_____

Crisis Translation Training
Challenges Arising from New Contexts of Translation[1]

Federico M. Federici (University College London, UK),
Minako O'Hagan (University of Auckland, New Zealand)
Sharon O'Brien (Dublin City University, Ireland)
Patrick Cadwell (Dublin City University, Ireland)

Abstract

Focused on material design and self-reflective practices, this article discusses a Crisis Translation Training pitched at master-level translation and interpreting students, developed within the research activities carried out for the INTERACT International Crisis Translation Network. The course was designed to enable them to develop a broader skillset in support of multilingual crisis settings. The learning objectives underpinning the materials address training lacunae in enabling linguists to be involved in relief operations (Federici, 2016; O'Brien, 2016). The authors perceive the complementary skills as crucial in the development of language mediation services assisting linguists operating in such zones of liminality as are crisis settings. Multilingual communication in crisis includes professional forms of translation, signing, and interpreting, as well as forms of intercultural mediation, and social work (Drugan, 2017). Emergencies and prolonged crises have an impact on the communicative dynamics among international relief operators, local institutions, and crisis-affected populations.
The authors developed training materials to prepare students to work in crisis settings by harnessing their language competences in crisis translation as a form of community translation (Taibi and Ozolins, 2016). Culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) communities often need support in language combinations that rarely match commercially

viable combinations (Federici and Cadwell, 2018; Shackleton, 2018).
This article critically reviews non-language specific Crisis Translation Training, delivered in three iterations across two sites. Reporting on the first phases of the process of material design and enhancement, the article reflects on how issues in delivery, emerging findings regarding the authentic needs of mostly untrained translators, and different pathways of delivery shaped the re-definition of the initial learning objectives and pushed towards a translator trainer approach that would suit a range of new contexts of language mediation.

1. Introduction

Focused on material design and pedagogical self-reflections, this article discusses insights gained from the process of developing and delivering training materials to build capacity for crisis translation consultants – a role enabling better collaboration between disaster/emergency management practices when working with translators and interpreters. Crisis translation is operationally defined here as any form of linguistic and cultural transmission of messages that enables access to information during an emergency, regardless of the medium. In emergencies, the confines between written, oral, or multimodal modes are narrower; many means of communication are needed, and multiple solutions are required. In emergencies, disasters, and crises (see discussion of differences in O'Brien and Federici, 2020), crisis managers, who coordinate resources, personnel, and activities, often need, seek, and deploy translators and interpreters without necessarily knowing what to expect and what to ask as they react to urgent needs, in time-constrained contexts.

The term 'crisis manager' will be used here as a convenient label to refer to coordinators and managers of resources during the response phase of a crisis. Instead, 'disaster managers' applies to natural-hazard related disasters and 'emergency manager' to large-scale localised emergencies, such a major car crash or incidents involving multiple responders at once – such as paramedics, firefighters and police.

The four co-authors designed and delivered the materials in academic settings to support the development of additional skills among students enrolled in master-level degrees in translation and interpreting. The co-authors developed the Crisis Translation Training whilst conducting research within the EU-funded

INTERACT International Crisis Translation Network project[2], when they were all based in Auckland, New Zealand. While the goal of the INTERACT project is to "to enhance human skills, competences and cross-sectoral collaboration across academic, humanitarian, and industrial sectors involved in crisis translation" also through "citizen translator education"[3], it became evident that Crisis Translation Training could not directly provide language support for rare language combinations.

The skillset of crisis translators however can include an ability to analyse emergency plans to offer language support in multilingual crisis settings where, for multiple reasons, no professional translators or interpreters are available. The focus of pioneering research in disaster interpreting (Moser-Mercer and Bali, 2007; Moser-Mercer *et al.*, 2014) can be expanded to the role crisis translation plays across different phases and contexts of crisis (O'Brien, 2016; O'Brien and Cadwell, 2017), with an emphasis on the fact that better multilingual communication practices can be part of emergency planning and risk reduction (Federici, 2016).

In crisis settings, communicating with culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) communities might mean communicating with vulnerable groups. Lack of preparedness means that ad-hoc, hastily-organized solutions prevail (Federici, 2016: 8-13; O'Brien and Cadwell, 2017). Even though a shift towards enhancing capabilities by creating standardised resources is required, the unpredictability of language needs requires considering flexibility as key to any training approach. In this article we will use the term 'Citizen Translation' to mean translation practice conducted, sometimes voluntarily by an individual or a community of individuals who are at best partially trained (see Federici and Cadwell 2018; cf. Basalamah 2005). Compared to technical or literary translation, this translational activity often carries the assumption of achieving the common good. The term Citizen Translator, in turn, refers to a person who performs Citizen Translation. Crisis Translation Training refers to practices focusing on embedding support to multilingual communication in crisis settings by familiarising trainee translators and interpreters with operational contexts in which crisis managers operate. These include the need to supply translation or interpreting services in language

---

[2] For details on the project, see
https://sites.google.com/view/crisistranslation/home
[3] See https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/734211

combinations that are not available on the market.

The article discusses the analysis of training materials and on the process of delivery. These were delivered by the tutors several times and monitored through an action research approach described in section 1.1. The tutors designed the materials collaboratively and assessed them together before first delivery. After each time, each tutor added personal notes about delivery, needs for revision, and points for review and discussion in a shared Google Doc reflective journal. Tutors delivered their sessions after consulting each other's entries in the journal to ensure a degree of organic delivery and to reflect consistency in the learning objectives.

This article is divided into four sections: firstly, it looks at the pedagogical rationale for the study. Secondly, it discusses the didactic methods used to design and deliver the materials. Thirdly, it considers the issue of flexible delivery by focusing on the observations made by the tutors delivering the teaching in different locations. Fourthly, it discusses how the self-reflective teaching influenced the re-organization of both teaching aims and learning outcomes as part of the training process.

1. Crisis Translation: learning outcomes

1.1. Action Research: Active Learning and Learning by Teaching

Non-language specific Crisis Translation Training sessions were delivered once at the University of Auckland (UoA), New Zealand, and twice at University College London (UCL), United Kingdom between 2017 and 2018.[4] Materials were designed, delivered, and reviewed following action research principles (Cohen *et al.*, 2013; Lewin, 1946; Wright, 2015; Nicodemus and Swabey, 2016).

Action research is an educational approach that uses cycles (plan, act, observe, and reflect; repeat) to improve the delivery of teaching and learning activities (a task, a unit of learning, or an entire module). The cyclical approach aims to ensure future deliveries of the same activity, consider what has worked and what has not in order to produce more efficient, refined materials for future delivery of the

---

[4] A further iteration was ongoing at Dublin City University at the time of completing this article, but due to time constraints it could not be discussed here.

content.

The approach is commonly used in educational settings to engage with fast-changing learning needs. Indeed, both tutors and students may be observers, and carry out regular reviews of teaching materials. This continued review of content and delivery influences teaching practices as the module progresses, with the ultimate aim of retaining continued student engagement.

The article critically reflects on team-taught lectures that were delivered in three cycles within the action research approach. The rationale for adopting this approach is two-fold. First, it is "a powerful tool for change and improvement at the local level" in terms of altering learning and teaching dynamics within the same group of learners (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, 2013: 344); and second, it can "change the life chances of disadvantaged groups in terms of housing, employment, prejudice, socialization and training" (ibidem). From the same perspective, the sessions drew from active learning didactics (Baldwin and Williams, 1988; Wright, 2015) that privilege learners' full participation in the classroom. In active learning, students can also be directly involved in *teaching* their peers. The most established example of active learning is a seminar presentation delivered by a student open for discussion to their peers. More complex forms of active learning include sharing acquired knowledge through tasks designed by students, followed by peer discussion without the tutor's guidance, and peer assessment.

Action research methods (plan, act, observe, reflect) were used in the cyclical evaluation of the teaching, learning, and students' response to the activities, as well as their level of participation in active learning tasks. These included a variety of data sources: tutors' planning meetings and reflective journals, and students' logs (UoA-only). Action research was chosen because one of the founding principles of the method posits fact-finding and reflective analysis of problems with trainers and trainees as a tool to improve both training and intergroup relationships in society (Lewin, 1946). Operational relationships between crisis managers and professional translators and interpreters are complex. Urgency and lack of specific competences mean non-professional and ad-hoc solutions often feature in the response phase of a crisis when driven only by crisis managers. This module envisages the training of crisis translation consultants as the potential link to establish strong intergroup relationships between crisis managers, professional associations of translators and interpreters, and (where market/training does not

provide professionals in the right language combinations) citizen translators. The Crisis Translation Training could hence benefit management of multilingual crises, by supporting trainee translators to learn about the potential roles they could play in the intergroup operations that follow a disaster or that happen during a crisis. In these settings, crisis managers, emergency responders, and multiple operators collaborate in complex contexts in which urgency and efficient decision-making carry additional constraints on multilingual communication. For example, interpreters and translators may be directly affected by the crisis; depending on language combinations; children speaking rare languages are used in dangerous rescue operations; written translations may be needed to be broadcast or the target text may need to be read out loud, etc.

Our reflections then focus on learners' skills and trainers' continuously-reviewed materials and their delivery. Focusing on all the agents in the learning process for us was crucial to verify whether a form of Crisis Translation Training could create crisis translation consultants able to better link translation and interpreting to accommodate language needs in emergency plans for multilingual crisis settings (O'Brien *et al.*, 2018). Action research facilitates activities in which learners take initiative and carry out research pro-actively. In this case, learners assess national emergency plans and information on how language needs are catered for, enter their own data on policy analysis or crisis contexts in international databases, and compare their data with those from recent research. These activities in turn provide learners with the opportunity to change teaching content, while the learning process is still ongoing. So, the learners are empowered, and become part of the community of researchers. As such, they will learn to use a range of data collection methods, such as desk-based policy analysis research, contacting crisis managers, surveying national crisis management practices, and so on. In doing so, learners develop the essential subject-specific knowledge (both translation competences and notions from a range of fields in terms of Crisis Translation Training).

This active research approach is not unique, nor is the typology of cycle that we adopted; we refer readers to the extensive bibliographies from the educational perspective in Kemmis, McTaggart, and Nixon (2013); Mitchell-Schuitevoerder (2014) also offers, an already dated yet, extensive overview from a translation-specific perspective. Furthermore, Nicodemus and Swabey (2016) contextualize action research as a research tool in Translation Studies

to investigate problems in concrete situations while assuming no single, correct, and unequivocal solution. In its epistemology, action research often entails partnership or collaboration between trainers and learners, as there is a common problem on which they work together to solve. Both learners and teachers critically review their learning and teaching (Parsons and Brown, 2002), thus making the learning process explicit and raising awareness of acquired skills and knowledge.

The other focus was on crisis response. From the 1940s, wartime efforts to protect the civil population have evolved into forms of community-driven preparedness to mitigate risks for local populations. Crises need to be managed efficiently to diminish their impact on society. Initially developed as command-and-control mechanisms for civil defence, emergency plans provide efficient responses and were seen as connected with discipline and the clear chain of command of military, with distribution of responsibility by rank. However, in the last 15 years, research in disaster risk reduction suggests that collaborative approaches which also involve affected communities are likely to produce better results (see Kapucu and Garayev, 2013; Waugh and Streib, 2006). Hence, emergency plans have become forms of civil protection in which multiple agencies respond to mitigate the impact of crises (Alexander, 2002b). This shift has greatly influenced training, as responders with diverse skillsets need to collaborate in crisis response scenarios during training. Yet the role of translators and interpreters in multilingual crisis situations continue to be overlooked: 'translation' is not even considered in these collaborative crisis training scenarios. The collaborative paradigm of emergency planning and disaster risk reduction motivated the authors to consider ways of supporting unpredictable language needs in crisis situations, through training materials that might connect language mediator (translators, signers, interpreters) skillsets with those of crisis managers. As action research focuses on improving intergroup collaboration whilst learning, its approach to the educational setting was particularly suited for developing the skillset that students taking this module would need in authentic crisis settings.

1.2. The learning objectives and teaching principles

Our initial discussions to organize the materials focused on
  a. Integrating intended learning outcomes of Crisis Translation

Training with UoA module objectives (see 2.2.1 on how the learning outcomes were aligned in the UCL module).
b. Differentiating overall intended learning outcomes from specific session objectives and whenever possible introducing essential concepts to retain after the module ('takeaways').
c. Coordinating delivery, active learning activities, and their sequential logic across individual lesson plans for UCL.

Each 3-hour lesson was designed individually then shared for group discussion. The initial face-to-face discussions were crucial for the development of complementary and cumulative sessions with a cohesive learning progression. Each hour was broken down into a series of tasks ranging from 7-to 30-minute each, with 10-minute breaks. The longer 30-minute tasks required discussion, reporting, and peer-work, often involving physical movement. For example, during group-work, diagrams/notes were created on flipcharts by students moving to other groups' flipcharts and ranking their ideas. In the UCL tutorials, students had to find evacuation plans for the floor of the building in which the teaching took place and report evacuation instructions using forms of chuchotage. For example, a student working in a group that went out to locate the evacuation plans would report in Mandarin Chinese, and a student from another group would interpret into English. All the students who would access the evacuation instruction in English would then translate them in writing into another language. This task would be followed by an assessment of difficulty of moving swiftly across modes, and by an assessment of what kind of information is missing in the pivoting activity. These types of tasks would then lead to discussion of note-taking techniques as well as reflections on the ethical issue when there is information loss.

The action research approach led us to "transformative reflections" (Biggs and Tang, 2007: 43). As tutors, we recorded our observations regarding the ways in which the temporal and spatial distance between planning, classroom delivery, and changing contexts of delivery altered learning and teaching. Each session's teaching/learning activities were aligned with the takeaways; and learners were recommended preparatory and further readings. The alignment of intended learning outcomes and teaching and learning activities was unnegotiable in our learning plan to achieve the constructive alignment. For instance, we finely scrutinized the distinction between "risk communication" and "crisis

communication", given the confusion these two different communicative strategies and priorities create in the field. By embedding an assessment of crisis communication practices as well as of priorities in risk communication in the course, we recognized the need to raise learners' awareness of overlapping yet also distinct communication strategies, which reflect the different perspectives of the two cognate disciplines, because they have an impact on the ways in which information is delivered to crisis-affected populations and on the training that crisis managers receive. Crisis communication techniques are planned and strategized in emergency plans. The emergency plans will recommend overarching communicative strategies to give information on how to be better prepared; stimulate discussion with specific communities to become aware of hazards; and give information on health risks, presenting immediate concerns for the population. Though all emergency plans will overlap in some ways, some crisis communication will also focuses on brand reputation, government credibility, and other communicative issues irrelevant to crises in which the reader may be involved.

Different communicative objectives and different phases in which communication occur in crisis contexts require the learners to acquire flexibility. In particular, they need to be able to connect communicative practices, text types, and other factors with specific phases of a crisis, the means and modes of delivering messages, and so on. For example, a warning system regarding a natural hazard may be pre-written, pre-recorded, and pre-translated; while information on where to collect medicines, access medical support, and how to avoid contagion in an ongoing response to an evolving epidemic needs real-time translation and/or interpreting (these are also clear examples of risk communication needs).

Active learning and participatory methods were introduced to elicit pro-active, critical, and enquiry-based learning in the students. Crisis Translation Training focuses on an under-researched area in which national and international humanitarian aid sectors, operating in multilingual contexts, often struggle to engage in multidirectional dialogue with crisis-affected communities. Training translation and interpreting students to support translation activities in these types of crisis settings also requires them to identify the barriers to communication in crises. Even though cross-disciplinary literature has highlighted the issue, the linguistic complexity of multilingual crisis communication is often underestimated (e.g. Pyle, 2018). From problem-solving, via information mining, to active evaluative

participation in the learning process during the classes and in-between, the action research approach tested tutors' didactic approaches and styles of classroom management.

Instructors' critical reflections were collected in journal entries, such as "the first consideration to make is: could we learn from WP3 [INTERACT Work Package 3: Language simplification] instead of [thinking about] translation?" As the students were involved in small group activities, we jotted down observations (on paper or electronically). After each session, tutors would type up their own reflections ranging from 700-1500 words approximately. Each tutor would share their reflections on Google Docs. The tutors' individual reflections were discussed in a meeting before the module in New Zealand, then remotely via the shared folder. Prior to the next cycle, each tutor looked back at their own journal reflections for their sessions, as well as other relevant points emerging from the other tutors' revised materials. Through this revision, the tutors reorganized their lesson plans and materials to respond to their own and their peers' observations. The reflections were distilled into three intuitive phases following the "What, So What, and Now What" framework (see Rolfe, Freshwater, and Jasper, 2001). 'What' refers to "reporting what happened, objectively", entailing presentation of methods without judgement or interpretation. 'So What' means "interpretation. What you learned", discussing one's feelings, ideas, and analysis of the session. 'Now What' considers future revisions.

As open tutor reflections were shared as collaborative documents before and/or after the delivery of their respective sessions, the discussion was non-linear; thus forcing a continued critical engagement with gaps and issues in previous experiences and entailing a time distance that furthered self and peer criticism in favour of sharper and more efficient training solutions. To maintain this approach, tutors added new thoughts in relation to the given session without using a pre-determined format.

2. Flexibility of deployment: Cycles of teaching

2.1. University of Auckland (UoA) cycle

This section describes the Crisis Translation Training at UoA – the first action research cycle in 2017. We discuss the course settings, the design, and the delivery mode together with relevant local

background information. Then, we briefly analyse the pedagogical approach we adopted.

Regarding New Zealand as a site for Crisis Translation Training, it is important to note that the country, with a population of less than 5 million, is home to a diverse range of immigrants and is known for seismic activity. The major damage caused by the 2010–2011 Canterbury and 2016 Kaikoura earthquakes has led to an increasing awareness among policy makers for the need to implement disaster management approaches which embrace the needs of CALD communities (Wylie, 2012; Zorn *et al.*, 2016). The training will therefore be of increasing importance for students considering working in New Zealand. As an additional background, translator training at a tertiary level in New Zealand is relatively limited with just a few institutions offering full postgraduate degree programmes. There has so far been no specialised translator training focused on crisis translation. At the time of writing the whole country was still reeling from the terrorist attack on mosques in Christchurch, highlighting the unpredictable nature of crisis translation contexts, which now include terrorism as well as disasters triggered by natural hazards.

The Crisis Translation Training was delivered as part of the existing semester-long Community Interpreting and Contextual Studies course which is offered to students pursuing either the MA or the Postgraduate Diploma in Translation Studies at the School of Cultures, Languages and Linguistics at UoA. Although not by design, the course provided a logical home for our pilot content within the broad remit of community translation and interpreting. Of the twelve face-to-face 3-hour weekly sessions, the training took place in the first four classes with expected 17-hour independent study per week. These sessions were followed by medical terminology and community interpreting classes.

Of nine students who registered for the course there were native speakers of Chinese, Malay, English, and Japanese. Six students had prior and ongoing translating or interpreting experiences. The students were at varying stages of completing their respective postgraduate degrees with six out of nine students having taken a translation theory course. The profiles of the students were therefore heterogeneous in terms of their practical experiences and background knowledge in translation studies.

2.1.1. Course Aims and Content

The CTT component of the module aimed to address:

(i) the role of community translators in emergency settings relating to disaster management, and

(ii) to raise students' awareness of the essential skills and knowledge enabling them to operate effectively and ethically under constrained circumstances typical of crisis communication.

In terms of intended learning outcomes, the students were expected to:

1. Become aware of the critical role played by community translation in crisis communication;
2. Minimise the risk of miscommunication under the various constraints of crisis communication;
3. Apply problem-solving skills, including the use of technology, to respond to time-critical translation demands; and
4. Be able to make ethical decisions in acting as a translator in crisis communication.

These outcomes were assessed through an authentic project in collaboration with the New Zealand Red Cross (NZRC), together with the weekly submission of students' reflective diaries. Students made use of a simple template that was made available on Canvas, the Virtual Learning Environment used by the University of Auckland. In 2017, the NZRC facilitated the community translation of an Earthquake Preparedness Guide published by the Wellington Region Disaster Management Office (WREMO; see Shackleton, 2018). Having been introduced to the NZRC project, the Crisis Translation Training students were required to prepare a briefing document and a set of guidelines for CALD communities to translate the earthquake guide with a 10-minute hypothetical "pitch" to promote the project among community translators. Students gave presentations of their briefing documents to the NZRC representative in charge of the community translation project – who, in turn had been instructed by WREMO risk reduction and crisis managers on the specific needs for this translation. The project is a quintessential example of crisis communication that focuses on

building better prepared multilingual societies as a way of mitigating risks and supporting WREMO crisis managers, in case any of the natural hazards were to trigger one of their emergency plans. The NZRC representative shared her experience of working with many different stakeholders in the collaborative project which was aimed at increasing general preparedness and on mitigating potential impact of risks to the CALD communities.

In accordance with the learning objectives we developed the content based on the following weekly topics:

- Week 1: Introduction to Community Translation - Crisis Translation
- Week 2: Communicating in a Crisis: Organizing Translation and Interpreting
- Week 3: Real-World Constraints on Crisis Translation: The Case of the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake
- Week 4: Crisis Translation: Exploring technology applications.

Our key interest was to introduce the specialised and emerging topic of crisis translation, incorporating insights derived from crisis communication and crisis management research (e.g. Schwarz, Seeger, and Auer, 2016), as well as issues informed by community translation research (e.g. Taibi and Ozolins 2016). In particular, the relevance for the topic to local contexts and the authentic assessments were aimed to increase student engagement. The students were given readings before and after each session (for an illustrative sample, see Appendix 1).

The sessions took place in a computer lab with multiple computer terminals on shared island desks and large TV screens positioned around the room connected to the instructor's terminal to enable students to collaborate and access resources as individuals and in small groups as the lessons progressed. Informed by the needs of a participatory approach, we were equipped with flipcharts, coloured pens, and flexible classroom configurations to allow the students to break into discussion groups. Interactivity through physical movement (standing up, moving around to work on different flipcharts, etc.) formed part of the participatory approach as well as the active learning philosophy. As active learning is characterised as involving "students in doing things and thinking about the things they are doing" (Bonwell and Eison, 1991, p. 2) it encourages

students to develop higher order thinking such as analysis and synthesis as a way of externalising cognitive processes. Active learning also seeks to provide students with the opportunity to explore their own attitudes and values through learning activities explicitly and making it part of their learning process (Matsushita, 2018). We wanted the students to be able to extend their pre-existing translation constructs to crisis translation as a specific and somewhat different instantiation of translation, connecting translation to social and, specifically, to disaster contexts.

For instance, in Week 3, one of the tasks asks learners to select essential ways to support language needs of CALD communities. Once the learners identify ways of accommodating language needs, they need to reduce them to a list of essentials to be included in emergency plans. As groups, they discuss concepts of multilingual communication in order of priority. Each group writes their group's suggestions on a flip chart sheet with a black marker; they then hang the sheet on the wall and present their suggestions to the other groups. After the presentation every group goes around the room to read the other groups' priorities adding additional suggestions in a different colour; and, finally they grade the most significant suggestions made by their colleagues to consolidate initial suggestions in shared, revised, and agreed recommendations (this is an example of a 'carousel activity').

This participatory form of peer-assessment familiarises the learners with collaborative practices in determining priorities often used in multi-stakeholder environments. It enables them to reflect actively on their knowledge of translation and interpreting concepts and on the ways in which the role of language mediators in multilingual crisis contexts does/does not reflect them, and how language mediation knowledge could be better embedded in current crisis and risk communication practices.

We designed the course to appeal to students' broader interest in social issues and current affairs both from local and global perspectives, and to encourage participation through peer-based learning activities. The selection of learning activities was of paramount importance and, in our case, these took mainly the form of small-group discussions as well as individual tasks, e.g. "What language provision should be considered in an emergency plan for the city of Auckland/London?". The use of short bursts of discussion, summary presentations and other small-group tasks aided by flip charts as instruments was intended to facilitate the students'

internalisation and externalisation of the key concepts introduced by the tutor and through prior readings. The next section provides an analysis of tutor reflections as the main source of data in relation to the training needs and provides directions for future iterations.

2.1.2. Data Analysis

When we revisited our collective reflective records of experience in designing and delivering the course content, common patterns emerged. The What, So What and Now What framework structured the systematic analyses of our reflections.

What

Tutors were concerned about how to retrofit new content on crisis translation into the pre-existing course without negatively affecting its flow. They recognised their own desire to introduce as much content as possible into a limited space while having to skip over some planned tasks. The reflections indicated the significant time spent on devising learning activities to match the learning objectives, ranging from the content of discussions to role plays. There were also concerns about the extent to which the students would engage in the activities. In theory, participatory methods presume that each learner report to the whole class, discuss, or write down information for the group in each task. In reality, some learners preferred to be involved in pair activities, but were less participative in group or class activities; some engaged very enthusiastically driving the discussion for the group, but one or two learners seemed less at ease with the participatory methods. Overall, as the weeks went by nearly everyone became comfortable with the participatory style. Content was designed with a particular interaction in mind, and when that interaction did not take place, tutors would have had to come up with an ad-hoc strategy.

So What

Three tutors felt that the students were responsive to the prepared learning activities, and that the key goals of each session were largely met. This was later confirmed in the students' reflective diaries and course evaluations, where they stated that the content was relevant and interesting. As well as the clear local relevance of the topic in relation to the recent major earthquakes experienced in New Zealand, the students' comments in their end-of-module

questionnaire suggested that having different tutors from different countries teaching similar classes piqued their curiosity, positively contributing to their learning. While the use of participatory methods was new to most students, they found it refreshing and they also indicated a certain degree of apprehension. Similarly, because of the on-the-spot nature of the participatory method, two tutors expressed unease, for example, at how to properly integrate the students' responses to the given tasks back into the lesson. This cannot be fully pre-planned due to the element of unpredictability of the interaction with the students, as reported in active learning literature (e.g. Lee 2015).

One incident which was not anticipated was in reference to a student who became emotional during class when recalling her experience of a major earthquake. The student recovered without requiring additional support, but it was something we discussed among ourselves for future revision. In following cycles, we added links for mental and well-being support in the module materials, and we have become even more explicit about the fact that the discussion may bring up traumatic experiences. At UCL, there was also some indication that the module was chosen by trainee translators and interpreters who already have experienced a crisis (often after a disaster triggered by a natural hazard).

Now What

A range of issues emerged from our reflections regarding the content, the target audience and the delivery. In relation to the content there was a concern raised about over-simplification of definitions, such as crisis, emergency, and disaster). The differences are not only semantic but correspond to different ways of financing responses and budgeting actions of preparedness. Over-teaching also emerged, such as the focusing on nuanced differences in communicative practices, while the whole question of translation and interpreting provision itself is currently given little consideration in emergency plans.

Although the student reception (seen in their reflective diaries and the learning outcomes as assessed through their project) was overwhelmingly positive, the tutors mentioned the challenge in striking the right balance between theory and practice. Specificity of content tied to a particular teaching site was another issue raised (e.g. Auckland content may not be relevant in London, and vice-versa). But, above all, the most pertinent question discussed among us

related to the target audience.

The action research approach allowed us to learn from the first cycle and ensure that trainee translators and interpreters were to be equipped with an understanding of the complex operational context of multilingual crisis settings and of the translation and interpreting needs corresponding to different phases of a crisis. Their integrated (translation and interpreting plus crisis/risk communication) competences would in turn become more effective in "facilitator roles", by supporting crisis managers to better work with translators and interpreters. Furthermore, we began considering the possibility of involving people trained though the Crisis Translation Training to deliver the INTERACT Citizen Translator Training, which focuses on developing human resources in language combinations unavailable in the local market (see full discussion in section 4). Another key issue concerned the difference in the mode of training delivery based on face-to-face active learning and participatory training as opposed to online, as specified in the INTERACT training plans, stipulated in the EU-funding application. The kinetic dimension of the group reporting – with the group speaker presenting from a variety of positions in the classroom, and standing or sitting – were not reproducible in the webinars that integrated the participatory lectures at the course delivered UCL (see discussion in 2.2). Grading activities and relay activities included moving around within the room, which was more difficult in an online environment because of the fixed camera limitations to "carousel" activities of peer assessment and their role in supporting discussions among the students.

The next section reflects on the second cycle of delivery at University College London (UCL), prior to concluding with a section bringing together reflections from all the cycles.

2.2. University College London cycles

In the UK hazardscape, flooding and storms are the most likely natural threat to people and property. However, multilingual crisis settings abound, with London as an exposed superdiverse megacity. For example, the 2017 Grenfell Tower Fire killed 72 people, forcing evacuation and the ongoing (as of 2019) resettlement of residents who needed information in 18 languages other than English. Evidence suggests that available data on multilingualism are not used in emergencies, and emergency plans only partially address the needs

of the superdiverse society (O'Brien *et al.*, 2018). The tragic events of the Grenfell Tower increased the learners' awareness for the relevance of the Crisis Translation Training module at UCL.

No other UK programme besides UCL's 15-credit course entitled Crisis Translation focuses on training for crisis contexts, at the time of writing.[5] Offered to postgraduate students pursuing master's degrees at the Centre for Translation Studies, the course was designed as an instance of UCL Connected Curriculum in which students are actively involved in ongoing research as part of their own learning. In this setting, the module was solely focused on crisis translation with a syllabus designed for integrating and expanding the training materials to be delivered by the INTERACT researchers. Compared to the UoA cycle, the UCL module was composed of six 3-hour active learning lectures, four 2-hour webinars, and 4 tutorials totalling 10 hours. The 36-hour module was assessed through two assignments: an analysis of a multilingual crisis setting with focus on deployment of translation and interpreting resources and personnel, and initially a "technological test" of the students' ability to mine for information digitally at speed whilst using server-based data collection systems. This assignment was then revised (see discussion in 2.2.2). At the time of writing, the module has been delivered to twenty students (12 in the first cycle, 8 in the second). Students attending the module were being trained in other modules of their master degree to become professional translators or interpreters into Arabic, Cantonese, Chinese, English, French, German, Hebrew, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Norwegian, Portuguese, Spanish, Swedish, and Welsh.

2.2.1. Course aims and content

Approved as a full module in January 2017, the intended learning outcomes of the Crisis Translation Training at UCL predated (and are somewhat less explicit than) those at UoA, which were developed after the INTERACT project had started. The intended learning outcomes of the module expected students:

---

[5] The Crisis Translation Training content was also leveraged for a module on Crisis Translation at Dublin City University, in Spring Semester 2019. The different target audience, students enrolled on MA in Refugee Integration, most of whom had no background in translation, imposed some customisation of the content towards refugee and humanitarian crises.

1. To gain an understanding of the cognitive and emotional challenges of operating in crisis communication.
2. To gain an understanding of the linguistic and technical issues of communicating in contexts and phases of crises.
3. To operate supported by a range of technologies.
4. To become able to support intercultural communication in crisis settings.

The team-taught sessions were delivered in a seminar room with chairs and tables forming a U; a large TV screen for projection, a portable flipchart, and colour markers completed the setup. Students were asked to bring one laptop per group to complete information mining tasks. Learners could move around, but room sizes reduced the levels of kinaesthetic interactivity – e.g. group spokespeople reported on their group activities while sitting down. Despite this overall change to the kinaesthetic and dynamic learning (e.g. no "carousel activity", no moving around, etc.), the students' participation levels were high.

Working in small groups, each student contributed to the discussion, they had to write down notes, work on diagrams, translate, provide on-the-spot unplanned interpretations of the discussion to the classroom, and produce schematic representations on flip charts. In order to prevent cultural clashes dictated by different classroom dynamics and the educational expectations in the international composition of the group, opportunities for pair, group, and class discussions were made available to put all learners at ease. From the outset we explained that the instructors were themselves "learners" in the process of researching translation in crisis settings, thus describing it as learning within a community of researchers.

UCL works on the principle of an extensive, inclusive, and innovative curriculum in its approaches to blended learning. Tutors are encouraged to record live lectures and offer webinars. The Crisis Translation Training standalone module format allowed us to test how the introduction of webinars and remote teaching could work in combination with active learning and participatory approaches. The training itself was delivered in a variety of forms in terms of length/number of credits, as a standalone module, or a set of lessons within another module. At their inception, in addition to these different institutional settings the sessions tested various modes of delivery. The training was intended to be standalone, and it is being

assessed for inclusion in professional development plans by national associations of translators and interpreters (and it will be proposed for inclusion in training packages for crisis managers expected to work with professional translators and interpreters). At UCL, the Crisis Translation Training materials were delivered as a full module, which allowed us to ascertain their viability of preparing translators, or crisis translation consultants, via remote training when infrastructural, time, or resource issues impede tutors to deliver training in situ.

2.2.2. Data Analysis

Once again, tutors followed exactly the same approach making observations of their teaching, adopting the note taking system discussed in section 2.1 and following the same What, So what, and Now What procedure. The main difference was that following the participatory lectures there was no opportunity for debriefing in situ immediately after the sections as a group, because after each iteration at UCL, the tutors returned to their institutions. As before, tutors carried out their discussions on Google Docs. The students' answers to the end-of-year questionnaire became the point of feedback for both cycles of delivery of the module.

  What
  Firstly, some UCL students had experienced crisis situations too. Secondly, as the second and third cycle progressed, we all concurred that the module content should prepare trainees to *support* citizen translators, rather than to become translators who operate in crisis settings. Thirdly, the students' interest in personal experiences of needs and operational activity in crisis settings prompted us to reflect that more resources based on authentic experiences in translating and interpreting are needed. Those provided by the tutors, or those emerging from an ongoing survey collecting data from translators working in crises are a starting point; more examples would better reflect the complexity and diversity of crisis settings. Text types include travel documents, information on natural hazards, humanitarian response project updates, news reports, health emergency messages and training documents in long-lasting crises[6].

---

[6] For the Great Easter Earthquake in Japan, as a disaster triggered by a natural hazard, see examples discussed in Cadwell 2015. For long-lasting crises, see examples of text

So what

As the training is offered as an optional module, the relevance of discussing disasters and crises was a lesser concern as the subject area interested the students enough *a priori* for them to elect to take the module. We revised the materials developed for the first cycle in UoA and delivered these twice, switching to an entirely student-led active learning, significantly reducing frontal-lecture content. The discussion regarding data available on the multilingual population of the UK led to the development of a focused discussion of "training needs for crisis managers". On the one hand, the very diverse composition of the cohort engendered discussion of disaster settings in different national contexts and the challenge to accommodate language needs of the local population. On the other hand, as the discussions revolved around defining concepts and classifying knowledge in relation to possible use in real-life settings. Citing from the end-of-year questionnaire, some learners perceived the active learning approaches as providing content that was based on "common sense" – probably meaning that because they were sharing peer knowledge and/or direct experience, their observations were driven by common sense only.

The sessions were planned to engage with the complex materials accessible. The students learned about emergency plans, the differences between disaster phases, and those between crisis and risk communication. They were also introduced to varieties of means of communication, of modes of communication, of complex language requirements, and to the use of translation technologies. They also learned how different crisis phases call for different approaches. However, UCL students did not find it easy to engage with the open and analytic structure of the first cycle of module.

The attempted "constructive" alignment (Briggs and Tang 2007: 249) between our intended learning outcomes, our teaching-learning adjustments, and the assessment tasks were criticised by the students in the institutional, end-of-module evaluations as "disjointed" and as structurally unclear. In the second UCL cycle, learners did not mention structure in their end-of-module evaluations and three out of eight students decided to write their dissertation (one third of their overall degree credits) on crisis translation. Although the sample was small and feedback only indicative, the feedback for the second cycle confirmed our hypothesis that logistic issues were responsible for the

---

types discussed in Al Shehari 2020.

UCL criticism, such as the erratic timetabling that was outside the tutors' control and room allocations - and not our planning. This problem however highlights the significance of the learning space in the active learning approach and in its focus on kinaesthetic activities.

Now What

After the two UCL cycles, it became clear that training materials for translators operating in crisis that INTERACT intended to produce as part of its goal to support "citizen translator education" have two distinctively diverse audiences, as well as intended outcomes that are complementary:

1) resources to support training of citizen translators in rare language combinations;
2) resources consolidating the ability to link up training of citizen translators with the needs of crisis managers are dependent on the openness, experience, and decision making of crisis managers in charge of each individual event.

The two typologies of training to enhance multilingual communication in crises, from the point of view of translator training, are complementary and equally needed in rare or low-resource language combinations. Open access Citizen Translation training materials (e.g. Federici and Cadwell, 2018) have to be integrated by Crisis Translation Training that enable trainee translators and interpreters to support competence and knowledge of crisis managers when the latter need to support efficient communication in crises.

The Crisis Translation Training is a risk reduction tool to increase the resilience of multilingual societies or the effectiveness of entities operating in international, multilingual settings. Whereas, the Citizen Translation training is an additional response tool to support urgent needs in language combinations that are not fully supported by local translation and interpreter professionals and by the offer on the local market.

As teachers-observers in the action research classrooms, our own perceptions of dealing with multilingual crisis settings were brought to the fore by the students. Our own experiences of accessing translated information or of contributing to translation projects in crisis settings were perceived by the students as useful to understand

at a human level how translators and interpreters perceive the emotional and cognitive challenges of operating in a crisis. This consideration reinforced our intuition that research into crisis translators' own accounts of the operational challenges needs to inform revisions of the Crisis Translation Training described here.

Our takeaways from the active learning lectures were numerous. Obviously, the possibility of delivering the Crisis Translation Training as a standalone module allowed further explicit discussion of the learners' potential role as recruiters, assessors, or trainers of citizen translators, when serving as crisis translation consultants. Our reflective journals remained open to debate and evaluation to all four co-authors for all the cycles, while the tutors' journals kept the reflective trajectory as intended in our action research approach. The different contexts and changes to the cycles made us realise that we had to make a balance. We needed detailed lesson plans, focusing on the duration and order of tasks, to achieve some fair and consistent delivery of the intended learning outcomes. We also needed the space to introduce specific examples of crises (preferably recent) that were geographically meaningful in terms of hazard to notice changes in practices for multilingual communication. As a result, we provided examples of texts referring to natural hazards warnings, news reports, health communication, or weather forecast warnings from a range of local disasters involving multilingual communities. Examples included the 2010 Christchurch and 2011 Canterbury earthquake; the 2017 Grenfell Tower fire in London; the 2018 Ophelia storm in Ireland, the 2011 Great Eastern Japan Earthquake. International events involving multilingual personnel and multilingual crisis-affected communities were also included, such as the 2014 Ebola epidemic and the 2014-ongoing Yemen crisis. The balance between fixed task order and flexible examples for the collaborative sessions were very necessary to retain coherence in the delivery without restraining the materials from including locally meaningful examples of crisis translation situations and of activities in training translators.

The webinars at UCL enabled learners to reflect on their knowledge of the fundamental principles of translation, especially once the assessment tasks were better aligned in the second cycle. The assignment now became the creation of a 3-minute video presentation in which the student provides voice-over instructions to share their knowledge on crucial notions of translation to a non-expert, novice audience. In particular, the tasks provided evidence of

the students' ability to step up as consultants if involved in supporting responders. UCL's end-of-course questionnaires are institutionally administered before the assignments are completed and marked, hence no data on learners' reflections on the assignment are available for discussion. This is a known limitation, which the tutors had tried to bypass by preparing both pre and end-of-module informal questionnaires. However, the UCL learners did not engage with these in viable numbers (we had only 2/12 complete pre-module questionnaires for the first cycle and 2/8 for the second cycle).

Nevertheless, constructive feedback emerged through the learners' meetings with their Personal Tutors (who agreed for positive feedback to be passed on to module tutors); at the Staff-Student Committee meeting, during discussions in the sessions, and via email. The learners explicitly mentioned[7] how the CTT had altered their perception of the role of translation in multilingual societies, and the assessment tasks represented a welcome diversification compared to other modes of assessments in their degree programme.

3. Tutors' reflections

The action research cycles have enhanced the students' abilities to aid actions in support of language needs in crisis settings. However, neither the means of providing such support, nor the role of Crisis Translation Training learners developed as we had anticipated, but rather progressed in the cycles of organic revision and enhancement. This section explains how the materials developed into useful tools to support multilingual crisis communication.

An overarching epistemological question emerged which regards the link between crisis translation and other types of translation. The first cycle at UoA took place by adding crisis translation as a type of community translation within the course focused on community interpreting and translation. The UCL cycles catered for trainee translators and public service interpreters. As learners had limited familiarity with community translation, crisis translation and citizen translation there was no clash with existing knowledge.

---

[7] Across the 2 cycles: 6 learners via email correspondences, 8 learners in conversation at the end of sessions, or in meetings during the lecturer's Feedback and Advice Hour.

Defining the target audience for the Crisis Translation Training became central to all the revisions of the syllabus. The action research cycles convinced the authors that the training should target professional or trainee translators (and interpreters, but with additional materials). Even at their relatively early stage of specialised translator training, all learners in the three cycles showed that prior knowledge in approaching the various aspects of translation would influence their decision-making regarding means, translation modes, and personnel training in crisis situations.

The first cycle at UoA showed that there are potential interferences between the learners' strict application of the professional rules for the commercial sector, which they are acquiring concurrently to taking the Crisis Translation Training, to the specific circumstances of working with (often non-commercial) rare language combinations in crisis settings. For instance, their UoA assignments asked them to develop a translation brief and specific guidelines for CALD community translators, and logically the learners directed CALD translators to the professional codes of ethics and conduct of the New Zealand Society of Translators and Interpreters.

Despite the discussions during class sessions highlighting the different expectations between professional and CALD community translators it proved difficult for many of the students not to impose very similar standards on the latter as if they were on par with the former. For example, the professional codes of ethics and conduct advises translators or interpreters not to take on a job which is deemed outside their expertise. Yet, this is a moot point with CALD community translation projects which by definition come under areas in which the community translators are not specifically trained, given the general lack of professional translator training in the needed language combinations. Quality is to be achieved, but individual citizen translators may not have the skillset to assess quality. Yet, successful community translation projects will deliver a translation that is accepted and well-used by the given community due to the consensual aspect and also due to the trust and the ownership of the translation, which have been developed from the ground up rather than imposed upon them. The authors embraced the action research finding that the liminal zone of operation in which this Crisis Translation Training is needed depends on translation and interpreting graduates using competences acquired in their master-level studies to support responders to match their

language needs.

From the first cycle, we had learnt that there is a difficulty for trainees to remember that their own language awareness is not necessarily shared and that this set of meta-skills is as relevant if not more so than their immediate support with a particular language combination. The UoA assignment enabled learners to act as project managers, while the UCL settings and assignments enabled learners to act as language consultants. The collaboratively-designed materials could cater for both roles.

3.3. Theory versus practice

The tutors' reflections showed concern for the course content not having sufficient theoretical bases, given that the INTERACT goal is research-informed training. Providing students with practical training in disaster settings, while at the same time ensuring they are versed in key theoretical disaster risk reduction notions, was a challenge. As implicit in one of the tutors' reflections, one of the areas which provides scope for theoretical applications may be ethics. Because of the largely unpredictable nature of disaster settings, one has to have a solid theoretical understanding of ethics to have cognitive readiness when a disaster strikes. In this way the work on crisis translation could feed into the theoretical basis of ethics in translation and interpreting, incorporating the increasingly complex settings surrounding ethics – a common pursuit of UoA and UCL professional translation degrees (respectively NAATI-endorsed and FIT associate member). In both institutions, ethics takes a central position in role-plays and in case-study analysis of crisis settings (e.g. Drugan and Megone, 2011).

3.4. Use of participatory methods

We reflected on the use of participatory methods and its pedagogical merit in relation to different learning styles and delivery modes. We found small group-based discussions and activities conducive to high student engagement, ideally aiding effective internalisation and externalisation of the cognitive processing of new information. Lee (2015) highlights the advantage of active learning in engaging students who are more accustomed to traditional transmissionist teaching approaches. We also found the active learning approach useful in enforcing more distributed participation by the students

regardless of the learners' academic background and previous studies. However, we sometimes needed to intervene directly in grouping the learners to encourage equal participation and engagement across groups of mixed-backgrounds, who tended to reorganize themselves according to region, if not country of origin. In the anonymous end-of-module questionnaire for the UoA cycle, five out of the nine learners commented on the value of learning from peers and found it highly effective and rewarding. One wrote in the reflective journal: "The input from fellow students helped me understand the topic from different angles which was useful".

For the UCL second cycle, six out of eight learners responded to the questionnaire, four of whom valued highly the interaction with peers in the classes. One learner observed that: "What I found most interesting in terms of theory was the introduction to emergency planning and humanitarian crisis as an academic field. I enjoyed how we were encouraged to view translation as an essential part of this and felt empowered to be able to actually take what I've learnt inside the classroom and apply it to real world scenarios." Another learner commented on the fact that the "first three interactive lectures are relatively too demanding compared to the webinars and tutorials". This comment highlights the significance of comparing demanding participatory methods with other teaching modes, and the challenges that tutors will face, if they were to deliver this training remotely to support translation in crisis settings.

4. Conclusions

The three cycles of Crisis Translation Training confirmed our two-fold hypothesis. Firstly, training of translation and interpreting graduates as crisis translation consultants to support crisis managers is conceptually justified in relation to known lacunae in current policies (O'Brien *et al.*, 2018). Secondly, we must refine our understanding of training needs of those actually providing language support in crises.

The Crisis Translation Training materials discussed here will be revised to reflect data collection of challenges experienced by translators operating in authentic crisis settings. Although no student voiced any concern regarding possible traumas, it may be necessary to collect some background information in a tactful, confidential, and ethical manner prior to running such modules. The training itself

does not aim to enhance the students' resilience to trauma, and this area might need further attention. Future revisions will be grounded on the findings from an ongoing INTERACT survey administered to commissioners of translation in crisis settings and to crisis translators (see a region-specific preliminary analysis in Al-Shehari 2020). Once the survey closes in 2020, the training materials will embed further authentic training needs of translators operating in crisis settings. In those regions in which professional translators and interpreters in language combinations needed in crises are not immediately available, the crisis translation consultants will seek to uphold deontological and ethical values connected with professional translation and interpreting whilst liaising with crisis managers who may only have access to non-professional and non-trained bilinguals. In supporting crisis managers, the roles of crisis translation consultants will be multiple, from engaging the national associations of professional translators and interpreters to delivering the citizen translation training (discussed in Federici and Cadwell 2018). Translation and interpreting graduates may not necessarily have the needed language combinations in a multilingual crisis but can be trained to acquire extra skills to deal with specific challenges arising from crisis translation, such as understanding crisis communication and risk communication practices, or understanding expectations set out in local language policies to support language needs.

Also, reflections on global versus local content emerged as a shared concern among the four tutors. They indicate that in future, local trainers can incorporate training content as required by the locale, in addition to the common core training material as in the INTERACT training module which has to be designed for global, non-language specific use. The action research methodology will allow us to continue to test the materials in the next cycles planned in the UK, Ireland, and New Zealand.

The most significant observations that emerged pertain to re-orientation of the training. The materials, as developed in a postgraduate programme, have the privileged position of referring to a body of knowledge that the students have, or at least are in the process of attaining. The metalanguage is shared; and the conceptualizations from the debates in the discipline (House, 2017) are becoming part of their new identities as proto-professionals. These luxuries, however, are not available in most crises. Low-resourced, rare, and endangered languages are the most vulnerable in crisis settings for accessing information, because they seldomly have

professional practitioners (Taibi 2017; Taibi and Ozolins, 2016). The Crisis Translation Training fills this gap by linking up translation and interpreting expertise with crisis managers' needs for practical, yet robust solutions to accommodate language needs that are not available in the commercial market, nor are supported in professional or academic training at the time of a crisis erupting. The next steps will entail a focus on capacity building by establishing collaborations involving professional translators and interpreters in crisis management training.

References

Alexander, D. E. 2002. *Principles of emergency planning and management*. Oxford; Harpenden: Oxford University Press on Demand/Terra Publishing.

Al-Shehari, K. 2020. "Crisis translation in Yemen: Needs and challenges of volunteer translators and interpreters". In F. M. and S. O'Brien (Eds), *Traslation in Cascading Crisies*. London: Routledge, 25-45.

Basalamah, S. 2005. "La traduction citoyenne n'est pas une métaphore". *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction*, 18(2), 49-69.

Baldwin, J., and H. Williams. 1988. *Active learning: a trainer's guide*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Biggs, J. B., and C. Tang. 2007. *Teaching for quality learning at university: what the student does* (3rd ed.). Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill.

Bonwell, C. C., and J. A. Eison. 1991. *Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom. ERIC Digest*. Washington, D.C: The George Washington University.

Cohen, L., L. Manion and K. Morrison. 2013. "Action research". In L. Cohen, L. Manion, and K. Morrison (Eds), *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge, 344-361.

Drugan, J. 2017. "Ethics and social responsibility in practice: interpreters and translators engaging with and beyond the professions". *The Translator*, 23(2), 126-142.

Drugan, J., and C. Megone. 2011. "Bringing ethics into translator training: an integrated, inter-disciplinary approach". *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 5(1), 183-211.

Federici, F. M. 2016. "Introduction: A state of emergency for crisis communication". In F. M. Federici (Ed.), *Mediating Emergencies and Conflicts. Frontline Translating and Interpreting*. New York, NY:

Palgrave Macmillan, 1-29.

Federici, F. M., and P. Cadwell. 2018. "Training Citizen Translators." In. W. Tesseur (Ed.), *Translation in non-governmental organisations.* Special issue of *Translation Spaces*, 7(1), 20-43.

House, J. 2017. *Translation: The Basics.* London: Routledge.

Hubscher-Davidson, S. 2015. "The role of intuition in the translation process: A case sudy". In M. Ehrensberger-Dow, B. Englund Dimitrova, S. Hubscher-Davidson, and U. Norberg (Eds.), *Describing Cognitive Processes in Translation. Acts and events.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 63-84.

Kapucu, N., and V. Garayev. 2013. "Designing, managing, and sustaining functionally collaborative emergency management networks". *The American Review of Public Administration*, 43(3), 312-330.

Kemmis, S., R. McTaggart, and R. Nixon. 2013. *The action research planner: Doing critical participatory action research.* Berlin: Springer.

Lee, H. 2015. "From a Well-Prepared Teacher to an On-the-Spot Facilitator: A Reflection on Delivering an Active Learning Course". *International Journal for Transformative Research*, 2(1), 26-34.

Lewin, K. 1946. "Action research and minority problems". *Journal of social issues*, 2(4), 34-46.

Matsushita, K. 2018. "An invitation to deep active learning". In K. Matsushita (Ed.), *Deep Active Learning. Toward Greater Depth in University Education.* Singapore: Springer, 15-33.

McTaggart, R., and S. Kemmis. 1988. *The Action Research Planner.* Deakin: Deakin University Press.

Mitchell-Schuitevoerder, R. 2014. *A Project-Based Syllabus Design Innovative Pedagogy in Translation Studies.* Unpublished PhD Thesis: Durham University.

Moser-Mercer, B., and G. Bali. 2007. "Interpreting in Zones of Crisis and War" Paper presented at the *MIT/LINC Conference Technology-enabled Education: A Catalyst for Positive Change*, Amman, Jordan.

Moser-Mercer, B., L. Kherbiche, and B. Class. 2014. "Interpreting Conflict: Training Challenges in Humanitarian Field Interpreting". *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 6(1), 140-158.

Nicodemus, B., and L. Swabey. 2016. "Action Research". In C. V. Angelelli and B. James Baer (Eds), *Researching Translation and Interpreting.* New York, NY: Routledge, 157-167.

O'Brien, S. 2016. "Training Translators for Crisis Communication: Translators Without Borders as an Example". In F. M. Federici (Ed.), *Mediating Emergencies and Conflicts. Frontline Translating and*

Interpreting. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 85-111.

O'Brien, S., and P. Cadwell. 2017. "Translation Facilitates Comprehension of Health-Related Crisis Information: Kenya as an example". *Journal of Specialised Translation*, 28, 23-51.

O'Brien, S., and Federici, F. M. 2020. "Crisis Translation: Considering Language Needs in Multilingual Disaster Settings". *Disaster Prevention and Management*, 29(1). doi:10.1108/DPM-11-2018-0373.

O'Brien, S., F. M. Federici, P. Cadwell, J. Marlowe, and B. J. Gerber. 2018. "Language Translation During Disaster: A Comparative Analysis of Five National Approaches". *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 28, 627-636.

Parsons, R. D., and K. S. Brown. 2002. *Teacher as reflective practitioner and action researcher*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Pyle, A. S. 2018. "Intercultural crisis communication: examining the experiences of crisis sojourners". *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 46 (3), 1-20.

Rolfe, G., D. Freshwater, and M. Jasper. 2001. *Critical reflection for nursing and the helping professions: A user's guide*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schwarz, A., M. W. Seeger, and C. Auer. 2016. *The Handbook of International Crisis Communication Research*. Oxford: John Wiley.

Shackleton, J. 2018. "Preparedness in diverse communities: Citizen translation for community engagement". *Understanding Risk, Risk Reduction, Consequences and Forecasting Track. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.

Taibi, M. 2017. "Quality Assurance in Community Translation". In M. Taibi (Ed.), *Translating for the Community*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 7-25.

Taibi, M., and U. Ozolins. 2016. "Community translation: Definitions, characteristics and status quo". In M. Taibi and U. Ozolins (Eds), *Community Translation*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 7-28.

Waugh, W. L., and G. Streib. 2006. "Collaboration and Leadership for Effective Emergency Management." *Public Administration Review*, 66, 131-140.

Wright, D. E. 2015. *Active learning: social justice education and participatory action research*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Wylie, S. 2012. *Best Practice Guidelines for Engaging with Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CALD) Communities in Times of Disaster*. Available   at:

https://ccc.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Services/Civil-Defence/Be
stPracticeGuidelinesofDiverseCommunitiesDisasterMarch2012.
pdf. Accessed 14 March 2019.

Zorn, T., M. Comrie, and S. Fountaine. 2016. "Crisis Communication Research in Aotearoa/New Zealand". In A. Schwarz, M. W. Seeger, and C. Auer (Eds), *The Handbook of International Crisis Communication Research*. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 347-356.

Appendix 1 – Reading Materials

Participatory Lecture 1

Crowley, J., and Chan, J. 2011. *Disaster Relief 2.0: The future of Information Sharing in Humanitarian Emergencies*. Washington, DC and Berkshire, UK: Harvard Humanitarian Initiative/Vodafone Foundation.

Federici, F. M. (ed.) 2016. *Mediating emergencies and conflicts: frontline translating and interpreting*. New York, NY: Springer.

Greenwood, F., Howarth, C., Poole, D. E., Raymond, N. R., and Scarnecchia, D. P. 2017. *The Signal Code: A Human Rights Approach to Information During Crisis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Humanitarian Initiative. Available at: https://hhi.harvard.edu/publications/signal-code-human-rights-approach-information-during-crisis.

Participatory Lecture 2

Marlowe, J., and Bogen, R. 2015. "Young people from refugee backgrounds as a resource for disaster risk reduction." *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 14, pp. 125-131.

Pescaroli, G., and Alexander, D. E. 2015. "A definition of cascading disasters and cascading effects: Going beyond the 'toppling dominos' metaphor." *planet @ risk*, 3(1) doi: https://planet-risk.org/index.php/pr/article/view/208.

Reynolds, B., and Seeger, M. W. 2014. *Crisis and Emergency Risk Communication. 2014 Edition*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Available at: https://emergency.cdc.gov/cerc/resources/pdf/cerc_2014edition.pdf.

Participatory Lecture 3

Hirota, S. 2013. "Problems of risk communication and uncertainty in the Great East Japan Earthquake. Emerging Issues Learned from the 3.11 Disaster as Multiple Events of Earthquake, Tsunami and Fukushima Nuclear Accident". Available at: http://www.sra-japan.jp/cms/uploads/311Booklet.pdf.

Kowata, Y., Saito, M., Shibata, A., Sugiuchi, Y., Tanaka, T., Tanaka, N., Yamada, K. 2012. "The Great East Japan Earthquake in Overseas Media: Survey of eight news programs in seven countries." NHK Broadcasting Culture Research Institute, Media Research and Studies. Available at: http://www.nhk.or.jp/bunken/english/reports/pdf/re

port_12090101-2.pdf.

O'Brien, S., and Cadwell, P. 2017. "Translation Facilitates Comprehension of Health-Related Crisis Information: Kenya as an example." *Journal of Specialised Translation*, 28, pp. 23-51.

Sato, T. 2013. "How Did NHK Cover the Great East Japan Earthquake? Challenges and Prospects of Transnational Disaster Reports." 20th *JAMCO Online International Symposium*. Available at: https://www.jamco.or.jp/en/symposium/20/3/.

Participatory Lecture 4

Cadwell, P. 2016. "A place for translation technologies in disaster settings: The case of the 2011 great east Japan Earthquake." In M. O'Hagan and Q. Zhang (Eds), *Conflict and Communication: A Changing Asia in a Globalizing World - Language and Cultural Perspectives*. New York: Nova Science Publisher, pp. 169-194.

Fraser, J. 1993. 'Public Accounts: Using Verbal Protocols to Investigate Community Translation." *Applied Linguistics*, 14 (4), pp. 325–343.

Olsen, B. S. 2015. "Riding the Wave of Technology and Interpreting: finding opportunity in uncharted waters." Available at: https://www.lourdesderioja.com/2015/04/14/technology-and-interpreting-three-questions-on-every-interpreters-mind/.

Pacific Beat. 2016. "Kaikoura Maori marae plays key role in earthquake relief." *ABC Radio Interview* (23 November 2016). Available at: https://www.abc.net.au/radio-australia/programs/pacificbeat/kaikoura-maori-marae-plays-key-role-in-earthquake/8051796.

Wylie, S. 2012. *Best practice guidelines: Engaging with culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) communities in times of disaster*. Available at: https://ccc.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Services/Civil-Defence/BestPracticeGuidelinesofDiverseCommunitiesDisasterMarch2012.pdf.