Translation literacy in additional language learning: Closing the conceptual divide between translation and language education

Gary MASSEY
ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences
IUED Institute of Translation and Interpreting
Theaterstrasse 15c, CH-8401 Winterthur
mssy@zhaw.ch

"Translation literacy" ("Übersetzungsliteralität") definiert sich als reflexives und evaluatives Wissen über die Art und Weise, wie Übersetzung funktioniert, wie sie in bestimmten Kontexten nützlich sein kann und welche Implikationen sich daraus ergeben, wenn sie zur Erfüllung bestimmter Kommunikationsbedürfnisse eingesetzt wird. Einen solchen Kontext bildet die Fremdsprachendidaktik. Das wiedererwachte Interesse an pädagogischer Übersetzung zur Förderung mehrsprachiger interkultureller Kompetenz, metalinguistischer Reflexion und individueller Selbstwirksamkeit in der Sprachausbildung spiegelt sich in zahlreichen Publikationen wider, die sich mit Themen von der Spracherwerbsforschung bis hin zur Sprachpolitik auseinandersetzen. Dennoch stellen Forschende eine anhaltende Kluft zwischen Übersetzung und Sprachunterricht fest. Diese lässt sich auf eine irreführende instrumentalistische Auffassung der Übersetzung als binäre, äquivalenzorientierte Tätigkeit zurückführen. Der vorliegende Artikel befasst sich mit der fortlaufenden Rekonzeptualisierung von Übersetzung als hermeneutisch-interpretativer, adaptiver interkultureller Mediation, die unseren zunehmend viel- und mehrsprachigen Gesellschaften einen erkennbaren Mehrwert bietet. Voraussetzung für den wertschöpfenden Einsatz pädagogischer Übersetzung in der Fremdsprachendidaktik ist eine umfassendere, auf einer vertieften Auseinandersetzung mit aktuellen Modellen, Forschungserkenntnissen und Ansätzen der Übersetzungswissenschaft und -didaktik beruhende "Translation literacy".

Stichwörter:
Translation Literacy, Übersetzungsdidaktik, Übersetzungskompetenz, Fremdsprachendidaktik, Interkulturelle Mediation, professionelle Übersetzung, Hermeneutik, Äquivalenz.

Keywords:
translation literacy, translation didactics, translation competence, additional language learning, intercultural communication, professional translation, hermeneutics, equivalence.

1. Introduction

The second definition of the word "literacy" in the online *Oxford English Dictionary*[1] describes its extended use as "the "ability to 'read' a specified subject or medium; competence or knowledge in a particular area". Bowker and Buitrago Ciro (2019: 33) make the point that new literacies are identified and labelled as societal needs evolve. "Information literacy", for example, was first coined in a report addressing the gap between the general and information literacy observable in the US population (Zurkowski 1974). By 2009, it had found its way into U.S. President Barack Obama's proclamation of October as

---

[1]   URL: https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/109054

"National Information Literacy Awareness Month", in which he called for Americans to "be adept in the skills necessary to effectively navigate the Information Age"[2]. A decade later, the term was categorised as a sub-form of a progressively expanding "digital literacy" (UNESCO Institute for Statistics 2018: 6) – the ability to access, manage, understand, integrate, communicate, evaluate and create information safely and appropriately through digital technologies.

A sub-category for digital literacy that has very recently emerged is "machine translation (MT) literacy" (Bowker & Buitrago Ciro 2019; O'Brien & Ehrensberger-Dow 2020): knowing how MT works, how it can be useful in a particular context and what the implications are of using MT for specific communicative needs. Proceeding from this definition, the present article applies and discusses the superordinate concept of "translation literacy", that is to say knowing, evaluating and reflecting on the way translation in general works, how it can be useful in the specific contexts of additional language learning (ALL), and what the implications are of using it to meet ALL needs.

2. Addressing misconceptions

How is translation literacy relevant to ALL? Since the turn of the century, a growing body of literature has advocated a multilingual view of ALL, with the aim of reinstating various forms of translation and translanguaging that had long been marginalised by immersive communicative approaches to language learning. A landmark in this "multilingual turn" (Conteh & Meier 2014; Laviosa 2019: 181-182) was set by Cook (2010), for whom translation has always been part of the strategic repertoire of language learners as they draw on existing linguistic and cultural knowledge to learn another language. Considering the dichotomy between translation "as a means and as an end", Cook (2010: 55) famously asserts that learning to translate "should be an integral part of a major aim of language learning – to operate bilingually as well as monolingually".

In the last decade, a growing body of publications, addressing topics from classroom research to language policy, has demonstrated a strengthening interest in translation as a pedagogical tool in ALL in order to foster linguistic and intercultural competence, self-efficacy and metalinguistic reflection (e.g. Machida 2011; Pavan 2013; Laviosa 2014; Andersen et al. 2018; Panzarella & Sinibaldi 2018; Skopečková 2018). The most visible recent advocacy of translation in ALL is found in the companion volume to the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR) (Council of Europe 2020), where it is introduced as a form of mediation, one of the four modes of communication alongside reception, production and interaction. The CEFR adopts a wide approach to mediation, where it is described as encompassing

---

[2]   URL: https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2009-10-07/pdf/E9-24290.pdf

not only interlingual mediation but also mediation related to communication and learning as well as social and cultural mediation. The reasons for this are its relevance in increasingly diverse classrooms, the spread of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), and "because mediation is increasingly seen as a part of all learning, but especially of all language learning" (Council of Europe 2020: 36).

Yet, the attempts to rehabilitate translation in ALL have not always been properly understood. As Pym (2018) observes, a clear divide persists between translation studies and didactics on the one hand, and ALL on the other. Misunderstandings and misapprehensions abound on both sides. Adopting a translation studies perspective, this article argues that engagement with appropriate models, research and approaches from translation studies and its didactic sub-field can only serve to help teachers deploy translation more evaluatively, reflectively and effectively in ALL.

In doing so, however, it by no means denies Pym's major point that there should be a two-way dialogue between the disciplines. It fully subscribes to his forceful view that translation studies must set aside an elite notion of translation as a professional activity essentially distinct from other forms of multilingual communication. Translation scholars should accept that translation is something that people do all the time, everywhere, and must engage much more closely with a language-education community from which it can learn as much as it can serve (Pym 2018: 218-220). The view is echoed by Laviosa (2019: 197), who proposes that translation studies should exploit the multilingual turn in educational linguistics by adopting translanguaging as a subject of study in its own right – a move already initiated in 2014 with a special issue of the *Interpreter and Translator Trainer* on "Translation in the Language Classroom"[3] and, a year later, with a new peer-reviewed journal *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*[4]. This would allow translators and language educators to share knowledge and expertise to the mutual benefit of both pedagogical translation in ALL *and* professional translator education.

Translation studies and the didactics it has spawned are heterogeneous fields. Only parts may be deemed appropriate to the practice of ALL in all its multifarious forms, settings, intentions and goals. But it is the very ability to evaluate, select and reflect on the basis of knowledge that itself forms the key component of translation literacy, empowering language teachers to apply those aspects of the theory, practice and teaching of translation that are most suitable for their own work. That knowledge has to begin by addressing conceptualisations of what translation actually is, what translators do and what

---

[3]   URL: https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/ritt20/8/1

[4]   URL: https://benjamins.com/catalog/ttmc

competences they need to do properly and well. The evidence is that this is not at all clear to many of those involved in ALL.

A relatively recent large-scale study on teacher, researcher and institutional attitudes to translation in primary, secondary and tertiary ALL was commissioned by the European Union some eight years ago (Pym et al. 2013a, 2013b). It obtained questionnaire survey responses from more than 950 teachers and other experts and included case studies of the relations between translation and language-learning methods in seven EU members as well as three comparison third countries. From a translation studies perspective, the findings are sobering. Translation appears to have a marginal status in ALL, cemented by some obvious misconceptions. ALL teachers in Europe and elsewhere advocate communicative teaching methodologies, but many of them do not see translating as a communicative act and are thus against its use, seemingly associating it frequently with grammar translation. The respondents revealed diverse concepts of translation, ranging from a naïve view that it involves sentence-level equivalence between source and target languages to the acknowledgement that it is a fifth language skill (after speaking, listening, reading and writing), but one wholly separate from language learning proper and reserved solely for professional translation service provision. In-between, there was an identifiable agreement with the proposition that "translating brings the skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking together", leading the researchers to propose that "the more the operative concept of translation involves communication and intercultural competence, the more favourable the attitudes to it tend to be" (Pym et al. 2013b).

From this, the authors draw three interrelated conclusions relevant to this article. Firstly, "many sterile debates could […] be resolved by carefully defining what the term 'translation' means" (Pym et al. 2013b). Secondly, "steps should be taken to foster a view of translation as a goal-driven communicative activity that […] is able to produce interactive knowledge about languages and cultures" and that, in situations where there is a narrow, non-communicative concept of translation, the term "mediation" should be used instead, though not to the detriment of the former. And thirdly, that teachers at all levels should have access to a communicative view of translation (Pym et al. 2013a: 139).

The necessary condition of all three is translation literacy. This is not to say that translation studies itself delivers a ready consensus on the nature of translation and how it is and should be done. Quite the opposite. But knowing the present discourse surrounding the processes, products and environments of translation is essential to making informed choices about whether and how to deploy it in ALL.

3. Re-conceptualising translation

One of the most cogent and accessible definitions of translation in recent times is provided by Colina (2015: 12):

> [...] translation can be understood as *the process or the product of transforming written text or texts from one human language to another which generally requires a significant degree of resemblance to or correspondence with respect to the source text.*

Tellingly in the context of the present article, Colina's book (2015: xv-xvi) explicitly addresses readers whose work can benefit from informed knowledge of translation, specifically students and other language specialists, in order to disseminate essential concepts and dispel persisting myths – key functional aspects of the translation literacy put forward here. Hers is a definition that adds to the core elements seen in more generic dictionary definitions (transfer/transformation, written mode, interlingual) the need for "a certain correspondence, resemblance or connection between the [source text] and the [target text] so that the target text can be considered a translation" (Colina 2015: 12). The degree of that correspondence can be situated on a continuum of interlingual writing activities and depends on the function, purpose, genre and norms (both cultural and translational) that prevail in any given communicative situation requiring the activity of translation. Thus, grammar translation, "a type of translation carried out to demonstrate whether a student of a foreign language understands the source text and its structure" (Colina 2015: 34), gravitates towards the source-text end of the spectrum, in that it resembles it as closely as possible in order to fulfil its purpose in the learning situation. Interestingly, the very mention of grammar translation suggests a prototype amongst translation scholars of the way translation is taught in ALL. But as we have already seen from the EU study (Pym et al. 2013a), it appears that the grammar-translation method is also the reason for many language teachers' opposition to using translation in ALL. Knowing more about the nuances of translation theory and practice can go a long way towards eliminating such misconceptions.

Pym (2018: 217) attributes part of the blame for the misunderstandings about translation in ALL to the conceptual poles bracketing the continuum that Colina describes. He refers to the "basic binarism" of a theoretical debate that has dominated thinking about translation for centuries, an overly simplistic either/or mentality that places the production of target texts on a cline between the extremes of translation that is semantic or communicative (Newmark 1981), domesticating or foreignising (Venuti 1995), covert or overt (House 2015) – all ultimately aiming at some notion of equivalence.

However, Pym may himself be guilty of over-generalisation. His summary sidesteps the hermeneutic tradition in translation scholarship, in which the focus is shifted from an equivalence-orientated fixation on reproducing source-text intentionality to the key interpretive role of translators. In the communicative act of translation, these are both receivers and producers of texts in their own right.

Translators, as the first readers of texts, appropriate textual meanings by constructing a mental representation of them, and then seek to convey those meanings adequately for a target audience that has also been modelled in their minds. "What is of prime importance is the (constructed) representation of the text in the translator's mind. The translator as understander and interpreter of the original text is given pride of place, and his creativity reigns supreme" (House 2018: 39).

A vociferous and celebrated proponent of the hermeneutic approach is Venuti (2019). Moving on from his best-known work on translators' invisibility (Venuti 1995), he drills down from the poles of domestication and foreignisation pegged out in that book (a target of Pym's criticism above) to question what he calls the "instrumentalist" core that underpins both. His rigorous hermeneutic model understands translation not as the "reproduction or transfer of an invariant that is contained in or caused by the source text" but as "an interpretive act that inevitably varies source-text form, meaning, and effect according to intelligibilities and interests in the receiving culture" (Venuti 2019: 1). Venuti's polemic is directed at the translation studies community, but it could equally apply to the communities of language specialists less familiar with translation theory, practice and didactics, such as language teachers and students. To amalgamate Venuti's (2019) terminology with Pym et al.'s (2013a) recommendations, it is important for teachers and students in ALL to revise any instrumentalist misapprehension of translation they may have as a mechanical, binary, equivalence-oriented activity.

The neo-hermeneutic tradition is often regarded as the province of literary translation and comparative literary studies, but it is acquiring new relevance in the wider conversations surrounding artificial intelligence, machine learning and the added value of professional non-literary translators. As neural machine translation (NMT) makes ever deeper inroads into professional translation ecologies and markets, a growing number of publications have been addressing the position, roles and value of human translators in the translation ecosystem. Among other things, they map out an increasing shift in demand for human translation towards user-centrism (Suojanen et al. 2015; Koskinen 2019), intercultural mediation and adaptive, transcreational work (Katan 2016; Liddicoat 2016; Massey & Ehrensberger-Dow 2017a; Massey & Wieder 2019). What they share is an implicit or explicit call to re-conceptualise translation, which places an increasing onus on empirically validating the interpretive and identifiably interventionist role that professional translators purportedly have as competent communicators between lingua-cultures.

4. Translation competence, didactics and ALL

Translation studies research into the target-text products and cognitive processes of translation furnish strong indications that this is indeed the case.

Translation competence models and frameworks abound in translation studies, the majority of them comprising a variety of components or sub-competences. While a number of these are heuristic, some have been subject to empirical validation through translation process research (TPR). The PACTE Group's model is a prime example, validated over a number of years in a series of TPR experiments (Hurtado Albir 2017). The PACTE Group's research has fed into the NACT translation competence framework (PACTE Group 2018), a set of performance level descriptors for translator training and assessment that is based on the CEFR. The descriptive categories applied cover language competence (reception of the source language and production in the target language, in relation to the genres liable to be translated at each level), cultural, world knowledge and thematic competence (mobilising knowledge of source and the target cultures, world knowledge and thematic knowledge in specific fields), instrumental competence (using documentation resources and technological tools), translation service provision competence (managing aspects of professional practice and the work market), and translation problem-solving competence, the central strategic competence governing the deployment of all the others to solve various problem types (PACTE Group 2018: 120-122). These categories and components are shared, in various permutations, by other key heuristic and evidence-based models of translation competence (see Massey 2017).

The PACTE Group's experiments involved a comparison between two groups of language professionals, professional translators and ALL teachers. Data were collected and triangulated from a variety of sources using typical TPR techniques: participant questionnaires, a corpus of translated target texts, translation problem questionnaires, screen recordings of the participants' translation processes, retrospective interviews and direct observation reports. Analysis of target-text quality ("acceptability") showed it to be higher among the translators (PACTE Group 2017: 282-295). Other distinguishing features of professional translator competence were a more dynamic (i.e. situationally varied) and coherent concept of translation, a more dynamic approach to the way of translating, a more efficient combination of internal cognitive resources and external documentary resources, a more efficient combination of automatised and non-automatised cognitive resources and a more efficient use of instrumental (i.e. digital and technological) resources.

Especially relevant to the present article is the conceptual and procedural dynamism – the *adaptivity* – of the translators (PACTE Group 2017: 283). Their concept of translation was more text-oriented, interpretive, communicative and functional than the teachers, who demonstrated a more static, literal, language-oriented concept of what constitutes translation. In the translation project on which they worked as part of the study, the translators also showed a more dynamic textual, interpretive, communicative and functional approach to solving

translation problems. The difference was reflected in the target texts, where the ALL teachers used more calques and arrived at translations that were very similar to each other, "which may be indicative of teachers not exploring all the possibilities of the target language before adopting their final solutions to translation problems" (PACTE Group 2017: 282).

The dynamic pattern of professional translators' decision-making and problem-solving appears to be reflected in studies of bilingual and multilingual corpora of source and target texts. For example, product-oriented corpus research on the translation of conceptual metaphor reveals a substantial degree of variation in lexical realisations (e.g. Monti 2009; Shuttleworth 2011; Schäffner 2012). Especially interesting in this regard is Samaniego Fernández's (2013: 192) key conclusion from her study, framed by conceptual metaphor theory, on the translation of novel metaphor:

> Equivalence is a formula that has to be enlarged to cover the multiplicity of translational answers given by translators, which include 'unfaithfulness', creation of new material and many other options that were not formerly contemplated in more traditional approaches to translation.

Such results suggest, of course, that competent professional translation is taking place at the conceptual level of intercultural transfer rather than on the lexical surface of the text, a claim supported by process-oriented studies deploying various TPR techniques to investigate the way translators handle conceptual metaphor (Mandelblit 1995; Tirkkonen-Condit 2002; Fougner Rydning & Lachaud 2011). Building on prior studies combining product-oriented and process-oriented studies of conceptual metaphor translation (Massey & Ehrensberger-Dow 2017b), Massey (2021) looks at how beginner BA students of applied languages, advanced MA students of translation and professional translators deal with conceptual metaphor, and it then compares the results with publicly available NMT output. The sample is relatively small, but the results do indicate a distinct cline in the variation of target-text solutions across the translator groups as degrees of experience increase, and a correspondingly growing range of deviation from the standardisation seen in the solutions produced by the NMT systems. That variation in the product data, when triangulated with process data on participants' pausing behaviour and retrospective verbal commentaries, indicates that the principal distinguishing feature of the professionals as a group is their selective use of intuition and reflection to access the conceptual level of meaning realised in a particular lexical form in the source language, and then generate multiple target-language solutions in a specific communicative situation to serve the receivers they have in mind. Such indications lend fresh relevance to Pym's (2003: 489) minimalist definition of translation competence as:

> [...] the ability to generate a series of more than one viable target text (TTI, TT2 ... TTn) for a pertinent source text (ST); the ability to select only one viable TT from this series, quickly and with justified confidence.

Results from TPR also suggest that translator education seems to be working. From the beginnings of TPR, a primary motivation has been didactic. In studies comparing the problem-solving behaviour, metalinguistic awareness, creativity, self-concept and self-efficacy of student at various levels of training and experienced professional translators, advanced students are consistently positioned between beginners and professionals (Göpferich & Jääskeläinen 2009; Bayer-Hohenwarter 2012; Ehrensberger-Dow & Massey 2013).

There have even been case and experimental studies researching how TPR tools and techniques can be used to supplement more conventional approaches to translation teaching. For example, Angelone (2013, 2016) has demonstrated the usefulness of screen recording as a teaching tool combined with concurrent or immediate retrospective commentaries, and how it can be used to gauge intercultural competence, improve problem recognition and mitigate errors. Massey and Ehrensberger-Dow (2011, 2013) have shown that process methods and tools, such as screen recording and eye tracking, encourage students to reflect on approaching their tasks and to broaden their interlingual and intercultural problem-solving strategies. These scenarios also benefit teachers by providing indicators of how students actually translate that are richer and more nuanced than the insights gleaned from product-oriented teaching based on source and target texts alone.

TPR and its didactic applications owe much to the methodologies and techniques of process writing research and instruction, with which they have long shared common ground (Dam-Jensen & Heine 2013). And as the example of the NACT descriptors suggests, translation didactics has also clearly been able to benefit from ALL frameworks. By the same token, the research on translation competence and didactics sketched out above serves to illustrate the potential that enhanced translation literacy can hold for teachers and learners in the prevailing multilingual turn. For instance, the case studies of translation and translanguaging pedagogy described by Canagarajah (2011), García and Kano (2014) and Laviosa (2019) bear certain similarities with TPR approaches. However, the actual techniques deployed in the learning scenarios appear to be less innovative than those that have been developed in process-oriented translation didactics. The more immediate access to learner processes that these provide would most likely add a valuable extra dimension to ALL.

Likewise, the translation module for AL learners outlined by Huffmaster and Kramsch (2020: 181-186) is predicated on the very binarism – between overt and covert translation – that Pym berates for reinforcing a misconception about translation that obscures its interpretive, adaptive and creative essence as a prototype of intercultural mediation. Undoubtedly, the initiative takes a laudable and comparatively large step in the right direction, but only a more consistent and coherent approach, informed by comprehensive translation literacy, is needed to take the use of pedagogical translation in ALL still further. To achieve

this, there must be increased awareness of current thinking about translation as a concept and a competence centred on active, interpretive, situationally adaptive and creative mediation between lingua-cultures.

The groundwork is being laid. Individual scholars (e.g. González Davies 2014; Carreres 2014) have been aligning the components of translation competence with ALL objectives and with the skills required of AL users in our increasingly global, multilingual societies – where, as Carreres (2014: 130) suggests, "translation is an everyday affair" and there is "a premium on translingual, transcultural individuals who are able to operate successfully between languages and cultures". They confront prevailing misconceptions about translation in ALL and address the need for an understanding of the nature of translation as a process of intercultural mediation. But the bridge is still under construction. In Scarino's (2016: 473) words:

> Understanding cultures is central to the interpretation, creation, and exchange of meanings across languages and cultures. As such, it is fundamental to translation [...]. Translation understood as intercultural mediation is work that also demands ongoing reflection on its products, processes, and [...] one's role as a mediator of meaning. As such, it becomes a prime task in both language using and language learning. The challenge for the teachers of languages is to reconceptualise translation in this way.

Translation literacy provides the keystone.

5. Some applications and implications

The question that now arises is how to develop and apply translation literacy in ALL at the higher secondary and tertiary levels where learners meet the necessary cognitive and linguistic pre-requisites. In an article of this scope, it is not possible to broach all the issues to a satisfactory extent. Instead, some initial thoughts are sketched out for educators, researchers and their institutions to build on them in future work.

As with all literacies, reflective practice (e.g. Schön 1983, 1987) on the basis of situated knowledge and experience (e.g. Dreyfus 2004; Kolb 2015) is key to developing the skills associated with translation literacy. Most obviously, dedicated continuing professional development (CPD) courses and workshops in the burgeoning field of translation didactics, run by institutions that educate professional translators, would lay a robust basis on which ALL teachers begin to build their knowledge, skills, attitudes and practices. In this regard, the process-oriented approaches mentioned above offer a particularly fruitful means of understanding learner processes as they translate in ALL settings. Experienced translator educators with a complementary first language (L1) could then mentor and/or team-teach with ALL teachers in order to consolidate and extend their translation literacy in classroom settings. This would, of course, necessitate far closer collaboration between the ALL and translator teaching communities and institutions than has hitherto been the case – but the benefits would certainly be considerable. They include the opportunities for teachers to

engage in sustained reflection on the textual, contextual and functional dependencies of linguistic mediation between cultural groups. For those teaching very advanced AL learners, this could be extended to the responsibilities, roles and loyalties of the non-professional interlingual mediators of meaning in a given situation. In all cases, the goal is to foster not only linguistic knowledge and basic mediatory skills, but also pragmatic, intercultural and metalinguistic awareness.

As we have partly seen above, starting points for designing and deploying didactic methods, materials and activities for mediation in ALL already exist. Examples include recent case studies, all undertaken in higher education, centred on the translation of poetry and other literary texts (Anderson 2018; Huffmaster & Kramsch 2020: 181-186; Laviosa 2019: 188-196; Vale de Gato 2020: 195-200), collaborative translation (Panzarella & Sinibaldi 2018), electronic tools and resources used to translate international law texts (Zanettin 2018), MT and other data-driven translation technologies in L2 learning (Enríquez Raído et al. 2020), translating audiovisual material (Pavan 2013; Baños et al. 2021) and the broader modelling and use of pedagogical translation to develop language skills (González Davies 2014; González Davies & Soler Ortínez 2021). However, although some of the studies claim that their results are transferable to other educational contexts (e.g. Baños et al. 2021; González Davies & Soler Ortínez 2021), there still appears to be a scarcity of work being done in settings outside higher education. This carries the strong implication that here in particular – though by no means exclusively – there is both the need and opportunity for more systematic research into, and development of, state-of-the-art concepts of intercultural mediation in ALL – a deficit that Scarino (2016) has already highlighted in the specific context of the Australian curriculum for languages. It is incumbent on both the translation studies and language teaching communities to close the current conceptual divide between them and help grow translation literacy in ALL.

6. Conclusion

The use of translation, conceptualised as intercultural mediation in a hermeneutic framework, can demonstrably foster linguistic and intercultural competence, develop metalinguistic awareness and promote self-efficacy in both translator education and ALL. Yet, an instrumentalist misconception of translation as a binary, equivalence-oriented activity rather than an interpretive, adaptive and creative act seems to persist outside – and to an extent also inside – translation studies and didactics. The ongoing process in translation studies of re-conceptualising translation as interpretive, adaptive, intercultural mediation can prove highly beneficial to AL learners in our increasingly global, multilingual societies. Translation literacy, founded on closer engagement with current models, research and approaches from translation studies and

didactics, is the necessary pre-requisite for teachers and their learners to identify and exploit the full value of translation in ALL.

REFERENCES

Anderson, L. (2018). Fostering metalinguistic awareness: Role play, pragmatics and L2 literary translation. *inTRAlinea Special Issue: Translation and Interpreting for Language Learners (TAIL).**

Anderson, L., Gavioli, L. & Zanettin, F. (eds.) (2018*). inTRAlinea special issue: Translation and interpreting for language learners (TAIL).**

Angelone, E. (2013). The impact of process protocol self-analysis on errors in the translation product. *Translation and Interpreting Studies, 8(2),* 253-271.

Angelone, E. (2016). A process-oriented approach for documenting and gauging intercultural competence in translation. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 10(3),* 304-317.

Baños, R. Marzà, A. & Torralba G. (2021). Promoting plurilingual and pluricultural competence in language learning through audiovisual translation. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts, 7(1),* 65-85.

Bayer-Hohenwarter, G. (2012). *Translatorische Kreativität: Definition–Messung–Entwicklung.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Bowker, L. & Jairo Buitrago Ciro, J. (2019). *Machine translation and global research: Towards improved machine translation literacy in the scholarly community.* Bingley: Emerald Publishing.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review, 2,* 1-28.

Carreres, A. (2014). Translation as a means and as an end: Reassessing the divide. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 8(1),* 123-135.

Colina, S. (2015). *Fundamentals of Translation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Conteh, J. & Meier, G. (eds.) (2014). *The multilingual turn in languages education.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Cook, G. (2010). *Translation in language teaching: An argument for reassessment.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Council of Europe (2020). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Companion volume.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.*

Dam-Jensen, H. & Heine, C. (2013). Writing and translation process research: Bridging the gap. *Journal of Writing Research, 5(1),* 89-101.

Dreyfus, S. (2004). The five-stage model of adult skill acquisition. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society, 24(3),* 177-181.

Ehrensberger-Dow, M. & Massey, G. (2013). Indicators of translation competence: Translators' self-concepts and the translation of titles. *Journal of Writing Research 5(1),* 103-131.

Enríquez Raído, V., Austermühl, F. & Sánchez Torrón, M. (2020). Computer-assisted L2 learning and translation (CAL2T). In S. Laviosa & M. González Davies, M. (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of translation and education* (pp. 278-299). London: Routledge.

Fougner Rydning, A. & Lachaud, C. (2011). Are primary conceptual metaphors easier to understand than complex conceptual metaphors? An investigation of the cognitive processes in metaphor comprehension. In C. Alvstad, A. Hild & E. Tiselius (eds.), *Methods and strategies of process research: Integrative approaches in translation studies* (pp. 169-186). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

García, O. & Kano, N. (2014). Translanguaging as process and pedagogy: Developing the English writing of Japanese students in the US. In J. Conteh & G. Meier (eds.), *The multilingual turn in languages education* (pp. 258-277). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

González Davies, M. (2014). Towards a plurilingual development paradigm: From spontaneous to informed use of translation in additional language learning, *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 8(1)*, 8-31.

González Davies, M. & Soler Ortínez, D. (2021). Use of translation and plurilingual practices in language learning: A formative intervention model. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts, 7(1)*, 17-40.

Göpferich, S. & Jääskeläinen, R. (2009). Process research into the development of translation competence: Where are we, where do we need to go? *Across Languages and Cultures, 10(2)*, 169-191.

House, J. (2015). *Translation quality assessment: Past and present.* London: Routledge.

House, J. (2018). *Translation: The basics.* London: Routledge.

Huffmaster, M. & Kramsch, C. (2020). Modern languages. In S. Laviosa & M. González Davies (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of translation and education* (pp. 173-188). London: Routledge.

Hurtado Albir, A. (ed.) (2017). *Researching translation competence by PACTE group.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Katan, D. (2016). Translation at the cross-roads: Time for the transcreational turn? *Perspectives, 24(3)*, 365-381.

Kolb, D. (2015)[2]. *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education.

Koskinen, K. (2019). Tailoring translation services for clients and users. In E. Angelone, M. Ehrensberger-Dow & G. Massey (eds), *The Bloomsbury companion to language industry studies* (pp. 139-152). London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Laviosa, S. (2014). *Translation and language education: Pedagogic approaches explored.* London: Routledge.

Laviosa, S. (2019). Translanguaging and translation pedagogies. In H. V. Damm, M. N. Brøgger & K. K. Zethsen (eds), *Moving boundaries in translation studies* (pp. 181-199). London: Routledge.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2016). Intercultural mediation, intercultural communication and translation. *Perspectives, 24(3)*, 354-364.

Machida, S. (2011). Translation in teaching a foreign (second) language: A methodological perspective. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2(4)*, 740-747.

Mandelblit, N. (1995). The cognitive view of metaphor and its implications for translation theory. In B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk & M. Thelen (eds.), *Translation and meaning: Part 3* (pp. 483-495). Maastricht: Hoogeschool Maastricht.

Massey, G. (2017). Translation competence development and process-oriented pedagogy. In J. Schwieter & A. Ferreira (eds.), *The handbook of translation and cognition* (pp. 520-544). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Massey, G. (2021). Re-framing conceptual metaphor translation research in the age of neural machine translation: Investigating translators' added value with products and processes. *Translation, Language and Culture, 5(1)*, 37-56.

Massey, G. & M. Ehrensberger-Dow, M. (2011). Commenting on translation: Implications for translator training. *The Journal of Specialised Translation, 16*, 26-41.

Massey, G. & Ehrensberger-Dow. M. (2013). Evaluating translation processes: Opportunities and challenges. In D. Kiraly, S. Hansen-Schirra & K. Maksymski (eds.), *New prospects and perspectives for educating language mediators* (pp. 157-177). Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Massey, G. & Ehrensberger-Dow, M. (2017a). Machine learning: Implications for translator education. *Lebende Sprachen, 62(2)*, 300-312.

Massey, G. & Ehrensberger-Dow, M. (2017b). Translating conceptual metaphor: The processes of managing interlingual asymmetry. *Research in Language, 15(2)*, 173-189.

Massey, G. & Wieder, R. (2019). Quality assurance in translation and corporate communications: Exploring an interdisciplinary interface. In E. Huertas Barros, S. Vandepitte & E. Iglesias Fernández (eds.), *Quality assurance and assessment practices in translation and interpreting* (pp. 57-87). Hershey: IGI Global.

Monti, E. (2009). Translating the metaphors we live by: Intercultural negotiations in conceptual metaphor. *European Journal of English Studies, 13(2)*, 207-221.

Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

O'Brien, S. & Ehrensberger-Dow, M. (2020). MT literacy – A cognitive view. *Translation Cognition & Behavior, 3(2)*,145-164.

PACTE Group 2017. Conclusions. Defining features of translation competence. In A. Hurtado Albir (ed.), *Researching translation competence by PACTE group* (pp. 281-308). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

PACTE Group. (2018). Competence levels in translation: Working towards a European framework. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 12(2)*, 111-131.

Panzarella, G. & Sinibaldi, C. (2018). Translation in the language classroom: Multilingualism, diversity, collaboration. *EuroAmerican Journal of Applied Linguistics and Languages, 5(2)*, 62-75.

Pavan, E. (2013). *The Simpsons*: Translation and language teaching in an EFL class. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 3(1)*, 131-145.

Pym, A. (2003). Redefining translation competence in an electronic age. In defence of a minimalist approach. *Meta, 48(4)*, 481-497.

Pym. A. (2018). Where Translation Studies lost the plot: Relations with language teaching. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts, 4(2)*, 203-222.

Pym, A., Malmkjaer, K. & Gutierrez-Colon Plana, M. (2013a). *Translation and language learning: The role of translation in the teaching of languages in the European Union. A study.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.*

Pym, A., Malmkjaer, K. & Gutierrez-Colon Plana, M. (2013b) *Translation and language learning: The role of translation in the teaching of languages in the European Union. A study. Executive summary.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.*

Samaniego Fernández, E. (2013). The impact of cognitive linguistics on descriptive translation studies: Novel metaphors in English-Spanish newspaper translation as a case in point. In A. Rojo & I. Ibarretxe-Antuñano (eds.), *Cognitive linguistics and translation* (pp. 159-198). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Scarino, A. (2016). Reconceptualising translation as intercultural mediation: A renewed place in language learning. *Perspectives, 24(3)*, 470-485.

Schäffner, C. (2012). Finding space under the umbrella: The Euro crisis, metaphors, and translation. *The Journal of Specialised Translation, 17*, 250-270.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* New York: Basic Books.

Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shuttleworth, M. (2011). Translational behaviour at the frontiers of scientific knowledge: A multilingual investigation into popular science metaphor in translation. *The Translator, 17(2)*, 301-323.

Skopečková, E. (2018). Translation and language learning: Untapped potential of functionalist approach to translation in the foreign language classroom. *Brno Studies in English, 44(2)*, 5-17.

Suojanen, T., Koskinen, K. & Tuominen, T. (2015). *User-centered translation*. London: Routledge.

Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (2002). Metaphoric expressions in translation processes. *Across Languages and Cultures, 3(1)*, 101-116.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2018). *A global framework of reference on digital literacy skills for indicator 4.4.2. Information paper no. 51.**

Vale de Gato, M. (2020). Translation and multilingual/creative writing. In S. Laviosa & M. González Davies, M. (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of translation and education* (pp. 189-206). London: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. London: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (2019). *Contra instrumentalism: A translation polemic*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Zanettin, F. (2018). Electronic tools and resources for translating and writing in the digital age. *inTRAlinea Special Issue: Translation and Interpreting for Language Learners (TAIL).**

Zurkowski, P. G. (1974). *The information service environment: Relationships and priorities*. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, Nov. 1974, ED100391.*

* These documents can be accessed online.