Susanne Hagemann (University of Mainz/Germersheim)

(Non-)Professional, Authentic Projects? Why Terminology Matters

The inspiration for this chapter came from the fact that the Second International Conference on Non-Professional Interpreting and Translation (NPIT2), held at Mainz University in May 2014, included a panel on Authentic, Non-Professional, Project-Based Translation Work in Translator Education, where I was invited to present a paper. The NPIT2 call for papers referred to non-professional translation as "the most widespread form of translational action" and explained: "Such an action occurs when an individual translates or interprets without receiving pay." ("Call" 2013) Defining *non-professional* as 'unpaid', and/or *professional* as 'paid', is of course not specific to NPIT2 but accords with, for instance, Pym's terminological recommendation: "If a translator is paid, they are professional" (2011: 89). However, I began to wonder about the connection between this definition and the panel to which I had been asked to contribute. This was the starting point of a foray into the terminological complexities of classroom projects. (By *classroom projects,* I mean projects that are carried out by students with support from their teachers in the context of a degree programme. The classroom may be a virtual one, and meetings may be scheduled as required, rather than at a fixed time every week.)

In the following, I shall argue that the terminological choices we make in discussing classroom projects are not neutral. For instance, while we can regard unpaid projects

as examples of non-professional translation, in the sense of unpaid translation, this implies a very specific view of project work. If we wish to promote different views, we will need different terminologies. In other words, I hope to show that the terminology of classroom projects matters because the same project can appear in quite different guises depending on the terminology in which we couch our descriptions. I shall begin by exploring the implications of *(non-)professional* as well as a number of partial synonyms, from *volunteer* to *expert-in-training,* and proceed to suggest an alternative approach, namely avoiding short-hand labels in favour of a competence-related terminology that distinguishes between different aspects of projects and student performance. A final section will be devoted to some other terms that recur in publications on classroom projects, including especially *authentic* and the term *project* itself.

My example will be a multilingual project for the blogging community Global Voices, which was organized by the German Department of Mainz University's Faculty of Translation Studies, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies (FTSK) in 2012. Students in our department all study German as their B language, and we offer German in combination with twelve A languages. Our projects therefore often involve more than one language combination even when we do not join forces with other departments at FTSK. We moreover encourage students to develop and manage their own projects, for which they get credits in a seminar on project management. The Global Voices project was initiated by one of the German Department's MA students and subsequently managed by other students in our project-management seminar. The actual translations were produced by four classes in the German Department and five in other departments at FTSK. The languages involved, in addition to German, were English, French, Greek, Russian, and Spanish ("FTSK" n.d.). The client, Global Voices, is a non-profit organization that describes itself as "a community of more than 800 bloggers and translators around the world who work together to bring you reports from blogs and citizen media everywhere, with emphasis on voices that are not ordinarily heard in international mainstream media" ("About" n.d.). Since Global Voices works exclusively with volunteer translators and relies "on grants, sponsorships, editorial commissions, and donations to cover [its] costs" ("About" n.d.), the project is a typical example of non-professional translation as defined by the NPIT2 organizers.

What does the NPIT2 conference's definition of *non-professional translation* tell us about the Global Voices project? I shall begin by stating the obvious: the definition tells us not only that payment makes a difference, but also that the difference is important enough to serve as a basis for a binary classification of types of translatorial action. And from one point of view, this is certainly true. In our unpaid project, students did not experience what it is like to translate for a living. They were neither faced with the implications of order acquisition and line prices for their personal finances, nor did they write invoices, let alone have to deal with clients unwilling to pay. But then, *professional translation* in the sense of 'paid translation' covers in-house work as well as freelance assignments; and while there are some important similarities between the two (such as the speed at which translators may be expected to work), financial issues are quite different. Being paid does not necessarily involve negotiating fees and writing invoices.

While I agree that issues surrounding fees, and more generally self-employment, should have a place in translation degree programmes, payment as such is not a useful defining characteristic for projects because it is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for project-based learning processes. It is true that the term *professional* in the sense of 'paid' seems meaningful when applied to projects such as those described by Kiraly (e.g. 2013: 217–19), Schmitt (2008), or Schwarz (2010), where students translate at higher-range market prices and under market conditions. However, such projects constitute only one example of the variety of classroom projects, and not necessarily the prototypical one.

There are at least two perspectives from which unpaid projects such as Global Voices have a raison d'être as well. Firstly, not translating under market conditions usually means being able to translate at a more leisurely pace, which allows more time for research, discussions, and feedback. While students certainly need to learn to translate quickly because this is what they will have to do when they translate for a living, they also need opportunities to reflect thoroughly on what they are doing and on feedback they have been given as this is an essential part of the learning process. Furthermore, they need space to explore various research methods in order to acquire or consolidate relevant procedural and declarative knowledge. Secondly, unpaid translation services

may be worth something in other than financial terms. Not all colleagues at FTSK would agree with me on this point. I have heard at least two of them argue that for a translation to have any value, it must be paid appropriately. I do not share their view. We should of course not offer free, or under-priced, translations to clients who would otherwise have to pay for them in the marketplace (though it is worth noting that this, too, would be covered by the above definition of *non-professional*). But the non-profit sector is a different matter. I would argue that it is not a bad thing for students at a university in a fairly free, peaceful, and prosperous country to donate some of their time and budding skills to the concerns of others who are less privileged than they are – in the case of Global Voices, to help the marginalized and the censored to be heard internationally.

The use of payment as a criterion is not exclusive to the term *non-professional.* It also occurs with a partial synonym such as *volunteer translation,* which is sometimes used for unpaid projects conducted with a view to helping others. For instance, Olohan (2012) theorizes volunteer translation against the background of altruism as described by behavioural economics, and Hokkanen (2012: 299–306) compares the concepts of *volunteering* and *service* with regard to church interpreting. Calling the Global Voices project an example of volunteer translation would on the one hand make it clearer that Global Voices is a non-profit organization, not a for-profit desirous of saving on translation costs (but it would at the same time raise the question of whether student groups actually volunteer, or are volunteered by their teachers). On the other hand, applying this terminology to the classroom would once more suggest a significant difference between paid and unpaid projects without taking account of the function which both types of project fulfil in teaching and learning. The same problem would arise with Jääskeläinen, Kujamäki, and Mäkisalo's term *non-profit translation* (2011: 144–5). I shall return to this point later.

First, however, I want to take another look at the term *non-professional.* In addition to 'unpaid', the term can be associated with a second characteristic, a lack of institutionalization in the sense of formal – and especially university – training[1], membership

---

[1] My use of *training* in this paper is generic and includes education. See below for a discussion of the two terms.

in professional associations, and codes of ethics (see Séguinot 2008: 2–3 for *professionalization*). In some publications, the two characteristics serve to describe different concepts (see e.g. McDonough Dolmaya 2012: 174). In others, they are combined to form a single concept: for instance, Pérez-González and Susam-Saraeva define *non-professional translators and interpreters* as "individuals not only without formal training in linguistic mediation but also working for free" (2012: 151). In yet others, quality is added as a further possible criterion (see e.g. Jääskeläinen/Kujamäki/Mäkisalo 2011: 146–7).[2] Some researchers, however, have questioned whether the field of translation, including translator training, is not too loosely structured for it to be called a profession. Thus, Katan summarizes the relevant results of his international survey of nearly 1000 translator and interpreter respondents as follows:

> […] when asked to focus on the wider reality they become acutely aware that they lack societal recognition, and that translators, in particular, lack status. They are also concerned about deprofessionalization from the cowboys but not (yet) from IT.[3] Yet, there is not really much mention or apparent awareness regarding wider professional autonomy or many of the key traits deemed necessary for the transformation of an occupation into a profession. In fact, control of output and its use in wider society is hardly mentioned, nor is the need for a recognized body of T/I knowledge (rather than practice) or professional certification/qualifications.
>
> It would appear that the T/I group surveyed are focused on their local realities, their immediate, and very individual, developmental paths, and focused very much on the text. There is little sign of the mediator or activist, or of the HAP [Higher Autonomy Professional] consultant living in the same world as their client. Hence, academic theory is out of sync with this reality, and for the moment we still have an occupation rather than a fully fledged profession. (2011: 84; see also e.g. Neather 2012: 249, Olohan 2012: 193–4, Schopp 2012: 329–31)

If this is the case, then universities might aspire to professionalize the field, but the status quo becomes questionable as an objective of translator training.

---

[2] It is worth noting in this context that *professional* has two antonyms, namely *non-professional* and *unprofessional,* and that a failure to comply with quality and/or ethical standards would often be referred to as *unprofessional* rather than *non-professional*. Interestingly, Harris (2009–14) has chosen to name his blog about "Natural Translation, Native Translation and Language Brokering" *Unprofessional Translation*.

[3] When the respondents were asked where they saw competition coming from, they focused on non-specialist translation amateurs (referred to as "cowboys" by one respondent) and subject-specialist translation amateurs, while technology played a comparatively minor role (Katan 2011: 73).

The use of *professional/non-professional* in this second sense, associated with institutionalization, sometimes focuses on formal training as a defining characteristic. This obviates the problem of how professional the field is, but raises other questions. For example, Jääskeläinen refers to the translatorial behaviour of first-year students as *non-professional* and to that of fifth-year students as *professional-like* or *semi-professional* (1993: 99–100). Similarly, Hönig categorizes advanced students as *semi-professional* ("semiprofessionell" [2011: 61]). This usage – which is not exclusive to the two authors I have quoted – emphasizes the fact that students have begun but have not yet completed their training. If we apply this terminology to projects (which neither Jääskeläinen nor Hönig does), we will set project work in the context of a degree programme, but once more without specifying the nature of the contribution it makes to the programme. And we will at least imply a correlation between the amount of time students have spent in the programme and the degree of competence they have developed – a correlation which of course does not necessarily exist. Kiraly's recent term *pre-professional* (in this volume) seems more promising in that it de-emphasizes the notion of automatic progression.

So far, I have argued that while we can apply the terms *non-professional* and *professional* to classroom projects, their established definitions do not fit in well with the specifics of a teaching and learning situation. In particular, they focus on differentiations that may well be less important in the classroom than outside; and conversely, they fail to indicate what project work is intended to achieve for students. Another relevant point is provocatively made by Pym:

> Translation professionals not infrequently engage in the sublime arrogance of supposing academics are somehow there to serve them. Theory, research, and teaching would have as their only goal the betterment of the profession and only the profession. If we want to know how to translate, apparently we should do research on what the best professionals do; if we want to know the right decisions to make, we should interview the professionals with the most years of experience. Many trainers and researchers have thus adhered to an unspoken pact, pretending to support professionals who at the same time claim to need no such support. (2012: 81)

Pym goes on to suggest that, instead of promoting a closed-shop mentality, we need to take crowd-sourced and machine translation seriously (2012: 82–5), and look at how

it interlinks with professional, for example revision and post-editing, services: "Professional translators […] still think they sell a specialized production process; they thus oppose the integration of machine translation and volunteers. Increasingly, they will have to realize that what they sell is their seal of approval, their trustworthiness, their responsibility" (2012: 86). In the context of projects, therefore, the opposition between *professional* and *non-professional* (however defined) is not contradictory: a project will not necessarily be either one or the other but may include elements of both. We might want our terminology to allow for this possibility, rather than closing it off by means of the prefix *non-*, which commonly expresses contradictoriness.

In the following, I shall discuss some other ways of talking about project work. My starting point is the fact that Jääskeläinen uses *novice* as a synonym of *non-professional* (1993: 100). Since she does not explain the pedagogical assumptions behind this term, it may be no more than a convenient stylistic alternative in her case. By contrast, when Kiraly spoke of *novices* in his 2000 monograph, he situated his use of the term in a complex educational approach. (I use the past tense advisedly.) Kiraly drew on Hoffman's model of expertise development in distinguishing five stages: novice, initiate, apprentice, journeyman, and expert. His definition of *novice* (2000: 58), which closely followed Hoffman's (1998: 84–5), read: "'a probationary member' of a knowledge community with minimal exposure to the domain". This definition suggests what Kiraly's classroom projects aimed to do, namely enable students to become members of a knowledge community; and the five stages of becoming a member are obviously relevant to teaching and learning processes. However, Kiraly has recently said that he is "no longer very comfortable with the idea of a 'novice' translator" because the term

> […] has strong overtones of the neophyte, almost completely lacking in experience, desperately in need of (cognitive) apprenticeship under a "master" of whatever it is that is being learned. But the apprenticeship system itself (from which cognitive apprenticeship surely and logically devolved or evolved) smacks of conventional reductionist epistemology, of filled receptacles pouring their contents into less-filled ones, of knowledge-as-truth being passed down from master to apprentice and from generation to generation. (2014)

This is one drawback of Hoffman's terminology. In fact, Hoffman himself calls attention to his model's "reliance on an outdated, male-oriented perspective" (1998:

95). Moreover, as Hoffman also points out (1998: 84), his terminology was originally associated with craft guilds. Is the metaphor sufficiently dead by now, or does it suggest that translation is a craft – and if it does, is this what we wish to suggest? Finally, *novice* etc. are designations for persons, and as such, they may be taken to imply a homogeneity of translation competence that in practice does not actually exist. For example, a translator may have excellent research skills but at the same time lack self-confidence and therefore ignore his or her own power of decision. For these reasons, I have come to think that we may need yet a different terminology.

A term that has gained considerable currency is Harris's *natural translation* (e.g. 1973: 137). However, this seems unsuitable to me in the context of classroom projects because it revolves around a complete lack of training. Thus, according to a recent definition of Harris's, natural translators "are people who do translation of a simple kind without having had any training in translation, either formal or informal. They have been observed among very young children, though natural translation […] is by no means limited to them" (2009). In this sense, even first-year students are not natural translators because they have already started their training. By contrast, in propagating the term *native translator,* Toury emphasizes the fact that "[t]he acquisition of translating as a skill […] does not involve the mere unfolding of the innate competence, but is always connected with and dependent on some environmental feedback resulting from the socio-cultural circumstances surrounding the emerging translator and his activity" (1984: 191). He argues that training "can be justified only to the extent that it leads to the attainment of the 'natural' results (that is, to the establishment of an advanced 'native translator') in a quicker and more efficient way" (1984: 193), and calls for the introduction of "a developmental model which is constructed exclusively around the evasive notion of socialization, or even the acquisition of a habitus" (^{2}2012: 289). In this context, students could certainly be referred to as *native translators.* However, this would once more direct attention away from the specifics of the classroom situation.

If we want to speak of students in general, and of what project work can contribute to translation learning, Washbourne's term *experts-in-training* (2013: 44) has the advantage of focusing both on the learning process and on its ultimate goal without ascribing

a specific set of competences to any individual student, or group of students. *Translation by experts-in-training* is an apt description of what I would regard as the core of the Global Voices project, albeit only with Washbourne's proviso that "[t]he use of 'training' in this ad hoc term does not preclude translator education or its goals" (2013: 44).

The use of *training* in connection with translation degree programmes is not uncontroversial. While it serves as a generic term in some publications (e.g. Kelly 2005), in others a sharp distinction is drawn between *training* and *education.* Bernardini for one argues that "[t]he aim of [training] is to prepare learners to solve problems that can be identified in advance through the application of pre-set, or 'acquired' procedures", whereas "the core aim of education is to favour the growth of the individual, developing her cognitive capacities, and those attitudes and predispositions that will put her in a position to cope with the most varying (professional) situations". The former is "cumulative"; the latter, "generative" (2004: 19). Kelly and Martin sum up current usage as follows:

> In very general terms, 'training' tends to be preferred by those who adopt a more vocational or market-driven approach to developing translator and interpreter skills, while 'education' is favoured by those who situate the acquisition of these skills in the broader social context of higher or tertiary education, although this split is not entirely clear-cut (²2009: 294).

My own use of *training* rather than *education* in this paper is partly motivated by Washbourne's term *experts-in-training,* and partly by the connection between project work and the translation market. However, I do not intend to suggest that education, in Bernardini's sense, is any less important (quite the contrary, in fact). As far as projects such as Global Voices are concerned, while they are usually regarded as an opportunity for students to acquire market-relevant competences, they are not a priori associated with either education or training, but can be used for both purposes; and it is worthwhile noting in this context that the purpose intended by a teacher will not necessarily be identical to that sought by (each of) their students. In the practice of classroom projects, the education/training distinction may therefore be less clear-cut than some definitions suggest.

Speaking of *experts-in-training* moreover begs the question of what we mean by *expert.* Not surprisingly, there are various answers. Washbourne himself discusses ethical expertise but not translation expertise in general. Pym, applying discourse analysis to uses of the terms *expert* and *expertise* in translation studies, concluded almost twenty years ago that they are not neutral but ideological, and that "[t]he ideology of the expert is self-justifying" (1996: 4). To put it very bluntly and simplistically, according to Pym we attribute the label *expert* to those whose discourses and practices accord with our own, and then refer to them in order to confirm the quality of our own work. Pym emphasizes that while sound empirical research is valuable, it does not offer an easy way out of the quandary:

> […] the appeal to science is itself often a major strategy for shoring up expertise. After all, […] there is always some personal or collective interest at stake in the setting up of any scientific research. Why focus on one particular area […]? Why choose some hypotheses and not others […]? What is the authority of the person organizing the research […]? (1996: 8)

If we apply Pym's analysis to the term *expert-in-training* and to the Global Voices project, it will become clear that both can take on quite diverse meanings depending on students' and teachers' underlying concepts of translation, translators, and translator training. For instance, the project lends itself to a holistic approach which includes aspects such as learning to work with HTML files, coordinating with other team members, and meeting deadlines, but it can also be used for a language-and-culture-centred type of teaching and/or learning in which technological and organizational aspects become extraneous. Proponents of either method may lay claim to the term *experts-in-training,* each on the basis of their own notions of expertise.

Shreve, taking his cue from Pym, argues:

> To be an expert […] means first and foremost to be able to perform domain-specific tasks at a level consistently and demonstrably superior to the performance of others (novices, students, experienced non-experts). Implicit in the notion of expert performance is an objective evaluation or assessment of some kind that establishes a *demonstrable* difference between the "superior" performances expected of experts and performances at lower levels. This assessment, at least in the case of translation performance, is not a trivial problem. […] the solution is to capture the multiple value systems

> translations can represent in performance models reflective of different performance-assessment situations. (2002: 151–2)

What is relevant here is that, in the current absence of such a bundle of operationalizable models, or of one generic model, the term *experts-in-training* will continue to remain to some degree ideological. By speaking of *experts-in-training* in connection with project work, I indicate that, in my view, translator training should relate to a specific concept of what superior performance in translation involves; but the nature of this concept is not self-evident and will remain open unless I explain it at some length.

Before proceeding to discuss the terminological dimension of such an explanation, I shall take a brief look at another aspect of what Pym calls ideology. The term *professional* is obviously easier to operationalize than *expert*, for example in terms of work experience[4] gained or income earned as a translator. However, it is no less ideological than *expert* when used in the context of classroom projects. Degree programmes are necessarily selective even when their design is holistic because it is impossible to reproduce the multiplicity of work situations in a few modules (or, for that matter, in the lifetime of any single translator). The moment we apply *professional* to what students should learn to do, the term will thereby become normative and raise questions of selection very similar to those raised by Pym for uses of *expert.*

Since this paper focuses on the implications of terminology for our views of classroom projects, I shall not set out the details of my own concept of superior performance in translation here. I shall, however, give an example of the terminology I would use to describe both project work and the performance of an individual expert-in-training. The example derives from a developmental model of translation competence created by Andrea Cnyrim, Julia Neu, and myself on the basis of Risku (1998). In our model, we provide labels for ideal-typical competence levels rather than real persons (2013:

---

[4] As a number of authors have pointed out, work experience alone is not a sufficient condition for superior performance and therefore for expertise. See e.g. Ericsson (1996: 3–4), and in translation studies Jääskeläinen (1993: 99–100 and 2010: 214–20), Risku (1998: 90), and Shreve (2002: 157 and 2006: 28). While Jääskeläinen, Kujamäki, and Mäkisalo (2011: 148–52) rightly remind us that a failure of working translators to achieve high quality in empirical settings may be due to problems caused by the research design or the concept of quality used, it seems unrealistic to assume that, if these problems were rectified, the performance of all would be equally good.

30–4 and passim).[5] This seems viable to me from my present terminological perspective as well. Focusing on competences obviates the problems posed by terms such as *novice.* It does not associate learning with an apprenticeship, or translation with a craft. Moreover, since our model is ideal-typical, it does not claim to reflect any specific individual's learning processes (2013: 13–14), and can therefore accommodate the fact that an individual translation student may have achieved different levels of competence depending on which aspects we spotlight, and also on the precise nature of the task at hand. The five dimensions of translation competence that the model comprises[6] are closely intertwined, which enables us, on the one hand, to view the project work done by students as an integrated whole, and on the other, to distinguish between different aspects of a student's performance.

Applying the terminology of our developmental model to the Global Voices project as a whole would involve saying that, depending on the texts chosen, the project was appropriate for Levels 3 or 4, which we refer to as *conceptual and procedural competence* and *multidimensional competence* respectively.[7] The project was suitable for promoting student development in some, but not all, dimensions of translation competence. For instance, since the project was carried out by several translation teams as well as a project-management team, it was relevant to co-organization, which is part of Risku's dimension of self-organization and relates to how the translation process is integrated into various frameworks of social action (Risku 1998: 235). By contrast, the project may not have contributed much to the advancement of students' guiding images of translation, i.e. their notions of what translation can be about, because many students would

---

[5] Following Risku (1998: 88–90 and passim), we sometimes refer to the extremes of the scale as *layperson* and *expert.* However, ideal-typical extremes by definition involve possessing a characteristic in the utmost possible degree, and will therefore be homogeneous.

[6] The dimensions, first described by Risku (1998: 131–239), are guiding images of translation (i.e. representations of the purpose of translation), macrostrategy formation (i.e. determining the goal of translatorial action), information integration (i.e. processes ranging from the use of previous knowledge via source-text reception to research), planning and decisions (i.e. procedures chosen in a specific translation situation), and self-organization (i.e. self-management as well as integration into frameworks of social action). They thus include both cognitive and social aspects of translation.

[7] In addition to its five dimensions of translation competence, the model has a total of five levels: (1) lay competence, (2) basic functional competence, (3) conceptual and procedural competence, (4) multidimensional competence, and (5) autonomous and progressive competence. As implemented in our own department, Level 3 covers the second and third BA years, and Level 4, the two MA years.

already have been familiar with the predominantly reproduction-oriented guiding image[8] promoted by Global Voices.

As far as an individual student's performance is concerned, I shall take one of our student project managers, in her first MA year, as an example. At one point she was faced with the issue of defective source texts, which she identified as a risk. On her own initiative, she consulted a Global Voices editor and posted their joint suggestions in our online project forum, where the translation teams were able to access them. She thus assumed appropriate and responsible roles in her interactions with other stake-holders, and therefore scored highly on co-organization. By contrast, in the dimension of guiding images she remained much closer to the lay end of the scale. For instance, she spoke of some defects "having no relevance to translation", as if there could be any type of defect that did not confront a translator with ethical issues linked to his or her possible roles (in fact, translation as reproduction, for example, would involve repro-ducing defects in the interests of the original author's voice, but perhaps at the expense of their power of conviction). She moreover proved quite reluctant to reflect on, let alone critically question, her assumptions. If we consider this student an expert-in-training, then she might have benefited from taking part in a further project geared to help students expand their range of guiding images.

What are the implications of this kind of competence-related terminology for project work? It is immediately obvious that speaking of competences involves far longer descriptions than classifying an entire project as *non-professional*, or students as *semi-professionals*. This is not a disadvantage, however. Rather, it indicates, firstly, that even when we take a holistic approach, we need to differentiate between various aspects of both the project and students' performance because we cannot expect either to be homogeneous. Secondly, it reinforces a point made earlier: when talking about class-room projects, we should explain not only our general pedagogical approach but also our concepts of translation and of the specific goals of translator training because they are not inherent in project work as such.

---

[8] See e.g. advice such as "Translators are encouraged to use bracketed 'translators' notes' when they needed [sic] to change something in the original post." ("Lingua Translators Guide" 2014)

The need to explicate our concepts and goals has a bearing on assessment as well. We measure students' performance against learning objectives; but whose objectives, or intended learning outcomes, are they – the teacher's or the student's? What happens if the two disagree? Questions such as these are obviously not first and foremost terminological; but they are worth briefly mentioning here not only because they do have a terminological component but also because the many-sidedness of projects offers a high potential for disagreement. For instance, in the anonymous final evaluation of the Global Voices project conducted by one of our project managers, a student said: "I would have preferred to translate more texts myself […] because what matters in specialized translation is routine and observing text-type conventions" (quoted in Mölbert 2012: 4; my translation). The project would doubtless have lent itself to translating large amounts of text, and also to working with text-type conventions. But if the unnamed teacher of this course intended the project to provide students with a holistic experience of translation that included aspects ranging from co-organization via revision to information and communication technology, then the question of whether we define *learning objectives* or *outcomes* from the student's or from the teacher's perspective becomes paramount. If the student rejects the teacher's objectives because they do not seem relevant to him or her, and instead aims for a different set of outcomes, how do we assess performance?

Another term we need to consider in connection with project work is *authentic.* Was the Global Voices project an authentic one – and what does the term tell us about the project? Before I began work on this paper, I would have said unhesitatingly that it was an authentic project because the translations were subsequently used outside the classroom in which they were produced. Authenticity for me would have resided in the existence of users other than the translation group (including the teacher), outside or inside FTSK.[9] But other definitions are possible. For instance, Schopp maintains that an authentic commission in translator training involves "the holistic and systematic working through of a commission in the commercial sense, that is, taking into account

---

[9] This is the implicit definition of authenticity on which the concept of networked translation teaching developed by Julia Neu and myself is based. Interestingly, we did not find it necessary to make our definition explicit when we published an account of our networked projects (Hagemann/Neu 2013); it seemed self-evident to us at the time. – An internal networked project, for users inside FTSK but outside the project teams' classrooms, is described in Sánchez (2012).

all stages of the translation process, starting from a price estimate in response to a client's or commissioner's request, to the final proofreading by the client and permission to print" (2006: 175–6). The Global Voices project would then have been inauthentic not only because it was unpaid but also because it lacked features such as an imprimatur and a contract setting out "all relevant parameters such as description of the work, final form of the text, grammatical and visual quality and due date" (Schopp 2006: 177). Interestingly, on the basis of this definition, an authenticity deficit will be found not only in some classroom projects but also in quite a number of paid projects in the translation market. For Schopp, the issue of authenticity seems to be closely bound up with his conception of what it would take for translation to become a full profession (2012: 329–31). Authenticity in this sense embodies a vision rather than a current reality.

Krenzler-Behm's concept of authenticity has some similarities with Schopp's in so far as her demarcation criteria include the existence of a real client who is available for queries, a negotiation of terms and conditions, a clear definition of the translation's intended use, degree of publicness, and addressees, as well as payment for the job (2013: 16). She differs from Schopp in her recommendation that the source text should be suitable for real-time classroom translation, and that it should be non-specialized because she considers most specialized texts too demanding (2013: 16, 88–9). However, this recommendation seems to spring from Krenzler-Behm's basically instructionist approach to teaching (2013: 198–204, 339) rather than from any assumptions about authenticity as such. While its usefulness is open to argument, it does emphasize the fact that project work needs to be considered in the context of a classroom situation.

From a different point of view, Kiraly has defined *authentic project work* as "the collaborative undertaking of complete translation projects for real clients" (2005: 1002). Does this make the Global Voices project authentic? The answer will depend on whether "collaborative" refers generally to the involvement of several translators (in the sense in which e.g. Folaron [2010: 233] speaks of "volunteer, collaborative networks") or specifically to Kiraly's own pedagogical approach, whether we regard Global Voices as a "real client" even though they do not remunerate their translators, and

whether a selection of texts from a larger website qualifies as "complete"[10]. A later definition of *authentic, collaborative translation project* reads: "a holistic piece of work undertaken by a team of students in the service of a real-world client or user" (Kiraly 2012: 84). Leaving aside the fact that the definiendum is different here, this definition is somewhat easier to apply to the Global Voices project because, from the perspective of student experience, the project may be "a holistic piece of work" even though it does not involve translating the "complete" website. And while Global Voices might still not count as a "real client" – witness the distinction drawn in this article between "translations commissioned by real-world clients" and "other types of published work", where "[g]roups of my students and I have sought out NGOs needing translations that they could not pay for" (2012: 91) –, the project would qualify as authentic on the strength of it being undertaken for the benefit of users of the Global Voices website.

Another definition in an earlier publication of Kiraly's raises an even more interesting issue: "Authenticity is the degree to which the activities undertaken in the classroom are representative of the nature and complexity of activities performed by professional translators in the course of their work." (2000: 58) Here, authenticity is said to be a matter of "degree". This fits in with the poststructuralist critique of the concept: "To claim that a category is authentic is to argue that it is genuine, natural, true and pure. […] the concept of authenticity is closely related to the notion of essentialism in that authenticity implies immaculate origins. It follows then that the anti-essentialism of poststructuralism and postmodernism rejects the idea of the authentic as such" (Barker 2004: 9). Classroom projects are – I am tempted to say: essentially – hybrid. Their origins are never immaculate because they always spring from a dual need: the classroom's and the client's. The point of our projects is precisely that they are carried out in a teaching/learning situation and not (or not only) in the marketplace – even if there were such a thing as 'the' translation marketplace. For instance, we will support students if there are any problems they cannot handle by themselves, and we will not let

---

[10] Compare Galán-Mañas (2011: 3), who defines *authentic practice* as "working on real translation projects, such as translating an entire website, documents involved in the sale of equipment (sales agreement, technical specifications, user manuals, etc.), software with all the corresponding documentation – hard copy or electronic format – or an entire magazine etc." This would exclude the Global Voices project because we did not translate the entire website.

them get themselves into a situation where they might incur substantial damages, even though this does happen to freelance translators. Our projects are never the same as any section of the heterogeneous translation market, and there is no reason why our terminology should gloss over, rather than emphasize, their hybridity. This is why I have used the term *classroom projects* rather than *authentic projects* in this paper.

A potential disadvantage of the term *classroom projects* is that some definitions of *project* leave open the question of whether the translations produced will actually be used or not. Thus, Kelly defines *project-based approach* as a type of teaching and learning "where an entire student group assumes responsibility for an authentic or realistically simulated large-scale translation commission" (2005: 116); and for Hansen-Schirra and Kiraly, classroom project work *(Projektunterricht)* is "a networked, situated, holistic learning experience" (2013: 7; my translation). Yet the presence or absence of a client (and/or of external users) can make a substantial difference not only to student motivation but also to aspects of the translation process ranging from co-organization to decision-making, and should therefore be reflected in our terminology. A viable solution for this problem would be to speak of *projects* in a business sense. For instance, the British project-management method PRINCE2™ defines *project* as "a temporary organization that is created for the purpose of delivering one or more business products according to an agreed Business Case[11]" (OGC [5]2009: 3). The notion of "delivering one or more business products" implies the existence of somebody to whom the products will be delivered – in the case of translations, the client or user. Since according to PRINCE2™, all projects "involve a team of people […] working together […] to introduce a change that will impact others outside the team" (OGC [5]2009: 3), it is clear that the teacher and the student translators themselves will not count as users. The PRINCE2™ definition excludes translation assignments whose sole purpose is classroom practice; but it is compatible with a concept of project work such as Hansen-Schirra and Kiraly's. Introducing a business definition of *project* into a teaching/learning context moreover emphasizes the hybridity of classroom projects which, as I have argued, the term *authentic project* fails to convey adequately.

---

[11] "The Business Case presents the optimum mix of information used to judge whether the project is (and remains) desirable, viable and achievable, and therefore worthwhile investing in." (OGC [5]2009: 21)

Numerous other terms could be discussed here. My final example, which I am not going to explore in detail, is *minimally invasive.* The concept of minimally invasive education is defined as "a pedagogic method that uses the learning environment to generate an adequate level of motivation to induce learning in groups of children, with none or minimal intervention from a teacher. In MIE [minimally invasive education], the role of the teacher is limited to providing, or guiding learners to, environments that generate adequate levels of interest" (Mitra et al. 2005). How does this terminology relate to classroom projects in translation studies? Rather than examine the obvious links between the definition of *minimally invasive* and project work (such as the fact that projects tend to engender a motivational environment, and are often predicated on a belief in learner autonomy and self-responsibility), I want to draw attention to a puzzling issue. In some of the classes in which the Global Voices project was carried out, students translated from B into A, and in others, from A into B; but as with many other projects at FTSK, the target language was invariably the teacher's A language. This makes sense if we believe that teaching involves imparting our knowledge to students; but in how far is it compatible with the definition of a minimally invasive approach? And why is the native-speaker principle in teaching so tenacious? Is this simply due to institutional inertia, or to students wanting the teacher to (be able to) guarantee the "correctness" of the target text, and/or to teachers being reluctant to give up a position of power? Looking at the ramifications of the term *minimally invasive* can make us question our assumptions about directionality in translation teaching.

To sum up, I hope to have shown in this paper that it is worth giving serious consideration to the terminology we adopt in discussing classroom projects. The factors we need to take into account are, firstly, existing terms with their definitions, contexts of use, and implications; and secondly, the assumptions and expectations which we ourselves bring to projects carried out in translation degree programmes and which comprise both translation- and pedagogy-related aspects. Seemingly convenient terminological short-cuts such as *(non-)professional* may well prove less than helpful because they tend to oversimplify three very complex processes, namely translation, teaching, and learning. Our terminology can both reflect and shape the ways in

which we think about these processes. We should deliberately employ it to conceptualize flexible, variegated, and training-centred approaches to project work.

Works Cited

"About" (n.d.). *Global Voices.* http://globalvoicesonline.org/about/ [3 March 2014; text modified between 2014 and 2019].

Barker, Chris (2004). *The SAGE Dictionary of Cultural Studies.* London: SAGE.

Bernardini, Silvia (2004). "The Theory behind the Practice: Translator Training or Translator Education?", in Kirsten Malmkjær (ed.): *Translation in Undergraduate Degree Programmes.* Benjamins Translation Library, EST Subseries 59. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 17–29.

"Call for Papers" (2013). *2nd International Conference on Non-Professional Interpreting and Translation.* http://www.fb06.uni-mainz.de/ikk/402.php [23 September 2019].

Cnyrim, Andrea / Hagemann, Susanne / Neu, Julia (2013). "Towards a Framework of Reference for Translation Competence", in Don Kiraly / Silvia Hansen-Schirra / Karin Maksymski (eds.): *New Prospects and Perspectives for Educating Language Mediators.* Translationswissenschaft 10. Tübingen: Narr, 9–34.

Ericsson, K. Anders (1996). "The Acquisition of Expert Performance: An Introduction to Some of the Issues", in K. Anders Ericsson (ed.): *The Road to Excellence: The Acquisition of Expert Performance in the Arts and Sciences, Sports, and Games.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1–50.

Folaron, Deborah (2010). "Networking and Volunteer Translators", in Yves Gambier / Luc van Doorslaer (eds.): *Handbook of Translation Studies.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, I: 231–4.

"FTSK" (n.d.). *Global Voices.* http://de.globalvoicesonline.org/author/ftsk/ [23 September 2019].

Galán-Mañas, Anabel (2011). "Translating Authentic Technical Documents in Specialised Translation Classes", *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 16. http://www.jostrans.org/issue16/art_manas.pdf [23 September 2019].

Hagemann, Susanne / Neu, Julia (2013). "Vernetzte Translationslehre", in Silvia Hansen-Schirra / Don Kiraly (eds.): *Projekte und Projektionen in der translatorischen Kompetenzentwicklung.* FTSK: Publikationen des Fachbereichs Translations-, Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft der Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz in Germersheim, series A, 61. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 189–209.

Hansen-Schirra, Silvia / Kiraly, Don (2013). "Einleitung", in Silvia Hansen-Schirra / Don Kiraly (eds.): *Projekte und Projektionen in der translatorischen Kompetenzentwicklung.* FTSK: Publikationen des Fachbereichs Translations-, Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft der Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz in Germersheim, series A, 61. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 7–10.

Harris, Brian (1973). "La Traductologie, la traduction naturelle, la traduction automatique et la sémantique", *Cahier de linguistique* 2, 133–46. http://www.erudit.org/revue/cl/1973/v/n2/800013ar.pdf [23 September 2019].

Harris, Brian (2009). "Essential Definitions", *Unprofessional Translation.*
http://unprofessionaltranslation.blogspot.de/2009/07/essential-definitions.html
[23 September 2019].

Harris, Brian (2009–14). *Unprofessional Translation.*
http://unprofessionaltranslation.blogspot.de/ [23 September 2019].

Hoffman, Robert R. (1998). "How Can Expertise Be Defined? Implications of Research from Cognitive Psychology", in Robin Williams / Wendy Faulkner / James Fleck (eds.): *Exploring Expertise: Issues and Perspectives.* New York: Macmillan, 81–100.

Hokkanen, Sari (2012). "Simultaneous Church Interpreting as Service", *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication* 18.2, 291–309.

Hönig, Hans G. (2011). "Übersetzen lernt man nicht durch Übersetzen: Ein Plädoyer für eine Propädeutik des Übersetzens" [1988], in Susanne Hagemann (ed.): *Übersetzen lernt man nicht durch Übersetzen: Translationswissenschaftliche Aufsätze 1976–2004* by Hans G. Hönig. Translationswissenschaftliche Bibliothek 3. Berlin: SAXA, 59–72.

Jääskeläinen, Riitta (1993). "Investigating Translation Strategies", in Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit / John Laffling (eds.): *Recent Trends in Empirical Translation Research.* Kielitieteellisiä tutkimuksia / Studies in Languages 28. Joensuu: University of Joensuu, Faculty of Arts, 99–120.

Jääskeläinen, Riitta (2010). "Are All Professionals Experts? Definitions of Expertise and Reinterpretation of Research Evidence in Process Studies", in Gregory M. Shreve / Erik Angelone (eds.): *Translation and Cognition.* American Translators Association Scholarly Monograph Series 15. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 213–27.

Jääskeläinen, Riitta / Kujamäki, Pekka / Mäkisalo, Jukka (2011). "Towards Professionalism – or Against It? Dealing with the Changing World in Translation Research and Translator Education", *Across Languages and Cultures* 12.2, 143–56.

Katan, David (2011). "Occupation or Profession: A Survey of the Translators' World", in Rakefet Sela-Sheffy / Miriam Shlesinger (eds.): *Identity and Status in the Translational Professions.* Benjamins Current Topics 32. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 65–87.

Kelly, Dorothy (2005). *A Handbook for Translator Trainers: A Guide to Reflective Practice.* Translation Practices Explained. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Kelly, Dorothy / Martin, Anne (²2009). "Training and Education", in Mona Baker / Gabriela Saldanha (eds.): *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies.* London: Routledge [1998], 294–300.

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

Kiraly, Don (2005). "Project-Based Learning: A Case for Situated Translation", *Meta: Journal des traducteurs / Meta: Translators' Journal* 50.4, 1098–1111.

Kiraly, Don (2012). "Growing a Project-Based Translation Pedagogy: A Fractal Perspective", *Meta: Journal des traducteurs / Meta: Translators' Journal* 57.1, 82–95.

Kiraly, Don (2013). "Towards A View of Translator Competence as an Emergent Phenomenon: Thinking Outside the Box(es) in Translator Education", in Don Kiraly / Silvia Hansen-Schirra / Karin Maksymski (eds.): *New Prospects and Perspectives for Educating Language Mediators.* Translationswissenschaft 10. Tübingen: Narr, 197–224.

Kiraly, Don (2014). "On Being a Novice …" Personal e-mail to Susanne Hagemann [16 April 2014]. Quoted by permission.

Krenzler-Behm, Dinah (2013). *Authentische Aufträge in der Übersetzerausbildung: Ein Leitfaden für die Translationsdidaktik.* TransÜD: Arbeiten zur Theorie und Praxis des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens 58. Berlin: Frank & Timme.

"Lingua Translators Guide" (2014). *GlobalVoices wiki.* https://community.globalvoices.org/guide/lingua-guides/lingua-translators-guide/ [23 September 2019].

McDonough Dolmaya, Julie (2012). "Analyzing the Crowdsourcing Model and Its Impact on Public Perceptions of Translation", *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication* 18.2, 167–91.

Mitra, Sugata, et al. (2005). "Acquisition of Computing Literacy on Shared Public Computers: Children and the 'Hole in the Wall'", *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology* 21.3, 407–26. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.1328 [23 September 2019].

Mölbert, Nina Brigitte (2012). "Umfrage für Studierende zur Evaluation des Global Voices Projekts." [Unpublished project evaluation, submitted on 28 August 2012.]

Neather, Robert (2012). "'Non-Expert' Translators in a Professional Community: Identity, Anxiety and Perceptions of Translator Expertise in the Chinese Museum Community", *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication* 18.2, 245–68.

OGC (⁵2009) [Office of Government Commerce]. *Managing Successful Projects with PRINCE2™.* London: The Stationery Office [1996].

Olohan, Maeve (2012). "Volunteer Translation and Altruism in the Context of a Nineteenth-Century Scientific Journal", *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication* 18.2, 193–215.

Pérez-González, Luis / Susam-Saraeva, Şebnem (2012). "Non-professionals Translating and Interpreting: Participatory and Engaged Perspectives", *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication* 18.2, 149–65.

Pym, Anthony (1996). "Ideologies of the Expert in Discourses on Translator Training." *Papers on Translator Training.* http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/on-line/translation/expert.pdf [23 September 2019]. [Print version in Yves Gambier / Mary Snell-Hornby (eds.): *Problemi e tendenze nella didattica dell'interpretazione e della traduzione.* Special issue of *Koinè: Quaderni di ricerca e didattica sulla traduzione e l'interpretazione.* Misano Adriatico: Istituto San Pellegrino, 139–49.]

Pym, Anthony (2011). "Translation Research Terms: A Tentative Glossary for Moments of Perplexity and Dispute", *Papers on Research Methodology.* http://isg.urv.es/publicity/isg/publications/trp_3_2011/pym.pdf [8 May 2014]. [Print version in Anthony Pym (ed.): *Translation Research Projects 3.* Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, 75–111. Page breaks differ between the two versions.]

Pym, Anthony (2012). *On Translator Ethics: Principles for Mediation between Cultures.* Trans. Heike Walker. Benjamins Translation Library, EST Subseries 104. Amsterdam: Benjamins. [Revised and updated version of *Pour une éthique du traducteur* (1997).]

Risku, Hanna (1998). *Translatorische Kompetenz: Kognitive Grundlagen des Übersetzens als Expertentätigkeit.* Studien zur Translation 5. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Sánchez, Alejandra (2012). "Bezug zwischen Lernzielen und Qualität am Beispiel des Projekts 'Kulturspezifika'." Unpublished BA thesis. Germersheim: FTSK.

Schmitt, Helmut (2008). "Translator Competence through Project-based Translation Praxis", in Frank Austermühl / Joachim Kornelius (eds.): *Learning Theories and Practice in Translation Studies.* Lighthouse Unlimited 138. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 63–83. [Electronic publication on CD-ROM.]

Schopp, Jürgen F. (2006). "How Good Is an Authentic Commission for Teaching Translation?", in John Kearns (ed.): *New Vistas in Translator and Interpreter Training.* Special issue of *Translation Ireland* 17.1, 171–80.

Schopp, Jürgen F. (2012). "'Sprachberufe' in Bewegung? Bemerkungen zum Begriff der Professionalität und zu aktuellen Entwicklungstendenzen im Translationswesen", in Niina Nissilä / Nestori Siponkoski (eds.): *Languages in Motion: VAKKI Symposium XXXII. Vaasa 10.–11.2.2012.* VAKKI Publications 1. http://www.vakki.net/publications/2012/VAKKI2012_Schopp.pdf [23 September 2019].

Schwarz, Hans (2010). "Praxisbezug durch Projektarbeit", *MDÜ: Fachzeitschrift für Dolmetscher und Übersetzer* 56.3, 20–1.

Séguinot, Candace (2008). "Professionalization and Intervention", in John Kearns (ed.): *Translator and Interpreter Training: Issues, Methods and Debates.* Continuum Studies in Translation. London: Continuum, 1–18.

Shreve, Gregory M. (2002). "Knowing Translation: Cognitive and Experiential Aspects of Translation Expertise from the Perspective of Expertise Studies", in Alessandra Riccardi (ed.): *Translation Studies: Perspectives on an Emerging Discipline.* Cambridge: CUP, 150–71.

Shreve, Gregory M. (2006). "The Deliberate Practice: Translation and Expertise", *Journal of Translation Studies* 9.1, 27–42.

Toury, Gideon (1984). "The Notion of 'Native Translator' and Translation Teaching", in Wolfram Wilss / Gisela Thome (eds.): *Die Theorie des Übersetzens und ihr Aufschlußwert für die Übersetzungs- und Dolmetschdidaktik / Translation Theory and its Implementation in the Teaching of Translating and Interpreting: Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums der Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée (AILA), Saarbrücken, 25.–30. Juli 1983.* Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 247. Tübingen: Narr, 186–95.

Toury, Gideon (²2012). *Descriptive Translation Studies – and Beyond.* Benjamins Translation Library, EST Subseries 100. Amsterdam: Benjamins [1995].

Washbourne, Kelly (2013). "Ethical Experts-in-Training: Connected Learners and the Moral Imagination", in Don Kiraly / Silvia Hansen-Schirra / Karin Maksymski (eds.): *New Prospects and Perspectives for Educating Language Mediators.* Translationswissenschaft 10. Tübingen: Narr, 35–52.