

## Translation in Language Teaching - The Need for Redefinition of Translation

Nguyen Thi Thu Huong<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The University of Foreign Language Studies, the University of Da Nang, Viet Nam

\* Corresponding author's email: [ntthuong@ufl.udn.vn](mailto:ntthuong@ufl.udn.vn)

\*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8032-2701>

\*  <https://doi.org/10.54855/acoj.241512>

® Copyright (c) 2023 Nguyen Thi Thu Huong

### Abstract

Translation has been long excluded from language classes due to its association with the drawbacks of the Grammar Translation Method (GTM). However, in recent years, translation has made a comeback with its positive impact on students' language performance. The effect of translation on the learner's language knowledge has been finite compared with other language activities. The paper presents a critical analysis of research on translation in language teaching. It is found that the limited results of studies on the impact of translation may involve linguistic focus. Generally, most of the studies did not focus on the meaningfulness of linguistic items, which can only be achieved by placing them in context. In other words, the linguistic view of translation is still common in studies supporting translation. The redefinition of translation should incorporate communicative aspects of translation and the function of translation in a communicative context. The literature-based paper reinstates the importance of a communicative view of translation in language teaching, and it makes proposals related to the inclusion of translation in language learning classes.

**Keywords:** Translation, language learning, communicative view

### Introduction

The translation was well-known in language teaching in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries through the GTM, which prioritized students' literature reading skills and their grammatical knowledge over oral skills. During the 20<sup>th</sup> century, a variety of teaching methods stressed oral skills, and translation lost favor in second-language pedagogy. In many classrooms, translation activities associated with the GTM disappeared. More recently, however, the role of translation in language classes has been reconfigured (Beecroft, 2013; Bonyadi, 2003; Carreres, 2014; Carreres & Noriega-Sánchez, 2011; Cook, 2010; Leonardi, 2010; Leonardi & Salvi, 2016). A myriad of studies have shown that translation can be an effective means of developing students' language knowledge and skills (Belpoliti & Plascencia, 2013; Pariente-Beltran, 2013).

In the meantime, translation can be considered a worthwhile skill in itself when learners use it in their daily and professional lives (Cook, 2010; Duff, 1989; Klein-Braley, 1996). Some authors, including Carreres (2014) and Leonardi (2010), also argue that translation should be regarded as the "fifth skill" in language learning in addition to speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Carreres (2014) indicates that there is a blurred line between translation as a means (to

help students improve their language learning) and an end (students knowing how to translate) in language teaching. A number of studies conducted in undergraduate language programs have attempted to enhance students' knowledge of and skills in Translation (Translation as an end) (see Section 2.2.2).

While there is insufficient research related to the shift from the traditional view of translation to the more communicative one, this paper attempts to explain this tendency. Specifically, this paper which reviews relevant journal articles and books describes a resurgence of translation in language teaching and re-examines how the role of translation is viewed and how it is taught in different contexts, which calls for the need to redefine translation in language teaching.

## Literature review

### *Language teaching and translation teaching*

#### Pedagogical Translation vs. Translation Pedagogy

A number of scholars (Davies & Kiraly, 2006; Holmes, 1994, 2004; Vermes, 2010) have agreed on a clear demarcation between pedagogical translation and translation pedagogy as they differ, mainly in function and audience. Firstly, the former kind of translation is a means of enhancing foreign language knowledge and skills and is a well-known concept in language teaching, while the latter equips students with knowledge, skills, and principles of translation as a profession and relates to professional translator training. Secondly, students who do pedagogical translation do not have to deal with any client or reader who needs to understand the target language (TT); the teacher, however, may use translation to assess students' comprehension and/or translation ability. This kind of translation is not a communicative activity in which a translator should fulfill the task of linguistic and cultural mediation, taking into account the needs of their readers or clients.

Some researchers advocate that translation in language teaching should reflect the principles of professional translation and enable learners to translate rather than just develop L2 competence (Carreres, 2014; Carreres & Noriega-Sánchez, 2011; Colina, 2002; Cook, 2010; Duff, 1989; Klein-Braley, 1996; Suparmin, 2003). Cook (2010, p. xx) argues that language learners need to be able to translate because translation is "part of everyday bilingual language use" both personally and professionally. Klein-Braley (1996, p. 24) adds that the aim of language courses "must be to enable all-round language professionals to tackle translation themselves for in-house and informal purposes, and also-and importantly-to supervise the translation of texts for public and formal purposes". Similarly, according to Duff (1989), who sees that translation is natural and necessary in the real world, when learners are introduced to a variety of oral and written text types, registers, and styles in translation, they will also develop the skills necessary in second language acquisition and the multilingual world.

The separation of translation as a means to teach languages and translation being taught as an end or a skill/profession is a result of diverging views about translation. Advocates of pedagogical Translation see translation as a linguistic activity in which learners learn language features by comparing and contrasting the first language (L1) and the second language (L2). On the other hand, through translation pedagogy, learners should learn to translate an ST, keeping in mind the target reader and the purpose of the translation. This means that translation

is seen as an act of communication in translation pedagogy. In an article titled "Translation as a means and as an end: Reassessing the divide", Carreres (2014) maintains that if we consider translation as a means to language learning and as a skill as two independent activities, we seem to acknowledge the "disconnection of translation from its natural goal of communication, which characterized the grammar-translation method" (p. 130). Carreres argues that "translation as a means is at its most effective and stimulating when learning objectives and pedagogical design are brought as close as possible to the realities of professional translation – that is, to translation as an end in itself" (p. 130). Meanwhile, Carreres indicates that the training of professional translators should also take into account the improvement of learners' knowledge of the languages involved.

In agreement with Carreres, who sees no difference between translating in language teaching and translation education, Colina and Lafford (2018) argue that the dichotomies, including pedagogical translation vs. translation pedagogy and language learning vs. translation learning, have "prevented fruitful interaction between these fields [translation studies and language acquisition], as the areas of overlap have been minimi(s)ed by prescriptivist and over-simplistic approaches" (p. 3). Therefore, I maintain that teaching translation in a language teaching context should not be only limited to pedagogical Translation (Translation as a means), but teaching translation should promote language learners' ability to translate (Translation as an end), adopting the view of translation as a communicative activity. The argument is supported throughout the rest of the paper. It will be first consolidated by a description of the similarities between language learning and translating, given the two activities are naturally part of communication. The next section compares language learning and translating before presenting the impact of language learning on translating.

### Language learning and translating

Language learning and translating both emphasize learners' ability to communicate (Carreres & Noriega-Sánchez, 2011; Colina, 2002). Colina (2002) relates the concept of communicative language competence by Savignon (1972, 1983) and Lee and VanPatten's (1995) to communicative translation competence by Kiraly (1995). She maintains that both activities aim at improving learners' ability to express, interpret, and negotiate meaning in communicative situations. In other words, communicative language competence is achieved by interacting with the input rather than learning formal aspects of the language, while communicative translation competence enables learners to act appropriately in communicative translation tasks. In the same vein, Carreres (2014) referred to the concept of communicative competence developed by Canale (1983) and Canale and Swain (1980), including: grammatical competence (the knowledge of linguistic aspects of languages), sociolinguistic competence (understanding of the social contexts and cultures), discourse competence (knowledge of text types and text type conventions) and strategic competence (strategies to enhance communication). Carreres affirms its closeness with translation competence, particularly as defined by Kelly (2005, pp. 32-33): "macrocompetence that comprises the different capacities, skills, knowledge and even attitudes that professional translators possess and which are involved in translation as an expert activity". Kelly's notion includes aspects such as communicative and textual competence in at least two languages and cultures, cultural and intercultural competence, subject area competence, and

strategic competence (e.g., problem identification and solving and self-assessment). Kelly also refers to professional and instrumental competence (use of documentary resources including dictionaries), psycho-physiological competence (e.g., self-confidence and memory), and interpersonal competence (e.g., teamwork and negotiation skills).

The strategic processes of language learning and translating are also similar. According to Bachman (1990), a language learning activity includes assessment, planning, and execution. In the assessment phase, language learners identify the situation in which communication takes place and determine the type of language competencies needed to achieve the goal of communication. The planning component allows them to retrieve relevant items from language competence, including linguistic and extralinguistic knowledge. Then they execute the plan in an appropriate way to fulfill the communication goal(s) (neurological and psychological processes involved). For instance, in comprehending a job advertising text, it is necessary for learners to assess the situation (e.g., the author, our background knowledge, and our reading expectations) before planning available resources (e.g., knowledge of vocabulary and the subject matter relevant to job descriptions) and adopting different reading strategies to achieve the goal of comprehension. In response to the advert, learners may write a letter of job application. Similar processes (i.e., assessment, planning, and execution) are involved. Learners should assess the communicative situation (e.g., who the reader is—the employer and what the purpose of the communication is—applying for a job) so that they can plan and execute relevant linguistic features and conventions of an application letter to succeed in applying for the job.

Similar phases of assessment, planning, and execution take place in the act of translating. In translating an advert, translators or translation students first assess the situation of the source text or ST (available from ST features such as author and place of publication) before planning and executing their available language competencies (linguistic and extralinguistic knowledge) to understand the ST. Then they go on to the production of the translation or the TT, which also involves assessment (the context of the TT is considered), planning, and execution (linguistic choices are considered and decided on depending on the target reader and the context of the translated advert).

Despite such similarities, language learning and translating differ in that the language learner directly produces a speech act in a communicative context, while the translator produces a speech act that is dependent on the context of its translation. In other words, both activities are focused on functional language use or functions of language. In language learning, comprehension may not necessarily be followed by production (reading the job advert is independent of writing a job application). If "production does follow comprehension, it is a reaction with a different Message, not a reformulation of the same Message" (Gile, 2009, p. 106). The production of a job application letter, which follows the act of reading, has a different message from the advert text. In the meantime, in translating, "comprehension and production follow each other systematically and act on the same message" (Gile, 2009, p. 106). In other words, the main difference between the two activities lies in the mediation of the ST in translating. The translator not only reads the text for their own comprehension, but they must also send the ST content and message(s) to target readers. Functioning as both the receiver and the sender of the ST, the translator must understand the ST and mediate differences in languages

and cultures to facilitate target readers' comprehension of the ST.

While the noticeable difference between language learning and translating involves the presence and the importance of the ST in Translation, the two activities can inform each other. It is assumed that language learners who have communicative language competence and an awareness of pragmatic features in communicative contexts are expected to perform well in translation. However, this is not always the case. Therefore, it is of great importance to understand language learners' behaviors in translation to apply appropriate pedagogical intervention in translation teaching (Colina, 2002).

### Impact of language learning on translation

Given the analogy between language learning and translating, language learners are expected to assess, plan, and execute the translation task in a communicative way. However, in practice, they lack the awareness of pragmatic features or the situations of communication to perform a communicative translation task. Colina (2002) and Pariente-Beltran (2013) explain that while many language programs are oriented to communicative practices, the GTM is still prevalent, and learners' communicative competence (particularly sociolinguistic, discursive, and strategic competencies) is not prioritized. As a result, learners lack an awareness of the communicative situation or pragmatic features in achieving the communication goal(s). Even when being taught by CLT methods, language learners usually have deeply rooted misconceptions about translation, and they consider translation as an activity in which they mainly achieve linguistic equivalence and/or grammatical correctness between the ST and the TT (Colina, 2002). Paying inadequate attention to ST and TT features, language learners may not properly understand ST meanings constrained by the author's intention or text type; neither do they produce a translation that meets the requirements of the TT.

Influenced by their language learning experience and/or their pre-existing conceptions about translation, language learners lack an awareness of the translation process as firmly supported by various studies on the behaviours of language learners and translators in Translation (Alves, 2005; Jonasson, 1998; Lørscher, 2005; Okonska & Kościalkowska-Okońska, 2013; Olk, 2001; Tirkkonen-Condit, 2005). Language learners often try to reproduce the ST as closely as possible, which does not always fulfill the communicative function of the translation. Unlike professionals who consider the situation of text and specific linguistic features in their top-down approach, language learners rely more on bottom-up processing, which is focused on the local level of words or phrases (Okonska & Kościalkowska-Okońska, 2013, pp. 227-228). They often rely on a heavy use of dictionaries to check the meanings of these lexical items (González-Davies, 2004). In other words, language learners take the "form-oriented approach in that they produce translations mainly by an exchange of language signs" (Lørscher, 2005, p. 605). This downplays the meaning of the translated text. They rarely use "sense-oriented procedures" (p. 605), which the translator frequently adopts to avoid the distortion of sense and violations of TL norms. Monitoring or checking the output with reference to the text type and discursive features is also lacking in their translation processes. In general, language learners' lack of awareness of texts and discursive features means that they disregard contextual factors in translating ST micro elements. Therefore, in seeking an effective method in teaching translation, language learners should be encouraged to avoid a total reliance on literal

translation, unlearn their misconceptions about translation, and develop an understanding of the translation process.

The discussion of the kinship between language learning and translating demonstrates the need to see translation as communication in language teaching and emphasizes language learners' ability to translate. This would, to some extent, resolve the differences between pedagogical translation and translation pedagogy. The urge to view translation as a communicative act will also be illustrated in the following review of translation in language teaching. Specifically, I elucidate how the status of translation has evolved in language teaching and how the issue of teaching translation has been discussed in language teaching in the next sections.

### *Translation in language teaching*

#### *Long-term neglect of translation in language teaching*

The translation was first used to teach languages in the 18th and 19th centuries with the rise of the GTM; it went out of favor after the advent of subsequent language teaching methods, such as the Direct Method, the Audiolingual Method, and the Communicative Approach. The GTM promoted the students' ability to read classical literature rather than speak the target language (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). In the GTM, grammar rules were presented in the L1 in a graded sequence and were exemplified through the translation of isolated sentences. Lists of decontextualized vocabulary items, along with their corresponding equivalents, were also memorized.

With the advent of language teaching methods that prioritized speech and oral practice, translation disappeared from language classes. The Direct Method advocated that L2 learning should resemble the learning of the L1 as much as possible. Therefore, teachers were advised not to include translation in their language class due to its lack of focus on oral language and the excessive use of isolated and artificial sentence structures (Newson, 1998). Similarly, translation was excluded from the Audiolingual Method, which was based on the structuralist linguistic paradigm and behaviorism. Particular dialogues and structures were learned by imitation, repetition, and memorization. The L1 was considered to be a source of interference with L2 acquisition because, according to behaviorism, new L2 habits are highly influenced by old L1 habits. If there is heavy use of L1 in L2 language classes, there will be L1 interference or a harmful effect on students' acquisition of native-like language proficiency (Cook, 2010; Lado, 1964; Newson, 1998). In the 1970s, when the Communicative Approach focused on functional categories or the purpose of communication rather than language structures, the translation of isolated sentences played a minimal part in enabling learners to express meanings and develop their' communicative competence (Laviosa, 2014). In other words, translation was only considered acceptable when it facilitated the learning process or enabled students to understand class instructions. In fact, translation was not considered a communicative activity in communicative language teaching.

Leonardi and Salvi (2016) summarise the limitations of translation teaching associated with the GTM: its excessive reliance on learners' L1, its neglect of oral language, and its use of artificial sentences to illustrate grammatical points. With these focuses, the learners' acquisition of native-like competence and their development of communicative competence are hindered.



Malmkjær (1998) lists other arguments against translation in language teaching, claiming that translation

- is independent of the four skills which define language competence: reading, writing, speaking and listening
- is radically different from the four skills
- takes up valuable time which could be used to teach these four skills
- is unnatural
- misleads students into thinking that expressions in two languages correspond one-to-one
- prevents students from thinking in a foreign language
- produces interference
- is a bad test of language skills
- is only appropriate for training translators. (p. 6)

Many of the above-mentioned arguments are challenged by studies reviewed in Section 2.2.2. The major reason for the objection of translation in language teaching can be somewhat accounted for by its connection with the GTM (Carreres & Noriega-Sánchez, 2011; House, 2008; Tsagari & Phlōros, 2013; Vermes, 2010; Widdowson, 2003). There have been “equally fallacious interpretations of the translation task as the common attempt of finding lexical and structural correspondences among L1 and L2 (grammar-translation)” (Tsagari & Phlōros, 2013, p. vii). The role of the view of translation will be discussed in the next section, which describes the revival of translation in language teaching.

### Resurgence of Translation and the need for redefinition

After decades of being downplayed in language teaching due to its association with the GTM, Translation has been reinstated in language teaching (Cook, 2010; House, 2008; Laviosa, 2014). At the least, it does no harm to language development and does not interfere with L2 acquisition (Duff, 1989; Harvey, 1996; Malmkjær, 1998). For example, Duff (1989) maintains that translation enables students to be aware of the L1 influence on L2 and to deal with problems caused by the interference. It enhances learners’ linguistic knowledge (Belpoliti & Plascencia, 2013; Hummel, 2010; Korošec, 2013; Pariente-Beltran, 2013; Valdeón, 2015), and develops their language skills (D’Amore, 2014; Kim, 2011; Lee, 2013). Translation enables students to develop confidence and self-esteem, and it is favorably regarded by both students and teachers (Canga-Alonson & Rubio-Goitia, 2016; Dagilienè, 2012; Fernández-Guerra, 2014; Kelly & Bruen, 2015; Kokkinidou & Spanou, 2013; Murtisari, 2016).

The matter of concern is not whether translation is useful or not, but rather, how to use it for what purpose and to what effect. I explore these issues further by examining recent empirical studies on translation in language teaching.

Belpoliti and Plascencia (2013) experimented with English-to-Spanish translation activities in which students were asked to read and analyze two newspaper articles (the original text in English and the Translation in Spanish). Groups of students found five pairs of equivalents in the two texts. The groups then looked for metaphors in the translated text and checked if they had equivalents in the English text. The students’ work was collected, and they discussed the exercises about problems in translation (e.g., word search) with their instructor. They finally

summarized the vocabulary learned. The authors found that learners improved their lexical awareness, but the effect was finite.

Valdeón (2015) asked students to render two episodes of a British sitcom into Spanish. The author noticed that the students' translations of taboos in the texts were close to the original. Valdeón found that the students were able to understand L1 and L2 differences in the use of taboos, and they were cautious in treating them in translation. Valdeón did not have a clear explanation for the students' caution except for his explanation that taboos were common in Spanish. The author did not emphasize the contextual factors in students' translation, even though they briefly referred to social contexts in the use of taboos.

Hummel (2010) experimented with three conditions: French L1 to English L2 translation, English to French Translation, and a rote-copying task. All the students were first given 15 unknown English words. Students of the first two conditions translated the English words into their L1, while those in the last group copied the words. After that, all the students were provided with booklets that contained L2 equivalents for the English words. The first two groups were asked to translate the provided sentences that contained the words into the L2 and L1, respectively, while the rote-copying group just copied the L2 sentences that contained the English words. Without previously having been informed that they would be tested on these words, all the students were then asked to recall the introduced words in a follow-up test. Hummel (2010) noticed that the three conditions all increased the learners' short-term lexical recall, but rote copying had a more significant impact. The author explains that the students in translation groups put more effort into translating the sentences in time-consuming tasks than in remembering the words, while the students copying sentences had more time to concentrate on memorizing them. This implies that the author adopted the perception of translation as a linguistic activity that focuses on contrasting isolated ST and TT items.

Korošec (2013) examined the role of Translation in English learning of first-year Slovene students. An experimental group was taught with the use of L1 and Translation. The control group was taught without L1 or Translation (there is no information about the teaching method used for this group). The teacher in the experimental group used the students' L1 to explain grammatical rules and provided them with homework in which they translated lexical items (e.g., nouns), sentences, or shorter texts that targeted particular structures from L1 into L2. The students then discussed these exercises in class. Even though the researcher mentioned discussions of appropriate solutions in contexts, there was not a clear elaboration on which factors they should focus on. The study revealed the usefulness of L1 and Translation to students' learning of linguistic knowledge. However, no significant differences in test results between the two groups were found. The author attributed the limited results to methodological flaws (e.g., statistical measurements on small samples and tests implemented long after treatment) rather than their limited focus on contextual factors of translation exercises.

Lee (2013) investigated whether translation enhanced students' scores on reading. The selected English and non-English-majors translated two passages of an English L2 reading passage into Chinese L1 before answering five multiple-choice questions in reading comprehension (three questions were concerned with the translated paragraphs). Even though the study suggested the benefits of translation in promoting students' text comprehension, the students did not have



correct answers for "text-based" or "inference-based" questions related to the meanings of words and phrases or general ideas expressed in paragraphs. This can be explained by students' lack of attention to textual features. In fact, in analyzing students' solutions, the researcher mentioned the application of the professional assessment criteria—accuracy and expression that focused on "student performance in accuracy, understanding of the original, expression, and language competence in using their mother tongue to represent the original meaning" (p. 15). This indicated the author's lack of emphasis on a communicative view of translation and contextualized translations. Therefore, these ideas could not have been engendered in the students.

Another study by D'Amore (2014) on the role of translation in reading combines reading comprehension and translation in the form of contrastive analysis to improve students' English L2 reading skills in Mexico. Students discussed their comprehension of English texts before they translated them into Spanish. In class discussions, the students read aloud sentences they had translated. D'Amore explains that by reading aloud their translations, the students could improve the coherence of Spanish versions. D'Amore also indicates that literal translation highlighted structural differences. The author criticized the translation of isolated sentences as advocated in the GTM and referred to authentic texts and communicative, collaborative translation tasks. However, how communicative tasks were implemented was not described. Exercises that used authentic texts mainly focused on matching extracts with their book covers. In fact, D'Amore employed translation mainly as a tool to learn English vocabulary and grammar. Raw data indicated that during semesters from 2009 to 2013, more students achieved a higher level of reading (from B1 to B2+ and C1 as described in the European English proficiency framework).

In a study that investigated the impact of translation on students' writing skill, E. Kim (2011) required students to translate verbatim sentences of their own writing in English L2 into Korean L1. Based on the students' reflections after translating their own English writing and that of their peers' into L1 or Korean, Kim concludes (with reference to anecdotal data) that translation enables the students to "look at their own writing more objectively, which they failed to do without the aid of their first language" (p. 158) and understand that "grammatical accuracy is vital for successful written communication" (p. 158). In other words, E. Kim employed translation as a linguistic activity to assist students in learning English.

In the above studies in support of translation in language teaching, translation has been used as a contrastive analysis activity in which sentences in the L1 and the L2 are compared and contrasted. The purpose of such an activity has been to enable students to learn isolated vocabulary items and grammatical sentential structures rather than focusing on contextual features of translation tasks or treating translation as a skill by itself. Most studies have prioritized students' memory of linguistic items to their functional use of language. The effect of translation on the learner's language knowledge has been finite compared with other language activities. Authors of some of these studies have not presented sound methodologies (e.g., results obtained from raw data or anecdotal data) and they did not have satisfactory explanations for the limited results of their studies. Generally, most of the studies did not focus on the meaningfulness of linguistic items which can only be achieved by placing them in contexts. In

other words, the linguistic view of translation is still common in studies supporting translation, which is similar to those against translation. In fact, House (2008) claims that a linguistic view of translation is held among those who plead against and for the use of translation in language teaching.

Linguistic approaches to translation (based on contrastive linguistics) do not consider the contextual use of words and sentences. It is important to note that translation is not the same as contrastive linguistics. Emphasizing the need to understand the differences between the two fields, House (2008) explains how "langue" or the language system differs from "parole" or concrete utterances in texts and insists that translation is performed at the level of parole rather than langue. This means that translators must choose among various target equivalents. According to House, "(w)hile contrastive linguistics tends to focus on the language system, translation is concerned with the reali(s)ation of that system in acts of communication" (p. 136). In fact, translation tasks based on contrastive analysis do not offer learners opportunities to improve their ability to achieve communicative goals in using a L2 language, as identified by Colina (2002), who mentions the drawback of associating translation with contrastive analysis as follows:

Translation is often associated with contrastive analysis since translation exercises are used to learn structural differences between languages and to test the student's knowledge of these differences. Students exposed to behaviorist/contrastive methodologies learn about the language rather than how to use it: there is no creation or exchange of meaningful information. (p. 3)

Colina (2002) explains that the GTM and audiolingual methodologies based their language learning theories on structuralism or behaviorism which focuses on linguistic forms rather than communicative aspects of language. Colina points out that due to the "formalist, non-communicative views of language" (p. 4), translation for the purpose of language learning, which is different from professional translation activity, has been frowned on by communicative language teachers.

Notably, avoiding the contrastive or behaviorist approach to learning, an increasing number of scholars who recognize the synergies between the two fields suggest that translation in language teaching should be defined from the perspective of communication (Carreres & Noriega-Sánchez, 2011; Leonardi & Salvi, 2016). "Translating means mediating a message between two different linguistic and cultural communities, and the same applies to language learning" (Leonardi & Salvi, 2016, p. 336). In other words, both language learning and translation should aim at getting the message across over linguistic and cultural differences. Obviously, the need to see translation as a communicative activity is emphasized. Many recent studies on translation in language teaching, including Phat (2022), have emphasized the role of contextual factors and communicative aspects in teaching translation.

Generally, translation has made a comeback in language teaching, as evidenced by a myriad of studies on the use of translation in language teaching. However, the impact of translation in language teaching is still limited partly due to the adopted purely linguistic view of translation. Similarities between language learning and translation and discussions on the communicative aspects of the two types of activities can justify the proposal to define translation from the

communicative viewpoint.

## Conclusion

Translation as a means of language teaching has had a resurgence in recent decades. Concurrently, there has been a demand for training in translation as an end or a skill by itself to meet the need for translation services. The paper reported that the dominant view of translation among teachers and learners in language courses in language programs was a linguistic one. When compared to other language exercises, translation has a limited impact on the learner's linguistic understanding. Some of these studies' authors have not provided sound techniques (such as conclusions derived from raw data or anecdotal data) or adequate justifications for the study's restricted findings. The meaningfulness of linguistic items—which can only be attained by placing them in contexts—was generally not the focus of most studies. Due to the limited view of translation and similarities between translation and language learning, a number of scholars have advocated for translation both as a means and an end in language teaching and indicated similarities between language teaching and translation studies based on communicative views of language and translation.

In tertiary language programs, it is necessary to broaden students' view of language in English classes so that by the time they enter translation courses, they will have an understanding that a range of factors influences all language use. Language and translation learning should be driven by a common communicative view of language and translation, and the two should be mutually informative. Students will then be less focused on the idea of language as a linguistic code than they are now. This will facilitate the teaching and learning of translation in subsequent translation courses.

It is the role of a language program to enable students to broaden their views of language and translation. Language teachers can be first introduced to diverse evidence for the resurgence of translation in language teaching so that they consider adopting a translation component in language classes. They should then be made aware of the role of a communicative view of translation in the teaching of translation before discussing the selection of texts for translation and the planning of effective translation activities in language teaching.

More empirical research is needed to justify the usefulness of a communicative view of translation in yielding satisfactory results in teaching a language as a means and an end. Studies that adopt this view of translation can be carried out in a larger scope and in greater depth. Comparison of the results of translation with those of other language learning activities in different contexts can be useful in enhancing the role of translation in language learning and teaching. This may help promote language proficiency in Vietnam, where foreign languages, particularly English, are used for different purposes (Truong & Le, 2022).

## References

- Alves, F. (2005). Bridging the gap between declarative and procedural knowledge in the training of translators: Meta-reflection under scrutiny. *Meta: Journal des Traducteurs/Translators' Journal*, 50(4). doi: 10.7202/019861ar
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beecroft, R. (2013). From intercultural speaker to intercultural writer: Towards a new understanding of translation in foreign language teaching. In D. Tsagari & G. Phlōros (Eds.), *translation in language teaching and assessment* (pp. 155-172). Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Belpoliti, F., & Plascencia, A. (2013). Translation techniques in the Spanish for heritage learners' classroom: Promoting lexical development. In D. Tsagari & G. Floros (Eds.), *translation in language teaching and assessment* (pp. 65-92). Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Bonyadi, A. (2003). Translation: Back from Siberia. *Translation Journal*, 7(3), 1983.
- Brender, A. S. (2002). *The effectiveness of teaching articles to (-Art) ESL students in writing classes using consciousness-raising methods*. (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, America). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. *Language and Communication*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47. doi: 10.1093/applin/1.1.1
- Canga-Alonso, A., & Rubio-Goitia, A. (2016). Students' reflections on pedagogical Translation in Spanish as a foreign language. *Tejuelo*, 23(1), 132-157
- Carreres, Á. (2014). Translation as a means and as an end: Reassessing the divide. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 8(1), 123-135. doi: 10.1080/1750399X.2014.908561
- Carreres, Á., & Noriega-Sánchez, M. (2011). Translation in language teaching: Insights from professional translator training. *The Language Learning Journal*, 39(3), 281-297. doi: 10.1080/09571736.2011.567356
- Colina, S. (2002). Second language acquisition, language teaching, and translation studies. *Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication*, 8(1), 1-24.
- Colina, S., & Lafford, B. A. (2018). Translation in Spanish language teaching: The integration of a "fifth skill" in the second language curriculum. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching*, 1-14. doi: 10.1080/23247797.2017.1407127
- Cook, G. (2010). *Translation in language teaching: An argument for reassessment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- D'Amore, A. M. (2014). The role of translation in language teaching: Back to GT in ELT?. In Y. Cui & W. Zhao (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching methods in language translation and interpretation* (pp. 118-135). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Dagilienė, I. (2012). Translation as a learning method in English language teaching. *Studies About Languages*, 21, 124-129. doi: 10.5755/j01.sal.0.21.1469
- Davies, M., & Kiraly, D. (2006). Translation: Pedagogy. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd ed., pp. 81-85). Cambridge, UK: Elsevier Ltd.
- Duff, A. (1989). *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fernández-Guerra, A. B. (2014). The usefulness of translation in foreign language learning: Students' attitudes. *IJ-ELTS*, 2(1), 153-170.
- Gile, D. (2009). *Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training* (Rev. ed.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- González-Davies, M. (2004). *Multiple voices in the translation classroom: Activities, tasks and projects*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Harvey, M. (1996). A translation course for French-speaking students. In P. Sewell & I. Higgins (Eds.), *Teaching translation in universities: Present and future perspectives* (pp. 45-65). London, UK: Assn. for French Language Studies & Centre for Information on Language Teaching & Research.
- Holmes, J. S. (1994). *Translated! Papers on literary translation and translation studies* (Vol. 7.). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- House, J. (2008). Using translation to improve pragmatic competence. In E. Alco'n Soler & A. Martinez-Flor (Eds.), *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing*, (pp. 3-25). Bristol, PA: Multilingual Matters.
- Hummel, K. M. (2010). Translation and short-term L2 vocabulary retention: Hindrance or help? *Language Teaching Research*, 14(1), 61-74. doi: 10.1177/1362168809346497
- Jonasson, K. (1998). Degree of text awareness in professional vs. non-professional translators. In A. Beylard-Ozeroff, J. Králová & B. Moser-Mercer (Eds.), *Translators' strategies and*
- Kelly, D. (2005). *A handbook for translator trainers: A guide to reflective practice*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Kelly, N., & Bruen, J. (2015). Translation as a pedagogical tool in the foreign language classroom: A qualitative study of attitudes and behaviours. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(2), 150-168. doi: 10.1177/1362168814541720
- Kim, E. (2011). Using translation exercises in the communicative EFL writing classroom. *ELT Journal*, 65(2), 154-160. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccq039
- Klein-Braley, C. (1996). Teaching translation: A brief for the future. In P. Sewell & I. Higgins (Ed.), *Teaching translation in universities: Present and future perspectives* (pp. 15-30). London, UK: AFLS & CILT.

- Kokkinidou, A., & Spanou, K. (2013). The didactic use of translation in foreign language teaching: A practical example. In D. Tsagari & G. Phlōros (Eds.), *translation in language teaching and assessment* (pp. 173-190). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Korošec, M. K. (2013). Teaching grammar through translation. In D. Tsagari & G. Phlōros (Eds.), *translation in language teaching and assessment* (pp. 23-40). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lado, R. (1964). *Language teaching: A scientific approach*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Laviosa, S. (2014). *Translation and language education: Pedagogic approaches explored*. New
- Lee, T. (2013). Incorporating translation into the language classroom and its potential impacts upon L2 learners. In D. Tsagari & G. Floros (Eds.), *translation in language teaching and assessment* (pp. 3-22). Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Leonardi, V. (2010). *The role of pedagogical translation in second language acquisition: From theory to practice*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Leonardi, V., & Salvi, R. (2016). Language pedagogy and translation studies: Towards a (re)definition of translation. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Border Crossings: Translation Studies and other disciplines* (pp. 331-348). Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Lörscher, W. (2005). The translation process: Methods and problems of its investigation. *Meta: Journal des Traducteurs/Translators' Journal*, 50(2), 597-608. doi: 10.7202/011003ar
- Malmkjær, K. (1998). Introduction: Translation and language teaching. In K. Malmkjær (Ed.), *Translation & language teaching: Language teaching & translation*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Murtisari, E. T. (2016). Translation skill in language learning/teaching: EFL learners' point of view. *Studies About Languages* (29), 102-113.
- Newson, D. (1998). Translation and foreign language learning. In K. Malmkjær (Ed.), *Translation and language teaching: Language teaching and translation* (pp. 63-68).
- Okonska, E. K., & Kościalkowska-Okońska, E. (2013). Researching translation competence: The expert problem. In K. Piatkowska (Ed.), *Correspondences and contrasts in foreign language pedagogy and translation studies* (pp. 219-232). New York, NY: Springer.
- Olk, H. M. (2001). *The translation of cultural references: An empirical investigation into the translation of culture-specific lexis by degree-level language students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kent, Canterbury, England).
- Phat, D. D. (2022). On the Shift of Parts of Speech in Prepositional Meaning in English-Vietnamese Translation. *Dinh, DP* (2022). *On the Shift of Parts of Speech in*



- Prepositional Meaning in English-Vietnamese Translation. AsiaCALL Online Journal, 13(1), 166-179.*
- Pariente-Beltran, B. (2013). *Evaluating translation as an explicit instruction tool to improve L2 written skills: An empirical study*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst, America). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Savignon, S. J. (1972). *Communicative competence: An experiment in foreign language teaching*. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.
- Savignon, S. J. (1983). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice: Texts and contexts in second language learning*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Suparmin, S. (2003). Translation in the teaching of a foreign language as a means and as an end. *TEFLIN Journal, 14(1), 73-81.*
- Tirkkonen-Condit, S., & Laukkanen, J. (1996). Evaluations: A key towards understanding the affective dimension of translational decisions. *Meta: Journal des Traducteurs/Translators' Journal, 41(1), 45-59.* doi: 10.7202/002360ar
- Truong, V. N. K., & Le, Q. T. (2022). Utilizing YouTube to Enhance English Speaking Skill: EFL Tertiary Students' Practices and Perceptions. *AsiaCALL Online Journal, 13(4), 7-31.*
- Tsagari, D., & Phlōros, G. (2013). Preface. In D. Tsagari & G. Phlōros (Eds.), *translation in language teaching and assessment* (pp. vii-xii). Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Valdeón, R. A. (2015). The (ab)use of taboo lexis in audiovisual Translation: Raising awareness of pragmatic variation in English-Spanish. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 12(3), 363-385.* doi: 10.1515/ip-2015-0018.
- Vermes, A. (2010). Translation in foreign language teaching: A brief overview of pros and cons. *Eger Journal of English Studies, 10, 83-93.*
- Widdowson, H. G. (2003). *Defining issues in English language teaching*: Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

## Biodata

*Dr. Huong Thi Thu Nguyen is a lecturer and a Vice Dean of the Faculty of English, the University of Foreign Language Studies - The University of Da Nang (UFLS-UD). Her research interests include translation, translation in language teaching, teaching translation, translation strategies, reader's reactions, and second language acquisition.*