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1. Leveraging MT Literacy

Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow & Sharon O’Brien

Thanks to the ready availability of so-called free online services, neural machine translation (NMT) has recently emerged as one of the most important language resources for lay and professional users in various domains (e.g. Nurminen 2019). The quality of the non-edited output has reached impressive levels for some language combinations, although there are still problems with sociolinguistic-, cultural-, domain- and register-inappropriateness. Users with reasonable levels of proficiency in both the source and target languages can recognize such problems and intervene to fix them (i.e. post-edit) or reject the output and translate from scratch. However, the misleadingly fluent quality of the output can deceive less proficient users into assuming that problematic output is actually acceptable (cf. Martindale & Carpuat 2018). Informed use of MT through MT literacy training has been suggested as an effective way to help prevent the risks associated with the naïve deployment of this technology (e.g. Bowker and Buitrago Ciro 2019; Cadwell et al. 2019; Nitzke et al. 2019; O’Brien & Ehrensberger-Dow 2020). A competent level of MT literacy can inform judgements about the suitability of using MT for certain genres, about quality expectations, about risks, and about when intervention by professional translators is required. Those judgements are based on the rich intercultural awareness that translators bring to their work, since they have been trained to recognize and deal with cultural differences, potential ambiguity, terminological inconsistencies as well as conceptual and lexical gaps (e.g. Federici & Declercq 2019), but are likely to be missing or inadequate for users who do not have such training. In this panel, we would like to go beyond the basics of MT literacy to explore in more depth its cognitive dimensions, including, for example, questions such as: What cognitive processes are at play when lay users evaluate the output of MT? Do the concepts of adequacy and fluency, for example, intuitively form part of their evaluation? What factors are used to judge whether a text needs to be post-edited? What role does trust play? How does MT-mediated communication affect the communicative process overall? Is creativity enhanced or inhibited? What risk assessment factors come into play when MT is used for mediation? What emotional responses does the use of MT for lay users elicit? Are there implications for other AI-based technology? The panel invites papers that respond to these questions and others relating to how MT literacy can be leveraged in various translation environments.

Sub-topics
- MT literacy and creativity
- MT literacy and new roles for language professionals
- MT literacy and genres
- MT literacy and evaluation
- MT literacy and risk assessment
2. Translator and Interpreter Studies: State of the art

Olha Lehka-Paul

In his agent model of translation, Chesterman (2009) put a translator (and an interpreter) in the limelight, acknowledging the fact that neither the translation (or interpreting) process nor product is possible without the human agent involved. A translator or an interpreter with their individual personality traits, emotions, background, experience and motivation is an indispensable element in the chain of actions involved in delivering the final translation product to the client. Yet, research centred around a translator/an interpreter and his or her psychological characteristics that interact with a given translation situation is still scarce. Interdisciplinary research combining personality psychology and Cognitive Translation Studies indicates that translators possess a distinct set of personality traits that make them different from the representatives of other professions (Abhissira 2019; Lehka-Paul [in press];) and that the translator’s preferred psychological functions may potentially influence their individual decision-making behaviours in the translation process (Lehka-Paul [in press]). Research into translator’s emotional intelligence (Hubscher-Davidson 2017) has shown that translators with high Emotional Intelligence trait scores are more satisfied with their jobs and are more prone to become successful. Lehr (2013) and later Rojo and Ramos (2016) found that emotional valence has an effect on creativity and accuracy in translation: positive emotions that translators experience foster creativity, while negative emotions increase accuracy. Using Bandura’s psychological construct of “self-efficacy” in the context of interpreting, Lee (2018) suggested that students’ self-efficacy scores can be strong predictors of interpreting performance. The methods that researchers use in such interdisciplinary endeavours range from key-logging and eye-tracking to questionnaires and systemic observation. Thus, in this panel we are going discuss recent developments in Translator (and Interpreter) Studies. Contributions are welcome in, but not restricted to, the following areas: psychological and cognitive aspects of translator’s and interpreter’s personality, emotional intelligence, emotion regulation and stress management, translator’s/interpreter’s self-efficacy and self-esteem, the role of motivation and creativity in translation performance. It will be particularly insightful to discuss interdisciplinary research projects, as well as studies that use multi-method approach to better understand the main agent in translation and interpreting.

Sub-topics

- translator’s and interpreter’s personality
- translator’s/interpreter’s self-efficacy
- translator’s/interpreter’s self-esteem
- emotions
- emotional intelligence
- motivation
- creativity
Translation and Interpreting programmes at European universities commonly comprise a series of language courses where students are supposed to acquire the necessary linguistic skills that will allow them to engage in subsequent translation and interpreting activities and courses. Even though there seems to be a broad consensus among translator and interpreter trainers that this language training needs to be different from general language courses, research into this area is still relatively scarce. Language competence is, however, the most relevant of all necessary competences for translating and interpreting, because, as Delisle (1980:41) so aptly puts it, "translation begins and ends with language". Hence, T&I oriented language competence is a crucial component in the training of prospective translators and interpreters and foreign language courses within such programmes are the ideal starting point for laying the groundwork for the development of translation/interpreting competence. Cognitive approaches from linguistics and second language acquisition as well as Translation Studies offer great potential for this area. However, up to date there are only a few contributions that link language acquisition and training in T&I programmes with cognitive approaches. The clearest examples are the contributions by Recio Ariza (2011), who discusses Cognitive Grammar in Foreign Language Teaching in T&I programmes, and by Carrasco Flores (2018), who proposes a cognitive and methodological framework of reference for materials analysis and development. Cognition, however, is also of great relevance in other important contributions like the ones by Berenguer (1996), Cerezo Herrero (2016) or Schmidhofer & Ahmann (2015). In this panel, we welcome contributions regarding the role of cognition in general within T&I oriented language acquisition and training and in specific areas like grammar or skill development as well as the relevance of cognitive and metacognitive learning strategies or cognitive approaches towards the development of T&I oriented language competence (cf. Schmidhofer 2020). The panel is also open for contributions about related topics like insights from cognitive contrastive linguistics or the development of a language user's or translator's/interpreter's identity.

Sub-topics
- the role of cognition in T&I oriented language acquisition and training
- cognitive and metacognitive learning strategies in T&I oriented language acquisition and training
- cognitive grammar in T&I oriented language acquisition and training
- cognition and skills development in T&I oriented language acquisition and training
- cognitive contrastive linguistics in T&I oriented language acquisition and training
Writing research and translation studies, are close relatives. In the same vein, writing didactics and translation didactics share conceptions, methodology, methods and theoretical approaches, and their work processes are systematically similar to the extent that they can be argued to form part of a superordinate category, i.e. text production (Dam-Jensen & Heine 2020). Common features of the two disciplines have recently been topicalized. For health communication, an area of specialized communication, van Vaerenbergh (2012) discusses interrelationships between technical communication and technical translation. In the field of translator training, Ehrensberger-Dow & Massey (2013) apply methods common to both fields to investigate translators’ understanding of their roles and responsibilities as text producers. Heine & Schubert (2013) discuss and compare theoretical models of specialized communication to shed light on similarities and differences. For translation pedagogy, Schrijver (2014) explores the effects of writing training on transediting and translation performance and Schrijver et al. (2014) measure the impact of writing skills on the translation product. Dam-Jensen, Heine & Schrijver (2019) investigate writing and translation across various sub-disciplines, and highlight distinct similarities and differences. And departing from the viewpoint of multilingual text production, Heine (2020) zooms into competence models of both fields of text production. Common to these specialised studies on writing and/or translation is a shared linguistic base, shared methodological references, shared concepts, such as competence, knowledge, motivation and – not least – text, and a common language for describing phenomena; yet some concepts carry different meanings in the disciplines. Process(es), phase(es), strategies and translation (understood as transfer in writing research) are terms that can cause misconception and require comparison and discussion and – on the part of the younger discipline of writing research – also definitions, when used in interdisciplinary approaches (Dam-Jensen, Heine & Schrijver in prep.). The closeness of means, procedures, tactics, strategies and processes (to name but a few potential foci) of writing and translation deserve joint scholarly attention. Such attention would encourage and nurture thinking across disciplinary boundaries, mutually draw on each other’s knowledge and allow for new perspectives on existing schools of thought and, hopefully, prompt a pooling of approaches. Drawing on the notion by Henry Ford that ”coming together is beginning, staying together is progress and working together is success”, this panel will bring together researchers who work and teach at the interface of the fields; to encourage interdisciplinary collaboration and to harness synergies that may transcend the disciplines.

Sub-topics

- Writing and translation procedures, processes and strategies
- Writing and translation research methods, methodology and theoretical approaches
- Writing and translation training and pedagogy
- Similarities and differences
- Interfaces and implications
Along the years, the scope of translation process research (TPR), which seeks to understand the cognitive processes at play during the translation process, has both broadened and deepened. Researchers stepped out of laboratories and classrooms into workplaces and started taking into account the environment in which translators work and the ways they interact with their surroundings. Such studies have reinstated the human, social and cultural dimensions of cognition and opened many research avenues (Muñoz 2014a). Following Halverson (2010), they are increasingly being called Cognitive Translation Studies (CTS). The focus of CTS, however, is still non-literary translation. Literary translation has so far remained on the fringes of CTS as only a handful of researchers have opted to study cognitive processes in literary translation (e.g. Borg 2019; Georgiou 2019; Kolb 2017). Much, thus, remains to be explored. For instance, literary and non-literary texts differ in several ways with certain features such as literary devices, style, and musicality taking more prominence in the former than in the latter. How do translators tackle such features? How do they handle, say, narrative aspects? Shedding light on actual processes (e.g. reading and interpretation of the source text, decision-making, creativity) operating during the translation process as well as on translators’ behaviour as they interact with their environment will enhance our understanding of literary translation and literary translators. Until now, research combining cognition and literary translation has been limited but insightful and promising. This panel, therefore, would like to invite contributions delving into cognitive aspects of literary translation and the situated literary translator.

Sub-topics
Contributions are welcome on cognitive aspects of literary translation such as (but not limited to):

- recent advancements in the area
- methodological insights and innovation (e.g. the application of aspects from anthropology, sociology, psychology, etc)
- the engagement of literary translators with the text
- cognitive processes in self-revision, other-revision and post-editing in literary translation
- decision-making, creativity, subjectivity during the literary translation process
- the interaction of literary translators with other participants in the translation process (e.g. editors, publishers, proofreaders)
- the interaction of literary translators with tools and resources (including technological tools such as CAT tools).
6. Priming as a factor in translators’ and interpreters’ productions: A psycholinguistic approach to source interference

Robert M. Maier

Although Baker (1993, cited from Mauranen 2004:65) rejects the consideration of interference from specific linguistic systems among universal features of translation, later authors (e.g. Toury 1995; Mauranen 2006) have pointed out that the occurrence of interference phenomena is a persistent feature of translation and interpreting (T&I), and thus may rate as a universal principle. While translators’ and interpreters’ actual productions are doubtlessly specific to the source and target languages involved, the principles behind their language processing presumably are not—in psycholinguistic terms, they may be described as involving cognitive representations of both languages and sequential or near-simultaneous processes of language comprehension and language production. Having gathered momentum over more than a decade (say, from Chmiel 2010, to a recent special issue of the journal Bilingualism: Language and Cognition in August 2020), the psycholinguistic angle may contribute to various issues in T&I research (e.g. questions of directionality, cognitive development of translation skills, granularity of units of translation). This panel, however, will return focus to Source Language Interference (SLI) as an aspect that promises particularly fruitful insights. Variously discussed in the 1970s and 1980s as a type of translation error, or together with similar phenomena in language acquisition, more recent research describes SLI as a result of “contact between two languages” that has been observed as “a form of bilingual processing” on all levels of linguistic organisation (Mauranen 2004:67). In psycholinguistic terms, phenomena of this type are accounted for with the phenomenon of cross-linguistic priming: representations of both languages are (necessarily) activated at the same time, permitting some activation energy to ‘seep’ from one into the other, thus creating a bias for target productions that share more or other features with the source than intended. This approach of combining T&I observations with psycholinguistic reasoning has seen some application in recent years (Maier, Pickering & Hartsuiker 2017; Chmiel 2018) and received new impulses from the MEMENTO bootcamp 2020 in Germersheim. This panel strives to gather researchers who carrying out corpus or experimental studies of T&I production with a view to priming on any level of linguistic organization.

Sub-topics
- semantic priming
- false friends
- morphological priming
- syntactic priming
- structure selection bias
- granularity of translation units
- priming and proficiencies
- modalities (speech, sign, writing)
- directionality
- methodology
Investigating the relationship between language and emotion is of paramount importance not only because of its implications for social interaction, especially nowadays with increasing demographic changes, but also because of its bidirectional nature: emotional states can be expressed through language, and language can influence the perception of emotion-related content. Emotional language processing can be considered from the perspective of the monolingual reader and its impact on one’s native language (Rojo, Ramos, & Valenzuela 2014) or from the perspective of the translator/interpreter who has access to two languages and makes conscious decisions on how to transfer affective information into the target language creating the intended effect. The case of unbalanced bilingual speakers, that is, of individuals who regularly use two languages but are more proficient in one of them and have not received training in either translation or interpreting is another perspective one would expect differential emotional language processing. Indeed, a number of studies in the last few years have demonstrated that a second/foreign language (L2) may reduce heuristic biases in decision making (Costa et al. 2014; Keysar Hayakawa, & An 2012) and create emotional distance in an L2 (Caldwell-Harris 2015; Pavlenko 2012). Finally, linguistic aspects (morphophonological or semantic ones) and their context of use, especially a figurative one, may also influence the interpretation and effect of emotional language (Ifantidou & Hatzidaki 2019). The topics that will be presented and discussed by this panel will touch upon psycholinguistic constructs and methods that can be employed to investigate emotional language processing in translation and interpreting.

Sub-topics

- Emotional language processing from the perspective of the reader
- Emotional language processing from the perspective of the translator/interpreter
- Foreign language effect
- Emotional language processing at the lexical and/or at the syntactic level
- Metaphors and emotional language processing in translation
8. Many minds: Theories of Mind in translation

Annie Sturm & Riccardo Raimondo

Being the main agent in an «other-directed act» (Robinson 2001:8), the translator has to metarepresent two other cognitions during the translation process: the minds of the source text author and target audience. Metarepresentational capacities can thus be considered a core component of translation competence (Gutt 2004:13). Developmental psychologists call the human capacity to represent another person's mind 'Theory of Mind' (ToM). This term has recently joined simulation, imitation, imaginative immersion and empathy among the concepts trying to explain how translators deal with the content of other minds. How and when do translators attribute mental states to author and audience and how does this influence the translation process? ToM could work as a platform concept to answer this question since it brings together several strands of research, both philosophical and evidence-based. ToM develops throughout life (Kobayashi 2008) just as our pragmatic competence continues to evolve until adulthood (Cummings 2007). Bilingualism is found to have an influence on ToM performance in children (Kovács 2009). In monolingual individuals, reading and writing are found to train ToM (Djikic & Oatley 2014; Djikic et al. 2013) and one of the milestones in the acquisition of translation competence is the understanding that translation is a psychological and social activity (Kiraly 1995; Mossop 1983, 2011). Furthermore, research in psychology and foreign language acquisition studies provide evidence for the role of translation tasks in the acquisition of metacognitive skills in general (Bruneau & Saxe 2012; Salles Rocha 2010; Shatz et al. 2006). Despite the central role of mental state attribution in translation, only few theoretical studies have been dedicated to this subject and very little research has been done to develop its interdisciplinary potential. The present panel proposes to «mind» this gap by exploring the different concepts about metacognition in translation, their function in the translation process, their traces in the translation product and their importance in the acquisition of translation competence.

Sub-topics

We invite the submission of papers on any type of mental state attribution in translation, be it theoretical, historical and methodological research into the subject, including:

- imitation, simulation, empathy, ToM
- metacognition
- philosophy of mind
- tolc
- literary translation
- corpus studies
The topic of translation and psychology has slowly received increasing attention in Translation Studies (Lörscher 1996; Fraser 2000; Hubscher-Davidson 2009, 2013, 2017, 2020; Jääskeläinen 2012; Haro Soler 2017; Kiraly 1995, 2019). The focus has already shifted from purely linguistic to a more interdisciplinary perspective, but still psychological issues need to be addressed more implicitly in translator education. For instance, concepts such as the psychosocial competence of the translator, student agency, self-regulation or self-efficacy still call for more research attention. Particularly, the aspect of the 'self' calls for recognition in today's translator training. The change in perspective on translation processes, initiated by Kiraly about 30 years ago, shifted the focus away from a predominantly linguistic focus to a doubly-articulated internal (psychological) and external (social) perspective" (Kiraly (2019:257). In the belief that people are "self-organizing, proactive, self-regulating, and self-reflecting" (Bandura 2006:164), the approach adopted in this panel is aimed at the translator's psychological self. As Macellan (2014:59) points out "there are many labels (sometimes with overlapping meaning) used in relation to the self: attribution, concept, control, efficacy, esteem, regulation and so on". The self of the translator is a notion of great interest to translation educators who promote metacognitive skills and empower students to become active participants of their own learning process.

Sub-topics

- translator's self
- psychology of translation
- metacognition
- self-regulation
- self-efficacy
- student agency
- psychosocial competence
10. Self-efficacy beliefs in translator education

María del Mar Haro Soler

Research on self-efficacy beliefs to translate, that is, a translator’s confidence in his/her ability to translate adequately, is relatively recent in Translation Studies. Although for the last decade several studies have been performed on this construct (Albin 2012; Atkinson 2014; Bolaños 2014; Haro-Soler 2018; Ho 2010; Muñoz 2014b; among others), further research is needed, especially from an educational perspective. Even though research on self-efficacy beliefs has been intense in a wide variety of fields, especially in Education, little attention has been paid to self-efficacy beliefs in research on translator education (Atkinson & Crezee 2014). This lack of attention contrasts with the benefits that self-efficacy beliefs can bring for (translation) students: self-efficacy beliefs can influence motivation, decision-making or the control of negative emotional states. In this panel, several experts on self-efficacy beliefs will analyse the sources and effects of self-efficacy beliefs regarding translation students. In other words, different studies on possible ways to incorporate the development of realistic self-efficacy beliefs in translator education programmes, as well as on the benefits of said realistic beliefs will be discussed.

Sub-topics

- Effects of self-efficacy beliefs on translation students
- Self-efficacy beliefs and the translator’s identity
- How to measure self-efficacy beliefs?
- Pedagogical approaches to foster translation students’ self-efficacy beliefs.
11. Translation process research and radical enactivism
Michael Carl & Fabio Alves

Starting in the mid 1980s, Translation Process Research has been investigating "by what observable and presumed mental processes do translators arrive at their translations?" (Jakobsen 2017:21). A large body of data and research findings have been produced that investigate, among other things the role of expertise, ergonomic, linguistic, and emotional factors, as well as the usage of (external) resources - such as computer assisted translation and machine translation - on the translation process and the impact on the distribution of attention, translation duration, translation effort, etc. This panel aims at interpreting TPR findings in the framework of radical enactivism. An enactivist view on cognition claims that we selectively create our environment through our interactions with the world. As translations emerge through a translator's interaction with the text and her social and technological environment, this claim is trivially true in a translation context. However, a radical enactivist position suggests, in addition, that the presumed mental processes are not necessarily or essentially contentful. That is, translators would not necessarily build up ‘representations' of the textual content but rather directly react (i.e translate) as a result of direct coupling between the translator and her environment. The notion of 'affordance' has often been used in this context. Affordances are "opportunities for behavior". They are relations between features of the environment (e.g. properties of the text) and abilities of an agent (i.e. the translator), which allow the agent to act directly on the environment without mentally representing it. The panel seeks at assessing what a Radical Encativist perspective might mean for the translation process, how a direct coupling of the translator and her environment could be measured and modeled, and what construct(s) of 'representation' might be required to explain the relation between the translation act and the translation event. We welcome empirical, conceptual and theoretical contributions, illuminating aspects of radical enactivism in translation.

Sub-topics
- enactive cognition in translation
- translational representation
- mental content
- direct translation
- vertical vs. horizontal processes
12. Contesting epistemologies in Cognitive Translation and Interpreting Studies

Sandra L. Halverson & Álvaro Marín García

After decades of what some might call a rather myopic focus on data collection, processing and analysis (Göpferich, Jakobsen and Mees 2009), Cognitive Translation and Interpreting Studies (CTIS) has grown into epistemological discussions that question established research traditions and the knowledge generated according to their methods and constructs (Chesterman 2020; Halverson 2015, 2020; Marín 2017, 2019; Muñoz 2016). A new research tradition has emerged, leading to the creation of new constructs and challenging previous ones. At the same time, we have seen variation in the methods of validation and assessment of models, leading to a point of disciplinary problematization and self-reflection in the wake of these new research traditions and the validation crisis in the Social Sciences (Risku 2014). We propose a panel to discuss the evolution of (and variation in) views of scientific knowledge as articulated and practiced in CTIS, both as they relate to transdisciplinary relationships between CTIS, Cognitive Psychology, Cognitive Science and Cognitive Linguistics/Semiotics and as they relate to other subdisciplines or areas within Translation Studies. We should like to consider the fruits of this discussion in light of an understanding of scientific disciplines as communities of practice that necessarily negotiate meaning in their constant interaction, transforming (translating across traditions) scientific discourse and therefore knowledge. We would also like to approach the challenges and opportunities that a plurality of validation methods and contesting research traditions bring to a field that has traditionally inscribed itself within a monist experimental paradigm.

Sub-topics

- CTIS and other fields (interdisciplinary interaction)
- CTIS and TIS (intradisciplinary interaction)
- New developments in CTIS theory
- Methodological challenges
- Socio-cognitive approaches
There is no shortage of cognitive models attempting at capturing either parts of or the entire simultaneous interpreting (SI) process. Many of these, however, date back to the early days of psychological inquiry into the field and most of them have not been updated to account for the latest findings in multilingual language processing. Similarly, interpreter training models have evolved relatively little since the early training approaches suggested by self-taught practicing professionals and are generally difficult to reconcile with the aforementioned cognitive models. This panel aims at showcasing the advances made in cognitive modelling of both, the interpreting process and interpreter training, including different modalities, modes and types of interpreting.

Sub-topics
We welcome and prioritize submissions comprising both a theoretical (i.e., modelling) component as well as an empirical (i.e., testing) component in all areas related to cognitive processes in interpreting, including but not limited to:

- Full process models
  - of spoken and/or signed language interpreting
  - of consecutive and/or simultaneous interpreting
  - of new hybrid modes of interpreting
- Partial process models
  - of spoken and/or signed language interpreting
  - of consecutive and/or simultaneous interpreting
  - of new hybrid modes of interpreting
- Comprehensive (i.e., holistic) training models
  - for spoken and/or signed language interpreting
  - for consecutive and/or simultaneous interpreting
  - for new hybrid modes of interpreting
- Partial (i.e., skill-specific) training models
  - for spoken and/or signed language interpreting
  - for consecutive and/or simultaneous interpreting
  - for new hybrid modes of interpreting
Ever since Wadensjö's (1998) landmark study, there has been a growing interest in the interactive nature of dialogue interpreting as a joint activity embedded in a specific communicative situation. Detailed analyses and observations of actual interpreter-mediated exchanges have shown that interpreters in dialogic settings are faced not only with the cognitively demanding task of listening, processing and translating the ongoing talk, but also with the added negotiation of role, turn management and general monitoring of the unfolding of the exchange (Mason 1999:i). More recently, research on dialogue interpreting has witnessed a 'multimodal turn', showing that dialogue interpreting does not just consist of verbal communication, but is conducted through an interplay of diverse multimodal resources (speech, gesture, gaze, etc.) (Davitti 2018). However, multimodal approaches to dialogue interpreting have been hampered by problems in data collection, issues of obtrusiveness and problems in capturing details of the visual behavior (such as gaze direction) from all participants. In contrast to the domain of conference interpreting, which has attracted considerable interest of neighbouring disciplines, such as (psycho)linguistics, cognitive sciences and neuropsychology, research on dialogue interpreting has known less methodological innovation. However, recent studies (e.g. Englund Dimitrova & Tiselius 2016; Davitti 2018; Vranjes et al. 2018; De Boe 2020; Tiselius & Sneed 2020) illustrate the potential of experimental approaches and novel research methods (such as eye-tracking) in the investigation of dialogue interpreting. In this panel we want to gather researchers focusing on the following two aspects of dialogue interpreting research: (i) Understanding embodiment in dialogue interpreting Empirical research has shown that dialogue interpreting is a complex, multimodal activity conducted through both verbal and embodied behavior. Which visual resources do interpreters resort to in dialogue interpreting? What is the relationship between different multimodal resources? What can a multimodal approach teach us about the interactive and cognitive processes involved in dialogue interpreting? (ii) Advancing multimodal methods Collecting multimodal data, analysing and interpreting embodied behaviour is a (technological) challenge, especially in interactional settings. Can state-of-the art data capturing tools (such as unobtrusive mobile eye-tracking) and mixed-methods approaches help to make sense of the complex nature of dialogue interpreting as a socio-cognitive process? What are the possibilities, challenges and restrictions of those developments?

Sub-topics
- eye-tracking
- multimodality
- cognitive processing in dialogue interpreting
- mixed-method approaches
15. Revisiting Interpreting in the Age of 4E Cognition

Alper Kumcu & Asiye Öztürk

Embodied, embedded, enacted, and extended (4E) cognition briefly argues that rather than an abstract information processing in the brain, human cognition is grounded in sensorimotor experiences, interoception, affection and on a larger scale, the sociocultural setting of the cogniser (Barsalou 1999, 2008; Pulvermüller 1999). This research programme further argues that the mind is not limited to the brain but extends to the body and the environment (Clark & Chalmers, 1998). As a reaction against the computational theory of mind and its related constructs, 4E cognition has deeply influenced our conceptualisation of human cognition in the last 20 years and accordingly, has reshaped the literature of several domains from language comprehension to memory. In this vein, a growing number of studies within the framework of cognitive translation and interpreting studies (CTIS) has revisited translation as an embodied process (Risku 2010; Risku & Windhager 2013; Zhu 2018). Despite being a cognitively demanding activity and thus, having attracted the attention of cognitive psychology/science traditionally, interpreting has remained relatively understudied in terms of 4E cognition with some exceptions (e.g., Dong & Turner 2016; González-Davies & Enríquez-Raido 2016; Kumcu 2020). Recent advances both in CTIS and 4E cognition shows that it is high time to present and discuss what 4E cognition could bring to interpreting studies. In this spirit, this panel invites experimental, theoretical and/or methodological studies that see interpreting from the lenses of 4E cognition and thus, at the intersection of mind, body and the environment of the interpreter. Studies can focus on the interpreter in the booth/field and their immediate, technosocial environment on a micro-scale or can address the interpreting process situated in a sociocognitive context.

Sub-topics
- Processing models
- Cognitive structures (executive functions, conceptual and event representations, language processing, etc.)
- Expertise Individual differences
- Interpreter training
- Ergonomics and human-computer interaction
- Sociocognitive/professional settings
- Methodological approaches
Cognitive load has repeatedly caught interpreting scholars’ attention as regards both interpreting models (Gile 2009; Seeber 2011) and experimental operationalization (e.g. Chen 2017a; Gieshoff 2018; Koshkin et al. 2018). Conceptualized as “a multi-dimensional construct reflecting the interactions between task and environmental characteristics and interpreter characteristics” (Chen 2017b:647), cognitive load has shown its potential in terms of pushing the boundaries of our knowledge about the process of interpreting. This panel will create an opportunity to discuss cognitive load in interpreting from multiple perspectives that match the multi-dimensionality of the construct itself. We would like to discuss both extrinsic (task- and environment-related) and intrinsic (interpreter-related) factors modulating cognitive load. These may include language pair specificity and syntactic asymmetry as an example of task-related factors, noise or visibility of the speaker as environmental factors or working memory and language proficiency as interpreter-related factors. We also want to focus on the nature of cognitive load that may be imported from processing a previous meaningful chunk or exported to the subsequent meaningful chunk (Gile 2008). Even if the problem trigger that increases the load is correctly resolved and interpreted, it might still export its load downstream and cause the spillover effect (Shlesinger 2000). All these instances of cognitive load should be carefully considered when planning experimental operationalization. Thus, last but not least, we would like to discuss how to operationalize cognitive load in experimental studies. What are the advantages and disadvantages of measuring cognitive load with pupil dilation (Seeber & Kerzel 2011), filled pauses (Defrancq & Plevoets 2018), eye-tracking measures (Chmiel & Lijewska 2019) or memory chunks (Shao and Chai 2020)? What other measures could be successfully employed? We believe this is a timely topic and creating an opportunity to exchange ideas and discuss methodological issues will contribute to further development of process research on interpreting.

Sub-topics

- experimental operationalisations of cognitive load
- factors modulating cognitive load
- theoretical conceptualisations of cognitive load
- local, imported and exported load
- spillover effect
17. Training interpreters by distance mode - current advances

Ewa Gumul

Teaching interpreting in distance mode is by no means a novel idea. Despite clear advantages of direct contact with the trainer and other course participants as well as working in a proper laboratory in the case of simultaneous interpreting, there are numerous references in Translation & Interpreting Studies literature to interpreting courses conducted partially or exclusively online in the course of the last two decades (see e.g., Carr & Steyn 2000; Moeketsi & Wallmach 2005; Ko 2006, 2008; Sandrelli 2015; de Rioja 2018). The worldwide outbreak of COVID-19 has forced this form of training on an unprecedented scale. The transition from face-to-face teaching to virtual environment was particularly difficult as it happened literally overnight. Previous experience in this area proved insufficient given the scale of the undertaking and the fact that blended teaching methods were no longer possible. The major problems interpreting trainers were forced to face were: the availability and use of technologies for distance teaching, interaction with course participants, collaboration between trainees, and online assessment, to name just a few. However, such situation is not without advantages. It has stimulated advances in distant teaching methods and tools fostering trainers’ creativity. The situation has prompted many trainers to reconsider their approach to teaching interpreting, which in the long run can be expected to influence also the traditional face-to-face training programmes. In this panel we would like to invite interpreting researchers and trainers to share their distance teaching experience and empirical research in this area.

Sub-topics

We are particularly interested in the following topics:

- constraints of training interpreters by distance mode
- impact of distance learning on the interpreting skills of trainees
- impact of distance learning on the interpreting strategies/tactics used by trainees
- cognitive effort experienced by trainees while performing classroom tasks in the distance mode
- stress and anxiety experienced by students in virtual environment training situations
- distance teaching of interpreting and the skill of remote interpreting
- role of technologies in teaching interpreting in virtual environment
18. Human-computer interaction and the augmented interpreter

Susana Rodríguez

The panel will explore the extended cognition of the interpreter to understand the role of mental models in guiding the interpreter’s interaction with the machine. A good user interface designer understands the mental models of their users and how representations can be used to correct those mental models. The panel will then explore methods for breaking down the interpreter’s behaviour into more objective, discernible, and measurable chunks. Through the principles of task analysis and with methods like the GOMS models, the panel will try to discover how to take the often ethereal patterns of human interaction and distil them into externalizable, manipulable chunks in order to learn how to use these methods to inform the design and improvement of interfaces targeted at helping the human interpreter with difficult-to-translate content in real-time. The panel will try to widen the general view to look at the context in which this kind of interfaces are deployed, exploring distributed cognition, which includes the notion that humans may offload cognitive tasks onto interfaces, and that humans and interfaces together may be considered higher level cognitive systems. The panel will reflect on theories for investigating the interpreter’s interaction with the machine in context, such as activity theory and situated action, and the role that human improvisation plays in any interface being designed. Through these lenses, the panel will explore the design not just of user interfaces of Computer-Assisted Interpretation real-time tools and Remote Simultaneous Interpreting systems, but user experiences developed with an understanding of the context around the interaction.

Sub-topics

- Application of modern development frameworks and theories like the Agile Method, Universal Design, Activity Theory and Value-Sensitive Design to HCI design of RSI or CAI interfaces.
- Role that the augmented interpretation can play in promoting accessibility to multilingual content for the cognitively-impaired people.
- HCI in CAI and RSI applications: human-to-human, open-ended dialogue interaction vs. affordance-like interaction to provide strong clues to the operations of things for the user to know what to do just by looking.
- Data visualization in CAI interfaces as the graphical display of abstract information for sense-making and communication: how to translate the abstract into physical attributes of vision (length, position, size, shape, color) following design principles that are derived from an understanding of human perception.
- The sketching technique to shape possibilities and copy images from the inner eye as microexperiments that respond with insights into strengths, weaknesses and possible changes in a tight loop of thinking that involves the hand, the senses and the mind when designing a RSI or CAI interface.
The role played by children and adolescents in helping their families adjust to a new language and culture is a fundamental yet under searched aspect of migration. Child language brokering is the practice of linguistic and cultural mediation or brokering performed by “bilingual children who mediate linguistically and culturally in formal and informal contexts and domains for their family, friends as well as members of the linguistic community to which they belong” (Antonini 2015:48). Though generally associated with the children of immigrant groups, in reality it takes place within all linguistic minority groups (e.g. signing communities and heritage linguistic minorities), that is in all those situations in which people who do not share the same language and culture come into contact and need to communicate. In the last three decades the proliferation of conferences, research projects and studies on CLB have contributed to provide an insight into the diverse aspects of this practice and its complexities and to increasing its visibility and interdisciplinarity in what has been labelled as the coming of age of CLB studies (Orellana 2017). Research has shed light on who these children and youth are, who they language broker for, in what situations and contexts, and the impact that this practice has on their identity, their emotional sphere, their family dynamics and relations (Weisskirch 2007, 2017). Nonetheless, there are many areas that are still uncharted and others that have only started to emerge in the last few years (Antonini 2019).

Sub-topics

- Literacy brokering in the classroom and outside the school
- CLB as a form of care
- CLB and translanguaging
- New research methodologies in CLB studies
20. Experimental research in AVT and MA
Gian Maria Greco & Anna Jankowska

Having relied on descriptive paradigms for a long time, audiovisual translation (AVT) and media accessibility (MA) have been recently witnessing a major experimental turn. Among the main reasons behind this turn are on the one hand the shift towards user-centred design and practices (Greco 2018; Suojanen, Koskinen & Tuominen 2015) and on the other hand, the cognitive turn in translation studies (TS) (O’Brien 2011). Within this general framework, AVT/MA researchers have been adopting tools from experimental psychology and cognitive sciences in order to investigate AVT/MA processes and phenomena. Thanks to this new approach, AVT/MA research offers researchers a chance to test existing assumptions and verify theories related to translation, perception and cognition. Over the past decades, many areas within social sciences have been experiencing similar experimental turns, resorting to experimental methods to obtain evidence to support their theoretical claims (Teele 2014). However, after the initial zeal, those areas were forced to address the methodological soundness and reliability of their experimental practices. Modern science is facing a replication crisis (Ioannidis 2005, Stevens 2017), as aptly demonstrated by the Reproducibility Project conducted by the Open Science Collaboration (2015). The Project showed the impossibility of replicating the results of some major studies in psychology and other fields. AVT is now facing the exact same issues. Experimental research in AVT and MA lacks common research protocols and methodologies, is highly fragmented and statistically unpowerful since it is often carried out within individual case studies of low level of experimental control. Methodological problems often lead to conflicting results and unsubstantiated generalisations. On the one hand, this makes the possibility to carry out replication studies as well as the reproducibility of findings highly challenging. On the other hand, it may backfire and undermine the very scientific reputation of AVT/MA (Orero et al. 2018). Acknowledging some of these issues, some scholars have been sporadically calling for careful attention to be paid to the ways experimental research is conducted and reported in AVT/MA (e.g. Díaz-Cintas & Szarkowska, 2020; Doherty 2018). In the wake of what has happened in other areas of social sciences, it is time to start a more systematic discussion on the methodological foundations of experimental research within AVT/MA as well. The goal of this session is to draw attention to the need for a systematic debate that addresses the methodological problems of experimental research in AVT/MA, in order to consolidate the scientific standing of AVT/MA and improve current research practices.

Sub-topics
We invite proposals that tackle the issue of the methodological foundations of experimental research in AVT and MA from both the theoretical and/or practical angle. We also look forward to the presentation of solutions and approaches that may help to address the burning issues of experimental research in AVT and MA. In particular we are interested in the following questions:

- What are the pros and cons of experimental research in AVT/MA?
- What are the main methodological problems of experimental research in AVT/MA?
- What corrective measures should be promoted to increase the scientific standing of experimental research in AVT/MA?
- What methods and statistical approaches should be used in experimental research on AVT/MA?
- What are the problems with current reporting standards in AVT/MA?
- How should reporting standards be promoted to enable replication and reproducibility of research findings in AVT/MA?
- What can AVT/MA learn from methodological debates on experimental research in other areas of the social sciences?
- How should AVT/MA researchers be trained on experimental research?
- How can experimental design and methodologies be integrated in AVT/MA education and training programmes?

Presenters at this session will then be encouraged to submit an article to a special issue on the same topic that will be guest-edited by the convenors of this session (together with Agnieszka Szarkowska) and has been accepted by Translation Spaces (issue 11(1), July 2022).
21. Accessibility through translation

Catalina Jiménez Hurtado & Antonio Chica Núñez

Cognitive-based Translation Studies have faced the challenge of describing the translation process by taking into account the journey from perception to meaning-making. Research in translation for multimodal environments has led to the study of the cognitive processes involved in accessing source texts characterized by the complex interaction and integration of different semiotic modes (Turner, Gao, Koenig, Palfy & McClelland 2017; Mansouri-Benssassi 2017) and reconstructing their meaning. Accessible Translation (AT) modalities also analyze how intended receivers decode texts according to their functional and cognitive abilities and how these influence information processing. In this sense, reception studies are being promoted, especially in the framework of AT modalities (di Giovanni & Gambier 2018; Barnés & Jiménez 2020, Chica & Jiménez in press). Given that the target groups are blind people, deaf people or people with reading difficulties, the creation of texts that enable recipients to access semiotically complex knowledge in an appropriate way implies studying the intricacies of AT from a cognitive perspective (Díaz-Cintas & Szarkowska 2020). In fact, in order to adopt this approach, the cognitive processes of attention, memory or language and those of multimodal information processing that may be at work when accessing and enjoying original texts (audiovisual productions, artworks, comics, etc.) and their translations: audio description (Ramos & Rojo 2020), subtitling for deaf people (Martínez Martínez 2015), sign language interpreting or easy reading (Maas & Rink 2020) must be considered. In short, the study of how multimodal information in AT is accessed and represented, including the tools that facilitate it, must be undertaken from a cognitive-based approach.

Sub-topics
• The cognitive operations carried out by translators during the process of receiving the source text and producing the target text, in its various forms.
• The multimodality of the semiotic structures that condition the production and reception of AT target texts:
  o Screen and heritage audio description
  o Subtitling for the deaf and hard-of-hearing
  o Sign language interpreting
  o Easy reading
  o Alternative and augmentative communication
• The complex types of grammatical structures that allow rendering multimodal discourses by using inter-semiotic translation strategies (natural language, interactions between images and language, visual-gestural language, etc.).
• The cognitive processes involved in the reception of the target text, in its different modalities.
• Given the need to lay the methodological foundations of the discipline, the methods (quantitative or qualitative) and techniques for studying and analyzing the abovementioned cognitive processes, both for the production and reception of the target text.
Open science is (slowly) reshaping the way in which we investigate and disseminate our research results. In Cognitive Translation and Interpreting Studies (CTIS), one out of four publications is publicly accessible, and the proportion of open-access publications is on the rise since the eighties (Olalla-Soler, Franco Aixelá & Rovira-Esteva 2020). However, open access is not the only open-science practice out there. Other practices, such as open data, might help us expand our knowledge and make CTIS stand on firmer grounds. Open data seeks to make the data employed for a study publicly available. Data is here understood not only as raw data, but also as the code generated to analyse the data. However, data sharing among CTIS scholars has been scarce (Göpferich 2010) and data are generally not made publicly available (the CRITT TPR-DB appears to be the sole exception). Open data allows researchers to reuse data for two main purposes (West 2016): checking for and correcting errors, and performing additional analyses. Open data aims at fostering replication, a (frequently forgotten) step of the scientific method that has been a matter of concern in recent years, because of the low replicability of science, especially in social sciences (Baker & Penny 2016) and due to the meagre replications in CTIS (also in Translation Studies as a whole [Olalla-Soler 2020]). Beyond replication, open data could also facilitate carrying out meta-analyses within CTIS, which are still scarce (Mellinger & Hanson 2020) and could provide sounder findings. Internet-mediated research could also be applied to CTIS to obtain (mainly) quantitative data on measures related to cognitive processes of translation and interpreting from very large samples (Mellinger 2015). Such research calls for new tools for data collection and (semi-)automated processing, as well as security protocols to facilitate data sharing without compromising participants’ rights to privacy. This panel welcomes contributions to explore how applicable open data is to CTIS, how data sharing could be fostered within the discipline, and what open data implies for CTIS in terms of developing new tools, new security procedures, new data sharing platforms, and new metadata standards.

Sub-topics
- benefits and drawbacks of open data for CTIS research
- ways to ensure data quality and data security
- ways of promoting open data in CTIS
- standardization of metadata in CTIS

Presentations based on replications, meta-analyses or Internet-mediated research are also welcome.
23. Authenticity and ecological validity in cognitive process research

Michaela Albl-Mikasa & Anne Catherine Gieshoff

Process-oriented investigations at the interface of translation, interpreting and cognition have benefitted from a growth in multi-method approaches that combine quantitative and qualitative data and analyses. No matter which methods are used, such process studies depend on interpreters and translators performing tasks based on processing a source text or speech. The authentic nature of the source material and ecological validity of the study design can be considered of decisive importance in making claims about the real-life behavior of interpreters and translators (e.g. Heilmann et al. 2019; Ladouce et al. 2017). The first hurdle is, of course, to gain permission for the use of authentic source texts, recordings of natural speech, or interpreting and translation processes in situ (see Ehrensberger-Dow & Massey 2019). Once obtained, the question arises as to the amount of editing, modifying or even simply shortening a text or speech that is acceptable for the material to still qualify as authentic. Often what are referred to as "authentic texts" in interpreting and translation research are, in reality, a continuum of more or less edited or modified texts with no common standards regarding their selection or description. The degree of manipulation carried out on the source material determines the influence exerted on the data and analyses and, ultimately, the relevance of the results for the discipline and the profession (Liu 2011). Above and beyond identifying the criteria that texts have to fulfil to be usable as authentic source material, they also need to be roughly comparable in terms of the genre and complexity typically encountered by interpreters and translators. In our research (into both interpreting and translation), we have been faced with a number of challenges from our commitment to using authentic material and have come up with solutions that merit further discussion (e.g. Ehrensberger-Dow et al. 2020). For example, authentic texts can contain stressors or problem triggers that make it difficult to exclude confounding factors or biases. Alongside the issue of confounding factors in the different texts applied to two testing conditions, authentic texts pose numerous methodological challenges in quasi-experimental or quasi-natural paradigms that often manifest in the form of a deterioration of data quality. The use of authentic texts therefore also requires novel approaches to data analysis. This panel invites contributions that deal with methodological challenges and selection and/or preparation procedures involved in the use of authentic text materials in cognitive process research into both interpreting and translation.

Sub-topics

- Quasi-experimental/naturalistic research with authentic materials
- Written and spoken ELF (English as a lingua franca) in T&I studies
- Non-standard input from (non-)native speakers
- Ecological validity
- Authenticity
Italian researchers have contributed to Cognitive Translation & Interpreting Studies for decades and ICTIC 3 is a great opportunity to relaunch our research in Italy. Back in the late 1980s, the SSLMIT of the University of Trieste placed a strong focus on simultaneous interpreting, especially on the process of interpreting and multi-tasking. Valeria Darò and Franco Fabbro developed a model of simultaneous interpreting. Darò focused in particular on the role of working memory and divided attention in interpreting training. Fabbro also worked with Laura Gran on the hemispheric specializations for languages in interpreting. Alessandra Riccardi, also at the Trieste School, concentrated on the procedural competence of simultaneous interpreting, in particular on interpreting strategies. Peter Mead, who at the time worked at the Forlì School, contributed with a perspective on the cognitive aspects of consecutive interpreting that highlighted the importance of divided attention between note-taking, listening and analysis. His work on filled pauses has recently attracted renewed interest. In the 2000s, Mariachiara Russo and Salvador Pippa delved into aptitude for interpreting, in a joint effort of both the Trieste and the Forlì centers. Their work on on-line paraphrasing as predictor of interpreting skills is now also attracting new researchers. Rachele Antonini, also in Forlì, has significantly contributed to advance our knowledge in child language brokering. From this account it is obvious that Italian contributions to the cognitive research of oral mediation has been substantial and varied, but it also makes it plain that early stage researchers in interpreting are not being heard and that work on the mental aspects of translation, postediting, and other non-oral tasks, including sign language, etc., need a push, sometimes perhaps a jumpstart. Against this backdrop, this panel will be an opportunity to share experiences, discuss problems and suggest solutions specifically related to carrying out cognitive research on multilectal mediated communication (MMC) tasks in Italy as a science system. This is an open call for researchers working in Italy on interpreting, translation, AVT, multilingual MT and NLP, bilingualism, psycholinguistics, cognitive, social and developmental psychology, cognitive ergonomics, Human-Computer Interaction, communication studies, and cognitive science, to map our lines of work, improve networking and establish synergies between us. Since international projection is part of the success of scientific endeavours, the panel will also welcome contributions by Italian researchers working on Cognitive Translation & Interpreting Studies elsewhere. To this end, this panel welcomes contributions that address current and emerging practices in cognitive translation and interpreting studies.

Sub-topics

- conference interpreting
- dialogue interpreting
- remote interpreting
- child-language brokering
- sign-language interpreting
- respeaking
- sight translation
- CAI
- interpreter training
- translation
- revision
- CAT & NLP support
- audiovisual tasks
- localization
- post-editing
- transcreation
- translation training
- multimodal approaches to MMC tasks
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