

Cognitive Strategies for Effective Translation Teaching

استراتيجيات معرفية لتعليم الترجمة بفعالية

لبقية نوال* Lebekia Naouel*

lebekianaouel@gmail.com & n.lebekia@yahoo.fr

ORCID: 0009-0007-6961-5993

يخلف زوليكها Yekhelef Zoulikha

yekhelef72@yahoo.fr

ORCID:3311-3515-0004-0009

Oran university 1 / Algeria

DOI : 10.46315/1714-015-002-043

Received: 22/12/2025 Accepted: 11/05/2026 Published : 10/06/2026

**

Abstract

Translation is a cognitively demanding activity that requires continuous problem-solving, monitoring, and decision-making under limited cognitive resources. Managing cognitive effort effectively is therefore essential for developing translator competence and for sustaining pedagogical efficiency in university translation classrooms. This article integrates insights from Cognitive Translation Studies, Cognitive Load Theory, and Gile's Effort Models to examine how cognitive effort can be explicitly addressed in translator education. Drawing on qualitative, classroom-based action research in an undergraduate translation program, it presents three pedagogical interventions—task segmentation, scaffolded collaborative work, and guided reflective logging—and analyzes their impact on students' perceived cognitive load, metacognitive awareness, and translation performance. The classroom cases indicate that segmenting tasks reduces intrinsic load, collaborative scaffolding helps redistribute effort and externalize reasoning, and structured reflection fosters germane load and self-regulated learning. The study argues that "cognitive effort management" should be treated as a core learning objective in translation pedagogy, with concrete implications for curriculum design, assessment, teacher training, and technology integration.

Keywords: translation pedagogy; cognitive effort; cognitive load; problem-solving; segmentation.

ملخص باللغة العربية:

تُعَدُّ الترجمة نشاطاً معرفياً معقداً يتطلب حلاً مستمراً للمشكلات، ومراقبة دقيقة للعمليات الذهنية، واتخاذ قرارات متواصلة في ظلّ محدودية موارد الذاكرة العاملة والانتباه، لذلك، أصبحت إدارة الجهد المعرفي هدفاً بيداغوجياً أساسياً في تكوين المترجمين، لا سيّما في ظلّ التزايد المستمرّ في كثافة مهام الترجمة داخل الجامعة وسوق العمل.

* naouel lebekia (n.lebekia@yahoo.fr)

Cognitive Strategies for Effective Translation Teaching

يستند هذا المقال إلى المقاربات المعرفية في دراسات الترجمة، ونظرية العبء المعرفي، ونماذج الجهد لدى غيل (Gile)، ويعرض دراسة صقيّة نوعية تستكشف الكيفية التي يمكن من خلالها لاستراتيجيات، مثل التقسيم المرحلي للنصوص، والتوجيه في إعادة الصياغة، والعمل التعاوني، والتأمل الذاتي المنظم، أن تُسهّم في تنظيم الجهد الذهني لدى طلبة الترجمة. وقد أظهرت الحالات الصقيّة أنّ تجزئة المهام تُسهّم في تقليل العبء المعرفي الداخلي، وأنّ العمل التعاوني يساعد على توزيع الجهد بين المتعلّمين، في حين تُسهّم دفاتر التأمل في تنمية الوعي فوق المعرفي وتعزيز استراتيجيات التنظيم الذاتي. كما تُبرز النتائج أهمية إدماج بُعد «إدارة الجهد المعرفي» بصورة صريحة في مناهج تعليم الترجمة، مع تدريب الأساتذة على تصميم مهام تراعي حدود الذاكرة العاملة، وتدعم بناء المخططات المعرفية لدى الطلبة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: تعليم الترجمة؛ الجهد المعرفي؛ العبء المعرفي؛ حل المشكلات؛ الاستراتيجيات المعرفية.

**

Introduction

Over the past three decades, cognitive approaches have profoundly reshaped the way translation is theorized and taught. The so-called cognitive turn in translation studies shifted attention from static notions of equivalence and textual comparison to the mental processes that govern translation performance. Within this framework, translating is conceptualized as a complex problem-solving activity involving planning, monitoring, and evaluating at multiple stages of comprehension and reformulation. Learners are no longer seen as passive recipients of linguistic input but as active cognitive agents who construct meaning, make inferences, and manage competing demands on working memory.

Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) offers a particularly useful lens for understanding how students' mental resources are consumed during translation tasks. When novice translators confront dense or unfamiliar texts, intrinsic cognitive load increases, and limited working-memory resources may be exhausted by local decoding and lexical search, leaving insufficient capacity for higher-order decision-making. If task design also generates unnecessary extraneous load-through unclear instructions or poorly sequenced activities-performance deteriorates further. Effective translation teaching therefore requires conscious reduction of extraneous load and promotion of germane load, that is, mental effort devoted to schema construction and meaningful learning.

Gile's Effort Models complement CLT by modelling translation (and interpreting) as the interplay of partially competing efforts-comprehension, memory, and production -rawing on shared and limited processing capacity. From a pedagogical standpoint, this suggests that translator education should not only aim at linguistic and cultural accuracy but also at teaching students how to regulate and distribute their cognitive effort across stages of the task. Strategies such as segmentation, note-taking, pause-and-reflect techniques, and collaborative problem-solving become essential tools for managing mental load.

Despite the prominence of cognitive theories in translation research, their systematic integration into everyday classroom practice remains uneven. In many translation courses, evaluation still privileges the final product-accuracy and fluency-while the underlying cognitive processes receive

limited explicit attention. As a result, students often experience translation as mentally exhausting without understanding why certain tasks overload them or how they might strategically respond.

This article addresses that gap by exploring how cognitive effort can be made an explicit focus of translation pedagogy through concrete classroom interventions. The study is guided by the following research questions:

How can principles from Cognitive Translation Studies, Cognitive Load Theory, and Gile's Effort Models be operationalized in university translation classrooms?

In what ways do task segmentation, scaffolded collaboration, and guided reflection affect students' management of cognitive effort during translation?

What pedagogical implications emerge for curriculum design, teacher training, and assessment in translator education?

By answering these questions, the article aims to contribute to cognitively informed translation pedagogy and to provide practical models that teachers can adapt in diverse institutional contexts.

1. Theoretical Framework:

This theoretical framework draws on cognitive approaches to translation and recent advances in translator education, viewing translation as a complex mental process shaped by cognitive demands, instructional design, and emerging AI tools, more specifically:

a. Cognitive Translation Studies and Mental Processes:

The emergence of Cognitive Translation Studies in the 1990s marked a significant shift in the discipline, moving the focus from static textual equivalence toward the dynamic mental processes underlying translation behavior. Researchers began to explore how translators perceive, interpret, and reformulate meaning, using methods such as think-aloud protocols, eye-tracking, and keystroke logging to capture real-time cognitive activity.

From a CTS perspective, translation is seen as a complex problem-solving activity that involves comprehension, decision-making, and continuous monitoring. These mental operations demand a high level of executive control, as translators must manage competing goals: faithfulness to the source text, fluency in the target text, and functional appropriateness for the intended reader. This cognitive balancing act requires not only linguistic expertise but also strategic awareness-the ability to plan, evaluate and adjust decisions as the task unfolds.

Within this paradigm, learning to translate is viewed as a process of cognitive apprenticeship, in which students progressively internalize expert strategies through observation, guided practice, and reflection. Teachers act as facilitators who make invisible mental operations explicit, helping learners to articulate how they read, understand, and re-express meaning. This aligns with constructivist

Cognitive Strategies for Effective Translation Teaching

learning principles, emphasizing collaborative problem-solving, self-regulation, and the gradual automation of cognitive routines that free working memory for higher-level reasoning.

b. Cognitive Load Theory and Its Application to Translation Pedagogy:

Cognitive effort management is the learner’s active regulation of mental resources (attention, working memory, and processing capacity) during task performance through the monitoring and adjustment of cognitive and metacognitive strategies (e.g. segmentation, prioritization, pausing, and planning), in order to balance task demands, prevent overload, and optimize performance efficiency.

In recent cognitive research, cognitive effort is conceptualized as the adaptive allocation of mental resources in response to task demands and performance constraints, integrating both cognitive load and self-regulatory control mechanisms.

While Cognitive Translation Studies provides the descriptive framework for understanding translators' mental processes, Cognitive Load Theory offers an explanatory model for how instruction can be designed to optimize these processes. Developed by Sweller (1988) and further refined by Paas, Renkl, and Sweller (2003), CLT is grounded in the assumption that human cognitive architecture includes a limited-capacity working memory and a virtually unlimited long-term memory. Effective learning occurs when instructional conditions manage the load imposed on working memory, allowing learners to process essential information without overload, as illustrated in the following chart:



Figure n°1 :
Cognitive Load Model in Translation

In translation teaching, cognitive load manifests in several forms. Intrinsic load arises from the inherent complexity of the source text or the difficulty of the translation problem. Extraneous load stems from inefficient instructional design—for instance, when tasks are poorly sequenced or explanations are unclear. Germane load, by contrast, refers to the mental effort devoted to schema construction and meaningful learning. The challenge for the translation teacher, therefore, is to

minimize extraneous load, control intrinsic load, and promote germane load through carefully structured learning experiences.

Practical applications of CLT in translation pedagogy include segmenting tasks into smaller, cognitively manageable units, providing scaffolding and feedback, and encouraging reflection and self-explanation. For example, a teacher might ask students to translate only the introduction of a text before tackling the full document, allowing them to rehearse comprehension and reformulation strategies in isolation. Such task sequencing helps learners develop translation schemas-mental frameworks that enable more automatic processing in future tasks. As these schemas become more sophisticated, students can devote less mental energy to low-level linguistic operations and more to macro-level textual and pragmatic decisions.

c. Gile's Effort Models and Resource Management :

The pedagogical relevance of managing cognitive effort becomes even clearer through Gile's (1995) Effort Models, originally developed for interpreting but later applied to translation. According to Gile, translation involves multiple simultaneous efforts: comprehension, memory, and production, each drawing on a limited pool of cognitive resources. When these efforts compete for the same resources, cognitive saturation occurs, leading to errors, omissions, or unnatural phrasing.

For novice translators, this model highlights the importance of balancing mental energy across stages of the task. Instructors can design exercises that isolate one cognitive component at a time-for instance, comprehension-focused activities (reading and paraphrasing), memory-based drills (summarizing without reference to the text), or reformulation exercises (translating after delayed exposure). By practicing these efforts separately, learners gradually build the automaticity and resilience needed to handle integrated translation tasks with less cognitive strain.

When applied pedagogically, Gile's framework emphasizes awareness and self-regulation: students are encouraged to notice when they experience cognitive overload, analyze its sources, and develop personalized coping strategies such as note-taking, chunking, or pre-translation planning. This transforms the classroom into a laboratory of cognitive management, where learners not only acquire translation competence but also learn to monitor and optimize their own mental processes.

d. Emerging Trends in AI-Assisted Translator Education:

Recent research highlights the increasing role of artificial intelligence and adaptive learning systems in translator education. AI tools, neural machine translation, and AI-assisted post-editing can support learner engagement, terminology management, and reflective problem-solving when integrated pedagogically (Jin, 2024; Kornacki & Pietrzak, 2024).

Cognitive Strategies for Effective Translation Teaching

At the same time, AI-mediated environments introduce new cognitive demands related to evaluation and decision-making (Xu, Su, & Liu, 2024). Consequently, contemporary translator training increasingly emphasizes AI literacy, cognitive regulation, and human–AI collaboration as essential components of translation competence (Wu et al., 2024).

2. Methods:

This section outlines the research design, participants, pedagogical interventions, and data collection procedures adopted to explore the role of cognitive load management in translation pedagogy:

a. Research Design and Context:

The study adopts a qualitative, classroom-based action research design, conducted in an undergraduate translation program at Algerian universities. Action research is particularly suitable for exploring pedagogical innovation because it allows the teacher-researcher to design, implement, observe, and iteratively refine interventions in a real teaching environment. The study was carried out within a practical translation module over the course of one semester.

The instructor acted as practitioner-researcher, systematically integrating cognitive scaffolding strategies into course activities and documenting their effects on learners' behaviour and perceptions. The overall aim was to translate cognitive theory into pedagogical practice: to design tasks that explicitly address cognitive effort and to observe how students respond to these interventions across multiple instructional cycles.

b. Participants and Context:

Participants consisted of a naturally occurring cohort of **30** undergraduate translation students enrolled in a core translation module within the program. The participants demonstrated intermediate to advanced proficiency in the working languages (Arabic, French, and English) and had limited prior formal exposure to cognitive approaches to translation studies. The study was conducted within a regular classroom setting during the academic semester. Participation in the reflective and observational components formed an integral part of the pedagogical design of the course. To ensure research ethics and confidentiality, all collected data were anonymized prior to analysis and reporting.

c. Pedagogical Interventions:

Three main pedagogical interventions were designed in accordance with the constructs of intrinsic, extraneous, and germane cognitive load, as well as with Daniel Gile's Effort Models.

i. Intervention 1: Task Segmentation and Sequencing

Translation tasks were systematically segmented into smaller, thematically coherent units in order to regulate intrinsic cognitive load and facilitate progressive processing. Rather than requiring students to translate an entire 400–500 word text in a single session, the instructor first assigned

specific sections only, such as the headline and introductory paragraph, before gradually moving to subsequent parts. This staged approach enabled students to focus on comprehension, terminology, and problem identification in a more controlled manner. Classroom discussions were conducted after each stage to examine translation difficulties and possible solutions. Students were subsequently encouraged to adopt similar segmentation strategies autonomously in later tasks.

ii. Intervention 2: Scaffolded Collaborative Workshops

To reduce extraneous cognitive load and distribute mental effort across learners, students participated in structured collaborative workshops organized in small groups of three to four members. Each workshop session involved short translation activities designed to promote interaction and collective problem-solving. Before the collaborative tasks, the instructor provided explicit process-oriented guidance concerning source-text analysis, anticipation of translation difficulties, and negotiation of translation choices. Throughout the workshops, the teacher primarily assumed the role of facilitator, intervening selectively when groups encountered cognitive bottlenecks or decision-making difficulties, rather than providing direct solutions. This approach aimed to support strategic thinking and shared cognitive regulation.

iii. Intervention 3: Guided Reflective Logs

To strengthen germane cognitive load and develop metacognitive awareness, participants completed structured "Cognitive Reflection Logs" following selected translation tasks. These reflective logs prompted students to identify the most cognitively demanding aspects of the activity, explain the strategies employed to manage mental effort, and evaluate the effectiveness of their problem-solving processes. Students were also invited to reflect on possible improvements and alternative strategies for future translation tasks. The reflective practice encouraged deeper self-regulation, heightened awareness of cognitive processes, and the gradual development of autonomous learning strategies in translation performance.

d. Data Collection

Data collection relied on multiple complementary sources to ensure methodological triangulation and provide a deeper understanding of students' cognitive processes and metacognitive development during translation tasks. The study combined the following three:

i. Data were collected from three sources:

Data were collected from three complementary sources in order to ensure methodological triangulation and a richer understanding of students' cognitive processes.

Cognitive Strategies for Effective Translation Teaching

- **Classroom observation and field notes:**

The teacher-researcher systematically recorded structured field notes during classroom sessions. These observations focused on visible indicators of cognitive strain, such as signs of fatigue, hesitation, or frustration, as well as students' interaction patterns during group work. Particular attention was also given to spontaneous verbal comments reflecting perceived task difficulty or cognitive overload.

- **Students' reflective logs:**

Written reflective logs constituted a central qualitative data source, offering direct insight into learners' perceptions of cognitive load, translation strategies, and developing metacognitive awareness. Over the course of the semester, approximately **80 reflective logs** were collected and analyzed. These logs provided longitudinal evidence of how students' cognitive and strategic approaches evolved over time.

- **Student products and in-class discourse:**

Students' draft translations, along with excerpts from classroom discussions, were examined to trace changes in problem-solving strategies and decision-making processes across the semester. This source enabled the researcher to identify shifts in translation performance, the emergence of more efficient strategies, and variations in collaborative reasoning during task execution.

ii. Data Analysis:

Data were analyzed using a thematic analysis approach, following iterative cycles of reading, coding, and categorization. The analysis began with multiple close readings of all data sources in order to gain familiarity with emerging patterns. An initial coding scheme was then developed to capture references related to intrinsic, extraneous, and germane cognitive load, as well as to specific learning and translation strategies such as segmentation, note-taking, peer collaboration, pausing, and revision.

In a second stage, these initial codes were systematically compared and grouped into higher-order categories. This process led to the emergence of broader analytical themes, including perceived task manageability, distributed cognitive effort, awareness of cognitive overload, and emerging self-regulation.

Finally, representative excerpts from observational notes, reflective logs, and student translation outputs were carefully selected to illustrate and support the identified patterns. These excerpts were used to strengthen interpretive validity and to highlight key pedagogical implications derived from the data.

3. Results

The introduction of task segmentation significantly influenced how students engaged with complex translation texts. When tasks were divided into shorter, thematically coherent sections,

students consistently reported reduced feelings of cognitive overload and an improved ability to concentrate on comprehension before addressing overall textual coherence. Reflective logs frequently highlighted this perceived improvement in manageability. Representative student comments included:

"I did not panic when I saw the text because we started with only one paragraph."

"Translating in parts helps my brain to concentrate on one idea at a time."

"When I know I have to work on small pieces, I feel ready to start."

Classroom observations corroborated these self-reports, indicating a clear reduction in visible signs of cognitive strain. Students spent less time passively confronting the full text and engaged more rapidly in discussing specific translation problems within the assigned segments.

As the semester progressed, a noticeable transfer of strategy use was observed. Students began to independently apply segmentation techniques to longer texts by identifying logical units, underlining key segments, numbering clauses, and planning their translation process step by step prior to production.

An additional noteworthy observation concerned students who completed segmented tasks earlier than expected. These students often proceeded to the next section without prompting, suggesting that the reduced cognitive load associated with smaller task units enabled them to maintain sustained engagement and reduce mental fatigue across consecutive translation activities.

a.Collaborative Scaffolding and Distributed Effort:

The collaborative workshops showed that group work helps distribute cognitive effort and externalize reasoning processes in translation tasks. Students verbalized their understanding of segments, proposed solutions, and justified choices based on context, register, and target audience.

Reflective logs highlighted this experience:

"Sharing the burden with others."

"Thinking together helped me see options I would not have found alone."

"Not feeling stuck inside my head."

Classroom observations indicated a shift from isolated lexical suggestions to more strategic discussions on textual coherence and pragmatic effects.

Overall, collaborative scaffolding reduced extraneous cognitive load by clarifying task expectations, allowing students to focus more on actual translation problem-solving.

b. Reflective Logs and Metacognitive Development:

Cognitive Reflection Logs fostered a clear development in students' metacognitive awareness. Early entries (weeks 1–3) described difficulties in general terms:

Cognitive Strategies for Effective Translation Teaching

"The text was hard."

"It was tiring."

"I did not understand some words."

By mid-semester (weeks 5–7), students began identifying specific sources of cognitive load:

"Too many new terms in one sentence."

"I tried to translate and understand at the same time and it was too much."

"Cultural references confused me."

In the final stage (weeks 10–12), students explicitly named and evaluated strategies:

"When I plan the steps... my mind is less overloaded."

"I can see when my brain is saturated and I take a break."

"Writing difficult words first helps reduce memory load."

This progression reflects a shift from general effort awareness to metacognitive regulation. In Daniel Gile's terms, students increasingly recognized overload situations and applied compensatory strategies.

By the end of the semester, about 73% of students reported using cognitive effort management strategies, with improved confidence in handling complex texts.

4. Discussion:

a. Interpreting the Classroom Evidence:

The classroom findings suggest that translation competence involves not only linguistic and cultural knowledge, but also the ability to regulate cognitive resources during complex tasks. By making cognitive effort explicit, the interventions helped students reinterpret mental strain as a manageable aspect of task processing rather than a personal deficiency.

Task segmentation reduced intrinsic cognitive load by allowing students to process smaller units before integrating them into a coherent whole, in line with Cognitive Load Theory (CLT). Collaborative scaffolding decreased extraneous load through clearer task guidance and peer support, while also increasing germane load via explanation, negotiation, and justification of choices. Reflective logs further strengthened germane load by directing attention toward strategy development and metacognitive awareness.

Overall, student development in logs and discourse—from vague descriptions of difficulty to precise identification of cognitive bottlenecks and strategic responses—reflects increasing metacognitive competence, moving from initial awareness of difficulty to controlled, strategic regulation of translation processes.

b. Cognitive Effort as a Core Learning Objective:

These findings suggest that cognitive effort management should be explicitly integrated into translation pedagogy. When students understand the relationship between task complexity, working memory limits, and strategic behaviour, they become more autonomous and resilient learners.

This implies that course design should explicitly address cognitive load, strategy use, and self-regulation. Classroom discourse should also normalize discussion of mental effort and overload, reframing difficulty as a natural part of translation rather than a sign of inability. This is particularly important for supporting less confident learners.

c. Implications for Translator Training Programs:

The findings of this study highlight several important implications for translator training programs, particularly in relation to curriculum design, assessment practices, teacher preparation, and technology integration:

- **Curriculum Design:** Curricula should follow a progression of cognitive complexity, beginning with short, focused tasks that isolate specific skills (e.g. segmentation, terminology management) and gradually moving toward integrated, complex translation projects.
- **Assessment Practices:** Evaluation should include process-oriented components such as reflective commentaries, strategy reports, and peer feedback. Portfolio-based assessment can better capture the development of strategic and metacognitive competence over time.
- **Teacher Education:** Instructor training should include basic cognitive principles such as working memory, attention, and cognitive load. Familiarity with models such as CLT and Daniel Gile's Effort Models can help teachers design more cognitively appropriate tasks and recognize signs of overload.
- **Technology Integration:** Digital tools (e.g., CAT tools, terminology databases, tracking software) can support cognitive effort management if introduced gradually and with clear pedagogical objectives. However, poorly structured integration may increase extraneous load rather than reduce it.

d. Limitations and Future Directions:

This study is limited by its qualitative design and single-cohort context, which restricts generalizability and does not measure translation quality in controlled experimental terms. Future research could combine qualitative approaches with quantitative pre- and post-tests, or compare experimental and control groups.

Further studies could explore cognitive-effort pedagogy in other translation domains (e.g. audiovisual, legal, medical translation, interpreting) and with different learner populations. The

Cognitive Strategies for Effective Translation Teaching

potential of AI-assisted adaptive tools for monitoring cognitive load also represents a promising direction.

Longitudinal research following learners into professional practice would further clarify the long-term impact of cognitive-effort-based training on translation expertise development.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations:

This article has argued that cognitive effort management should be recognized and taught as a central component of translation competence. By drawing on Cognitive Translation Studies, Cognitive Load Theory, and Gile's Effort Models, and by implementing these frameworks through segmentation, collaborative scaffolding, and guided reflection, the study illustrates how cognitively informed pedagogy can transform classroom practice.

When students learn to recognize overload, articulate their strategies, and deliberately adjust the way they allocate mental resources, they become more autonomous, confident, and resilient translators. For teacher-researchers, treating the classroom as a "laboratory of cognition" opens up new opportunities to align theory, practice, and student experience in a coherent, evidence-based way.

i. Recommendations for Translation Educators:

Introduce cognitive effort management explicitly into syllabi and classroom discourse, using language that normalizes mental challenge and positions strategic problem-solving as a core competence.

Design translation tasks with deliberate attention to cognitive load: sequence tasks from less to more complex, segment longer texts into manageable chunks, and provide clear, process-oriented instructions to reduce extraneous load.

Incorporate reflective practice into assessment, asking students to articulate their cognitive processes, strategies, and areas of overload, not just to translate accurately.

Build collaborative learning opportunities into courses, recognizing that peer interaction can distribute cognitive effort and promote metacognitive awareness.

Engage in professional learning communities with colleagues to share cognitively informed activity designs and to troubleshoot implementation challenges.

ii. Recommendations for Institutional Leaders:

Provide professional development programs in translation pedagogy that include modules on Cognitive Load Theory, cognitive process research, and strategy instruction.

Allocate resources for curriculum redesign that incorporates progressive cognitive complexity and scaffolded learning pathways.

Support technology infrastructure that can reduce extraneous load (e.g., integrated CAT tools, terminology management systems) while avoiding tool overload that increases cognitive demands.

Consider reducing course loads for instructors piloting cognitively informed pedagogies, recognizing that the design of scaffolded, reflective learning environments requires substantial planning time.

Establish research partnerships with university research groups to generate evidence on the effectiveness of cognitive-effort-focused instruction in different translation subfields and contexts.

iii. Recommendations for Future Research:

Conduct longitudinal studies examining the transfer of cognitive strategies and effort management skills to professional translation practice.

Compare the effectiveness of cognitive-effort-focused pedagogy across different translation specializations (audiovisual translation, legal translation, interpreting, etc.).

Develop and validate digital tools that can monitor and visualize students' cognitive effort in real time, providing data for both learner reflection and teacher decision-making.

Investigate how AI-driven adaptive learning systems might scaffold cognitive effort management, personalizing task difficulty and feedback based on individual performance patterns.

Conduct cost-benefit analyses comparing the resource requirements and outcomes of instructor-intensive scaffolding versus technology-enabled approaches to cognitive support.

**

References:

1. Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. *W. H. Freeman*.
2. Flavell, J. H. (1979). *Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry*. *American Psychologist*, 34 (10), 906–911.
3. Gile, D. (1995). Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training. *John Benjamins*.
4. Göpferich, S. (2009). *Towards a model of translation competence and its acquisition: The longitudinal study TransComp*. In S. Göpferich, A. L. Jakobsen, & I. M. Mees (Eds.), *Behind the mind: Methods, models and results in translation process research* (pp. 11–37). *Samfundslitteratur*.
5. Hurtado Albir, A. (2017). *Multidimensional translation competence: A cognitive framework*. In A. Hurtado Albir (Ed.), *Researching translation competence by experimental methods* (pp. 15–43). *Routledge*.
6. Jakobsen, A. L. (2003). *Effects of think aloud on translation speed, revision, and segmentation*. In F. Alves (Ed.), *Triangulating translation: Perspectives in process oriented research* (pp. 69–95). *John Benjamins*.
7. Jin, Y. (2024). *Artificial intelligence and translator education: Enhancing reflective problem-solving in technology-mediated translation learning*. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 19(1), 55–72.
8. Kiraly, D. (2000). *A social constructivist approach to translator education: Empowerment from theory to practice*. *St. Jerome Publishing*.
9. Kiraly, D. (2014). *Beyond the static competence impasse in translator education*. In D. Kiraly (Ed.), *Translation pedagogy: A dynamic approach* (pp. 15–30). *Routledge*.
10. Kornacki, M., & Pietrzak, P. (2024). *Human–AI collaboration in translator training: Rethinking translation competence in the age of generative AI*. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 18(2), 134–150.

Cognitive Strategies for Effective Translation Teaching

11. Massey, G. (2017). *Process-oriented translator education: Expanding the knowledge base*. *Journal of Specialised Translation*, 28, 8–27.
12. Massey, G., & Ehrensberger-Dow, M. (2011). *Investigating translation competence: Conceptual and methodological issues*. *Meta*, 56(2), 329–341.
13. Mayer, R. E. (2005). *The Cambridge handbook of multimedia learning*. Cambridge University Press.
14. Muñoz Martín, R. (2010). *Looking at the learner: An overview of cognitive processes in translation*. *Meta*, 55(2), 301–316.
15. Muñoz Martín, R. (2014). *Situating translation expertise: A review with a sketch of a construct*. In A. Pym, D. Orrego-Carmona, & E. Torres-Simón (Eds.), *Translation research projects 5* (pp. 2–25). *Intercultural Studies Group*.
16. Paas, F., Renkl, A., & Sweller, J. (2003). *Cognitive load theory and instructional design: Recent developments*. *Educational Psychologist*, 38(1), 1–4.
17. Pym, A. (2017). *Translation skill-sets in a machine-translation age*. In A. Pym (Ed.), *Translation research projects 7* (pp. 11–28). *Intercultural Studies Group*.
18. Risku, H. (2012). *Situatedness in translation studies*. *Cognitive Systems Research*, 23, 50–59.
19. Shreve, G. M. (2006). *The deliberate practice: Translation and beyond*. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 1(1), 1–23.
20. Shreve, G. M., & Angelone, E. (Eds.). (2010). *Translation and cognition*. John Benjamins.
21. Song, L. (2024). *Cognitive sustainability and adaptive learning in translation pedagogy*. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 37(3), 421–438.
22. Sweller, J. (1988). *Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning*. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285.
23. Sweller, J., van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Paas, F. (2019). *Cognitive architecture and instructional design: 20 years later*. *Educational Psychology Review*, 31(2), 261–292.
24. Tekwa, I., Su, X., & Li, Y. (2024). *Cognitive ergonomics in AI-assisted translation environments: Implications for translator education*. *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, 32(1), 88–104.
25. Tian, Z. (2024). *Adaptive AI-supported feedback systems and self-regulated learning in translation education*. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 72(2), 611–629.
26. Wu, H., Zhang, Y., & Chen, X. (2024). *Human–AI interaction and the evolving role of translators in educational contexts*. *Journal of Specialised Translation*, 41, 95–112.
27. Xu, Q., Su, X., & Liu, T. (2024). *Cognitive load and decision-making in AI-assisted translation workflows*. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 25(1), 67–84.
28. Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). *Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview*. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(2), 64–70.