

Translation and Language Teaching

Translation and Language Teaching:

Continuing the Dialogue

Edited by

Melita Koletnik and Nicolas Froeliger

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Translation and Language Teaching: Continuing the Dialogue

Edited by Melita Koletnik and Nicolas Frøeliger

This book first published 2019

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2019 by Melita Koletnik, Nicolas Frøeliger and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-3462-6

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-3462-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editors' Foreword..... vii

Acknowledgements xiii

Part I. The Language Didactics Perspective: Translation for Language Teaching

Chapter One..... 3

Translation and L2 Teaching's Relationship Status: From Former
"Friends" and "Enemies" to Current "Strangers"

Antigoni Bazani

Chapter Two 23

Mapping Translation in Foreign Language Teaching:
Demystifying the Construct

Lucía Pintado-Gutiérrez

Chapter Three 39

Seek and Thou Shalt Learn: Information Seeking and Language
Learning in Minority Language Translation

Päivi Kuusi, Kaisa Koskinen and Helka Riionheimo

Chapter Four..... 59

Elements of Pedagogical Translation within Teaching Foreign
Languages for Specific Purposes

Darja Mertelj

Chapter Five 83

Exploring Learners' Beliefs on the Use of L1 in L2 Learning
through Metaphor Elicitation

Aretousa Giannakou

Chapter Six	103
A Return to Translation in the Language Classroom: Iranian EFL Teachers' Perspective Mohammad Saleh Sanatifar and Ali Jalalian Daghigh	
Part II. Translation Studies Perspective: Language Teaching for Translators	
Chapter Seven.....	127
A Personalised Autonomous Model for Enhancing Translation Students' Linguistic Competence Mira Kim and Bosheng Jing	
Chapter Eight.....	147
Key Terms in Communicative Language Teaching Applied in the Training of Translators Csilla Szabó	
Chapter Nine.....	171
What a Difference Language Teaching Makes in Translator Training Eva Seidl and Elisabeth Janisch	
Chapter Ten	189
Raising Awareness of Appraisal Language among Students of Translation Agata Križan	
Part III. The Development of Translator Competence	
Chapter Eleven	215
Are we Getting it Right for our Translation Programs? A Tentative Method to Measure if we are Nicolas Froeliger	
Chapter Twelve	239
The Influence of Directionality on Student Success Rates Nike K. Pokorn and Melita Koletnik	
Contributors.....	261

EDITORS' FOREWORD

MELITA KOLETNIK AND NICOLAS FROELIGER

Recent developments in the domains of language policy and geopolitics, combined with ever-growing academic and practitioner interest, have instigated a progressive change in attitudes towards translation and its role in foreign and/or second language (L2) teaching of future language professionals and future translators. It seems that the history of this debate is centuries—if not millennia—long, and, as is often the case in such enduring situations, it is at times easy to forget the underlying reasons or arguments, and keep only the conclusions.

Following a number of pleas (for example, Cook 2010, Carreres and Noriega-Sanches 2011, Carreres 2014, Pym, Malmkjaer and Gutiérrez-Colón Plana 2013, Kerr 2014) for a more balanced examination of this role and for contributions that would objectively assess the effects of translation in real-life language classroom settings, new research has opened up interesting avenues attempting to re-establish the relative merits of translation in L2 teaching, e.g. as a legitimate and effective tool for instructing, learning and assessing foreign languages (Laviosa 2014), or as a task promoting contrastive analysis between the languages (Leonardi 2010), to name but a few.

Drawing upon convergences between the two disciplines that have emerged as a result of recent research and as a follow-up to the successful conference on Translation and Language Teaching held at the University of Maribor in Slovenia in September 2017, this volume continues the dialogue between Translation Studies and L2 Didactics by allowing for epistemological two-way traffic between the disciplines, marrying established yet so far unrelated or under-researched conceptual approaches, and presenting innovative empirical evidence from countries as far apart as Australia, Finland, Chile and Iran.

By aiming the spotlight on areas of interest that have emerged in recent decades, e. g. translation within bi-, multi- and/or plurilingualism and mediation paradigms, this volume presents and discusses selected recent research and developments that cross disciplinary boundaries. Additionally, by incorporating chapters on the application of translation in language

instruction for future translators and general considerations on developing translator competence, it answers the pleas put forward by scholars almost a quarter-century ago (e.g. Berenguer 1996) that much time could be saved by adapting the teaching of L2 to the specific needs of future translators.

Why is it a contemporary issue? Because the gradual opening of frontiers to the movement of goods, services and people is changing the place of both foreign languages and translation in most countries. There is convergence here. At the same time, the professionalization of translation programmes—a major development across Europe and beyond in the past 30 years—is changing the very definition of what is meant by translation and translators. And this calls for highly specialised teaching—and teachers—who, more often than not, lack the same background, or even ideas, as L2 teachers. Is there convergence here? Not quite. But perhaps a need for convergence, and for updating what we, individually or collectively, thought we knew about these questions. What about directionality, what about the types of texts involved, the purposes at play, and the foci? What about the emerging and future professions that have been promised to us, ones that could (possibly) change us L2 teachers and translator trainers into dinosaurs if we do not at least pay attention to them?

The debate, as stated earlier, is not new: dust has settled upon it, to the point that one might easily have considered it a closed case. The editors of this book thought it might be worthwhile to reopen and continue it, however slightly, in order to lead to a possibly brighter, greener future. This intention is summed up by the photograph of a window we chose to adorn the cover (courtesy of Juliette Dubois-Vigier).

The volume follows a tripartite structure. Part I focuses on the language didactics perspective. It brings together past and present, and explores the lesser-known aspects of the history of translation in the L2 classroom, its role in most recent L2 teaching approaches, and various methods for its application to promote students' linguistic competence. Doing an about-face, Part II shifts perspective to Translation Studies and examines selected aspects of teaching language to future translators to best address the development of their linguistic needs. Part III presents two longitudinal studies and concludes the volume with chapters debating concerns linked to the development of translator competence.

Part I is introduced by Antigoni Bazani's outline (Chapter One) of the long-standing relationship between translation and L2 teaching, which in the meantime, she believes, has reached a stage of amicable estrangement. Given the failure of the monolingual doctrine to fulfil its promises and events that shape contemporary reality, e.g. globalization, immigration, economic and social mobility and linguistic diversity, L2 teaching has

recently found a new partner in the concepts of bi-, multi- and plurilingualism, translanguaging and mediation, within which, however, the role of translation remains disputed. Lucía Pintado-Gutiérrez (Chapter Two) picks up the topic by mapping translation in L2 teaching onto the framework of mediation according to the Council of Europe's Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), drawing special attention to the most recent development of the CEFR's descriptors for mediation (2014–2016). She continues by discussing the latest mediation-related activities proposed by diverse authors in terms of how they explore various pedagogical issues, and recognizes the need to develop further specific tasks or activities involving translation.

One example of such translation-related activity comes from information seeking tasks, which are used in a project that aims to maintain and protect the endangered minority language of Karelian in Finland, and are presented by Päivi Kuusi, Kaisa Koskinen, and Helka Riionheimo (Chapter Three). Information seeking tasks constitute an important aspect of the *Kiännä!* ("Translate!") language revitalization project that operated between 2015 and 2018, and in which speakers and learners of Karelian from Finland and Russia were given seminars and workshops on professional translation skills to support revitalization of the language by producing and publishing texts in translation.

The volume then moves from minority languages to languages for specific purposes; in the next chapter, Darja Mertelj explores the use of L1 and pedagogical translation in teaching foreign languages for specific purposes (FLSP) through the in situ observation of the teachers' discourse and learners' responses during English, German and Italian classes at the tertiary level in Slovenia (Chapter Four). Despite ample literature advocating the use of L1 and translation, she concludes, it seems that even in FLSP teaching, the practice has yet to overcome cognitive or motivational biases that had amassed in past decades against translation and the use of L1.

The next two chapters study beliefs. Aretousa Giannakou scrutinizes the attitude to translation and L1 use in L2 language teaching and learning practices from the learners' perspective and through metaphor elicitation (Chapter Five). Her study setting is a Modern Greek classroom consisting of adult learners at a university in Chile. Part I concludes with Mohammad Saleh Santifar and Ali Jalalian's contribution, in which they shift the focus to educators' beliefs and give an in-depth examination of Iranian teachers' responses to a questionnaire on employing translation as a pedagogical tool in FLT (Chapter Six). In the Iranian context, they investigate issues such as

what group of learners' benefits most from such activities and what skills they promote.

Part II begins with Mira Kim and Boshen Jing's contribution (Chapter Seven). Building on the Personalised Autonomous Model, which has been developed and refined by Kim for postgraduate translation and interpreting students since 2010 and which provides a unique framework for students to individually address their own linguistic needs, develop critical thinking and support independent learning, they report on qualitative analysis of students' personal project portfolios, which are set up as an integral part of the model. In the next chapter, proceeding from the premise that translation is an inherently communicative activity, Csilla Szabó (Chapter Eight) argues for the adoption of basic tenets of the communicative language teaching tradition in the instruction of future translators, and sets out to identify parallels between them.

Elisabeth Janisch and Eva Seidl take this argument further and critically compare and contrast the didactic approaches they employ when teaching German as a foreign language at the tertiary level in a programme for modern languages and in a programme that prepares students for a Master's degree in Translation or Interpreting in Austria (Chapter Nine). Building on empirical evidence, they provide advice on how to adapt the language teaching methods to students from both backgrounds, particularly the aspiring translators. Part II concludes with Agata Križan's paper on raising awareness of appraisal language (Chapter Ten), in which she adopts the principles of systemic functional linguistics, in particular appraisal theory, to teaching translation analysis.

The papers in Part III revisit and examine the development of translation competence. Both analyse longitudinal data obtained from second-year Master's students of translation at two European institutions belonging to the European Master's in Translation (EMT) network. Nicolas Froeliger's study (Chapter Eleven) is based on students' self-observation and assesses their individual progression in 48 competences, which have been developed within the EMT network, while Nike K. Pokorn and Melita Koletnik (Chapter Twelve) correlate translation competence(s) and directionality and focus on students' success rates at examinations at the end of their translator training.

Based on the contributions in this volume, we feel safe to assume that the debate pertaining to the relative merits of translation in L2 teaching, whether for future language professionals or aspiring translators, has matured and moved on from the initial question of whether or not translation has earned a place in the language classroom. We hope that the spectrum of perspectives presented in this volume will shed new light on this debate and

respond to pleas for a more collaborative and inclusive approach to translation, as well as instigating new research questions to explore the interface between Translation Studies and L2 Didactics.

Melita Koletnik
Nicolas Froeliger
Maribor, Paris, September 2018

Works Cited

- Berenguer, Laura. 1996. "Didáctica de segundas lenguas en los estudios de traducción." In *La enseñanza de la traducción*, edited by Amparo Hurtado Albir, 9–30. Castelló: Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I.
- Carreres, Angeles. 2014. "Translation as a means and as an end. The Interpreter and Translator Trainer," 8(1):123–135.
- Carreres, Angeles, and Maria Noriega-Sanchez. 2011. "Translation in language teaching: insights from professional translator training." *The Language Learning Journal*, 39(3):281–297.
- Cook, Guy. 2010. *Translation in Language Teaching: An Argument for Reassessment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kerr, Philip. 2014. *Translation and Own-language Activities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Laviosa, Sara. 2014. *Translation and Language Education: Pedagogic Approaches Explained*. Oxon, New York: Routledge.
- Leonardi, Vanessa. 2010. *The Role of Pedagogic Translation in Second Language Acquisition. From Theory to Practice*. Bern, Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Pym, Anthony, Kirsten Malmkjær, and María del Mar Gutiérrez-Colón Plana. 2013. *Translation and language learning: The Role of translation in the Teaching of Languages in the European Union*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, we would like to thank the authors for their invaluable contribution in making this volume. We are also very much indebted to the reviewers, particularly Michelle Gadpaille of the University of Maribor, and Monique Memet and John Humbley of Université Paris Diderot, for their expert advice and effort to improve the manuscripts, and to Victor Kennedy of the University of Maribor for his generous willingness to share knowledge and experience.

This publication would not have been possible without colleagues from the University of Maribor's Department of Translation Studies and from the support services, who dedicated their time and energy to help organize the Translation and Language Teaching–TLT 2017 conference in Maribor in September 2017. Melita Koletnik would also like to acknowledge a special friend and colleague, Ian Wright, who influenced and encouraged her early academic experience.

We would also like to thank Juliette Dubois-Vigier for allowing us to use her photograph as our cover. The photograph was taken as part of her *UrbEx* project, in which she explores abandoned places in Paris, its vicinity and underground spaces.

PART I:

THE LANGUAGE DIDACTICS PERSPECTIVE: TRANSLATION FOR LANGUAGE TEACHING

CHAPTER ONE

TRANSLATION AND L2 TEACHING'S RELATIONSHIP STATUS: FROM FORMER “FRIENDS” AND “ENEMIES” TO CURRENT “STRANGERS”

ANTIGONI BAZANI

1. Introduction

One attribute that could unanimously characterise the relationship between Translation and L2 teaching is “long-standing.” Throughout the centuries, since the first time translation was employed as a L2 teaching technique, the course of this relationship has passed through the various stages of “friendship,” “engagement” and “divorce,” up to its current stage of “estrangement.” The following chapter examines this relationship, attempting to highlight both its diachronic presence, as well as its contemporary status. It first explores its past, arguing that some lesser-known aspects of its history, as well as mistakes and misunderstandings, are partly responsible for its current state. Next, focusing on the present, and more precisely on the circumstances under which this phase of “estrangement” is taking shape, it imputes the rest of the responsibility to a sense of reluctance between TS and FLT to (re)open the dialogue and (re)build their relationship.

2. The “early years” of the relationship between translation and L2 teaching

The early history of the relationship between translation and L2 teaching has attracted, thus far, less attention compared to its more recent past. In fact, Guy Cook (2007) claims that, historically, the discussion of the topic of translation in L2 teaching is mostly confined to the argumentation developed at the end of the nineteenth century against the

Grammar–Translation Method. He further cites a number of “standard introductions” in language teaching in which the topic “either does not appear at all” or “is dealt with as a historical curiosity” (ibid., 1–2). Subsequently, in order to rebuild this early part of the picture of a “largely unexplored [area]” (Laviosa 2014, 144) one would have to rely on relatively older resources. A closer inspection of these, however, reveals the “fairly unknown” and “surprising” fact that bilingual teaching methodologies—heavily dependent on the use of translation—dominated the early history of FLT.

Bell (1981), Titone (1968) and Brunner (1958) make references to a few early connections between translation and language learning dating back to Hellenistic times (Bell 1981, 79) and in the Egyptian Empire of the Eighteenth-Twentieth Dynasties (Titone 1968, 6). Kelly (1969) perpetuates that “translation did not originate as a school exercise, but as an administrative necessity in the multilingual empires of 3,000 years ago” (ibid., 171–172). He traces the first instances of translation practice for pedagogical reasons to the third century B.C., based on the need to learn Latin in order to participate in the life of the Roman community. Thus, translation entered the elementary class in the Greek communities of the Roman Empire in the form of bilingual word lists, a grammar drill exercise called a *cycle* and bilingual manuals including dialogues on daily life (1969, 24, 115). The communicative focus underlining these primitive forms of L2 teaching was complemented by the fact that both Greek and Latin teachers used the same bilingual manuals in order to teach the young Romans both languages at the same time, manifesting the bilingual *modus* in the earliest L2 teaching methodologies.

Similar bilingual patterns prevailed in the subsequent centuries, even during the Middle Ages, described as “the only period from which it [translation] is largely absent” (Kelly 1969, 171). Alfred the Great’s ambitions (in the eleventh century) regarding the teaching of the Anglo-Saxon language relied heavily on the practice of translation. His efforts included Aelfric’s Grammar, a first step towards a contrastive and comparative method between Latin and English grammar (Hall 2009, 202), as well as Aelfric’s Glossary, also described as the first attempt at a bilingual English glossary (Thompson 1981, 155–57). In fact, Hüllen (2006, 66) praised Aelfric’s combination of grammar with a universal word-list, arguing that “translation combined both ways of teaching and learning in order to ensure correct semantization.”

From the fourteenth century onwards, translation assumed a more specific role in the history of L2 teaching methodologies (Kelly 1969, 137), which is quite intriguing, considering the shift in the L2 teaching

context of the time. More precisely, although in antiquity and the Middle Ages Latin and Greek were the languages of language teaching and academic learning, during the Renaissance period modern languages entered the curriculum alongside classical ones (Mackey 1965, 141). The move was dictated by an “increased interest in the European vernaculars as cultural vehicles and as languages worth studying in their own right” (Rutherford 1988, 16), effectively shifting the focus of L2 teaching to functionality and oral communication, instead of literature study and formalities. As Bell (1981, 80) argues, in the Renaissance “even Latin and Greek were taught to be spoken and only secondarily written.” This set of “direct” teaching priorities, which resembles to a high degree the L2 “direct” teaching mentality prevailing in the twentieth century, paradoxically, did not call for a rejection of translation for teaching purposes, as it did later.

On the contrary, the introduction of the teaching of modern languages during the Renaissance was naturally based on the way Latin was taught in the best schools of that period, and that involved the task of translation. Some of the most typical examples of how translation was implemented in the L2 lessons of that period include the “vulgar” (Kelly 1969, 173), the “double translation” or back translation, and “interlinear” translation, already quite common since the medieval age in Europe, or “parallel” translation (Kelly 1969, 145). In other cases, use of translation more closely resembles a teaching approach, as in the case of Hamilton, who treated translation as “an inductive method of sorts, as the pupil was expected to make the connection himself between the translation and the original” (Kelly 1969, 147). Notwithstanding some astonishing similarities between the Renaissance and more recent L2 methodologies (Bell 1981, 80), Kelly (1969, 138) pinpoints that translation was not a standard feature in the teaching of modern languages until the beginning of the nineteenth century, when, retrospectively speaking, its relationship to L2 teaching would start receiving a series of systematic criticisms.

3. The “engagement” and the “divorce” period

Ironically enough, until the end of the eighteenth century, translation did not have an “intense” relationship with grammar. Kelly maintains that “there was little use of [it] in grammar learning” (1969, 51), although it had a constant presence in L2 teaching. In fact, Mackey (1965, 153) distinguishes between two early learning approaches, the “Grammar Method” and the “Translation Method.” This distinction is indicative of the two major L2 teaching attitudes and activities up to that time: study of grammar and use of translation. Whereas the latter was primarily used for

expanding the vocabulary, comparing different aspects of the languages and teaching the skills of reading and writing (Kelly 1969, 218), the first one gradually became an end in itself, manipulating at the same time the use of translation.

Several factors contributed to translation's "engagement" with *grammar*. The idea of learning an L2 via one's own was one reason. This was picked up by scholars at Port-Royal, a grammar school in seventeenth-century Paris, where teachers showed more interest in teaching the vernaculars rather than Latin and Greek, and developed an early concept of "Universal Grammar"—a belief that all languages share similarities and common characteristics. This led to the assumption that the best model for teaching one's language would be the teaching model of the classical languages, which made use of translation for grammatical purposes. Moreover, consideration of the "vulgar," a type of translation exercise used in Renaissance England as an aid to grammar learning alongside Meidinger's *Praktische französische Grammatik* (1783), which favoured translation into the L2 by applying grammar rules, also contributed to preparing "the climate for translation methods in grammar learning by postulating that there was one basic system for all" (Stern 1983, 51–52). Stern critically points out that, despite the evidence that both grammar and translation formed part of L2 teaching for centuries, there is no full and carefully documented history of grammar-translation, whereas the regular combination of grammar rules with translation into the L2 "as the principal practice technique became popular only in the late eighteenth century" (*ibid.*, 453).

By that time, the Grammar-Translation Method appears to have dominated the L2 teaching scene in Europe (Kelly 1969, 454). Translation's regular "misuse" and "overuse" in this relationship is best illustrated in some of the most influential textbooks of that period (Ollendorf 1840; Plötz 1894). Titone (1968) maintains that these grammars not only provided the reader with a clear idea of the current mindset, but were also responsible for perpetuating the obsession with grammar that would later follow (1968, 27). In the aftermath of the Grammar-Translation Method, the Direct-Methodists could no longer identify comparison between the L1 and the L2 as beneficial for the learning of a foreign language; hence, the value of translation as a teaching tool gradually diminished, until its official "divorce" from the L2 teaching.

The first subsequent years were unanimously considered as years of reform, but views on what this "reform" should entail, including the presence within it of translation, differed widely (Stern 1983, 98). To put it differently,

The only period in which the priorities of the various skills were clear-cut was the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when written skills, in the form of translation, dominated the classroom. In every other period teachers have adopted contradictory approaches, each group finding valid arguments to defend its position.¹

This becomes even more evident in the second half of the twentieth century, which witnessed the birth of some of the most prominent language theories and teaching methods of that century. More specifically, the behaviourists' and structuralists' firm stand on the negative role of students' L1 in L2 acquisition meant that translation became the least favourite teaching tool in the audiolingual language classrooms (Johnson 2001, 173–5), although not completely rejected (Stern 1983, 464). A similar approach is found in the Communicative Approach, based on the concept of “communicative competence” (Hymes 1972), which suggested a judicious use of translation and L1 only if needed (Richards and Rodgers 1986, 66, 83). Discouraging use of translation for L2 teaching purposes underlined the “official break-up” of the relationship between translation and L2 teaching during the twentieth century; “unofficially,” however, it left enough space for “affairs.” These occurred sporadically, on a personal level (L2 teachers and learners “secretly” continued using it), on a method-level (Suggestopedia, Community Language Learning) and on the research level (Malmkjær 1998), until the moment was right for the relationship to enter a new phase.

4. Translation and contemporary L2 teaching: New era, new relationships

Towards the beginning of the twenty-first century, the relationship between translation and L2 teaching entered a new era. Leaving behind years of heated debate on its benefits or disadvantages, the relationship seems to have been moving towards a different consensus: translation and L2 teaching currently stand next to each other, as separate subjects as well as independent disciplines, but their connection to each other for L2 teaching purposes depends on whether translation bears any relationship to the contemporary L2 teaching scene around Europe. Thus, it could be argued that the key element in this investigation lies in the examination of the L2 teaching theories and methodologies emerging since the dawn of the new century, and whether they encourage their (re)connection with

¹ Kelly 1969, 218.

translation. Paradoxically, the answer to this question appears to be both positive and negative, drawing once again a quite ambiguous picture of the use of translation in L2 teaching, but this time for different reasons.

4.1. The fall of the “monolingual doctrine”: A reconnection motive

Perhaps the most significant factor contributing to the rise of contemporary bi-/multilingual teaching approaches is the deconstruction of the Monolingual Doctrine. Formal language education has traditionally displayed a “monolingual bias” supporting the view of “one speaker, one language” (Pavlenko 2005) and upholding, therefore, that “[...] use of translation in the classroom could do more damage than good” (Carreres 2006, 2). Despite the prevalence of this view, the pedagogical value of monolingual teaching practice has been challenged, from various perspectives. More specifically, recent cognitive research on bilingualism confirms the view that a speaker’s linguistic systems (L1, L2, L3 etc.) are based on a common conceptual system in the human brain (Cook 2001; Proverbio et al. 2007; Grosjean 2010). The findings provide a theoretical framework for the idea that incoming information in a bilingual brain must be matched up against prior knowledge, which is used as a basis in order to understand and learn more (Cummins 2007). Supporting use of translation in this context, Carreres (2006) argues that L2 learners will inevitably refer to their L1 and make use of translation to assist the process of L2 acquisition (2006, 6), echoing what Titford has earlier called “translate silently” (1985, 78).

Colina and Garcia Mayo (2009) challenge the view of L1 as a source of cross-linguistic influence. They praise the use of translation in order to counteract L1 interference and “one-to-one correspondence” (Lederer 2003) and argue that it provides “an easy avenue to enhance linguistic awareness and pride in bilingualism” (Malakoff and Hakuta 1991, 163). Addressing fears that translation allows uncontrolled use of L1, evidence has shown that judicious and not exclusive use of L1 is crucial to save time for “classroom management” and “feedback providing” (Inbar-Lourie 2010), for facilitating more comprehensible input (Krashen 2006), and for assisting with cognitively demanding L2 tasks (Nation 2003).

Notwithstanding all the above, in recent years, use of L1 in the L2 classroom appears to have stepped out of a “strictly” pedagogical context, and is no longer justifiable “only as a crutch in additional language learning” (Escobar and Dillard-Paltrineri 2015, 307). On the contrary, L1 usage is currently also prescribed for socio-ideological and political

reasons, closely related to the view that “monolingualism is no longer considered as the default for human communication” (Escobar and Dillard-Paltrineri 2015, 302). This perspective on L1 usage is primarily fuelled by external phenomena (e.g. globalisation, immigration, socio-economical mobility, challenges to the hegemonic languages, etc.) which have been constantly transforming the linguistic and cultural structure of societies, and therefore of the language classroom too. The phenomenon of superdiversity (Blommaert and Rampton 2011) effectively puts under the microscope the reality of the emergent multilingual classrooms. In order to contemplate these teaching environments and the identity of the newly emergent bilinguals—both as learners and entities—their communicative practices need to be observed and analysed. Therefore, new L2 teaching approaches have been emerging, attempting to take into account the whole spectrum of the functions and nature of L1 use in these L2 contexts (Escobar and Dillard-Paltrineri 2015, 307).

4.2. Translation as a “stranger” to plurilingualism and translanguaging

Surprisingly enough, according to contemporary L2 teaching approaches, emergent bilinguals seem currently to code-switch, code-mix, translanguague or mediate across their languages, in an unofficial manner for communication purposes, but they do not appear necessarily to translate/interpret across their languages. In order to contemplate the reasons for the “uncertainty,” to say the least, surrounding the role of translation in these contexts, one needs to further explore these communicative strategies and discursive practices, currently shaping the plurilingual teaching context.

Starting with a definition of the latter, the introduction of plurilingualism to the L2 teaching scene is often associated with the *Common European Framework of Reference* (CoE 2001), a widely accepted and non-prescriptive document on L2 education policies. CEFR distinguishes between “multilingualism” and “plurilingualism,” maintaining that, whereas multilingualism refers to the social organisation of several languages in specific social and educational contexts, plurilingualism refers to “an individual repertoire of linguistic competence” (CoE 2007a, 17). Álvarez and Pérez-Cavana (2015) point to the fact that in the secondary literature the two terms are frequently used interchangeably, and that other terms have also been used to describe similar concepts (Jørgensen et al. 2011). Notwithstanding the different terminology, plurilingualism rejects the idea of “multiplied” monolingualism (Lähteenmäki et al. 2011), as well as the

idea of “one, ideal native speaker.” Most importantly, plurilingualism, as a “changing repertoire over time” (Kivinen 2011, 16), is defined by the element of “ordinary imbalance” (CoE 2009, 11). The latter, understood as partial but at the same time functional competence, stands at the very core of plurilingual education, effectively embracing the development of plurilingual competence and intercultural education.

In this context of plurilingual education, the role of L1 in L2 teaching becomes indisputable, but not necessarily the role of translation in it. Few research studies currently connect a plurilingual approach explicitly with translation use. One such attempt is the didactic Integrated Plurilingual Approach (IPA) model. Inspired by the overall acceptance of the CEFR in Spain, it reports how teachers appear to advocate the use of pedagogically based translation, as a “not literal, but contextualised, i.e. communicative and meaning-driven” activity, which can promote plurilingual thinking, thus, reconceptualising translation as a translanguistic practice (Esteve et al. 2015, 6). In another example, Corcoll Lopez and Gonzalez-Davies describe and compare “two specific plurilingual learning strategies,” as means to advance communicative development through language in action (2016, 67). Specifically, “Pedagogically Based Code-switching” (PBCS) and “Translation for Other Learning Contexts” (TOLC) are considered as learning and communicative strategies which can both be implemented in a long-term, plurilingual approach aimed at training plurilingual speakers. The latter attempt is based on the notion of translanguaging which, in this case, is explicitly connected to translation.

Nevertheless, the relationship between translation and translanguaging appears to have more of an enigmatic character. Pointing precisely to this aspect, Williams (1996), who first coined the term “translanguaging” in the context of bilingual English-Welsh language teaching, argues that it requires a deeper understanding than just translating, as it moves from finding parallel words to processing and relaying meaning and understanding. This definition, however, admittedly restricts the concept of translation to a mere process of establishing linguistic equivalence between languages. Garcia and Sylvan maintain that, although the notion of translanguaging includes the practice of translation, it differs from the “simple practice” of translation, in that it refers to the process by which bilingual students perform bilingually in the classroom (reading, writing, taking notes, discussing, signing, etc.) (2011, 389).

Also intriguing is the relation between translation and specific translanguaging strategies, such as use of “bilingual reading/writing partners,” “multilingual books and language tools,” “practice writing for a bilingual audience,” “mak[ing] connections between words,” “brainstorm[ing]

using different languages,” “listening to translations” and “using Google Translate” (Celic 2012). Although the practice of translation can be identified in these strategies, its explicit use as such is either discouraged or not mentioned at all. Ironically, however, most of the above translanguaging strategies have already been described as bilingual/multilingual translation exercises (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009), in support of the students' right to use their L1 in L2 teaching. The negative bias towards the (explicit) connection between translation and translanguaging is equally profound in Fallas Escobar and Dillard-Paltrineri's case study, where they set out to investigate the beliefs of teachers and students about use of translanguaging in the L2 classroom. Their interview findings indicate a general rejection of translanguaging because “L1 use in the classroom too closely resembles translation and would detract from the methods of communicative language teaching” (2015, 312), but acceptance of translanguaging as a natural form of communication for multilinguals.

Considering translanguaging from a different perspective, Li Wei turns to the discipline of TS for some answers. He introduces the concept of “translanguaging space” and argues that this is “a space for the act of translanguaging as well as a space created through translanguaging,” or else “a space where the process of what Bhabha calls “cultural translation” between traditions takes place” (2011, 1222). In an analogous example, Al-Hassnawi draws a comparison between “translanguage” and “interlanguage” in order to explain translanguaging. He argues that if

[...] learning strategies and the communicative competence of the FL learners generate Interlanguage [...] translation strategies and translation competence generate Translanguage.²

He sees interlanguage as the product of foreign language learning and translanguage as the product of translation, or more precisely as “an approximate form of translation product, which falls midway between SL and TL, with various degrees of approximation to either language” (2010, 3). Therefore, whereas interlanguage might be understood as an “imperfect” but “acceptable” form of language during the L2 learning process, translanguage might be also understood as an “imperfect” but “acceptable” translation product during the translating process. Surprisingly, although drawing parallels between the disciplines of TS and FLT evidently provides useful insights into how translation and the current plurilingual teaching approaches are related, the idea appears to be less than attractive, especially in the next case of language mediation.

² Al-Hassnawi 2010, 7.

4.3. Translation as a “stranger” to language mediation

Olmedo (2003) considers language mediation as a holistic approach that facilitates bilingual education, next to plurilingualism and translanguaging. In European higher education contexts, L2 acquisition and translation/interpreting are frequently combined subjects in a variety of under-/postgraduate degrees aiming to develop primarily intercultural mediation skills. At the level of school education, the relation amongst the concepts of L2 learning, mediation and translation was first introduced in the context of CEFR (2001). According to its authors, mediation is construed as an act of communication between parties “who are unable to understand each other directly—normally (but not exclusively) speakers of different languages” (CoE 2001, 87). The language user who performs the act of mediation is conceived simply as “an intermediary between interlocutors” (CoE 2001, 87) and as such they are not expected to express their own meanings. Within the Framework, both translating and interpreting are introduced as examples to practice mediation (next to paraphrasing, summarising, etc.). Translation in particular is defined as a case of producing a parallel text in a different language or code (CoE 2001, 99).

The initial lack of illustrative scales with can-do statements for the act of mediation (Little 2007, 646) as well as the brief outlining of mediation strategies (Atabekova et al. 2012, 6) have prompted North and Piccardo to draft the document *Developing Illustrative Descriptors of Aspects of Mediation for the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR)* (2016). This recent document identifies interlingual mediation as a specific type of the more general concept of language mediation and reasserts the view of translation/interpreting as meaningful ways to practice it. Its inclusion also of elaboration of both concepts, mediation and translation, could be held as answering the criticism that the initial suggested relationship has caused.

Indeed, since translation was introduced as a way to practice mediation, the relationship between the two has triggered a more explicit reaction by researchers and language teachers than in the case of plurilingualism and translanguaging. The arguments, which support a similar view of “estrangement,” are not built on the pedagogical value of translation as an inefficient L2 teaching tool. Instead, they rest on some very specific views of the translation concept, and its comparison to the concept of mediation, which appears to be *something different*, hinting, therefore, towards a problem of definition of the two concepts. Although Garcia has already argued the differences between translation and

translanguaging (see 4.2), the polemic against translation and mediation is fiercer. Mader and Urkun (2010), for instance, argue that

[...] some of what is said in the CEFR about mediation seems inconsistent. This poses a dilemma, as in some places in the CEFR mediation is taken to mean translation / interpretation, in others the central meaning is that of mediation in intercultural contexts, which broadens and changes its significance and may lead to a different interpretation.³

Their arguments offer a first indication of how translation is being distinguished from mediation. The latter appears as a broader concept, encompassing two different directions; one is translation, which is more concerned with the accurate transfer of the linguistic features, and the other is intercultural communication, which they do not consider as part of the translating process. Atabekova et al. also heavily criticise the link between mediation and translation, maintaining that viewing the concept of mediation from the perspective of translation and interpretation “restrict[s] the activity under study to the language usage field, thus shadowing those challenges that emerge in the course of intercultural communication” (2012, 6). Looking for an explanation, Byram (2008) detects translation's disassociation from the cultural element in the phrases used to describe the concept of translation in CEFR, such as “finding a ‘corresponding’ or ‘parallel’ text,” “translation of example sentences” and “translation equivalence.” He cautions that, although the above phraseology would be considered rather “simplistic” by translators (vigdis.hi.is), from the L2 teachers' point of view it could “mistakenly” evoke Grammar-Translation practices—which would provide a reason “good enough” to avoid or ignore any link of mediation to translation. Be that as it may, in the given case of language mediation, the concept of translation as a word-for-word exercise is not accused of causing interference and hindering L2 acquisition; it is rather contrasted to the way the concept of mediation is practiced in the L2 classroom.

More precisely, taking a look at the implementation of mediation in the L2 school education context around Europe, it seems that mediation tasks have been incorporated in the Greek national curriculum, as well as in several cases in Germany⁴. However, use of translation as a mediation activity is typically discouraged (Dendrinos et al. 2010; Pym 2013). Moreover, an EU study that has recently reviewed the role of translation in

³ Mader and Urkun 2010, 18.

⁴ Every federal state in Germany has its own school system; however, FL learning is compulsory across all states.

L2 teaching reveals that, apart from Germany, none of the other participant countries⁵ appears to have taken a special interest in the concept of mediation (Pym et al. 2013). Even in Germany, the link between mediation and the concept of translation has not been well received. For example, mediation is treated as a separate, fifth skill in the secondary education curricula in Niedersachsen, although, according to Hallet (2008, 3), the other skills should also be integrated into mediation. In fact, in Hallet's account, translation and interpreting are skills that differ from mediation on the basis of their high demand for equivalence, as well as the demand for excellent language skills and special training (Hallet 2008, 4–5).

A similar conceptualisation is shared by Stathopoulou (2013). She asserts that translation “concerns professionals whose main goal is to transfer as closely as possible meanings [...],” whereas Dendrinos explains that mediation is “a form of everyday social practice” which is indeed “altogether different from professional translation and mediation” (2006, 16). Consequently, translation, as discussed in this specific L2 teaching context, appears to move away from the notion of a pedagogical activity and become more of a separate professional one. This particular “assigning of roles,” however, is what effectively turns translation into a “stranger” to L2 teaching. In other words, mediation, understood as a flexible and dynamic form of interlingual and intercultural communication, has been currently assigned a pedagogical role in the L2 classroom, incorporating the benefits of “pedagogical translation.” Translation, on the other hand, understood only as a different and separate, strictly professional activity, appears to have no pedagogical role in the L2 classroom.

These narrow conceptualisations reconfirm the assumption of a definition problem with regards to translation. Moreover, such views seem to be based more on individual fears and personal interpretations of the CEFR rather than on an inclusive view of the concept of translation that is at ease with contemporary definitions of translation in the field of TS. Further reinforcing this assumption, Tocatlidou claims that translators, like interpreters, as opposed to mediators, should remain totally “invisible” in the produced discourse, and “true to the original text which they are required to respect,” without having “the ‘right’ to change the discourse, genre or register of the text they are producing [...] nor resort to reported speech” (cited in Dendrinos 2006, 17). At first sight, her views may be advocated, or rejected, by both L2 teachers and translators. What is

⁵The participant countries were Finland, Poland, UK, Spain, France, Germany, Croatia, China, Australia and the USA. Greece was not included in the study.

particularly significant, however, at this point, is not the stand L2 teachers and translators take on the translator's ethics, but their level of knowledge of the critical debate on the role of translator as mediator, a debate that has been taking place within the discipline of TS for years. Since translators must undoubtedly become aware of the various aspects of this issue before deciding on their translating approach, one might wonder whether L2 teachers should become equally acquainted with the role of the translator as a language mediator, before establishing their opinion.

That said, Howell (2017, 152) offers a rather positive perspective to the discussion of this topic. In his attempt to raise awareness of the benefits of incorporating cross-language mediation in the EFL curricula in Japan, he considers mediation as a way of adapting "the traditional means of translation to a more task-oriented and communicative style of teaching." At the same time, the suggestion by North and Piccardo (2016) for a more functional and informal communicative view of translation as a way to practice *interlingual* mediation could also stir a positive reaction.

The apparent breakdown of communication between the two disciplines of TS and L2 teaching has been accurately pinpointed by Pym (2014). He argues that the culprit for the inconsistent use of the terms "translation" and "mediation" in the educational language context—especially, but not exclusively of school language education—is the discrepancy between the two disciplines. Digging a little deeper, he uncovers that the problem relates, firstly, to the

[...] teachers and policy makers' lack of awareness regarding the development of the TS discipline for the past thirty years, as well as their ignorance of even basic concepts and theories in the field.⁶

Indeed, contemporary translation studies can offer an array of critical resources with which to better understand the seemingly problematic relationship between translation and mediation in the language teaching context, ranging from various theories on the notion of equivalence, functional approaches and the Skopos theory, the Relevance theory, cultural studies, translation ethics, including the role of the translator as a cultural mediator, to "the general acceptance that translation is a mode of transformation" (Pym 2014, 192).

Adding a historical perspective to the relationship between translation and mediation, Pym recalls that initially:

⁶ Pym 2014, 192.

[...] the term Sprachmittler (language mediator) has been used with reference to translation and interpreting, [...] in the Leipzig school of Translation Studies in the 1970s [...]⁷

However, as Pym continues, the term “mediation” gradually became synonymous with any act of interlingual communication, whereas “translation” and “interpreting” were construed as specific forms of mediation, constrained by equivalence. This fact was supported by a slight diversion of the use of mediation within the field of research on bilingualism, as Knapp and Knapp-Potthoff (1985) referred to it to describe interlingual communicative acts between lay bilinguals (Pym 2014, 193–194). On the other hand, Harris and Sherwood (1978) had already described translation as a “natural” and an “innate skill,” referring to its use as an act of communication between lay bilinguals. In accordance with that, the term “language brokers” (Baker 2001) has also been used in the context of globalised societies, referring to non-professional translators/interpreters who assume the role of language mediators. Acknowledging the tragic irony, Pym concludes that whereas the concept of “translation” is synonymous with “mediation” in German-language TS, it remains a very limiting and narrow concept for the language-learning experts, who fail to make the connections (Pym 2014, 293), thereby suggesting “interdisciplinarity” as the only possible antidote to the problem of miscommunication between the two disciplines of TS and L2 teaching.

5. Conclusion

The idea of interdisciplinarity is a current attribute of many disciplines, including TS and FLT. Discussing interdisciplinarity from the perspective of TS, Cem Odacıoğlu and Köktürk (2016, 4) argue that, since its establishment as a discipline on its own, TS has had a long relationship with several other disciplines, including literature, linguistics, history, sociology, etc. Without rejecting interdisciplinarity, they believe that it is currently the concept of “transdisciplinarity,” or the transgression of former borders, that will best advance the progress of the translation discipline and translation teaching in particular (*ibid.*, 4). At the same time, Stapleton (2014, 438) argues for “an interdisciplinary leap” within FLT—a move from the thus far limited impact of the social sciences on L2

⁷ Pym 2014, 193.