

WestminsterResearch

<http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

**Operationalising Intercultural Competence for Translation
Pedagogy**

Tomozeiu, D. and Kumpulainen, M.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in the *Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, DOI:10.1080/1750399X.2016.1236558. Published online: 17 October 2016.

The final definitive version is available online:

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2016.1236558>

© Taylor & Francis Inc.

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of WestminsterResearch: (<http://westminsterresearch.wmin.ac.uk/>).

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail repository@westminster.ac.uk

Operationalizing Intercultural Competence for Translation Pedagogy

Daniel Tomozeiu* and Minna Kumpulainen**

**University of Westminster, London, UK*

** *University of Eastern Finland, Joensuu, Finland*

This article discusses intercultural competence in the context of translator training. It looks at the way this competence is incorporated and defined in the overall translation competence models, moving on to introduce two models that focus on intercultural competence in particular and serve to operationalize the concept for pedagogical purposes. Making this competence more explicit in translator training is considered vital: in the light of results gained from a survey into the current pedagogical practice (PICT 2012), translator trainers' and translation students' understanding of the nature and extent of (inter)cultural training do not match. This calls for re-evaluation of teaching practice which, in turn, presupposes a detailed, comprehensive account of the various dimensions of intercultural competence a translator is to possess. This article discusses these dimensions and provides exemplary scenarios on how to address them in translator training.

Keywords: intercultural competence, operationalization, translator training, competence model

Introduction

Since the emergence of functionalist translation theories (e.g. Reiss and Vermeer 1991; Nord 1997) and the so-called cultural turn in translation studies (Bassnett and Lefevere 1990, 12), translation has been considered both a cultural and a linguistic procedure (Schäffner 2003, 83–85). Consequently, translation has been acknowledged to be one form of intercultural Communication (IC) by various authors in the field of TS (e.g. Vermeer 1989; Snell-Hornby et al. 1995; Katan 2004; House 2009). The view is also reflected in the subtitles of some leading journals in field of TS, such as *The Translator*, *Studies in Intercultural Communication*, and *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology; Language and Intercultural Communication; Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development* (Schäffner 2003). Within IC, in turn, translation was considered as “a specialized discipline within the field of intercultural communication” even earlier (Arjona 1978, 35). Schäffner (2003, 91), pondering on the different and similar interests of the two research fields concludes that the difference between translation and intercultural communication lies in the different concept of communication: while in the field of intercultural communication communicators act in their own role, using intercultural communicative competence to achieve their own goals (in business negotiations for example), translators produce texts *which are used by others* for communication.

The pedagogical agenda followed suit. (Inter)cultural competence was acknowledged as an element of translation competence (TC) and incorporated in translation competence models.

A number of these models have been developed over the last two decades as it will be discussed further in this paper. These models are, however, designed as learning outcomes; they depict the competence a translator is to possess at the end of his or her training, but pay little attention to any specification of intercultural competence. For this reason, the authors feel that the operationalization process has so far fallen short of the required pedagogical needs. The current article will discuss several widely cited translation competence models from an IC perspective, identifying how IC appears in these models (if at all). The authors will then propose a specific “translator’s intercultural competence model” (PICT 2012a), and discuss it in parallel with yet another recent IC model, that of Yarosh (2015), thus contributing to the unfolding pedagogical debate in this research area. What sets PICT model apart from the others is its focus. While the existing TC models seem to recognize IC skills needed to translate a text, they do not pay attention to the translator’s overall IC competence which goes beyond text production. As Yarosh (2015) states, “student translators should develop as future professionals whose task is to enable intercultural communication”. In other words, the translator, as a professional, has to develop a complex set of IC skills in order to perform in today’s complex work environment. They need not only be able to deal with culture-related problems in text production, but also manage communication with various agents in the commissioning process. Hence, even if *translation* can be set apart from intercultural communication in terms of different concept of communication as proposed by Schäffner (2003, 91), a *translator* is not only a skilled text producer but is also capable of intercultural communication in his or her own role to achieve his or her own goals – just as any other intercultural communicator. *Translator’s* intercultural competence encompasses a larger repertoire of skills than intercultural competence *in translation* (=text production).

The article will also make the case for a very explicit engagement with IC competences in translation classes by giving examples of how the suggested model can be operationalized for pedagogical practice. This is to further emphasize the need to clearly and explicitly identify IC competences in order to enable junior translators to acknowledge their own strengths in this area and support their development. Given today’s complex and constantly evolving understanding of what culture is in today’s world (see for example Gupta and Ferguson, 1997) as well as the professional pressures that surround the modern translator, only an explicit and reflection-informed approach will enable junior translators to develop the type of IC competence that will enable them to engage successfully with these new cultural challenges.

Intercultural competence in translation competence models

Translation is a complex cognitive process, and there is still no consensus among translation scholars as to the relevant elements of translation competence; Kiraly (2013, 210–211), for example, calls for further efforts into elucidating the subcompetences that have been proposed in the various models published to date. The earliest accounts of the constituents of TC were language-bound, but along with the cultural turn in Translation Studies, the importance of cultural skills or cultural competence was noted (e.g. Nord 1991; Neubert

2000, 6). As Kelly (2005, 31–32) points out, translation competence can be modelled for different purposes and from different viewpoints. Most accounts attempt at listing skills which translator training should provide in order to meet the market's demand. Such a listing can be based on direct or indirect observation of the profession and on information received from the employers as well as translation teachers' own experience as practicing translators. Kelly herself gives a synthesis of such a listing (Kelly 2005, 32). Probably the most detailed and recent account is provided by the EMT Expert Group whose translator competence model is explicitly designed as a curriculum framework document, entailing the skills that a student should possess at the completion of master's degree (Gambier 2009).

Perhaps the most widely cited TC model in TS is provided by the Spanish research group PACTE (e.g. 2000, 2003, 2005, 2009, 2011). Their model is exceptional in that it has emerged as a result of empirical experimenting with translation experts and non-experts, who in PACTE's study were foreign language teachers with no experience or training in translation. Göpferich's model (2009, 20–22) is a modification of PACTE's. Despite the apparent differences between the models of PACTE or Göpferich and of EMT expert group or Kelly, their ultimate goal is the same: to depict what translation competence consists of in order to teach those skills to translation students and thus to contribute to curriculum work in translator training. In the following paragraphs, these models are discussed as to their stance on intercultural competence as a part of TC.

Given that translation is generally considered to be a form of intercultural communication, one might expect to find intercultural competence as one of the elementary subcompetences of a translator in the various models. This, however, seems not to be the case; few models explicitly mention intercultural competence, and if they do, the concept is poorly specified and as such, cannot be readily operationalized for pedagogical purposes. Kelly (2005, 32–33) is an exception since she mentions cultural *and intercultural* competence as one of the relevant subcompetences of a translator, defining them as intercultural communication process awareness, factual knowledge of relevant cultures and familiarity with how respective values, beliefs, stereotypes, etc. usually get represented in texts. As pointed out by Yarosh (2015, 161), however, the very inter-cultural mediating component is never mentioned by Kelly. Moreover, Kelly's *communicative and textual communicative competence in at least two languages* also entails skills – such as knowledge of culturally specific textual and discourse conventions – that could be regarded as intercultural. Hence, in Kelly's list of competences, intercultural subcompetence is not conceptualized as a skill in its own right but rather, as a skill that contributes to various phases in the translation process.

The model that pays most attention to the role of Intercultural competence in translation is that of EMT expert group (Gambier 2009). In their TC model, IC is defined as having two dimensions, the sociolinguistic and the textual, and both dimensions are at play when contrasting discursive practices of working languages in a translation situation: intercultural competence is needed to analyse a text in its cultural context and to make decisions as to how to transfer its meaning to another target audience in another culture in an appropriate,

understandable manner. As pointed out by Yarosh (2015, 162), in this account it is the linguistic form (as means of evoking/suggesting cultural conventions) that students need to focus on. In other words, intercultural competence is mainly needed to produce a text on the basis of another text and to recognize and to deal with various culture-specific problems in the text production process; in Pym's (2013, 491) words, intercultural competence in the EMT model turns out to be a disguise for text linguistics and sociolinguistics and could thus have been placed under the heading of "language competence". Furthermore, ability to summarize, to draft, rephrase, restructure, condense, and post-edit rapidly and well as well as to compose a document in accordance with the conventions of the genre and rhetorical standards are considered as workings of intercultural competence in the EMT model. To us, these seem to be skills required also in monolingual text production and as such, not specific to interlingual text production. Yarosh (2015, 163) shares the authors' view that the construct of the intercultural competence would probably be more complete if not only linguistic and textual dimensions are included in its working, and more coherent if not all textual operations are regarded as part of it either.

The PACTE model, in turn, splits TC into five subcompetences: bilingual subcompetence, extra-linguistic subcompetence, knowledge about translation subcompetence, instrumental subcompetence and strategic subcompetence (PACTE 2003). Intercultural competence is implicit, and the element of a translator being in-between two cultures is not focused on in the model. *Bilingual sub-competence* is defined as predominantly procedural knowledge needed to communicate in two languages (not *between* two languages), including pragmatic, socio-linguistic, textual, grammatical and lexical knowledge in the two languages. In addition, bilingual competence as a translator's sub-competence includes the specific feature of interference control, the ability to keep languages apart when alternating between them; this is where the intercultural – or at least interlingual – competence is implied. Cultural knowledge, in turn, is explicitly mentioned as one category of translator's *extra-linguistic sub-competence*, which is defined as predominantly declarative knowledge, both implicit and explicit, about the world in general and about special areas. PACTE divides this subcompetence into three knowledge categories, one of which is cultural knowledge of both the source and target cultures. Again, the element of being "in-between" is missing: it is not merely the knowledge of two cultures that is relevant in translation but also knowledge on how cultural differences affect translation and on how to take them into account in successful communication that matters. In Göpferich's TC model (2009), IC as a translator's subcompetence is similarly implicit.

Hence, intercultural competence is either implicit in multicomponent translation competence models, or alternatively, it is specified in a vague, and sometimes incoherent manner. Perhaps due to this, as Yarosh (2013, 53) states, the issue of translator intercultural training remains largely unexplored; there seems to be a "blank spot" in TS pedagogical literature in this regard. Yarosh (2013, 2015) herself has recently zoomed into translators' intercultural competence in particular, proposing a model depicting various elements of that specific competence as well as suggesting ways to operationalize the model for pedagogical purposes.

Yarosh is drawing on Witte's definition of translator's intercultural competence, which the scholar herself calls *expert cultural competence*. The definition is as follows: ...*the ability to become critically aware of what is "known" unconsciously and to "learn" consciously what is not "known" about one's own culture and other culture(s), as well as the ability to relate and contrast the cultures so as to be able to produce behaviours in accordance with the aim of the communication and tailored to the particular communicative situation, behaviours that account for the communicative needs of at least two actors from two different cultures, so as to enable the communication between these actors* (Witte 2005, 50). This definition does not limit intercultural competence of translators to sociolinguistics or text linguistics but rather, acknowledges intercultural competence as a *translator* subcompetence – a skill that a translator needs not only to solve translation problems but to manage communication with various agents in the translation commissioning process. In this respect, we follow the lead of Yarosh in our conceptualization of intercultural competence.

Toward a Model of translator's intercultural competence

Selected Findings of the PICT Survey

Some of the shortcomings of the proposed competence models can be identified also in the day-to-day translation teaching practice in the classroom. As part of the Promoting intercultural Competence in Translators (PICT) Erasmus project, in which both authors were involved, a survey was undertaken in 2012 across six EU countries (Bulgaria, Finland, France, Italy, Poland and United Kingdom). The six were chosen to represent a good geographical spread from across Europe, countries with a long tradition in translation training. The survey contained open, closed and ranking questions, asking translation lecturers and students about the current IC training provisions and the desired ones (PICT 2012b). In total 462 respondents participated in the survey (399 postgraduate translation students and 63 academics training on the respective programmes).

The findings of the survey make for fascinating reading. Based on the current provisions three aspects became clear: first, the different understanding of what IC meant (the boundaries of IC in translator training); second, the disadvantages of an implicit approach (lecturers thought they were covering the topic while students were not aware of it); and third, the emphasis on the textual dimensions of IC, to the disadvantage of all the other ones. The survey also demonstrated a very high level of interest, across the board, in developing IC competences. This interest is also reflected in the desired IC training provisions.

In the view of the authors a certain level of flexibility in understanding what is meant by IC in a translation context is to be welcomed. Authors such as House (2009, 8) have acknowledged different understandings of "culture" ranging from the humanistic approach to the anthropological one. These different understandings of culture and therefore of IC were obvious also in the PICT survey where a number of academics pointed to cultural heritage, literature and the arts in the source and target culture as being the main focus of their IC training. Without diminishing the importance of such elements of knowledge for the erudite

translators, the authors advocate for a pedagogical approach based on intercultural competencies, rather than just cultural knowledge. In today's constantly changing cultural paradigm developing the skills that enable the translator to keep up with this changing environment becomes paramount. As Yarosh (2015, 160) notes, "student translators need IC simply to live together with culturally-different others". Also, while students can acquire cultural knowledge also outside the classroom (and, based on the PICT survey many of them do), the classroom provides that safe environment where students can develop and hone their IC skills and attitudes through group work or critical incident analysis, for example. While acknowledging that different academic cultures will prioritize knowledge over skills or the other way around the authors advocate for a comprehensive approach in line with the proposals put forward by the Council of Europe (2001).

One of the most striking conclusions of the PICT survey was that a number of translation students felt they were not getting IC training while the lecturers that took part in the survey said they were offering it. There can be several explanations for this miss-match. It could be that lecturers that do not teach IC decided not to take part in the survey but their students did. It could also be that the students and their lecturers have different understandings of what culture and IC is, and therefore the former are failing to recognize the pedagogical input of the latter. However, much more likely in the view of the authors is the possibility that the lecturers were teaching IC in an implied manner which was hard to recognize and acknowledge by the students. Therefore the authors suggest a very explicit approach to the teaching of IC on translation programmes. This approach would involve a clear IC curriculum framework being presented by the lecturer (similar to the PICT curriculum framework), ideally with levels of achievement identified for each IC dimension. Furthermore, the lecturer would signpost throughout the teaching whenever a particular IC dimension was being developed in order to raise awareness among the students.

Another important conclusion of the survey was that the translation, in most cases as product, and sometimes as process, was at the centre of the IC class discussions. In plain terms, whenever the source text contained non-equivalent notions these would trigger a discussion about culture and the competence the translation students had to develop. While the textual dimension of IC is extremely important in translation, the authors would like to make the case for a need to shift the focus from the translation to the translator. This shift is based on the view that the role of the translation course is to prepare competent professional translators. IC translation (or textual) skills and IC translator skills are not separate entities. The authors view translator IC skills as encompassing and going beyond IC translation skills. A competent translator is not only able to undertake a professional translation but he or she also needs to have a strong theoretical basis in TS and IC in order to understand and justify the translational choices made. At the same time the professional translator needs to have the professional skills that allow him or her to operate in a commercial environment. Some of these skills are IC skills; they form part of what the translator needs "to know or believe in order to operate in a manner acceptable to its (i.e. society's) members" (House 2009, 9) and

to engage effectively and professionally with the client or translation project manager or other fellow translators that might have different cultural values and practices.

The PICT IC Competencies Model

Given the level of interest signalled both by the growing number of scholarly articles on this topic as well as the responses to the PICT survey, IC training for translators is at the moment enjoying attention from both theorists and practitioners. This opportunity should be used in order to re-evaluate current practice and propose new ways forward that allow explicit training of IC competences in future generations of translators. The PICT competencies model is based on the considerations outlined in the previous section. It identifies three dimensions deemed equally important by the members of the consortium that developed the curriculum framework: a theoretical, a textual and an interpersonal dimension. Each of these dimensions is further subdivided into four sub-dimensions, each of them having specific achievement levels attached to them. The actual sub-dimensions and the achievement levels do not represent the focus of the current paper. The overall principle of this competencies model, its focus and dimensions are presented below.

At the core of IC competences training for translators there needs to be an understanding of the theoretical background that underpins the skills set. It is not the intention of the authors to be prescriptive in terms of which theoretical approaches are to be incorporated; such a discussion would surely deserve a paper of its own. However, a few important points are to be highlighted at this stage. The advantage of a solid theoretical underpinning is that it provides an academic background for the IC related decisions the translator has to make. Academic degrees in translation can set themselves apart from more professional ones by providing their students with a good understanding of the “how” to address IC complexities, as well as the “why”. By anchoring their translation decisions in the theoretical corpus of both IC theory and translation theory, the students will be informed professionals who are able to explain and defend their translation decisions.

The second important aspect of the theoretical dimension is that it can provide an opportunity to bring together the two theoretical fields (TS and IC), allowing the students to build connections between the two epistemological areas. In a pedagogical setting by linking translation theory and IC theories the students will benefit from a continuous theoretical framework to inform their professional practice. For example, when deciding in a foreignization- domestication situation (e.g. Paloposki 2012; Pym 2012; Snell-Hornby 2006), conceptual tools for analysing intercultural perspectives such as different frameworks for intercultural comparison (Byram 1997; Hofstede 1991; Lustig and Koester 2010) can support the decision-making process of the translator. As Yarosh demonstrates in her model, Byram’s model, for example, can be used to bring together comparative cultural knowledge and IC process awareness (Yarosh, 2015, 165). By understanding the theoretical background of the translation decisions from several perspectives, the translator will be in a much stronger position as an informed competent professional.

Based on the results of the PICT survey, the textual dimension appears to be the most taught one in translation training. Its popularity seems to be derived from the fact that it can be easily discussed in the context of specific text-based activities. Addressing issues around non-equivalence and recognizing cultural characteristics of different text-types were some of the most frequently mentioned examples of IC training currently taking place. Given its popularity, the authors will not discuss the various aspects of the textual dimension in detail. For this, the PICT Curriculum Framework (PICT 2012a) provides all the necessary details. However, it might be of relevance to point out that one of the sub-dimensions least mentioned by the survey respondents, and that is not often addressed by literature, is the recognition of the impact of the translator's internalized culture and emotional reaction to elements of the source culture and text, and its management in text production. To the knowledge of the authors few translation programmes address this particular aspect, despite its growing recognition. In a period where self-awareness and reflectiveness are becoming more central to a number of professions, recognizing the impact of the translator's internalized culture on the translation process and product, and training students in its management is becoming an ever more important task. An example of how this subdimension can be addressed in teaching is given in the final section of this paper.

Supporting young translators in becoming reflective professionals is to be understood not only in relation to their interaction with the text, but also in relation to the other professionals they are working with. This is where the third dimension, interpersonal, comes in. This dimension is specific to the PICT IC competencies model. While the EMT, for example, requires "means and strategies for identifying and solving culture-bound translation problems" (Gambier 2009), the PICT model looks beyond the translation problems at the totality of the translator's tasks and activities. The authors, and the other members of the PICT consortium, feel that the role of training and education is to develop reflective professionals that can function in the work context. The need to develop the interpersonal dimension has been recognized in literature, for example by Witte (1994) when the ability to judge the client's knowledge about different cultures is discussed. The PICT model attempts to turn this in a more comprehensive approach. The work of the translators requires communication and interaction before the translation (discussing the translation brief, agreeing on timeline and price), during the translation (checking back with the commissioner or author of source text, discussing with fellow translators) and after the translation (addressing follow-up questions, confirming receiving payment). In today's global world it is likely that at least some of these interactions will involve communication with people of a different cultural background. In order to successfully undertake these various tasks and to create long-lasting relations with clients, managers and colleagues, the modern translator requires a high level of intercultural competence.

While some translators, due to their upbringing or the location of their education establishment in a multicultural area, will be more exposed to intercultural interactions developing therefore a practical understanding of them, others might grow up and study in

more mono-cultural environments. Both groups will benefit from understanding IC theory and developing, through exercises and simulations, IC competences that will enable them to operate as professional translators in an ever-more-global work environment. Cultural awareness and empathy, along with curiosity, pro-activeness and a high level of awareness in social positioning (PICT 2012a) are all relevant competences that a translator needs to develop early in their career and keep on updating through continuous professional development (CPD) as acknowledged by Witte (1994) and echoed by Yarosh (2015).

It is true that the above mentioned competences are not exclusive to the professional translator. They are competencies that benefit a large number of professionals working in today's global world. However, as intercultural communication is a translator's core activity, professional translators can be expected to have a strong understanding of cultural and intercultural issues whereas for other professionals, a more incoherent competence may be sufficient. However, the paper does not want to engage in a discussion on hierarchy and levels of IC. Some authors, for example Robinson (2007, 195) have suggested that translators need a higher level of IC than non-translators due to the nature of their job, a claim rebuffed by Yarosh (2015, 161) who sees the need for a different configuration of IC rather than a higher competence level. The academic and pedagogical research in this field is still far from concluding what the required or desirable components and levels are, and therefore it is of importance that the various models put forward in the literature are compared, contrasted and discussed. In addition to the model proposed in the PICT project, Yarosh has recently suggested a comprehensive Translators' IC model. In the following paragraphs the parallels as well as particular distinctions between the two recent models will be introduced and discussed.

Yarosh's Model of Translator's Intercultural Competence

According to Yarosh, “the *cultural and intercultural competence* consists of the intercultural communication process awareness, factual knowledge of relevant cultures, and familiarity of how respective values, beliefs, stereotypes, etc. usually get represented in texts” (Yarosh 2015, 161, italics in the original). Starting from this definition, Yarosh (2015, 162–165) proposes an 8-factor model of translator's intercultural competence (TrIC) which is based both on IC literature as well as empirical research findings. Similarly to PICT, the focus is on translator's overall skills rather than translation skills only; the model aims to depict the translator as an intercultural communicator who needs intercultural skills not only to produce a text on the basis of a given source text but to manage in the working environment in general. Yarosh (2015, 165–166) uses labels that situate TrIC within the general IC discourse and points out that the differences between general IC models and that of her TrIC model become evident at the level of detail (*ibid.*); hence the model alone does not give a very detailed account of the elements of translator's intercultural competence. However, deriving from her competence model, Yarosh (*ibid.*) provides a grid of eighteen learning objectives with developmental level indicators to be used for didactic purposes. Hence, her goal is

similar to that of the PICT project: to come up with a comprehensive account of what translator’s intercultural competence consists of and how it can be acquired.

In Yarosh’s model, five factors are directly related to the elements of translator’s intercultural competence, while three are linked with learning IC. The factors are as follows:

1. **Interculturally-Competent Core Translation Behaviour**, i.e. managing the translation process so that the intercultural dimension of the activity is taken into account at every step.
2. **Comparative cultural knowledge**, i.e. knowledge of differences and similarities between cultures (national, supra-national, regional, local, professional etc.) one works with.
3. **Cultural awareness**, i.e. awareness of the fact that people’s ideas about the world, attitudes and behaviour are culturally shaped.
4. **Intercultural communication process awareness**, i.e. awareness of the way communication and intercultural communication is shaped and affected by culture.
5. **Professional identity and values**, i.e. Motivation and responsibilities associated with the professional translator’s role within the intercultural mediation process
6. –8. **Learning dimensions (two levels) and ability to learn autonomously**.

On the face of it, Yarosh’s model appears rather different from PICT, but the apparent differences lie partly in the way different elements are organized: while Yarosh conceptualizes various factors relating to the TrIC as the foundation of learning objectives, in PICT an attempt is made to depict the different dimensions of translator’s IC and organize the learning objectives accordingly. The models seem to complement each other: the same elements of competence are approached from different angles. In addition, both models entail elements that are not incorporated in the other model; hence, together they shed more light to the nature of translator’s IC competence than neither model alone does. Yarosh’s first five factors that are directly related to intercultural competence seem to align with the textual and interpersonal dimensions in the PICT model. The elements related to learning are non-existing in the PICT model, whereas the theoretical dimension in the PICT model seems to have no explicit counterpart in the Yarosh model. The suggested parallels and differences between the two models are depicted in Table 1 below.

PICT	YAROSH
THEORETICAL DIMENSION a) Core concepts of the theory of intercultural communication (e.g. culture, identity, representations, etc.)	No explicit references to theoretical knowledge.

<p>b) Conceptual tools for analysing intercultural perspective (e.g. frameworks for cultural comparison, scales of cultural awareness etc.)</p> <p>c) Knowledge of the cultural context of translation (e.g. differences between professional translation practices in several countries, implications for translators, etc.)</p> <p>d) The links between intercultural communication theory and Translation Studies (e.g. cultural profiling and readership analysis, cultural subjectivity and translator's personal visibility)</p>	
<p>TEXTUAL DIMENSION</p> <p>a) Comparative analysis of cultural issues from source and target audiences</p> <p>b) Comparative analysis of texts from an intercultural perspective – lexical and syntactic features, discourse patterns, visual resonance - and use of the analysis in the translation processes</p> <p>c) Recognition of problems of non-equivalence and applying strategies to address them</p> <p>d) Recognition and management of the impact of the translator's internalized culture and emotional reaction to elements of the source culture and text</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interculturally Competent Core Translation Behaviour, i.e. managing the translation process so that the intercultural dimension of the activity is taken into account at every step • Comparative cultural knowledge: knowledge of differences and similarities between cultures (national, supra-national, regional, local, professional etc.) one works with
<p>INTERPERSONAL DIMENSION</p> <p>a) Cultural awareness and empathy manifested in social exchange</p> <p>b) Curiosity and pro-activeness in all forms of contact with other cultures</p> <p>c) Sensitivity to affects and potential conflicts in communication</p> <p>d) Social positioning (i.e. deciding</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interculturally-Competent Core Translation Behaviour, i.e. managing the translation process so that the intercultural dimension of the activity is taken into account at every step • Cultural awareness, i.e. awareness of the fact that people's ideas about the world,

whether to conform, hybridize or deviate from the dominant social norms)	<p>attitudes and behaviour are culturally shaped</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intercultural communication process awareness, i.e. awareness of the way communication and intercultural communication is shaped and affected by culture • Professional identity and values, i.e. Motivation and responsibilities associated with the professional translator's role within the intercultural mediation process
No explicit reference to Learning Dimensions	TWO SEPARATE LEARNING DIMENSIONS

Table 1. Parallels and differences between PICT's and Yarosh's model.

It seems to us that Interculturally Competent Core Translation Behaviour, which lies at the centre of Yarosh's model, is a kind of metacompetence which can be paralleled with both the textual and interpersonal dimensions in the PICT model: to take the intercultural dimension of the translation activity into account at every step in the translation process, one needs to pay attention to intercultural issues both in text production as well as in social exchange with clients and other agents involved in the translation process. Yarosh's *comparative cultural knowledge*, in turn, relates to the first element of PICT's textual dimension, while *cultural awareness* and *intercultural communication process awareness* as well as *professional identity and values* seem to be covered in PICT's interpersonal dimension. Thus, Yarosh seems to emphasize that translator's intercultural competence is indeed much more than a textual competence; intercultural issues must be considered throughout the translation commission process, not only in the text production.

There is one dimension that seems implicit in Yarosh's model which is made explicit and detailed in the PICT model: theoretical knowledge both on translation as well as intercultural communication. Yarosh seems to emphasize the ability to pinpoint intercultural differences and the way they affect translation strategies and communication in the overall translation process, whereas in PICT's model, a deeper theoretical understanding of the intercultural phenomena is also considered as an integral element of translator's intercultural competence, for the reasons given earlier in this paper. The more solid is the theoretical understanding and the more theoretical tools one possesses, the better equipped one is to manage intercultural communication situations and to justify one's actions (various translation solutions, for example).

Conversely, the learning element is completely missing from the PICT model whereas it enjoys a prominent role in that of Yarosh. Two separate learning dimensions are identified in this competence model. The first one focuses on learning about foreign cultures while the

second on reflecting and considering one's own culture. The PICT survey (PICT, 2012b) highlights the importance attributed to these aspects by translation lecturers and in particular translation students. It could be claimed, however, that incorporating the learning element turns a model from a competence model to a competence *acquisition* model; while willingness to lifelong learning is important, it is not specific to intercultural competence only, but is vital in the acquisition of any competence.

In sum, the two models are to a large extent complementary and identify a common body of elements and dimensions. Despite their different names, as well as the different weighting, some of these elements have in the two models, for the authors the obvious overlaps are a sign of the more "settling phase" the debate might be entering. Consensus building around underlying concepts (the need to focus on the translator rather than the translation only, for example) as well as the centrality of some of the sub-dimensions (cultural awareness, for example), can be considered a positive development in this research and pedagogical debate. At the same time, the differences between the two models are a reminder of the complex questions that remain open in the quest for comprehensive and appropriate pedagogical models for translator training.

From models and learning objectives to pedagogical practice

The goal of intercultural competence models such as those suggested by Yarosh and the PICT project is first, to depict and make explicit all aspects of IC that are relevant for a translator, and second, to facilitate the systematic inclusion of IC in translation programmes. In this section we will discuss how the various aspects of intercultural competence can be taught in order to reach the learning objectives, giving some examples from the learning materials designed in the PICT project. The complete set of Lesson Plans designed in the PICT project can be accessed at <http://www.pictlp.eu/en/teaching-material>.

As stated before, the textual dimension of IC seems well covered in teaching except for the recognition and management of the impact of the translator's internalized culture and emotional reaction to elements of the source culture and text. Therefore, raising students' awareness of their internalized culture is the goal of the first example presented here. The lesson plan titled simply "internalized culture" was designed first, to promote students' ability to analyse their own emotional reactions to a text, and second, to prepare students to translate texts which, due to their internalized culture, they cannot necessarily sympathize with or feel comfortable with. The text discussed in the exemplary lesson plan is a speech given by President Obama at the Tucson Memorial service in 2011 in honour of the victims of the shooting rampage at a "Congress on Your Corner" event in Tuscon. Due to varying conventions of presidential speeches in different cultures, this very emotional, patriotic and essentially American speech can be expected to stir mixed reactions in non-American readers or listeners.

The first tasks in this session aim at explicating the emotional response to the speech. Students are first guided to sources where background info of the shooting incident is given, after which they are advised to watch the YouTube video of the speech as well as to download the manuscript. Having listened to the speech, students write down five words that best describe their reaction to it. At this point, students form small groups, trying to explain in more detail what it is in the text that makes them react in the way they did. Is it certain expressions or words that are used? Is it the way the speech is designed as a whole – what is talked about and how? Is it the way the speech is presented? After this, the concept of *internalized culture* is introduced to the students. Students are prompted to think about their own internalised culture and its influence on their reaction to President Obama’s text, and discuss their ideas in small groups. The more multi-cultural the group, the more insightful and fruitful the discussion is likely to be. As a closing task, students are prompted to imagine a corresponding scenario in their home country: In what respect would a speech given by the leader of their country in the midst of a national tragedy differ from President Obama’s speech?

In addition to the tasks listed above, a selected part of the text can be given as a translation assignment to the students. The translation brief would be to translate the text into each students’ native language to be published in a website of the biggest national newspaper with the title „Obama’s words of consolation to the Americans”. The translator’s challenge with this kind of task is to control his or her own reactions and emotions towards the speech and its style and approach it as a representative of American speech culture, rather than modify his or her speech to conform to conventions she or he has internalized. Hence, the translation task forces the translator to suppress his or her internalized culture and encourages reading of the text through American eyes.

The second example of PICT teaching materials focuses on the interpersonal dimension of IC, since this dimension is specific to the PICT model and seems to be largely neglected in the current practice of translator training. Given that a high number of translation tutors are or were professional translators, enables them to modify the tasks by identifying interactions with clients, colleagues or managers that are particularly illustrative of the professional environment in which translators operate. Starting from real-life scenarios, the tutor can design a series of pedagogical activities and exercises enhancing the students’ understanding of the culture specific to their chosen career.

The lesson plan titled “Showing pro-activeness and cultural curiosity/awareness in commercial e-mail communication” was designed in order to support the development of the interpersonal sub- dimensions (PICT Session Plan, 2013). This particular lesson plan enables the lecturer to introduce or create connections with IC theory elements such as essentialism, internalized culture, and Hofstede’s cultural theory (Hofstede, 2003). One of the strong points of the plan is that it allows the students to see the application of theoretical concepts to a very familiar, even mundane, situation- answering an e-mail. The lesson plan provides a sample e-mail with a large number of cultural challenges, but the tutor is encouraged to adapt this

starting e-mail to local context requirements. Another strength lies in classroom grouping flexibility; many of the tasks can be completed individually, in pairs or groups. The sample e-mail is given below:

You are a freelance translator. You receive this e-mail from a client that has approached you previously regarding the translation of a museum brochure. You have not worked for this particular client before.

From: Dr. Fidel Djambo <drfideldjambo@alms.eu>
To: Minja Frodo translate@O2.com

Dear Minja,

Trust you have received my previous e-mail. Under time pressure here. My boss wants an answer by tomorrow COP (bosses, you know!). You still interested in doing this job? The job on the new museum brochure is not too big, just a few sentences of written text... You don't translate the photos, do you?

Just reply to me, don't copy in my boss, it's simpler that way. I am here to help if you need more details. If you wanna talk, my mobile is +07767038399.

Were you happy with the suggested rate? Budget rather tight, we can negotiate a bit but not a lot of space there.

Talk soon,
Fidel
Dr. Fidel Djambo
Director of Community Outreach
London Anti-Slavery Museum
+44 7767038399 (mobile)

The first two tasks are meant to support the students in “localizing” the specific e-mail by defining its aim as well as its place in the communication chain. Students are first asked to think about the e-mail’s general aim, individually, and then in pairs to place the e-mail in the communication chain. They are to discuss what type of message could have preceded and will probably follow the e-mail, reflecting on the cultural characteristics of the sender. In the experience of the authors, students often find these tasks both engaging and challenging as they allow the students to use their prior knowledge of what professional correspondence should sound like, unveiling some of their cultural expectations.

The following two enable the tutor to link these cultural expectations to theoretical concepts and models. Students are prompted to discuss cultural protocols used in drafting the e-mail (how is information constructed? who is copied in? why? what register is the sender using? is the register high/low? is he/she using their first language or a lingua franca?) and link the discussion back to cultural concepts previously discussed. Moreover, they are encouraged to discuss what cultural concepts (aspects of their own internalized culture) influenced their reading of the e-mail. These two tasks are meant to enhance the students understanding of the importance of intercultural competence in the context of professional translation.

The last three tasks are meant to encourage student reflection. It is advisable that they are preceded by a classroom discussion about internalized culture and social positioning. After that, students are to discuss in pairs whether they would reply to this e-mail, and if they would, what would be the purpose of response, and whether they should mirror the style of the original e-mail or not. They are prompted to make a list of factors that would influence their decision and influence the drafting of the reply. Reflecting on their reaction to a message that challenges the students' cultural and professional expectations, helping them understand where this reaction comes from and identify the reasons for pursuing a certain line of action in this context is, in the view of the authors, a worthwhile pedagogical undertaking that helps prepare future professional translators.

The two examples offered above highlight how the PICT model could be operationalized in a classroom environment. The PICT website (www.pictllp.eu) contains no less than 21 teaching and assessment lesson plans. While they will all have to be adapted to the cultural and academic environment in which they are used, the materials were developed in order to encourage translator trainers to explicitly incorporate IC elements in their sessions.

Conclusion

The research and pedagogical agenda of IC training for translators has evolved significantly over the past decade. While interest in the area, as demonstrated by the number of publications, has increased, most existing translation competence models seem to offer no tools for operationalizing IC. An analysis of existing models demonstrates that the IC needs of translators are defined vaguely and inconsistently. A survey undertaken by the PICT consortium provides empirical data to support the trend identified above: the importance of IC training for translators is acknowledged by both trainers and students alike, but its exact definition and operationalization requirements seem to remain unclear to a large number of respondents.

Acknowledging some of the recent attempts in (further) defining IC competence and its dimensions in particular, the article undertook a comparative analysis of the Yarosh and PICT model. In the authors' view the two models are complementary, despite the different focus and weight they give to different elements/dimensions. While both are lacking certain elements the other incorporates, the overlap between the two could demonstrate that the academic debate over IC training for translators is entering a "settling phase". However, the very fact that two projects were carried out, with similar goals and interests, at the same time demonstrates the need for a more comprehensive approach to defining, piloting and delivering IC training for translators. The variety of aspects that need to be considered when teaching (or testing) IC competences in translators becomes obvious through the two examples given in this paper.

Whether entering a "settling phase" or not, the research agenda, as well as the operationalization approaches, have to be considered and developed in the future. New IC

competence models will be developed benefiting from the knowledge created by models introduced in this paper, for example. They will serve to make IC explicit in the translator training, and in this way they will also contribute to overall TC models which are designed to depict the final learning outcomes of training. All these approaches hold relevant lessons in terms of focus, boundaries, level of explicitness, etc. At the same time the operationalization of competence models has to take into account the cultural complexities of the specific teaching and learning environment. The requirements of a pan-European approach (such as the EMT, for example) might be different from those of a particular national or regional educational context.

REFERENCES

- Arjona, E. 1978. Intercultural Communication and the Training of Interpreters at the Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies. In *Language interpretation and communication* edited by D. Gerver and H. W. Sinaiko, 35–44. New York: Plenum Press.
- Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevere, eds. 1990. *Translation, history and culture*. London: Pinter.
- Byram, Michael. 1997. *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Council of Europe. 2001. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Strasbourg: Language Policy Unit.
- Gambier, Yves. 2009. Competences for professional translators, experts in multilingual and multimedia communication.
http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/programmes/emt/key_documents/emt_competences_translators_en.pdf (accessed 20 August 2015)
- Göpferich, Susanne. 2009. “Towards a Model of Translation Competence and its Acquisition: the Longitudinal study TransComp.” In *Behind the mind. Methods, models and results in translation process research* edited by Susanne Göpferich, Arnt Lykke Jakobsen and Inger M. Mees, 11–37. Copenhagen studies in language 37. Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur Press.
- Gupta Akhil and James Ferguson. 1997. *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hofstede G. 1991. *Cultures and Organisations*. London: McGraw Hill.
- House, Juliane. 2009. “Moving across Languages and Cultures in Translation”. In *Translational action and Intercultural Communication* edited by Kristin Bührig, Juliane House and Jan D. ten Thije. London and New York: Routledge.

- Katan, David 2004. *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*. London: Routledge.
- Kelly, Dorothy. 2005. *A Handbook for Translator Trainers: a Guide to Reflective Practice*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Kiraly, Don. 2013. "Towards a View of Translator Competence as an Emergent Phenomenon: Thinking Outside the Box(es) in Translator Education." In *New Prospects and Perspectives for Educating Language Mediators* edited by Don Kiraly, Silvia Hansen-Schirra and Karin Maksymski, 197–224. Tübingen: Narr.
- Lustig, Myron W. and Jolene Koester. 2010. *Intercultural Competence*. Boston: Pearson.
- Neubert, Albrecht. 2000. "Competence in Language, in Languages, and in Translation." In *Developing Translation Competence* edited by Christina Schäffner and Beverly Adab, 3–18. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nord, Christiane 1991. *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-oriented Text Analysis*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Nord, Christiane. 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- PACTE 2000. "Acquiring translation competence: hypotheses and methodological problems in a research project." In *Investigating Translation* edited by Allison Beeby, D. Ensinger and Marisa Presas, 99–106. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- PACTE 2003. "Building a Translation Competence Model." In *Triangulating Translation: Perspectives on Process-oriented Research* edited by Fabio Alves, 43–66. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- PACTE 2005. "Investigating Translation Competence: Conceptual and Methodological Issues." *Meta: Translators' Journal*, vol. 50, no 2, 2005: 609–619.
- PACTE 2009. "Results of the validation of the Pacte translation competence model: acceptability and decision-making." *Across languages and cultures* 10(2), 207–230.
- PACTE 2011. "Results of the validation of the PACTE translation competence model: translation project and dynamic translation index." In *IATIS Yearbook 2010* edited by Sharon O'Brien. London: Continuum.
- Paloposki, Outi. 2012. "Domestication and Foreignization", In *Handbook of Translation Studies 2* edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, 40-43. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

PICT - Promoting intercultural communication in translators.2012a. Intercultural Competence Curriculum Framework, <http://www.pictllp.eu/en/curriculum-framework> (accessed 12.10.2015)

PICT- Promoting intercultural communication in translators. 2012b. Situational survey report, http://www.pictllp.eu/download/PICT_SURVEY_REPORT.pdf (accessed 01.12.2014)

Pym, Anthony. 2012. *On Translator Ethics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Pym, Anthony. 2013. “Translation skill-sets in a Machine-Translation Age.” *META*, 58 (3), 487–503.

Reiss, Katharina and Hans J. Vermeer. 1991. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*, 2nd edition, Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Robinson, Douglas. 2007. *Becoming a translator: an introduction to the theory and practice of translation*. London: Routledge.

Schäffner, Christina 2003. “Translation and Intercultural Communication: Similarities and Differences.” *Studies in Communication Sciences* 3/2, 79–107.

Snell-Hornby, Mary. 2006. *The Turns of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Snell-Hornby Mary, Zuzana Jettmarová and Klaus Kaindl, eds. 1995. *Translation as Intercultural Communication: Selected Papers from the EST Congress, Prague 1995*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vermeer, Hans J. 1989. *Skopos und Translationsauftrag. Part. 2*. Heidelberg: Verlag für Interkulturelle Kommunikation

Witte, Heidrun. 1994. “Translation as a means for a better understanding between cultures.” In *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 2* edited by C. Dollerup and A. Lindegaard, 69–75. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Witte, Heidrun. 2005. Traducir entre culturas. La competencia cultural como componente integrador del perfil experto del traductor. *Sendebarr*, 16, 27–58.

Yarosh, Maria 2013. “Towards a Systemic Approach to Identifying Culturally-specific Elements.” In *New Prospects and Perspectives for Educating Language Mediators* edited by Don Kiraly, Silvia Hansen-Schirra and Karin Maksymski, 53–77. Tübingen: Narr.

Yarosh, Maria. 2015. “Translator Intercultural Competence: A model, learning objectives and level indicators”. In *Handbook of Research on Teaching Methods in Language Translation and Interpretation* edited by Ying Cui and Wei Zhao, 160–178. Hershey, Pennsylvania: IGI Global.