

Kelly Washbourne  
Kent State University

## Ethical Experts-in-Training: Connected Learners and the Moral Imagination

### 1 Introduction

Whether we speak of situated cognition (Risku 2002), translation in situation (Vienne 1994), or problem-based learning (Inoue 2005), a task or concept model is inauthentic to the extent that it ignores the ethical dimension. In this study I wish to take up ethics, or moral philosophy, from a developmental and pedagogical perspective. I also wish to posit for translator training and education an ethical expertise and an ethical literacy, fostered by method and guided by structural-developmental models of student maturation or ethical readiness. According to Davidson/Morrissey (2011: 45-46), *ethical literacy* implies the use of theory, metaethical vocabulary, and decision frameworks, and an understanding of ethical evaluative criteria and their implications. Following Narvaez (2008: 312), moral experts demonstrate both knowing the good and knowing how to carry it out, resolving the notorious gap between reasoning and action, the intuitive and the deliberative. Weinstein even marks this distinction between knowing and doing with the terms '*epistemic*' experts and '*performative*' experts (1994: 61), reminiscent of Aristotle's *sophia* (theoretical wisdom) and *phronesis* (practical wisdom). Narvaez establishes that moral experts "demonstrate holistic orientations (sets of procedural, declarative, and conditional knowledge) in one or more of at least four processes critical to moral behaviour: *ethical sensitivity* [multiple perspective taking], *ethical judgment* [reasoning about duty and consequences], *ethical focus* [self-regulating, prioritizing], and *ethical action* [implementing and intervening according to moral goals], see Table 1.

<i>Ethical sensitivity</i>	<i>Ethical judgment</i>
Understanding emotional expression	Understanding ethical problems
Taking the perspectives of others	Using codes and identifying judgment criteria
Connecting to others	Reasoning critically

Responding to diversity	Reasoning ethically
Controlling social bias	Understanding consequences
Interpreting situation	Reflecting on process and outcome
Communicating well	Coping and resiliency
<i>Ethical focus</i>	<i>Ethical action</i>
Respecting others	Resolving conflicts and problems
Cultivating conscience	Asserting respectfully
Helping other	Taking initiative as a leader
Being a community member	Planning to implement decisions
Finding meaning in life	Cultivating courage

Table 1: Ethical skills (Narvaez 2008: 319; cf. Rest et al. 1999)

Ethical development accords perfectly with Becoming in the philosophical sense, as ethics presupposes discordance between natural law and moral law (de Beauvoir 1980: 10, following Hegel's *Phenomenology of Mind*):

... [T]he most optimistic ethics have all begun by emphasizing the element of failure involved in the condition of [humanity]; without failure, no ethics; for a being who, from the very start, would be an exact co-incidence with himself, in a perfect plenitude, the notion of having-to-be would have no meaning.

For Paulo Freire, this Becoming accompanies our condition as

inserted in and formed by a socio-historical context of relations, [in which] we become capable of comparing, evaluating, intervening, deciding, taking new directions, and thereby constituting ourselves as ethical beings. It is in our becoming that we constitute our being so. (1998: 38-39)

The "teaching of contents", moreover, "cannot be separated from the moral formation of the learners" (1998: 39). We need a concomitant shift to creating learning experiences as personal engagements that centre on the whole student - intellectual, but also socio-affective and moral dimensions - and not only in the classroom but everywhere and lifelong. Becoming characterizes this progressive view of education; stage theories of moral progression situate the learner in a process that is open-ended rather than predetermined, and prize the learner's self-determination as the greatest good (Carr 2002: 8). To Kohlberg (1981: 26), moral thought undergoes increasing differentiation and integration, and behaves like other kinds of thought; moral progress - moral learning - is possible.

Neuroscientific research is now making the case that the “anchors of morality” are attachment and trust, “dispositions that contour social-problem space” (Churchland 2008: 410). Learning today takes place in ever more vast spaces, collaboratively in networks as co-constructions inside and outside our situated practice, in formal, informal and social learning – in a way that has been called *connected learning* (Nussbaum-Beach 2012). These environments, while emancipatory for education, can intensify the countervailing force of the ‘hidden curriculum’<sup>1</sup> (Snyder 1970; Kohlberg 1981; Hafferty/Franks 1994). The ‘hidden curriculum’ is a tacit value-set or ‘curriculum in action’, most famously identified in medical school students, which erodes ethical commitments by secretly transmitting, or self-replicating a culture of narrower, self-interested, less empathetic interests and perspectives. Parker Palmer stakes a claim against this ‘anti-community’ ethic: “Ultimately” he writes, “an ethical education is one that creates a capacity for connectedness in the lives of students” (1993: xviii). Connectedness, then, constitutes a precondition for ethical expertise, as Varela declares: “an ethical expert is nothing more or less than a full participant in a community” (1999: 24). Inghilleri’s recent work (2012), bringing a ‘discourse ethics’ to bear in Interpreting Studies, shows how thinkers in this vein have sought to fashion a consensus-building that “[shifts] the frame of reference away from the isolated moral consciousness of the individual toward a more inter-subjective approach” (2012 33). *Moral autonomy* has long been framed, at least as far back as Piaget, as the interdependent, active, cooperative construction of judgments (Turiel 2002: 290-291). Moreover, Aristotle’s *hexis* (acquired virtues) has a revealing Latin gloss – the word *habitus*, which refers to both individuals and groups. An *inter-group* and *intra-group* ethics makes strong claims for attention in our era, in which, as Pym (2003) reminds us, translation production teams, authorless texts, and ‘collective responsibility’ are the norm.

## 2 Characterizing the Ethical Problem: Ethical Decision-Making

How can we characterize the ethical problem for the translation classroom? First, ethical problems are *coherence problems* (Thagard 2000) or *constraint*

---

<sup>1</sup> Hafferty (2010) contrasts the ‘manifest’ curriculum with what he classifies as “Informal/Hidden/& Other Types of Curriculum”: The creditless curriculum, the curriculum in action, the experienced/experiential/lived curriculum, the ideal/ideological curriculum, the institutional curriculum, the latent curriculum, the learned curriculum, the null curriculum, the operational curriculum, the operative curriculum, the perceived curriculum, the peripheral curriculum, the recommended curriculum, the shadow curriculum, the tacit curriculum, the taught curriculum, the tested curriculum, the unintended curriculum (Hafferty, “Definition, Metaphors and Conceptual Framework”, slide 19)

*satisfaction problems* (Churchland 2008: 410) to be negotiated. Derrida disrupts ethics further by adding the trait of ‘undecidability’, by which he means not indecision but *action in the face of incomplete knowledge*. Moral deciding, he argues, occurs in a state of not knowing and yet obligation to decide; the urgency for justice has only immediate facts but requires infinite information (Derrida 1992: 23-24, qtd. in Smith 2005: 81-82). “The impossibility to find one’s way is the condition of ethics”, Derrida tells us, and

[T]hat’s where responsibility starts, when I don’t know what to do. If I know what to do, well, I would apply the rule, and teach my students to apply the rule. But would that be ethical? I’m not sure. I would consider this unethical. Ethics starts when you don’t know what to do, when there is this gap between knowledge and action, and you have to take responsibility for inventing the new rule which doesn’t exist. [...] An ethics with guarantees is not an ethics. [...] Ethics is dangerous. (2003: 31-32)

This appraisal lands us squarely at the intersection of problem-solving, decision-making, and risk-management. In translation, the ethical moment manifests itself in multiple possible scenarios involving not only texts but patrons, users, and translators: a potential boundary issue, compromised impartiality, information asymmetry or other moral hazards, conflict of interest, degraded standards or working conditions, or misrepresentation.<sup>2</sup> With John Dewey, I will argue that ethical reasoning strives not for *infallibility*, that is, eternal verities, but for the provisional, reasoned resolution of some contemporary problems (Putnam 2004: 31; cf. also Walton 2003). But we need not imagine ethical intervention only as crisis response.

---

<sup>2</sup> Summarized and categorized based on questions in student questionnaires developed by Ginori (2011); more completely:

- Access to privileged information or threats to confidentiality
- Knowledge of another’s wrongdoing or potential wrongdoing, whether aided by the translation or not
- Compromised impartiality or conflict of interest between the initiator and translator
- Inability to meet contractual or professional duties or standards
- Conflicting loyalties to message, sender, receiver, other translators, or language mediation profession itself, or to yourself in the case of playing mutually conflicting roles in the use of the translation
- Assertion of refusal to complete delivery of a service on ideological grounds (conflicting loyalty to self and translation assignment)
- Suppressing, leaving unaccounted for, or distorting the content of a source text in translation
- Requests to misrepresent a text or present it misleadingly, or the seeking of your complicity in others doing so
- Working in conditions that degrade general working standards for translators

Kwame Anthony Appiah (2008: 193-197) questions the use of “quandary ethics” (Pincoffs’ term; 1971), defined as the problem-posing of ethical questions through stylized scenarios, in that they present abstract, solitary, dispassionate agents wrestling with neatly defined options. In fact, he objects to the reduction of moral discourse to conflict, to ‘problems’ (2008: 197). This ‘applied ethics’ model is akin, in his view, to a ‘clinical intervention’, rather than the more Aristotelian everyday, and he defends an ethics of ‘wellness’, not ‘illness’ (2008: 198). The great philosophers were concerned not with difficult choices but with “moral enlightenment, education, and the good” (Pincoffs 1971: 553). The ethical expert-in-training must discern, by this logic, the ethical dimension of the *everyday*, or ‘small e’ ethics. Let us suppose the medical translator, for instance, is assigned a patient information leaflet written at a level of discourse too high for its intended target. Whereas an ethical novice may learn to discern situational features of field, mode, and tenor, the expert will also recognize the situation’s implicit ethical imperative, and frame his or her actions to answer the question: Is it ethical to knowingly produce medical texts that are incomprehensible to the target audience (after Hochhauser 2003)?<sup>3</sup> Or more fundamentally: do patients not have the right to informed participation in their own health decisions? Law, precedent or *skopos*<sup>4</sup> alone may or may not guide the translator well here, and professional ethics may be too broad to apply neatly.

### 3 Conflict and Complexity

And yet, Appiah’s misgivings notwithstanding, ethical quandaries remain, products of competing roles, claims, rights and responsibilities. These scenarios make visible the heart of ethics: namely, *conflict*. Carol Maier calls for translators to “[address] the presence of conflict as an integral part of much translation practice” (2007: 265), and Matchett (following Ozar 2001) identifies a knowledge of the “potential conflicts between [a wide array of values, principles, and ideals]” and the incentives and penalties correlating to given behaviours (2008: 32).<sup>5</sup> In short, as Davidson/Morrissey note: “Students need to

---

<sup>3</sup> Chesterman (1997: 69) called this the *communication norm*, one of four *norm-based ethics* (clarity/expectancy; truth/relation; understanding/communication; and trust/accountability).

<sup>4</sup> My thanks to a reviewer who pointed out that ethical discourse may be *included* in the *skopos*, and should not be considered something outside it.

<sup>5</sup> Contrast the awareness of (micro) conflict in Translation Studies with the view of conflict in Interpreting Studies, where it tends to be seen as the trigger to entire role shifts (e.g. Jalbert 1998, in which the interpreter moves from cultural broker to advocate). Role shifts, plotted with a ‘y axis’ of ethical scenarios, may be one useful framework for the translator as well.

have practice at doing what is right and to experience the challenges of acting ethically when doing so is socially, organizationally, or professionally unpopular, or when it means confronting real practical obstacles" (2011: 49). Undergirding translatorial ethics always is the idea of the *translator as social actor*, not merely observer, as Salama-Carr (2007: 7) reminds us. The contributions of critical pedagogy, in particular Giroux's ethic of critique (1991), locate ethics in a "social discourse grounded in struggles" against exploitation, inequality, injustice, and the silencing of marginal voices. Abdallah (2011: 134) invokes this connection as well, drawing on this tradition to trace a politically committed 'reflexive ethics' for the translation trainee, in part to avoid exploitative business relationships, for example in cases of what we can describe as *role strain* or *role conflict* in which:

[T]ranslators are [...] forced into a position where their role as business people conflicts with their role as agents for translation users. This is a mutually exclusive, fractured role which makes it difficult to act, to retain one's agency and hold on to one's ethical principles, whether derived from business or the profession. (2011: 144)

Ethical rights and responsibilities thus extend not only to others, but to oneself, one's author, one's target community or communities, and to the profession. Significantly, they extend to *competing claims not only from individuals but from different ethical systems* (in an ethics of scale: the self in relation to self, other, organization, nation, profession, etc.). One framework, *global or cosmopolitan ethics*, de-privileges all moral claims based on identifications other than 'human being', placing the onus on all alike to redress power inequities, and cultural and economic trade imbalances (Day/Masciulli 2007: 110-111).

Conflict is a function of *moral complexity*, defined as situations that invoke incompatible values (Lefkowitz 2003: 108-109). For Schäffner, to add *ethical competence* to translator competence reflects "the fact that translators are working in a complex socio-political context" (2003: 101). As Floros writes, "[F]oregrounding ethical thinking [is prerequisite] to reinforcing [students'] sense of responsibility [...] and encouraging them to reflect on the complexities of their task" (2011: 67). Perhaps the most useful construct to model this complexity is that of *ethical intensity* (Jones 1991)<sup>6</sup>, which offers a way to size

---

<sup>6</sup> Jones' (1991) six dimensions of *moral intensity* in more detail are as follows: variables of "(a) magnitude of consequences - the sum of the harms (or benefits) done to victims (or beneficiaries) of the moral act in question; (b) social consensus - the degree of social agreement that a proposed act is evil (or good); (c) probability of effect - a joint function of the probability that the act in question will actually take place and the act in question will actually cause the harm (or benefit) predicted; (d) temporal immediacy - the length of time between the present and the onset of consequences of the moral act in question (shorter length implies greater immediacy); (e) proximity - the feeling of nearness (social, cultural, psychological, or physical) that the moral agent has for victims (or beneficiaries) of the evil (or beneficial) act in question; and (f) concentration of

up the ethical problem using six components of impact: harm, others' perceptions, probability of effects, time lag between action and effects, number affected, and psychological (empathetic) proximity. Classroom tasks that use ethical scenarios as prompts to be rated using this metric could situate the translation task in its complex sociological ethics. The disabuse of student text-involvement in favour of a healthy *world-involvement* is a first condition of an ethical training or education in translation.

#### 4 Intellectual Development in College Students

As a prelude to a discussion of goals in ethics education for translators, a brief consideration of ethical development is in order. Following William Perry (1968/1999):

Stages of ethical development:

- duality:** knowledge is divided into right and wrong; knowledge is absolute, is handed down from authorities, and learned passively; the view of knowledge is quantitative (163);
- multiplicity:** knowledge is a question of opinion; evaluation is seen as subjective; student prone to frustration if one's own perspective is not validated; student starts to be open to differences of opinion, no longer absolute "rightness"; learning becomes personal, student may disagree with authorities, knowledge starts to be constructed (164);<sup>7</sup>
- relativism:** knowledge shifts toward a qualitative view of knowledge. Not all opinions are equally valid. Rather than sages, instructors now become guides and model critical engagement with content. There is autonomy built in this stage, but student is frustrated that no theory is all-embracing (164);<sup>8</sup>
- commitment:** knowledge is now nuanced and informed. The student commits to a theory not as an absolute but as a foundation for further refinement (165).

How does this scheme play out in the classroom and beyond? To a dual stage learner, the idea that there is no definitive reading of a source text is

---

effect – an inverse function of the number of people affected by an act of given magnitude (cf. Jones, 1991: 374-378)" (May/Pauli 2002: 88).

<sup>7</sup> A classroom in which there is a single "right" and multiple "wrong" solutions clearly can hinder progression to higher stages of development. By the same token, multiplicity, the stage at which many college students graduate, may be in part a response to insufficient objective norms.

<sup>8</sup> Floros' insight (2011: 72) implicitly points from ethical relativity to the ethical commitment stage: "Sensitizing students, as future translators, to the issue of ethical relativity is the first step towards self-reflexivity (critical reflection and possibility of contestation)."

horrifying or meaningless; to a multiplicity stage learner, his translation is valid *because it is his*; to the relativist, a feminist translation project may seem too subjective or incomplete. To the committed stage learner, comparatively expert decision-making outcomes, now comparatively expert, must be predicated on one's motivation to uphold some system of values, for example, that of the profession. Such decisions would include refusing to allow one's name to be associated with a translation altered ideologically after delivery, or resisting pressure to do as was done in the case of some classic novels commissioned into Brazilian Portuguese in which the translator merely replaced the continental Portuguese syntax and pronouns with the Brazilian counterparts, labelled the translation a 'revised translation', and omitted all credit to the original translator (Rónai 2005: 49). The dynamic applies in evaluating translations as well: the dualist is blind to the possibility that two different translations may be deemed equally adequate for different reasons.

Parallels between Perry's scheme and Milton Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) are striking: in the latter model, the student progresses from an ethnocentric to an ethnorelative condition: moving from *denial* (only one's own culture is real) through *defence* and *minimization* (differences are denigrated or downplayed) to *acceptance*, *adaptation* and *integration* (experience of difference, inclusion, multiperspectivism and expansion). According to Bennett's ethnorelativism: "ethical choices will be made on grounds other than the ethnocentric protection of one's world view or in the name of absolute principles" (1993: 43).<sup>9</sup> Bennett's schematic recalls the early work of Antoine Berman, whose evaluative pole of ethical translation - "receiving the Other as Other" (1999: 74) - stood in opposition to an ethnocentric one.

An important correlating factor for developmental ethics is the decline in empathy or empathetic reasoning, as one study of American college students confirmed. Declining empathic awareness may represent a challenge to ethical growth: Anderson/Konrath (2012) report that "since 1980 scores have dropped 34 percent on 'perspective taking' (the ability to imagine others' points of view) and 48 percent on 'empathic concern' (the tendency to feel and respond to others' emotions)." Selman's (1980) developmental stage theory on perspective taking arrays perspective taking, predictably, from the undifferentiated and egocentric all the way up to the societal-symbolic. Perspective taking (*self-focused* [imagining self as other] or *other-focused* [imagining the other given what one knows about him or her], Maxwell 2008: 134) is a clear component of the translator trainee's ethical and interpersonal sub-competences. Emotional intelligence, or emotional literacy, represents still another area related to ethicality (cf. Mesmer-Magnus et al. 2008).

---

<sup>9</sup> For the interaction of cognitive development with norms, cf. Schäffner (1999).

## 5 Goals in Ethics Education

The prime goals in the teaching of ethics, in Callahan's well-known formulation (1980: 64-69), include: 1) stimulating the moral imagination; 2) recognizing ethical issues; 3) eliciting a sense of moral obligation; 4) developing analytical skills; and 5) tolerating – and reducing – disagreement and ambiguity. The objective to foster the moral imagination harks back to John Dewey. To Dewey, in Johnson's words, "[e]thical thinking is a form of imaginative dramatic rehearsal [...]. Moral reasoning [...] is situated (historically, culturally and personally), shaped by emotion, and reconstructive of our ongoing experience" (qtd. in Ambrose/Cross 2009: 150). Matchett's nuancing is especially useful for our purposes in that she points to the conditional knowledge underlying ethical choice – not only knowing which rules, but how, when, and if they should apply: "there are times when we want to figure out which rules are justified, how they should be prioritized, or whether any of the usual rules are even applicable" (2008: 31). Moreover, our goals should include *fostering ethical reasoning* as much as producing ethical professionals. Reasoned moral practice relies on *reasoning skills* (classification, compare/contrast, drawing valid inferences, question-formulation); *inquiry skills* (hypothesis formulation, explanation), *concept-formulation skills* and *metacognitive acts* (Lipman 1987: 144-145).

A second category of goals relates to *moral identity*. Abdallah uses Rest's 4-component ('neo-Kohlbergian') model of morality to articulate the goal of learners becoming 'empowered moral agents' (2011: 139-148). Moral agency may be considered to have a kind of executive function in which intentional control and ownership are exerted, not merely responsiveness to external stimuli; agency has been defined as a "series of processes, of various complexity, appearing at different points along the developmental continuum. Some of these are will, effort, sense of mastery and control, self-control, choice, decision, persistence, sense of responsibility, and commitment" (Blasi 2008: 274-275). Principled reasoning is inextricable to the learner's development of self-direction, autonomy, and *decentration* (the shift in cognitive maturity from attending to the most salient features of a problem to a broader, more balanced attention, to its complexity, leading to decreased 'egocentric bias' and a greater sense of equality and reciprocity [Gibbs et al. 1992: 8-9]). Tichy et al. (2010: 785) argue for moral reasoning, moral motivation, moral character, and the acquisition of ethical skills: *perspective taking*, *rule orientation*, and *self-perception as a moral person*, the latter of which are schemas psychologists term the *moral self-concept* and ethicists of care call the *ethical ideal* (Noddings 2003: 178). *Ethical efficacy* (Bandura 1991; Mitchell/Palmer 2010) has been theorized as an individual's domain-specific self-perception of his or her ability to resolve, regardless of consequences and through self-regulation of behaviour and motivation, a given ethical issue.

Others have termed this moral courage (Serkerka/Bagozzi 2007).<sup>10</sup> In translator training and education, these considerations provide a dimension largely missing from conceptualizations of empowerment and the learner's self-concept. Additionally, they form part of the learning goals of any translator, whether in everyday ethics (e.g. Is it acceptable to produce a covert translation of a college application essay for admission abroad?) or the more exceptional dilemmas (e.g. What are the translator's obligations in wartime?).

A final goal relates to fostering a notion of 'property-as-other': Students must learn to gather, store, represent and disseminate information ethically. *Information ethics* (which could also include a translation research ethics and which would embrace power and censorship, copyright, access, moral and property rights, and information systems)<sup>11</sup> is but one of a number of developing subfields arising out of the new digital-age literacies and calling urgently for application and definition in Translation Studies.

## 6 Pedagogy for Experts-in-Training<sup>12</sup>

The design of tasks, courses, modules and curricula has been shown to be most effective when *challenges* and *supports* are provided from a developmental perspective, that is, stage-appropriate input.<sup>13</sup> Problems themselves must be authentic as opposed to hypothetical (Snarey/Samuelson 2008: 71) and must be targeted: a lofty value problem of interest to the reflective expert tends to be of small concern to the ethical novice, who focuses on more mundane, immediate, and solvable problems (Bebeau/Monson 2008: 575).<sup>14</sup> Conflict, which we saw is the prime characteristic of values or roles in action, is also the trigger for maturation: according to Kohlberg, the teacher's role involves: 1) attending to the learner's stage; 2) matching students to stimulation (e.g. modes of reasoning one stage above); 3) producing cogni-

---

<sup>10</sup> Significantly, ethical expertise presupposes far transfer; Lickona (1980: 110) distinguishes between *vertical development* ('to more comprehensive, more consistent, more integrated stages of logical and moral functioning') and *horizontal development* ('the application of one's highest stage to an ever widening realm of one's life experience').

<sup>11</sup> <http://icie.zkm.de/research> (International Center for Information Ethics)

<sup>12</sup> The use of 'training' in this ad hoc term does not preclude translator education or its goals.

<sup>13</sup> For a discussion of scaffolding in moral education and the use of moral schemas as scaffolds, cf. Pijanowski 2009: 7.

<sup>14</sup> Teaching strategies can be geared to different kinds of knowers; in Baxter-Magolda's 'model of epistemological reflection' (1992, following Perry 1968/1999 and Belensky et al. 1986), learners move through four stages: *absolute* (in which they learn best from demonstrations and strong support) to *transitional* (in which they favor group projects and experiments) to *independent* (in which they thrive in mutual exploration and varied viewpoints) to *contextual* (in which they seek collegiality with instructors and peers) ("Intentional Learning...").

tive and social conflict (not the 'right answers' of traditional education) and 4) exposing the student to stimuli that encourage an active role and "in which assimilatory response to the stimulus situation is associated with 'natural' feedback" (Kohlberg 1981: 59).<sup>15</sup> For Kohlberg, moral arguments are the site of plus-stage change: "Developmental moral discussion thus arouses cognitive-moral conflict and exposes students to reasoning by other students at the next stage above their own" (Kohlberg 1981: 27). Cognitive disequilibrium and re-examination of moral commitments have been shown to result from such challenges (Haan 1978). For the translation classroom, task design may take many forms (see below), so long as tasks are written to target students' ethical stages, students' ethical learning is largely deliberate, and their role in learning is active.

Ethics emerge much less through transference of fixed rules or codes than through our collaborative problem-solving competence applied to novel situations. Levy's (2007) work on neuroethics reminds us of how "moral knowledge, like all knowledge, is an ongoing, distributed, community-wide enterprise in which, through moral debate and under the pressure of objection and argument, our judgments are tested and revised" (MacKenzie 2012: 247, summarizing Levy 2007: 308-316). The classroom conceived as a *community of ethical inquiry* constitutes a methodology promoting autonomous, reflective moral agency (Sprod 2001: 5, 195). While the specific mechanics of teaching translation ethics is well beyond the scope of this paper, task architectures and assessments that can be designed on the aforementioned principles and with the objectives described, all of them dialogic frameworks and perspectives rather than authoritarian transmission, include:

- Ethical decision making (EDM) frameworks: evaluating alternative actions and providing *ethical justifications*; e.g. five sources of standards: the utilitarian approach, the rights approach, the fairness approach, the common good approach, the virtue approach (<http://www.scu.edu/ethics/practicing/decision/framework.html>);
- Case method reasoning tasks: classifying an event through analogical reasoning, drawing on paradigms; identifying relevant presumptions; commenting on circumstances of the case and their effect on overall judgment of the event; reflecting on opinions of prior authorities; and rendering a verdict (Miller 1996: 5). Ethical argumentation of case studies can be eval-

---

<sup>15</sup> Cognitive conflict is induced and resolved Socratically, as in the work of John Rawls, for example: "Citing Aristotle and Henry Sidgwick, the 19th-century English philosopher, as his guides, Rawls envisages ethical reflection as basically Socratic: We hold up alternatives found in philosophical tradition to our own 'considered judgments' asking which among them we take to be the most firm and nonnegotiable. [...] Seeking consistency and fit, we sometimes revise our judgments to accommodate a powerful theory that impresses us; but often we reject or revise a theory to suit our considered judgments" (Nussbaum 2001).

uated on four criteria: structural correctness of inferences, relevance of inferences, weight given to both sides of a dilemma, and maieutic function (the eliciting of new insights) (Walton 2003: 63);

- Mock complaints committee: role-playing (Johnston/Corser 1998);
- Transactive discussion (Berkowicz/Gibbs 1983, qtd. in Lapsley 1996: 87): using a “mode of dialogue that operates on the reasoning of another (e.g. clarification, comparative critique, contradiction, competitive extension) rather than simply representing it (e.g. paraphrase, feedback or justification request)”;
- Constructive (or cooperative) controversy: engaging in a type of creative problem-solving used in conflict resolution theory. Johnson/Johnson (2002) recommend “students master arguments on both sides of a controversial issue and work towards a resolution that integrates the interests of both positions” (Bebeau/Monson 2008: 566). Each side can first master their respective positions, refine them through dialogue, and then reverse sides, choosing an opposing advocacy team’s position to argue themselves (Johnson et al. 2000: 78; cf. also social interdependence theory, Tichy et al. 2010; Johnson/Johnson 1989);
- Digital gaming (FitzGerald/Groff 2011) and ethical simulators: privileging empathetically connected learning, a web-enabled ethical simulator shows *effects of decision* and morally developmental activities: “e.g. the scaffolding of reasoning, the intimate relationship between reason and action, and the importance of narrative to provide meaning to experience” (Freier/Saulnier 2011: 187);
- Cognitive-structural assessment tools<sup>16</sup>: using ethical reasoning value rubrics, inventories, and tests adapted for translation scenarios.

In sum, effective task types include debate, dialogue, role-play, and virtual simulation, and the learning process ought to elicit students’ reasoning as well as just resolutions. In this sense, ethical learning fits naturally in process-oriented learning frameworks. Diagnostic and formative assessment of developmental ethics would help form a truer picture of translators’ readiness to participate in communities of practice. Just as Chesterman (1997: 189) claims that students ought to be given the option to break norms, *in full awareness of the consequences of choices*, so too can ethical behaviours be shown to be alternatives chosen from the translator’s subjectivity that have impacts on wider networks of stakeholders and participants – the translator’s *intersubjectivity*. For the instructional designer, the imperative of *ethical authenticity* inheres to any translation task, and making ethics explicit in the brief, the

---

<sup>16</sup> Some of these resources to consult in developing a comparable instrument for translation: Ethical Reasoning Inventory (ERI); Index of Ethical Congruence; Measure of Moral Orientation (MMO), which measures care and justice orientations; Defining Issues Test (DIT); the Developmental Theory and Moral Maturity Index (DTMMI); or the Moral Judgment Interview (MJI), which tests progression on Kohlberg’s moral reasoning scheme.

process, and the assessment is incumbent upon us if we are to speak meaningfully of authenticity in pedagogy.

## 7 Conclusion

Ethics may be especially vital for emerging disciplines such as ours in that it performs boundary-maintenance, legitimizing those who are practicing with deliberate ethical standards. Ethics highlights the *socially negotiated nature* of norms, a key dynamic for the initiate into professionalization; ethics makes visible for critical review our implicit assumptions; and vitally, ethics anchors the process of self-direction in an expertise no less determinant than subject mastery.

Translational ethics as a field of study, and as a pedagogics, is in its infancy. Interpreting Studies has broken ground in producing much work in ethics upon which our neighbouring discipline would do well to draw. Although Baker/Maier produced a recent issue of *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* (2011) devoted to ethics, many areas remain to be researched in Translation Studies: Rawlsian justice ethics, ethics constituted in and across language(s), organizational ethics (including longitudinal descriptive studies), moral agency theory, and the role of ethics in client education, editing translations, the translator's subjectivity (cf. Munday 2012), and decision making and problem structuring. Our goal in the field ought to be not to inculcate the good or the right but to develop more principled ethical criteria for decision-making for situated moral action, *to do things with ethics*, the *phronesis*, or practical reason, of the Greeks. Ultimately our role is no less than to model and foster ethical congruence – the alignment of behaviour to values – and to incline translation students to take morally imaginative actions not only toward expert translation but toward justice and human flourishing.

### References

- Abdallah, Kristiina (2011): "Toward Empowerment: Students' Ethical Reflections on Training in Production Networks" *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 5(1): 129-154.
- Ambrose, Don/Tracy Cross, eds. (2009): *Morality, Ethics, and Gifted Minds*. New York, London: Springer.
- Anderson, Paul/Sara Konrath (2012): "'Why Should we Care?' – What to Do about Declining Student Empathy" *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <http://chronicle.com/article/Why-Should-We-Care-What/128420/> [08/08/2011]
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony (2008): *Experiments in Ethics*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Baker, Mona/Carol Maier (2011): "Ethics in Interpreter and Translator Training: Critical Perspectives" *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 5(1): 1-14.

- Bandura, Albert (1991): "Social Cognitive Theory of Moral Thought and Action" Kurtines, William M./Jacob L. Gewirtz, eds.: *Handbook of Moral Behavior and Development* Vol. 1. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 45-103.
- Baxter-Magolda, Marcia (1992): *Knowing and Reasoning in College: Gender-related Patterns in Students' Intellectual Development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bebeau, Muriel J./Verna E. Monson (2008): "Guided by Theory, Grounded in Evidence: A Way Forward for Professional Ethics Education" Nucci, Larry P./Darcia Narvaez, eds.: *Handbook of Moral and Character Education*. New York, London: Routledge, 557-582.
- Belensky, Mary Field/Blythe McVicker Clinchy/Nancy Rule Goldberger/Jill Mattuck Tarule (1986): *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice and Mind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bennett, Milton (1993): "Toward Ethnorelativism: A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity" Paige, Michael, ed.: *Education for the Intercultural Experience*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, 20-72.
- Berkowicz, Marvin/John Gibbs (1983): "Measuring the Developmental Features of Moral Discussion" *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 29: 399-410.
- Berman, Antoine (1999): *La Traduction et la Lettre, ou L'auberge du Lointain*. Paris: Seuil.
- Blasi, Augusto (2008): "Moral Agency" Power, F. Clark/Ronald J. Nuzzi/Darcia Narvaez/Daniel K. Lapsley/Thomas C. Hunt, eds.: *Moral Education: A Handbook*. Volume M-Z. Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 274-275.
- Callahan, Daniel/Sissela Bok (1980): *Ethics Teaching in Higher Education*. New York, London: Plenum Press.
- Carr, David (2002): "Moral Education and the Perils of Developmentalism" *Journal of Moral Education* 31(1): 5-19.
- Chesterman, Andrew (1997): *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Churchland, Patricia Smith (2008): "The Impact of Neuroscience on Philosophy" *Neuron* 60(3): 409-411.
- Davidson, Graham R./Shirley A. Morrissey (2011): "Enhancing Ethical Literacy of Psychologically Literate Citizens" Cranney, Jacquelyn/Dana Dunn, eds.: *The Psychologically Literate Citizen: Foundations and Global Perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press, 41-55.
- Day, Richard B./Joseph Masciulli (2007): *Globalization and Political Ethics*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- de Beauvoir, Simone (1980): *The Ethics of Ambiguity*. Trans. Bernard Frechtman. Secaucus, NJ: Citadel Press.
- Derrida, Jacques (1992): "Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority" Cornell, Drucilla/Michael Rosenfeld, eds.: *Deconstruction and the Possibility of Justice*. New York: Routledge, 3-68.

- Derrida, Jacques (2003): "Following Theory" Payne, Michael/John Schad, eds.: *Life After Theory*. London: Continuum, 1-51.
- "The Field". International Center for Information Ethics (2001) ZKM | Zentrum für Kunst und Medientechnologie Karlsruhe. <http://icie.zkm.de/research> [07/06/2012]
- FitzGerald, Ross/Jennifer Groff (2011): "Leveraging Digital Games for Moral Development in Education: A Practitioner's Reflection" Schrier, Karen/David Gibson, eds.: *Designing Games for Ethics: Models, Techniques and Frameworks*. Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference, 234-251.
- Floros, Georgios (2011): "'Ethics-less' Theories and 'Ethical' Practices". *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 5(1): 65-92.
- Freier, Nathan G./Emile T. Saulnier (2011): "The New Backyard: Social and Moral Development in Virtual Worlds". *Designing Games for Ethics: Models, Techniques and Frameworks*. Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference, 179-192.
- Freire, Paulo (1998): *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Gibbs, John C./Karen S. Basinger/Dick Fuller (1992): *Moral Maturity: Measuring the Development of Sociomoral Reflection*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Ginori, Luciano (2011): "Ethical Issues for Translators: Student's Workbook" *Sydney Institute* [http://translatingandinterpreting.sydneyinstitute.wikispaces.net/file/detail/Ethics+Qs+4+TR\\_Student%27s+Workbook\\_2011.doc](http://translatingandinterpreting.sydneyinstitute.wikispaces.net/file/detail/Ethics+Qs+4+TR_Student%27s+Workbook_2011.doc) [09/05/2013]
- Giroux, Henri, ed. (1991): *Postmodernism, Feminism, and Cultural Politics: Redrawing Educational Boundaries*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Haan, N. (1978): "Two Moralities in Action Contexts: Relationship to Thought, Ego Relation, and Development" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 36: 286-305.
- Hafferty, Frederic W. (2010): "The Hidden Curriculum: Definitions, Metaphors, & Conceptual Shadings" Canadian Conference on Medical Education, St. John's, Newfoundland, May 4, 2010, <http://www.mededconference.ca/archives/documents/FredHafferty-DefinitionMetaphorsandConceptualFramework.pdf> [08/07/2012]
- Hafferty, Frederic W./Ronald F. Franks (1994): "The Hidden Curriculum, Ethics Teaching, and the Structure of Medical Education" *Academic Medicine* 69(11): 861-871.
- Hegel, Georg W. F. (1967): *Phenomenology of Mind*. Trans. J.B. Baillie. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hochhauser, Mark (2003): "Is it Ethical to Give out Unreadable Information?" *Managed Care Quarterly* 11(2): 34-36.
- Inghilleri, Moira (2012): *Interpreting Justice: Ethics, Politics and Language*. New York: Routledge.
- Inoue, Izumi (2005): "PBL as a New Pedagogical Approach for Translator Education" *Meta* 50(4): 1-21.

- Jalbert, Maya (1998): "Travailler avec un Interprète en Consultation Psychiatrique" *P.R.I.S.M.E.* 8(3): 94-111.
- Johnson, Mark (2009): "What Cognitive Science Brings to Ethics" Ambrose, Don/ Tracy Cross, eds.: *Morality, Ethics, and Gifted Minds*. London, New York: Springer, 147-150.
- Johnson, Brad W./Rioh'det Corser (1998): "Learning Ethics the Hard Way: Facing the Ethics Committee" *Teaching of Psychology* 25(1): 26-28.
- Johnson, David W./Roger T. Johnson (1989): *Cooperation and Competition: Theory and Research*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.
- Johnson, David W./Roger T. Johnson/Dean Tjosvold (2000): "Constructive Controversy: The Value of Intellectual Opposition" Deutsch, Morton/ Peter T. Coleman, eds.: *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 65-85.
- Jones, Thomas M. (1991): "Ethical Decision Making by Individuals in Organizations: An Issue-contingent Model" *Academy of Management Review* 16: 366-395.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence (1981): *The Philosophy of Moral Development: Moral Stages and the Idea of Justice*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Lapsley, Daniel K. (1996): *Moral Psychology*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Lapsley, Daniel K. (2008): "Moral Self-Identity as the Aim of Education" Nucci, Larry P./Darcia Narvaez, eds.: *Handbook of Moral and Character Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Lefkowitz, Joel (2003): *Ethics and Values in Industrial-organizational Psychology*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Levy, Neil (2007): *Neuroethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lickona, Thomas (1980): "What Does Moral Psychology Have to Say to the Teacher of Ethics?" Callahan, Daniel/Sissela Bok, eds.: *Ethics Teaching in Higher Education*. New York: Plenum Press, 103-132.
- Lipman, Matthew (1987): "Ethical Reasoning and the Craft of Moral Practice" *Journal of Moral Education* 16(2): 139-147.
- MacKenzie, Catriona (2012): "Emotions, Reflection, and Moral Agency" Langdon, Robyn/Catriona Mackenzie, eds.: *Emotions, Imagination, and Moral Reasoning*. New York: Psychology Press, 237-255.
- Maier, Carol (2007): "The Translator's Visibility and the Rights and Responsibilities Thereof" Salama-Carr, Myriam, ed.: *Translating and Interpreting Conflict*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi, 251-266.
- Matchett, Nancy J. (2008): "Ethics across the Curriculum" Moore, Stephanie L., ed.: *New Directions for Higher Education: Practical Approaches to Ethics for Colleges and Universities* 142: 25-38.
- Maxwell, Bruce (2008): *Professional Ethics Education: Studies in Compassionate Empathy*. New York: Springer.

- May, Douglas/Kevin Pauli (2002): "The Role of Moral Intensity in Ethical Decision Making: A Review and Investigation of Moral Recognition, Evaluation, and Intention" *Business & Society* 41: 84-117.
- Mesmer-Magnus, Jessica/Chockalingam Viswesvaran/Jacob Joseph/Satish P. Deshpande (2008): "The Role of Emotional Intelligence in Integrity and Ethics Perceptions" Zerbe, Wilfred J./Charmine E. J. Hartel/Neal M. Ashkanasy, eds.: *Emotions, Ethics, and Decision-making*. London: Emerald/JAI.
- Miller, Richard Brian (1996): *Casuistry and Modern Ethics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mitchell, Marie S./Noel F. Palmer (2010): "The Managerial Relevance of Ethical Efficacy" Schminke, Marshall, ed.: *Managerial Ethics: Managing the Psychology of Morality*. New York: Routledge, 89-110.
- Munday, Jeremy (2012): *Evaluation in Translation: Critical Points of Translator Decision-making*. Abingdon, New York: Routledge.
- Narvaez, Darcia (2008): "Human Flourishing and Moral Development: Cognitive and Neurobiological Perspectives on Virtue Development" Nucci, Larry P./Darcia Narvaez, eds.: *Handbook of Moral and Character Education*. New York: Routledge, 310-327.
- Noddings, Nel (1984/2003): *Caring: A Feminist Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nussbaum, Martha (2001): "The Enduring Significance of John Rawls" *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <http://chronicle.com/article/The-Enduring-Significance-of/7360/08/04/2012>
- Nussbaum-Beach, Sheryl/Lani Ritter Hall (2012): *The Connected Educator: Learning and Leading in a Digital Age*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- Ozar, David T. (2001): "An Outcomes Centered Approach to Teaching Ethics" *Teaching Ethics* 2(1): 1-29.
- Palmer, Parker (1993): *To Know as We Are Known: Education as a Spiritual Journey*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.
- Perry, William Graves (1968/1999): *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Pijanowski, John (2009): "The Role of Learning Theory in Building Effective College Ethics Curricula" *Journal of College and Character* 10(3): 1-13.
- Pincoffs, Edmund (1971): "Quandary Ethics" *Mind* 80(320): 552-571.
- Putnam, Hilary (2004): *Ethics without Ontology*. Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.
- Pym, Anthony (2003): "Translational Ethics and Electronic Technologies" *A Profissionalização do Tradutor: actas*. Lisbon: Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia/União Latina, 121-126. [http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/on-line/translation/lisbon\\_ethics.pdf](http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/on-line/translation/lisbon_ethics.pdf) [02/05/2012]

- Rest, James/Darcia Narvaez/Muriel J. Bebeau/Stephen J. Thoma (1999): *Postconventional Moral Thinking: A Neo-Kohlbergian Approach*. Hoboken: Taylor & Francis.
- Risku, Hanna (2002): "Situatedness in Translation Studies" *Cognitive Systems Research* 3: 523-533.
- Rónai, Paulo (2005): "Notes toward a History of Literary Translation in Brazil" Trans. Tom Moore. *Translation Review* 69: 49-53.
- Salama-Carr, Myriam (2007): *Translating and Interpreting Conflict*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.
- Schäffner, Christina (1999): *Translation and Norms*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Schäffner, Christina (2003): "Translation and Intercultural Communication: Similarities and Differences" *Studies in Communication Sciences* 3(2): 79-107.
- Selman, Robert L. (1980): *The Growth of Interpersonal Development*. New York: Academic Press.
- Sekerka, Leslie E./Richard P. Bagozzi (2007): "Moral Courage in the Workplace: Moving to and from the Desire and Decision to Act" *Business Ethics: A European Review* 16(2): 132-149.
- Smith, James K.A. (2005): *Jacques Derrida: Live Theory*. New York, London: Continuum.
- Snarey, John/Peter Samuelson (2008): "Moral Education in the Cognitive Development Tradition: Lawrence Kohlberg's Revolutionary Ideas" Nucci, Larry P./ Darcia Narvaez, eds.: *Handbook of Moral and Character Education*. New York, London: Routledge, 53-79.
- Snyder, Benson R. (1970/1973): *The Hidden Curriculum*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Sprod, Tim (2001): *Philosophical Discussion in Moral Education: The Community of Ethical Inquiry*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Thagard, Paul (2000): *Coherence in Thought and Action*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Tichy, Michelle/David W. Johnson/Roger T. Johnson/Cary J. Roseth (2010): "The Impact of Constructive Controversy on Moral Development" *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 40(4):765-787.
- Turiel, Elliot (2002): *The Culture of Morality: Social Development, Context, and Conflict*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Varela, Francisco J. (1999): *Ethical Know-How: Action, Wisdom, and Cognition*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Vienne, Jeanne (1994): "Toward a Pedagogy of 'Translation in Situation'" *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 1: 51-59.
- Walton, Douglas N. (2003): *Ethical Argumentation*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Weinstein, Bruce D. (1994): "The Possibility of Ethical Expertise" *Theoretical Medicine* 15: 61-75.