V&R Academic

Don Kiraly et al.

Towards Authentic Experiential Learning in Translator Education

With 17 figures

V&R unipress

Mainz University Press

JOHANNES GUTENBERG
UNIVERSITÄT MAINZ

JG|U

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available online: http://dnb.d-nb.de.

ISBN 978-3-8471-0495-7
ISBN 978-3-8470-0495-0 (e-book)
ISBN 978-3-7370-0495-4 (V&R eLibrary)

You can find alternative editions of this book and additional material on our website: www.v-r.de

Publications of Mainz University Press
are published by V&R unipress GmbH.

Printed in Germany.
Cover image: A Human Tower of Catalunya – The Epitome of Collaboration, © Virginia Morna Schweter
Printed and bound by CPI buchbuecher.de GmbH, Zum Alten Berg 24, 96158 Birkach, Germany.

Printed on aging-resistant paper.

Contents

Acknowledgements

Publication of this book was quite literally made possible thanks to the unwavering and multi-faceted support of Prof. Dr. Silvia Hansen-Schirra, Head of the Division of English Linguistics and Translation Studies (DELTS) at the School of Translation, Linguistics and Cultural Studies (FTSK) of the University of Mainz. Without her constructive criticism, her invaluable insights into the subject at hand, her seemingly endless patience and her ability and untiring efforts to remove obstacles and hindrances from the path to publication with apparent ease, bringing this volume to print would have been a far more laborious and far less satisfying enterprise. The authors of the contributions to this volume are fighting what often appears to be an uphill battle to bring much-needed innovation to the training of translators and interpreters. This is only the latest – and certainly not the last – enormous boost that Silvia will have provided to the cause of improving education for language mediators. We are eternally grateful for her support.

I also owe many thanks to the participants in my two graduate seminars held in the winter semester of 2014–15 and the summer semester of 2015 in the DELTS. These students painstakingly reviewed, discussed and critiqued chapters of this book and contributed enormously to the coherence, quality and readability of each and every one. The seminar participants (in no particular order) were:

Victoria Bender
Dennis Hermann
Katharina Sterzer
Hilde Fazakas
Anne Lebenstedt
Natalia Schneider
Joeri Destreel
Karen Leicht
Katharina Tonendal
Maj-Britt Kalusche
Marina Nikic
Yvette Gossel
Sara-Maria Römer
Anna Droll
Jolinda Kunz
Boris Pflug

I am also very grateful to Ms. Wendy Fox, Ms. Michelle Lin and Ms. Sarah Signer. With their tremendous graphic design skills, Wendy and Michelle were instrumental in helping me turn my mental images into the *emergent learning*

models that are to be found in the chapters I authored or co-authored, and Wendy also stepped in to take on a significant amount of unexpected formatting work with her usual precision and care when the book was nearing completion. Sarah proofread all of the chapters, ironing out stylistic infelicities and making innumerable improvements to the readability of the text. I am also endebted to my daughter, Jessica Kiraly, for her tremendous technical and administrative support throughout the Moodle project.

Without the generous support I received from the Gutenberg Teaching Council at the University of Mainz, I would not have had the time off from my teaching duties or the financial support that were necessary to undertake the classroom research that led to my contributions to this volume. I am especially grateful to Prof. Dr. Dörte Andres, who led the Gutenberg Teaching Council at the time and to Prof. Dr. Mechthild Dreyer, Vice-President for Studies and Teaching at the University of Mainz, for their unequivocal support, without which this volume would not have come to fruition.

Last, but certainly not least, I thank my wife and perpetual interlocutor, Christa Noll-Kiraly, for her immeasurable patience and myriad invaluable insights throughout this project.

Don Kiraly

Preface

This volume brings together the voices of a number of translation scholars and educators (and one interpreter educator) representing several different cultures and language combinations to present their views on and experiences with *authentic experiential learning* in professional T&I educational programmes. The idea behind the book – and in fact most of its chapters – emerged from a panel on authentic translation project work in translator education that formed part of the *2nd Non-Professional Translation and Interpreting Conference*, which was held at the School of Translation, Linguistics and Cultural Studies of the University of Mainz in Germersheim, Germany in May, 2014. From the outset, it is important to point out that the particular variety of 'non-professional' translation and interpreting that was dealt with in the panel presentations and that is the focus of attention throughout this volume could actually be called *pre-professional* as it refers to translation and interpreting activities carried out by students being educated and trained to enter the language mediation professions. This clearly puts them in a special relationship with 'professional' translation and interpreting that distinguishes them from other types of non-professional language mediators. Several contributions to this volume (in particular those by Massey & Brändli, Hagemann and Dingfelder Stone) discuss the utility of this term.

This volume does not purport to offer a balanced view of the pros and cons of using authentic projects to educate translators and interpreters because, in the end, the set of contributions that came together, actually quite serendipitously, were all written by educators who have found authentic experiential work to be an effective platform for learning. Nevertheless, dissenting viewpoints are taken into consideration within various contributions. It is hoped that those readers of this volume who happen to be translator or interpreter educators that have not yet explored the possibility of incorporating authentic experiential learning into their teaching will be encouraged by this short collection of chapters to consider or reconsider this pedagogical option. In addition, given the virtual absence of significant teacher training for language mediation educators worldwide, it is

also hoped that new and up-and-coming educators in this field will be inspired by the volume to reflect on their own understandings of what it means to know, to learn and to teach as they set out to educate translators and interpreters competently and wisely in this still new millennium.

In Chapter 1, Raquel Pacheco Aguilar begins by exploring the meaning of the concepts of 'authenticity' and 'translator education' from the perspective of educational philosophy. She considers the functions of education in general and of translator education specifically and she touches on a range of topics that have long been discussed in the philosophy of education in other educational domains but that are rarely broached in the literature on translator education. In Chapter 2, Susanne Hagemann discusses a wide range of terms and concepts that have been referred to in translator education – often with a plethora of denotations. Her objective is to establish some common terminological ground so that researchers and teachers can better understand different pedagogical approaches and techniques that may have been misunderstood in the past. Her argument for terminological rigor should contribute to better defined contours of the concepts educational researchers use as they work towards establishing exemplary innovative tools for teaching and environments for learning. Chapter 3 picks up on one of the topics Raquel Pacheco Aguilar broaches in Chapter 1: the question of pedagogical epistemology and its relation to authentic project work. In this chapter, Don Kiraly[1] outlines the origins of the still dominant positivist paradigm of pedagogical thought, which he claims is grounded in the empirico-rationalist worldview that has dominated science (and education) since the Enlightenment. This paradigm has justified the continued use of the conventional "who-will-take-the-next-sentence" instructional technique that has been used to teach translation skills and knowledge since the dawn of contemporary translator education. Kiraly goes on to briefly review social-constructivist epistemology as a step beyond positivism, and he concludes with his most recent proposal of an 'emergentist' epistemology as a plausible foundation for translator education for the 21st century, that includes authentic project work.

In Chapter 4, Kiraly and Hofmann take another step towards an emergent epistemology by proposing a postpositivist curriculum development model derived from their work on the European Graduate Placement Scheme (EGPS) – an EU project designed to create a platform for international placements for students of translation. Instead of seeing work placements as a an extra-curricular activity, Kiraly and Hofmann propose an approach that incorporates work placements directly into the curriculum in a sequenced and scaffolded

1 Faced with the quandary of reflecting my shifting roles in this volume, including editor, author and co-author, I found it expeditious to switch between first and third person narration in different parts of the book.

manner. In Chapter 5, Lisa Rüth, Marcus Wiedmann and Don Kiraly discuss a multiple educational case study involving e-learning in translator education. In the study, the authors utilized the emergent model of learning presented in Chapter 3 and the findings that were surfacing simultaneously from the EGPS project to investigate: 1) the potential for using e-learning at different stages of translator education, and 2) the possibility of scaffolding learning by progressing, for example, from less authentic to more authentic learning activities over the course of a programme of study.

Chapter 6 stands out from the rest of the contributions to this volume in that it deals specifically with the education of conference interpreters rather than translators. In this chapter, Maren Dingfelder Stone discusses two teaching approaches that have been developed and applied at the FTSK in Germersheim: 1) the so-called 'Friday conference', which is a regular instructional offering where students can participate in authentic interpreting events, and 2) the Moodle Online Platform for Self-Study in Interpreting (MOPSI), which Dingfelder Stone developed with a University-funded grant in 2014–2015. While the author clearly sees the authentic Friday Conference as a suitable environment for promoting the emergence of professional interpreter competence, she also proposes the MOPSI e-learning programme as a complementary self-instructional technique. In her view, students would be expected to identify and reflect on weaknesses they perceive in their own authentic performances during the conferences, and then access the online Moodle course and choose appropriate remedial tasks to remedy those inadequacies in their performance.

In Chapter 7, Andrea Cnyrim focuses on the development of intercultural competence through authentic projects in the translation practice classroom. After reviewing the nature of the intercultural competence component of translator competence, Cnyrim introduces a series of projects carried out in the German Department of the FTSK involving authentic translations. She demonstrates how, with a suitable theoretical focus on appropriate translation commissions, students can be encouraged to develop the kind of intercultural competence they will need upon graduation. In Chapter 8, Catherine Way discusses an approach to undertaking authentic project work used in the Translator Education programme at the University of Granada that was specifically designed to avoid some of the concerns voiced by professional translator associations related to having non-professionals (students) undertake the work of professional (graduate) translators. In the experimental setting she discusses, translation students worked together with students in the University's school of law to provide the latter with translations that they needed for their coursework. Way shows how such authentic 'intra-university' projects can be used to provide

students with authentic professional practice without encroaching on the market that professionals see as their own territory.

In Chapter 9, Carmen Canfora explores the concept of the 'portfolio' as a tool for instruction and assessment in heterogeneous learning groups involved in Translator Education. In her experimental work, Canfora had students involved in highly autonomous simulated translation projects submit portfolios of their work to their instructor for assessment and feedback. This chapter clearly shows the potential value of the portfolio concept as a component in highly autonomous learning activities – including authentic project work. And finally, in Chapter 10, Gary Massey and Barbara Brändli present research they have undertaken on collaborative feedback flows in authentic translation project work at the Zürich University of Applied Sciences. Drawing on the emergent epistemology of learning proposed by Kiraly in Chapter 4, Massey and Brändli emphasize the dynamic and inter-subjective nature of learning and focus in on the feedback provided by teachers, clients and students within the context of authentic projects and how it can enhance (or hamper) performance and learning.

Don Kiraly

Raquel Pacheco Aguilar
(University of Mainz/Germersheim)

Chapter 1: The Question of Authenticity in Translator Education from the Perspective of Educational Philosophy

Introduction

Translator Education increasingly resorts to authentic translation work to create meaningful, occupation-related learning experiences (Amman and Vermeer 1990; Baer and Koby 2003; González Davies 2004; Kelly 2005; Kiraly 2000, 2005a, 2005b, 2012a, 2012b 2013, 2014; Mitchell-Schuitevoerder 2013; Galán-Mañas 2013, Hagemann and Neu 2013). As the theme of this volume suggests, one way to implement authentic translation work in the classroom is to use a real-project based methodology with near-professional working conditions, a learning-centred approach to Translator Education and a conceptualisation of learning as emergent and embodied action (Kiraly 2014). This methodology offers a framework for Translator Education that is based on "learner empowerment" (Kiraly 2000: 17), which means that by doing authentic translation work, students can be expected to take control of and responsibility for their own learning process and can also have an influence on social and political forces in their educational environment.

The objective behind undertaking authentic translation work within the educational setting is to strengthen the links between theoretical reflection and practical know-how in order to develop self-reflective professional translator expertise and generic skills like creativity, critical thought, autonomy, responsibility, cooperativeness and professionalism in a holistic way (Mitchell-Schuitevoerder 2013: 127–128). Adopting a holistic approach to translator education means educating each student "in an all-round manner […], as a 'whole person' […] and as a well-rounded translation specialist" (Tan 2008: 597). During their education, students grow as translators in their abilities and skills; rather than closing in on a predetermined ideal outcome, they are encouraged to evolve as unique, yet interconnected emergent selves.

My goal in this chapter is to investigate the nature of authenticity in Translator Education from the perspective of educational philosophy. In order to begin this exploration, I will first need to make some distinctions regarding the very

concept of 'learning'. While there may be a variety of suppositions about what learning entails, authenticity in Translator Education implies particular epistemological assumptions about this term. This aspect will be explored in this first section. Next, I will outline some of the background behind the term 'authenticity' as it has been the focus of considerable philosophical debate. In discussing this term, I will attempt to engage with some of the scholars that have dealt most directly with matters of authenticity on the one hand and Translator Education on the other. Finally, I will focus on other educational questions like the purposes of education and the relationships between educational agents and their environment. With these final considerations I hope to illuminate some of the implications of authenticity for the field of study and enterprise of Translator Education.

Learning in Translator Education

Exploring the notion of authenticity from an educational perspective leads us first to critical reflection on the epistemological foundations of 'learning'. According to Biesta's deconstructive interpretation (2006), learning is frequently understood as an "economic transaction", in which:

> (1) the learner is the (potential) consumer, the one who has certain "needs", in which (2) the teacher, the educator, or the educational institution is seen as the provider, that is, the one who is there to meet the needs of the learner, and where (3) education itself becomes a commodity – a "thing" – to be provided or delivered by the teacher or educational institution and to be consumed by the learner. (Biesta 2006: 19–20)

This economic conceptualisation of learning views both knowledge and skills as consumer goods that can be transmitted from educator to student, and as student needs to be met by educational institutions. This concept of learning suggests a framework in which education can be reduced to a matter of technical implementation of a programme that defines the learner's needs before they even begin the educational process (Biesta 2006: 21). Furthermore, once these needs are identified, they can be met by transmitting units of objective knowledge to the would-be learners.

As Hagemann illustrates using the example of the Germersheim School of Translation Studies, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies of Mainz University in Germany, this view of learning is reflected in common terms such as 'learning outcomes' or 'needs assessment' that have been introduced in many module handbooks and assessment regulations at numerous European universities through the implementation of the Bologna Process (Hagemann 2014: 157). Instead of promoting constructivist pedagogical practices as some translation

researchers have suggested, these concepts are firmly embedded in a *modernist* or *positivist* view of learning (see Kiraly in Chapter 3 of this volume). As Hagemann affirms, the:

> […] elaborate specifications for teaching seem […] to be predicated on the assumption that all students will be able to learn the same things in similar ways – but this is actually one of the objections that have been raised to traditional talk-and-chalk styles. (Hagemann 2014: 158)

Hence, a view of learning as assessment and accomplishment of needs presupposes the following situations. First, the educational institution defines "what a learner knows, understands and is able to do on completion of a learning process" ('learning outcome', European Commission 2008: 3). The identification of learning outcomes can be based on theoretical constructs and research findings or on negotiations between stakeholders (researchers, policymakers, practitioner communities and employers), or it can be adapted from pre-existing sets of learning outcomes (Bulgarelli et al. 2009: 50). The relationship between learners and those responsible for describing the learning outcomes is, in many cases, opaque. Bulgarelli emphasizes this muddy relationship in terms of vocational education and training: "It is often difficult to ascertain the source from which learning outcomes have been derived, how the development work has been undertaken and with which experts, partners and/or stakeholders" (2009: 39).

Second, the teacher develops tools to facilitate the learning process and to measure the extent to which the students have achieved the specified learning outcomes. However, even when some authors underline the use of formative assessment instead of summative assessment in the translation classroom[1], Firmino Torres and Leite show that in higher education and under the influence of the Bologna Process, "the use of more emancipatory methods of assessment does not become apparent" (Firmino Toores and Leite 2014: 26). In general, it is still student performance that is being measured, especially when the number of students in a group is excessive with respect to a particular set of norms, a programme of study or a set of learning outcomes.

Finally, once the learners' deficiencies are identified in relation to the specified learning outcomes ('learning gap'), the students can carry out the appro-

1 Formative assessments, also known as self-assessments or assessments for learning, are procedures that allow students to assume responsibility for their own learning. This emancipatory method consists of assisting in the learning process by providing information. On the other hand, summative assessments consist of items to determine the students learning progress at the end of a limited period. Summative assessments include measuring the level achieved by the students using tests and exams after completing the programme of study or a specific academic period (Firmino Torres and Leite 2014).

priate action to close the gap. In addition, this conceptualization considers learning to be a cumulative and linear process: the 'incomplete' student collects the bits and pieces of skills and knowledge necessary to become an accomplished professional. This understanding of learning suggests that there is a linear evolution from incomplete novice to polished professional and it implies a predictable causal relationship between what teachers do and what happens to the students when they engage in the educational process (Davis 2004: 22–24). Nevertheless, what essentially devolves from this perspective on characterizing the learning process is that it is assumed that the translation profession, like the 'real world', is a stable and tangible entity, an existing ontological presence that precedes the educational act. In fact, it is assumed that this pre-determined entity can be transmitted to the students by representing it faithfully in the classroom (Ulmer 1985). However, this implies a binary understanding of knowledge that comprises, on the one hand, the real outside world, and on the other hand, the representation of the real world within the learning process. The latter is held to be an accurate representation of the former. For the purposes of education, the former can be fully acknowledged. This representational assumption – that there is a world out there that is present in itself and of which we can have accurate knowledge – poses major problems as Biesta indicates:

> The assumption that the world can simply be present and can simply be presented, the assumption that we would be able to go back to the world "as it is" in and for itself, in its own original presence, is a problematic assumption. This is not only because the world never speaks for itself but always requires our descriptions. It is also because there is no original consciousness, no pre-linguistic and pre-social centre of perception and experience to which the world is simply present. (2009: 108)

On the basis of these conclusions, it can be noted that, whilst the introduction of 'learning outcomes' may be useful in order to review the pedagogical content and objectives of Translator Education, it may also prove to be based on the idea of closing gaps, fulfilling needs, transmitting pieces of information, consuming commodities, representing a static world, and thus on transmissionist epistemological assumptions. Accordingly, we could pose the question as to whether Translator Education should be understood in these terms or not. If we think that education has little in common with an economic transaction and that learning is not a matter of gathering pieces of information, or of meeting needs, but that we learn when we interact with our world as unique and singular beings, when we enter into dialogue with others and when we reflect on these experiences, then education has to be understood in other terms.

Education has an essentially communicative nature and always involves experience of some sort (Dewey 2008). Surely, we learn when we communicate with others and when we interact with our environment. Hence, I wish to emphasize

here that in communication, the 'receivers' not only take in information from the 'senders', but they interpret this information on the basis of their own historical, psychological, ethical and political background in order to make sense of it. Likewise, learning does not depend only on the activities of the 'sender', but also on the 'receiver's interpretations (Biesta 2009: 105). Rather than being merely passive recipients of knowledge, students are active participants in the learning process. Learning becomes a transformative process. Acquiring knowledge means transforming our relationship with the world around us and challenging our sense of self. As Russon puts it:

> Learning is transformation, a reconfiguring of the very way in which we are engaged with our world. Learning requires that I can address possibilities that are not yet disclosed in my situation and, equally, that I can hold out the possibility to become someone different. (Russon 2008: 104)

When we communicate, we always run the risk of misinterpretation and misunderstanding; so when we learn, we can actually become someone we could not have imagined before. Yet, just as misunderstanding, equivocation, and ambiguity are not accidental, exceptional or negative instances of communication, they constitute the very possibility of understanding (Dizdar 2006, 2012), so the incalculable risk (and thus the possibility) of becoming someone unexpectedly different is posed in the very action of learning. This argumentation becomes clear when we imagine a situation in which learning does not entail any risk. In such a situation, transformations would be determined, calculable and mechanical, but in addition, actions, consequences and reactions would be predictable. Under such conditions, would-be translators would not be open to a changing world, but enclosed in an exclusionary system. This self-defeating system would exclude all that is different. It would be an "economy of the same"[2] and hence truly unjust. As Biesta suggests, following Derrida, "we are obliged – in the very name of justice – to keep the unforeseen possibility of the in-coming of the other, the surprise of the 'invention' of the other, open" (2009: 104). Finally, because experience involves the person as a whole – intellect, feelings, senses, body, self perception – learning, far from being the consumption of commodities, involves the risk of the incalculable, the violence of challenging students' identities and the responsibility for the unique and singular subjectivity of the student (Biesta 2006: 24–32).

How does this concept of learning apply to Translator Education? I suggest that moving away from an economic way of looking at education, acknowledging the responsibility for the transformative process that arises through learning,

2 This term is used in gender and deconstructivist studies to criticize the reduction of all that is different from the norm. Otherness, alterity and singularity are excluded. This exclusion causes that which is outside of the standard to remain unarticulated.

and being open to the unforeseen possibilities in the translation classroom means understanding learning – and hence the development of translator competence – from a complexivist perspective, as an enacted and emergent phenomenon that occurs by acting authentically (Kiraly 2013, Kiraly Chapter 3 in this volume). In addition, by considering learning as an enacted activity, we are also suggesting that the translation classroom could be seen as a place for holistic experiential performance, where learning does not only occur inside of craniums, but embodied in the participants and between their dynamic interactions[3]. In conclusion, associating learning with enactment raises the question of the nature of authentic action.

Authentic Translator Education

What does it mean to be authentic? Authenticity is a multifaceted concept and enjoys wide and varying connotations, most of which have a common reference to some person, thing or idea being somehow true and faithful to some other original person, thing or idea (see e. g. Oxford Dictionary). Before focussing on the implications of 'authenticity' in Translator Education, it is necessary to reflect on the ordinary use of this evolving and ambiguous concept. It is important to understand the development and ambiguities of the concept before using it in a context related to Translator Education.

Etymologically, the term authenticity derives from the Greek *authentikos* > *authentes* (*auto* originally means 'self' and *hentes* 'doer, being', 'one acting on one's own authority'). In this sense, the term can be seen in opposition to simulated, false or artificial. Looking at a painting, for example, we could say: "This self-portrait is an authentic Rembrandt." To say that an object is authentic is to say that it had been made by the author's own hand. In this case, the term authentic is used in the sense of being of undisputed authorship or origin. Questions about authentic paintings and texts are a matter of preservation and authority. Indeed, an authentic painting has more value than a copy; it is original, genuine, trustworthy, better. We commonly suppose that authenticity has a positive value. Undoubtedly, the authentic = good / inauthentic = bad dichotomy is very powerful. Therefore, saying that something is authentic involves a value judgement.

The meaning of authenticity appears to be even more complex if the term is considered within the context of Translator Education. Here is an example: in the

3 Some practical examples of this view of learning as enactment can be observed in Bahadir (2009, 2010a), Kiraly (2012b, 2013), Dizdar (2014) and some of the contributions to this volume.

20th century, music lovers became interested in hearing what the Baroque music by composers such as Johann Sebastian Bach would originally have sounded like in the 17th and early 18th centuries. Since the instruments used during that period were made differently and sounded different from those made today, instrument makers started to make instruments the old way in order to bring the authentic Baroque sound back to life. These instruments are often called 'authentic period instruments'. When we say that a harpsichord or a violin is authentic, we do not mean that the instruments were built during a particular period of history, but we are talking about a relation of similarity. Hence, similarity is a matter of degree and implies a comparison between an original archetype and an object that is 'the same as' the original (Splitter 2008: 138). What does this conception of authenticity imply when we think about Translator Education?

Authentic translation work in the classroom involves active learning with guidance from an expert teacher through "real translation assignments embedded in authentic situations with the same sorts of complexity and problem-solving constraints" that professional work involves (Kiraly 2005a). This conceptualisation can also be found in the constructivist, student-centred approach to authentic pedagogy proposed by Newmann et al. (1996). They wrote that educational activities have to be connected to the 'real world' in order to meet the standard of authenticity. In highlighting the relationship between the world within and beyond the classroom, Newmann et al. imagine a pedagogy that could be compared with a period musical instrument: what students do in the classroom is the same as what goes on in the 'real world'. This understanding of authentic learning implies a criterion of comparison between the classroom and the 'real world' and, as Splitter writes, "the presumption that what happens in 'the world beyond the classroom' offers a standard for what we mean, or might mean, by authenticity" (2008: 139). Since authenticity standards are set by what professionals do (Newmann et al. 1996), being authentic means performing in the same way experts do – indeed not merely in the same way that they actually act, but in the way they ought to act. Accordingly, "an authentic problem in science or law, or an authentic task in the fine arts, for example, must correspond not merely to what scientists, lawyers and artists do, but to what they ought to do, i. e. to some kind of idealized sense or normative ideal of what science, law and art really are" (Splitter 2008: 143). Consequently, the conception of authenticity proposed here implies a normative ideal. This takes us back to where we started: authenticity is a matter of judgement.

An understanding of authenticity, not as a matter of judgement, but as an ontological quality, can be explored by considering that the object of authenticity is not the learning process itself and the learning situation in which that process is embedded, but the individuals who are involved in this process,

that is, students and educators. Let us take this insight back to the issue of acting authentically, as being true to oneself exposed in the etymological definition of the term. How can I, or any person, strive to become authentic? What does it mean to be one's self? What is the nature of the 'authentic self'?

Many conceptions of the authentic self can be found throughout the history of Western philosophy. As Taylor points out, in pre-modern societies, people found their identity through their position within a social system:

> What we would now call a person's identity was largely fixed by his or her social position. That is, the background that made sense of what the person recognized as important was to a great extent determined by his or her place in society and whatever role or activities attached to this. (Taylor 1991: 47)

With the rise of the modern worldview, a number of social changes led to a shift in terms of acknowledging the ideal of the human being. One's identity was no longer specified by the circumstances of birth or social position. Aspects such as autonomy, independence, "being a self-directed, affective actor in the world" (Guignon 2004: 77) became increasingly important. Nevertheless, as Guignon continues, "being self-directed requires (1) knowing what you believe and feel and (2) honestly expressing those beliefs and feelings in what you do" (2004: 77). With this modern conception of the self, the individual became, on the one hand, self-transparent and self-governing, which means that human beings are able to capture their own essence introspectively and to have effective control over their actions. A space of interiority appears and becomes a guiding authority of human agency. We must attain a substance in order to be true to ourselves. On the other hand, this imposes a rupture between one's inner and outer self, between the individual and the social. This dichotomy has important consequences for the conception of learning. Note that there are similarities between this modern conception of the self and the modern understanding of knowledge and learning explained at the beginning of this article (in Chapter 3 of this volume, Kiraly also elucidates the consequences of a modernist epistemology for Translator Education).

However, thinkers such as Nietzsche and Freud questioned the conception of human nature as a unified and underlying self. The Freudian inclusion of the unconscious as a part of the mind that is inaccessible to the conscious and that influences our thoughts, feelings and actions – "ego is not the master in its own house, but must content itself with scanty information of what is going on unconsciously in its mind" (Freud 1917: 284–285) – reframed the modern notion of the self. As Davis writes: "The suggestion that our conscious mind is more a passenger than a pilot was revolutionary […]. Freud helped foreground the roles of social habitus and non-conscious processes in the shaping of individual and collective characters" (Davis 2004: 107). Postmodern thinkers rejected the idea

of a self-transparent ego and argued instead that "human identities are transitory, fragmented, and interlocked" (ibid.).

This postmodern perspective emphasizes the necessity to reconsider the notion of acting authentically as a matter of acting on one's own authority – as being true to one's self. This is so particularly because 'doing one's own thing' may entail the risk of succumbing to impulses from our dark, unconscious self. In this context, being authentic might not be at all admirable and could even be ethico-politically undesirable. From this perspective, seeking 'authenticity' could lead to a translation class in which everything goes, as long as the students and the teachers are expressing themselves, even if the interpretations, the translations and the classroom actions are motivated by antisocial, violence-inciting values. Second, authenticity as 'self-fulfilment' suggests that we are capable of having a profound awareness of our own potential and that we can transform this potential into action. For translation students, this means that they could foresee the potential abilities they have before they engage in the learning process and would take the necessary steps on the way to becoming accomplished professional translators. In both cases, I wish to highlight that this idea of authenticity is based on the possibility of a complete self-understanding and on a human essence that can be determined by consciousness. If we question the persuasiveness of these assumptions, we may have to think about authenticity in another way.

Heidegger's conception of authenticity[4] (1996), for example, shares with the modern concept the idea of being true to oneself, but he rejects the belief of a distinctive human essence. By analysing human participation in life (*Dasein*), he points out that, on the one hand, human beings can be inauthentic in doing something just because it is the way others behave. In this case, we simply apply or implement a programme; we believe without considering whether it is our own belief; "we can disown ourselves and live dispersed in 'the they'", as Russon puts it (2008: 97). By being inauthentic, our action is the "applied consequence" of a law, a tradition or a set of rules (Derrida 1992: 45). In Translator Education, this means that, as educators we may follow, for example, the description of learning outcomes literally, without leaving any space for invention and improvisation in the classroom.

On the other hand, Heidegger also proposed that human beings could choose to be authentic by expressing an openness to the possible, that is, by remaining open to the transformative possibilities of an undecidable future (Russon 2008, Trubody 2015). Authenticity as a response to a unique situation is to answer a

4 Trubody reminds us that "Heidegger's use of the term 'authentic' in German is an appropriation of the term *eigen*, an adjective meaning 'own,' 'strange,' or 'peculiar'. Eigen gave rise to the word *eigentlich* meaning 'real,' 'actual,' or 'truly'" (2015: 18).