Localization, training, and instrumentalization

ANTHONY PYM

Intercultural Studies Group
Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Spain

Discourses on the cross-cultural rendering of software and websites now huddle around one of the major communication sectors of our time, known by the semi-misnomer "localization". However, the key concepts of the localization industry tend not to concern translation, which is often marginalized as a non-communicative phrase-replacement activity. This poses serious problems for the training institutions that would want to prepare translators to enter the industry. In the absence of any stable "localization competence" that might be mapped straight onto a study program, our training institutions must take steps to convey competence in the basic technologies and to develop links with the localization industry. Such links are partly strained by the very different ways in which industry and the academy convert knowledge into economic capital, and thus by the ways in which they build social networks. For sociological reasons, relations between the academy and the localization industry have not been easy. At the same time, this disjuncture should allow training institutions to offer a critical view of localization discourses and technologies, particularly of those that turn cross-cultural communication into phrase-replacement exercises. Rather than supply cheap labor for industry, intelligent training should intervene in the future of localization itself.

Keywords: localization, technology, training, translation

What "localization" means here

I use the term "localization" to refer to a general set of discourses informing cross-cultural text production and adaptation in the fields of software, product documentation, web technology, and some international news services. We find these discourses within what is sometimes also known as the "globalization, internationalization, localization and translation industries" (GILT for short), but the names change each year.

Although those four long "–ion" terms are all somehow necessary to describe what those industries do, or what kind of communication they are

From Translation Research Projects 5, eds. Esther Torres-Simon and David Orrego-Carmona,
Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, 2014. pp. 37-50.
http://isg.urv.es/publicity/isg/publications/trp_5_2014/index.htm

engaged in, the four are rarely used together, and the acronym GILT has not really caught on (perhaps due to some kind of well-deserved guilt). In the place of those four terms, we usually find the one word "localization", which at least has the serious virtues of not being an acronym and not being too long, especially when reduced to the form "L10N". The term definitely comes from the industry, rather than from esoteric theory or any felt needs of training institutions – the sad truth is that academic theory has had no historical effect on industry practices in this field, which have been happily theorizing without us. So the term "localization" has leaped out from places where money is made, jobs are created, and academia is at bay. That might be enough reason for my interest in it. But can the one term really represent the whole complex of interrelated communication processes (the thing that GILT was supposed to cover)? Can the part really stand for the whole? If not, what price do we pay for this convenient reduction? What is it covering over?

Standard definitions of "localization" usually come accompanied with definitions of the terms associated with it (the ones sharing the space of the GILT industries). Here, for example, are those offered by the Education Initiative Taskforce of the now-defunct Localization Industry Standards Association (LISA) (Fry 2003):

- **Localization** involves taking a product and making it linguistically and culturally appropriate to the target locale (country/region and language) where it will be used and sold.

- **Internationalization** is the process of generalizing a product so that it can handle multiple languages and cultural conventions without the need for re-design. Internationalization takes place at the level of program design and document development.

- **Globalization** addresses the business issues associated with taking a product global. In the globalization of high-tech products this involves integrating localization throughout a company, after proper internationalization and product design, as well as marketing, sales, and support in the world market.

We might say that there is one general process called "globalization" (here understood at the level of the individual company), of which "internationalization" and "localization" are parts. In order to globalize, you first make your product in some way general ("internationalization"), then you adapt ("localize") it to specific target markets ("locales"). The terms are by no means as standard as they may appear (Microsoft uses them very differently, especially for degrees of internationalization). Yet they encapsulate a whole logical process, a coherent view of the ways in which cross-cultural marketing can be carried out in an age of information technology and international capitalism. Together, the terms can form a whole. If the one term "localization" should simply represent that whole, it might be a matter of mere convention, and little more need be said. Yet things are not quite that simple. For example, I have described this whole as a "process of communication", but exactly who is communicating with whom through a localized product? What are the effects of the massive amounts of technology that stand between any sender (perhaps now a "developer") and any receiver (now a profiled "user")? And then, more worryingly, what is the precise role of "translation" within this wider whole? The term "translation" is indeed part of the GILT tetra; but it has no place alongside the reductions L10N or i18N (for "internationalization"). No one talks about "T09N". Translation is definitely not cool enough for a neologism.

I suggest that these simple questions, if pursued, reveal that the whole known as "localization" is far more fragmentary and problematic than it might first appear.

Many of its visions are in fact of no more than parts.

What localization is not

If this coherent set of communication processes exists, then the term "localization" should obviously not be reduced to a mode of translation constrained only by the norms of target-culture usage. That could be a correct reading of the phrase "make [the product] linguistically and culturally appropriate", which we might otherwise term "adaptation" or perhaps "re-marketing" (on a par with Ezra Pound's dictum "Make it new" in the field of poetry translation). The notion of adaptation is certainly present as a communicative ideal. One does frequently hear localization professionals state that the end user of the software, website or product documentation should be able to interact with the product in a "completely natural" way, as if the product had been developed from within the target locale. However, the economic workings of the industry are very far from such ideals. In the interests of efficiency, the communication process also involves significant *internationalization*, the production of a neutral, generic product, apparently culture-free (in fact belonging to the technical culture of the localization industry itself). Internationalization then allows for numerous modes of semi-automatic translation and multilingual content management. Those technologies in turn tend to incur constraints that are far more powerful than any ideals of pristine end-user locales, apparently unaware of where the products come from. And those constraints almost invariably ensure that the resulting language is anything but adapted or "linguistically and culturally appropriate". In sum, the ideology of localization as naturalization is a sham, a subterfuge, camouflage. The key to localization processes is *inter-*

nationalization, the initial production of the generic, and not adaptation. If you doubt it, just ask why we all still put up with the phrase “1 files left to download”, in many languages.

As a consequence of this wider context, the use of the term “localization” to denote just one part of the whole is bound to be misleading, and not just randomly so. And yet that is precisely the term that is being showcased in our training institutions, and in ways that are even more sham-ridden and camouflaging than is the case in industry. Classes in “localization” mostly turn out to be on translation technologies. Are such things needed? Of course. Should they be called “localization”? I have no idea why. A course in translation memories should be a course in translation memories. A course on how to create and translate websites does not necessarily deal with localization. A course in “how to write for translation” (i.e. how to produce texts that are going to be translated into many languages) has a lot to do with internationalization, but is certainly not teaching the whole of localization. A course on comparative cultural behavior, using the paradigms of Hofstede and the like, might reflect some of the naïve ideals of theory but is certainly not to be confused with the realities of the localization industry. Further, courses in terminology management or content management convey very useful software-application skills but do not necessarily have anything to do with localization. And even courses in project management, of the kind much needed by the industry, ultimately involve basic business management skills; they need not have anything in particular to do with localization itself. All those things are parts of localization processes since they all involve skills that are in demand in parts of the industry; none of them by itself can properly be labeled a course on “localization”.

When our training institutions, at least in Europe, offer courses and programs in “localization”, they are using a fashionable term to suggest that their teaching is somehow in tune with developments in the industry. More often than not, the institutions are repackaging traditional skills under deceptively new labels. In so doing, they offer no more than fragments of what should be seen as a wider, more complex and problematic whole.

Hence a first threat of fragmentation: Our training institutions cannot see, and in some cases not even name, the professional whole. It follows that they will train students to work in the galleys or mastheads of industry, without being able to ask where the ship is headed.

Is there a localization competence?

Of course, this use of the term “localization” within our institutions could be a simple fact of academic marketing, which has no need to be judged in terms of right or wrong (student enrollments and job placements are more significant measures). Further, the fragmentary nature of training courses is perhaps not entirely a misrepresentation; it may reflect something deeper within the localization processes themselves, and indeed within the localization industry.

Let me probe this possibility with a question: We may freely admit that our training institutions can convey numerous skills that are in demand within the localization industry, but do those skills add up to anything like a unitary "localization competence"?

It is easy enough to recognize a "translation competence", and to break that down into aptitudes, skills and knowledge that a translator should have in order to be a competent translator. An institution can then use that model in order to set about training translators, occupying as many years as it wants to inscribe in the competence. The same could be said of the various kinds of interpreters, whose professions correspond to different varieties of interpreting competence. But how can we think in those terms with respect to localization? Who or what is a competent localizer? Impossible to say—localization is carried out by teams.

When you ask that kind of question, you quickly discover that the localization industry is not configured in the same way as the traditional markets for translators and interpreters. Its training needs cannot be approached in the same way. If localization is a competence, it is certainly not one in the same way as translation and interpreting are.

Divisions of labor

Localization processes certainly do exist, at least as logical steps that a product has to go through in order to be localized successfully. Here, for example, is a basic process model for the localization of software (here adapted from Esselink's 2000 textbook):

Analysis of Received Material
Scheduling and Budgeting
Glossary Translation or Terminology Setup
Preparation of Localization Kit (materials for the translators)
Translation of Software
Translation of Help and Documentation
Processing Updates
Testing of Software
Testing of Help and Publishing of Documentation
Product QA and Delivery
Post-mortem with Client

There is a certain competence involved in getting all those things to happen in a timely and coordinated way (or better, controlling the chaos when they all happen together). That skill set is called "project management", and it is useful for any kind of work that involves teams and projects. (Note, in passing, that localization can also involve long-term maintenance or up-dating programs as well as projects, for example in the case of multilingual websites.) Within this process, there is work for people competent in terminology, revising, testing, software engineering, and yes, translation. But all those things are usually done by different people. There is no one person there who acts as an all-round "localizer". In its very nature, the localization project requires a significant division of labor. And it is in this structural and very necessary division that we might locate the underlying reason for the fragmentary visions of the process as a whole.

Some might object that project managers do indeed see the whole, and that *their* competence should properly be described as "localization". And yet, do project managers generally see what happens in the reception of the product, or in the rendition of all the languages? Managers often have to coordinate work into languages they do not know. Do they consistently see anything beyond times and quantities? Do they have time to do so? Is that their responsibility? There are many variables involved, and the project management we most like in theory will certainly require all the visions we can muster, especially those involving translation. But one must seriously doubt whether project managers really require, in the eyes of the industry, competencies other than those associated with good business and organizational skills.

One must then doubt the industrial virtues of anything like a localization competence. What industry requires, and what various training institutions can supply, are sets of skills and aptitudes, some of which may involve translation, and all of which require workers able to follow orders.

The role of translation

This brings us to the role of translation. As can be seen in the above process model, translation is commonly seen as *part* of the localization process. It is just one in a series of steps, and it is probably not the most important step (internationalization is the real revolution, and bad scheduling or a lack of testing can cost more heads than a bad translation). This state of affairs tends to upset translation theorists, whose maximum concession is to see localization as a special case of translation. The result is at best a dialogue of the deaf.

From the perspective of training, we might partly resolve the dilemma by recognizing translation and localization as two aspects of cross-cultural communication. Within this frame, localization brings in specific key elements like internationalization and, as a consequence, considerable technological mediation and teamwork. Translation, for its part, concerns multiple features of interlingual processes that are overlooked in most models of localization. It, too, has its specificity.

This way of approaching the two terms also has its geopolitical dimension. As is well known, most localization projects go from English into other languages. The labor requirements in English-speaking centers are thus likely to be quite different from those found in projects into more peripheral languages. We should not be surprised to find the United States offering many programs in technical writing (including how to write texts that are to be translated), whereas Europe invests considerably more institutional effort in training translators as such. One might also venture the general impression (awaiting some kind of empirical verification) that many project managers in the US come from business backgrounds, whereas many project managers in Europe have been trained as translators or come from backgrounds that concern languages. The *producing* centers require the skills closest to internationalization. The actual *adaptation* processes require the services of translators.

This is by no means a neat balancing act. The division of labor commonly involves reducing translation to a basic phrase-replacement process. There are several reasons for this. Translation-memory and machine-translation programs break texts into phrase and sentence units, inviting translators not to alter the renditions already in the database. The mind of the translator is consequently moved from the level of text and communication to that of phrase and formal equivalence. Alternatively, much translation work is outsourced to freelancers in the form of Excel files and the like, along with specific glossaries but rarely with indication of context. All the translator has to do is render the text at phrase level, respecting the glossary. Translators are often not trusted to do anything more spectacular. And rightly so: most of them have no specific training in the fields being localized, and they have only a vague awareness of what the entire localization process involves. If any special aptitude is required here, it might be capacity to put up with prolonged donkeywork.

That is one scenario. It embodies the fundamental paradox of localization. The communicative frame that superficially promises complete adaptation to a new locale threatens to reduce its lingual component to precisely the opposite. Translation becomes the phrase-level replacement exercise it was thought to be in the 1960s and 1970s, in the days of the linguistic equivalence paradigm. Since then, some thirty years of translation theories have increasingly seen adaptation as a legitimate part of the translator's activity. The process of localization would want to take that progress and place it in the hands of its marketing experts and desktop publishers. Translators are turned back to the basics.

There is an alternative scenario. Some localization companies (and some of their clients) are reported to appreciate that bad translations result in bad localization projects, with economic consequences at the point of the end-user. They are also aware that experienced translators have cultural skills that can help in the marketing of products in new locales. The established concept of translation as phrase-replacement is thus undergoing some revision. Yet I am unable to say to what extent this is happening, nor to what actual effect.

The role of training institutions

How might these competing scenarios be addressed within a training institution? Here are a few suggestions:

- First, students should be warned about the kind of donkeywork jobs being created in the localization industry. They should be advised to work their way, as soon as possible, into the more creative (and probably more lucrative) positions available. Even better, they should receive the added management skills needed to have them start somewhere in the environs of project management.
- Second, some means should be found to develop lines of communication with the industry, in such a way that the competencies of professional translators might become a source of shared benefits. This is happening as the odd localization professional is employed in a training institution, presumably indifferent to the salary drop. There is also a handful of academics seriously interested in discovering what is happening in the localization industry. But they are only a handful, unfortunately surrounded by crews of cultural theorists who are sure they know where everything is headed.
- Third, teamwork and project management should become parts of our training in technical translation and translation technologies. This should happen throughout the entirety of our programs, both within translation courses and in projects involving other faculties (law, engineering, informatics, etc.). Through the various modalities of inter-professional teamwork, our students should become aware of the range of services they can provide, avoiding any illusion that there is only one eternal kind of professional translator. In our own age, translators are called upon to do other tasks in addition to translating: documentation, terminology, rewriting, and especially post-editing. There is also a wide range of professionals who have to learn how to interact with experts in cross-cultural communication.
- Fourth, those training institutions that also incorporate research programs (usually at PhD level) should be seeking research contracts with the localization industry. This has been done most spectacularly by the CNGL Centre for Global Intelligent Content in Ireland, on a long-term basis by relations between SAP and several translator-training institutions in Germany, to cite two examples because I am aware of no others. As a general rule, research cooperation between

industry and the academy has been very scant, sometimes reduced to the use of students for the testing of products.

Industry vs. academics

An earlier version of this paper, written in 2006, was very pessimistic about possible relations between academics and the localization industry. Let me list the reasons for that pessimism, before moving to the more optimistic outlook that I have now in 2014.

First, academics tend not to take the localization industry seriously because they, the academics, have established themselves in apparently stable professional fields (technical translation, literary translation, conference interpreting) and see no reason to change. The new kid on the block seems to offer no more than hype and money, without the humanistic discourses still treasured by ageing teachers ("translation helps create dialogue and peace among the peoples of the earth", and so on).

Second, localization experts mistrust academics because they think that they, the academics, know nothing about the industry, or about any real-world industry for that matter. And often they are quite right.

Third, in keeping with the above, there are strange cultural differences. Localization experts use very smart cell phones; academics use email. Localization research is published as PowerPoints; academics write long meandering articles. Localization people smile all the time (happiness indicates success, which brings new business); academics look permanently distressed (our role is to be critical of the present world, knowledgeable about better things, and thus professionally discontent). Localization discourse attributes values to large impressionistic numbers, percentages of growth, the latest advance, and a revolution a week; when academics occasionally do the same, it is not uncommonly with a tinge of self-irony. Localization partners get rich or go bust; academics wallow in middling financial comfort. Localization gurus are ranked by how much they sold their last company for; academics have ranks that date back to the late Middle Ages, and we still keep the funny hats and gowns, waiting in closets for the occasional days when we show that we are speaking from another place, with other values.

Fourth, and no doubt less anecdotic, the localization industry has done much to create its own social field (in Bourdieu's sense), and part of this creation is the production of its own modes of training. Localization professionals do not simply lament that translation schools fail to produce good employees; they have developed training programs themselves. Thus we find courses offered by a "Localization Institute"[1] in the United States, the Institute of Localisation Professionals[2] in Ireland, and a search for web pages called "Localis/zation 101" gives about 4,000 hits – there are a lot of would-be industry trainers out there! In the web pages of the Localization Institute you can currently find online tutorials in things like "Game Culturalization", at a cost of US$200 per session. The 12-week self-study course in Localization Project Management costs US$600, plus US$1,450 if you sign up for the certification seminar. The client is implicitly invited to take on small online lessons, then go for bigger ones if they work. In sum, these services have adopted the money-for-knowledge practices of the Peripatetics (except that Socrates purportedly only asked for money *after* the lesson, if the student thought they had learned anything). All this happens while industry experts insist that the academic institutions thus imitated are of little practical value. The industry is doing the training, but in a very direct and financially oriented way.

Fifth, localization seminars and conferences suggest similar differences with respect to academic norms. The man in suspenders wants several hundred dollars from each participant in his seminars on internationalization; some company directors pay this, not because the expert necessarily knows more than them, but because he will be a kind of football coach, a motivation man, for the company's employees. He is a good investment. As for the actual conferences, they can cost participants some US$700 a day, and are spatially designed so that the full fee will get you to the inner circle of knowledge (people speaking and showing), whereas a reduced fee will allow you into the outer fringe of the "demonstration area". The only free knowledge is website hype. Such is industry. Knowledge has market value if it is expensive (Bourdieu might talk about the immediate inter-convertibility of cultural and economic capital), at the same time as high fees keep the riff-raff out and enable organizers to offer reductions to the people they like (for Bourdieu, they restrict the circulation of social capital—the people you know and exchange favors with). The economic is swiftly converted into knowledge and networks.

Academic seminars and conferences tend not to operate like that. In Europe, at least, we are quite good at converting cultural capital (knowledge) into symbolic capital (titles and degrees), without any quick conversion into economic capital (money). The localization industry can then only imitate the symbolic capital, and disdain the rest. Thanks to this fundamental difference, our social capital (the people we meet and know) tends not to include representatives of the localization industry, and their social capital certainly does not include us. Hence the two worlds.

However, as I have said, things have changed over the past ten years or so. In 2006, the Education Initiative Taskforce of the Localization Industries Standards Association (LISA) had seven university members, which was respectable enough, albeit just a fraction of the more than 500 translator-training institutions in the world.[3] Then LISA disappeared, apparently bankrupt. Its functions have been taken over by organizations including the Globalization and Localization Association (GALA[4]), and the Translation Automation User Society (TAUS[5]), which are doing real work on the institutional relations and tools of the industry, and which seem remarkably more open to discussions with academics. Representatives of entities like the European Language Industry Association (ELIA[6]), the European Union of Associations of Translation Companies (EUATC[7]) and the Globalization and Localization Association (GALA[8]) are occasionally invited speakers at academic conferences, and academics sporadically appear at the industry meetings. Along the way, at least to judge from the names of the organizations in Europe, the term “localization” is gradually being absorbed into superordinates like “language industry”, “translation companies”, or even, sometimes, “translation”.

Perhaps the most spectacular move in recent years has come from where one might least have expected it: the European Commission’s Directorate General for Translation (DGT). This has involved two main initiatives. First, the DGT has commissioned a series of reports on issues such as the size of the language industry in Europe, the role of English as a lingua franca, the use of intercomprehension (bilingual conversations), the status of translators, and so on.[9] It has been interested in discovering how the language industry works in Europe as a whole, and not just within its own corridors. Second, the same DGT has launched the European Masters in Translation (EMT[10]), which regularly includes industry representatives at its meetings and has spawned the research projects of Optimale, which has set out to gather data on what the industry expects of trainers. At last! So what does the industry say? What do you expect them to say, when they don’t know who is listening in: accuracy is the foremost requirement (as reported in Optimale research), the ability to follow the rules, apply the glossary, and get the right expression. Did you expect them to admit that speed and variable qualities are what constitute their bottom line? In sum, dialogue and self-report data might get us part of the way to mutual understanding, but not all the way.

One last mode of contact between industry and academics is through having doctoral students carry out research in industry or with the help of industry. Translation is perhaps one of the few areas of the humanities where this is very feasible: doctoral research is paid for by Microsoft, for example, and I have come across doctoral students who were doing their translation research for BMW, and others for an Italian manufacturer of kitchens (why not?). Over the past few years I have been involved in a European Union Marie Curie project designed to place four doctoral researchers within companies, in both the private and public sectors, for short well-paid-for stays.[11] In the part of that experience that has directly concerned localization companies, the job placements have been anything but easy (see the reports in Pym et al. 2014). The companies all respond positively at first, since any costs will be covered, there is some prestige to be gained, and the researcher might even discover something really useful. But then comes the negotiation phase: exactly what will the researcher do?, what is it possible to do?, how much will this get in the way?, then the killer, given that all real-world projects are for real-world clients, how do we allow the researcher access to confidential texts? We have mostly only been able to arrange research stays in situations where there were prior contacts between the people involved, either through the researcher having worked as a translator at the company concerned or with the people at the company, or a company researcher having reached out and placed one foot in academia (a prime example being Fred Hollowood formerly from Symantec, with his involvement in the CNGL Centre for Global Intelligent Content). Despite all the rationalist models where aims and backgrounds dovetail perfectly, cooperation between industry and academics still requires strong personal ties.

Training beyond industry

When industry and the academy cooperate, they can do so very well, bringing different insights that genuinely help open new horizons on both sides. The underlying question, though, concerns the prime aim of the cooperation, which tends to fall more one side than the other. The easy assumption is that we are both in the business of perfecting training programs: industry representatives thus tell academics what kind of skilled people they need, and academics happily supply the required products. That very simplistic assumption might work well enough for the online PowerPoints in the industry's multiplying "Localization 101" courses, but it is not likely to take us very far with respect to universities.

That is one reason why I have included *research* in the above discussion: we academics can indeed provide industry with some of the numbers, and perhaps the odd idea that they can use, but with that insistence on research, which need not be entirely dissociated from training, comes a malignant resistance to servitude. Academic researchers traditionally inherit an ethics that encourages free, disinterested inquiry, with data and results available to all. Some of us actively embrace that millennial ethos, along with the mediocre salaries it may entail. The questions we ask are *our* questions; and the answers are for *all*. There is rarely any thought of us providing numbers that directly drive the profits of any one company, or of hiding results in the name of confidentiality or financial secrets. To be sure, the actual conflicts over such matters may be few and far between. Yet the division is there, and is even cemented into place by a certain amount of mutual respect. For the most part, there are situations of reasoned exchange between professions: academics produce knowledge that may be of use; industry provides the data needed for the knowledge, which will hopefully be of use to them. All that seems fair enough, at least as far as research is concerned.

But training? Surely our aim is to ensure employment for our students? Yes and no. We lost the division between polytechnics and universities, and thereby our capacity to feign indifference to employment. But this does not mean that we have succumbed to producing users of technology, followers of guidelines, meeters of deadlines, reliable and invisible bearers of meaning from language to language. If such creatures exist, they have little need of much that we can teach. Far better, I suggest, at least with respect to the people who might indeed learn from us, to provide all those serious virtues along with something else, something along the lines of a critical capacity to think beyond the needs of industry, albeit from within it. For example, instead of applying dehumanized rules, our students might occasionally ask about who is communicating with whom, to what end, and to what common improvable purpose. This does not mean simple resistance – the charge of "dehumanization" is not necessarily a complaint about technological progress, since much of the more recent progress is precisely in highly humanizing social media. But it does mean producing graduates with a capacity to think for themselves, and to seek their own way through the labyrinths.

To summarize

The sliding of the loose terms should indicate that there is no such thing as a "translation industry", in the singular. There are only conjunctural industry demands and complaints, which are met well or badly at certain points in history, according to the varying capacities of each partner in the exchange. The really strange thing is that some of our training institutions fail to see this; they act as if we really were all in the same boat, rowing against the same winds, seeking the same port. There is no surer way, I suggest, to have the boat sink, losing benefits for all concerned.

The prime role of our training institutions should *not* be to provide immediate industry needs. We should not suddenly be adjusting all our courses to fill the labor gaps that open momentarily. We should, however, be able to train people for long, adventurous and multi-faceted careers, for the long-term well-being of both the graduate and the industry itself.

This means two things. First, we must be teaching the basic technical competence that will save the localization industry from exploiting public ignorance (none of our students should be paying for an introductory PowerPoint presentation of Trados—they should be quite good at finding all the technical information they want on the web and in discussion groups). We ignore technology at our peril; we must be there; we must teach students how to find it, learn it quickly, and move to the next release, all for free. Second, and far more important, we should be able to edge our graduates toward a critical *vue d'ensemble*, an overview of what cross-cultural communication is, of how it is being affected by technology, and of how far the current practices of the localization industry privilege numbers more than communication. And both those things should be done at the same time, if enough disaffected localizers and technocratic academics can be found.

In a word, our students should be able to work not just within the localization industry, but also beyond it. With luck, they might one day be able to communicate, rather than replace internationalized phrases.

References

Esselink, Bert. 2000. *A Practical Guide to Localization*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Fry, Deborah. 2001. *The Localization Primer*. Revised version. http://www.cit.gu.edu.au/~davidt/cit3611/LISAprimer.pdf Visited April 2003.

Pym, Anthony, et al. 2014. "Work placements in doctoral research training in the humanities: Eight cases from Translation Studies". *Across* 15(1): 1-23.

Notes

[1] http://www.localizationinstitute.com/

[2] http://www.tilponline.net/

[3] See the list of translator-training institutions at http://isg.urv.es/tti/tti.htm.

[4] http://www.gala-global.org/

[5] https://www.taus.net/

[6] http://www.elia-association.org/

[7] http://www.euatc.org/

[8] http://www.gala-global.org/

[9] See http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/publications/studies/

[10] http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/programmes/emt/index_en.htm

[11] http://eu-researchprojects.eu/time