Language teaching and translation training: A case of (ir)reconcilable differences?

Estefanía Muñoz Gómez

Department of Spanish, Portuguese and Latin American Studies, UCC

Abstract

Although the debates surrounding the relationship between language teaching and translation are by no means new, they remain topical, given the global nature of current social, political and economic networks. While the value of translation in the language classroom has long been recognised, it continues to be commonly framed as a tool to assist the language learning process. Similarly, language proficiency is still widely seen as a prerequisite to the development of translation skills rather than a core element of the practice. Pedagogical translation and translation in dedicated training programmes are therefore conceptualised as fundamentally unrelated activities, a perspective which unproductively appears to ignore their common interlingual communicative objective. This essay presents an overview of the traditional divide between these two assumed forms of translating and encourages reassessing the assumptions underlying the theoretical concepts of communicative and translation competence. Commenting on the specific context of Ireland as an example of skills supply and demand imbalance, this paper calls for a greater focus to be placed on the translational nature of multilingual communication as the needs for cultural and linguistic mediation continue to grow and evolve in an increasingly technologically driven market.

Language teaching and translation training are now broadly concerned with the use of language from a communicative perspective. Language learning has greatly abandoned traditional methods focused only on formal features in order to concentrate on interaction. Likewise, as Translation Studies evolved and left behind more purely linguistic approaches in favour of cultural theories, the discipline moved to investigate translation as a multifaceted communicative act. Nevertheless, foreign language teaching and translation training continue to hold a uniquely ambivalent relationship.

Although the wider understanding of translation beyond a simple formal replacement operation has led to a progressive return of the practice to the language classroom, the attitudes of old still inform how translation is generally approached. At the same time, the institutionalisation and professionalisation of translation manifested in the creation of national and international associations, the establishment of translation departments in Higher

Education Institutions, and the growing demands for translators have provided an opportunity for promoting the status of translation both as an academic discipline and as a profession. As such, translation training remains interested in distinguishing its objectives from those of translation as employed in language classrooms. Pedagogical translation and translation as presented in dedicated training programmes are therefore still seen as essentially unrelated activities, which is only contributing to perpetuate the disciplinary undermining of their mutual dependency. As the needs for cultural and linguistic mediation continue to grow exponentially beyond the scope of the traditional conceptualisation of the profession, it is increasingly necessary to reassess the relationship between these two assumed forms of translation if we are to exploit the practice's potential to respond to current and future skills needs.

The discussion presented here is not a new one, but it is still topical. It certainly remains a pressing issue in the Republic of Ireland, home to major multilingual employers and a growing multilingual population. An increasing number of international companies in the country are in need of highly skilled specialists with language-related expertise, but seem to be having difficulties recruiting them at home (EFGSN 2016). These potential employees need not necessarily be translators by trade and, arguably, often are not. They are nevertheless professionals who will be working with and in-between languages, whether native speakers of languages other than English or traditional English and Irish bilinguals. As such, recognising the translational nature of this activity becomes crucial.

Beyond the specific context of Ireland, the question becomes a wider disciplinary one. The conflicting relationship between translation as a tool for language learning and translation training for professional practice unproductively ignores their common interlingual communicative objective. This essay reviews how language teaching and Translation Studies, more specifically translation pedagogy, have positioned themselves in relation to each other, with a view to presenting the wider implications for teaching and learning and the need for bridging this traditional divide by reassessing current concepts of competence.

1. Language teaching and translation

The rejection of translation in foreign and second language teaching stemmed from the reaction against the now widely disregarded grammar-translation method and its artificial and decontextualised materials. With the rise of the direct method, the use of learners' first language or L1 was barred from the classroom, and translation naturally suffered the same

fate, at least formally. When the teaching of languages shifted away from behaviourism towards the more functional and student-centred strategies supported by the communicative approach, interaction and communication in the target language became the goals. It is therefore no surprise that the potential of L1 in facilitating second language acquisition continued to be mostly ignored.

Although the communicative approach does not explicitly stand against translation or L1 use in the classroom, teaching methods under the communicative umbrella are guided by the underlying assumption that the more target language input, the faster the learning would occur (Ellis 2005). As a result, the discouragement of L1 use has long been the norm in many language teaching contexts, whether from a position of complete rejection or from one of avoidance. Seen from a more positive perspective, the aim is still to at least maximise learners' exposure to the target language (Cook 2001). Macaro (2009) associates this stance with what he calls the *virtual position*. The virtual position borrows from first language acquisition theory to defend that the classroom should act as a 'virtual reality' and resemble a L1 learning environment, where no other language is available. Fear of both interference and limited target language input is therefore a key motivator behind the dismissal of the L1, albeit not the only contributing factor. Theoretical developments in foreign language teaching have been widely informed by the literature surrounding English as a Foreign Language. These works often originate in multilingual settings or contexts where teachers have no access to the learners' L1, which can also help explain the preponderance of methods that rely exclusively on the target language. The interest of international publishing houses on monolingual textbooks is also influential, since these materials are cheaper to produce and can be distributed globally (Butzkamm 2003; Carreres 2014).

Providing learners with as much target language input as possible is certainly a laudable aim, but the existing gaps between theory, institutional constraints and actual classroom practice mean that this objective cannot always be reached. As a consequence, many teachers feel that an exclusive target language classroom is 'an unattainable ideal' and therefore take a maximal position (Macaro 2009). Accepting the need for maximising the target language use but recognising the impossibility of fulfilling that goal can often lead to feelings of guilt when making use of the learners' first language (Cook 2001; Butzkamm 2003; Macaro 2009). The L1 is seen as a last resort to turn to only in case of emergency, and its use is viewed by many as a failure. To confess having to fall back on the L1 becomes almost unconsciously akin to an admission to professional misconduct, despite the better judgement of teachers wanting to capitalise on the L1 for very valuable objectives such as

speeding classroom management, promoting student rapport, facilitating deeper understanding and encouraging learners to make connections between their languages.

While it can be argued that the L1 never fully left the classroom, being used as above, for some years now it has been increasingly reclaimed for its pedagogical potential. A key argument against the exclusion of the L1 in the foreign language classroom is directly related to a change in the perception of both native speakers and second language learners, who are better seen as valid multilingual individuals rather than failed imitations of an ideal. As Cook (2001, p. 407) suggests, "L1 'success' in becoming native speakers is different from L2 success in becoming L2 users". Contrary to children acquiring their first language, learners approaching a second or subsequent language do not start from a blank slate. Their learning is shaped by their cultural and social backgrounds, their experiences and knowledge of the world, their particular affective filters and their L1 identity, which is forced to negotiate with the newly developing one. Even in monolingual classes, Butzkamm suggests, "the mother tongue is 'silently' present" (2003, p. 31). He adds:

> Using the mother tongue, we have (1) learnt to think, (2) learnt to communicate and (3) acquired an intuitive understanding of grammar. […] This foreknowledge is the result of interactions between a first language and our fundamental linguistic endowment, and is the foundation on which we build our Selves. It is the greatest asset people bring to the task of foreign language learning. For this reason, the mother tongue is <u>the</u> master key to foreign languages, the tool which gives us the fastest, surest, most precise, and most complete means of accessing a foreign language (p.31). (emphasis in the original)

The return of L1 to the foreign language classroom has meant, by extension, the reintroduction of translation and the challenging of traditional arguments against it. These can be summarised as follows: translation is completely different from the four skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking; translation leads to interference and reinforces one-to-one comparisons; and translation restricts free composition (see Pintado Gutiérrez 2012a for a more detailed overview). As Malmkjær (1998) points out, however, translation can actually increase awareness of the differences between languages and therefore help avoid interference if properly situated and understood as a communicative activity. Since it requires careful reading, it can also encourage better comprehension at a textual, syntactic and semantic level. Translation can therefore help improve mother tongue competence and promote "a reflective language consciousness about the function of language and the relationship between language and thought, language and culture" (Zojer 2009, p. 35). It can highlight unknown elements by limiting avoidance strategies (Cook 2010), and even the long rejected practice of word-for-word or mirror translation can be used to stress formal

structures and facilitate grammatical explanations (Butzkamm 2001).

There is now an extensive and ever growing body of literature dealing with the implementation of translation in foreign language teaching and learning (e.g. Malmkjær 1998; Witte et al. 2009; Leonardi 2010; Laviosa 2014). Nevertheless, pedagogical translation, i.e. translation in the foreign language classroom, is far from being understood and employed in a coherent and systematic way (Pintado 2012a). Translation may be used as a tool to facilitate explanations and understanding, as a method to enhance vocabulary and grammar knowledge, or as a comprehensive exercise addressing linguistic, cultural and pragmatic issues. Nevertheless, even when the pedagogical merits of translation as an authentic communicative activity are acknowledged, its objective is still ultimately to assist the language learning process. Pedagogical translation "does not intend to create specialists in translation but to introduce in the curriculum a practice that entails the employment of the language as a whole" (Pintado 2012b, p. 178). Learning a language through translation is seen as a completely different endeavour to learning translation: translation is a means in the former and an end in the latter (Carreres 2014, p. 124). Whatever conflicting relationship language learning and translation training may typically hold, it is at least precisely on this distinction that both fields seem to agree.

2. Translation and language teaching

Just as language teaching declares itself unconcerned with the teaching of translation, translation training remains largely preoccupied with dissociating itself from the language classroom. Although translator training takes place in varied settings, most research on the area originates from Higher Education Institutions, often linked to courses of a generalist nature that aim to introduce students to the requirements of translation as a professional activity. Language competence is seen as a prerequisite, so addressing any gaps appears to get in the way of translation teaching per se. Trainers in these programmes tend to note that, even when students are highly proficient in their working languages, they are unable to adequately respond to the demands of an authentic translation task, failing to consider pragmatic factors such as purpose and audience. As Colina (2002) explains, language teaching is negatively viewed because of students' attitudes towards translation and the expectations they hold as a result of their previous experiences in the language classroom. When translating, these manifest in the form of behaviours such as "fear of interference, lack of global strategies, tendency towards 'sign-translating' (i.e. transcoding), excessive reliance on dictionaries and the perception of translation as a language exercise" (Colina

2002, p. 7) focused on words and phrases as isolated units, as well as on grammatical correctness (Colina 2002, p. 7). As such, students are forced to "unlearn what they learnt" (Schäffner 2000, p. 144) in order to emulate professional performance.

The emphasis placed on the translation profession is understandable in the wider context of the increased vocational orientation in tertiary education, but it is also reflective of key trends in the development of Translation Studies as a self-standing discipline. This can be traced back to the second half of the twentieth century, which roughly coincided with the discrediting of translation as language teaching method (Carreres 2014). Following the more systematic study of translation, Translation Studies established itself as rich and distinct area of scholarship, moving away from fields such as comparative literature and contrastive linguistics, to which it had been restricted. From the original interest on products, researchers started adopting interdisciplinary approaches to investigate the cognitive process of translation, and for some decades now much of their work has broadly concentrated in the figure of the translator. As the focus shifted from purely linguistic approaches to incorporate insights from cultural and social studies, the gap between translation theory and pedagogical translation widened. Distancing itself from the lingering view of translation as a mere exercise in formal replacement, the discipline evolved around the recognition of translation as a multifaceted communicative practice.

This communicative orientation matches that of most current language teaching approaches, which emphasise the use of language for communication rather than as a formal activity (Colina 2002). Indeed, by highlighting the functional and communicative nature of translation, translation scholars have greatly contributed to its judicious reintroduction in the language classroom. Nevertheless, the process of institutionalisation that came about with the growth of Translation Studies research and the subsequent proliferation of dedicated training programs at tertiary level have added to the means and end debate, reinforcing the presumption that pedagogical translation is a fundamentally distinct phenomenon, and therefore does not lie among the discipline's key concerns.

It could be argued that this view has undoubtedly played a crucial role in raising the status of translation as a complex linguistic, cognitive and sociocultural object of study and a highly-skilled but often underrated occupation. However, what the division between translation as an aid to the language learning process and as the goal of instruction appear to overlook is that, independently of the objective, it is one phenomenon that both assumed forms of the practice are dealing with. As communication landscapes evolve with advances in information technologies in an increasingly interconnected world, the demands for linguistic

and cultural mediation also change, making it the more relevant to identify the core of an individual's ability to communicate successfully in multiple (and in between) languages.

3. The elusive concept of competence

It is generally taken for granted that the language classroom does not prepare students to work as professional translators, and that translation training includes far more than language classes. Ultimately, language learning is said to aim at developing communicative competence, while the stated goal in translation training is translation competence. How do these two concepts differ?

Although there is no clear consensus on the definition of *communicative competence*, the most widely used model today is based on that of Canale and Swain (1980), which is comprised by grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competence. Following the work of Hymes (1972), these four interrelated dimensions move beyond the knowledge of language systems to include notions of adequacy and acceptability. Competence is therefore measured in relation to the ability to express, interpret and negotiate meaning, and it is achieved through meaningful interaction (Lee & Van Patten 1995). Language learners are seen as active participants in communication, capable multilingual individuals rather than defective native speakers. Since they cannot but bring along their prior cultural and linguistic background, it follows that the process of meaning negotiation and interpretation associated to communicative competence in a second or subsequent language is by nature translational: "For the successful language learner, bilingual knowledge is always implicated in monolingual use, and it makes little sense to think that one can exist without the other" (Cook 2010, p. xx).

Translation is then not only "a key skill that any language learner wishing to achieve well-rounded competence in the L2 should aim to develop" (Carreres 2014, p. 130). Bilingualism is by definition a prerequisite to translation. On the basis of that idea, Harris (1976) defines the bilingual speaker as a 'natural translator'. At the heart of this concept is the idea that bilingualism and translation, whether spontaneous or professional, "are connected at a very fundamental cognitive level" (Shreve 2012, p. 1). Associating the knowledge of two languages to the ability to translate, however, does not tend to be well received among translation scholars, since translation is seen to require a unique set of skills that call for different mechanisms of activation and selection (Shreve 2012).

This set of skills is referred to as 'translation competence', an umbrella term widely used to encompass a combination of both procedural and declarative knowledge, as well as

traits of a more psychological nature. As such, despite being many and varied, most theoretical models of competence in the Translation Studies literature take language competence to be just one of the components that make up the ability to translate, although they differ in the number and nature of the remaining subcompetences (cf. Schäffner 2000; Neubert 2000; PACTE 2003; Kelly 2005; Göpferich 2008). This is where the key problem lies: once translation competence is framed as more than language competence, there is virtually no end to the amount of potential additions (Pym 2003). The dominant models cover similar areas: language, culture, domain specific knowledge, research, transfer and a combination of personality and cognitive dispositions like memory, attention, curiosity, motivation, or perseverance. Many of these could be labelled as transferable or soft skills, the development of which is now in the agenda of most Higher Education Institutions, independently of the field of study. While their inclusion can be useful from a pedagogical perspective, it begs the following question: if the concept of translation competence is meant to define concretely the ability to translate, to what extent is it theoretically sound to include skills that are broadly applicable to every graduate?

Even if consensus on a concrete number of subcompetences were to be reached, their nature is still up to interpretation. This is very clear in the case of language competence, where the different definitions appear to suggest varying understandings of language and communication. For example, Neubert talks about "proficiency in both the mother tongue and the foreign language or languages, knowledge of their grammatical and lexical systems and awareness of their changing nature and of their conventions" (2000, p. 3). For Schäffner it is linguistic competence, "knowledge of the linguistic systems of the languages concerned in the translation process" (2000, p. 146). PACTE presents the language component as bilingual sub-competence: "predominantly procedural knowledge needed to communicate in two languages. It includes pragmatic, sociolinguistic, textual, grammatical and lexical knowledge" (2003, p. 58; 2011, p. 33). Kelly makes the move towards communicative competence but nevertheless distinguishes it from textual aspects, including "active and passive skills, and awareness of textual and discourse conventions" (2005, p. 32). Göpferich, in turn, does use the term "communicative competence" (2008, p. 115; 2011, pp. 59–60), common in language teaching.

The value of these multicomponential models is in their potential application to curriculum design in translation training programs. Nevertheless, the conceptual confusion that they evidence should not be underestimated, since the manner in which the various areas of competence are defined can lead to relevant differences in the framing of training needs

and objectives. In addition, with the summative view of competence associated with these multicomponential models comes also the risk of the compartmentalising of skills as separate elements which need to be mastered before translation competence can be developed. The question then becomes one of degrees of competence. Is it possible to calculate an overall level of competence based on each of the different subcompetences? What level of each subcompetence would need to be achieved? Robinson asks himself very similar questions:

> Is it enough to have profound and extensive experience of one or more foreign languages? If so, is it enough to have been exposed to that language or those languages in books and classrooms, or is it experience of the culture or cultures in which it is natively spoken essential? How important is rich experience of one's mother tongue(s)? And how rich? […]
>
> Alternatively, is extensive experience of a certain subject matter enough, if the translator has a rudimentary working knowledge of at least one foreign language? If so, does that experience need to be hands-on practical experience of the field, experience of the objects and the people who handle them and the way those people speak about the objects? Or is it enough to have experience of books, articles, and coursework on that subject matter?
>
> […] would it be enough for a competent professional translator from Spanish and Portuguese to have heard a little Italian and own a good Italian dictionary in order to translate a fairly easy and routine text from the Italian?
>
> One answer to *all* of these questions is: Yes, in certain cases. (2003, pp. 98–99).

The issue is particularly relevant in the case of language competence. As discussed before, it is often taken for granted or only dealt with for remedial purposes: "Translation classes must strive to minimize this interface between the two [language study and translation practice] and shorten it in order to focus on translation as such" (Dollerup 1994, p. 121). However, the general assumption that translation trainees need a high level of language proficiency in order to develop translation skills is now being challenged, and authors like Schäffner (2000, 2004) are stressing the benefits of developing some form of translation competence or translation awareness along with language competence. As Berenguer puts it, "if language teaching is translation oriented, much time can be saved in the translation class" (1996, p. 10). Even if the aim is not to train future translators, translational skills can still help build students' critical understanding of the structural and functional underpinnings of language as a complex system.

Given the range of roles and tasks associated with translation as a communicative operation between languages and cultures, a solid theoretical concept of competence cannot be derived from models that attempt to be fully comprehensive. Translators do not just

translate, and translation is not their exclusive realm either. Robinson stresses that "a good translator is someone who has never quite experienced enough" (Robinson 2003, p. 99), but what multicomponential models seem to describe is an ultimate translator who has optimised their competence. They represent "a transcendental ideal translator" (Pym 2003, p. 487). A certain parallelism can be seen here with the ideal 'native speaker', now dethroned, and perhaps a similar future should be advocated for this ultimate translator. The growing preference for terms like mediators, language professionals and language service providers also points in that direction and acknowledges the diverse professional intercultures surrounding translation in the technological age (Pym 2002, p. 21).

4. The ability to translate

Although for the most part language learning and translation training both care about language use as communication, traditional notions of translation as a grammar and vocabulary exercise still have an effect in shaping attitudes towards the practice. In turn, translation training distances itself from the aims of language learning, and understandably insists that language competence alone is not sufficient to translate. But the assumption being made when contesting the relationship between bilingualism and translation tends to be related exclusively to quality and professionalism, ignoring the ability ingrained in "natural translators". In Pym's words:

> Just as everyone can sing, be it badly or well, so everyone who knows more than one language can translate, to some degree. However, not everyone is paid to sing opera, and not all translators are at the pinnacle of the translation profession. The difference between the various levels may partly be due to training—we train people not just to translate, which they can already do, but to translate well, perhaps for a specific purpose, market, or technological environment (2011, p. 313).

In this context, the distinction proposed by Kiraly (2000) between translation competence (producing acceptable texts) and translator competence (joining different communities like users of languages and new technologies or experts in technical fields) becomes meaningful. Since purposes, markets and technological environments are in constant flux, what seems to be common to all scenarios is ultimately the ability to successfully negotiate meaning through adequate interaction. A view of competence based on decision-making and problem-solving seems better suited to respond to this objective and the fragmented reality of the practice. Pym puts forward a minimalistic approach to competence consisting just of two joint elements:

> The ability to generate a series of more than one viable target text (T1, T2 … Tn) for a pertinent source text (ST);

> the ability to select only one viable TT from this series, quickly and with justified confidence (2003, p. 489).

This can be considered above all a concept of 'translating competence'. Even with no clear source text present, this model could be still applied to a view of communicative language competence from a translational perspective. The value of this definition is in its holistic, top-down take on competence that allows for a wider understanding of translational activities, making it more suitable for the current context of constant technological advances, but also more adaptable to future changes and needs. Without rejecting the need for developing more specific skill areas like subject domain knowledge or the use of tools and resources for future professional translators, this less considered alternative understanding of competence highlights the more instrumental role that these aspects of the curriculum play in the core ability to translate (Pym 2003, p. 494). This view is in line with Bernardini's (2014) distinction between training and education, and matches her call for the prioritisation of awareness, resourcefulness and reflectiveness independently of the professional sector. Such a conceptualisation of competence advances an approach which is sensitive to market needs but not reliant on immediate, utilitarian goals, and which focuses on the long-term flexibility that will make for a successful language professional today and tomorrow.

Conclusion

The protracted nature of the means and end debate is ultimately, in a way, a question of words. What is meant and understood when discussing translation? The traditional rejection of translation in language teaching has to do with a narrow interpretation. Similarly, what does bilingualism and language competence mean? For many in Translation Studies, and in translation training in particular, it is only a prerequisite for translation rather than the core element of the activity. In and of itself, this also demonstrates a particular understanding of translation, related almost exclusively to translation as a professional career. Translation is certainly a loaded term, a contentious space that dominant competent models seem to be trying to contain and demarcate almost against the reality of the global marketplace. How we as scholars, practitioners and instructors understand translation and language competence, how we define these concepts and how we make them explicit to both learners and employers has important repercussions for the kind of profiles in which professionals can recognise themselves, and the kind of skill sets that employers set out to find.

In the case of Ireland, where the demand for professionals with language skills is not relinquishing and the supply is in a continuous flux, these debates are more pertinent than

ever and must consider the particularities of an officially bilingual and increasingly multilingual nation, defined at the same time by the advantages and disadvantages of an international lingua franca. Educational efforts towards increasing language skills have to be supported by a clearer understanding of skills needs, objectives and outcomes. These, contrary to the perspectives sometimes unconsciously presented in generalist training programs, are constantly evolving. A more meticulous disciplinary dialogue is necessary to ensure that learners, whether in the language or in the translation class, are directed to the bigger picture of linguistic and cultural problem-solving.

Although with its own characteristics, the Irish context appears nonetheless to be indicative of the dynamic needs of today's interconnected, information-based economies. Linguistic and cultural mediation are a daily reality and, without a wider look at translational forms beyond those carried out by professional translators, a great deal of translating may remain unexplored and unguided. As Cook suggests, "in multilingual, multicultural societies [...], and in a world of constant cross-linguistic and cross-cultural global communication, there are reasons to see translation as being widely needed in everyday situations, and not as a specialized activity at all" (2010, p. 109). This does not mean transforming the language classroom into a classic translation classroom. Similarly, it does not mean doing away with specialised translator training nor bringing Translation Studies back under the wings of Linguistics or Second Language Acquisition. Such an approach would certainly not favour the elimination of traditional views of translation as an exercise in vocabulary and grammar testing which cloud the key role of translation as a form of communicative language use. There will always be a need and a place for linguists and language experts, as well as for all-round professional translators, translators by trade. But for any efforts to be fruitful, translation training must not forget that the translation profession is not a stable whole, and translation is commonly carried out by many different language users in many different contexts. Likewise, language teaching cannot just see in translation a tool, but has to engage with learners as multilingual speakers who develop communicative competence through a meaning negotiating process that is translational at its core.

The return of translation to the language classroom is a positive development because it demonstrates the recognition of its pedagogical and affective benefits, but also because it provides more realistic objectives for language teaching: learners become valid L2 users instead of failed native speakers. Nevertheless, the question remains whether it is still realistic for Higher Education Institutions to teach with natural bilinguals in mind, as it often seems to be the objective derived from the dominant communicative approach, or whether the

aim should be openly directed at the production of multilingual experts instead. If the aim is the latter, however, it seems that translation can play a vital role in making the connections between languages explicit, may it be at a word-for-word structural level or at a functional communicative level. This becomes especially relevant as the ideas of native or near-native proficiency are being increasingly challenged, and bilingualism ceases to be equated with full mastery of a distinct linguistic system and is rather understood as the use of multiple languages at different levels and in varied communicative contexts.

From the point of view of translation, the objective of teaching cannot be blindly built around an ideal competence as previously discussed. With the changing nature of the translation profession and the wider presence of translation in the global workplace, it is only to be expected that a model of competence that aims to account for *everything* that translators need to know and do is inexorably destined to lag behind developments in the market. It will never be comprehensive in any meaningful way, and may bind otherwise highly-skilled language experts to a limiting perception of their professional identity. Teaching cannot ignore that translation can take many forms. A positive step is the challenging of the idea that full language proficiency is necessary to start developing translation competence, although it is an assumption that still runs deep within the discipline and is ingrained in the dominant models of competence that inform much of what happens at curricular level. Authors like Li (2001) have stressed the need to rethink and properly tailor the language component in translation courses, but there is still a dearth of studies that directly deal with the teaching of languages for translators-to-be. Assuming that proficiency must come first and translation later while detaching itself completely from how that proficiency is attained and the role that translation plays in that process is no more than a vicious circle. As mentioned above, students are faced with having to unlearn previously acquired ideas about translation and language competence, and this will continue to be the case if languages keep being conceptualised as a separate tool that needs to be learned before being able to understand the tricks of the trade, instead of being taken as the very essence of the activity.

Language teaching and translation pedagogy have a complicated relationship, but their differences are not necessarily insurmountable. As disciplines, language education and Translation Studies have their own history, frameworks and paradigms but also share approaches and common questions. Both disciplines may stand strong independently but cannot ignore each other. They have an unavoidable connection and face similar challenges ahead, such as assessment, teacher training and the pedagogical implementation of new technologies. More than a decade since Colina (2002, p. 17) was asking already for greater

cooperation, translation has progressed in making a place for itself in the language classroom, although her hopes for full integration in the curriculum have not been fully realised yet and research on the interface between the two fields is still relatively limited. There is clearly a lot that they can still learn from one another by talking not just about how to use translation in the classroom in a beneficial way, or about how to better teach language so that translation trainees can develop an awareness of pragmatic and textual features more effectively. It is at the level of the fundamental theoretical concepts that the dialogue must occur for real progress to be made towards the common underlying objective of developing the ability to communicate in and between languages and cultures.

Estefanía Muñoz Gómez is a PhD candidate in the College of Arts, Celtic Studies and Social Sciences at University College Cork, where she was awarded an Excellence Scholarship for her project on translation practices in multilingual business settings. As both a translator and a language teacher, her research interests revolve around the areas of translation competence, translators training and education, the translation profession and non-professional translation and interpreting.

Works Cited

Berenguer, L., 1996. Didáctica de segundas lenguas en los estudios de traducción. In: A. Hurtado Albir, ed. *La enseñanza de la traducción*. Castellón: Universidad Jaume I, pp. 9–30.

Bernardini, S., 2004. The theory behind the practice: Translator training or translator education? In: K. Malmkjær, ed. *Translation in undergraduate degree programmes*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 17–30.

Butzkamm, W., 2001. Learning the language of loved ones: On the generative principle and the technique of mirroring. *ELT Journal*, 55 (2), pp. 149–154.

Butzkamm, W., 2003. We only learn language once. The role of the mother tongue in FL classrooms: death of a dogma. *Language learning journal*, 28 (1), pp. 29–39.

Canale, M. and Swain, M., 1980. Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics,* 1 (1), pp. 1–47.

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

Colina, S., 2002. *Second Language Acquisition, Language Teaching and Translation Studies*. The Translator, 8 (1), pp. 1–24.

Cook, V., 2001. Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57 (3), pp. 402–423.

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

Ellis, R., 2005. Principles of instructed language learning. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly,* 7 (3), pp. 9–24.

Expert Group on Future Skills Needs, 2016. *National Skills Bulletin 2016.* Available at: http://www.skillsireland.ie/Publications/2016/National%20Skills%20Bulletin%202016.html [Accessed 10 January 2018]

Göpferich, S., 2008. *Translationsprozessforschung: Stand – Methoden – Perspektiven*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Göpferich, S., Bayer-Hohenwarter, G., Prassl, F., Stadlober, J., 2011. Exploring translation competence acquisition: Criteria of analysis put to the test. In: S. O'Brien, ed. *Cognitive Explorations of Translation*. London/New York: Continuum, pp. 57–85.

Harris, B., 1976. The importance of natural translation. *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 12, pp. 96–114.

Hymes, D., 1972. On Communicative Competence. In J. Pride and J.t Holmes, eds. *Sociolinguistics*. Harmonsworth: Penguin, pp. 269–293.

Kelly, D., 2005. *A Handbook for Translator Trainers: A guide to reflexive practice*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Kiraly, D., 2000. *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education. Empowerment from Theory to Practice*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Laviosa, S., 2014. *Translation and language education: Pedagogic approaches explored*. London/New York: Routledge.

Lee, J. and Van Patten, B., 1995. *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Leonardi, V., 2010. *The Role of Pedagogical Translation in Second Language Acquisition. From Theory to Practice*. Oxford: Peter Lang.

Li, D., 2001. Language teaching in translator training. *Babel*, 47 (4), pp. 343–354.

Macaro, E., 2009. Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring optimal use. In: M. Turnbull and J. Dailey-O'Cain, eds. *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Bristol/Buffalo: Multilingual Matters, pp. 35–49.

Malmkjær, K., 1998. *Translation & language teaching: Language teaching & translation*. Manchester: Saint Jerome Publications.

Neubert, A., 2000. Competence in language, in languages, and in translation. In: C. Schäffner

and B. Adab, eds. *Developing translation competence*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 3–18.

PACTE, 2003. Building a translation competence model. In: F. Alves, ed. *Triangulating Translation: Perspectives in Process Oriented Research*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 43–66.

PACTE, 2011. Results of the validation of the PACTE translation competence model: Translation project and dynamic translation index. In: S. O'Brien, ed. *Cognitive Explorations of Translation*. London/New York: Continuum, pp. 30–56.

Pintado, L., 2012a. Fundamentos de La Traducción Pedagógica: Traducción, Pedagogía y Comunicación. *Sendebar*, 23, pp. 321–353.

Pintado Gutiérrez, L., 2012b. The Use of Translation towards Foreign Language Autonomous Learning. In P. Alderete-Díez, L. Incalcaterra McLoughlin, L. Ní Dhonnchadha, eds. *Translation, Technology and Autonomy in Language Teaching and Learning*. Oxford: Peter Lang, pp. 175–195.

Pym, A., 2002. Training language service providers: Local knowledge in institutional contexts. In: B. Maia, J. Haller and M. Ulrych, eds. *Training the language services provider for the New Millennium: proceedings of the III Encontros de Traduçao de Astra-FLUP*. Porto: Universidad do Porto, pp. 21–30.

Pym, A., 2003. Redefining translation competence in an electronic age. In defence of a minimalist approach. *Meta: Journal des traducteurs*, 48 (4), pp. 481–497.

Pym, A., 2011. Training translators. In: K. Malmkjær and K. Windler, eds. *The Oxford handbook of Translation Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 313–321.

Robinson, D., 2003. *Becoming a translator: an introduction to the theory and practice of translation*. London: Routledge.

Schäffner, C., 2000. Running before walking? Designing a translation programme at undergraduate level". In: C. Schäffner and B. Adab, eds. *Developing translation competence*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 143–156.

Schäffner, C., 2004. Developing professional translation competence without a notion of translation. In: K. Malmkjær, ed. *Translation in undergraduate degree programmes*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 113–126.

Shreve, G., 2012. Bilingualism and translation. In: Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer, eds. *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Vol 3. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 1–7.

Witte, A., Harden, T., and De Oliveira Harden, A.R., eds. 2009. *Translation in second language learning and teaching*. New York: Peter Lang.

Zojer, H., 2009. Translation as language awareness: overburdening or enriching the foreign language classroom? In: A. Witte, T. Harden and A.R. De Oliveira Harden, eds. *Translation in second language learning and teaching*. New York: Peter Lang.