 2014). It is due to such an advantage that, as Kim (2004) argues, the process-oriented approach to EVALUATION, not the product-oriented approach, has psychological VALIDITY.

In-house training in TIS

The term in-house training is defined by Kelly (2005:298) as “initial or continuing training of staff organized and carried out in a company”. It, in fact, refers to a training context often limited to one specific aspect of translation practice such as translation memory tools, to few participants at a time, and are usually flexible in their design (Kelly 2005). Kelly (ibid), from a didactic perspective, stresses that in such a training context, motivation tends to be extrinsic and very specific. Other authors (Thelen 2019) report the training function of a so-called *in-house skills lab* as a good context of simulated translation bureau at the Maastricht School of Translation and Interpreting of Zuyd University of Applied Sciences in the Netherlands, which, while being “more in line with the translation industry”, is one option to implement professionalization and has a special focus on quality assessment (centered, in turn, on service provision), quality assurance and management, and feedback. In-house training for interpreters has been offered by international organizations and courts in line with their specific needs rather than interpreters’ more general background training (Stern 2011b). One may, by way of example only, point out that TRAINING OF TRAINERS (ToT) courses for conference interpreters is mainly conducted within the format of in-house training, i.e. within universities where new staff learns from more experienced staff (Wilson 2013).

Training models in TIS

In her overview of interpreter training curriculum, Sandrelli (2007) shows that the structure of most interpreter training courses relies heavily on autonomous learning pedagogical approach, or AUTONOMY. In his review of training programs, Renfer (1992:175) identifies four basic training models for translators and/or interpreters: 1) the two-tier system (with courses offered in consecutive stages, i.e. interpreter training is preceded by translator training; 2) the parallel model with translator and interpreter courses running parallel, followed by two separate final examinations; 3) the Y-model, in which the curricula for translators and interpreters bifurcate after a common curricular trunk for all students; and 4) postgraduate interpreter training in schools, or intensive on-the-job training in

international organizations, with the practical aspect of the program being its main advantage. As for the latter (Y-model), one should point out, by way of example only, that it is the model standard curricula for translator and/or interpreter training in German universities. Setton (2006), based on his observations, roughly divides interpreter training doctrines into two approaches: 1) the *multitasking* approach exemplified by XiaDa model for interpreting and interpreter training (see Liu 2014) (with a perhaps too much focus on component sub-tasks, including SHADOWING technique and lexical retrieval), and 2) the *holistic* approach (as represented by the Interpretive Theory (IT) paradigm successfully applied by Paris School to interpreter training and dominated the field for almost two decades, see Lederer 2010, 2015b; Salama-Carr 2009; Setton 1999, ch.2). What is more, recent research (Dong 2018), relying on empirical findings, hopes to integrate particularistic models for interpreter training based on Dynamic Systems Theory as a metatheoretical framework.

Common to translation training are student presentations as a popular method aiming to organize a plenary session in which a particular translation commission and product is analyzed from different points of view after individual, pair or small group work (Kelly 2005). Kaczmarek (2012) advocates using this method in community interpreting context and argues for its advantage of improving trainee skills and self-confidence, and that of provoking discussion and feedback.

Professional training has been growingly emphasized through the establishment of university consortiums such as European Masters in Conference Interpreting (EMCI), the first organized and systematic attempt in Europe in training conference interpreters, with its core, somehow flexible, curriculum focused on such areas as theory of interpretation, practice of interpretation, consecutive interpretation, simultaneous interpretation, and European Union and International Organizations, and of other important organizations such as CIUTI (Conférence Internationale Permanente d'Instituts Universitaires de Traducteurs et Interprètes), and the International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC) (Bao 2015).

Technology & training in TIS

Be that as it may, different forms of technology, and accordingly, of learning, appear in educational and training contexts worldwide, and their effects and challenges have been lately addressed in TIS (see the special issue of *the FITIS/Pos International Journal* 5 (1), 2018). But TIS literature, has not been paying enough attention to the important issue of learning and using technologies, and of course, digital education, in translator and

interpreter training (Jiménez-Crespo 2009; Kelly 2008) despite the fact that as far as the effects of new technologies on translation and interpreting are concerned, it is the latter that is lagging behind (Blasco Mayor & Jiménez Ivars 2007). Apart from that, translator and interpreter training programs typically have limited budgets; human resources is the greatest challenge in regard to training translators and interpreters (Bontempo 2012). There is also a dearth of studies dedicated to translator and interpreter training in a BLENDED LEARNING mode (Galán-Mañas & Hurtado Albir 2010). It must be borne in mind that trainers and educators in IS may need to be ready for getting adapted to this new (technological) trend and perhaps reconsider syllabi and curricula in an attempt to move boundaries in interpreting (see e.g. Pöchhacker 2019; Ruiz Mezcuca 2016; Tripepi Winteringham 2010; for the challenges in this respect, see Braun 2006; see under *AVDICUS PROJECT*).

Two technological trends focus on translator training, namely CAT (computer-aided translation) tools in the translation profession; and free and open-source software packages (Bowker et al. 2008; see also Bowker & Corpas Pastor 2015; Bowker & Fisher 2010; Sikora 2014; Veiga Díaz & García González 2015) with their specific advantages and disadvantages (Flórez & Alcina 2011).

Focusing specifically on interpreter training, Maren Dingfelder Stone (personal communication, August 24, 2017) suggests that mixing classroom approaches with collaborative settings might allow the maximum rate of success among students, and collaborative learning options can quite easily be incorporated even into traditional chalk-and-talk instruction settings, most notable (but not exclusively) in the form of the so-called 'MOCK CONFERENCE', a live training format and an interesting suggestion echoed earlier by Braun et al. (2013) regarding both mock conferences and the IVY project, as far as interpreter training is concerned. Another useful representation of exploiting technology in translator (Ustaszewski 2017) and interpreter training is Web 2.0 applications/technologies: one good case example for the latter (interpreter training) is SIMON PROJECT created at the University of Geneva. With different forms of technology appearing in TIS, distance learning, which falls under the umbrella term blended learning, has found its way into translator and interpreter training courses and programs (whether stand-alone or series) varying greatly in content and scope. In IS, distance learning as adopted to training interpreters, despite being cost effective, 'requires at least twice as much administrative work as face-to-face teaching', which is a crucial factor in the planning of any interpreter training program by distance mode (Carr & Steyn 2000; Ko 2008) when faculty and face time are limited (see also Sawyer & Roy 2015).

What is more, lately the call for a need for specific training and preparation in remote interpreting (RI) as one form of technologized interaction has become louder (see Amato et al. 2018; Couture 2018), some authors (Goldsmith 2018b) have underscored the need for training in the new key area of *tablet interpreting*, and others (Darden & Maroney 2018) have explored the feasibility of applying mobile technology (m-learning) to interpreter education. Despite advantages such as contributing to interpreter recruitment everywhere, and cost-efficiency (Amato et al. 2018), the so-called *distance interpreting*, which is an umbrella term for *(video) remote interpreting* and *videoconference interpreting*, is far from becoming a component of interpreter training curricula due to the current state of available technologies and scant empirical data in this respect (Seeber 2018). As for the former, technology-mediated distance interpreting may be a double-edged sword in that it can create new opportunities and options for efficient provision of interpreting services on one hand, and pose serious challenges of quality issues, skill training, working conditions, user expectations, and impact such a combination can have on the whole interpreting event on the other. Besides, given this specific status, there is a need for training interpreters and interpreting stakeholders (Braun & Davitti 2018).

Training translators & interpreters in specialized contexts

One needs to raise awareness of the importance of training business translators (Mo 2013); training citizen translators in crisis communication scenarios (Federici & Cadwell 2018); training interpreters working in an asylum context (UNHCR Austria 2017); training interpreters regarding the risk of vicarious trauma and those at risk in community interpreting in general (Knodel 2018; Lai et al. 2015), in healthcare settings in particular (Bontempo & Malcolm 2012), and in signed language interpreting (MacDonald 2015); and training of translators and interpreters to address the needs of gender violence survivors (Del Pozo 2017), among others.

TRAINING OF/THE TRAINERS → TRAINING
 TRAIT → TEST CONSTRUCT
 TRANSCODAGE → TRANSCODING

TRANSCODING

The term *transcoding*, sometimes called *transcodage*, developed by Seleskovitch (1968), refers to a micro-STRATEGY (or language-based

strategy) in interpreting, and in simultaneous, consecutive, and SIGHT INTERPRETING/TRANSLATION modes, using which the interpreter quickly renders such elements as technical terms; proper nouns; names of places; or numbers and figures without semantic processing (Kader & Seubert 2015; Kalina 2015e) and “using a word-for-word approach by sticking to the surface structure of the original” (Li 2015b:175). This said, it should be added that other types of information do not lend themselves to the strategy of transcoding, and therefore, need to be rendered interpretively (see Lederer 2015a). This has, to some extent, led Seleskovitch to give less importance to transcoding in interpreting, if not reject it altogether (Lederer 2015a; Seleskovitch 1975). Transcoding has also been discussed in TS (see Nida 1969).

TRANSCOMP → COMPETENCE

TRANSFORMATIVE LEARNING

Implemented through such important concepts as (learner/trainee) EMPOWERMENT, and supporting collaborative learning (as an essential feature of the SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH), the term transformative learning is a type of approach to (adult) learner-/student-centered EDUCATION, which is consistent with humanistic principles of learning and teaching and current higher education teaching philosophy, and has the potential of enhancing intrinsic motivation (IM). While, depending on the perspective and theoretical reflection, different definitions of the term transformative learning have been suggested, it can be best treated through a brief description of the different trends and perspectives it has experienced, from Freire’s emancipatory approach to learning (focused on altering the social structures of inequality and injustice) (Freire 1970), to Mezirow’s view of learning as perspective transformation (focused on psychological and cognitive characteristics of human nature influencing the process of education) (Mezirow 1991) and aiming to “liberate the individual from personal unconscious content and reifications of cultural norms and patterns that block the individual’s self-actualization” (Boyd & Myers 1988), and to Boyd’s transformative education (centered on expressive or emotional-spiritual dimensions of learning) (Boyd 1991; Boyd & Myers 1988), among others.

The optics one may adopt here is that all these trends and perspectives primarily emphasize the importance of meaning in learning and the role adults play in constructing and making that meaning within the learning experience (Dirkx 1998), and this may point to Don Kiraly’s social

constructivist approach to translator (and perhaps, to some extent, interpreter) education (Kiraly 2000), which, he considers, along with transformational educational theory (underlying transformative learning), to be “potential sources of inspiration to nourish a learning-centered approach to developing translator EXPERTISE in institutional settings” (Kiraly 2012a:1). However, some authors (Klimkowski 2015:100) warn against treating this approach as having the potential of becoming “an official ideology of an objectivist-positivist kind” because “transformation, although endorsed in a social context, is epistemologically a matter of a single brain. It cannot be directly caused, forced, transferred or transmitted”.

TRANSLATION ASSIGNMENT → TRANSLATION BRIEF

TRANSLATION BRIEF

The term translation brief, also referred to in the literature as the *translation assignment*, refers, in brief, to details of the readership, the purpose and the status of a translation (Fraser 2000). In other words, it refers to the expectation clients have as related to a specific translation job (Palumbo 2009). A translation brief includes information about the (intended) text function(s); the target-text addressee(s); the (prospective) time and place of text reception; the medium over which the text will be transmitted; and the motive for the production or reception of the text (Nord 2018:57). A translation brief, as a focal point of Christiane Nord’s functionalist approach to TRANSLATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT (TQA), is considered to play an important role in the training of professional translators (Beeby 2004; Nord 1988, 2018), and in the grading and ASSESSMENT of translated texts (Fraser 2000; Palumbo 2009; Schäffner 2012).

TRANSLATION DIARY

Alternatively called *translation logs*, *translator’s diary*, *learner’s diary*, *learning diary*, and *reflective diary*, a translation diary, as a form of ASSESSMENT, is a personal written record of all aspects of one’s work, assignments, strategies and decisions taken in classroom trainees or learners keep as a useful source of *natural data* (Matsumoto 1987). As a matter of fact, translation diaries are relatively new ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS/TOOLS to the student translator classroom (Galán-Mañas & Hurtado Albir 2015; Huertas Barros & Vine 2017; Mitchell-Schuitevoerder 2014). It was Fox (2000) who proposed and tested translation diaries in translation classroom for the purpose of capturing

developmental aspects of the process of acquiring translation COMPETENCE (TC). Being based on meta-cognitive approaches, a translation diary, submitted for assessment, is an instrument used, not alone though, for the purpose of gaining insights into learners'/trainees' thinking (Wakabayashi 2003), and representing and monitoring developmental aspects of acquiring translation competence (Fox 2000) and interpreting competence in general, and developing attitudinal competence in particular (Muñoz-Miquel 2018). Therefore, mention must be made of the fact that it can be useful for both translation/interpreting trainers and trainees, as it takes them through a process-oriented translation teaching methodology, facilitates trainees' self-awareness and self-reflection (in the form of metacompetences as advocated by Lesznyák 2007 as possible contributing factors to the acquisition of new competences in translation), and improves assessment of translation performance (Fox 2000). Such diaries can be used for the same purposes by trainers and trainees in interpreting (see Postigo Pinazo 2008); they are called *interpreter's diary* or *interpreting diary*.

TRANSLATION ENVIRONMENT TOOLS → CAT TOOLS

TRANSLATION LOG → TRANSLATION DIARY

TRANSLATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT → ASSESSMENT

TRANSLATION SUPPORT TOOLS → CAT TOOLS

TRANSLATOR TRAINER COMPETENCE → TRAINING OF
TRAINERS

TRANSLATOR WORKBENCHES/WORKSTATIONS → CAT
TOOLS

TRANSMISSIONIST APPROACH

The term transmissionist approach, alternatively called *conduit approach*, refers to a teacher-centered default approach to EDUCATION, based on which teaching methods are “dominated by lectures, assigned reading of books and electronically based materials and set problem-solving exercises” (Cannon & Newble 2000:155-156). Exemplified by the traditional technique “Who’ll take the next sentence?” (WTNS) (Nord 1996), the transmissionist approach is a strongly traditional approach, in which much of translator education is still deeply embedded (Kiraly 2000, 2015), is no longer considered appropriate to (higher) education and is even thought of as a didactically ineffective and detrimental paradigm (Inoue 2005; Kiraly 2000; Klimkowski 2015; Veiga Díaz & García González 2016). This approach, characterized, among others, by a dominating, active role assumed by the teacher (i.e. the role of the instructor in the classroom), and

a relatively active, but dominated, role assumed by the student, i.e. mere transfer of knowledge (Kiraly 2014; Klimkowski 2015; Klimkowski & Klimkowska 2012), enhances only **EXTRINSIC MOTIVATION** (EM), and has proven to be much less effective than what is today known as transformative learning. According to Kiraly (2014:10), based on a transmissionist approach to teaching translation, “translation students’ actual experience in dealing with the authentic, situated work of the translator would be of negligible relevance for the learning process- at least during class”. In TS, Don Kiraly’s **SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH** to translator education is considered to be an innovative practice which, while emphasizing (learner) **AUTONOMY**, goes against the transmissionist approach to teaching and learning as rightly criticized by Kiraly (2005a, 2005b, 2016b) himself as the true representation of the pervasive **WTNS** approach, a term he borrowed from Nord (1996).

It must be noted, however, that Kiraly’s distinction (social constructivist approach vs. transmissionist approach) has been questioned by some TS authors (e.g. Pym 2011) on the grounds that it is not perfectly formed; it matches poorly with the many professional situations based on hierarchies; and it will be far less useful if the competencies have been defined and calculated in a pre-established blueprint.

Interpreter training, to say it with Merlini (2017:139), “going beyond the transmissionist approach, is evolving towards a learner-/student-centered **MODEL**” of education, with learners’ flexible and critical thinking reflected in their engagement in **EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING** (see also Bentley-Sassaman 2009) and in learning activities such as true-to-life role plays. In the same vein, translation **PEDAGOGY**, as a subfield of TS, is starting, more or less, to experience such a paradigm shift (Piotrowska & Tyupa 2014).

USER EXPECTATIONS/PERCEPTIONS → QUALITY

VALIDITY

Definitions & considerations

As the central, old concept in educational psychology, and testing and assessment, validity is a criterion against which a measurement tool can be checked (Bailey & Curtis 2015). The term validity, traditionally speaking, refers to whether a test really measures what it purports to measure (Heaton 1975; Hughes 1989; Kelley 1927; Lado 1961; Leighton 2008). The concept of validity, considered the most fundamental component of developing and

evaluating educational and psychological tests (Leighton 2008), may be represented in the question “What exactly should be assessed?” This said, it should be added that the first step one must take in order to establish the validity of test-score interpretations is a written statement of the manner of interpretation of the test scores (Leighton 2008). However, some authors (e.g. Chappelle 2012), while criticizing the concept of validity, argue against the idea of a single conception of validity, and instead, argue for and emphasize the role of the socioacademic community in conceptualization of validity as related to test interpretations.

Issues of validity in translation & interpreting assessment

Within the broad panorama of TIS, validity, along with concepts such as RELIABILITY and QUALITY, has been one focal point of test design, ASSESSMENT and EVALUATION procedures that has remained unaddressed (Angelelli 2009, 2018; Eyckmans & Anckaert 2017; Eyckmans et al. 2009; Salaets & Balogh 2015b). However, recently some authors in IS (Wallace 2019) have proposed a hybrid MODEL of court interpreter CERTIFICATION in order to address the challenge of reliability and validity. This said, it should be added that, in essence, validity issues in interpreter assessment concern the design of the assessment criteria (Cheung 2007) carrying different weights (Collados Ais & García Becerra 2015a, 2015b; Gile 2003, 2009a), and a valid interpreting performance assessment should aim for nothing other than assessing the quality of interpreting or the level of interpreting skills (Lee 2008) based on reliable and valid assessment criteria (see e.g. Setton & Dawrant 2016b:424-425). In order to attain valid testing, a link must be established between research, TRAINING and practice (Iglesias Fernández 2011). It must be added that, compared to the situation in the domain of language testing and assessment and other related fields, TIS is lagging behind as far as assessment in general (Angelelli 2018), and concepts of validity and reliability in testing and assessment in particular (Eyckmans et al. 2009; Eyckmans & Anckaert 2017) are concerned. In the area of educational assessment, and also in TIS, validity, traditionally speaking, is classified into five types: 1) predictive validity; 2) concurrent validity; 3) construct validity; 4) face validity; and 5) content validity.

Predictive validity

The term predictive validity is a type of validity, which relates to whether the test predicts accurately or well some future performance (Gipps 1994). This type of validity is considered to be the most important feature of

APTITUDE tests (Timarová & Ungoed-Thomas 2009; see also Sawyer 2004; Skaaden 1999; Timarová 2015a).

Concurrent validity

The term concurrent validity refers to a type of validity, which is a measure of whether a particular validated test correlates with, or gives substantially the same results as, another validated test of the same skill or CONSTRUCT (see e.g. Gipps 1994).

Construct validity

The term construct validity, as a central issue in assessment, refers to a type of validity, which relates to whether it can be justified that our interpretation of a particular test score with regard to measuring a particular construct is valid (Bachman 1990; Bachman & Palmer 1996; Gipps 1994), with the term construct originally introduced by MacCorquodale & Meehl (1948).

In order for an interpreting test to have construct validity, one must take into consideration the multidimensional nature of QUALITY ASSURANCE in the field and a complex set of skills and a multiplicity of test constructs (preferably within a coherent theoretical framework) to be measured and assessed (Lee 2015; Wu 2010b).

Face validity

The term face validity can be defined as the extent to which a test appears/looks to assess what (e.g. skills, tasks) it is intended to assess. This type of validity is generally not considered to be a scientifically sound basis for assessment/test results (see e.g. Bachman 1990; Boyle & Fisher 2007). In order for an interpreting test to have face validity, it must include constructs (e.g. interpreting speeches) which have AUTHENTICITY, i.e. they must be selected from those interpreters working in different modes and settings may actually encounter (Wu 2010b).

Content validity

The term content validity, as a type of validity, is about the relevance of the covered content in a particular test (Bachman 1990; Gipps 1994).

In order for an interpreting test to have content validity, one must take into consideration “authenticity of the subject matter and terminology being tested” (Sawyer 2004: 99) among others. One useful way to increase content

validity and INTER-RATER RELIABILITY of an interpreting test is to hire two independent raters for the test (Hertog 2014). Another way to ensure content validity of an interpreting test is to focus on constructing test items in a way they adequately represent the content of the domain that is assessed (Clifford 2004).

Ecological validity

In interpreter testing and assessment, Giambruno (2014a:247) defines ecological validity as a type of validity which ensures the authenticity of test components, materials, and setting. In other words, it ensures how real the test components, materials, and the setting are. A potential weakness for ecological validity concerns task authenticity in interpreter training and assessment as related to the nature of the task, i.e. when sometimes written tasks are assigned while interpreting, by nature, mainly involves oral tasks. What is more, mention must also be made of the importance of gaining access (both audio and video) to assessors' gestures and responses from test-takers, the lack of which can raise issues of ecological validity regarding the assessment, especially in case of recorded-performance for later assessment. This reflects the idea of test authenticity in interpreter assessment (Hlavac 2013a; Wallace 2012), a condition which enhances the ecological validity of the assessment. Apart from that, ecological validity is considered to be an important component of designing studies of EXPERTISE in IS (Tiselius & Hild 2017). There are ways to increase the ecological validity of a research study as well. As a case in point, in her recent study, conducting an international survey on the relationship between tolerance of ambiguity, trait emotional intelligence and job satisfaction among professional translators, Hubscher-Davidson (2018a) collected data from 85 participants with a wide range of language combinations and coming from many different countries, and in this way, enhanced the ecological validity of her study.

VERBATIM SHADOWING → **SHADOWING**
WAITING → **STALLING**

WASHBACK

Definitions & typologies

The term washback, alternatively called *washback effect*, or *backwash* (in general educational research), is a commonly used term in applied

linguistics and language testing, which refers to the multifaceted effect tests may have on teaching and learning practices at the classroom level (Alderson & Wall 1993; Fulcher 2010; Hughes 1989; Mousavi 2012; Nation & Macalister 2010; Tsagari & Cheng 2017; Wall 2012, 2013), a critical issue that has been the object of empirical research in the field of language testing (see Cheng et al. 2004). Washback, a criterion against which a measurement tool can be checked (Bailey & Curtis 2015), is of two types: *positive* washback; and *negative* washback, both produced by ASSESSMENT-based decisions: whereas the former (as a primary goal for test developers) refers to the condition of the testing accurately representing the aims of the CURRICULUM, the latter points to the mismatch between the test itself and the aims of the curriculum (Alderson & Wall 1993; Wall 2012, 2013); washback can be both positive and negative as well. Boosting the positive washback can be effectively aimed for through, among others, testing abilities whose development is aimed for; sampling widely and unpredictably; using direct testing; engaging in CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTING (CRT); and justifying the test rationale, and its specifications (Mousavi 2012:52-53).

Washback in translator & interpreter TRAINING

Some authors (Angelelli 2018:436) advise against giving too much weight to issues of assessment in translator and interpreter training contexts, as such a behavior may result in “an assessment-led T&I educational program rather than a learning-led one”. In an interpreter training context, as Chen (2009) concludes, ensuring that positive washback is exerted on interpreting learning and teaching requires AUTHENTICITY, the lack of which can have a negative washback effect on PEDAGOGY as such: one good example is provided by ●zolins (2017:58), who mentions using recorded, not live, final assessments, and turning them back into shorter or longer consecutive exercises or virtually translation exercises: this leaves no room for interaction and no way of testing trainees’ coordination skills (e.g. the time-management skills, see Wadensjö 1998; or the skill of coordinating NOTE-TAKING, listening and memory in consecutive interpreting). ●ne good way to boost the positive washback of teaching interpreting is to apply a MOCK CONFERENCE training format to this practice because it, associated with the pedagogical MODEL of SITUATED LEARNING, simulates trainees’ enthusiasm and AUTONOMY (see Li 2015a).

WEBINAR

The term webinar, short for *web-based seminar*, refers to an interactive seminar over the Internet. In translator TRAINING, webinars and interactive webinars, focused on the practicalities of teaching COMPUTER-AIDED/-ASSISTED TRANSLATION (CAT) TOOLS in the classroom have turned into a standard method to offer training to their members (Mitchell-Schuitevoerder 2014).

ZONE OF PROXIMAL DEVELOPMENT → SCAFFOLDING

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdallah, K. (2011) 'Towards Empowerment: Students' Ethical Reflections on Translating in Production Networks,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 5 (1): 129-154. DOI: 10.1080/13556509.2011.10798815.
- Ábrányi, H. (2016) 'Translation Environment Tools,' in Horváth (ed.) (2016), pp.167-182.
- Abuín González, M. (2012) 'The Language of Consecutive Interpreters' Notes: Differences across Levels of Expertise,' *Interpreting* 14 (1):55-72.
- Ackermann, D., Lenk, H. & Redmond, M. (1997) 'Between Three Stools: Performance Assessment in Interpreter Training,' in Fleischmann et al. (eds.) (1997), pp.262-267.
- Adams, K. (2017) 'Domain-Specific Activities in ASL-English Interpreting & Their Relevance to Expertise Development,' *Interpreting* 19 (2): 186-208. DOI: 10.1075/intp.19.2.02ada.
- Agrifoglio, M. (2004) 'Sight Translation & Interpreting: A Comparative Analysis of Constraints & Failures,' *Interpreting* 6 (1):43-67.
- Ahrens, B. (2002) 'The Interdependence between Verbal & Nonverbal Elements in Simultaneous Interpretation,' in Garzone et al. (eds.) (2002), pp.37-46.
- Ahrens, B. (2004) *Prosodie beim Simultandolmetschen*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Ahrens, B. (2005) 'Prosodic Phenomena in Simultaneous Interpreting: A Conceptual Approach & its Practical Application,' *Interpreting* 7 (1): 51-76.
- Ahrens, B. (2015a) 'Note-Taking,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.283-286.
- Ahrens, B. (2015b) 'Prosody,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.326-327.
- Ahrens, B. (2018) 'Phonetics, Phonology & Interpreting,' in Malmkjær (ed.) (2018), pp.64-76.
- Akbari, A. (2017) 'Needed Skills & Strategies to Improve the Efficiency of Sight Translation in Classroom Context,' *trans-kom* 10(1):22-44.
- Akbari, A. & Segers, W. (2017) 'Diverse Personality Traits & Translation Quality: Preselected Items Evaluation & NEO Five-Factor Inventory,' *trans-kom* 10(2):242-270.

- Alkrami, A., Ghonsooly, B., Yazdani, M. & Mohammad Alami, P. (2018) 'Construction & Validation of a Computerized Open-ended Bifunctional Translation Assessment System,' *New Voices in Translation Studies* 18:1-37.
- Albl-Mikasa, M. (2012) 'The Importance of Being Not Too Eamest: a Process-and-Experience-Based Model of Interpreter Competence,' in Ahrens et al. (Hg.) (2012), pp.59-92.
- Albl-Mikasa, M. (2013a) 'Developing & Cultivating Expert Interpreter Competence,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 18:17-34.
- Albl-Mikasa, M. (2013b) 'Teaching Globish? The Need for an ELF Pedagogy in Interpreter Training,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 5 (1):3-16.
- Albl-Mikasa, M. (2015) 'English as a Lingua Franca,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.140-142.
- Albl-Mikasa, M., Guggisberg, S. & Talirz, F. (2017) '(Source) Texting ELF. Native & Non-Native English Speaker Discourse Production & Conference Interpreters' Preference for the Native Speaker,' in Zybatow et al. (eds.) (2017a), pp.267-275.
- Aldea, B. (2008) 'Self-study in Interpreter Training: A few Methodological Guidelines,' *Revue Internationale d'Etudes en Langues Modernes Appliquées* 1:95-101.
- Alderson, J. C., & Wall, D. (1993) 'Does Washback Exist?' *Applied Linguistics* 14:115-129.
- Al-Khanji, R., El-Shiyab, S. & Hussein, R. (2000) 'On the Use of Compensatory Strategies in Simultaneous Interpretation,' *Meta* 45(3): 548-557.
- Allen, J.P.B. (1984) 'General-Purpose Language Teaching: A Variable Focus Approach,' in Brumfit (ed.) (1984), pp.61-74.
- Al-Qinai, J. (2000) 'Translation Quality Assessment: Strategies, Parameters & Procedures,' *Meta* 45(3):497-519.
- Altman, J. (1989) 'The Role of Tutor Demonstration in Teaching Interpretation', in Gran & Dodds (eds.) (1989), pp.237-240.
- Alves, F. (2005) 'Bridging the Gap between Declarative & Procedural Knowledge in the Training of Translators: Meta-Reflection under Scrutiny,' *Meta* 50(4): None-None. DOI: 10.7202/019861ar.
- Alves, F. & Gonçalves, J. L. (2007) 'Modelling Translator's Competence: Relevance & Expertise under Scrutiny,' in Gambier et al. (eds.) (2007), pp.41-55.
- Amato, A. (2018) 'Telephone Interpreting for Health Care Service: Potential Problems & Solutions,' in *SHIFT Report 2, 2018:52-85*.

- Amato, A., Spinolo, N. & González Rodríguez, M. J. (eds.) (2018) *The SHIFT Handbook of Remote Interpreting*, AMSActa, the Institutional Research Repository of the University of Bologna. <http://amsacta.unibo.it.5955>. (Accessed July 15, 2018).
- Amman, M. (1990) 'Anmerkungen zu einer Theorie der Übersetzungskritik und ihrer praktischen Anwendung,' *TEXTconTEXT* 6:55–62.
- Anderson, J. R. (2015) *Cognitive Psychology & Its Implications*, 8th edn, New York: Worth Publishers.
- Andrade, H. L. & Cizek, G. J. (eds.) (2010) *Handbook of Formative Assessment*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Andres, D. (2015a) 'Easy? Medium? Hard? The Importance of Text Selection in Interpreter Training,' in Andres & Behr (eds.) (2015), pp.103-124.
- Andres, D. (2015b) 'Consecutive Interpreting,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.84-87.
- Andres, D. & Behr, M. (2015) 'Preface,' in Andres & Behr (eds.) (2015), pp.11-16.
- Andres, D., Boden, S. & Fuchs, C. (2015) 'The Sense & Senselessness of Preparatory Exercises for Simultaneous Interpreting,' in Andres & Behr (eds.) (2015), pp.59-73.
- Angelelli, C. V. (1999) 'The Role of Reading in Sight Translation: Implications for Teaching,' *The ATA Chronicle* 28(5):27–30.
- Angelelli, C. V. (2000) 'Interpretation Pedagogy: A Bridge Long Overdue,' *The ATA Chronicle* 29(11):40-47.
- Angelelli, C. V. (2004) *Revisiting the Interpreter's Role: A Study of Conference, Court & Medical Interpreters in Canada, Mexico & the United States*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Angelelli, C. V. (2005) 'Healthcare Interpreting Education: Are We Putting the Cart Before the Horse?' *The ATA Chronicle* 34(11):33-38, 55.
- Angelelli, C. V. (2006) 'Designing Curriculum for Healthcare Interpreting Education: A Principles Approach,' in Roy (ed.) (2006), pp.23-46.
- Angelelli, C. V. (2007) 'Assessing Medical Interpreters: The Language & Interpreting Testing Project,' *The Translator* 13(1):63–82.
- Angelelli, C. V. (2009) 'Using a Rubric to Assess Translation Ability: Defining the Construct,' in Angelelli & Jacobson (eds.) (2009), pp.13-47.
- Angelelli, C. V. (2010) 'A Professional Ideology in the Making: Bilingual Youngsters Interpreting for Their Communities & the Notion of (No) Choice,' *TIS* 5(1):94–108. DOI: 10.1075/tis.5.1.06ang.
- Angelelli, C. V. (2013a) 'Foreword,' in Tsagari & Van Deemter (eds.) (2013), pp.9-11.

- Angelelli, C. V. (2013b) 'Teaching Translation & Interpreting,' in Chappelle (ed.) (2013), pp.5666–5670.
- Angelelli, C. V. (2013c) 'Translation & Interpreting & Bilingualism,' in Chappelle (ed.) (2013), pp.5914–5920.
- Angelelli, C. V. (ed.) (2014) *The Sociological Turn in Translation & Interpreting Studies*, Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Angelelli, C. V. (2017) 'Anchoring Dialogue Interpreting in Principles of Teaching & Learning,' in Cirillo & Niemants (eds.) (2017), pp. 29-44.
- Angelelli, C. V. (2018) 'Assessment,' in D'hulst & Gambier (eds.) (2018), pp.435-442.
- Angelelli, C. V., Baer, B. J. & Grbić, N. (2013) 'Translation & Interpreting: Overview,' in Chappelle (ed.) (2013), pp.5920–5923.
- Angelelli, C. V., Enright, K. & Valdés, G. (2002) 'Developing the Talents & Abilities of Linguistically Gifted Bilingual Students: Guidelines for Developing Curriculum at the High School Level. The National Research Center on the Gifted & Talented,' RM02156. University of Connecticut, University of Virginia, Yale University. Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut.
- Angelone, E. (2010) 'The Benefits of Sight Translation in Early-Stage Translator Training: A Process-Oriented Approach to Modeling Expertise,' *Current Trends in Translation Teaching & Learning* 3:35-58.
- Angelone, E. (2012) 'The Place of Screen Recording in Process-Oriented Translator Training,' *RITT* 14:41–55.
- Angelone, E. (2013) 'Watching & Learning from 'Virtual Professionals': Utilizing Screen Recording in Process-Oriented Translator Training,' in Kiraly et al. (eds.) (2013), pp.139–155.
- Angelone, E. (2015) 'A Corpus-Based Comparison of Self-Reflection Modalities in Process-Oriented Translator Training,' in Cui & Zhao (eds.) (2015a), pp.346-361.
- Angelone, E. (2017) 'Perspectives of Students & Professionals on Translation Theory: During Training, After Training, Without Training,' in Zybatow et al. (eds.) (2017b), pp.67-75.
- Angelone, E. (2019) 'Process-Oriented Assessment of Problems & Errors in Translation: Expanding Horizons through Screen Recording,' in Huertas-Barros et al. (eds.) (2019a), pp.179-198.
- Angelone, E. & Marín García, Á. (2017) 'Expertise Acquisition through Deliberate Practice: Gauging Perceptions & Behaviors of Translators & Project Managers,' *Translation Spaces* 6(1):122–158. DOI: 10.1075/ts.6.1.07ang.

- Araghian, R., Ghonsooly, B. & Ghanizadeh, A. (2018) 'Investigating Problem-solving Strategies of Translation Trainees with High & Low Levels of Self-efficacy,' *Translation, Cognition & Behavior* 1(1):74–97. DOI: 10.1075/tcb.00004.ara.
- Aranda, M. (2016) 'The Influence of Machine Translation & CAT Tools on Creativity & Quality,' in Thelen et al. (eds.) (2016), pp.169–182.
- Arjona-Tseng, E. (1984) 'Issues in the Design of Curricula for the Professional Education of Translators & Interpreters,' in McIntire (ed.) (1984), pp.1–35.
- Arjona-Tseng, E. (1994) 'A Psychometric Approach to the Selection of Translation & Interpreting Students in Taiwan,' in Lambert & Moser-Mercer (eds.) (1994), pp.69–86.
- Arocha, I. S. & Joyce, L. (2013) 'Patient Safety, Professionalization, & Reimbursement as Primary Drivers for National Medical Interpreter Certification in the United States,' *Translation & Interpreting* 5(1):127–142. DOI: 10.105201.2013.a07.
- Arumí Ribas, M. (2010) 'Formative Assessment in the Interpreting Classroom: Using the Portfolio with Students,' *Current Trends in Translation Teaching & Learning* 3:97–131.
- Arumí Ribas, M. & Vargas-Urpi, M. (2017) 'Strategies in Public Service Interpreting: A Role play Study of Chinese-Spanish/Catalan Interactions,' *Interpreting* 19(1):118–141. DOI: 10.1075/intp.19.1.06aru.
- Aston, G. (2009) 'Foreword,' in Beeby et al. (eds.) (2009a), pp. ix-x.
- Aston, G. (2018) 'Acquiring the Language of Interpreters: A Corpus-Based Approach,' in Russo et al. (eds.) (2018), pp.83–96.
- Atkinson, J. W. (1957) 'Motivational Determinants of Risk-Taking Behavior,' *Psychological Review* 64:359–372.
- Atwood, A. A. (1987) 'Clinical Supervision as a Method of Providing Behavioral Feedback to Sign Language Interpreters & Students of Interpreting,' in McIntire (ed.) (1987), pp.87–93.
- Austermühl, F. (2006) 'Training Translators to Localize,' in Pym et al. (eds.) (2006), pp.69–81.
- Ayob, L. (2010) 'Issues in Interpreting Pedagogy,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 2:102–110.
- Bach, J. (2010) 'Praxis,' in Kridel (ed.) (2010), pp.680–681.
- Bachman, L. F. (1989) 'The Development & Use of Criterion – Referenced Tests of Language Proficiency in Language Program Evaluation,' in Johnson (ed.) (1989), pp.242–258.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990) *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Bachman, L. F. (2004) *Statistical Analyses for Language Assessment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Bachman, L. F. (2007) 'What Is the Construct? The Dialectic of Abilities & Contexts in Defining Constructs in Language Assessment,' in Fox et al. (eds.) (2007), pp.41-71.
- Bachman, L. F. & Clark, J.L.D. (1987) 'The Measurement of Foreign/Second Language Proficiency,' *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 490:20-33.
- Bachman, L & Palmer, A. (1996) *Language Testing in Practice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baer, B.J. & Bystrova-McIntyre, T. (2009) 'Assessing Cohesion: Developing Assessment Tools on the Basis of Comparable Corpora,' in Angelelli & Jacobson (eds.) (2009), pp.159-183.
- Bahadır, Ş. (2009) 'Body-and-Enactment-Centered Interpreting Pedagogy: Preliminary Thoughts on a Train-the-Trainers Concept for (Medical) Interpreting,' in Dörte & Pöllabauer (eds.) (2009), pp.29-43.
- Bahadır, Ş. (2011) Interpreting Enactments: A New Path for Interpreting Pedagogy,' in Kainz et al. (eds.) (2011), pp.177-210.
- Bahadır, Ş. (2017) 'The Interpreter as Observer, Participant & Agent of Change: The Irresistible Entanglement between Interpreting Ethics, Politics & Pedagogy,' in Biagini et al. (eds.) (2017), pp.122-145.
- Bailey, K. M. & Curtis, A. (2015) *Learning about Language Assessment*, 2nd edn, Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.
- Baixauli-Elmos, L. (2013) 'A Description of Interpreting in Prisons Mapping the Setting through an Ethical Lens,' in Schäffner et al. (eds.) (2013), pp.45-60.
- Baker, D. (1989) *Language Testing: A Critical Survey & Practical Guide*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Baker, M. (1993) 'Corpus Linguistics & Translation Studies: Implications & Applications,' in Baker et al. (eds.) (1993), pp.233-250.
- Baker, M. (2018) *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*, 3rd edn, London/New York: Routledge.
- Baker, M. & Maier, C. (2011) 'Ethics in Interpreter & Translator Training,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 5(1):1-14. DOI: 10.1080/13556509.2011.10798809.
- Baker, M. & Saldanha, G. (eds.) (2009) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 2nd edn, London/New York: Routledge.
- Bale, R. (2013) 'Undergraduate Consecutive Interpreting & Lexical Knowledge: The Role of Spoken Corpora,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 7(1):27-50.

- Bale, R. (2015) 'An Evaluation of Spoken Corpus-based Resources in Undergraduate Interpreter Training,' *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 25(1):23-45.
- Ball, C. (2007) *The History of American Sign Language Interpreting Education*, Doctoral Thesis, William Woods University.
- Ball, C. (2018) 'Historical Foundations of a Trust-based Profession,' in Roberson & Shaw (eds.) (2018), pp.23-36.
- Ballester, A. & Jiménez, C. (1992) 'Approaches to the Teaching of Interpreting: Mnemonic & Analytic Strategies,' in Dollerup & Loddegaard (eds.) (1992), pp.237-243.
- Balogh, D. & Lesznyák, M. (2018) 'Project Work in the Legal Translation Classroom-First Results of an Empirical Investigation,' in Horváth (ed.) (2018), pp.173-190.
- Balogh, k. & Salaets, H. (2018) 'Videoconferencing in Legal Context: A Comparative Study of Simulated & Real-Life Settings,' in Napier et al. (eds.) (2018b).
- Bancroft, M. A. (2017) 'The Voice of Compassion: Exploring Trauma-Informed Interpreting,' in Valero-Garcés & Tipton (eds.) (2017), pp. 195-219.
- Banta, T. W. & Palomba, C. A. (2015) *Assessment Essentials: Planning, Implementing, & Improving Assessment in Higher Education*, 2nd edn, California: Josey-Bass.
- Bao, C. (2015) 'Pedagogy,' in Mikkelsen & Jourdenais (eds.) (2015), pp.400-416.
- Barranco-Droege, R., Collados Aís, Á., Fernández Sánchez, M. M., García Becerra, ●., Iglesias Fernández, E., Pradas Macías, E. M. & Stévaux, E. (2013) 'Quality in Interpreting,' in Chappelle (ed.) (2013), pp.4823-4827.
- Barrows, H. S. (1996) 'Problem-Based Learning in Medicine & Beyond: A Brief Overview,' *New Directions for Teaching & Learning* 68:3-12. DOI:10.1002/tl.37219966804.
- Barrows, H. S. & Tamblyn, R. M. (1980) *Problem-Based Learning: An Approach to Medical Education*, New York: Springer.
- Bartłomiejczyk, M. (2010) 'Effects of Short Intensive Practice on Interpreter Trainees' Performance,' in Gile et al. (eds.) (2010), pp.183-194.
- Bartłomiejczyk, M. (2015) 'Directionality,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.108-110.
- Bartolina, F. (2005) 'Theory & Translator Training,' in Tement (ed.) (2005a), pp.177-189.

- Bastin, G.L. (2000) 'Evaluating Beginners' Re-expression & Creativity: A Positive Approach,' *The Translator* 6(2):231-245.
- Bates, J. E., Almekdash, H. & Gilchrest-Dunnam, M. J. (2017) 'The Flipped Classroom: A Brief, Brief History,' in Santos Green et al. (eds.) (2017), pp.3-10.
- Baxter, R. N. (2013) 'A Simplified Multi-Model Approach to Preparatory Training in Simultaneous Interpreting,' *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 22(3):1-24. DOI:10.1080/0907676X.2012.758751.
- Baxter, R.N. (2014) 'Undergraduate Interpreter Training in the Spanish State: An Analytical Comparison,' *Sendebarr: Revista de la Facultad de Traducción e Interpretación* 25:219-246.
- Beard, C. & Wilson, J. P. (2006) *Experiential Learning: A Best Practice Handbook for Educators & Trainers*, 2nd edn, London/Philadelphia: Kogan Page.
- Beeby, A. (2004) 'Language Learning for Translators: designing a syllabus,' in Malmkjær (ed.) (2004), pp.39-65.
- Beeby, A., Rodríguez-Inés, P. & Sánchez-Gijón, P. (eds.) (2009a) *Corpus Use & Translating Corpus Use for Learning to Translate & Learning Corpus Use to Translate*, Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Beeby, A., Rodríguez-Inés, P. & Sánchez-Gijón, P. (2009b) 'Introduction,' in Beeby et al. (eds.) (2009a), pp.1-8.
- Beetham, H. & Sharpe, R. (2007) 'An Introduction to Rethinking Pedagogy for a Digital Age,' in Beetham & Sharpe (eds.) (2007), pp.1-10.
- Behr, M. (2015) 'How to Back the Students- Quality, Assessment & Feedback,' in Andres & Behr (eds.) (2015), pp.201-217.
- Bell, B. S. & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (2002) 'Goal Orientation & Ability: Interactive Effects on Self-Efficacy, Performance & Knowledge,' *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87:497-505.
- Bendazzoli, C. (2015) 'Corpus-Based Research,' in Pöhhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.87-91.
- Bendazzoli, C. (2018) 'Corpus-Based Interpreting Studies: Past, Present & Future Developments of A (Wired) Cottage Industry,' in Russo et al. (eds.) (2018), pp.1-19.
- Bendazzoli, C., & Sandrelli, A. (2009) 'Corpus-based Interpreting Studies: Early work & Future Prospects,' *Revista Tradumática* 7. http://www.fi.uab.cat/tradumatica/revista/num7/articles/08/08_art.htm.
- Bentley-Sassaman, J. (2009) 'The Experiential Learning Theory & Interpreter Education,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 1:62-67.
- Bentley-Sassaman, J. (2010) *Experiences & Training Needs of Deaf & Hearing Interpreter Teams*, Doctoral Thesis, Walden University.

- Berber Irabien, D. (2010a) *Information & Communication Technologies in Conference Interpreting*, Doctoral Thesis, Tarragona: Universitat Rovira I Virgili.
<http://www.tdx.cat/bitstream/handle/10803/8775/tesi.pdf>.
- Berber Irabien, D. (2010b) 'The Use of Pedagogical and Non-pedagogical ICT in Conference Interpreter Training,' in Pellatt et al. (eds.) (2010), pp.229-249.
- Bergen, D. (2009) 'The Role of Metacognition & Cognitive Conflict in the Development of Translation Competence,' *Across Languages & Cultures* 10(2):231–250. DOI: 10.1556/Acr.10.2009.2.4.
- Bergmann, J. & Sams, A. (2012) *Flip your Classroom: Reach Every Student in Every Class Every Day*, Oregon & Washington, D.C.: International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE).
- Berk-Seligson, S. (2004) 'The Miranda Warnings & Linguistic Coercion: The Role of Footing in the Interrogation of a Limited English-Speaking Murder Suspect,' in Cotterill (ed.) (2004), pp.127-43.
- Bernardini, S. (2000) *Competence, Capacity, Corpora – A Study in Corpus-Aided Language Learning*, Bologna: Clueb.
- Bernardini, S. (2004a) 'Corpus-aided Language Pedagogy for Translator Education,' in Malmkjær (ed.) (2004), pp.97-111.
- Bernardini, S. (2004b) 'The Theory behind the Practice: Translator Training or Translator Education?' in Malmkjær (ed.) (2004), pp.17-29.
- Bernardini, S. (2010) 'The Theory behind the Practice: Translator Training or Translator Education?' in Malmkjær (ed.) (2010), pp.17-30.
- Bernardini, S. (2016) 'Intermodal Corpora: A Novel Resource for Descriptive & Applied Translation Studies,' in Corpas Pastor & Seghiri (eds.) (2016), pp.129-148.
- Bernardini, S., Ferraresi, A., Russo, M., Collard, C. & Defrancq, B. (2018) 'Building Interpreting and Intermodal Corpora: A How-to for a Formidable Task,' in Russo et al. (eds.) (2018), pp.21-42.
- Bernardi, S. & Russo, M. (2018) 'Corpus Linguistics, Translation & Interpreting,' in Malmkjær (ed.) (2018), pp.342-356.
- Bertozzi, M. (2018) 'ANGLINTRAD: Towards a Purpose Specific Interpreting Corpus,' *inTRALinea* special issue.
<http://www.intralinea.org/archive/article/2317> (Accessed July 11, 2018).
- Best, B. A. (2016) 'E-Professionalism & Signed Language Interpreters: Considering Social Media, Online Disclosure, & Small World Ethics,' *Journal of Interpretation* 25 (1).
<http://digitalcommons.unf.edu/joi/vol25/iss1/2> (Accessed June 30, 2018).

- Bestué, C. & Orozco-Jutorán, M. (2016) 'Online Training in Legal Translation: Designing Curricula for Bilingual Students,' *Babel* 62(3): 470-494. DOI: 10.1075/babel.62.3.06bes.
- Biagini, M., Boyd, M. S. & Monacelli, C. (eds.) (2017) *The Changing Role of the Interpreter: Contextualizing Norms, Ethics & Quality Standards*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Biel, L. (2011) 'Professional Realism in the Legal Translation Classroom: Translation Competence & Translator Competence,' *Meta* 56(1):162-178.
- Bilgen, B. (2009) *Investigating Terminology Management for Conference Interpreters*, Doctoral Thesis, University of Ottawa.
- Black, P. & Wiliam, D. (1998) *Inside the Black Box*, London: NFER Nelson.
- Blasco Mayor, M. J. & Jiménez Ivars, A. (2007) 'E-Learning for Interpreting,' *Babel* 53(4):292-302.
- Blewett, J. (1987) 'Interpreting & Translating in Australia: A Celebration of Ten Years,' *Paper Presented to the 8th World Congress of Applied Linguistics*, University of Sydney, Australia, August 1987.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1986) 'Shifts of Cohesion & Coherence in Translation,' in House & Blum-Kulka (eds.) (1986), pp.17-35.
- Bobbitt, J. F. (1918) *The Curriculum*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bolton, G. & Heathcote, D. (1999) *So You Want to Use Role Play? A New Approach in How to Plan*, London: Trentham.
- Bontempo, K. M. (2012) *Interpreting by Design: A study of Aptitude, Ability & Achievement in Australian Sign Language Interpreters*, Doctoral Thesis, Macquarie University.
- Bontempo, K. M. & Malcolm, K. (2012) 'An Ounce of Prevention Is worth a Pound of Cure: Educating Interpreters about the Risk of Vicarious Trauma in Healthcare Settings,' in Swabey & Malcolm (eds.) (2012), pp.105-130.
- Bontempo, K. M. & Napier, J. (2011) 'Evaluating Emotional Stability as a Predictor of Interpreter Competence & Aptitude for Interpreting,' *Interpreting* 13(1):85-105.
- Bontempo, K., Napier, J. Hayes, L. & Brashear, V. (2014) 'Does Personality Matter? An International Study of Sign Language Interpreter Disposition,' *Translation & Interpreting* 6(1):23-46.
- Boud, D. (ed.) (1985) *Problem-Based Learning in Education for the Professions*, Sydney: Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia.

- Bowen-Bailey, D. (2012) 'Just What the Doctor Ordered? Online Possibilities for Healthcare Interpreting Education,' in Swabey & Malcolm (eds.) (2012a), pp.131-146.
- Bowker, L. (1998) 'Using Specialized Monolingual Native-language Corpora as a Translation Resource: A Pilot Study,' *Meta* 43(4):631-651.
- Bowker, L. (2000) 'A Corpus-Based Approach to Evaluating Student Translations,' *The Translator* 6(2):183-210. DOI: 10.1080/13556509.2000.10799065.
- Bowker, L. (2001) 'Towards a Methodology for a Corpus-Based Approach to Translation Evaluation,' *Meta* 46(2):345-364. DOI: 10.7202/002135ar.
- Bowker, L. (2002) *Computer-Aided Translation Technology: A Practical Introduction*, Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Bowker, L. (2015) 'Computer-assisted Translation: Translator Training,' in Chan (ed.) (2015), pp.88-104.
- Bowker, L. & Corpus Pastor, G. (2015) 'Translation Technology,' in Mitkov (ed.) (2015).
- Bowker, L. & Fisher, D. (2010) 'Computer-aided Translation,' in Gambier & Van Doorslaer (eds.) (2010), pp.60-65.
- Bowker, L. & Fisher, D. (2013) 'Technology & Translation,' in Chapelle (ed.) (2013), pp.5778-5782.
- Bowker, L. & Marshman, E. (2009) 'Better Integration for Better Preparation: Bringing Terminology & Technology More Fully into Translator Training Using the CERTT Approach,' *Terminology* 15(1):60-87. DOI:10.1075/term.15.1.04bow.
- Bowker, L. & Marshman, E. (2010) 'Toward a Model of Active & Situated Learning in the Teaching of Computer-Aided Translation: Introducing the CERTT Project,' *Journal of Translation Studies* 13(1-2):199-226.
- Bowker, L., McBride, C. & Marshman, E. (2008) 'Getting More than You Paid for? Considerations in Integrating Free and Low-cost Technologies into Translator Training Programs,' *redit* 1:26-47.
- Bown, S. (2013) 'Autopoiesis: Scaffolding the Reflective Practitioner toward Employability,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 5(1):51-63.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1982) *The Competent Manager: A Model for Effective Performance*, New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Boyatzis, R.E. (1984) *Identification of Skill Requirements for Effective Job Performance*, Boston: McBer.
- Boyd, R.D. (1991) *Personal Transformation in Small Groups: A Jungian Perspective*, London/New York: Routledge.

- Boyd, R.D. & Myers, G.J. (1988) 'Transformative Education,' *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 7(4): 261-284.
- Boyle, J. & Fisher, S. (2007) *Educational Testing: A Competence-Based Approach. Text for the British Psychological Society's Certificate of Competence in Educational Testing (Level A)*, Oxford: BPS Blackwell.
- Brander de la Iglesia, M. (2017) 'A Sea of Troubles': Ethical Dilemmas from War Zones to the Classroom,' in Valero-Garcés & Tipton (eds.) (2017), pp.84-101.
- Bransford, J., Barron, B., Pea, R.D., Meltzoff, A., Kuhl, P. et al. (2006) 'Foundations & Opportunities for an Interdisciplinary Science of Learning,' in Sawyer (ed.) (2006), pp.39-77.
- Braun S. (2006) 'Multimedia Communication Technologies & their Impact on Interpreting,' in Carroll et al. (eds.) (2006), Proceedings of the Marie Curie Euroconferences MuTra: Audiovisual Translation Scenarios Copenhagen, http://www.euroconferences.info/proceedings/2006_Proceedings/2006_proceedings.html.
- Braun S. (2012) 'Recommendations for the Use of Video-mediated Interpreting in Criminal Proceedings,' in Braun & Taylor (eds.) (2012), pp.301-328.
- Braun, S. (2013) 'Keep your Distance? Remote Interpreting in Legal Proceedings: A Critical Assessment of a Growing Practice,' *Interpreting* 15 (2):200-228.
- Braun, S. (2015a) 'Remote Interpreting,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.346-348.
- Braun, S. (2015b) 'Remote Interpreting,' in Mikkelsen & Jourdenais (eds.) (2015), pp.352-367.
- Braun, S. (2016) 'What a Micro-analytical Investigation of Additions and Expansions in Remote Interpreting can Tell us About Interpreter's Participation in a Shared Virtual Space,' *Journal of Pragmatics* special issue. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2016.09.011.
- Braun, S. (2018) 'Videoconference Interpreting,' in *SHIFT Report 2, 2018:35-40*.
- Braun, S. & Balogh, K. (2016) 'Bilingual Videoconferencing in Legal Proceedings: Findings from the AVDIDICUS Projects,' in Proceedings of the conference 'Elektroniczny protokół-szansą na transparentny i szybki proces' (Electronic Protocol – A Chance for Transparent & Fast Trial), Polish Ministry of Justice, Warsaw, May 2015, pp.21-34.
- Braun, S. & Davitti, E. (2018) 'Social, Pragmatic & Ethical Implications of Distance Interpreting,' in Amato et al. (eds.) (2018), pp.39-46.

- Braun, S., Davitti, E., Dicerto, S. (2018) 'Video-Mediated Interpreting in Legal Settings: Assessing the Implementation,' in Napier et al. (eds.) (2018b).
- Braun, S., Davitti, E., Dicerto, S., Slater, C., Tymczyńska, M., Kajzer-Wietrzny, M., Floros, G., Kritsis, K., Hoffstaedter, P., Kohn, K., Roberts, J.C., Ritsos, P.D. & Gittins, R. (2014a) 'EVIVA Project (Evaluating the Education of Interpreters and their Clients through Virtual Learning Activities,' *Education Studies*:1-142.
- Braun, S., Sandrelli, A. & Townsley, B. (2014b) 'Technological Support for Testing,' in Giambruno (ed.) (2014a), pp.109-139.
- Braun, S. & Slater, C. (2014) 'Populating a 3D Virtual Learning Environment for Interpreting Students with Bilingual Dialogues to Support Situated Learning in an Institutional Context,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 8(3):469-485.
- Braun, S., Slater, C., Gittins, R., Ritsos, P.D. & Roberts, J.C. (2013) 'Interpreting in Virtual Reality: Designing & Developing a 3D Virtual World to Prepare Interpreters & their Clients for Professional Practice,' in Kiraly et al. (eds.) (2013), pp.93-120.
- Braun, S. & Taylor, J. L. (eds.) (2012) *Videoconference & Remote Interpreting in Criminal Proceedings*, Cambridge/Antwerp: Intersentia.
- Braun, S. & Taylor, J. L. (eds.) (2015) *Advances in Videoconferencing & Interpreting in Legal Proceedings*, Cambridge/Antwerp: Intersentia.
- Breault, D. A. & Marshall, J. D. (2010) 'Definitions of Curriculum,' in Kridel (ed.) (2010), pp.179-181.
- Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1995) 'A Service-Learning Curriculum for Faculty,' *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 2:112-122.
- Brockbank, E. (2000) 'Internships: Bridging the Gap from the Classroom to the Real World,' *The ATA Chronicle* 29(11):48-50.
- Brookfield, S. (1997) 'through the Lens of Learning: How the Visceral Experience of Learning Reframes Teaching,' in Boud et al. (eds.) (1997), pp.21-32.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2013) *How to Create & Use Rubrics for Formative Assessment & Grading*, Alexandria/Virginia: ASCD.
- Brown, A. L., & Campione, J. C. (1994) 'Guided Discovery in a Community of Learners,' in McGilly (ed.) (1994), pp.229-270.
- Brown, G. T. L. & Harris, L. R. (2013) 'Student Self-Assessment,' in McMillan (ed.) (2013), pp.367-393.
- Brown, J. D. (2013) 'Cut Scores on Language Tests,' in Chapelle (ed.) (2013), pp.1634-1639.
- Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989) 'Situated Cognition & the Culture of Learning,' *Educational Researcher* 18(1): 32-42.

- Brunette, L. (2000) 'Towards a Terminology for Translation Quality Assessment,' *The Translator* 6(2):169-182. DOI: 10.1080/13556509.2000.10799064.
- Brunson, J. L. (2018a) 'Consumers, Colleagues, & Certification: Exploring the Politics of Interpreting,' in Stone & Leeson (eds.) (2018).
- Brunson, J. L. (2018b) 'The Irrational Component in the Rational System: Interpreters Talk about their Motivation to Work in Video Relay Services,' in Napier et al. (eds.) (2018b).
- Buck, V. (2000) 'An Interview with Panayotis Mouzourakis,' aiic.net. March 23, 2000 (Accessed August 9, 2018) <<https://aiic.net/p/121>>.
- Budin, G., Krajcso, Z. & Lommel, A. (2013) 'The TransCert Project: Ensuring That Transnational Translator Certification Meets Stakeholder Needs,' *Translation & Interpreting* 5(1):143-155. DOI: ti.105201.2013.a08.
- Buendía-Castro, M. & López-Rodríguez, C. I. (2013) 'The Web for Corpus & the Web as Corpus in Translator Training,' *New Voices in Translation Studies* 10:54-71.
- Bühler, H. (1986) 'Linguistic (Semantic) & Extra-linguistic (Pragmatic) Criteria for the Evaluation of Conference Interpretation Interpreters,' *Multilingua* 5(4):231-235.
- Bum, J. A. & Crezee, I. (2017) "'That Is Not the Question I Put to You, Officer": An Analysis of Student Legal Interpreting Errors,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 9(1):40-56.
- Cabrera, T. (2017) 'Applications of Simultaneous-Interpreting Corpora in Terminology Research,' *New Voices in Translation Studies* 17:31-51.
- Cagle, K. M., Lott, S. J. & Wilcox, P. P. (2018) 'ASL Head Movements: Critical Features in Interpretation,' in Holcomb & Smith (eds.) (2018), pp.77-92.
- Calvo, E. (2009) *Análisis Curricular de los Estudios de Traducción e Interpretación en España. Perspectiva del estudiantado*, Doctoral Thesis, Universidad de Granada, Granada.
- Calvo, E. (2011) 'Translation and/or Translator Skills as Organising Principles for Curriculum Development Practice,' *JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialised Translation* 16:5-25.
- Calvo, E. (2015) 'Scaffolding Translation Skills through Situated Training Approaches: Progressive & Reflective Methods,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 9(3):1-17. DOI: 10.1080/1750399X.2015.1103107.
- Calvo, E. (2018) 'From Translation Briefs to Quality Standards: Functionalist Theories in Today's Translation Processes,' *Translation & Interpreting* 10(1):18-32. DOI:10.12807/ti.110201.2018.a02.

- Calzada Pérez, M. (2005) 'Applying Translation Theory in Teaching,' *New Voices in Translation Studies* 1:1-11.
- Campbell, S. (1991) 'Towards a Model of Translation Competence,' *Meta* 36(3):329-343.
- Campbell, S. & Hale, S. (2003) 'Translation and Interpreting Assessment in the Context of Educational Measurement,' in Anderman & Rogers (eds.) (2003), pp.205-224.
- Canfora, C. (2016) 'Assessing Learning in Heterogeneous Learning Groups in Translator Training—A Role for Portfolios,' in Kiraly et al. (ed.) (2016), pp.161-176.
- Carmon, R. & Newble, D. (2000) *A Handbook for Teachers in Universities and Colleges*, 4th edn, London: Kogan Page.
- Cao, D. (1996) 'Towards a Model of Translation Proficiency,' *Target* 8(2): 325-340.
- Carbonell Cortés, ●. (1998) 'Orientalism in Translation: Familiarizing & Defamiliarizing Strategies,' in Beylard-●zeroff et al. (eds.) (1998), pp.63-70.
- Carl, M. & Braun, S. (2018) 'Translation, Interpreting & New Technologies,' in Malmkjær (ed.) (2018), pp.374-390.
- Carr, S. E. & Steyn, D. (2000) 'Distance Education Training for Interpreters: An Insurmountable ●xymoron?' in Roberts et al. (eds.) (2000), pp.83-88.
- Carsten, S. (2013) 'A Different Shade of Shadowing: Source Text to Source Text as Efficient Simultaneous Processing Exercise,' *Vertimo Studijos* 6:9-33.
- Castagnoli, S. & Niemants, N. (2018) 'Corpora worth Creating: A Pilot Study on Telephone Interpreting,' *inTRALinea* special issue. <http://www.intralinea.org/archive/article/2315> (Accessed July 11, 2018).
- Castilho, S., Doherty, S., Gaspari, F. & Moorkens, J. (2018) 'Approaches to Human & Machine Translation Quality Assessment,' in Moorkens et al. (eds.) (2018a), pp.9-38.
- Čeňková, I. (2010) 'Sight Translation: Prima Vista,' in Gambier & Van Doorslaer (eds.) (2010), pp. 320-323.
- Čeňková, I. (2015) 'Sight Interpreting/Translation,' in Pöchhacker (eds.) (2015d), pp. 374-375.
- Cerezo Merchán, B. (2019) 'Audiovisual Translator Training,' in Pérez-González (ed.) (2019), pp.468-482.
- Chabasse, C. (2009) *Gib es eine Begabung für das Simultandolmetschen? Erstellung eines Dolmetscheignungstests*, Berlin: Saxa Verlag.
- Chabasse, C. (2015a) 'Aptitude,' in Andres & Behr (eds.) (2015), pp.43-57.

- Chabasse, C. (2015b) 'Cloze,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.55.
- Chabasse, C. & Kader, S. (2014) 'Putting Interpreting Admissions Exams to the Test: the MA KD Gernersheim Project,' *Interpreting* 16(1):19–33.
- Chan, A. L. J. (2013a) 'Signal Jamming in the Translation Market & the Complementary Roles of Certification & Diplomas in Developing Multilateral Signaling Mechanisms,' *Translation & Interpreting* 5(1):211-221. DOI: ti.105201.2013.a11.
- Chan, C. H.Y. (2013b) 'From Self-interpreting to Real Interpreting: A New Web-Based Exercise to Launch Effective Interpreting Training,' *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 21(3):358-377.
- Chan, C. H. Y. (2014) 'Building an Online Library for Interpretation Training: Explorations into an Effective Blended-Learning Mode,' *Computer Assisted Language Learning* 27(5):454-479.
- Chan, S-w. (2004) *A Dictionary of Translation Technology*, Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.
- Chan, S-w. (ed.) (2015) *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Technology*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Chan, S-w. (2017) *The Future of Translation Technology: Towards a World Without Babel*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Chapelle, C. A. (2012) 'Conceptions of Validity,' in Fulcher & Davidson (eds.) (2012), pp.21-33.
- Chen, J. (2009) 'Authenticity in Accreditation Tests for Interpreters in China,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 3(2):257-273.
- Chen, S-J. (2001) 'Interpreter Training Using Cooperative Learning Approaches & Improvised Simultaneous Interpreting Equipment,' *The ATA Chronicle* 30(10):30-33.
- Chen, Y. (2007) 'Trainee Translators' Awareness-raising: A Process-oriented Study on Diary, Think-Aloud & Small Group discussion,' in *The proceedings of the 2007 International Conference on TESOL & Translation*, Taiwan: Chang Jung Christian University.
- Chen, Y. (2010) 'Trainee Translators' Reflective Learning in Small Group Discussion,' in Pellatt et al. (eds.) (2010), pp.81-95.
- Chen, Y. (2019) 'Assessing Translation Students' Reflective & Autonomous Learning,' in Huertas-Barros et al. (eds.) (2019a), pp.288-314.
- Cheng, L., Watanabe, Y. & Curtis, A. (eds.) (2004) *Washback in Language Testing: Research Contexts & Methods*, Mahwah/New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cheng, S. (2019) 'Exploring Process-oriented Translation Competence Assessment: Rationale, Necessity, & Potential From a Problem-Solving Perspective,' in Huertas-Barros et al. (eds.) (2019a), pp.199-225.

- Chemov, G. V. (2004) *Inference & Anticipation in Simultaneous Interpreting: A Probability-Prediction Model*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Cherry, C. (1953) 'Some Experiments on the Recognition of Speech with One and Two Ears,' *Journal of the Acoustic Society of America* 25(5): 975–979.
- Chesterman, A. (1993/2017) 'From 'Is' to 'Ought': Laws, Norms & Strategies in Translation Studies,' in Chesterman (2017), pp.167-183.
- Chesterman, A. (1996) 'Teaching Translation Theory: The Significance of Memes,' in Dollerup & Appel (eds.) (1996), pp.63-71.
- Chesterman, A. (2000) 'Teaching Strategies for Emancipatory Translation,' in Schäffner & Adab (eds.) (2000), pp.77-89.
- Chesterman, A. (2005/2017) 'Towards Consilience?' in Chesterman (2017), pp.35-41.
- Chesterman, A. (2016) *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*, Rev. edn, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Chesterman, A. & Arrojo, R. (2000/2017) 'Shared Ground in Translation Studies,' in Chesterman (2017), pp.17-24.
- Chesterman, A. & Wagner, E. (2002) *Can Theory Help Translators? A Dialogue between the Ivory Tower & the Wordface*, Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
- Cheung, A. K. (2007) 'The Effectiveness of Summary Training in Consecutive Interpreting Delivery,' *FORUM* 5(2):1–22.
- Chiaro, D. & Nocella, G. (2004) 'Interpreters' Perception of Linguistic & Non-linguistic Factors Affecting Quality: A Survey through the World Wide Web,' *Meta* 49(2):278–293.
- Chládková, S. (2017) *Tlumočnické Samostudium* (Interpreter's Self-Training) (in Czech), Master's thesis, Charles University.
- Chmiel, A. (2010) 'How Effective is Teaching Note-Taking to Trainee Interpreters?' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 4(2):233-250. DOI:10.1080/13556509.2010.10798805.
- Chmiel, A. (2015) 'Contextualizing Interpreter Training through Simulated Conferences,' in Pietrzak & Deckert (eds.) (2015), pp.159-176.
- Chmiel, A., Tymczyńska, M., Braun, S. & Slater, C. (2012) 'Kształcenie Kooperatywne i Sytuacyjne Metodą Projektów: Zastosowanie Wirtualnego Środowiska IVY w Szkoleniu Tłumaczy Ustnych,' in Janikowski & Przemysław (eds.) (2012), pp.213–240.
- Cho, J. & Roger, P. (2010) 'Improving Interpreting Performance through Theatrical Training,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 4(2):151-171. DOI:10.1080/13556509.2010.10798802.

- Choi, J. Y. (2006) 'Metacognitive Evaluation Method in Consecutive Interpretation for Novice Learners,' *Meta* 51(2):273–83.
- Chomsky, N. (1965) *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Christ, T. J. & Skaar, N. (2008) 'Aptitude tests,' in Salkind (ed.) (2008), pp.50-55.
- Christensen, B. (2011) 'Interpretation & Certification,' aiic.net. March 15, 2011 (Accessed August 9, 2018) <<https://aiic.net/p/3588>>.
- Cintra, H. P. (2010) 'Magnifying Glasses Modifying Maps: A Role for Translation Theory in Introductory Courses,' in Gile et al. (eds.) (2010), pp.167-181.
- Cirillo, L. & Niemants, N. (eds.) (2017) *Teaching Dialogue Interpreting: Research-Based Proposals for Higher Education*, Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Cirillo, L. & Radicioni, M. (2017) '(Role-) Playing Fair(s): Introducing Interpreting Students to Business Negotiations,' in Cirillo & Niemants (eds.) (2017), pp.119-135.
- Cizek, G. J. (2010) 'An Introduction to Formative Assessment: History, Characteristics, & Challenges,' in Andrade & Cizek (eds.) (2010), pp. 3-17.
- Clark, B., Drugan, J., Hartley, T. & Wu, D. (2006) 'Training for Localization: (Replies to a Questionnaire),' in Pym et al. (eds.) (2006), pp.45-47.
- Clark, M. (2013) 'Assessment across Languages,' in Chapelle (ed.) (2013), pp.147–155.
- Clark, R.C. (2008) *Building Expertise: Cognitive Methods for Training & Performance Improvement*, 3rd edn, San Francisco: Pfeiffer.
- Clarke, S., Timperley, H. S., & Hattie, J. A. (2003) *Unlocking Formative Assessment: Practical Strategies for Enhancing Students' Learning in the Primary & Intermediate Classroom*, Auckland, New Zealand: Hodder Moa Beckett Publishers Limited.
- Class, B. (2009) *A Blended Socio-constructivist Course with an Activity-based, Collaborative Learning Environment Intended for Trainers of Conference Interpreters*, Thèse de doctorat: University of Genève.
- Class, B. & Moser-Mercer, B. (2013) 'Training Conference Interpreter Trainers with Technology- A Virtual Reality,' in García Becerra et al. (eds.) (2013), pp.293-313.
- Class, B., Moser-Mercer, B. & Seeber, K. (2004) 'Blended Learning for Training Interpreter Trainers,' in Remenyi, D. (2004), pp.507-515.

- Class, B. & Schneider, D. (2014) 'Design Issues for Technology-Enhanced Professional Development,' *Journal of Interactive Learning Research* 25(2): 161-186.
- Clifford, A. (2001) 'Discourse Theory & Performance-Based Assessment: Two Tools for Professional Interpreting,' *Meta* 46(2):365-378.
- Clifford, A. (2004) *A Preliminary Investigation into Discursive Models of Interpreting as a Means of Enhancing Construct Validity in Interpreter Certification*, Doctoral Thesis, University of Ottawa.
- Clifford, A. (2005) 'Putting the Exam to the Test: Psychometric Validation & Interpreter Certification,' *Interpreting* 7(1):97-131.
- Colina, S. (2008) 'Translation Quality Evaluation: Empirical Evidence for a Functionalist Approach,' *The Translator* 14(1):97-134.
- Colina, S. (2009) 'Further Evidence for a Functionalist Approach to Translation Quality Evaluation,' *Target* 21(2):215-44.
- Colina, S. (2011) 'Evaluation/Assessment,' in Gambier & Van Doorslaer (eds.) (2011), pp.43-48.
- Colina, S. (2013) 'Assessment of Translation,' in Chapelle (ed.) (2013), pp.245-251.
- Coll, C. & Martín, E. (2014) 'Curriculum Reform & the Field of Curriculum in Spain,' in Pinar (ed.) (2014), pp.445-461.
- Collados Aís, A. (1998a/2002) 'Quality Assessment in Simultaneous Interpreting: The Importance of Nonverbal Communication,' in Pöchhacker & Shlesinger (eds.) (2002), pp.327-336.
- Collados Aís, A. (1998b) *La Evaluación de la Calidad en Interpretación Simultánea: La Importancia de la Comunicación No Verbal*, Peligros (Granada): Editorial Comares.
- Collados Aís, Á., Fernández Sánchez, M. M., Iglesias Fernández, E., Pérez-Luzardo, J., Pradas Macías, E. M., Stévaux, E., Blasco Mayor, M. J. & Jiménez Ivars, A. (2004) 'Presentación de Proyecto de Investigación sobre Evaluación de la Calidad en Interpretación Simultánea (Bff2002-00579),' in Actas del IX Seminario Hispano-Ruso de Traducción e Interpretación, pp.3-15.
- Collados Aís, Á. & García Becerra, ●. (2015a) 'Quality Criteria,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.337-338.
- Collados Aís, Á. & García Becerra, ●. (2015b) 'Quality,' in Mikkelsen & Jourdenais (eds.) (2015), pp.368-383.
- Collins, A., Brown, J. S. & Newman, S. (1989) 'Cognitive Apprenticeship: Teaching the Craft of Reading, Writing, & Mathematics,' in Resnick (ed.) (1989), pp.453-494.

- Collis, B., Winnips, K. & Moonen, J. (2000) 'Structured Support versus Learner Choice via the World Wide Web (WWW): Where is the Payoff?' *Journal of Interactive Learning Research* 11(2):163–196.
- Conde, J. & Chouc, F. (2018) 'Developing a Comprehensive Strategy to Foster Professional Skills in Conference Interpreting Trainees,' Presentation in *1st Annual APTIS Conference: Challenges & Opportunities in Teaching Translation & Interpreting*, November 23–24, 2018, Aston University, Birmingham.
- Connell, T. (2006) 'The Application of New Technologies to Remote Interpreting,' *Linguistica Antverpiensia* 5:311–324.
- Conway, D. & Ryan, H. (2018) 'Feeling "Fully Human": Working to Reduce Health Inequalities in Primary Care through Video Interpreting,' in Napier et al. (eds.) (2018b).
- Cook, G. (2011) 'Discourse Analysis,' in Simpson (ed.) (2011), pp.431–444.
- Corder, S.P. (1967) 'The Significance of Learner's Errors,' *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 5: 162–70.
- Corder, S. P. (1971) 'Idiosyncratic Dialects & Error Analysis,' *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 9:147–159.
- Cordero, A. (1994) 'The Role of the University in the Professionalization of the Translator,' in Hammond (ed.) (1994), pp.171–179.
- Cordova, D. I., & Lepper, M. R. (1996) 'Intrinsic Motivation & the Process of Learning: Beneficial Effects of Contextualization, Personalization, & Choice,' *Journal of Educational Psychology* 88:715–730.
DOI:10.1037/0022-0663.88.4.715.
- Corpas Pastor, G. (2008) *Investigar con Corpus en Traducción: Los Retos de un Nuevo Paradigma*, Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.
- Corpas Pastor, G. & Durán-Muñoz, I. (eds.) (2018) *Trends in E-Tools & Resources for Translators & Interpreters*, Leiden: Brill.
- Corpas Pastor, G. & Seghiri, M. (2009) 'Virtual Corpora as Documentation Resources: Translating Travel Insurance Documents (English-Spanish),' in Beeby et al. (eds.) (2009a), pp.75–107.
- Corsellis, A. (2005) 'Training Interpreters to Work in the Public Services,' in Tement (ed.) (2005a), pp.153–173.
- Corsellis, A. (2008) *Public Service Interpreting. The First Steps*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Costa, H., Corpas Pastor, G. & Durán-Muñoz, I. (2014) 'Technology-assisted Interpreting,' *MultiLingual* 143, 25(3):27–32. April/May.
- Costa, H., Corpas Pastor, G. & Durán-Muñoz, I. (2018) 'Assessing Terminology Management Systems for Interpreters,' in Corpas Pastor & Durán-Muñoz (eds.) (2018), pp.57–84.

- Couture, S. (2018) 'Modality Matters: Including Remote Interpreting in Interpreter Training Programs,' *The ATA Chronicle* 47(5):24-26.
- Cox, T.R. (2013) *Exploring Learner-Centeredness within an Americal Sign Language/English Interpreter Training Program*, Doctoral Thesis, Texas State University.
- Crabbe, D. (1993) 'Fostering Autonomy from within the Classroom: The Teacher's Responsibility,' *System* 21(4):443-452.
- Cranton, P. (2001) *Becoming an Authentic Teacher in Higher Education*, Malabar, FL: Krieger.
- Cranton, P. & Carusetta, E. (2004) 'Perspectives on Authenticity in Teaching,' *Adult Education Quarterly* 55(1):5-22.
- Crawford, S. R. & Senecal, J. (2017) 'Tools of the Trade: What Do You Need to Flip?' in Santos Green et al. (eds.) (2017), pp.37-50.
- Crawley, V. (2016) *Achieving Understanding via Interpreter Participation in Sign Language/English Map Task Dialogues: An Analysis of Repair Sequences Involving Ambiguity & Underspecificity in Signed & Spoken Modes*, Doctoral Thesis, University of Leeds.
- Crawley, V. (2018) 'Interpreting between Modes: Navigating between Signed & Spoken Language,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 10(1):5-17.
- Cresswell, A. (2018) 'Looking up Phrasal Verbs in Small Corpora of Interpreting: An Attempt to Draw out Aspects of Interpreted Language,' *inTRALinea* special issue.
<http://www.intralinea.org/archive/article/2319> (Accessed July 11, 2018).
- Crezee, I. (2015) 'Semi-authentic Practices for Student Health Interpreters,' *Translation & Interpreting* 7(3):50-62. DOI: 10.12807/ti.107203.2015.a04.
- Crezee, I. (2016) 'The Benefits of Reflective Blogs in Language-Neutral Translator Education,' *FITISPos International Journal* 3:28-41.
- Crezee, I., Atkinson, D., Pask, R., Au, P. & Wong, S. (2015a) 'Teaching Interpreters about Self-Care,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 7(1):74-83.
- Crezee, I. & Burn, J. (2019) 'Action Research & its Impact on the Translation & Interpreting Classroom,' in Tipton & Desilla (eds.) (2019).
- Crezee, I., Burn, J. A. & Gailani, N. (2015b) 'Authentic Audiovisual Resources to Actualize Legal Interpreting Education,' *MonTI* 7:271-293. DOI: 10.6035/MonTI.2015.7.10.
- Crocker, L. & Algina, J. (1986) *Introduction to Classical and Modern Test Theory*, Orlando, FL: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

- Cronbach, L. J. & Meehl, P. E. (1955) 'Construct Validity in Psychological Tests,' *Psychological Bulletin* 52 (4):281-302.
- Crosby, J. (1996) 'Learning in Small Groups,' *Medical Teacher* 18(3):189-202. DOI: 10.3109/01421599609034160.
- Crump, C. (2012) 'Mental Health Interpreting: Training, Standards, & Certification,' in Swabey & Malcolm (2012a), pp.54-76.
- Cui, Y. & Zhao, W. (2015a) *Handbook of Research on Teaching Methods in Language Translation & Interpretation*, Hershey PA: Information Science Reference.
- Cui, Y. & Zhao, W. (2015b) 'Preface,' in Cui & Zhao (2015a), pp.xvii-xxiv.
- Cunningham, G. K. (1998) *Assessment in the Classroom: Constructing & Interpreting Texts*, London/Washington: The Falmer Press.
- Dal Fovo, E. (2013) 'Quality as Coherence Maintenance. A Corpus-based Study on Topical Coherence in Simultaneous Interpretation on Television: The Question/Answer Group,' in García Becerra et al. (eds.) (2013), pp.149-173.
- Dal Fovo, E. (2015) 'Media Interpreting,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.245-247.
- Dal Fovo, E. (2017) 'Research on Television Interpreting: A Case of Flouted Norms,' in Biagini et al. (eds.) (2017), pp.173-202.
- Dam, H. V. (1993) 'Text Condensing in Consecutive Interpreting,' in Gambier & Tommola (eds.) (1993), pp.297-313.
- Dam, H. V. (2010) 'Consecutive Interpreting,' in Gambier & Van Doorslaer (eds.) (2010), pp.75-79.
- Dam, H.V. (2017) 'Interpreter Role, Ethics & Norms: Linking to Professionalization,' in Biagini et al. (eds.) (2017), pp.228-239.
- Darden, V. & Maroney, E. M. (2018) "Craving to hear from you": An Exploration of M-learning in Global Interpreter Education,' *TIS* 13(3):442-464. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.00024.dar>.
- Darus, S. (2013) 'Error Analysis,' in Robinson (ed.) (2013), pp.213-215.
- Dastyar, V. (2017) *Dictionary of Research Methodologies in Translation & Interpreting Studies*, Tabriz: Zaban Academic Publishing.
- Davis, J. (1987) 'Team Interpreting as an Approach to the Supervision of Practicum Students,' in McIntire (ed.) (1987), pp. 111-115.
- Davitti, E. & Braun, S. (2018) 'Role-Play Simulations,' in Amato et al. (eds.) (2018), pp.150-159.
- Dean, R. K. (2015) 'Demand Control Schema,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.100-101.
- Dean, R. K., & Pollard, R. Q. (2001) 'Application of Demand-Control Theory to Sign Language Interpreting: Implications for Stress

- Interpreter Training,' *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education* 6(1): 1–14.
- Dean, R. K. & Pollard, R. Q. (2005) 'Consumers & Service Effectiveness in Interpreting Work: A Practice Profession Perspective,' in Marschark et al. (eds.) (2005), pp.259-282.
- Dean, R. K. & Pollard, R. Q. (2011) 'Context-Based Ethical Reasoning in Interpreting: A Demand Control Schema Perspective,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 5(1):155-182.
- Dean, R. K. & Pollard, R. Q. (2012) 'Beyond "Interesting": Using Demand Control Schema to Structure Experiential Learning,' in Swabey & Malcolm (eds.) (2012a), pp.77-104.
- Dean, R. K. & Pollard, R. Q. (2013) *The Demand Control Schema: Interpreting as a Practice Profession*, South Carolina: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.
- Dean, R. K., Pollard, R. Q. & Alan English, M. (2004a) 'Observation-Supervision in Mental Health Interpreter Training,' in Maroney (ed.) (2004), pp.55-75.
- Dean, R. K., Pollard, R. Q., Davis, J., Griffin, M., LaCava, C., Morrison, B., Pamir, J., Smith, A., Storme, S. & Suback, L. (2004b) 'The Demand-Control Schema: Effective Curricular Implementation,' in Maroney (ed.) (2004), pp.145-161.
- DeCesaris, J. A. (1996) 'Computerized Translation Managers as Teaching Aids,' in Dollerup & Appel (eds.) (1996), pp.263-269.
- Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991) 'Motivation & Education: The Self-Determination Perspective,' *Educational Psychologist* 26(3-4):325–346. DOI:10.1080/00461520.1991.9653137.
- Defrancq, B. & Plevoets, K. (2018) 'Over-uh-Load, Filled Pauses in Compounds as a Signal of Cognitive Load,' in Russo et al. (eds.) (2018), pp.43-64.
- De Groot, A.M.B. (2000) 'A Complex-skill Approach to Translation & Interpreting,' in Tirkkonen-Condit & Jääskeläinen (eds.) (2000), pp.53-68.
- De Higes Andino, I. & Cerezo Merchán, B. (2018) 'Using Evaluation Criteria & Rubrics as Learning Tools in Subtitling for the D/deaf & the Hard of Hearing,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 12(1):68-88. DOI: 10.1080/1750399X.2017.1418809.
- Déjean le Féal, K. (1997) 'Simultaneous Interpretation with "Training Wheels",' *Meta* 42(4):616–621.
- DeKeyser, R. M. (2013) 'Aptitude,' in Robinson (ed.) (2013), pp.27-31.

- Delgado Luchner, C. & Kherbiche, L. (forthcoming) 'Ethics Training for Humanitarian Interpreters,' *Journal of War & Culture Studies* special issue.
- Delisle, J. (1980/1988) *L'Analyse du Discours Comme Méthode de Traduction (Translation: An Interpretive Approach*, translated by P. Logan & M. Creery), Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa.
- Del Pozo, M. (2017) 'The Right of Gender Violence Victims & Survivors to Quality Translation & Interpreting According to Legislation. The SOS-VICS Contribution,' in Liimatainen et al. (eds.) (2017), pp.23-45.
- Del Vecchio, S., Cardarelli, M, De Simone, F. & Petitta, G. (2015) 'Interacting with Participants Outside of Interpretation,' in Nicodemus & Cagle (eds.) (2015), pp.24-48.
- Devaux, J. (2017a) *Technologies in Interpreter Mediated Criminal Court Hearings: An Actor-Network Theory Account of the Interpreter's Perception of Her Role-Space*, Doctoral Thesis, University of Salford.
- Devaux, J. (2017b) 'Virtual Presence, Ethics & Videoconference Interpreting: Insights from Court Settings,' in Valero-Garcés & Tipton (eds.) (2017), pp.131-150.
- Dewey, J. (1938) *Experience & Education*, New York: Simon/ Schuster.
- De Wit, M., Salami, M. & Hema, Z. (2012) 'Educating Sign Language Interpreters in Healthcare Settings: A European Perspective,' in Swabey & Malcolm (eds.) (2012a), pp.229-259.
- Dewolf, L. (2016) 'Crafting the Training & Testing of Interpreting Students towards Employability,' in Thelen et al. (eds.) (2016), pp.117-127.
- D'Hayer, D. (2013) 'Public Service Interpreter Education: A Multidimensional Approach Aiming at Building a Community of Learners & Professionals,' in Schäffner et al. (eds.) (2013), pp.321-337.
- Diamond, B.J & Shreve, G.M. (2017) 'Deliberate Practice & Neurocognitive Optimization of Translation Expertise,' in Schwieter & Ferreira (eds.) (2017), pp.476-495.
- Díaz Galaz, S. (2011) 'The Effect of Previous Preparation in Simultaneous Interpreting: Preliminary Results,' *Across Languages & Cultures* 12(2): 173-191.
- Díaz-Galaz, S. (2015) *La Influencia del Conocimiento Previo en la Interpretación Simultánea de Discursos Especializados: Un Estudio Empírico*, Doctoral Thesis, Universidad de Granada.
- Díaz Galaz, S., Padilla, P. & Bajo, M. T. (2015) 'The Role of Advance Preparation in Simultaneous Interpreting: A Comparison of Professional Interpreters & Interpreting Students,' *Interpreting* 17(1):1-25.

- Dickenson, P. (2015) 'Flipping the Classroom in a Teacher Education Course,' in Information Resources Management Association (eds.) (2015), pp.1022-1039.
- Dingfelder Stone, M. (2015a) 'The Theory & Practice of Teaching Note-Taking,' in Andres & Behr (eds.) (2015), pp.145-166.
- Dingfelder Stone, M. (2015b) '(Self-) Study in Interpreting: Plea for a Third Pillar,' in Andres & Behr (eds.) (2015), pp.243-255.
- Dingfelder Stone, M. (2016) 'Authenticity, Autonomy, & Automation: Training Conference Interpreters,' in Kiraly et al. (ed.) (2016), pp.113-128.
- Diriker, E. (2004) *De/re-Contextualizing Conference Interpreting: Interpreters in the Ivory Tower*, Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Diriker, E. (2010) 'Simultaneous Conference Interpreting & Technology,' in Gambier & Van Doorslaer (eds.) (2010), pp.329-332.
- Diriker, E. (2015) 'Conference Interpreting,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.78-82.
- Dirkx, J.M. (1998) 'Transformative Learning Theory in the Practice of Adult Education: An Overview,' *PAACE Journal of Lifelong Learning* 7:1-14.
- Dodds, J. (1990) 'On the Aptitude of Aptitude Testing,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 3:17-22.
- Doherty, S. (2017) 'Issues in Human & Automatic Translation Quality Assessment,' in Kenny (ed.) (2017), pp.131-148.
- Doherty, S., Moorkens, J., Gaspari, F. & Castilho, S. (2018) 'On Education & Training in Translation Quality Assessment,' in Moorkens et al. (eds.) (2018a), pp.95-106.
- Dollerup, C. (1994) 'Systematic Feedback in Teaching Translation,' in Dollerup & Lindegaard (eds.) (1994), pp. 121-132.
- Domingue, R. L. & Ingram, B. L. (1978) 'Sign Language Interpretation: The State of the Art,' in Gerver & Sinaiko (eds.) (1978), pp.81-85.
- Dong, J., & Napier, J. (2016) 'Towards the Construction of Organisational Professionalisation in Public Service Interpreting,' *CTIS Occasional Papers*, 7, 22-42. Centre of Translation & Intercultural Studies, University of Manchester.
<http://hummedia.manchester.ac.uk/schools/salc/centres/ctis/publication/s/occasional-papers/Dong-and-Napier.pdf>. (Accessed June 25, 2018).
- Dong, Y. (2018) 'Complex Dynamic Systems in Students of Interpreting Training,' *TIS* 13(2):185-207.
- Donovan, C. (2003) 'Entrance Exam Testing for Conference Interpretation Courses: How Important Is It?' *FORUM* 1(2):17-44.

- Donovan, C. (2006a) 'Trends—Where Is Interpreting Heading & How can Training Courses Keep Up?' Contribution at the EMCI conference: The Future of Conference Interpreting: Training, Technology and Research, 30 June – 1 July 2006.
http://www.emcinterpreting.org/repository/pdf/UoW_conf_06_C.Donovan.pdf.
- Donovan, C. (2006b) 'Conference Interpreter Training – Constraints & Responses,' *FORUM* 4(1):1-22.
- Donovan, C. (2010) 'Adapting Training to the Changing Professional Landscape: The Example of Video Conferencing,' *FORUM* 8(1):55-71.
- Donovan, C. (2011) 'Ethics in the Teaching of Conference Interpreting,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 5(1):109-128. DOI: 10.1080/13556509.2011.10798814.
- Douglas, D. (2014) *Understanding Language Testing*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Downing, B. T. & Ruschke, K. (2012) 'Professionalizing Healthcare Interpreting between Spoken Languages: Contributions of the National Council on Interpreting in Health Care,' in Swabey & Malcolm (eds.) (2012a), pp.209-228.
- Downing, B. T. & Tillery, K. H. (1992) *Professional Training for Community Interpreters: A Report on Models of Interpreter Training & the Value of Training*, Minnesota University: Center for Urban & Regional Affairs.
- Dörnyei, Z. & Ushioda, E. (2011) *Teaching & Researching Motivation*, 2nd edn, London/New York: Longman.
- Dragsted, B. (2004) *Segmentation in Translation & Translation Memory Systems. An Empirical Investigation of Cognitive Segmentation & Effects of Integrating a TM System into the Translation Process*, Doctoral Thesis, PhD Series 5, Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur.
- Dragsted, B. (2005) 'Segmentation in Translation: Differences across Levels of Expertise & Difficulty,' *Target* 17(1):49–70.
- Dreyfus, H. L. & Dreyfus, S. E. (1986) *Mind over Machine*, Oxford: Blackwell / New York: The Free Press.
- Drezek McConnell, K. & Doolittle, P. E. (2012) 'Classroom-Level Assessment: Aligning Pedagogical Practices to Enhance Student Learning,' in Secolsky & Denison (eds.) (2012), pp.15-30.
- Driscoll, M. (2002) 'Blended learning: Let's Get beyond the Hype,' *E-learning* 1(4): 1-4.
- Drugan, J. (2013) *Quality in Professional Translation: Assessment & Improvement*, London/New Delhi: Bloomsbury.

- Drugan, J. (2014) 'Top-down or Bottom-up: What do Industry Approaches to Translation Quality Mean for Effective Integration of Standards & Tools?' *Translating & the Computer* 36. *Proceedings of the International Association for Advancement in Language Technology*.
- Drugan, J. & Megone, C. (2011) 'Bringing Ethics into Translator Training,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 5(1):183-211. DOI: 10.1080/13556509.2011.10798817.
- Dubslaff, F. (2001) 'Beginners' Problems in Interpreting Research: A Personal Account of the Development of a PhD Project,' in Gile et al. (eds.) (2001), pp.145-161.
- Duflou, V. (2016) *Be(com)ing a Conference Interpreter: An Ethnography of EU Interpreters as a Professional Community*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Dungan, N. (2013) 'Translation Competence & the Practices of Translation Quality Assessment in Turkey,' in Tsagari & Van Deemter (eds.) (2013), pp.131-144.
- Dybiec-Gajer, j. (2013) *Zmierzyć Przekład? Z Metodologii Oceny w Dydaktyce Przekładu Pisemnego [Measuring Translation? Towards an Assessment Methodology in Translator Education]*, Kraków: Universitas.
- Dybiec-Gajer, j. (2014) 'Going Professional: Challenges & Opportunities for the Contemporary Translator Educators,' *inTRALinea* special issue. <http://www.intralinea.org/archive/article/2104> (Accessed March 19, 2018).
- Ebel, R. L. & Frisbie, D. A. (1991) *Essentials of Educational Measurement*, 5th edn, New Delhi: Prentice-Hall.
- Ebrahimi, N. A. (2013) 'Constructivist Translation Classroom Environment Survey (CTLES): Development, Validation & Application,' *Translation & Interpreting* 5(2):163-186. DOI: 10.5202.2013.a10.
- Echeverri, Á. (2015) 'Translator Education & Metacognition: Towards Student-Centered Approaches to Translator Education,' in Cui & Zhao (eds.) (2015a), pp.297-323.
- Edelmann, G. (2017) 'Qualitätssicherung von Übersetzungsleistungen durch Integrierung des Fachwissens in die Ausbildung,' in Liimatainen et al. (eds.) (2017), pp.241-257.
- Egbert, J., Herman, D. & Chang, A. (2015) 'To Flip or Not To Flip? That's Not the Question: Exploring Flipped Instruction in Technology Supported Language Learning Environments,' in Information Resources Management Association (eds.) (2015), pp.1561-1571.

- Ehrensberger-Dow, M. & Jääskeläinen, R. (2019) 'Ergonomics of Translation: Methodological, Practical, & Educational Implications,' in Dam et al. (eds.) (2019), pp.132-150.
- Ehrensberger-Dow, M., & Massey, G. (2013) 'Indicators of Translation Competence: Translators' Self-Concepts & the Translation of Titles,' *Journal of Writing Research* 5(1):103-131.
- Einhorn, H. J. (1974) 'Expert Judgment: Some Necessary Conditions & an Example,' *Journal of Applied Psychology* 59(5):562-571.
- Eisner, E. (2002) 'The Three Curricula that All Schools Teach,' in Eisner (ed.) (2002), pp.87-97.
- Elder, C. (2013) 'Bias in Language Assessment,' in Chapelle (ed.) (2013), pp.406-412.
- Elliot, A.J., Dweck, C.S. & Yeager, D.S. (2017) 'Competence & Motivation: Theory & Application,' in Elliot et al. (eds.) (2017), pp.3-5.
- Elliot, A. J. & Zahn, I. (2008) 'Motivation,' in Salkind (ed.) (2008), pp.686-692.
- Ellis, R. (2003) *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching*, Oxford/New York: Oxford Applied Linguistics.
- EMT Expert Group. (2013) 'The EMT Translator Trainer Profile. Competences of the Trainer in Translation,' http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/programmes/emt/key_documents/translator_trainer_profile_en.pdf.
- Englund Dimitrova, B. (2002) 'Training & Educating the Trainers: A Key Issue in Translators' Training,' in Hung (ed.) (2002), pp.73-82.
- Eraut, M. (1994) *Developing Professional Knowledge & Competence*, London/Washington D.C.: The Falmer Press.
- Ericsson, K. A. (2000) 'Expertise in Interpreting: An Expert-Performance Perspective,' *Interpreting* 5(2):187-220.
- Ericsson, K. A. (2006) 'The Influence of Experience & Deliberate Practice on the Development of Superior Expert Performance,' in Ericsson et al. (eds.) (2006), pp.683-703.
- Ericsson, K. A., Charness, N., Feltovich, P. J., & Hoffman, R. R. (eds.) (2006) *The Cambridge Handbook of Expertise and Expert Performance*, New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R. Th., & Tesch-Römer, C. (1993) 'The Role of Deliberate Practice in the Acquisition of Expert Performance,' *Psychological Review* 100:363-406.
- Ertl, A. & Pöllabauer, S. (2010) 'Training (Medical) Interpreters—the Key to Good Practice. MedInt: A Joint European Training Perspective,' *JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialised Translation* 14:165-193.

- Eszenyi, R. (2016) 'The Modern Translator Trainer's Profile – Lifelong Learning Guaranteed,' in Horváth (ed.) (2016), pp.195-206.
- Ettenson, R. T., Shanteau, J. & Krogstad, J. (1987) 'Expert Judgment: Is More Information Better?' *Psychological Reports* 60: 227-238.
- Eyckmans, J., & Anckaert, P. (2017) 'Item-based Assessment of Translation Competence: Chimera of Objectivity versus Prospect of Reliable Measurement,' *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies* 16:40–56.
- Eyckmans, J., Anckaert, P. & Segers, W. (2009) 'The Perks of Norm-Referenced Translation Evaluation,' in Angelelli & Jacobson (eds.) (2009), pp.73-93.
- Eysenck, M. W. & Keane, M. T. (2010) *Cognitive Psychology: A Student's Handbook*, 6th edn, Hove & New York: Psychology Press.
- Falbo, C. (2002) 'Error Analysis: A Research Tool,' in Garzone et al. (eds.) (2002), pp.111-127.
- Falbo, C. (2015) 'Error Analysis,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.143-144.
- Falchikov, N. (2005) *Improving Assessment through Student Involvement. Practical Solutions for Aiding Learning in Higher & Further Education*, London/New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Falchikov, N. (2007) 'The Place of Peers in Learning & Assessment,' in Boud & Falchikov (eds.) (2007), pp.128-143.
- Fan, D. (2012) *The Development of Expertise in Interpreting through Self-Regulated Learning for Trainee Interpreters*, Doctoral Thesis, University of Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Fantinuoli, C. (2006) 'Specialized Corpora from the Web for Simultaneous Interpreters,' in Baroni & Bernardini (eds.) (2006), pp.173–190.
- Fantinuoli, C. (2009) 'InterpretBank: Ein Tool zum Wissens- und Terminologie management für Simultandolmetscher,' in *Tagungsband der Internationalen Fachkonferenz des Bundesverbandes der Dolmetscher und Übersetzer e.V. (BDÜ)*, pp.411-417, Berlin.
- Fantinuoli, C. (2011) 'Computerlinguistik in der Dolmetschpraxis unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Korpusanalyse,' *Translation: Corpora, Computation, Cognition special issue on Parallel Corpora: Annotation, Exploitation, Evaluation* 1(1):45–74.
- Fantinuoli, C. (2012) *InterpretBank – Design & Implementation of a Terminology & Knowledge Management Software for Conference Interpreters*, Doctoral Thesis, University of Mainz.
- Fantinuoli, C. (2016a) 'Revisiting Corpus Creation and Analysis Tools for Translation Tasks,' *Cadernos de Tradução* 36(1):62–87.

- Fantinuoli, C. (2016b) 'InterpretBank. Redefining Computer-Assisted Interpreting Tools,' *Proceedings of the Translating & the Computer 38 Conference*, pp.42–52.
- Fantinuoli, C. (2017) 'Computer-assisted Preparation in Conference Interpreting,' *Translation & Interpreting* 9(2):24–37.
- Fantinuoli, C. (2018) 'Computer-assisted Interpreting: Challenges & Future Perspectives,' in Corpas Pastor & Durán-Muñoz (eds.) (2018), pp.153-174.
- Fantinuoli, C. (ed.) (forthcoming) *Interpreting & Technology*, Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Fantinuoli, C. & Zanettin, F. (eds.) (2015) *New Directions in Corpus-Based Translation Studies* (Translation and Multilingual Natural Language Processing 1), Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Farahzad, F. (1992) 'Testing Achievement in Translation Classes,' in Dollerup & Loddegaard (eds.) (1992), pp.271-278.
- Farrow, J. (1996) 'Propositional Analysis & Macrorules in Indexing,' *Library Review* 45(1):6-15.
- Federici, F.M. (2010) 'Assessing Translation Skills: Reflective Practice on Linguistic & Cultural Awareness,' in Pellatt et al. (eds.) (2010), pp.171-191.
- Federici, F. M. & Cadwell, P. (2018) 'Training Citizen Translators: Design & Delivery of Bespoke Training on the Fundamentals of Translation for New Zealand Red Cross,' *Translation Spaces* special issue 7(1):20-43. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.00002.fed>.
- Felberg, T. R. (2016) 'Towards a Unified Model for Interpreter User Training in Communication via an Interpreter: The Norwegian Experience,' in Munday et al. (eds.) (2016), pp.135-156.
- Fengxia, J. (2015) 'Evaluating Emotional Stability as a Predictor of Chinese MTI Students' Interpreter Aptitude,' in Cui & Zhao (eds.) (2015a), pp.362-376.
- Fernández Prieto, C. & Sempere Linares, F. (2010) 'Shifting from Translation Competence to Translator Competence: Can Constructivism Help?' in Pellatt et al. (eds.) (2010), pp.131-147.
- Ferraresi, A. (2016) 'Intermodal Corpora & the Translation Classroom: What Can Translation Trainers & Trainees Learn from Interpreting?' *Linguaculture* 2:27-51. DOI: 10.1515/linu -2016-0011.
- Fictumová, J. (2005) 'E-learning for Translators & Interpreters: The case of CMS Moodle,' *Theory and Practice in English Studies* 3: (proceedings from the eighth conference of British, American & Canadian studies, Brno: Masarykova univerzita: 201-206).

- Fictumova, J., Brusnik, A. & Stepankova, K. (2017) 'Teaching Specialized Translation. Error-tagged Translation Learner Corpora,' *Sendebár* 28: 209-241.
- Flanagan, M. & Christensen, T. P. (2014) 'Testing Post-editing Guidelines: How Translation Trainees Interpret them & How to Tailor them for Translator Training Purposes,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 8 (2):257-275. DOI: 10.1080/1750399X.2014.936111.
- Flavell, J. H. (1978) 'Metacognitive Development,' in Scandura & Brainerd (eds.) (1978), pp.34-78.
- Flavell, J.H. (1979) 'Metacognition & Cognitive Monitoring: A New Area of Cognitive-Developmental Inquiry,' *American Psychologist* 34(10): 906-911.
- Flerov, C. & Jacobs, M. (2016) *Improving the Interpreter's Voice*, Morrisville, NC: Lulu.
- Flórez, S. & Alcina, A. (2011) 'Free/Open-Source Software for the Translation Classroom,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 5(2): 325-357. DOI:10.1080/13556509.2011.10798824.
- Floros, G. (2011) 'Ethics-less' Theories & 'Ethical' Practices: On Ethical Relativity in Translation,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 5(1): 65-92. DOI: 10.1080/13556509.2011.10798812.
- Folaron, D. A. (2018) 'Technology,' in D'hulst & Gambier (eds.) (2018), pp.113-116.
- Fowler, Y. (2007) 'Formative Assessment: Using Peer & Self-Assessment in Interpreter Training,' in Wadensjö et al. (eds.) (2007), pp.253-262.
- Fowler, Y. (2013) *Non-English-Speaking Defendants in the Magistrates Court: A Comparative Study of Face-to-Face & Prison Video Link Interpreter-Mediated Hearings in England*, Doctoral Thesis, Aston University.
- Fowler, Y. (2018) 'Interpreted Prison Video Link: The Prisoner's Eye View,' in Napier et al. (eds.) (2018b).
- Fowler, Y., Ng, E. & Coulthard, M. (2013) 'Legal Interpreting,' in Millán & Barina (eds.) (2013), pp.402-414.
- Fox, J. (2017) 'Using Portfolios for Assessment/Alternative Assessment,' in Shohamy et al. (eds.) (2017), pp.135-147.
- Fox, J. (2000) 'The Use of Translation Diaries in a Process-Oriented Translation Teaching Methodology,' in Schäffner & Adab (eds.) (2000), pp.115-130.
- Frankenberg-Garcia, A. (2009) 'Are Translations Longer than Source Texts? A Corpus-Based Study of Explicitation,' in Beeby et al. (eds.) (2009a), pp.47-58.

- Frankenberg-Garcia, A. (2016) 'A Corpus Study of Loans in Translated & Non-translated Texts,' in Corpas Pastor & Seghiri (eds.) (2016), pp.19-42.
- Fraser, J. (2000) 'The Broader View: How Freelance Translators Define Translation Competence,' in Schäffner & Adab (eds.) (2000), pp.51-62.
- Freeman, M. (1995) 'Peer Assessment by Groups of Group Work,' *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 20(3):289-300.
- Freire, P. (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, New York: Seabury Press.
- Frérot, C. (2013) 'Incorporating Translation Technology in the Classroom: Some Benefits & Issues on Using Corpora & Corpus-based Translation Tools,' in Way et al. (eds.) (2013), pp.143-166.
- Fulcher, G. (2010) *Practical Language Testing*, London, UK: Hodder Education.
- Fulcher, G. & Davidson, F. (2007) *Language Testing & Assessment: An Advanced Resource Book*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Fung-Ming, L. C. (2017) 'Perception of Translation Graduates on Translation Internships, with Mixed-Methods Approach,' *Babel* 63(4): 580-599. DOI: 10.1075/babel.63.4.06liu.
- Furmanek, O. (2013) 'Professionalization of Interpreters,' in Chapelle (ed.) (2013), pp.4685-4693.
- Fymeir, A.B., Shulman, G. M. & Houser, M. (1996) 'The Development of a Learner Empowerment Measure,' *Communication Education* 45(3):181-199.
- Gajewski Mickelson, P. (2008) 'Shedding Light on Issues & Interests That Drive Conflict in Interpreting,' in Roberson & Shaw (eds.) (2008), pp.51-70.
- Galán-Mañas, A. (2011) 'Translator Training Tools: Moving towards Blended Learning,' *Babel* 57(4):414-429.
- Galán-Mañas, A. (2016) 'Learning Portfolio in Translator Training: the Tool of Choice for Competence Development & Assessment,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 10(2):161-182. DOI: 10.1080/1750399X.2015.1103108.
- Galán-Mañas, A. & Hurtado Albir, A. (2010) 'Blended Learning in Translator Training: Methodology & Results of an Empirical Validation,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 4(2):197-231.
- Galán-Mañas, A. & Hurtado Albir, A. (2015) 'Competence Assessment Procedures in Translator Training,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 9(1):63-82. DOI: 10.1080/1750399X.2015.1010358.
- Galindo Almohalla, R. (2013) *Training Conference Interpreters in Spain: A Comparative Analysis*, Maîtrise: University of Genève.

- Gambier, Y. (2010) 'Translation Strategies & Tactics,' in Gambier & Van Doorslaer (eds.) (2010), pp.412-418.
- Gambier, Y. (2012) 'Teaching Translation/Training Translators,' in Gambier & Van Doorslaer (eds.) (2012), pp.163-171.
- Gambier, Y. (2018) 'Institutionalization of Translation Studies,' in D'hulst & Gambier (eds.) (2018), pp.179-194.
- Gambier, Y. & van Doorslaer, L. (eds.) (2012) *Translation Studies Bibliography*, <https://www.benjamins.com/online/tsb>. Assessed 17 December 2017.
- Gao, Z. M. & Chiou, Sh. H. (2018) 'Computer-Aided Translation,' in Shei & Gao (eds.) (2018), pp.485-505.
- Garcia, I. (2015) 'Computer-Aided Translation Systems,' in Chan (ed.) (2015), pp.68-87.
- García Becerra, ●. (2012) 'First Impressions in Interpreting Quality Assessment: The Incidence of Nonverbal Communication,' in Jiménez Ivars & Blasco Mayor (eds.) (2012), pp.173-192.
- García González, M. & Veiga Díaz, M. (2015) 'Guided Inquiry & Project-Based Learning in the Field of Specialised Translation: A Description of Two Learning Experiences,' *Perspectives* 23(1):107-123. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2014.948018>.
- Garzone, G. (2002) 'Quality & Norms in Interpretation,' in Garzone & Viezzi (eds.) (2002a), pp.107-119.
- Garzone, G. & Viezzi, M. (eds.) (2002a) *Interpreting in the 21st Century: Challenges & Opportunities*, Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Garzone, G. & Viezzi, M. (2002b) 'Introduction,' in Garzone & Viezzi (eds.) (2002a), pp.1-11.
- Gehrke, M. (1990) 'Community Interpreting in the Curriculum,' in Bowen & Bowen (eds.) (1990), pp.131-135.
- Gentile, A. (1996) 'Translation Theory Teaching: Connecting Theory & Practice,' in Dollerup & Appel (eds.) (1996), pp.55-62.
- Gentile, A. (2015) 'Australia,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.26-29.
- Gerloff, P. (1986) 'Second Language Learners' Reports on the Interpretive Process: Talk-Aloud Protocols of Translation,' in House & Blum-Kulka (eds.) (1986), pp.243-262.
- Gerver, D., Longley, P. E., Long, J. & Lambert, S. (1989) 'Selection Tests for Trainee Conference Interpreters,' *Meta* 34(4):724-735.
- Ghaemi, H. (2013) *The Impact of Task-Based Translator Training Program on the Development of Translation Competence*, Doctoral Thesis, University of Tehran.

- Ghiselli, S. (2018) 'The Translation Challenges of Premodified Noun Phrases in Simultaneous Interpreting from English into Italian: A Corpus-Based Study on EPIC,' *inTRALinea* special issue. <http://www.intralinea.org/archive/article/2322> (Accessed July 11, 2018).
- Giambruno, C. (ed.) (2014a) *Assessing Legal Interpreter Quality through Testing and Certification: the Qualitas project*, Publicaciones de la Universidad de Alicante.
- Giambruno, C. (2014b) 'The Current State of Affairs in the EU: Member State Profiles,' in Giambruno (ed.) (2014a), pp.149-190.
- Giambruno, C. (2014c) 'Preface & Acknowledgement,' in Giambruno (ed.) (2014a), pp. 9-11.
- Giambruno, C., Maxwell-Hyslop, H., Van Deemter, R.& von den Hoff, H. (2014) 'The Organization & Administration of Certification Schemes,' in Giambruno (ed.) (2014a), pp.141-148.
- Gibbons, P. (2013) 'Scaffolding,' in Robinson (ed.) (2013), pp.563-564.
- Gibbs, G. (2006) 'How Assessment Frames Student Learning,' in Bryan & Clegg (eds.) (2006), pp.23-36.
- Gile, D. (1992) 'Basic Theoretical Components in Interpreter & Translator Training,' in Dollerup & Loddegaard (eds.) (1992), pp.185-193.
- Gile, D. (1994a) 'The process-oriented Approach in Translation Training,' in Dollerup & Lindegaard (eds.) (1994), pp.107-112.
- Gile, D. (1994b) 'Opening up in Interpretation Studies,' in Snell-Hornby et al. (eds.) (1994), pp.149-58.
- Gile, D. (1999) 'Variability in the Perception of Fidelity in Simultaneous Interpretation,' *Hermes-Journal of Linguistics* 22:51-79.
- Gile, D. (2001) 'The Role of Consecutive in Interpreter Training: A Cognitive View,' <http://aiic.net/page/377/the-role-of-consecutive-in-interpreter-training-a-cognitive-view/lang/1> (Accessed August 11, 2018).
- Gile, D. (2003) 'Quality Assessment in Conference Interpreting: Methodological Issues,' in Collados Ais et al. (eds.) (2003), pp.109-123.
- Gile, D. (2004) 'Integrated Problem and Decision Reporting as a Translator Training Tool,' *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 2:2-20.
- Gile, D. (2005) 'Teaching Conference Interpreting: A Contribution,' in Tennent (ed.) (2005a), pp.127-151.
- Gile, D. (2009a) *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter & Translator Training*, Rev. edn, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Gile, D. (2009b) 'Interpreting Studies: A Critical View from Within,' *MonTI* special issue 1:135-155.
- Gile, D. (2010) 'Why Translation Studies Matters: A Pragmatist's Viewpoint,' in Gile et al. (eds.) (2010), pp.251-261.

- Gile, D. (2013) 'Institutional, Social and Policy Aspects of Research into Conference Interpreting,' in García Becerra et al. (eds.) (2013), pp.9-31.
- Gile, D. (2015) 'Foreword,' in Andres & Behr (eds.) (2015), pp.9-10.
- Gile, D. (2017) 'Norms, Ethics & Quality: The Challenges of Research,' in Biagini et al. (eds.) (2017), pp. 240-250.
- Gillespie, H., Boulton, H., Hramiak, A. & Williamson, R. (2007) *Learning & Teaching with Virtual Learning Environments*, Exeter: Learning Matters.
- Gillies, A. (2005) *Note-Taking for Consecutive Interpreting—A Short Course*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Gillies, A. (2013) *Conference Interpreting: A Student's Practice Book*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Ginther, A. (2013) 'Assessment of Speaking,' in Chapelle (ed.) (2013), pp.234-240.
- Gipps, C. (1994) *Beyond Testing: Towards A Theory of Educational Assessment*, London/Washington: Falmer.
- Gish, S. (1992) 'A Vygotskian Perspective on Interpreter Assessment,' in Winston (ed.) (1992), pp. 19-44.
- Glaser, R. (1963) 'Instructional Technology & the Measurement of Learning Outcomes,' *American Psychologist* 18:519-521.
- Goh, C. (2005) 'Second Language Listening Expertise,' in Johnson (ed.) (2005), pp.64-84.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1968) 'Simple Models or Simple Processes? Some Research on Clinical Judgment,' *American Psychologist* 23:483-496.
- Goldsmith, J. (2018a) 'The Interpreters' Toolkit: Interpreters' Help, A One-Stop Shop in the Making?' aiic.net. June 2018 (Accessed August 11, 2018) <<https://aiic.net/p/8499>>.
- Goldsmith, J. (2018b) 'Tablet Interpreting: Consecutive Interpreting 2.0,' *TIS* 13(3):342-365. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.00020.gol>.
- Gómez, M.A. & Weinreb, S. (2002) 'An Alternative Instructional Model: Teaching Medical Translation Online,' *Meta* 47(4):643-648.
- Gonçalves, J. L. (2005) 'Desenvolvimento da Competência do Tradutor: Em Busca de Parâmetros Cognitivos,' in Alves et al. (eds.) (2005), pp. 59-90.
- González Davies, M. (2003) (coord.) *Secuencias: Tareas Para el Aprendizaje Interactivo de la Traducción Especializada*, Barcelona: Octaedro-EUB.
- González Davies, M. (2004) *Multiple Voices in the Translation Classroom*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- González Davies, M. (2005) 'Minding the Process, Improving the Product: Alternatives to Traditional Translator Training,' in Tennent (ed.) (2005a), pp.67-82.
- González Davies, M. (2018) 'Collaborative Learning in Translator Training: Moving towards Student Agency,' Keynote Speech in *1st Annual APTIS Conference: Challenges & Opportunities in Teaching Translation & Interpreting*, November 23-24, 2018, Aston University, Birmingham.
- González Davies, M. & Enríquez-Raído, V. (eds.) (2017) *Situated Learning in Translator & Interpreter Training*, London/New York: Routledge.
- González Rodríguez, M. J. (2018) 'Preparatory Exercises,' in Amato et al. (eds.) (2018), pp.144-159.
- González Rodríguez, M. J. & Spinolo, N. (2017) 'Telephonic Dialogue Interpreting: A Short Teaching Course,' in Cirillo & Niemants (eds.) (2017), pp. 241-257.
- Göpferich, S. (2008) *Translationsprozessforschung: stand-Methoden – Perspektiven*, Tübingen: Narr.
- Göpferich, S. (2009) 'Towards a Model of Translation Competence and its Acquisition: The Longitudinal Study TransComp,' in Göpferich et al. (eds.) (2009), pp.12–38.
- Gorjanc, V., Egorova, ●. & Zitek, V. (2016) 'Blended Learning: Students' Attitudes towards the Use of Technology in Interpreting Training,' *Humanitarian Researches* 60(4):52-59.
- Gostkowska, K. (2016) 'Terminologist as ●ne of a Translator's "Professions": The Role of Teaching Terminology in Translator Training,' *Journal of Translator Education & Translation Studies* 1(1): 23-34.
- Gouadec, D. (2000) 'Position Paper 2: Innovation in Translator & Interpreter Training. Report on an ●n-line Symposium,' *Across Languages & Cultures* 1(2): 222-231.
- Gouadec, D. (2002) *Profession: Traducteur, La Maison du Dictionnaire*, Paris.
- Goutondji, A. E. G. (2014) *The Use of Mock Conferences as Means of Practical Instruction in Simultaneous Interpreting Training, with Specific Reference to Model United Nations Conferences*, Master's thesis, University of Pretoria.
- Gran, L. (1998) 'In-Training Development of Interpreting Strategies & Creativity,' in Beylard-●zeroff et al. (eds.) (1998), pp.145-162.
- Gran, L., Carabelli, A. & Merlini, R. (2002) 'Computer-Assisted Interpreter Training,' in Garzone & Viezzi (eds.) (2002a), pp. 277–294.

- Granger, S. (2013) 'Learner Corpora,' in Chapelle (ed.) (2013), pp.3235–3242.
- Grbić, N. (2008) 'Constructing Interpreting Quality,' *Interpreting* 10(2): 232–257.
- Grbić, N. (2015) 'Quality,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.333-336.
- Grbić, N. & Pöchhacker, F. (2015) 'Competence,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.69-70.
- Griessner, F., Stachl-Peier, U. & Springer, C. (2017) 'Note-taking,' in UNHCR Austria (ed.) (2017), pp. 104-120.
- Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994) 'Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research,' in Denzin & Lincoln (eds.) (1994), pp.105-117.
- Gumul, E. (2006) 'Explicitation in Simultaneous Interpreting: A Strategy or a By-Product of Language Mediation?' *Across Languages and Cultures* 7(2):171–190.
- Gumul, E. (2008) 'Explicitation in Simultaneous Interpreting – the Quest for Optimal Relevance,' in Walaszewska et al. (eds.) (2008), pp.188–205.
- Gumul, E. (2015) 'Explicitation,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.156.
- Guo, Y. (2013) 'Toward a Model for Evaluating Meaning Transfer Quality in Consecutive Interpreting,' in García Becerra et al. (eds.) (2013), pp. 57-84.
- Gustafsson, K., Norström, E. & Fioretos, I. (2012) 'Community Interpreter Training in Spoken Languages in Sweden,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 4(2):24-38.
- Gutiérrez Florido, R., Corpas Pastor, G. & Seghiri, M. (2016) 'Trainees' Perspective on the Use of Corpora in Translation & Interpreting: A Trip into the Unknown,' in Corpas Pastor & Seghiri (eds.) (2016), pp.239-252.
- Hale, S. B. (2007) *Community Interpreting*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hale, S. B. (2011) 'Public Service Interpreting,' in Malmkjær & Windle (eds.) (2011).
- Hale, S. B. (2015a) 'Approaching the Bench: Teaching Magistrates & Judges How to Work Effectively with Interpreters,' *MonTI* 7:163-180. DOI: 10.6035/MonTI.2015.7.6.
- Hale, S. B. (2015b) 'Community Interpreting,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.65-69.
- Hale, S. B., Garcia, I., Hlavac, J., Kim, M., Lai, M., Turner, B., & Slatyer, H. (2012) *Improvements to NAATA Testing: Development of a Conceptual Overview for a New Model for NAATI Standards, Testing & Assessment*, Sydney, Australia: The University of New South Wales.

- Hale, S. B. & Gonzalez, E. (2017) 'Teaching Legal Interpreting at University Level: A Research-Based Approach,' in Cirillo & Niemants (eds.) (2017), pp.199-216.
- Hale, S. B. & Napier, J. (2013) *Research Methods in Interpreting: A Practical Resource*, London/New Delhi: Bloomsbury.
- Hale, S. B., Ozolins, U. & Stern, L. (eds.) (2009) *The CriticalLink 5: quality in interpreting—A Shared Responsibility*, Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hambleton, R.K., Zenisky, A. L. & Popham, W. J. (2016) 'Criterion-Referenced Testing: Advances over 40 Years,' in Wells & Faulkner-Bond (eds.) (2016), pp.23-37.
- Hambrick, D. Z., Oswald, F. L., Altman, E. M., Meinz, E. J., Gobet, F. & Campitelli, G. (2014) 'Deliberate Practice: Is That All It Takes to Become an Expert?' *Intelligence* 45 (2014):34-45. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2013.04.001>.
- Hamidi, M. & Pöchhacker, F. (2007) 'Simultaneous Consecutive Interpreting: A New Technique Put to the Test,' *Meta* 52(2): 276-289.
- Hamlyn, D.W. (1983) *Perception, Learning & the Self: Essays in the Philosophy of Psychology*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Hammer, A. & Van den Bogaerde, B. (2017) 'Sign Language Interpreting Education: Reflections on Interpersonal Skills,' in Cirillo & Niemants (eds.) (2017), pp.63-81.
- Han, C. (2015a) *Building the Validity Foundation for Interpreter Certification Performance Testing*, Doctoral Thesis, Macquarie University.
- Han, C. (2015b) 'Investigating Rater Severity/Leniency in Interpreter Performance Testing: A Multifaceted Rasch Measurement Approach,' *Interpreting* 17(2): 255-283.
- Han, C. (2017) 'Using Analytic Rating Scales to Assess English-Chinese Bi-Directional Interpreting: A Longitudinal Rasch Analysis of Scale Utility and Rater Behavior,' *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies* 16:196-215.
- Han, C. (2018) 'Using Rating Scales to Assess Interpretation Practices, Problems & Prospects,' *Interpreting* 20(1):59-95. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.00003.han>.
- Han, C. & Slatyer, H. (2016) 'Test Validation in Interpreter Certification Performance Testing: An Argument-based Approach,' *Interpreting* 18 (2):231-258. DOI: 10.1075/intp.18.2.04han.
- Hanifehzadeh, S. & Farahzad, F. (2016) 'A Meta-analysis of the Potentially Required Criteria in Constructing a Scale for Evaluating Translation

- Quality,' *Journal of Translator Education & Translation Studies* 1 (2):78-96.
- Hansen, G. (2006) 'Retrospection Methods in Translator Training & Translation Research,' *JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialised Translation* 5:2-41.
- Harmer, J. (2000) 'Teacher Education for the Interpretation & Translation Classroom,' *The ATA Chronicle* 29(11):37-39.
- Haro-Soler, M. D. M. (2018) 'Self-confidence & Its Role in Translator Training: The Students' Perspective,' in Lacruz & Jääskeläinen (eds.) (2018), pp.131-160.
- Harris, R. (1993) *The Linguistic Wars*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, B. & Sherwood, B. (1978) 'Translating as an Innate Skill,' in Gerver & Sinaiko (eds.) (1978), pp.155-170.
- Harris, I. (2016) 'Improving the Integration of Performance Assessments within the Curriculum across the Professions,' in Wimmers & Mentkowski (eds.) (2016), pp. 39-50.
- Hasbún Avalos, ●., Pennington, K. & Osterberg, L. (2013) 'Revolutionizing Volunteer Interpreter Services: An Evaluation of an Innovative Medical Interpreter Education program,' *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 28(12):1589-1595.
- Hartnett, M. (2016) *Motivation in Online Education*, New York: Springer.
- Hatano, G. & Inagaki, K. (1986) 'Two Courses of Expertise,' in Stevenson, Azuma & Hakuta (eds.) (1986), pp.263-272.
- Hatim, B. (2013) *Teaching & Researching Translation*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1997) *The Translator as Communicator*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Hayes, J. R. & Flower, L. (1980) 'Identifying the Organization of Writing Processes,' in Gregg & Steinberg (eds.) (1980), pp.3-30.
- Heaton, J.B. (1975) *Writing Language Tests*, London, UK: Longman.
- Hedding, T. & Kaufman, G. (2012) 'Health Literacy & Deafness: Implications for Interpreter Education,' in Swabey & Malcolm (eds.) (2012a), pp.164-189.
- Heine, C. (2019) 'Student Peer Feedback in a Translation Task: Experiences with Questionnaires & Focus Group Interviews,' in Huertas-Barros et al. (eds.) (2019a), pp.337-357.
- Heritage, M. (2010) *Formative Assessment: Making It Happen in the Classroom*, California: Corwin.
- Hermans, T. (2009) 'Models,' in Baker & Saldanha (eds.) (2009), pp.178-182.

- Heron, J. & Reason, P. (2006) 'The Practice of Co-operative Inquiry: Research with rather than on People,' in Reason & Bradbury (eds.) (2006), pp.144–54.
- Herrington, J., Oliver, R., & Reeves, T. C. (2003) 'Patterns of Engagement in Authentic Online Learning Environments,' *Australian Journal of Educational Technology* 19(1):59–71.
- Hertog, E. (2010) 'Community Interpreting,' in Gambier & Van Doorslaer (eds.) (2010), pp.49–54.
- Hertog, E. (2013) 'Legal Interpreting,' in Chapelle (ed.) (2013), pp.3274–3281.
- Hertog, E. (2014) 'Testing Knowledge of Codes of Ethics,' in Giambruno (ed.) (2014a), pp.77–92.
- Heydarian, S. H. (2016) 'A Closer Look into Concept of Strategy & Its Implications for Translation Training,' *Babel* 62(1):86–103. DOI: 10.1075/babel.62.1.05hey.
- Hild, A. (2014) 'The Role of Self-regulatory Processes in the Development of Interpreting Expertise,' *TIS* 9(1):128–149. DOI: 10.1075/tis.9.1.07hil.
- Hild, A. (2015) 'Retrospective Protocols,' in Pöschhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.351–354.
- Hiltunen, S. & Vik, G-V. (2015) 'Interpreters – Experts in Careful Listening & Efficient Encoding? Findings of a Prose Recall Test,' *International Journal of Bilingualism* 21(2):194–212.
- Hlavac, J. (2013a) 'Should Interpreters Be Trained & Tested in Telephone & Video-Link Interpreting? Responses from Practitioners & Examiners,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 5(1):34–50.
- Hlavac, J. (2013b) 'A Cross-National Overview of Translator & Interpreter Certification Procedures,' *Translation & Interpreting* 5(1):32–65. DOI: 10.12807/ti.105201.2013.a02.
- Hlavac, J. (2016) 'Interpreter Credentialing, Testing and Training in Australia: Past, Contemporary & Future Directions,' *FIITISPos International Journal* 3:59–81.
- Hlavac, J., Orlando, M. & Tobias, S. (2012) 'Intake Tests for a Short Interpreter Training Course: Design, Implementation, Feedback,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 4(1):21–45.
- Ho, G. (2015) 'Adapting Translator & Interpreter Training to the Job Market,' in Cui & Zhao (eds.) (2015a), pp.377–396.
- Hoffman, R. R. (1997) 'The Cognitive Psychology of Expertise & the Domain of Interpreting,' *Interpreting* 2(1/2):189–230.
- Hoffman, R. R. & Militello, L. G. (2008) *Perspectives on Cognitive Task Analysis: Historical Origins & Modern Communities of Practice*, Hove/New York: Psychology Press.

- Hodge, E., Collins, S. & Giordano, T. (2011) *The Virtual Worlds Handbook: How to Use Second Life® & Other 3D Virtual Environments*, Boston/Toronto/London/Singapore: Jones & Bartlett Publishers.
- Holcomb, T. K. & Smith, D. H. (eds.) (2018) *Deaf Eyes on Interpreting*, Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.
- Holmes, J. S. (1972/1988) *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation & Translation Studies*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Holz-Mänttäri, J. (1984) *Translatorisches Handeln: Theorie und Methode*, Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia.
- Hörmann, P. (1992) 'Introducing Theory in a Course of Translation: A Chilean Case Study,' in Dollerup & Loddegaard (eds.) (1992), pp.57-61.
- Horning, A. S. (1987) 'Propositional Analysis & the Teaching of Reading with Writing,' *Journal of Advanced Composition* 6:49-64.
- Horváth, I. (2007) 'Autonomous Learning: What Makes It Work in Postgraduate Interpreter Training?' *Across Languages & Cultures* 8 (1):103-122. DOI: 10.1556/Acr.8.2007.1.6.
- Horváth, I. (2016a) 'Information & Communication Technologies in Interpreting & Machine Interpretation,' in Horváth (ed.) (2016), pp.183-191.
- Horváth, I. (2016b) 'The Role of Cooperative Learning in Translator & Interpreter Training,' in Horváth (ed.) (2016), pp.233-241.
- House, J. (1977/1981) *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*, Tübingen: Narr.
- House, J. (2009) 'Quality,' in Baker & Saldanha (eds.) (2009), pp.222-225.
- House, J. (2013) 'Quality in Translation Studies,' in Millán & Bartrina (eds.) (2013), pp.534-547.
- House, J. (2015) *Translation Quality Assessment: Past & Present*, London/New York: Routledge.
- House, J. (2018) *Translation: The Basics*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Hoza, J. (2016) *Interpreting in the Zone: How the Conscious & Unconscious Function in Interpretation*, Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.
- Hsieh, E. (2015) 'Healthcare Interpreting,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.177-182.
- Hu, K. (2016) *Introducing Corpus-based Translation Studies*, Heidelberg/New York: Springer.
- Hu, W. (2018) *Education, Translation & Global Market Pressures. Curriculum Design in China & the UK*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Hubscher-Davidson, S. (2009) 'Personal Diversity & Diverse Personalities in Translation: A Study of Individual Differences,' *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 17(3):175–192. DOI: 10.1080/09076760903249380.
- Hubscher-Davidson, S. (2013a) 'The Role of Intuition in the Translation Process: A Case Study,' *TIS* 8(2):211–232. DOI: 10.1075/tis.8.2.05hub.
- Hubscher-Davidson, S. (2013b) 'Emotional Intelligence & Professional Translation,' Paper delivered at the International Online Workshop on Affective factors in Translation Process Research: To Feel or not to Feel? That is the Question, Aston University, December 6.
- Hubscher-Davidson, S. (2016) 'Trait Emotional Intelligence & Translation: A Study of Professional Translators,' *Target* 28(1):132–157.
- Hubscher-Davidson, S. (2018a) 'Do Translation Professionals Need to Tolerate Ambiguity to be Successful? A Study of the Links between Tolerance of Ambiguity, Emotional Intelligence & Job Satisfaction,' in Lacruz & Jääskeläinen (eds.) (2018), pp.77–103.
- Hubscher-Davidson, S. (2018b) *Translation & Emotion: A Psychological Perspective*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Huertas Barros, E. (2011) 'Collaborative Learning in the Translation Classroom: Preliminary Survey Results,' *JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialised Translation* 16:42–60.
- Huertas-Barros, E., Vandepitte, S. & Iglesias-Fernández, E. (eds.) (2019a) *Quality Assurance & Assessment Practices in Translation & Interpreting*, Hershey PA: IGI Global.
- Huertas-Barros, E., Vandepitte, S. & Iglesias-Fernández, E. (2019b) 'Preface,' in Huertas-Barros et al. (eds.) (2019a), pp.xvii–xxix.
- Huertas Barros, E. & Vine, J. (2017) 'Current Trends on MA Translation Courses in the UK: Changing Assessment Practices on Core Translation Modules,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer*. DOI: 10.1080/1750399X.2017.1400365.
- Huertas Barros, E. & Vine, J. (2019) 'Constructing Standards in Communities: Tutors' & Students' Perceptions of Assessment Practices on an MA Translation Course,' in Huertas Barros et al. (eds.) (2019a), pp.245–269.
- Hughes, A. (1989) *Testing for Language Teachers*, 1st edn, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hui, T. (2013) 'The Potential of Role-Playing as a Translator Training Tool: Students' Performance & Reflections,' *New Voices in Translation Studies* 10:39–53.

- Humphrey, J.H. (2000) 'Portfolios. One Answer to the Challenge of Assessment & the 'Readiness to Work' Gap,' in Roy (ed.) (2000b), pp. 153–175.
- Hurtado Albir, A. (1983) 'Apprendre à Traduire,' *Reflét* 7:32–37.
- Hurtado Albir, A. (1993) 'Un Nuevo Enfoque de la Didáctica de la Traducción. Metodología y Diseño Curricular,' in Gauchola et al. (eds.) (1993), pp.239–252.
- Hurtado Albir, A. (1995) 'La Didáctica de la Traducción: Evolución y Estado Actual,' in Fernández & Bravo (eds.) (1995), pp.49–74.
- Hurtado Albir, A. (1996) 'La Enseñanza de la Traducción Directa "General": Objetivos de Aprendizaje y Metodología,' in Hurtado Albir (ed.) (1996), pp.31–55.
- Hurtado Albir, A. (ed.) (1999) *Enseñar a Traducir. Metodología en la Formación de Traductores e Intérpretes*, Madrid: Edelsa.
- Hurtado Albir, A. (2007) 'Competence-Based Curriculum Design for Training Translators,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 1(2):163–195.
- Hurtado Albir, A. (2008) 'Compétence en Traduction et Formation par Compétences,' *Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction* 21(1):17–64.
- Hurtado Albir, A. (2010) 'Competence,' in Gambier & Van Doorslaer (eds.) (2010), pp.55–59.
- Hurtado Albir, A. (2015a) *Aprender a Traducir del Francés al Español. Competencias y Tareas Para la Iniciación a la Traducción*, Castellón/Madrid: Universitat Jaume I/Edelsa.
- Hurtado Albir, A. (2015b) *Aprender a Traducir del Francés al Español. Competencias y Tareas Para la Iniciación a la Traducción: Guía Didáctica*, Castellón/Madrid: Universitat Jaume I/Edelsa.
- Hurtado Albir, A. (ed.) (2017) *Researching Translation Competence by PACTE Group*, Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hurtado Albir, A. (2018) 'Training,' in D'hulst & Gambier (eds.) (2018), pp.415–427.
- Hurtado, Albir, A. & Pavani, S. (2018) 'An Empirical Study on Multidimensional Summative Assessment in Translation Teaching,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 12(1):25–47. DOI: 10.1080/1750399X.2017.1420131.
- Hussey, H.D., Fleck, B.K.B, Richmond, A.S. (2015) 'Promoting Active Learning through a Flipped Course Design,' in Information Resources Management Association (eds.) (2015), pp.106–130.
- Hvelplund, K. T. & Dragsted, B. (2018) 'Genre Familiarity & Translation Processing: Differences & Similarities between Literary & LSP Translators,' in Lacruz & Jääskeläinen (eds.) (2018), pp.55–76.

- Iannone, E., Matti, E., Böser, U., Sargeant, M. & Monteoliva, E. (2017) 'The Basic Principles of Interpreting,' in UNHCR Austria (ed.) (2017), pp. 38-49.
- Ibrahim-González, N. (2011) 'E-learning in Interpreting Didactics: Students' Attitudes & Learning Patterns, & Instructor's Challenges,' *JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialised Translation* 16:224-241.
- Ibrahim-González, N. (2013) 'Learner Autonomy via Self-assessment in Consecutive Interpreting for Novice Learners in a Non-interpreting Environment,' in Barranco-Droege et al. (eds.) (2013), pp. 223-238.
- Iglesias Fernández, E. (2011) 'Under Examination. Do All Interpreting Examiners Use The Same Criteria?' *The Linguist* 50 (2):12-13.
- Iglesias Fernández, E. (2013a) 'Unpacking Delivery Criteria in Interpreting Quality Assessment,' in Tsagari & Van Deemter (eds.) (2013), pp.51-66.
- Iglesias Fernández, E. (2013b) 'Understanding Variability in Interpreting Quality Assessment: User's Sex & Judgments for Pleasant Voice,' in Way et al. (eds.) (2013), pp.103-125.
- Iglesias Fernández, E. (2015) 'Voice Quality,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.440-441.
- Iglesias Fernández, E. & Russo, M. (2018) 'A Multidisciplinary Theoretical Framework for the Study of Remote Interpreting,' in *SHIFT Report 2, 2018:20-35*.
- Ilg, G. & Lambert, S. (1996) 'Teaching Consecutive Interpreting,' *Interpreting* 1(1):69-99.
- Ilhami, N. & Way, C. (2016) 'Terminology in Undergraduate Translation & Interpreting Programmes in Spain: The Case of Arabic as a First Foreign Language,' in Taibi (ed.) (2016a), pp.91-114.
- Ingo, R. (1992) 'Translation Theory: Four Fundamental Aspects,' in Dollerup & Loddegaard (eds.) (1992), pp.49-56.
- Ingram, R.M. (1985) 'Simultaneous Interpretation of Sign Languages: Semiotic & Psycholinguistic Perspectives,' *Multilingua* 4(2):91-102.
- Inoue, I. (2005) 'PBL as a New Pedagogical Approach for Translator Education,' *Meta* 50(4), Proactive Translatology. Proceedings. DOI: 10.7202/019865ar.
- Inoue, I. & Candlin, C. N. (2015) 'Applying Task-Based Learning to Translator Education: Assisting the Development of Novice Translators' Problem-Solving Expertise,' *TIS* 10(1):58-86.
- INSTB (Buysschaert, J., Fernández-Parra, M., Van Egdom, G.W.) (2017) 'Professionalising the Curriculum & Increasing Employability through Authentic Experiential Learning: The Cases of INSTB,' *Current Trends in Translation Teaching & Learning E* 4:78-111.

- Irons, A. (2008) *Enhancing Learning through Formative Assessment & Feedback*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Isaacs, T., Zara, C., Herbert, G., Coombs, S. J. & Smith, C. (2013) *Key Concepts in Educational Assessment*, Los Angeles/London: SAGE Publications.
- Ito, H. (2017) 'Theory & Practice of Notetaking: Cognitive-Psychological Perspective,' in Someya (ed.) (2017a), pp.29-70.
- Ivanova, A. (1998) 'Educating the 'Language Elite',' in Malmkjær (ed.) (1998), pp.91-109.
- Jääskeläinen, R. (1993) 'Investigating Translation Strategies,' in Tirkkonen-Condit & Laffling (eds.) (1993), pp.99-120.
- Jääskeläinen, R. (2007) 'Translation Strategies-What Are They?' in Chłopicki et al. (eds.) (2007), pp.343-361.
- Jääskeläinen, R. (2009) 'Think-aloud Protocols,' in Baker & Saldanha (eds.) (2009), pp.290-293.
- Jääskeläinen, R. (2010a) 'Think-aloud Protocol,' in Gambier & Van Dorslaer (eds.) (2010), pp.371-373.
- Jääskeläinen, R. (2010b) 'Looking for a Working Definition of "Translation Strategies",' in Mees et al. (eds.) (2010), pp.375-387.
- Jääskeläinen, R. (2010c) 'Are All Professionals Experts? Definitions of Expertise & Reinterpretation of Research Evidence in Process Studies,' in Shreve & Angelone (eds.) (2010), pp.213-227.
- Jääskeläinen, R., Kujamäki, P. & Mäkisalo, J. (2011) 'Towards Professionalism-Or Against It? Dealing with the Changing World in Translation Research & Translator Education,' *Across Languages & Cultures* 12(2):143-156. DOI: 10.1556/Acr.12.2011.2.1.
- Jääskeläinen, R. & Lacruz, I. (2018) 'Translation-Cognition-Affect-& Beyond: Reflections on an Expanding Field of Research,' in Lacruz & Jääskeläinen (eds.) (2018), pp.1-16.
- Jackson, P. W. (1968) *Life in Classrooms*, New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Jacobs, E. A., Diamond, L. C. & Stevak, L. (2010) 'The Importance of Teaching Clinicians When & How to Work with Interpreters,' *Patient Education & Counseling* 78(2):149-153.
- Jacobson, H.E. (2009) 'Moving Beyond Words in Assessing Mediated Interaction: Measuring Interactional Competence in Healthcare Settings,' in Angelelli & Jacobson (eds.) (2009), pp.49-70.
- Jänis, M. (2002) 'From the A Language to the B Language and from the B Language to the A Language: what is the difference?' in Garzone et al. (eds.) (2002), pp.53-64.

- Järvelä, S. (1995) 'The Cognitive Apprenticeship Model in a Technologically Rich Learning Environment: Interpreting the Learning Interaction,' *Learning & Instruction* 5:237-259.
- Jeong, H. (2015) 'Rubrics in the Classroom: Do Teachers Really Follow Them?' *Language Testing in Asia* 5(6):1-14. DOI: 10.1186/s40468-015-0013-5.
- Jiménez-Crespo, M. A. (2009) 'The Internet in Translation Education: Two Decades Later,' *TIS* 10(1):33-57. DOI:10.1075/tis.10.1.03jim.
- Jiménez-Crespo, M. A. (2017) *Crowdsourcing & Online Collaborative Translations: Expanding the limits of Translation Studies*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Jiménez-Crespo, M. A. (2018) 'Crowdsourcing & Translation Quality: Novel Approaches in the Language Industry & Translation Studies,' in Moorkens et al. (eds.) (2018a), pp.69-93.
- Jiménez Ivars, A. & Pinazo Calatayud, D. (2001) 'I Failed Because I Got Very Nervous'. Anxiety & Performance in Interpreting Trainees: An Empirical Study,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 11:105-118.
- Jin, Y. (2018) 'Consecutive Interpreting,' in Shei & Gao (eds.) (2018), pp.321-335.
- Johansson, S. (1978) *Studies of Error Gravity*, (Gothenburg Studies in English 44.) Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg.
- Johnson, J. E. (2003) 'Learning through Portfolios in the Translation Classroom,' in Baer & Koby (eds.) (2003), pp.97-116.
- Johnson, J. E. (2016) *Effect of Mindfulness Training on Interpretation Exam Performance in Graduate Students in Interpreting*, Doctoral Thesis, University of San Francisco.
- Johnston, S. (2007) 'Interpreter Internship Program: Forging Employer-community Partnerships,' in Wadensjö et al. (eds.) (2007), pp.263-271.
- Jones, R. (1998) *Conference Interpreting Explained*, Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
- Jones, R. W. (2007) 'Learning & Teaching in Small Groups: Characteristics, Benefits, Problems & Approaches,' *Anaesth Intensive Care* 35(4):587-592.
- Kaczmarek, Ł. (2012) 'Addressing the Question of Ethical Dilemmas in Community Interpreter Training,' in Hubscher-Davidson & Borodo (eds.) (2012), pp.217-239.
- Kader, S. & Seubert, S. (2015) 'Anticipation, Segmentation ... Stalling? How to Teach Interpreting Strategies,' in Andres & Behr (eds.) (2015), pp.125-144.

- Kadiu, S. (2017) 'Teaching Theory through Practice: A Reflexive Approach,' *Current Trends in Translation Teaching & Learning E4*: 48–77.
- Kadrić, M. (2015) 'Role Play,' in Pöschhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.360-361.
- Kadrić, M. (2017a) 'Make it different! Teaching Interpreting with Theatre Techniques,' in Cirillo & Niemants (eds.) (2017), pp.275-292.
- Kadrić, M. (2017b) 'Role-Playing Exercises,' Translated by Sylvi Rennert, in UNHCR Austria (ed.) (2017), pp. 6-10.
- Kaiser-Cooke, M. (1994) 'Translational Expertise - A Cross-cultural Phenomenon from an Inter-disciplinary Perspective,' in Snell-Hornby et al. (eds.) (1994), pp.135-139.
- Kajzer-Wietrzny, M. (2013) 'Idiosyncratic Features of Interpreting Style,' *New Voices in Translation Studies* 9:38-52.
- Kajzer-Wietrzny, M. & Tymczyńska, M. (2014) 'Integrating Technology into Interpreter Training Courses: A Blended Learning Approach,' *inTRALinea* special issue. <http://www.intralinea.org/specials/article/2101> (Accessed March 18, 2018).
- Kalina, S. (1992) 'Discourse Processing & Interpreting Strategies: An Approach to the Teaching of Interpreting,' in Dollerup & Loddegaard (eds.) (1992), pp.251-257.
- Kalina, S. (1994) 'Some Views on the Theory of Interpreter Training and Some Practical Suggestions,' in Snell-Hornby et al. (eds.) (1994), pp. 219-225.
- Kalina, S. (1998) *Strategische Prozesse beim Dolmetschen. Theoretische Grundlagen, empirische Fallstudien, didaktische Konsequenzen*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Kalina, S. (2000) 'Interpreting Competences as a Basis and a Goal for Teaching,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 10:3–32.
- Kalina, S. (2002) 'Quality in Interpreting and its Prerequisites: A Framework for a Comprehensive View,' in Garzone & Viezzi (eds.) (2002a), pp.121–130.
- Kalina, S. (2005a) 'Quality Assurance for Interpreting Processes,' *Meta* 50(2):768-784.
- Kalina, S. (2005b) 'Quality in the Interpreting Process: What Can Be Measured and How?' in Godijns & Hinderdael (eds.) (2005), pp.27–46.
- Kalina, S. (2007) 'Microphone Off - Application of the Process Model of Interpreting to the Classroom,' *Kalbotyra* 57 (3): 111-121.
- Kalina, S. (2013) 'Conference Interpreting,' in Chapelle (ed.) (2013), pp.880–884.
- Kalina, S. (2015a) 'Ethical Challenges in Different Interpreting Settings,' *MonTI* special issue 2: 63-86.

- Kalina, S. (2015b) 'Interpreter Training & Interpreting Studies – Which is the Chicken & Which is the Egg?' in Andres & Behr (eds.) (2015), pp.17-41.
- Kalina, S. (2015c) 'Compression,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.73-75.
- Kalina, S. (2015d) 'Preparation,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.318-320.
- Kalina, S. (2015e) 'Strategies,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.402-405.
- Kalina, S. & Ziegler, K. (2015) 'Technology,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.410-412.
- Karasek, R. A. (1979) 'Job Demands, Job Decision Latitude, & Mental Strain: Implications for Job Redesign,' *Administrative Science Quarterly* 24 (2):285-307.
- Karliner, L.S., Pérez-Stable, E.J. & Gildengorin, G. (2004) 'The Language Divide: The Importance of Training in the Use of Interpreters for Outpatient Practice,' *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 19(2):175–183. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1497.2004.30268.x>.
- Karoubi, B. (2016a) *Assessor-Centered Translation Quality Assessment: A Theoretical Model & A Case Study*, Doctoral Thesis, Leiden University Institute for Area Studies.
- Karoubi, B. (2016b) 'Translation Quality Assessment Demystified,' *Babel* 62(2):253–277. DOI: [10.1075/babel.62.2.05kar](https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.62.2.05kar).
- Karoubi, B. (2017) 'Assessor-Centered Translation Quality Assessment: A Case Study,' *Asia Pacific Translation & Intercultural Studies* 4(1). DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/23306343.2017.1280761>.
- Kasandrinou, M. (2010) 'Evaluation as a Means of Quality Assurance: What Is It & How Can It Be Done?' in Pellatt et al. (eds.) (2010), pp.193-205.
- Kashirina, N. (2015) 'Psychology of Translation: Critical & Creative Thinking,' in Cui & Zhao (eds.) (2015a), pp.274-296.
- Katz, A. & Gottlieb, M. (2013) 'Assessment in the Classroom,' in Chapelle (ed.) (2013), pp.161–169.
- Kearns, J. (2006) *Curriculum Renewal in Translator Training: Vocational Challenges in Academic Environments with Reference to Needs and Situation Analysis and Skills Transferability from the Contemporary Experience of Polish Translator-Training Culture*, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Dublin City University.
- Keams, J. (2008a) *Translator & Interpreter Training: Issues, Methods, & Debates*, UK: Continuum.
- Kearns, J. (2008b) 'The Academic & the Vocational in Translator Education,' in Kearns (ed.) (2008a), pp. 184–214.
- Keiser, W. (1978) 'Selection & Training of Conference Interpreters,' in Gerver & Sinaiko (eds.) (1978), pp.11-24.

- Kelley, T.L. (1927) *Interpretation of Educational Measurements*, New York: New World Book Company.
- Kelly, D. (2005) *A Handbook for Translator Trainers: A Guide to Reflective Practice, Translation Practices Explained*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Kelly, D. (2007) 'Translator Competence Contextualized. Translator Training in the Framework of Higher Education Reform: In Search of Alignment in Curricular Design,' in Kenny & Ryou (eds.) (2007), pp.128-142.
- Kelly, D. (2008) 'Training the Trainers: Towards a Description of Translator Trainer Competence & Training Needs Analysis,' *TTR* 21(1): 99-125.
- Kelly, D. (2010a) 'Curriculum,' in Gambier & Van Doorslaer (eds.) (2010), pp.87-93.
- Kelly, D. (2010b) 'Translation Didactics,' in Gambier & Van Doorslaer (eds.) (2010), pp.389-396.
- Kelly, D. & Martin, A. (2009) 'Training & Education,' in Baker & Saldanha (eds.) (2009), pp.294-300.
- Kemp, J., Livingstone, D. & Bloomfield, P. (2009) 'SL●●DLE: connecting VLE Tools with Emergent Teaching Practice in Second Life,' *British Journal of Educational Technology* 40(3):551-555.
- Kennedy, G. (1992) 'Preferred Ways of Putting Things with Implications for Language Teaching,' in Svartvik (ed.) (1992), pp.335-373.
- Kenny, D. (2007) 'Translation Memories and Parallel Corpora: Challenges for the Translation Trainer,' in Kenny & Ryou (eds.) (2007), pp.192-208.
- Kenny, D. (2009) 'Corpora,' in Baker & Saldanha (eds.) (2009), pp.59-62.
- Kenny, D. (2011) 'Electronic Tools & Resources for Translators,' in Malmkjær & Windle (eds.) (2011).
- Kenny, D. (2017a) *Human Issues in Translation Technology*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Kenny, D. (2017b) 'Introduction,' in Kenny (ed.) (2017a), pp.1-7.
- Kenny, D. & Doherty, S. (2014) 'Statistical Machine Translation in the Translation Curriculum: ●vercoming ●bstacles & Empowering Translators,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 8(2):276-294. DOI: 10.1080/1750399X.2014.936112.
- Kent, S. J. (2009) 'A Discourse of Danger & Loss: Interpreters on Interpreting for the European Parliament,' in Hale et al. (eds.) (2009), pp.55-70.
- Kerkkä, K. (2009) 'Experiment in the Application of Problem-Based Learning to a Translation Course,' *Vakki:n julkaisut* 36:216-227. http://www.vakki.net/publications/2009/VAKKI2009_Kerkka.pdf.

- Kerremans, K. & Temmerman, R. (2016) 'How Terminological Equivalence Differs from Translation Equivalence: Quantitative & Qualitative Comparisons of Term Variants & Their Translations in A Parallel Corpus of EU Texts,' in Corpas Pastor & Seghiri (eds.) (2016), pp.43-63.
- Ketterer, J. J. (2008) 'Zone of Proximal Development,' in Salkind (ed.) (2008), pp.1017-1022.
- Khammohammad, H. & Sanloo, M. (2009) 'Moving toward Objective Scoring: A Rubric for Translation Assessment,' *Journal of English Language Studies* 1(1):131-153.
- Khosravani, Y. & Bastian, S. (2017) 'Translation Quality Assessment: Guidelines for the Evaluation of Persian Subtitles Regarding the Omission of Interpersonal Elements of Language,' in Zybatow et al. (eds.) (2017a), pp.235-243.
- Kilpatrick, B. R. & Andrews, J. (2009) 'Accessibility to Theater for Deaf & Deaf-Blind People: Legal, Language & Artistic considerations,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 1:77-94.
- Kim, C. (2001) *Sight Translation in Its own Right*, Master's thesis, California State University.
- Kim, D. (2017) 'Flipped Interpreting Classroom: Flipping Approaches, Student Perceptions, & Design Considerations,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 11(1):1-18.
- Kim, M. (2009) "Meaning-oriented Assessment of Translations: SFL & its Application to Formative Assessment,' in Angelelli & Jacobson (eds.) (2009), pp. 123–157.
- Kim, M. (2013) 'Research on Translator & Interpreter Education,' in Millán & Bartrina (eds.) (2013), pp.102-116.
- Kim, R. (2004) 'Process-Oriented Pedagogical Translation Evaluation,' *FORUM* 2(1): 47-70.
- Kingston, N. (2008) 'Norm-Referenced Tests,' in Salkind (ed.) (2008), pp.734-738.
- Kintsch, W. (1974) *The Representation of Meaning in Memory*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kiraly, D. (1995) *Pathways to Translation*, Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Kiraly, D. (2000) *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Kiraly, D. (2003a) 'From Instruction to Collaborative Construction: A Passing Fad or the Promise of a Paradigm Shift in Translator Education?' in Baer & Koby (eds.) (2003), pp.3-27.

- Kiraly, D. (2003b) 'From Teacher-Centered to Learning-Centered Classrooms in Translator Education: Control, Chaos or Collaboration?' in Pym (ed.) (2003), pp.27-31.
- Kiraly, D. (2005a) 'Situating Praxis in Translator Education,' in Károly & Fóris (eds.) (2005), pp.117-138.
- Kiraly, D. (2005b) 'Project-Based Learning: A Case for Situated Translation,' *Meta* 50(4):1098-1111.
- Kiraly, D. (2006) 'Beyond Social Constructivism: Complexity Theory & Translator Education,' *TIS* 1(1):68-86.
- Kiraly, D. (2012a) 'Growing a Project-Based Translation Pedagogy: A Fractal Perspective,' *Meta* 57(1):82-95.
- Kiraly, D. (2012b) 'Skopos Theory Goes to Paris: Purposeful Translation & Emergent Translation Projects,' *MTM* 4:119-144.
- Kiraly, D. (2013) 'Towards a View of Translator Competence as an Emergent Phenomenon: Thinking Outside the Box(es) in Translator Education,' in Kiraly et al. (eds.) (2013), pp.197-224.
- Kiraly, D. (2014) 'From Assumptions About Knowing & Learning to Praxis in Translator Education,' *inTRAlinea* special issue.
<http://www.intralinea.org/specials/article/2100>.
- Kiraly, D. (2015) 'Occasioning Translator Competence: Moving Beyond Social Constructivism toward a Postmodern Alternative to Instructionism,' *TIS* 10(1):8-32.
- Kiraly, D. (2016a) 'Authentic Project Work & Pedagogical Epistemologies: A Question of Competing or Complementary Worldviews?' in Kiraly et al. (ed.) (2016), pp.53-66.
- Kiraly, D. (2016b) 'Beyond the Static Competence Impasse in Translator Education,' in Thelen et al. (eds.) (2016), pp.129-142.
- Kiraly, D. et al. (ed.) (2016) *Towards Authentic Experiential Learning in Translator Education*, Mainz: Mainz University Press.
- Kiraly, D. & Hofmann, S. (2016) 'Towards a Postpositivist Curriculum Development Model for Translator Education,' in Kiraly et al. (ed.) (2016), pp.67-87.
- Kiraly, D. & Piotrowska, M. (2014) 'Towards an Emergent Curriculum Development Model for the European Graduate Placement Scheme,' in Pixel (ed.) (2014), pp.368-373.
- Kitchenham, A. (ed.) (2011) *Blended Learning across Disciplines: Models for Implementation*, New York: Information Science Reference.
- Kivilehto, M., & Salmi, L. (2017) 'Assessing Assessment: The Authorized Translator's Examination in Finland,' *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies* 16:57-70.

- Klaudy, K. (1996) 'Quality Assessment in School vs. Professional Translation,' in Dollerup & Appel (eds.) (1996), pp.197-204.
- Klaudy, K. (2009) 'Explicitation,' in Baker & Saldanha (eds.) (2009), pp.104-108.
- Klimkowski, K. (2015) *Towards a Shared Curriculum in Translator & Interpreter Education*, Wrocław/Washington: Wyższa Szkoła Filologiczna we Wrocławiu, Polska Akademia Nauk, Oddział we Wrocławiu & International Communicology Institute.
- Klimkowski, K. & Klimkowska, K. (2012) 'Towards Empowerment in Translator Education: Students' Opinions & Expectations of a Translation Training Course,' in Hubscher-Davidson & Borodo (eds.) (2012), pp.180-194.
- Knodel, R. K. (2018) 'Coping with Vicarious Trauma in Mental Health Interpreting,' *Journal of Interpretation* 26 (1).
<https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/joi/vol26/iss1/2> (Accessed June 30, 2018).
- Ko, L. (1996) 'Teaching Dialogue Interpreting,' in Dollerup & Appel (eds.) (1996), pp.119-127.
- Ko, L. (2006) 'Teaching Interpreting by Distance Mode: Possibilities & Constraints,' *Interpreting* 8(1):67-96.
- Ko, L. (2008) 'Teaching Interpreting by Distance Mode: An Empirical Study,' *Meta* 53(4): 814-840.
- Ko, L. (2015) 'E-learning,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.139-140.
- Ko, L. & Chen, N.S. (2011) 'Online-interpreting in Synchronous Cyber Classrooms,' *Babel* 57(2):123-143.
- Koby, G.S. & Baer, B.J. (2003) 'Task-based Instruction & the New Technology: Training Translators for the Modern Language Industry,' in Baer & Koby (eds.) (2003), pp.211-227.
- Koby, G. S. & Lacruz, I. (2017) 'The Thorny Problem of Translation & Interpreting Quality,' *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies* 16:1-12.
- Kockaert, H. J., & Segers, W. (2014) 'Evaluation de la Traduction: La Méthode PIE (Preselected Items Evaluation),' *Turjuman. Revue de Traduction et d'Interprétation / Journal of Translation Studies* 23(2): 232-250.
- Kockaert, H. J., Segers W. (2017) 'Evaluation of Legal Translations: PIE Method (Preselected Items Evaluation),' *JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialised Translation* 27:148-163.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984) *Experiential Learning*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

- Koller, M. & Pöchhacker, F. (2018) “‘The Work & Skills . . .’: A Profile of First-Generation Video Remote Interpreters,” in Napier et al. (eds.) (2018b).
- Korin, T. L. & Wilkerson, L. (2011) ‘Bringing Problems to Life Using Video, Compare/Contrast, & Role-play,’ in Barrett & Moore (eds.) (2011), pp.75-86.
- Koponen, M. (2015) ‘How to Teach Machine Translation Post-Editing? Experiences from a Post-Editing Course,’ in *Proceedings of the 4th workshop on post-editing technology & practice*, Miami, USA, 3 November, pp.2–15.
- Korpal, P. (2016) *Linguistic & Psychological Indicators of Stress in Simultaneous Interpreting*, Doctoral Thesis, UAM.
- Kościałkowska-końska, E. (2015) ‘Translation Teaching: How to Make it More Effective for our Students?’ in Pietrzak & Deckert (eds.) (2015), pp.49-62.
- Kovács, M. (2016) ‘New Courses in the Curriculum: Language Technology, Supervised Translation Project Work,’ in Horváth (ed.) (2016), pp.207-218.
- Krajcso, Z. (2011) ‘Fostering Social Competence in Translation Studies,’ *Babel* 57(3): 269–282. DOI: 10.1075/ babel. 57.3.02kra.
- Kramsch, C. (2008) ‘Ecological Perspectives on Foreign Language Education,’ *Language Teaching* 41(3):389-408.
- Kramsch, C. (2012) ‘Why Is Everybody so Excited About Complexity Theory in Applied Linguistics?’ *Mélanges CRAPEL* 33:9-24.
- Kreber, C., Klampfleiter, M., McCune, V., Bayne, S. & Knottenbelt, M. (2007) ‘What Do You Mean By “Authentic”? A Comparative Review of the Literature on Conceptions of Authenticity in Teaching,’ *Adult Education Quarterly* 58(22):22-43.
- Krings, H. P. (1986a) *Was in den Köpfen von Übersetzern vorgeht. Eine empirische Untersuchung zur Struktur des Übersetzungsprozesses an fortgeschrittenen Französischlernern*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Krings, H. P. (1986b) ‘Translation Problems & Translation Strategies of Advanced German Learners of French (L2),’ in Blum-Kulka & House (eds.) (1986), pp.263–276.
- Krouse, L. (2010) ‘Cooperative Learning Applied to Interpreting Education,’ *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 2:180-200.
- Krüger, R & Serrano Piqueras, J. (2015) ‘Situated Translation in the Translation Classroom,’ *Current Trends in Translation Teaching & Learning* E2:5–30.
- Krystallidou, D. (2017) ‘Non-verbals in Dialogue Interpreter Education: Improving Student Interpreters’ Visual Literacy & Raising Awareness

- of Its Impact on Interpreting Performance,' in Cirillo & Niemants (eds.) (2017), pp.259-273.
- Krystallidou, D. & Salaets, H. (2016) 'On Interprofessionality in Interpreter Training: A Few Thoughts & Two Stories,' *Dragoman* 4(6):6-22.
- Krystallidou, D., Theys, L., Salaets, H., Wermuth, C. & Pype, P. (2018a) 'Empathiccare4all: Development of Interprofessional Education (IPE) Curriculum for Interpreting-and Medical Students on Emphatic Communication,' Presentation in *1st Annual APTIS Conference: Challenges & Opportunities in Teaching Translation & Interpreting*, November 23-24, 2018, Aston University, Birmingham.
- Krystallidou, D., Van De Walle, C., Deveugele, M., Dougali, E., Mertens, F., Truwant, A., Van Praet, E. & Pype, P. (2018b) 'Report. Training "Doctor-Minded" Interpreters & "Interpreter-Minded" Doctors: The Benefits of Collaborative Practice in Interpreter Training,' *Interpreting* 20(1): 126–144. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.00005.kry>.
- Kubiszyn, T. & Borich, G. (2013) *Educational Testing & Measurement: Classroom Application & Practice*, 10th edn, Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley Publishing.
- Kübler, N. & Aston, G. (2010) 'Using Corpora in Translation,' in Keeffe & McCarthy (eds.) (2010), pp.501-515.
- Kučiš, V. & Seljan, S. (2014) 'The Role of Online Translation Tools in Language Education,' *Babel* 60(3):303–324. DOI: 10.1075/babel.60.3.03kuc.
- Kumpulainen, M. (2016) *Learning Translation. An Empirical Study into the Acquisition of Interlingual Text Production Skills*, Publications of the University of Eastern Finland. Dissertations in Education, Humanities, & Theology, No 91, Joensuu: University of Eastern Finland.
- Kumpulainen, M. (2018) 'Translation Competence from the Acquisition Point of View: A Situation-based Approach,' *Translation, Cognition & Behavior* 1(1):147–167. DOI: 10.1075/tcb.00007.kum.
- Kuncel, N. R. & Klieger, D. M. (2008) 'Aptitude,' in Salkind (ed.) (2008), pp.47-50.
- Kunz, K., Castagnoli, S. & Kübler, N. (2010) 'Corpora in Translator Training: A Program for an ELearning Course,' in Gile et al. (eds.) (2010), pp.195-207.
- Kurz, C. A. N., Kurz, K. B. & Harris, R. (2018) 'Effectively Interpreting Content Areas Utilizing Academic ASL Strategies,' in Holcomb & Smith (eds.) (2018), pp.253-268.
- Kurz, I. (1992) 'Shadowing Exercises in Interpreter Training,' in Dollerup & Loddegaard (eds.) (1992), pp. 245-250.

- Kurz, I. (1993) 'Conference Interpretation: Expectations of Different User Groups,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 5:13–21.
- Kurz, I. (2001) 'Conference Interpreting: Quality in the Ears of the User,' *Meta* 46(2):394–409.
- Kurz, I. (2002) 'Interpreting Training Programmes: The Benefits of Coordination, Cooperation, & Modern Technology,' in Hung (ed.) (2002), pp.65–72.
- Kussmaul, P. (1995) *Training the Translator*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kutz, W. (2010) *Dolmetschkompetenz: Was muss der Dolmetscher wissen und können?* Munich: Europäischer Universitätsverlag.
- Kwan, A. (2009) 'Problem-Based Learning,' in Tight et al. (eds.) (2009), pp.91-107.
- Lado, R. (1961) *Language Testing*, London: Longman.
- Laet, F. D. (2010) 'Mock Conferences: A Challenge for Trainer & Trainee,' in Pellatt et al. (eds.) (2010), pp.251-260.
- Lai, M. (2018) 'Chinese Public Service Interpreting,' in Shei & Gao (eds.) (2018), pp.336-354.
- Lai, M., Heydon, G. & Mulayim, S. (2015) 'Vicarious Trauma Among Interpreters,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 7(1):3-22.
- Lambert, J. (2013) 'Prelude: The Institutionalization of the Discipline,' in Millán & Bartrina (eds.) (2013), pp.7-27.
- Lambert, S. (1989) 'La Formation d'Interprètes: la méthode cognitive,' *Meta* 34 (4): 726-744.
- Lambert, S. (1991) 'Aptitude Testing for Simultaneous Interpretation at the University of Ottawa,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 4:25-32.
- Lambert, S. (1992a) 'Shadowing,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 4:15–24.
- Lambert, S. (1992b) 'Aptitude Testing for Simultaneous Interpretation at the University of Ottawa,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 4:25-32.
- Lamkin, M. L. & Saleh, A. (2010) 'Action Research,' in Kridel (ed.) (2010), pp.6-9.
- Lang, M. F. (1992) 'Common Ground in Teaching Translation & Interpreting: Discourse Analysis Techniques,' in Dollerup & Loddegaard (eds.) (1992), pp.205-208.
- Larcara, M. (2015) 'Benefits of the Flipped Classroom Model,' in Information Resources Management Association (eds.) (2015), pp.93-105.
- Larkin, M. J. (2008a) 'Rubrics,' in Salkind (ed.) (2008), pp.859-861.
- Larkin, M. J. (2008b) 'Scaffolding,' in Salkind (ed.) (2008), pp.863-864.

- La Rocca, M. (2007) *El taller de Traducción: una metodología didáctica integradora para la enseñanza universitaria de la traducción*, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Universitat de Vic.
- Larose, R. (1998) 'Méthodologie de L'évaluation des Traductions,' *Meta* 43:163–86.
- Laur, D. (2013) *Authentic Learning Experiences: A Real-World Approach to Project-Based Learning*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Lauscher, S. (2000) 'Translation Quality Assessment: Where Can Theory & Practice Meet?' *The Translator* 6(2):149–68.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Laviosa, S. (2010) 'Corpora,' in Gambier & Van Doorslaer (eds.) (2010), pp.80-86.
- Laviosa, S. (2016) 'Corpus-Based Translanguaging for Translation Education,' in Corpas Pastor & Seghiri (eds.) (2016), pp.151-171.
- Lederer, M. (1996) 'La Place de la Théorie dans l'Enseignement de la Traduction et de l'Interprétation,' in Israel (ed.) (1996), pp. 17-31.
- Lederer, M. (2010) 'Interpretive Approach,' in Gambier & Van Doorslaer (eds.) (2010), pp.173-179.
- Lederer, M. (2015a) 'Transcoding,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.420-421.
- Lederer, M. (2015b) 'Paris School,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.295-297.
- Lee, H. (2006) 'Translator Training: Beyond the Dichotomy of Theory vs. Practice,' *FORUM* 4(2):41-51.
- Lee, J. (2008) 'Rating Scales for Interpreting Performance Assessment,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 2(2):165-84. DOI: 10.1080/1750399X.2008.10798772.
- Lee, J. (2009) 'Toward More Reliable Assessment of Interpreting Performance,' in Hale et al. (eds.) (2009), pp.171-185.
- Lee, J. (2018) 'Feedback on Feedback: Guiding Student Interpreter Performance,' *Translation & Interpreting* 10(1):152-170. DOI:10.12807/ti.110201.2018.a09.
- Lee, J. & Choi, M. (2015) 'Recommendations for Interpreter Training for Asylum Interview Settings: the South Korean case,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 7(2):39-54.
- Lee, L. F., Sidhu, G. K., Chan, Y. F., Geethanjali, N. & Teoh, S. H. (2016) 'Assessing Writing Readiness for Academic Purposes Among Students in Higher Education,' in Tang & Logonathan (eds.) (2016), pp.327-338.

- Lee, S-B. (2015) 'Developing an Analytic Scale for Assessing Undergraduate Students' Consecutive Interpreting Performances,' *Interpreting* 17(2): 226–254. DOI: 10.1075/intp.17.2.04lee.
- Lee, S-B. (2016a) 'University Students' Experience of 'Scale-Referenced' Peer Assessment for a Consecutive Interpreting Examination,' *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. DOI:10.1080/02602938.2016.1223269.
- Lee, Y. (2016b) 'Comparing Self-Assessment & Teacher's Assessment in Interpreter Training'. http://cms.ewha.ac.kr/user/erits/download/review_1/04_Yunhyang%20Lee.pdf.
- Lee, Z-Y. (2015) *The Reflection & Self-Assessment of Student Interpreters through Logbooks: A Case Study*, Doctoral Thesis, Heriot-Watt University.
- Leeson, L. (2009) 'Signed Language Interpreting,' in Baker & Saldanha (eds.) (2009), pp.274-279.
- Leighton, J. P. (2008) 'Validity,' in Salkind (ed.) (2008), pp.995-1000.
- Lenglet, C. (2015) 'Norms in Face-Threatening Instances of Simultaneous Conference Interpreting: Results from a Questionnaire,' *MonTI* special issue 2:237-257.
- Lesznyák, M. (2007) 'Conceptualizing Translation Competence,' *Across Languages & Cultures* 8(2):167–194.
- Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (2016) 'Principle of Cluster Equivalence & Parallel Corpora,' in Thelen et al. (eds.) (2016), pp.229-244.
- Lewin, K. (1946/1948) 'Action Research & Minority Problems,' in Lewin (ed.) (1946/1948), pp.201–216.
- Lewkowicz, J. (2000) 'Authenticity in Language Testing: Some Outstanding Questions,' *Language Testing* 17(1):43–64.
- Li, D. (2000) 'Needs Assessment in Translation Teaching: Making Translator Training More Responsive to Social Needs,' *Babel* 46(4): 289-299.
- Li, D. (2002) 'Translator Training: What Translation Students Have to Say,' *Meta* 47(4):513–531.
- Li, D. (2007) 'Translation Curriculum & Pedagogy: Views of Administrators of Translation Services,' *Target* 19(1):105-133.
- Li, D. (2012) *Curriculum Design, Needs Assessment & Translation Pedagogy, with Special Reference to Translation Training in Hong Kong*, Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Li, D. (2017) 'Translator Style: A Corpus-Assisted Approach,' in Ji et al. (eds.) (2017), pp.103-136.

- Li, D., Zhang, Z. & He, Y. (2015) 'Project-based Learning in Teaching Translation: Students' Perceptions,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 9(1):1-19. DOI: 10.1080/1750399X.2015.1010357.
- Li, H. (2006) Cultivating Translator Competence: Teaching & Testing, *Translation Journal* 10(3).
- Li, X. (2013) 'Are Interpreting Strategies Teachable? Correlating Trainees' Strategy Use with Trainers' Training in the Consecutive Interpreting Classroom,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 18:105-128.
- Li, X. (2015a) 'Mock Conference as a Situated Learning Activity in Interpreter Training: A Case study of Its Design & Effect as Perceived by Trainee Interpreters,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 9(3): 323-241. DOI: 10.1080/1750399X.2015.1100399.
- Li, X. (2015b) 'Putting Interpreting Strategies in Their Place: Justifications for Teaching Strategies in Interpreter Training,' *Babel* 61(2):170-192. DOI: 10.1075/babel.61.2.02li.
- Li, X. (2018) 'Self-assessment as 'Assessment as Learning' in Translator & Interpreter Education: Validity & Washback,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer*. DOI: 10.1080/1750399X.2017.1418581.
- Lightfoot, S. L. (1986) 'On Goodness of Schools: Themes of Empowerment,' *Peabody J Educ* 63(1):9-28.
- Lim, L. (2013) 'Examining Students' Perceptions of Computer-Assisted Interpreter Training,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 7(1):71-89. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2013.10798844>.
- Lindquist, P. P. (2002) 'Reducing the Impact of Preconceptions in Interpreter Training through Corpus-Based Studies,' *The ATA Chronicle* 31(11):35-40.
- Liontou, K. (2012) *Anticipation in German to Greek Simultaneous Interpreting: A Corpus-Based Approach*, Doctoral Thesis, University of Vienna.
- Liontou, K. (2013) 'Anticipation in German-to-Greek Simultaneous Interpreting: Does (Erroneous) Anticipation Influence Interpreting Quality?' in García Becerra et al. (eds.) (2013), pp. 221-244.
- Liontou, K. (2015) 'Anticipation,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.15-17.
- Lisaitè, D., Vandepitte, S., Maylath, B., Mousten, B., Valdez, S., Castel-Branco, M. & Minacori, P. (2016) 'Negotiating Meaning at a Distance: Peer Feedback in Electronic Learning Translation Environments,' in Thelen et al. (eds.) (2016), pp.99-113.
- Lise Laursen, A. & Arinas Pellón, I. (2012) 'Text Corpora in Translator Training,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 6(1):45-70. DOI:10.1080/13556509.2012.10798829.

- Little, D. (1997) 'Language Awareness & the Autonomous Language Learner,' *Language Awareness* 6(2-3):93-104.
- Little, D., Ridley, J. & Ushioda, E. (2002) *Towards Greater Learner Autonomy in the Foreign Language Classroom*, Dublin: Authentik.
- Liu, H. (2018) 'Help or Hinder? The Impact of Technology on the Role of Interpreters,' *FITISPos International Journal* 5(1):13-32.
- Liu, J. (2014) 'Reconsidering Interpreter Training Models in Light of Divergent Contexts,' *FORUM* 12(1):41-77.
- Liu, M. (2001) *Expertise in Simultaneous Interpreting: A Working Memory Analysis*, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Texas at Austin.
- Liu, M. (2015a) 'Assessment,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.20-22.
- Liu, M. (2015b) 'Certification,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.45-46.
- Liu, M. (2015c) 'Experimental Research,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.150-152.
- Liu, M. & Chiu, Y-H. (2011) 'Assessing Source Material Difficulty for Consecutive Interpreting: Quantifiable Measures & Holistic Judgment,' in Setton (ed.) (2011), pp.135-156.
- Liu, X. & Hale, S. (2017) 'Facework Strategies in Interpreter-mediated Cross-examinations: A Corpus-assisted Approach,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 22:57-77.
- Lommel, A. (2013) 'Alternatives to Certification,' *Translation & Interpreting* 5(1):222-234. DOI: ti.105201.2013.r02.
- Longley, P. (1978) 'An Integrated Programme for Training Interpreters,' in Gerver & Sinaiko (eds.) (1978), pp.45-56.
- Lörscher, W. (1986) 'Linguistic Aspects of Translation Processes: Towards an Analysis of Translation Performance,' in House & Blum-Kulka (eds.) (1986), pp.277-92.
- Lörscher, W. (1991) 'Thinking-Aloud as a Method for Collecting Data on Translation Processes,' in Tirkkonen-Condit (ed.) (1991), pp. 67-77.
- Lörscher, W. (2005) 'The Translation Process: Methods & Problems of Its Investigation,' in *Meta* 50(2):597-608.
- Lu, X. (2014) *Computational Methods for Corpus Annotation & Analysis*, Heidelberg and New York: Springer.
- Luccarelli, L. (2000) 'AIIC Thinks Training: Interview with Birgit Strolz,' aiic.net. February 15, 2000 (Accessed August 9, 2018) <<https://aiic.net/p/81>>.
- Luccarelli, L. (2013) 'Tips on Helping Interpreters Prepare for Your Meeting' <https://aiic.net/page/6533/tips-on-helping-interpreters-prepare-for-your-meeting/lang/l> (Accessed January 26 2018).
- Lung, R. (2015) 'China,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.49-54.

- Luoma, S. (2013) 'Self-Assessment,' in Chappelle (ed.) (2013), pp. 5169–5174.
- Lydia Ding, Y. (2017) 'Using Propositional Analysis to Assess Interpreting Quality,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 9(1):17-39.
- Lynch, A.J. (1982) 'Authenticity' in Language Teaching: Some Implications for the Design of Listening Materials,' *British Journal of Language Teaching* 20:9–16.
- MacCorquodale, K. & Meehl, P.E. (1948) 'On a Distinction between Hypothetical Constructs & Intervening Variables,' *Psychological Review* 55:97–105. DOI: 10.1037/h0056029.
- MacDonald, J. L. (2015) 'Vicarious Trauma as Applied to the Professional Sign Language Interpreter,' *Montview Liberty University Journal of Undergraduate Research* 1(1):1-15.
- Macdonald, R.F., & Savin-Baden, M. (2004) 'A Briefing on Assessment in Problem-Based Learning,' *LTSN Generic Centre Assessment Series*. http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/York/documents/resources/resourcedatabase/id349_A_Briefing_on_Assessment_in_Problembased_Learning.pdf.
- Mackenzie, R. (1998) 'Creative Problem-solving & Translator Training,' in Beylard-zeroff et al. (eds.) (1998), pp.201-206.
- Mackintosh, J. (1995) 'A Review of Conference Interpretation: Practice & Training,' *Target* 7(1):119–133. DOI: 10.1075/target.7.1.10mac.
- Mackintosh, J. (1999) 'Interpreters Are Made Not Born,' *Interpreting* 4(1): 67-80.
- Macnamara, B. (2008) 'Interpreter Cognitive Aptitudes,' in Roberson & Shaw (eds.) (2008), pp.33-49.
- Macnamara, B., Moore, A. B., Kegl, J. A. & Conway, A. R. A. (2011) 'Domain-General Cognitive Abilities & Simultaneous Interpreting Skill,' *Interpreting* 13(1):121–142.
- Mafela, M. J. (2016) 'Marking Plural Forms in Tshivenda & the Study of Translation & Mass Nouns,' in Thelen et al. (eds.) (2016), pp.245-254.
- Magaia, A. A. (2016) 'Assessing Translation Competence at Eduardo Mondlane University,' in Thelen et al. (eds.) (2016), pp.55-68.
- Magnifico, C. & Defrancq, B. (2017) 'Hedges in Conference Interpreting: The Role of Gender,' *Interpreting* 19(1):21–46. DOI: 10.1075/intp.19.1.02mag.
- Mahmoodzadeh, K. (1992) 'Consecutive Interpreting: Its Principles & Techniques,' in Dollerup & Loddegaard (eds.) (1992), pp.231-236.
- Mahn, G. (2008) 'Standards & Evaluation in Translator Training,' in Krawutschke (ed.) (2008), pp.100-108.

- Major, G., Napier, J. & Stubbe, M. (2012) “‘What Happens Truly, Not Textbook!’: Using Authentic Interactions in Discourse Training for Healthcare Interpreters,” in Swabey & Malcolm (eds.) (2012a), pp.27-53.
- Marais, K. (2013) ‘Constructive Alignment in Translator Education: Reconsidering Assessment for Both Industry & Academy,’ *Translation & Interpreting* 5(1):13-31. DOI: ti.105201.2013.a01.
- Marais, K. (2014) *Translation Theory & Development Studies: A Complexity Theory Approach*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Marco, J. (2009) ‘Training Translation Researchers: An Approach Based on Models & Best Practice,’ special issue of *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 3 (1).
- Marco, J. & Van Lawick, H. (2009) ‘Using Corpora & Retrieval Software as a Source of Materials for the Translation Classroom,’ in Beeby et al. (eds.) (2009a), pp.9-28.
- Marks, A. (2018) “‘Hold the Phone’’: Turn Management Strategies & Techniques in Video Relay Service Interpreted Interaction,’ *TIS* 13(1):87-109. DOI:10.1075/tis.00006.mar.
- Maroney, E. M. (ed.) (2004) *CIT: Still Shining After Twenty-Five Years: Proceedings of the Fifteenth National Conference*, Washington, DC: Conference of Interpreter Trainers.
- Marschark, M., Peterson, R. & Winston, E. A. (eds.) (2005) *Sign Language Interpreting & Interpreter Education: Directions for Research & Practice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Marsh, C.J. (2009) *Key Concepts for Understanding Curriculum*, 4th edn, London/New York: Routledge.
- Marsh, G., Mcfadden, A. & Price, B. (2003) ‘Blended Instruction: Adapting Conventional Instruction for Large Classes,’ *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration IV*, [Available at: <http://www.westga.edu/distance/ojdla/winter64/marsh64.htm>]
- Martellini, S. (2013) ‘Prosody in Simultaneous Interpretation: a Case Study for the German-Italian Language Pair,’ *The Interpreters’ Newsletter* 18:61-79.
- Martínez-Gómez, A. (2015) ‘Prison Settings,’ in Pöschhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.320-321.
- Martínez Melis, N. & Hurtado Albir, A. (2001) ‘Assessment in Translation Studies: Research Needs,’ *Meta* 46 (2): 272-287.
- Marzocchi, C. (2003) ‘Summary of Discussion on Interpreting,’ in Pym (ed.) (2003), pp.41-44.
- Mason, I. (2000) ‘Models & Methods in Dialogue Interpreting Research,’ in Olohan (ed.) (2000), pp. 215–232.

- Mason, I. (2009) 'Research Training in Translation Studies,' special issue of *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 3 (1).
- Mason, M. (2008a) 'Complexity Theory and the Philosophy of Education,' in Mason (ed.) (2008c), pp.1-15.
- Mason, M. (2008b) 'What Is Complexity Theory and What Are Its Implications for Educational Change?' in Mason (ed.) (2008c), pp.32-45.
- Mason, M. (ed.) (2008c) *Complexity Theory & the Philosophy of Education*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mason, R. & Rennie, F. (2008) *E-Learning & Social Networking Handbook: Resources for Higher Education*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Massey, G. (2017) 'Translation Competence Development & Process-oriented Pedagogy,' in Schwieter & Ferreira (eds.) (2017), pp.496-518.
- Massey, G. & Ehrensberger-Dow, M. (2011) 'Commenting on Translation: Implications for Translator Training,' *JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialised Translation* 16:26-41.
- Massey, G. & Wieder, R. (2019) 'Quality Assurance in Translation & Corporate Communications: Exploring an Interdisciplinary Interface,' in Huertas-Barros et al. (eds.) (2019a), pp.57-87.
- Mastropierro, L. (2018) 'Key Clusters as Indicators of Translator Style,' *Target* 30(2):240-259. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.17040.mas>.
- Matsumoto, R. (1987) 'Diary Studies of Second Language Acquisition: A Critical Overview,' *JALT Journal* 9(1):17-34.
- McAlester, G. (2000) 'The Evaluation of Translation into a Foreign Language,' in Schäffner & Adab (eds.) (2000), pp.229-241.
- McAlester, G. (2003) 'A Comment on Translation Ethics & Education,' in Anderman & Rogers (eds.) (2003), pp. 225-227.
- McCarthy, M. & O'Keeffe, A. (2010) 'Historical Perspective: What Are Corpora & How Have They Evolved?' in McCarthy & O'Keeffe (eds.) (2010), pp. 3-13.
- McClelland, D. C. (1973) 'Testing for Competence rather than for Intelligence,' *American Psychologist* 28:1-14.
- McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A., & Lowell, E. L. (1953) *The Achievement Motive*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- McDermid, C. (2009) 'The Ontological Beliefs & Curriculum Design of Canadian Interpreter & ASL Educators,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 1:7-32.
- McDermid, C. (2012) *Adult Second Language Pragmatic Enrichment: The Case of ASL*, Doctoral Thesis, York University.
- McDermid, C. (2015) 'A Pragmatic, Multidimensional Model of the Interpreting Process,' in Nicodemus & Cagle (eds.) (2015), pp.97-129.

- Mckay, S. (2013) 'Authenticity in the Language Teaching Curriculum,' in Chapelle (ed.) (2013), pp.299-302.
- McLeod, P. (1977) 'A Dual-Task Response Modality Effect: Support for Multiprocessor Models of Attention,' *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 29:651-667.
- McLoughlin, C. (2002) 'Learner Support in Distance and Networked Learning Environments: Ten Dimensions for Successful Design,' *Distance Education* 23(2):149-162.
- Mead, P. (2000) 'Control of Pauses by Trainee Interpreters in their A & B Languages,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 10:89-102.
- Mead, P. (2015) 'Repairs,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.348-349.
- Mead, P. (2017) 'Ideas for Use of Notes and Other Visual Prompts in Dialogue Interpreting Classes,' in Cirillo & Niemants (eds.) (2017), pp. 101-115.
- Mees, I. M., Alves, F. & Göpferich, S. (eds.) (2010) *Methodology, Technology & Innovation in Translation Process Research*, Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur.
- Melby, A. K. (2013) 'Introduction,' *Translation & Interpreting* 5(1):1-12. DOI: ti.105201.2013.r01.
- Mellinger, C. (2018a) 'Re-Thinking Translation Quality: Revision in the Digital Age,' *Target*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.16104.mel>.
- Mellinger, C. (2018b) 'Problem-Based Learning in Computer-assisted Translation Pedagogy,' *Hermes—Journal of Language & Communication in Business* 57:195-208.
- Mellinger, C. & Hanson, T. (2017) *Quantitative Research Methods in Translation & Interpreting Studies*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Mental health interpreting Guidelines for Interpreters: Guidelines on Definitions, Protocols, Ethics, Practices, Self-care & Content Knowledge for Interpreters Working in Mental health Settings*, prepared by Jim Hlavac, Monash University.
- Mercer, S. (2011) *Towards an Understanding of Language Learner Self-Concept*, Dordrecht/Heidelberg: Springer.
- Merlini, R. (2017) 'Developing Flexibility to Meet the Challenges of Interpreting in Film festivals,' in Cirillo & Niemants (eds.) (2017), pp. 137-157.
- Metzger, M. (2000) 'Interactive Role-Plays as a Teaching Strategy,' in Roy (ed.) (2000b), pp.83-108.
- Meyer, B. (2002) 'Medical Interpreting: Some Salient Features,' in Garzone & Viezzi (eds.) (2002a), pp.159-169.
- Mezirow, J. (1991) *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Mikhailov, M. & Cooper, R. (2016) *Corpus Linguistics for Translation & Contrastive Studies*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Mikkelsen, H. (1996) 'Community Interpreting: An Emerging Profession,' *Interpreting* 1 (1): 125-129. DOI: 10.1075/intp.1.1.08mik.
- Mikkelsen, H. (1999) 'The Professionalization of Community Interpreting,' *Journal of Interpretation* 1999:119-133.
- Mikkelsen, H. (2004) 'The Professionalization of Community Interpreting,' aiic.net. October 25, 2004 (Accessed August 9, 2018) <<https://aiic.net/p/1546>>.
- Mikkelsen, H. (2013) 'Universities & Interpreter Certification,' *Translation & Interpreting* 5(1):66-78. DOI: 10.12807/ti.105201.2013.a03.
- Miller, M. D. (2008) 'Reliability,' in Salkind (ed.) (2008), pp.846-852.
- Miller, M. D., Linn, R. L. & Gronlund, N. E. (2009) *Measurement & Assessment in Teaching*, 10th edn, New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Miner, A. J. (2016) 'Collaboration in Learning: Situating Student Learning in Real World Contexts,' *Paper presented to 2016 Biennial Conference-Out of the Gate, Towards the Triple Crown: Research, Learn, & Collaborate.* <http://www.cit-asl.org/new/collaboration-in-learning-situating-student-learning-in-real-world-contexts/> (Accessed April 2, 2018).
- Miner, A. J. (2018) *The Use & Effectiveness of Situated Learning in American Sign Language-English Interpreter Education*, Doctoral Thesis, Gallaudet University.
- Miner, A. J., Pattenaude, A., Donovan, L., Nelson, A., Edwards, T., Behunin, C., vonPingel, T., Nelson, H., Bishara, S. & Ball, C. (2016) 'Mock Interpreting in the Classroom,' *Paper presented to 2016 Biennial Conference-Out of the Gate, Towards the Triple Crown: Research, Learn, & Collaborate.* <http://www.cit-asl.org/new/mock-interpreting-in-the-classroom/> (Accessed April 2, 2018).
- Mitchell-Schuitevoerder, R. E. H. (2011) 'Translation & Technology in a Project Based Learning Environment,' *Session 3 – Training translators / La formation du traducteur.* <http://odel.irevues.inist.fr/tralogy/index.php?id=173>.
- Mitchell-Schuitevoerder, R. (2013) 'A Project-based Methodology in Translator Training,' in Way et al. (eds.) (2013), pp.127-142.
- Mitchell-Schuitevoerder, R. (2014) *A Project-Based Syllabus Design Innovative Pedagogy in Translation Studies*, Durham Theses, Durham University, available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/10830/>

- Mo, A. (2013) 'Designing the Master Programme in Business Translation: An Exploratory Study,' (in Chinese), *Chinese Translators Journal* 34(3): 39-43.
- Moeketsi, R. & Wallmach, K. (2005) 'From Sphaza to Makoya!: A BA Degree for Court Interpreters in South Africa,' *Journal for Speech, Language and the Law: Forensic Linguistics* 12:77-108.
- Monacelli, C. (2009) *Self-Preservation in Simultaneous Interpreting: Surviving the Role*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Monikowski, C., & Peterson, R. (2005) 'Service Learning in Interpreting Education: Living & Learning,' in Marschark et al. (eds.) (2005), pp.188-207.
- Monikowski, C. (2017) *Conversations with Interpreter Educators: Exploring Best Practices*, Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.
- Monti, C., Bendazzoli, C., Sandrelli, A. & Russo, M. (2005) 'Studying Directionality in Simultaneous Interpreting through an Electronic Corpus,' *Meta* 50(4):1079-1147. <http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2005/v50/n4/019850ar.pdf>. DOI: 10.7202/019850ar.
- Moon, J. A. (2004) *A Handbook of Reflective & Experiential Learning: Theory & Practice*, London/New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Moorkens, J., Castilho, S., Gaspari, F. & Doherty, S. (eds.) (2018a) *Translation Quality Assessment: From Principles to Practice*, Berlin: Springer.
- Moorkens, J., Castilho, S., Gaspari, F. & Doherty, S. (2018b) 'Introduction,' in Moorkens et al. (eds.) (2018a), pp.1-6.
- Morales, R. (2008) *Empowering Your Pupils through Role-play: Exploring Emotions & Building Resilience*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Moreland, C. & Agan, T. (2012) 'Educating Interpreters as Medical Specialists with Deaf Health Professionals,' in Swabey & Malcolm (eds.) (2012a), pp.147-163.
- Morelli, M. (2017) 'Interpreting & Mediation: Raising Awareness by Training,' in Cirillo & Niemants (eds.) (2017), pp.83-99.
- Moreno, J. L. (1946) 'Psychodrama & Group Psychotherapy,' *Sociometry* 9(2/3):249-253.
- Moreno, M. R., Otero-Sabogal, R. & Soto, C. (2011) 'Using Web-Based Training to Improve Skills Among Bilingual Dual-Role Staff Interpreters,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 3:28-48.
- Morgan, P. & Adam, R. (2012) 'Deaf Interpreters in Mental Health Settings: Some Reflections on & Thoughts about Deaf Interpreter Education,' in Swabey & Malcolm (eds.) (2012a), pp.190-208.

- Morgan-Fleming, B. & Phillips, N. (2010) 'Open Classroom & Open Education,' in Kridel (ed.) (2010), pp.622-623.
- Móricz, K. A. (2018) 'The Usage of ICT Tools as CAI Tools in Interpreting,' in Horváth (ed.) (2018), pp.33-51.
- Morin, E. (2005) *Introduction à la Pensée Complexe*, Paris: Seuil.
- Morin, K. H., Barbin, F., Moreau, F., Toudic, D. & Phuez-Favris, G. (2017) 'Translation Technology & Learner Performance: Professionally-oriented Translation Quality Assessment with Three Translation Technologies,' in Jakobsen & Mesa-Lao (eds.) (2017), pp.207-233.
- Morris, R. (2000) 'Plus Ca Change...? Community Interpreters at the End of the Twentieth Century,' in Roberts et al. (eds.) (2000), pp.243-264.
- Morrison, K. (2008) 'Educational Philosophy & the Challenge of Complexity Theory,' in Mason (ed.) (2008), pp.16-31.
- Morselli, N. (2018) 'Interpreting Universals: A Study of Explicitness in the Intermodal EPTIC Corpus,' *inTR4Linea* special issue. <http://www.intralinea.org/archive/article/2320> (Accessed July 11, 2018).
- Moser, P. (1996) 'Expectations of Users of Conference Interpretation,' *Interpreting* 1 (2):145-178.
- Moser, B. (1978) 'Simultaneous Interpretation: A Hypothetical Model,' in Gerver & Sinaiko (eds.) (1978), pp.353-368.
- Moser-Mercer, B. (1984) 'Testing Interpreting Aptitude,' in Wilss & Thome (eds.) (1984), pp. 318-325.
- Moser-Mercer, B. (1985) 'Screening Potential Interpreters,' *Meta* 30(1): 97-100.
- Moser-Mercer, B. (1994) 'Aptitude Testing for Conference Interpreting: Why, When & How,' in Lambert & Moser-Mercer (eds.) (1994), pp.57-69.
- Moser-Mercer, B. (1997a) 'Methodological Issues in Interpreting Research: An Introduction to the Ascona Workshops,' *Interpreting* 2(1/2):1-11.
- Moser-Mercer, B. (1997b) 'The Expert-Novice Paradigm in interpreting Research,' in Fleischmann et al. (eds.) (1997), pp.255-261.
- Moser-Mercer, B. (2005a) 'Challenges to Interpreter Training,' in Mayer (ed.) (2005), pp.61-72.
- Moser-Mercer, B. (2005b) 'The Teaching of Simultaneous Interpreting: The First 60 Years (1929-1989),' *FORUM* 3(1):205-226.
- Moser-Mercer, B. (2008) 'Skill Acquisition in Interpreting: A Human Performance Perspective,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 2(1): 1-28.

- Moser-Mercer, B. (2010) 'The Search for Neuro-Physiological Correlates of Expertise in Interpreting,' in Shreve & Angelone (eds.) (2010), pp.263-287.
- Moser-Mercer, B. (2011) 'Remote Interpreting,' in Gambier & Van Doorslaer (eds.) (2011), pp.131-134.
- Moser-Mercer, B. (2015a) 'Pedagogy,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.303-307.
- Moser-Mercer, B. (2015b) 'Expert-Novice Paradigm,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.155.
- Moser-Mercer, B., Class, B. & Seeber, K. (2005) 'Leveraging Virtual Learning Environments for Training Interpreter Trainers,' *Meta* 50(4). www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2005/v50/n4/019872ar.pdf (Accessed October 30, 2017).
- Moser-Mercer, B., Frauenfelder, U., Casado, B., & Künzli, A. (2000) 'Searching to Define Expertise in Interpreting,' in Englund Dimitrova & Hyltenstam (eds.) (2000), pp.107-32.
- Moss, P. (1994) 'Can There Be Validity without Reliability?' *Educational Researcher* 23(2):5-12.
- Motta, M. (2011) 'Facilitating the Novice to Expert Transition in Interpreter Training: A 'Deliberate Practice' Framework Proposal,' *Studia UBB Philologia* 1: 27-42.
- Motta, M. (2016) 'A Blended Learning Environment Based on the Principles of Deliberate Practice for the Acquisition of Interpreting Skills,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 10(1):133-149.
- Mousavi, S. A. (2012) *An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language Testing*, 5th edn, Tehran: Rahnama Press.
- Mouzourakis, P. (1996) 'Videoconferencing: Techniques & Challenges,' *Interpreting* 1(1):21-38.
- Mulayim, S. (2012) 'A Study of Interpreting Accreditation Testing Formats in Australia,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 4(2):39-51.
- Munby, J. (1978) *Communicative Syllabus Design*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Munday, J. (2016) *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories & Applications*, 4th edn, London/New York: Routledge.
- Muñoz Martín, R. (2010) 'On Paradigms & Cognitive Translatology,' in Shreve & Angelone (eds.) (2010), pp.169-187. DOI: [org/10.1075/ata.xv.10mun](https://doi.org/10.1075/ata.xv.10mun).
- Muñoz Martín, R. (2014) 'Situating Translation Expertise: A Review with a Sketch of a Construct,' in Schwieter & Ferreira (eds.) (2014), pp.2-56.

- Muñoz-Miquel, A. (2018) 'Assessing How Closely Postgraduate Translation Programmes Fit the Reality of Professional Practice: A Case Study of the Spanish Context,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 12(1). DOI: 10.1080/1750399X.2017.1418582.
- Munyangeyo, T., Webb, G. & Rabadán-Gómez, M. (eds.) (2016) *Challenges & Opportunities in Public Service Interpreting*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Napier, J. (2004) 'Exploring Signed Language Discourse with Interpreting Students: Promoting an Effective Pedagogical Approach,' in Maroney (ed.) (2004), pp.43-53.
- Napier, J. (2005a) 'Linguistic Features & Strategies of Interpreting: From Research to Education to Practice,' in Marschark et al. (eds.) (2005), pp.84-111.
- Napier, J. (2005b) 'Training Sign Language Interpreters in Australia,' *Babel* 51(3):207-223.
- Napier, J. (2006) 'Educating Signed Language Interpreters in Australia: A Blended Approach,' in Roy (ed.) (2006), pp.67-97.
- Napier, J. (2012) 'Editorial: Putting Interpreter Educators to the TEST: Testing, Ethics, & Technology,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 4(1):1-4.
- Napier, J. (2013a) 'Editorial: Evidence-Based Pedagogy,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 5(2):1-3.
- Napier, J. (2013b) 'Editorial: Intersecting Interpreting Modalities,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 5(1):1-2.
- Napier, J. (2016) *Linguistic Coping Strategies in Sign Language Interpreting*, Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.
- Napier, J. (2017) 'Not Just Child's Play: Exploring Bilingualism & Language Brokering as a Precursor to the Development of Expertise as a Professional Sign Language Interpreter,' in Antonini et al. (eds.) (2017), pp.381-409.
- Napier, J. & Goswell, D. (2013) 'Signed Language Interpreting Profession,' in Chappelle (ed.) (2013), pp.5204-5210.
- Napier, J. & Leeson, L. (2015) 'Signed Language Interpreting,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.376-381.
- Napier, J., Lloyd, K., Skinner, R., Turner, G. & Wheatley, M. (2018a) 'Using Video Technology to Engage Deaf Sign Language Users in Survey Research: An Example from the Insign Project,' *Translation & Interpreting* 10(2):101-121. DOI:10.12807/ti.110202.2018.a08.
- Napier, J., Skinner, R. & Braun, S. (eds.) (2018b) *Here or There: Research on Interpreting via Video Link*, Washington: Gallaudet University Press.

- Napier, J. Song, Z. & Ye, S. (2013) 'Innovative & Collaborative Use of iPads in Interpreter Education,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 5(2):13-42.
- Nasir, N.S., Rosebery, A.S., Warren, B., & Lee, C.D. (2014) 'Learning as a Cultural Process: Achieving Equity through Diversity,' in Sawyer (ed.) (2014), pp.686-706.
- Nation, I.S.P. & Macalister, J. (2010) *Language Curriculum Design*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Neubert, A. (1994) 'Competence in Translation: A Complex Skill, How to Study & How to Teach it,' in Snell-Hornby et al. (eds.) (1994), pp.411-420.
- Neubert, A. (2000) 'Competence in Language, in Languages, & in Translation,' in Schäffner & Adab (eds.) (2000), pp.3-18.
- Newman, D. L., Deyoe, M. M., Connor, K. A. & Lamendola, J. M. (2015) 'Flipping STEM Learning: Impact on Students' Process of Learning & Faculty Instructional Activities,' in Information Resources Management Association (eds.) (2015), pp.23-41.
- Newmann, F. M., Marks, H. M. & Gamoran, A. (1996) 'Authentic Pedagogy & Student Performance,' *American Journal of Education* 104:280-312.
- Newman, G. E. & Smith, R. K. (2016) 'Kinds of Authenticity,' *Philosophy Compass* 11(10):609-618. DOI: 10.1111/phc3.12343.
- Ng., B. C. (1992) 'End Users' Subjective Reaction to the Performance of Student Interpreters,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* special issue 1:35-41.
- Ng, E. (2015) 'Teaching & Research on Legal Interpreting: A Hong Kong Perspective,' *MonTI* 7:243-270. DOI: 10.6035/MonTI.2015.7.9.
- Nicodemus, B., Cole, J. & Swabey, L. (2015) 'Storied Classrooms: Narrative Pedagogy in American Sign Language-English Interpreter Education,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 7 (2):55-62.
- Nicodemus, B. & Swabey, L. (2016) 'Action Research,' in Angelelli & Baer (eds.) (2016), pp.157-167.
- Nida, E. A. (1969) 'Science of Translation,' *Language* 45(3):483-498.
- Niemants, N. (2013) 'From Role-playing to Role-taking: Interpreter Role(s) in Healthcare,' in Schäffner et al. (eds.) (2013), pp.305-319.
- Niemants, N. & Cirillo, L. (2017) 'Dialogue Interpreting: Research, Education & Professional Practice,' in Cirillo & Niemants (eds.) (2017), pp. 1-25.
- Niemants, N. & Stokoe, E. (2017) 'Using the Conversation Analytic Role-play Method in Healthcare Interpreter Education,' in Cirillo & Niemants (eds.) (2017), pp.293-321.

- Niska, H. (2007) 'From Helpers to Professionals: Training of Community Interpreters in Sweden,' in Wadensjö et al. (eds.) (2007), pp.297-310.
- Nizet, I. & Meyer, F. (2015) 'A Flipped Classroom Design for Preservice Teacher Training in Assessment,' in Information Resources Management Association (eds.) (2015), pp.610-629.
- Nord, C. (1988) *Textanalyse & Übersetzen: Theoretische Grundlagen, Methode & didaktische Anwendung einer übersetzungsrelevanten Textanalyse*, Heidelberg, Germany: Groos.
- Nord, C. (1996) 'Wer Nimmt Denn Mal den Ersten Satz? Überlegungen zu Neuen Arbeitsformen im Übersetzungsunterricht,' in Lauer, Gerzymisch-Arbogast, Haller & Steiner (eds.) (1996), pp. 313-28.
- Nord, C. (2010) 'Functional Approaches,' in Gambier & Van Doorslaer (eds.) (2015), pp.120-128.
- Nord, C. (2013) 'Functionalism in Translation Studies,' in Millán & Bartrina (eds.) (2013), pp.201-212.
- Nord, C. (2018) *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*, 2nd edn, London/New York: Routledge.
- Nunan, D. (1988) *Syllabus Design*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brien, S. (2012) 'Towards a Dynamic Quality Evaluation Model for Translation,' *JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialised Translation* 17. http://www.jostrans.org/issue17/art_obrien.pdf. (Accessed June 05, 2018).
- Brien, S. & Conlan, ●. (2019) 'Moving Towards Personalising Translation Technology,' in Dam et al. (eds.) (2019), pp.81-97.
- Brien, S., Ehrensberger-Dow, M., Hasler, M. & Connolly, M. (2017) 'Irritating CAT Tool Features that Matter to Translators,' *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication in Business* 56:145-162.
- Hagan, M. (2009) 'Computer-aided Translation (CAT),' in Baker & Saldanha (eds.) (2009), pp.48-51.
- Hagan, M. (2013) 'The Impact of New Technologies on Translation Studies: A Technological Turn?' in Millán & Bartrina (eds.) (2013), pp.503-518.
- lalla-Soler, C. (2015) 'An Experimental Study into the Acquisition of Cultural Competence in Translator Training: Research Design & Methodological Issues,' *Translation & Interpreting* 7(1):86-110. DOI: ti.106201.2015.a01.
- lohan, M. (ed.) (2000) *Intercultural Faultlines: Research Models in Translation Studies I–Textual & Cognitive Aspects*, Manchester: St. Jerome.

- lohan, M. & Baker, M. (2009) 'Coherence & Clarity of Objectives in Doctoral Projects: A Research Design Workshop,' special issue of *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 3(1).
- lvera Lobo, M. D., Robinson, B., Castro Prieto, R. M., Quero Gervilla, E., Muñoz Martín, R., Muñoz Raya, E., Murillo Melero, M., Senso Ruiz, J. A., Vargas Quesada, B. & Díez Lerma, J. L. (2007) 'A Professional Approach to Translator Training (PATT),' *Meta* 52(3):517-528.
- no, N. (2013) 'Development & Pilot Testing of a Novel Education Method for Training Medical Interpreters,' *Patient Education & Counseling* 93:604–611. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2013.09.003>.
- rdóñez-López, P. & Agost, R. (2015) 'An Empirical Study of Students' Views on Theoretical Subjects: The Role of Theory in Translation Degrees at Spanish Universities,' in Cui & Zhao (eds.) (2015a), pp.324-345.
- rlando, M. (2010) 'Digital Pen Technology & Consecutive Interpreting: Another Dimension in Note-taking Training & Assessment,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 15:71–86.
- rlando, M. (2012) 'Training of Professional Translators in Australia: Process-Oriented & Product-Oriented Evaluation Approaches,' in Hubscher-Davidson & Borodo (eds.) (2012), pp.197-216.
- rlando, M. (2014) 'A Study on the Amenability of Digital Pen Technology in a Hybrid Mode of Interpreting: Consec-Simul with Notes,' *Translation & Interpreting* 6(2): 39–54.
- rlando, M. (2015) 'Implementing Digital Pen Technology in the Consecutive Interpreting Classroom,' in Andres & Behr (eds.) (2015), pp.171-199.
- rlando, M. (2016) *Training 21st Century Translators & Interpreters: At the Crossroads of Practice, Research & Pedagogy*, Berlin: Frank & Timme.
- rlando, M. (2017) 'Testing Digital Pen Technology in a Hybrid Mode of Interpreting,' aiic.net. May 2, 2017 (Accessed August 9, 2018) <<https://aiic.net/p/7944>>.
- rnstein, A. C. & Hunkins, F. (2017) *Curriculum: Foundations, Principles, & Issues*, 7th edn, London/ Boston: Pearson.
- rtegaHerráez, J. M. & Iliescu Gheorghiu, C. (2015) 'The Interpreter Hears Voices...Academic & Professional Perspectives X-Rayed & Interpreted,' *MorIT* special issue 2:37-62.
- rtega Herráez, J. M., Sandrelli, A. & Townsley, B. (2014) 'Interpreting Test Format,' in Giambruno (ed.) (2014a), pp.41-67.
- 'Rourke, K., Goldring, L. & Ody, M. (2011) 'Students as Essential Partners,' in Barrett & Moore (eds.) (2011), pp.50-62.

- zolins, U. (2017) 'It's Not about the Interpreter: ●bjectives in Dialogue Interpreting Teaching,' in Cirillo & Niemants (eds.) (2017), pp.45-62.
- Pacheco Aguilar, R. (2016) 'The ●uestion of Authenticity in Translator Education from the Perspective of Educational Philosophy,' in Kiraly et al. (ed.) (2016), pp.13-31.
- Pachler, N. & Daly, C. (2011) *Key Issues in e-Learning: Research & Practice*, London/ New York: Continuum.
- PACTE. (1998) 'La Competencia Traductora y su Aprendizaje: ●bjetivos, Hipótesis y Metodología de un Proyecto de Investigación,' Poster, IV Congrés Intemacional sobre Traducció, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- PACTE. (2000) 'Acquiring Translation Competence: Hypotheses & Methodological Problems in a Research Project,' in Beeby et al. (eds.) (2000), pp.99-106.
- PACTE. (2001) 'La Competencia Traductora y su Adquisición,' *Quaderns. Revista de Traducció* 6:39-45.
- PACTE. (2003) 'Building a Translation Competence Model,' in Alves (ed.) (2003), pp.43-66.
- PACTE. (2011) 'Results of the Validation of the PACTE Translation Competence Model,' in Alvstad et al. (eds.) (2011), pp.317-343.
- PACTE. (2014) 'First Results of PACTE Group's Experimental Research on Translation Competence Acquisition: The Acquisition of Declarative Knowledge of Translation,' *MonTI* special issue 1:85-115.
- PACTE. (2015) 'Results of PACTE's Experimental Research on the Acquisition of Translation Competence: the Acquisition of Declarative & Procedural Knowledge in Translation. The dynamic Translation Index,' *Translation Spaces* special issue 4(1):29-53.
- Pakkala-Weckström, M. J. (2019) 'Introducing a Student Self-Evaluation Grid for Translation Assignments,' in Huertas-Barros et al. (eds.) (2019a), pp.270-287.
- Palumbo, G. (2009) *Key Terms in Translation Studies*, London: Continuum.
- Pan, J., Wang, H. & Yan, J. X. (2017) 'Convergences & Divergences between Studies on Translator Training & Interpreter Training: Findings from a Database of English Journal Articles,' *Target* 29(1):110-144.
- Papaleontiou-Louca, E. (2003) 'The Concept & Instruction of Metacognition,' *Teacher Development* 7(1):9-30.
- Paradowska, U. (2015) 'Expert Web Searching Skills for Translators –A Multiple-Case Study,' in Pietrzak & Deckert (eds.) (2015), pp.227-244.
- Paris, S.G. & Winograd, P. (1990) 'How Metacognition Can Promote Academic Learning & Instruction,' in Jones & Idol (eds.) (1990), pp.15-51.

- Parke, C. S. (2008) 'Criterion-Referenced Testing,' in Salkind (ed.) (2008), pp.200-206.
- Patrie, C. (1994) 'Entry Level to the Profession. Response Paper #1: The Readiness-to-work-gap,' in Winston (ed.), (1994), pp. 53-56.
- Pedersen, J. (2017) 'The FAR Model: Assessing Quality in Interlingual Subtitling,' *JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialised Translation* 28:210-229.
- Penet, J-C. (2018) 'Can Theory Enhance TIS Students' Employability? "Translating for the EU's Institutions": A Case Study,' Presentation in *1st Annual APTIS Conference: Challenges & Opportunities in Teaching Translation & Interpreting*, November 23-24, 2018, Aston University, Birmingham.
- Peng, G. (2017) 'A Case Study of Knowledge Enhancement in Undergraduate Interpreter Training Courses in Taiwan,' *Compilation and Translation Review* 10(1):121-158.
- Perez, I. A., & Wilson, C. W. L. (2011) 'The Interlinked Approach to Training for Interpreter-Mediated Police Settings,' in Kainz et al. (eds.) (2011), pp.242-262.
- Pérez-Luzardo, J. (2015) 'Pre-Interpreting Exercises,' in Pöschhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.317-318.
- Pérez-Pérez, P. S. (2018) 'The Use of a Corpus Management Tool for the Preparation of Interpreting Assignments: A Case Study,' *Translation & Interpreting* 10(1):137-151. DOI: 10.12807/ti.l10201.2018.a08.
- Peterson, R. (2000) 'Metacognition & Recall Protocols in the Interpreting Classroom,' in Roy (ed.) (2000b), pp.132-152.
- Phelan, M. (2018) 'Interpreter Provision, Medical Training & Ethics,' in Stone & Leeson (eds.) (2018).
- Pietrzak, P. (2014) 'Towards Effective Feedback to Translation Students: Empowering through Group Revision & Evaluation,' in *TRALinea* special issue. <http://www.intralinea.org/specials/article/2095> (Accessed March 18, 2018).
- Pietrzak, P. (2015) 'Using Verbal Protocols for Translator Training Purposes,' in Pietrzak & Deckert (eds.) (2015), pp.211-225.
- Pietrzak, P. (2016) 'Students' Engagement in Metacognitive Activities as a Source of Feedback for the Translation Teacher,' *Journal of Translator Education & Translation Studies* 1(1):56-67.
- Pignataro, C. (2011) 'Skilled-based & Knowledge-based Strategies in Television Interpreting,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 16:81-98.
- Pignataro, C. (2015) 'ELF Pragmatics & Interpreting,' in Sánchez Nieto (ed.) (2015), pp.105-124.

- Pignataro, C. & Velardi, S. (2013) 'The Quest for Quality Assessment Criteria in Media Interpreting,' in García Becerra et al. (eds.) (2013), pp. 129-147.
- Pinar, W.F. (2014) 'Introduction,' in Pinar (ed.) (2014), pp.1-14.
- Piotrowska, M. (2015) 'Revisiting the Translator Competence in the 21st Century,' in Pietrzak & Deckert (eds.) (2015), pp.13-25.
- Piotrowska, M. & Tyupa, S. (2014) 'Translation Pedagogy - A New Sub-Discipline of Translation Studies,' *inTRALinea* special issue. <http://www.intralinea.org/archive/article/2112> (Accessed March 19, 2018).
- Pirone, J. S., Henner, J. & Hall, W. C. (2018) 'American Sign Language Interpreting in a Mainstreamed College Setting: Performance Quality & Its Impact on Classroom Participation Equity,' in Holcomb & Smith (eds.) (2018), pp.45-57.
- Pitkäsalo, E. & Ketola, A. (2018) 'Collaborative Translation in a Virtual Classroom: Proposal for a Course Design,' *Transletters. International Journal of Translation & Interpreting* 1:93-119.
- Plaza Lara, C. (2016) 'Instrumental Competence in Translation & Interpreting Curricula in Spain: Pre-EHEA vs. EHEA Bachelor's Degrees,' *Current Trends in Translation Teaching & Learning E* 3: 258-310.
- Plevoets, K. & Defrancq, B. (2016) 'The Effect of Informational Load on Disfluencies in Interpreting: A Corpus-Based Regression Analysis,' *TIS* 11(2):202-224.
- Plevoets, K. & Defrancq, B. (2018) 'The Cognitive Load of Interpreters in the European Parliament: A Corpus-Based Study of Predictors for the Disfluency Uh(m),' *Interpreting* 20(1):1-28. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.00001.ple>.
- Pöchhacker, F. (1992) 'The Role of Theory in Simultaneous Interpreting,' in Dollerup & Loddegaard (eds.) (1992), pp.211-220.
- Pöchhacker, F. (1994a) *Simultandolmetschen als Komplexes Handeln*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Pöchhacker F. (1994b) 'Quality Assurance in Simultaneous Interpreting,' in Dollerup & Lindegaard (eds.) (1994), pp.233-242.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2000) *Dolmetschen: Konzeptuelle Grundlagen & Deskriptive Untersuchungen*, Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2001a) 'Working within a Theoretical Framework,' in Gile et al. (eds.) (2001), pp.199-219.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2001b) 'Quality Assessment in Conference & Community Interpreting,' *Meta* 46(2): 410-425.

- Pöchhacker, F. (2006) “‘Going Social?’ On Pathways & Paradigms in Interpreting Studies,” in Pym et al. (eds.) (2006), pp.215-232.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2009) ‘Issues in Interpreting Studies,’ in Munday (ed.) (2009), pp.128-140.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2010a) ‘The Role of Research in Interpreter Education,’ *Translation & Interpreting* 2(1):1–10.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2010b) ‘Interpreting Studies,’ in Gambier & Van Doorslaer (eds.) (2010), pp.158-172.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2010c) ‘Why Interpreting Studies Matters,’ in Gile et al. (eds.) (2010), pp.3-13.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2011a) ‘Simultaneous Interpreting,’ in Malmkjær & Windle (eds.) (2011).
- Pöchhacker, F. (2011b) ‘Researching Interpreting: Approaches to Inquiry,’ in Nicodemus & Swabey (eds.) (2011), pp.5–26.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2013) ‘Teaching Interpreting/Training Interpreters,’ in Gambier & van Doorslaer (eds.) (2013), pp.174-180.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2014) ‘Assessing Aptitude for Interpreting: The SynCloze Test,’ in Pöchhacker & Liu (eds.) (2014), pp.147-160.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2015a) ‘User Expectations,’ in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.430-432.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2015b) ‘Hypertext,’ in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.186-187.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2015c) ‘Simultaneous Consecutive,’ in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.381-382.
- Pöchhacker, F. (ed.) (2015d) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2016) *Introducing Interpreting Studies*, 2nd edn, London/New York: Routledge.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2019) ‘Moving Boundaries in Interpreting,’ in Dam et al. (eds.) (2019), pp.45-63.
- Pöchhacker, F. & Liu, M. (eds.) (2014) *Aptitude for Interpreting*, Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Poikela, S. & Moore, I. (2011) ‘PBL Challenges Both Curriculum & Teaching,’ in Barrett & Moore (eds.) (2011), pp.229-238.
- Pokom, N. K. (2015) ‘Positioning,’ in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.312-314.
- Pöllabauer, S. (2013) ‘Community Interpreting,’ in Chapelle (ed.) (2013), pp.746–753.
- Pöllabauer, S. (2017) ‘Issues of Terminology in Public Service Interpreting: From Affordability through Psychotherapy to Waiting Lists,’ in Antonini et al. (eds.) (2017), pp.131-155.

- Popham, W.J. (1997) 'What's Wrong—& What's Right—with Rubrics,' *Educational Leadership* 55:72–75.
- Popović, M. (2018) 'Error Classification & Analysis for Machine Translation Quality Assessment,' in Moorkens et al. (eds.) (2018a), pp.129–158.
- Postigo Pinazo, E. (2008) 'Self-Assessment in Teaching Interpreting,' *TTR* 21(1):173–209.
- Pradas Macías, E. M. (2015) 'Fluency,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.165–166.
- Prawat, R. S. (2008) 'Constructivism,' in Salkind (ed.) (2008), pp.182–183.
- Presas, M. (2012) 'Training Translators in the European Higher Education Area,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 6(2):139–169. DOI: 10.1080/13556509.2012.10798834.
- Preston, J. (2017) *Competence Based Education & Training (CBET) & the End of Human Learning. The Existential Threat of Competency*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Preziosi, I. & Garwood, C. (2017) 'Training Legal Interpreters in an Imperfect World,' in Cirillo & Niemants (eds.) (2017), pp.217–237.
- Pritchard, A. & Woollard, J. (2010) *Psychology for the Classroom: Constructivism & Social Learning*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Pym, A. (1992) 'Translation Error Analysis & the Interface with Language Teaching,' in Dollerup & Loddegaard (eds.) (1992), pp.279–290.
- Pym, A. (1998) 'Ideologies of the Expert in Discourses on Translator Training'. <http://www.fut.es/~apym/expert.html>.
- Pym, A. (2000) 'Innovations in Translator & Interpreter Training: Report on an On-line Symposium,' *Across Languages & Cultures* 1(2):209–273.
- Pym, A. (2003) 'Redefining Translation Competence in an Electronic Age: In Defence of a Minimalist Approach,' *Meta* 48(4):481–497.
- Pym, A. (2006) 'Asymmetries in the Teaching of Translation Technology,' in Pym et al. (eds.) (2006), pp. 113–124.
- Pym, A. (2011) 'Training Translators,' in Malmkjær & Windle (eds.) (2011).
- Pym, A. (2013) 'Research Skills in Translation Studies: What We Need Training In,' *Across Languages & Cultures* 14(1):1–14.
- Pym, A. (2014) *Exploring Translation Theories*, 2nd edn, London/New York: Routledge.
- Pym, A. (2018) 'Introduction: Why Mediation Strategies Are Important,' *Language Problems & Language Planning* 42(3):255–266. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/IpIp.00022.pym>.

- Quah, C. K. (2006) *Translation & Technology*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Quinci, C. (2015) *Translators in the Making: An Empirical Longitudinal Study on Translation Competence & Its Development*, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Università degli Studi di Trieste.
- Quinci, C. (2017) 'Does Translation Competence Equal Translation Quality?' in Zybatow et al. (eds.) (2017b), pp.295-301.
- Quinlan, A. M. (2008) 'Certification,' in Salkind (ed.) (2008), pp.128-129.
- Rabadán-Gómez, M. (2016) 'Professionalisation & Standardisation of Public Service Interpreting,' in Munyangeyo et al. (eds.) (2016), pp.47-85.
- Rabadán, R., Labrador, B. & Ramón, N. (2009) 'Corpus-based Contrastive Analysis & Translation Universals: A Tool for Translation Quality Assessment English → Spanish,' *Babel* 55(4): 303-328.
- Rahab, N. (2001) 'Training the Specialised Translator without a Theoretical Framework: A Wise Decision? The Role of Translation Theory in Training the Specialist Translator,' in Desblache (ed.) (2001), pp.48-54.
- Ramírez Espinosa, A. (2015) 'Fostering Autonomy through Syllabus Design: A Step-by-Step Guide for Success,' *HÖH* 22(2):114-134.
- Rasmussen, K. (2008) 'Halo Effect,' in Salkind (ed.) (2008), pp.458-459.
- Rata, E. & Barrett, B. (2014) 'Introduction: knowledge & the Future of the Curriculum,' in Rata & Barrett (eds.) (2014), pp.1-20.
- Ray, B.B. & Powell, A. (2015) 'Preparing to Teach with Flipped Classroom in Teacher Preparation Programs,' in Information Resources Management Association (eds.) (2015), pp.1461-1481.
- Reason, P. & Bradbury, H. (2008) 'Introduction,' in Reason & Bradbury (eds.) (2008), pp.1-10.
- Recommendations for Practices & Protocols for Interpreters to Follow in Mental Health Interactions* (2017), prepared by Jim Hlavac, Monash University.
- Reichert, M. & Mouza, C. (2015) 'Use of Tablet Computers & Mobile Apps to Support 21st Century Learning Skills,' in Information Resources Management Association (eds.) (2015), pp.392-406.
- Reiss, K. (1968) 'Überlegungen zu einer Theorie der Übersetzungskritik,' *Linguistica Antverpiensia* 2:369-383.
- Reiss, K. (1971) *Möglichkeiten & Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik*, Munich: Hueber.
- Reiss, K. (1973) 'Der Texttyp als Ansatzpunkt für die Lösung von Übersetzungsproblemen,' *Linguistica Antverpiensia* 7:111-127.
- Reiss, K. & Vermeer, H. J. (1984) *Grundlegung Einer Allgemeinen Translationstheorie*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.

- Renfer, C. (1992) 'Translator & Interpreter Training: A Case for a Two-Tier System,' in Dollerup & Loddegaard (eds.) (1992), pp.174-184.
- Remmert, S. (2010) 'The Impact of Fluency on the Subjective Assessment of Interpreting Quality,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 15:101-115.
- Resnick, L.B. (1989) 'Introduction,' in Resnick (ed.) (1989), pp.1-24.
- Riccardi, A. (1996) 'Language-specific Strategies in Simultaneous Interpreting,' in Dollerup & Appel (eds.) (1996), pp.213-222.
- Riccardi, A. (2002a) 'Evaluation in Interpreting: Macrocriteria & Microcriteria,' in Hung (ed.) (2002), pp.115-126.
- Riccardi, A. (ed.) (2002b) *Translation Studies: Perspectives on an Emerging Discipline*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Riccardi, A. (2003) *Dalla Traduzione All'Interpretazione, Studi d'Interpretazione Simultanea*, Milano: Led Edizioni Universitarie di Lettere Economia Diritto.
- Riccardi, A. (2005) 'On the Evolution of Interpreting Strategies in Simultaneous Interpreting,' *Meta* 50(2):753-767.
- Riccardi, A. (2015a) 'Shadowing,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.371-373.
- Riccardi, A. (2015b) 'Stress,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.405-407.
- Riccardi, A. & Russo, M. (2013) 'Editorial,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 18:VII-IX.
- Risku, H. (1998) *Translatorische Kompetenz. Kognitive Grundlagen des Übersetzens als Expertentätigkeit*, Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Risku, H. (2002) 'Situativeness in Translation Studies,' *Cognitive Systems Research* 3:523-533.
- Risku, H. (2004) *Translationsmanagement. Interkulturelle Fachkommunikation im Kommunikationszeitalter*, Tübingen: Narr.
- Risku, H. (2010) 'A Cognitive Scientific View on Technical Communication and Translation: Do Embodiment & Situativeness Really Make a Difference?' *Target* 22(1):94-111.
- Risku, H. (2016) 'Situating Learning in Translation Research Training: Academic Research as a Reflection of Practice,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 10(1):1-17. DOI:10.1080/1750399X.2016.1154340.
- Ritsos, P, Gittins, R, Roberts, JC, Slater, C & Braun, S. (2012) 'Using Virtual Reality for Interpreter-mediated Communication & Training,' *International Conference on Cyberworlds (CW)*. DOI: 10.1109/CW.2012.34.
- Ritsos, P. D., Gittins, R., Braun, S., Slatyer, C. & Roberts, J.C. (2013) 'Training Interpreters Using Virtual Worlds,' *LNCSTransactions on Computer Science XVII* 7848: 21-40.

- Rizzato, I. (2015) 'Style is Fiction & Non-Fiction: Applying Stylistic Methods & Strategies to Translation & Interpretation Teaching,' in Cui & Zhao (eds.) (2015a), pp.46-56.
- Roberson, L. (2015) 'Interpreting Students' Perceptions of a Blended Degree Program,' *Journal of Interpretation* 24 (1).
<http://digitalcommons.unf.edu/joi/vol24/iss1/6> (Accessed June 30, 2018).
- Roberson, L. (2018) 'Interpreting: An Overview,' in Roberson & Shaw (eds.) (2018), pp.1-21.
- Roberson, L., Russell, D. & Shaw, R. (2012) 'A Case for Training Signed Language Interpreters for Legal Specialization,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 4(2):52-73.
- Robert, I. S., & Remael, A. (2017) 'Assessing Quality in Live Interlingual Subtitling: A New Challenge,' *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies* 16:168-195.
- Roberts, R. P. (2000) 'Interpreter Assessment Tools for Different Settings,' in Roberts et al. (eds.) (2000), p.103-120.
- Roberts, R. P. (2002) 'Community Interpreting: A Profession in Search of Its Identity,' in Hung (ed.) (2002), pp.157-175.
- Roberts, R. P. (2014) 'Enhancing Short-Term Memory for Accurate Interpreting,' *The ATA Chronicle* 43(7):18-26.
- Roberts, R. P., Carr, S. E., Abraham, D. & Dufour, A. (eds.) (2000) *The Critical Link 2: Interpreters in the Community*. Selected Papers from the Second International Conference on Interpreting in Legal, Health & Social Service Settings, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 19-23 May 1998, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Roberts-Smith, L. (2009) 'Forensic Interpreting: Trial & Error,' in Hale et al. (eds.) (2009), pp. 13-35.
- Robinson, B. J., López Rodríguez, C.I. & Tercedor Sánchez, M.I. (2006) 'Self-assessment in Translator Training,' *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 14 (2):115-138.
- Robinson, B. J., López Rodríguez, C.I. & Tercedor Sánchez, M.I. (2008) 'Neither Born nor Made, but Socially Constructed: Promoting Interactive Learning in an Online Environment,' *TTR* 21(2):95-129.
- Robinson, D. (2012) *Becoming a Translator: An Introduction to the Theory & Practice of Translation*, 3rd edn, London/New York: Routledge.
- Robinson, P. (2013) 'Aptitude in Second Language Acquisition,' in Chapelle (ed.) (2013), pp.129-133.
- Rodríguez de Céspedes, B. (2018) 'Lights, Camera, Action! Finding Out Industry Translation Training Practices through Action Research,' Presentation in 1st Annual APTIS Conference: Challenges &

- *opportunities in Teaching Translation & Interpreting*, November 23-24, 2018, Aston University, Birmingham.
- Rodríguez Inés, P. (2009) 'Evaluating the Process & Not Just the Product When Using Corpora in Translator Education,' in Beeby et al. (eds.) (2009a), pp.129-149.
- Rodríguez-Inés, P. (2010) 'Electronic Corpora & other Information & Communication Technology Tools,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 4(2): 251-282. DOI: 10.1080/13556509.2010.10798806.
- Rodríguez-Inés, P. (2013) 'Electronic Target-Language Specialised Corpora in Translator Education: Building & Searching Strategies,' *Babel* 59(1):57-75.
- Rodríguez-Inés, P.& Hurtado Albir, A. (2012) 'Assessing Competence in Using Electronic Corpora in Translator Training,' in Hubscher-Davidson & Borodo (eds.) (2012), pp.96-126.
- Rodríguez Morell, J. L. (2011) 'Toward the Development of a Metacognitive Intercultural Communicative Competence in the Education of Students of Interpreting: General Theoretical/ Pragmatic Foundations,' *Translation & Interpreting* 3(1):106-118.
- Rothwell, A. (2017) 'CAT in the Cloud: Some Implications for Translator Training,' in Zybatow et al. (eds.) (2017a), pp.157-163.
- Rousmaniere, T., Goodyear, R. K., Miller, S. D. & Wampold, B. E. (2017) 'Introduction,' in Rousmaniere et al. (eds.) (2017), pp.3-22.
- Rowell, L. L., Bruce, C. D., Shosh, J. M. & Riel, M. M. (eds.) (2017) *The Palgrave International Handbook of Action Research*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Roy, C. B. (1987) 'Evaluating Performance: An Interpreted Lecture,' in McIntire (ed.) (1987), pp.139-147.
- Roy, C. B. (2000a) *Interpreting as a Discourse Process*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roy, C. B. (ed.) (2000b) *Innovative Practices for Teaching Sign Language Interpreters*, Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Roy, C.B. (ed.) (2006) *New Approaches to Interpreter Education*, Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.
- Roy, C. B. & Winston, E. A. (eds.) (2019) *The Next Generation of Research in Interpreter Education: Pursuing Evidence-based Practices*, Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Rubin, J. (2005) 'The Expert Language Learner: A Review of Good Language Learner Studies & Learner Strategies,' in Johnson (ed.) (2005), pp.37-63.

- Rudvin, M. & Tomassini, E. (2011) *Interpreting in the Community & Workplace: A Practical Teaching Guide*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ruiz Mezcua, A. (2010) *El Equipo de Interpretación Simultánea y sus Implicaciones Didácticas*, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Universidad de Málaga.
- Ruiz Mezcua, A. (2016) 'Technological Advances in Interpreting: New Challenges for Training,' in Rojo López & Campos Plaza (eds.) (2016), pp.295-309.
- Russo, M. (1989) 'Text Processing Strategies: A Hypothesis to Assess Students' Aptitude for Simultaneous Interpreting,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 2:57-64.
- Russo, M. (2005) 'Simultaneous Film Interpreting & Users' Feedback,' *Interpreting* 7(1):1-26.
- Russo, M. (2014) 'Aptitude Testing over the Years,' in Pöchhacker & Liu (eds.) (2014), pp.7-31.
- Russo, M. & Alonso-Araguás, I. (2017) 'Interpreting in International Organizations. Research, Training, & Practice,' *CLINA: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Translation, Interpreting & Intercultural Communication* 3(2):13-17.
- Russo, M. & Pippa, S. (2002) 'Aptitude for Conference Interpreting: A Proposal for a Testing Methodology based on Paraphrase,' in Garzone & Viezzi (eds.) (2002a), pp.245-256.
- Russo, M. & Pippa, S. (2004) 'Aptitude to Interpreting: Preliminary Results of a Testing Methodology Based on Paraphrase,' *Meta* 49(2):409-432.
- Rybicki, J. (2012) 'The Great Mystery of the (Almost) Invisible Translator: Stylometry in Translation,' in Oakes & Ji (eds.) (2012), pp.231-248.
- Sachinis, M. (2011) 'Translator Training: Commodity or Necessity? On the Emergence of a New Area of Studies,' *JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialised Translation* 16:2-4.
- Sachtleben, A. (2015) 'Pedagogy for the Multilingual Classroom: Interpreting Education,' *Translation & Interpreting* 7(2):51-59. DOI: 10.12807/ti.107202.2015.a04.
- Şahin, M. (2013) 'Virtual Worlds in Interpreter Training,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 7(1):91-106.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2013.10798845>.
- Sakamoto, A. (2011) 'An Empirical Study on the Use of Note-taking for Consecutive Interpreting in the Teaching of Written Translation,' *JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialised Translation* 16:203-223.
- Sakwe, G. (2017) 'Assessing Translator Education in the Light of Competency-Based Approaches: Dashboard Indicators & Stakeholders'

- Sense-Making,' *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies* 5(3):111-128.
- Salaets, H. (2012) 'The Next Step in the CBI Professionalisation Process: Training the Public Services Providers,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 17:191-203.
- Salaets, H. & Balogh, K. (2015a) 'Co-Minor-IN/QUEST: Research Findings,' in Balogh & Salaets (eds.) (2015), pp.175-227.
- Salaets, H. & Balogh, K. (2015b) 'Development of Reliable Evaluation Tools in Legal Interpreting: A Test Case,' *Translation & Interpreting* 7 (3):103-120.
- Salama-Carr, M. (2009) 'Interpretive Approach,' in Baker & Saldanha (eds.) (2009), pp.145-147.
- Saldanha, G. & O'Brien, S. (2014) *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*, New York: Routledge.
- Salmi, L. & Kinnunen, T. (2015) 'Training Translators for Accreditation in Finland,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 9(2):1-14.
- Salvia, J., & Ysseldyke, J. E. (1995) *Assessment*, 6th edn., Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Sampaio, G. R. L. (2017) 'O Papel dos Aportes Teóricos na Formação do Intérprete,' (The Role of Theoretical Input in Interpreter Training), *Tradução em Revista* 23:1-17.
- Samson, R. (2005) 'Computer-assisted Translation,' in Tennet (ed.) (2005a), pp.101-126.
- Sánchez Cárdenas, B. & Faber, P. (2016) 'Corpus Analysis & the Translation of Adverbs in Specialised Texts: Raising Student Awareness,' in Corpas Pastor & Seghiri (eds.) (2016), pp.195-217.
- Sánchez-Gijón, P. (2009) 'Developing Documentation Skills to Build Do-It-Yourself Corpora in the Specialised Translation Course,' in Beeby et al. (eds.) (2009a), pp.109-127.
- Sánchez-Gijón, P., Aguilar-Amat, A., Mesa-Lao, B. & Pahisa Solé, M. (2009) 'Applying Terminology Knowledge to Translation: Problem-based Learning for a Degree in Translation & Interpreting,' *Terminology* 15(1):105-118. DOI: 10.1075/term.15.1.06san.
- Sánchez Ramos, M. M. (2016) 'Community Healthcare Translator Training & Ad Hoc Corpora,' *Current Trends in Translation Teaching & Learning E* 3:119-139.
- Sánchez Ramos, M. M. & Vigier Moreno, F. J. (2016) 'Using Corpus Management Tools in Public Service Translator Training: An Example of Its Application in the Translation of Judgments,' in Pareja-Lora et al. (eds.) (2016), pp. 375-384). DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2016.tislid2014.449>.

- Sandrelli, A. (2007) 'Designing CAIT (Computer-Assisted Interpreter Training) Tools: Black Box,' in Gerzymisch-Arbogast & Nauert (eds.) (2007). www.euroconferences.info/proceedings/2005_Proceedings/2005_Sandrelli_Annalisa.pdf (Accessed May 29, 2014).
- Sandrelli, A. (2015a) 'Computer Assisted Interpreter Training,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.75-77.
- Sandrelli, A. (2015b) 'Becoming an Interpreter: The Role of Computer Technology,' *MonTI* special issue 2: 118–138.
- Sandrelli, A. (2018) 'Interpreter-Mediated Football Press Conferences: A Study on the Questioning & Answering Strategies,' in Russo et al. (eds.) (2018), pp.185-204.
- Sandrelli, A. & de Manuel Jerez, J. (2007) 'The Impact of Information & Communication Technology (ICT) on Interpreter Training: State-of-the-Art & Future Prospects,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 1(2): 269–303.
- Santamaría Ciordia, L. (2017) 'Implementing Safe & Effective Collaborative Environments in Technology-Enhanced Interpreter Training,' *CLINA: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Translation, Interpreting & Intercultural Communication* 3(1):35-55. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14201/clina2017313555>.
- Savin-Baden, M., Gourlay, L., Tombs, C., Steils, N., Tombs, G. & Mawer, M. (2010) 'Situating Pedagogies, Positions & Practices in Immersive Virtual Worlds,' *Educational Research* 52(2): 123-133.
- Savin-Baden, M. & Major, C. H. (2004) *Foundations of Problem-Based Learning*, Maidenhead/Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Sawyer, D. B. (2000) 'Towards Meaningful, Appropriate, & Useful Assessment: How the False Dichotomy between Theory & Practice Undermines Interpreter Education,' *The ATA Chronicle* 29(2):32-40.
- Sawyer, D.B. (2004) *Fundamental Aspects of Interpreter Education: Curriculum & Assessment*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Sawyer, D.B. (2006) 'Foreword,' in Roy (ed.) (2006), pp.vii-xv.
- Sawyer, D. B. (2008) 'Interpreter Training & Education at the U.S. Department of State: Origins, Developments, & Current Practices,' *Interpreting & Translation Studies: The Journal of the Japan Association for Interpreting and Translation Studies* 8:267-277.
- Sawyer, D.B. (2015) 'Curriculum,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.96-99.
- Sawyer, D. B. & Roy, C. B. (2015) 'Education,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.124-130.
- Scaglioni, G. (2013) 'Simultaneous Interpreting from German into Italian: the Importance of Preparation on a Selection of Cultural Items,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 18:81-103.

- Schafer, T. (2011) 'Developing Expertise through a Deliberate Practice Project,' *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 3:16–27.
- Schäffner, C. (1998) 'From 'Good' to 'Functionally Appropriate': Assessing Translation Quality,' in Schäffner (ed.) (1998), pp.1-6
- Schäffner, C. (2000) 'Discourse Analysis for Translation & Translator Training: Status, Needs, Methods,' *Current Issues in Language & Society* 7(3):177-184. DOI: 10.1080/13520520009615580.
- Schäffner, C. (2004) 'Developing Professional Translation Competence without a Notion of Translation,' in Malmkjær (ed.) (2004), pp.113-125.
- Schäffner, C. (2009) 'Functionalist Approaches,' in Baker & Saldanha (eds.) (2009), pp.115-121.
- Schäffner, C. (2012) 'Translation Competence: Training for the Real World,' in Hubscher-Davidson & Borodo (eds.) (2012), pp.30-44.
- Schäffner, C. (2013) 'Discourse Analysis,' in Gambier & Van Doorslaer (eds.) (2013), pp.47-52.
- Schäffner, C. (2017) 'Self-Awareness, Norms & Constraints: Dealing with Metaphors in Interpreter-Mediated Press Conferences,' in Biagini et al. (2017), pp. 149-172.
- Schäffner, C. & Adab, B. (2000) 'Developing Translation Competence: Introduction,' in Schäffner, & Adab (eds.) (2000), pp.vii-xvi.
- Scherf, W. G. (1992) 'Training, Talent, & Technology,' in Dollerup & Loddegaard (eds.) (1992), pp.153-160.
- Schjoldager, A. (1995) 'An Exploratory Study of Translational Norms in Simultaneous Interpreting: Methodological Reflections,' *Hermes-Journal of Linguistics* 14:65-87.
- Schjoldager, A. (1996) 'Assessment of Simultaneous Interpreting,' in Dollerup & Appel (eds.) (1996), pp.187-195.
- Schleiermacher, F. (1813/2012) 'On the Different Methods of Translating,' in Venuti (ed.) (2012), pp.43–63.
- Schoonmaker, F. (2010) 'Curriculum Evaluation,' in Kridel (ed.) (2010), pp.208-211.
- Schweda Nicholson, N. (1990a) 'The Role of Shadowing in Interpreter Training,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 3:33-37.
- Schwenke, T. (2015) 'Personality,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.309-310.
- Schweda Nicholson, N. (1990b) 'Consecutive Note-Taking for Community Interpretation,' in Bowen & Bowen (eds.) (1990), pp.136-145.
- Šeböková, S. (2010) *Comparing Translation Competence*, Master's diploma thesis, Masaryk University.

- Secara, A., Pascaline, M. & Ramírez, Y. (2009) 'What's in Your Blend? Creating Blended Resources for Translator Training,' *The Interpreter & Translator Trainer* 3(2):275–294. DOI: 10.1080/1750399X.2009.10798792
- Seeber, K. G. (2006) 'SIMON: An Online Clearing House for Interpreter Training Materials,' in Crawford et al. (eds.) (2006), pp.2403–2408.
- Seeber, K. G. (2015) 'Cognitive Approaches,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.56–60.
- Seeber, K. G. (2017) 'Simultaneous Interpreting into a “B Language”': Considerations for Trainers & Trainees,' in Zybatow et al. (eds.) (2017a), pp.321–328.
- Seeber, K. (2018) 'Distance Interpreting & Its Challenges,' *UNSpecial*: 20–21.
- Segers, W., & Kockaert, H. J. (2016) 'Can Subjectivity Be Avoided in Translation Evaluation?' in Thelen et al. (eds.) (2016), pp. 69–78.
- Seleskovitch, D. (1962) 'L' Interpretation de Conference,' *Babel* 8(1):13–18.
- Seleskovitch, D. (1968) *L'Interprète dans les Conference Internationals*, Paris: Minard.
- Seleskovitch, D. (1975) *Langage, Langues et Mémoire—Étude de la Prise de Notes en Interprétation Consécutive*, Préface de Jean Monnet. Paris: Minard lettres modernes.
- Seleskovitch, D. (1999) 'The Teaching of Conference Interpretation in the Course of the Last 50 Years,' *Interpreting* 4(1):55–66.
- Seleskovitch, D. & Lederer, M. (1984) 'Chapitre II: L'Enseignement de l'Interprétation,' in Seleskovitch & Lederer (eds.) (1984), pp.163–241.
- Seleskovitch, D. & Lederer, M. (1989) *Pédagogie Raisonnée de l'Interprétation*, Paris: Didier Érudition.
- Seleskovitch, D. & Lederer, M. (2001) *Interpréter Pour Traduire*, 4th edn, Paris: Didier Érudition.
- Seleskovitch, D. (2008) 'Teaching Conference Interpreting,' in Krawutschke (ed.) (2008), pp.65–88.
- Seresi, M. (2016) 'New Paths in Interpreter Training: Virtual Classes,' in Horváth (ed.) (2016), pp.219–232.
- Setton, R. (1994) 'Experiments in the Application of Discourse Studies to Interpreter Training,' in Dollerup & Lindegaard (eds.) (1994), pp. 183–198.
- Setton, R. (1999) *Simultaneous Interpretation: A Cognitive-Pragmatic Analysis*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Setton, R. (2006) 'New Demands on Interpreting & the Learning Curve in Interpreter Training,' in Chai & Zhang (eds.) (2006), pp. 36–71.

- Setton, R. (2010a) 'From Practice to Theory & Back in Interpreting: The Pivotal Role of Training,' *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 15:1-18.
- Setton, R. (2010b) 'Conference Interpreting,' in Gambier & Van Doorslaer (ed.) (2010), pp.66-74.
- Setton, R. (2011) 'Corpus-Based Interpreting Studies (CIS): Overview & Prospects,' in Kruger et al. (eds.) (2011), pp. 33–75.
- Setton, R. (2013) 'Models of Interpreting,' in Chapelle (ed.) (2013), pp.3722–3730.
- Setton, R. (2015a) 'Simultaneous with Text,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.385-386.
- Setton, R. (2015b) 'Models,' in Pöchhacker (ed.) (2015d), pp.263-268.
- Setton, R. & Dawrant, A. (2016a) *Conference Interpreting: A Complete Course*, Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Setton, R. & Dawrant, A. (2016b) *Conference Interpreting: A Trainer's Guide*, Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Shamma, T. (2015) 'Competition & Collaboration in Translation Education: The Motivational Impact of Translation Contests,' in Cui & Zhao (eds.) (2015a), pp.1-26.
- Shamy, M. & de Pedro Ricoy, R. (2017) 'Retrospective Protocols: Tapping into the Minds of Interpreting Trainees,' *Translation & Interpreting* 9 (1):51-71.
- Sharpe, R. & Oliver, M. (2007) 'Designing Courses for E-learning,' in Beetham & Sharpe (eds.) (2007), pp.41-51.
- Shaw, S. (2011) 'Cognitive & Motivational Contributors to Aptitude: A Study of Spoken & Signed Language Interpreting Students,' *Interpreting* 13(1):70-84.
- Shaw, S. (2013) *Service Learning in Interpreter Education: Strategies for Extending Student Involvement in the Deaf Community*, Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Shaw, S. (2018) 'Aptitude & Disposition: Learned vs. Nurtured Characteristics of Student Interpreters,' in Roberson & Shaw (eds.) (2018), pp.65-72.
- Shaw, S., Grbic, N. & Franklin, K. (2004) 'Applying Language Skills to Interpretation: Student Perspectives from Signed & Spoken Language Programs,' *Interpreting* 6(1):69–100. DOI: 10.1075/intp.6.1.06sha.
- Shei, Ch. (2018) 'Teaching & Learning Translation: Traditional Approach & New direction,' in Shei & Gao (eds.) (2018), pp.81-98.
- Sheneman, N. (2018) 'Your Name What? You from Where?' in Holcomb & Smith (eds.) (2018), pp.269-280.

- Sherman, G. L. (2009) 'Martin Heidegger's Concept of Authenticity: A Philosophical Contribution to Student Affairs Theory,' *Journal of College & Character* 10(7). DOI: 10.2202/1940-1639.1440.
- SHIFT Report 2, (2018): *Remote Technologized Interpreting (Telephone-Based & Video-based Remote Interpreting): Main Features & Shifts with On-site Bilateral Interpreting*, www.shiftinorality.eu
- Shlesinger, M. (1995) 'Shifts in Cohesion in Simultaneous Interpreting,' *The Translator* 1(2): 193–214.
- Shlesinger, M. (1998) 'Corpus-Based Interpreting Studies as an Offshoot of Corpus-based Translation Studies,' *Meta* 43(4): 486–493.
- Shlesinger, M. (2000) 'Interpreting as a Cognitive Process: How Can We Know What Really Happens?' in Tirkkonen-Condit & Jääskeläinen (eds.) (2000), pp.3-15.
- Shlesinger, M. & Pöchhacker, F. (2011) 'Aptitude for Interpreting,' *Interpreting* 13(1):1-4. DOI: 10.1075/intp.13.1.01int.
- Shohamy, E. & Reves, T. (1985) 'Authentic Language Tests: Where From & Where To?' *Language Testing* 2(1):48-59.
- Shreve, G. (1995) 'Foreword: Prescription & Description in Translation Teaching,' in Kiraly (1995), pp.ix-xiv.
- Shreve, G. M. (1997) 'Cognition & the Evolution of Translation Competence,' in Danks et al. (eds.) (1997), pp.120-136.
- Shreve, G.M. (2002) 'Knowing Translation: Cognitive & Experiential Aspects of Translation Expertise from the Perspective of Expertise Studies,' in Riccardi (ed.) (2002b), pp.150-171.
- Shreve, G.M. (2006) 'The Deliberate Practice: Translation & Expertise,' *Journal of Translation Studies* 9(1): 27-42.
- Shreve, G. M. (2009) 'Recipient-Oriented & Metacognition in the Translation Process,' in Dimitriu (ed.) (2009).
- Shreve, G. M., Lacruz, I. & Angelone, E. (2018) 'Are Expertise & Translation Competence the Same? Psychological Reality & the Theoretical Status of Competence,' in Lacruz & Jääskeläinen (eds.) (2018), pp.37-54.
- Shuttleworth, M. (2001) 'The Role of Theory in Translator Training: Some Observations About Syllabus Design,' *Meta* 46:497-506.
- Shuttleworth, M. & Cowie, M. (1997) *Dictionary of Translation Studies*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Shuttleworth, M. (2017) 'Cutting Teeth on Translation Technology: How Students at University College London Are Being Trained to Become Tomorrow's Translators,' *Tradução em Revista* 22(1):18-38. DOI: 10.17771/PUCRio.TradRev.30595.

- Sikora, I. (2014) 'The Need for CAT Training within Translator Training Programmes: Modern Bare Necessities or Unnecessary Fancies of Translation Trainers?' *inTRALinea* special issue. <http://www.intralinea.org/archive/article/2092> (Accessed March 18, 2018).
- Sikora, I. (2015) 'Students' Errors in Business Translation: Causes, Consequences & Implications,' in Pietrzak & Deckert (eds.) (2015), pp.133-156.
- Sikora, I. (2016) 'Procedural Approach to Translation Quality, Translation Standards & Teaching Translation at the Undergraduate Level: Focus on Pre- & Post-translation Stages,' *Journal of Translator Education & Translation Studies* 1(2):38-57.
- Silberman, M. (ed.) (2007) *The Handbook of Experiential Learning*, California: John Wiley & Sons.
- Simonton, D. K. (1977) 'Creative Productivity, Age, & Stress: A Biographical Timeseries Analysis of 10 Classical Composers,' *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology* 35:791-804.
- Sirén, S. & Hakkarainen, K. (2002) 'Expertise in Translation,' *Across Languages & Cultures* 3 (1): 71-82.
- Skaaden, H. (1999) 'Lexical knowledge & Interpreter Aptitude,' *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 9(1):77-97.
- Skaaden, H. (2013) 'Assessing Interpreter Aptitude in a Variety of Languages,' in Tsagari & Van Deemter (eds.) (2013), pp.35-50.
- Skaaden, H. (2017) "That We All Behave like Professionals": an Experiential-Dialogic Approach to Interpreter Education & Online Learning,' in Cirillo & Niemants (eds.) (2017), pp.323-340.
- Skaaden, H. & Wadensjö, C. (2014) 'Some Considerations on the Testing of Interpreting Skills,' in Giambruno (ed.) (2014a), pp.17-26.
- Skaaden, H. & Wattne, M. (2009) 'Teaching Interpreting in Cyberspace: The Answer to All our Prayers?' in De Pedro Ricoy et al. (eds.) (2009), pp.74-88.
- Skidmore, D. & Murakami, K. (eds.) (2016) *Dialogic Pedagogy: The Importance of Dialogue in Teaching & Learning*, Bristol/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Skinner, R. (in progress) *British Sign Language & Video-Mediated Interpreting: Proximity in Police Settings*, Doctoral Thesis, Heriot-Watt University.
- Slatyer, H. (2006) 'Researching Curriculum Innovation in Interpreter Education: The Case of Initial Training for Novice Interpreters in Languages of Limited Diffusion,' in Roy (ed.) (2006), pp.47-65.