

## **Pedagogical translation: An attempt to analyse the evolution of the understanding of the concept<sup>1</sup>**

ADAM JAROSZ  
JOLANTA HINC

*Received 4.10. 2024,  
received in revised form 25.01.2025,  
accepted 30.01.2025*

### **Abstract**

Since the second half of the twentieth century, pedagogical translation (PT) has become an important strand of reflection in language teaching. Despite its undeniably growing popularity, the notion of PT continues to be the subject of intense debate, becoming a source of contradictory opinions. As part of the discussion on the function of translation in language teaching and learning, the authors of the present study aim to present the evolution of the concept of PT from the first definitions of the term as such to the present day. In line with the stated aim, the analysis will focus on four key themes: the need to clarify the meaning

---

<sup>1</sup> The article is an extended version of "Tłumaczenia pedagogiczne – o ewolucji pojęcia" [Pedagogical Translation: On the Evolution of the Concept], a text by J. Hinc and A. Jarosz, published in the monograph *Socjolingwistyczne badania w teorii i praktyce* [Sociolinguistic Research in Theory and Practice], vol. 9, 2023, edited by J. Mampe, J. Hinc and A. Jarosz.

of PT, the controversies in understanding and defining PT before the publication of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), the role of PT within the CEFR and its functioning in the multilingual paradigm. That final point will be examined through the example of the Integrated Plurilingual Approach (IPA) and PT understood as Translation for Other Learning Contexts (TOLC) in line with the terminology put forward by Gonzáles-Davies (2012, 2014, 2017, 2020, 2021, and subsequent works).

### **Keywords**

pedagogical translation, linguistic translation, IPA (Integrated Plurilingual Approach), TOLC (Translation for Other Learning Contexts), translanguaging

## **Tłumaczenie pedagogiczne – próba analizy ewolucji rozumienia pojęcia**

### **Abstrakt**

Od drugiej połowy XX wieku tłumaczenia pedagogiczne stanowią ważny nurt refleksji w dydaktyce języków obcych. Rozumienie ich roli jest przedmiotem intensywnej debaty, a także niejednokrotnie źródłem sprzecznych opinii. Autorzy niniejszej publikacji stawiają sobie za cel ukazanie głównych etapów ewolucji rozumienia pojęcia tłumaczeń pedagogicznych, poczynając od jego pierwszych definicji aż do chwili obecnej. Zgodnie z określonym celem analiza koncentruje się wokół czterech osi tematycznych: potrzeby doprecyzowania pojęcia tłumaczeń pedagogicznych, kontrowersji w postrzeganiu pojęcia w okresie poprzedzającym publikację Europejskiego Systemu Opisu Kształcenia Językowego (ESOKJ), przedstawienia roli tłumaczeń pedagogicznych w ramach ESOKJ (tłumaczenie jako forma mediacji językowej) i charakterystyki ich funkcjonowania w ramach paradygmatu wielojęzycznego. To ostatnie zagadnienie zostało przedstawione głównie na przykładzie tłumaczenia rozumianego jako TOLC (Translation for Other Learning Contexts) zgodnie z terminologią zaproponowaną przez Gonzáles-Davies (2012, 2014, 2017, 2020, 2021 i inne).

## **Słowa kluczowe**

tłumaczenie pedagogiczne, tłumaczenie lingwistyczne, translingwalizm, zintegrowane podejście plurilingwalne (ang. IPA), tłumaczenia dla innych kontekstów uczenia się (ang. TOLC)

## **1. Introduction**

Since the second half of the twentieth century, the concept referred to as pedagogical translation (PT)<sup>2</sup> has constituted an important area of reflection in foreign language teaching. Despite the undeniably growing popularity of PT as such, it continues to spark lively debate, often becoming a source of conflicting opinions. “Confused rehabilitation of the translation” (“confusa rehabilitación de la traducción”, Sánchez-Iglesias 2009: 33), “disordered and chaotic reality” (“realidad desordenada y caótica”, Pintado Gutiérrez 2012: 335), “the re-emergence of translation in language teaching” (“vuelta a la escena de la traducción en la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras”, Garcia Benito 2019: 197), “a marginal development in the field of foreign language teaching” (“un hecho marginal en el ámbito de la enseñanza de las idiomas extranjeros”, Zabalbescoa Terrán 1990: 75) and “demonization of translation under the heading ‘communicative approach’” (Balboni 2017: 277) are just a few examples of expressions describing the still unclear status of translation in the field of foreign language didactics.

Contributing to the ongoing discussion about the significance and function of translation in foreign language teaching and learning, the author of this analysis aims to present the

---

<sup>2</sup> In the English-language literature on the subject, there are at least three synonymous terms for translation used in foreign language didactics: the acronym TILT (Translation in Language Teaching) by Cook, “pedagogical translation” (Leonardi 2010) and “pedagogic translation” (Laviosa 2014). In further discussion, I will treat these terms as synonymous and use the acronym PT (Pedagogical Translation).

evolution of the understanding of the concept of PT, from its earliest definitions to the present day. He deliberately choose not to address issues such as evaluating the role of translation in the historical review of teaching methods and approaches, or the advantages and disadvantages of using translation exercises in foreign language didactics, as these topics have already been extensively discussed in the literature (Carreres 2006, Janowska 2016, Koletnik-Korošec 2013, Laviosa 2014, Leonardi 2010, Pintado Gutiérrez 2012, Vermes 2010 et al.). In line with the aim of this analysis, the following discussion will focus on: (1) the need to clarify the meaning of PT in the didactic discourse, (2) an explanation of the controversies surrounding the understanding and definition of PT prior to the publication of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR 2001), (3) the role of PT within the framework of the CEFR, and (4) its functioning within the multilingual paradigm. The final issue will be discussed using the example of PT understood as TOLC (Translation for Other Learning Contexts), operating within the multilingual approach defined as the Integrated Plurilingual Approach (IPA), following the terminology put forward by Gonzáles-Davies (2012, 2014, 2017, 2020, 2021, and subsequent works).

## **2. Factors determining the need for a terminological clarification of PT**

When considering the need for a terminological clarification of pedagogical translation (PT), it is worth referring to Pintado Gutiérrez (2018: 1–21), who analyses the factors driving this necessity. Pintado Gutiérrez identifies the following factors:

- the low recognition of the concept of PT in related academic fields;
- the reluctance to use the term PT, still pejoratively associated with criticisms aimed at the traditional grammar-translation method;

- the need to distinguish PT from related concepts such as code-switching, bilingualism, the use of the first language, translanguaging, and TILT (Translation in Language Teaching) as defined by Cook (2010: XX);
- the need to address the numerous educational contexts and aspects in which translation is studied (Pintado Gutiérrez 2018: 12–14);
- the necessity to incorporate new approaches, research perspectives, and theoretical constructs, in light of which the traditional opposition of monolingualism vs. bilingualism becomes secondary to the opposition of monolingualism vs. multilingualism (Pintado Gutiérrez 2018: 9). As emphasised by many scholars (Gębal 2016: 77–82, Gonzáles-Davies 2017: 126–127, Gonzáles-Davies 2020: 434), adopting the multilingual paradigm enables students to activate their full linguistic resources in interactions with both peers and teachers.

### **3. The evolution of the concept of PT**

The evolution of the concept of PT can be divided into three stages. The first stage corresponds to the second half of the twentieth century, marked by a noticeable rise in interest in translation methods. This was driven by theoretical reflections and research that are now considered classic (Atkinson 1987, Besse 1998, Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009, Carreres 2006, 2014, Duff 1990, Grellet 1991, González Davies 2004, 2017, Hurtado Albir 1994, Keith and Masson, Königs 2000, Lavault 1985, 1987, 1991, Laviosa 2014, Leonardi 2010, Malmkjaer 1998, Nord 1999, Pintado Gutiérrez 2012, 2018, Puren 1995, Sánchez-Iglesias 2009, Titford and Hieke 1985, Widdowson 1980, and others). These authors made early attempts to conceptualise the notion of *translation*, often already described with the adjective *pedagogical*. In defining PT during this period, as will be elaborated in more detail below, two conflicting visions of the purpose of PT emerged. One vision saw translations as purely linguistic exercises, effectively a form of trans-

coding isolated sentences or text fragments, primarily in order to test acquired language skills. The other vision, informed by specific translation theories, understood translation as an act of linguistic communication (Hatim and Masson 1990: 23, Malmkjær 1998: 8, Zanettin 2014: 210–211, Sánchez-Iglesias 2009: 37–40).

The emergence of the second stage in the evolution of the concept of PT is a consequence of the creation and popularisation of the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR 2001), a document that provides a foundational methodological framework for foreign language teaching. In the CEFR, translations – though not explicitly termed *pedagogical* – are presented as mediation skills, with a clear emphasis on their communicative function.

The third stage is linked to the rise of the multilingual paradigm in foreign language didactics. The dominance of this paradigm led to the development and popularisation of new theoretical concepts (such as code-switching, scaffolding, translanguaging, informed use of L1, Pedagogically Based Code-Switching), including a new perspective on PT understood as TOLC (Translation for Other Learning Contexts), functioning within the Integrated Plurilingual Approach (IPA).<sup>3</sup> TOLC is one of the key language practices that contribute not only to the development of language skills but also to plurilingual communicative competence (PCC): a competence that enables effective communication in multilingual and multicultural environments (González-Davies 2017: 125).<sup>4</sup>

In approaching a more detailed discussion of the first stage in the evolution of PT, it should be noted that early attempts to define the concept reflect a fundamental opposition between translations understood as a means of teaching foreign languages (translation as a means) and professional translations (translation as an end). Lavault (1987: 17), a co-creator and

---

<sup>3</sup> Floros (2021: 289) indicates the identity of the concepts of PT and TOLC.

<sup>4</sup> González-Davies (2017: 125) defines PCC as: “an appropriate use of natural plurilingual practices (e.g. translation, code-switching or an informed use of the L1) to advance inter-linguistic and intercultural communication”.

populariser of the concept of PT, states the following: “It is in fact customary to oppose pedagogical translation to ‘translation proper’ which we will call here professional translation”.<sup>5</sup> She further explains:

Pedagogical translation is a tool used in foreign language didactics. It is not an end but a means because what is important is not the meaning conveyed by the text but the act of translation itself and its various functions: language acquisition, improvement (language skills), control. In the case of pedagogical translation, it is more about transcoding (translating one linguistic code into another) than about translation in the strict sense of the word (Lavault 1987: 117).<sup>6</sup>

In a similar fashion, Déjean Le Féal (1987: 107) claims:

It is customary to combine educational translation with professional translation. The first is supposed to be a means of control in language didactics. Unlike the second, it is not assigned a communicative function but a linguistic one since it is intended to reveal whether the meaning(s) of the words and structures studied have been understood by the students. Although this exercise is called “translation,” it should not, in my opinion, be designated by that term because it does not consist, most of the time, in the reexpression of the meaning of the original statement—the only operation that deserves the name “translation”—but in a switching of codes.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> “On a en effet coutume d’opposer la traduction pédagogique a la “traduction proprement dite” qu’on appellera ici la traduction professionnelle” (Lavault 1987: 17).

<sup>6</sup> “Traduction pédagogique est un outil utilisé dans le cadre de la didactique des langues. Elle n’est pas une fin, mais un moyen, car ce qui importe, ce n’est pas le sens que le texte véhicule, mais l’acte de traduire et les différentes fonctions qu’il remplit: acquisition de la langue, perfectionnement, contrôle... Il s’agit plutôt de transcodage que de traduction” (Lavault 1987: 117). In giving Lavault’s definition, it is worth noting at the same time that the term *traduction pédagogique* has been present in the literature since the publication of Lavault’s classic study (1985); however, Lavault herself attributes the authorship of the term to Ladmiral. See Sánchez-Iglesias (2009: 3).

<sup>7</sup> “L’usage veut que l’on oppose la traduction pédagogique à la traduction professionnelle. La première est censée être un moyen de contrôle en didactique des langues. Contrairement à la seconde, on ne lui assigne pas la fonction communicative, mais linguistique puisque elle est destinée à révéler

As is not difficult to notice, both understandings of PT reduce PT to transcoding, i.e. linguistic translation (Durieux 2005: 36), where the focus is solely on individual words, grammatical structures, or sentences, with no consideration of their context. In light of this perspective, PT:

- is linguistic translation and consists in translating individual words or sentences rather than entire translation units (Lavault 1985: 14, Leonardi 2011: 27);
- serves solely as a tool for assessing the acquired lexical and grammatical skills (Ladmiral 1972: 32–34, Lavault 1985: 19);
- lacks communicative significance as its only recipients are the teacher and students (Lavault 1985: 18);
- is merely a means of language teaching and never an end in itself; translation exercises are not used in training translation skills understood as the *fifth skill*;
- does not take into account the context of the translated words or sentences, which determines its artificiality (Pintado Gutiérrez 2012: 330);
- in its application, the teacher expects translations that are closest to the original, while adhering to the rules of the target language (Durieux 2005: 37, Lavault 1985: 32);
- leads to the phenomenon of excessive attachment to the meanings of words provided in bilingual dictionaries without the ability to understand the contextual meanings of the given lexical units (Déjean Le Féal 1987: 108, Déjean Le Féal 1993: 178).

The reductionist vision of PT presented above not only served as a form of PT's devaluation but also provided a basis for dialogue between three disciplines: pedagogical translation, professional translation, and translation didactics. This dialogue

---

si la ou les significations des mots et structures étudiés ont bien été comprises par les élèves. Bien que cet exercice soit appelé 'traduction', il ne devrait pas, à mon avis, être désigné par ce terme, car il ne consiste pas, la plupart du temps, en la réexpression du sens de l'énoncé original – seule opération qui mérite le nom 'traduction' – mais en une commutation des codes”.



has resulted in outlining a new perspective on PT that refers to specific theories and concepts borrowed from translation theory. The ones most frequently mentioned by Pintado Gutiérrez (2012: 336) include:

The interpretative model of ESIT or the theory of meaning (Seleskowitz and Lederer), the sociological and psycholinguistic model of Kiraly, the holistic model and the dynamic model of acquisition of the translator language of the PACTE group, or the theories, postulates and reflections of authors such as Baker, Hatim and Mason, Octavio Paz, Reiss, Vermeer, Wilss, etc.<sup>8</sup>

In light of the newly crystallised perspective on PT:

- it refers to specific translation theories that emphasise its communicative nature;
- it emphasises conveying the meaning of the message rather than just translating its linguistic layer (Déjean Le Féal 1987: 105, Lavault 1985: 50, 1991: 55, Seleskovitch and Lederer 2001: 104–115, 184–18);
- it proposes qualitatively new types of translation exercises that refer to the three fundamental phases of translation according to the theory of meaning:

1. understanding the message,
  2. deverbalisation (the phase of separating the meaning layer of the message from the language in which it was expressed),
  3. re-verbalisation/expression of the message in the target language (De Arriba García 1996: 271–272, Déjean Le Féal 1993: 155–195, Hurtado Albir 2021: 314–380, and others);
- it emphasises the fundamental role of understanding the source

---

<sup>8</sup> “El modelo interpretativo de la ESIT o teoría del sentido (Seleskowitz y Lederer) el modelo sociológico y psicolingüístico de Kiraly, el modelo holístico y el modelo dinámico de adquisición de la lengua traductora del grupo PACTE o teorías, postulados y reflexiones de autores como Baker, Hatim y Mason, Octavio Paz, Reiss, Vermeer, Wilss etc”. (Pintado Gutiérrez 2012: 336). In the discussed context, it is necessary to supplement this list of theories with the anthropocentric theory of translation by Grucza (2014: 127–137) and Żmudzki (2013: 177–187).

message and its cultural context as an essential stage of translation;

- it is understood not as a separate type of translation but rather as one of the ends of the PT–translation didactics continuum (Carreres 2014: 128, Cook 2010: 55, De Arriba García 1996: 275, Gonzáles-Davies 2004: VII, Gonzáles-Davies 2020: 434, Pintado Gutiérrez 2018: 8);
- it resembles a genuine translation process, indicating a specific recipient of the message;
- it puts forward learning translation as the fifth communication skill; (Carreres 2014: 130, Carreres, Norriega-Sánchez 2017: 100, Carreres, Nuñez-Calvo, Norriega-Sánchez 2011: 285–297, Kubicka and Bałajewska-Migus 2021: 107);
- according to the socioconstructivist paradigm, it is a (re)construction of the meaning of the source message by considering its linguistic and cultural context (“*guided creation meaning*”) (Halliday 1992:15).<sup>9</sup> As emphasised by Ballard (1998), the translator does not translate the *ready-made* meaning of the source document but, instead, (re)constructs it through a process of careful reading and interpretation. Ballard (1998: 27) states the following:

Translators do not start from the meaning, they starts from a text made up of signifying forms which he must first read, in the sense of perceiving, and from which they make an interpretation in order to construct a meaning which will be the meaning they attribute to the text and which may differ to a greater or lesser extent from the author’s intention and from the interpretation of other authors.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Italics as used in the original text.

<sup>10</sup> “Le traducteur ne part pas du sens, il part d’un texte constitué de *formes signifiantes* qu’il doit d’abord lire, au sens de *percevoir*, et dont il fait une *interprétation* afin de *construire un sens* qui sera le sens qu’il attribue au texte et qui pourra différer plus ou moins de l’intention de l’auteur et de l’interprétation d’autres auteurs” (Ballard 1998: 27). Italics as used in the original text.

Moving on to the discussion of the second stage in the development of the concept of PT, it would be impossible not to refer to the CEFR (2001). The CEFR's adoption of an action-based perspective allows for a better understanding of the mechanisms of foreign language communication and language learning. A foreign language is learned through action and in action within a specific task situation in order to achieve a defined goal, which the CEFR (2001: 9) articulates as follows:

The approach adopted here, generally speaking, is an action-oriented one in so far as it views users and learners of a language primarily as 'social agents' i.e. members of society who have tasks (not exclusively language-related) to accomplish in a given set of circumstances, in a specific environment and within a particular field of action. (CEFR 2001: 9).

According to the CEFR, translation is therefore a form of linguistic mediation. In the light of the CEFR, mediation is one of the six basic linguistic competences understood as skills and activated in the process of linguistic communication. The CEFR (2001: 87) singles out:

1. reception (corresponds to two skills: listening comprehension, reading comprehension);
2. production (conversation, text editing);
3. interaction;
4. mediation.

Receptive and productive activities correspond to the four traditional linguistic competences (listening comprehension, reading comprehension, conversation and text editing), while linguistic interaction and mediation are completely new language skills resulting from a qualitatively new view of the process of linguistic communication.

Interactive activities involve at least two people participating in an oral or written exchange of information. Production and reception activities alternate. In oral communication, they may

even interpermeate (Janowska 2017: 81). The development of new information technologies related to communication (such as email, text messaging, chats and blogs) indicates the importance of interaction in the life of society.

Mediating activities enable communication between people who, for various reasons, cannot communicate with each other. Importantly, the person who undertakes mediating activities is only an intermediary between the interlocutors but never expresses their own views. The CEFR (2001: 87) states that: “Examples of mediating activities include spoken interpretation and written translation as well as summarising and paraphrasing texts in the same language, when the language of the original text is not understandable to the intended recipient”.

Chapters 4.4.4.1 and 4.4.4.2 of the CEFR (2001: 87) list the most important forms of oral and written mediation:

1. oral mediation:
  - simultaneous interpretation (conferences, meetings, formal speeches etc.);
  - consecutive interpretation (speeches of welcome, guided tours, etc.);
  - informal interpretation;
2. written mediation:
  - exact translation (e.g. of contracts, legal and scientific texts, etc.);
  - literary translation (novels, drama, poetry, libretti, etc);
  - summarising gist (newspaper and magazine articles, etc.) within L2 or between L1 and L2;
  - paraphrasing (specialised texts for lay persons, etc.).

The way mediation was presented according to the 2001 CEFR met with many critical opinions which pointed primarily to the unsatisfactory description of mediation and the lack of language proficiency descriptors for this activity (Janowska 2016: 47). As a result of editorial work, additional volumes were put out (2016, 2018, 2020) containing, among other

things, a significantly expanded concept of mediation (textual, conceptual and cultural mediation). The CEFR Companion Volume (2020: 90–100) points out the following mediation activities:

1. Mediating a text:

- relaying specific information;
- explaining data;
- processing text;
- translating a written text;
- note-taking (lectures, seminars, meetings, etc.);
- expressing a personal response to creative texts (including literature);
- analysis and criticism of creative texts (including literature).

2. Mediating concepts:

- facilitating collaborative interaction with peers;
- collaborating to construct meaning;
- managing interaction;
- encouraging conceptual talk;

3. Mediating communication:

- facilitating pluricultural space;
- acting as an intermediary in informal situations (with friends and colleagues);
- facilitating communication in delicate situation and disagreements).<sup>11</sup>

The third stage in the evolution of the concept of PT is associated with a change in the teaching paradigm, where the opposition between monolingualism and bilingualism takes a back seat to the opposition between monolingualism and multilingualism. As noted by González-Davies (2020: 434):

---

<sup>11</sup> CEFR Companion Volume (2020: 90–103). These pages also contain updated lists of language descriptors.

Recently, a shift from a monolingual to a plurilingual paradigm in (language) learning is increasingly becoming visible through the publication of studies and experiences that describe efficient uses of mediation skills to develop plurilingual and intercultural competence.

The concept of TOLC plays an important role in the context of this change. In the literature on the subject, TOLC is presented in the context of the Integrated Plurilingual Approach (IPA). Since a detailed characterisation of the IPA exceeds the scope of this analysis, will only cite the most significant of its characteristics, according to which the IPA creates “a natural and realistic plurilingual and translanguaging environment” (González-Davies 2020: 439), i.e. an overarching methodological framework within which all linguistic resources of students and teachers in multilingual classes can be activated (the use of the native language, translations, code-switching, etc.). Thus, the IPA as a multilingual approach advocates for the use of students’ actual linguistic repertoire and their cultural identity, while also allowing for “[r]eimagining [foreign language] classrooms as translangual environments” (Anderson 2017: 8).

Returning to the concept of TOLC, it is worth citing the definition proposed by González-Davies (2020: 434):

Distinctive traits may be discerned between what may be called translation for other learning context (TOLC), here defined as translation to acquire linguistic and intercultural mediation skills in fields other than translation training, and translator and interpreter training proper, that is, translation to acquire professional translator competence.

TOLC is understood in opposition to professional translations and in reference to the understanding of translation as linguistic and cultural mediation. González-Davies also points out two important features of TOLC: (1) the communicative nature of translation and (2) its dual function (translation understood as both a means and an end). Referring to the communicative

nature of TOLC, Gonzáles-Davies (2017: 129) states the following:

TOLC integrates a broad view of translation as a “dynamic process of communication” (Hatim and Mason 1990, 223) so that, far from considering it a static teacher-to-student written exercise, the activities and projects revolve around interaction. In TOLC, noticing, deciding, and justifying are key actions because the translation task involves conscious awareness not only of the product, but also of the process.

Characterising the other feature of TOLC (translation as a means and an end in foreign language teaching), Gonzáles-Davies (2017: 129) notes:

[...] TOLC views translation not only as a means to understand (i.e., “translate”) the morphosyntactic, lexico-semantic and/or pragmatic and cultural aspects of a language. It also perceives translation competence as a set of specific linguistic, encyclopaedic and transfer skills, along with specific professional intra- and interpersonal skills. Thus, translation here goes far beyond its traditional use to check on-the-spot comprehension or syntactic and lexical points in tests, to become a (planned and unplanned) translanguaging scaffolding activity.<sup>12</sup>

In order to further clarify the meaning of the concept of TOLC, it is worth referring to Pintado Gutiérrez (2018: 15), who, when presenting the current state of research on PT, offers “a map of neighbouring concepts that ascertain a better understanding of the various terms related to translation and L1/L2 use in language pedagogy for a beneficial use of these practices” (Pintado Gutiérrez 2018: 2). Pintado Gutierrez (2018: 16) tabulates three basic concepts: pedagogical translation, code-switching and interior translation. Pedagogical translation is understood as:

---

<sup>12</sup> In another place Gonzáles-Davies (2021: 306) concludes: “TOLC adopt an open and communicative approach to translation that considers it to be both a process and a product of communication”.

translating activities and/or tasks that are included in foreign language (FL) teaching and learning. These tasks enhance the development of specific language and translating skills and are based on various aspects of translation and other pragmatic issues central to the FL classroom: language awareness, accuracy, pragmatic and intercultural competence, creativity, problem solving, and autonomy and collaboration, to name just a few. These translation-based activities help the language learner to have a better command of the language and translation, as a key skill for language users. It involves not only written activities but also multimodal material, including texts that reproduce oral features.

Code-switching is realised as through classroom interactions. Pintado Gutiérrez (2018: 16) states:

Code-switching involves different forms of alternation between the learners and the teachers' languages (L1, L2, etc). That is, it refers to the interaction between the teacher and the students or among the students. Usually employed in an oral context, it applies to various situations, be it addressing problematic sources such as lack of understanding (for instance, clarifying linguistic or socio-cultural matters that the students find difficult to interpret), discussing certain communicative nuances by raising the student's awareness, maintaining the student's attention with the introduction of humour, etc.

According to Pintado Gutiérrez (2018: 16) Interior translation is a set of cognitive strategies that:

involve the use of the students' own language (L1) or additional languages (ALL) as a tool. The student relies on his/her L1/ALL with the purpose of building, developing or structuring the knowledge of the foreign language (FL) This strategy usually happens instinctively and the learners are often unaware of it. Most research attribute this process to the earliest stages of learning a FL.



In the light of the above considerations, PT can be understood:

- as a translation task or translation project carried out according to the principles of task-based learning in multilingual classes (second to the left column of the table);
- as one of the numerous practices of translanguaging and a form of multilingual scaffolding, enabling the student to accomplish tasks within their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) according to Vygotsky's terminology (1978: 86);<sup>13</sup>
- as a cognitive translation strategy identified with mental translation, involving the student's reference to their native language or other known languages, used for ensuring effective communication in multilingual and multicultural environments.

The table also clearly emphasises the distinction between translation and code-switching, two language practices that are part of translanguaging and are often mistakenly treated as synonymous. The fundamental difference between these two linguistic phenomena lies in the fact that, in the case of translation, the same message appears in both the source language and the target language, whereas in the phenomenon of code-switching, full repetitions of the message are rarely observed. Wilson (2020: 32) states the following:

Corcoll [...] justifies the classification of switching codes and translation under the global term of translanguaging in that switching codes involves at least two languages, as is true for translation. However, in the case of translation, a source language(s) and a target language(s) and the same message is conveyed in all the languages involved, which cannot be said for switching codes. In the

---

<sup>13</sup> Scaffolding can be understood here as a planned or spontaneously applied multilingual translation technique used by teachers and/or other students in order to support the student realising the language goals lying in their zone of proximal development, see: Van de Pol, Elbers (2013: 32–41) and Kayi-Aydar (2013: 324).

case of code-switching, different messages are transmitted alternatively rather than repeated between the languages.<sup>14</sup>

The above comments on code-switching conclude the discussion of the terms associated with translation. There is no doubt that their presentation contributes to a greater clarity of the terminology used for translation in language teaching.

## 5. Conclusions

In summary of the analysis conducted, it must be stated that since the moment the concept of PT was established, it has been a hybrid term with both negative and positive connotations as its application encompasses context-free translation practices, understood as transcoding, as well as translation tasks regarded as acts of communication. This latter, innovative understanding of the concept has become possible through the integration of PT with translation theories and translation pedagogy (including the theory of meaning).

Thanks to the publication of the CEFR, PT, although devoid of the adjective, has gained the status of language mediation, which has further emphasised its communicative nature. The introduction of detailed descriptors of language mediation has also contributed to a better methodological grounding of PT in foreign language teaching.

The transition from bilingual education to multilingual education, the very reality of multilingual classrooms, alongside the numerous spontaneous and guided language practices referred to as translanguaging, have brought about a new understanding of the concept of PT. Therefore, PT can be understood as: (1) the implementation of various translation tasks conducted in multicultural and multilingual classes, (2) the

---

<sup>14</sup> I will omit a more detailed characterisation of the phenomenon of code-switching, understood both as a spontaneous strategy used by students and as the so-called PBCS (Pedagogically Based Code-Switching), which refers to techniques used by teachers for educational purposes (Corcoll, Gonz  les-Davies 2015: 67–77, Wilson 2020: 33).

spontaneous and/or planned use of translation techniques understood as forms of multilingual scaffolding, and (3) a cognitive translation strategy (mental translation) enabling students to communicate effectively in a multilingual and multicultural environment.

At the same time, the presented characteristics of TOLC reveal a fundamental transformation that has occurred in the understanding of the concept of PT. From a technique solely used for learning a foreign language (translation as a means), PT has also become an end in itself (translation as an end), that is, a technique for improving the translation competencies of those learning a foreign language.

## References

- Anderson, Jason (2017). "Reimagining English language learners from translingual perspective". *ELT Journal* 72/1: 26–37.
- Atkinson, David (1987). "The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected source?". *ELT Journal* 41/4: 241–247.
- Ballard, Michel (1998). "Les «mauvaises lectures»: étude du processus de compréhension". In: Jean Deslisle, Hannelore Lee-Jahnke (eds.). *Enseignement de la traduction et traduction dans l'enseignement*. Ottawa: Les Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa, 27–47.
- Balboni, Paolo (2017). "Translation in language learning: A 'what for' approach". *Entre Linguas* 2/3: 276–299. Also available at <[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321871791\\_Translation\\_in\\_language\\_learning\\_a\\_what\\_for\\_approach](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321871791_Translation_in_language_learning_a_what_for_approach)>. Accessed 23.09.2024.
- Besse, Henri (1998). "Trois genres de traduction". In: Germaine Forges, Alain Braun (eds.). *Didactique des langues, traductologie et communication*. Bruxelles: de Boeck, 102–107.
- Butzkamm Wolfgang, John Caldwell (2009). *The Bilingual Reform*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Carreres, Ángel (2006). "Strange bedfellows: Translation and language teaching. The teaching of translation into L2 in modern languages degrees, uses and limitations" Available at <[https://www.academia.edu/27650215/Strange\\_Bedfellows\\_Translation\\_and\\_Language\\_teaching](https://www.academia.edu/27650215/Strange_Bedfellows_Translation_and_Language_teaching)>. Accessed 23.09.2024.

- Carreres, Ángel (2014). "Translation as a mean and as an end: Reassessing the divide". *Interpreter and Translation Trainer* 8/1: 123–135.
- Carreres, Ángel, Micaela Nuñez-Calvo, María Norriega-Sánchez, (2017). "Translation in Spanish language teaching fifth skill". *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching* 4/2: 99–109. Also available at <[https://www.academia.edu/37218993/2018\\_Carreres\\_Translation\\_in\\_Spanish\\_Language\\_Teaching\\_The\\_Fifth\\_Skill\\_pdf](https://www.academia.edu/37218993/2018_Carreres_Translation_in_Spanish_Language_Teaching_The_Fifth_Skill_pdf)>. Accessed 23.09.2024.
- Carreres Ángel, María Norriega-Sánchez, (2011). "Translation in language teaching: insights from professional translator training". *The Language Learning Journal* 39/3: 281–297. Also available at <<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09571736.2011.567356?scroll=top&needAccess=true>>. Accessed 23.09.2024.
- Cook, Guy (2010). *Translation in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Corcoll, Cristina, Maria González-Davies, (2015). "Switching codes in additional language classroom". *ELT Journal* 70/1: 67–77.
- Council of Europe (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, Companion Volume*. Available at <<https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4>>. Accessed 23.09.2024.
- Council Of Europe (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching Assessment*. Available at <<https://rm.coe.int/16802fc1bf>>. Accessed 23.09.2024.
- De Arriba García, Clara (1996). "Introducción a la traducción pedagógica". Available at <<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/61902194.pdf>>. Accessed 23.09.2024.
- Déjean Le Féal, Karla (1993). "Pédagogie raisonnée de la traduction". *Meta* 38/2 : 155–195.
- Déjean Le Féal, Karla (1987). "Traduction pédagogique et traduction professionnelle". *Le Français dans Le Monde*, numéro spécial: retour à la traduction, 107–110.
- Duff, Alan (1990). *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Durieux, Christine (2005). "L'enseignement de la traduction: enjeux et les démarches". *Meta* 50/1: 36–47. Also available at <<https://www.erudit.org/fr/revues/meta/2005-v50-n1-meta864/010655ar/>>. Accessed 23.09.2024.
- Floros, Georgios (2021). "Prospects of translation in translanguaging classrooms". In: Meng Ji, Sara Laviosa (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook*

*of Translation and Social Practices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 281–299.

- García Benito, Ana Belén (2019). “Vuelta a escena de la traducción en la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras: experiencias en PLE”. *Hermeneus Revista de Traducción e Interpretación* 21: 197–234. Also available at <<https://revistas.uva.es/index.php/hermeneus/article/view/4045/3203>>. Accessed 23.09.2024.
- Gębał, Przemysław (2016). “Interkomprehencja, strategie mediacyjne i nauczanie języków obcych”. In: Ewa Lipińska, Anna Seretny (eds.). *Tłumaczenie dydaktyczne w nowoczesnym kształceniu językowym*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 77–93.
- González-Davies, Maria (2020). “Developing mediation competence through translation”. In: Sara Laviosa, Maria González-Davies (eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Education*. London–New York: Routledge, 434–450.
- González-Davies, Maria (2004). *Multiple Voices in the Translation Classroom: Activities, Tasks and Projects*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- González-Davies, Maria (2012). “The role of translation in others learning contexts: Towards acting interculturally”. In: Séverine Hubsher-Davidson, Michał Borodo (eds.). *Global Trends in Translation and Interpreter Training: Mediation and Culture*. London: Continuum, 161–179.
- González-Davies, Maria (2017). “The use of translation in an Integrated Plurilingual Approach to language learning: teacher strategies and best practices”. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching* 4/2: 124–135.
- González-Davies, Maria (2014). “Towards a plurilingual development paradigm. From spontaneous to informed use of translation in additional language teaching”. In: Sara Laviosa (ed.). *Translation in the Language Classroom Theory Research and Practice. The interpreter and Translation Trainer* (special issue) 8/1: 8–31.
- González-Davies, Maria (2021). “Using translation to develop plurilingual competence in high-complexity schools”. In: Meng Ji, Sara Laviosa (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Translation and Social Practices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 301–323.
- Grellet, Françoise (1991). *Apprendre à traduire. Typologie d'exercices de traduction*. Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy.
- Grucza, Sambor (2014). „Grundzüge der anthropozentrischen Translatorik”. In: Aleksandra Łyp-Bielecka (ed.). *Mehr als Worte: Sprachwissenschaftliche Studien Professor Dr. habil. Czesława Schatte*

- und Professor Dr. habil. Christoph Schatte gewidmet. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 127–137.
- Halliday, Michael (1992). "Language Theory and Translation Practice". *Rivista internazionale di tecnica della traduzione* no 0. Udine: Compansotto Editor: 15–26. Also available at <<https://www.openstarts.units.it/server/api/core/bitstreams/abc8ffee-832d-4a92-956b-be4d191e9dff/content>>. Accessed 23.09.2024.
- Hatim, Basil, Ian Mason (eds.) (1990). *Discourse and The Translator*. London – New York: Routledge.
- Hurtado Albir, Amparo (2021). *Traducción y Traductología. Introducción a la traductología*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Janowska, Iwona (2017). "Mediacja i działania mediacyjne w dydaktyce języków obcych". *Języki Obce w Szkole* 3: 80–86.
- Janowska, Iwona (2016). "Od metody gramatyczno-tłumaczeniowej do mediacji językowej". In: Ewa Lipińska Ewa, Anna Seretny (eds.). *Tłumaczenia dydaktyczne w nowoczesnym kształceniu językowym*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 37–54.
- Kayi-Aydar, Hayrie (2013). "Scaffolding language learner in an academic ESL classroom". *ELT Journal* 67/3: 324–335. Also available at: <[https://www.academia.edu/19757400/Scaffolding\\_language\\_learning\\_in\\_an\\_academic\\_ESL\\_classroom](https://www.academia.edu/19757400/Scaffolding_language_learning_in_an_academic_ESL_classroom)>. Accessed 23.09.2024.
- Keith Hugh, Ian Mason (eds.) (1987). *Translation in the modern Languages Degree*. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.
- Königs, Frank G. (2000). "Übersetzen im Deutschunterricht? Ya, aber ander". *Fremdesprache Deutsch* 28: 6–13.
- Koletnik Korošec, Melita (2013). "Translation in foreign language teaching". In: Nike K. Pokorn, Kaisa Koskinen (eds.). *New Horizons in Translation Research and Education 1*. Joensuu. University of Eastern Finland: 6–174. Also available at <[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259227329\\_Translation\\_in\\_Foreign\\_Language\\_Teaching](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259227329_Translation_in_Foreign_Language_Teaching)>. Accessed 23.09.2024.
- Kubicka Emilia, Ewa Bałajewska-Miglus (2022). "Obraz tłumaczenia pedagogicznego w polskiej literaturze glottodydaktycznej XXI wieku". *Języki Obce w Szkole* 4: 105–114.
- Ladmiral, Jean-René (1972). "La traduction dans l'institution pédagogique". *Langues* 28: 8–39.
- Lavault, Elisabeth (1991). "Traduire en classe: pourquoi et pour qui?". In: Ann Malamah-Thomas, Hans Blaasch, Paul Chaix (eds.). *The role of Translation in Foreign Language Teaching*, Paris: Didier Érudition, 49–58.

- Lavault, Elisabeth (1985). *Fonction de la traduction en didactique des langues. Apprendre une langue en apprenant à traduire*. Paris: Didier Érudition.
- Lavault, Elisabeth (1987). "Traduction pédagogique ou pédagogie de la traduction?". *Le Français dans le Monde*, numéro spécial: *Retour à la traduction*: 117–125.
- Laviosa, Sara (2014). *Translation and Language Education*. London–New York: Routledge.
- Leonardi, Vanessa (2011). "Pedagogical translation as a naturally occurring cognitive and linguistic activity in foreign language learning". *Annali Online di Lettere – Ferrara* 1–2: 17–28. Also available at <[https://www.academia.edu/35691922/Pedagogical\\_Translation\\_as\\_a\\_Naturally\\_Occuring\\_Cognitive\\_and\\_Linguistic\\_Activity\\_in\\_Foreign\\_Language\\_Learning](https://www.academia.edu/35691922/Pedagogical_Translation_as_a_Naturally_Occuring_Cognitive_and_Linguistic_Activity_in_Foreign_Language_Learning)>. Accessed 05.01.2025.
- Leonardi, Vanessa (2010). *The Role of Pedagogical Translation in Second Language Acquisition: From Theory to Practice*. Bern – Berlin – Bruxelles – Frankfurt am Main – New York – Oxford – Vienna: Peter Lang.
- Malmkjær, Kirsten (ed.) (1998). *Translation and Language Teaching*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
- Nord, Christine (1991). *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology and Didactic Application of Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Pintado Gutiérrez, Lucía (2012). "Fundamentos de la traducción pedagógica: traducción pedagógica y comunicación". *Sendebare* 23: 321–353.
- Pintado Gutiérrez, Lucía (2018). "Translation in language teaching, pedagogical translation, and code-switching: Restructuring the boundaries". *The Language Learning Journal* 49/2: 1–21. Also available at <[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329062070\\_Translation\\_in\\_language\\_teaching\\_pedagogical\\_translation\\_and\\_code-switching\\_restructuring\\_the\\_boundaries](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329062070_Translation_in_language_teaching_pedagogical_translation_and_code-switching_restructuring_the_boundaries)>. Accessed 23.09.2024.
- Puren, Christian (1995). "Pour un nouveau statut de la traduction en didactique des langues". *Langues Modernes* 3: 7–22.
- Sánchez-Iglesias Jorge (2009). *La traducción en la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras: una aproximación polémica*. Available at <<https://www.educacionyfp.gob.es/dam/jcr:4efabb0b-47d6-4fae-a9c6-a8a13df5fa97/2009-bv-10-22sanchez-iglesias-pdf>>. Accessed 23.09.2024.

- Seleskovitch, Danica, Lederer, Marianne (2001), *Interpréter pour traduire*. Paris: Didier Érudition.
- Titford, Christofer, Adolf Ernst Hieke (eds.) (1985). *Translation in Foreign Language Teaching and Testing*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Van de Pol, Janneke, Ed Elbers (2013). "Scaffolding students learning: A microanalysis of teacher-student interaction". *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction* 2/1: 32–41. Also available at <<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2210656113000020>>. Accessed 23.09.2024.
- Vygotsky, Lev (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Vermes, Albert (2010). "Translation in foreign language teaching: A brief overview of pros and cons". *Eger Journal of English Studies* X: 83–93.
- Widdowson, Hans Georg (1979). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, Jaclyn (2020). *Working within The Plurilingual Paradigm. Use of translation to Enrich Additional Language Learning and Plurilingual Competence in Secondary Education in Catalonia*. Available at <[https://www.tesisenred.net/bitstream/handle/10803/670267/Tesi\\_Jaclyn\\_Wilson.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y](https://www.tesisenred.net/bitstream/handle/10803/670267/Tesi_Jaclyn_Wilson.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y)>. Accessed 23.09.2024.
- Wilson, Jaclyn, Maria Gonzáles-Davies (2016). "Tackling the plurilingual student/monolingual classroom phenomenon". *Tesol Quarterly* 51/1: 207–219. Also available at <[https://www.recercat.cat/bitstream/handle/2072/356508/Wilson%20and%20Gonz%C3%A1lez%20Davies\\_TESOL%20%281%29.pdf?sequence=1](https://www.recercat.cat/bitstream/handle/2072/356508/Wilson%20and%20Gonz%C3%A1lez%20Davies_TESOL%20%281%29.pdf?sequence=1)>. Accessed 23.09.2024.
- Zabalbeascoa Terrán, Patrick (1990). "Aplicaciones de la traducción a la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras". *Sintagma* 2: 75–86.
- Zanettin, Federico (2014). "Corpus-based translation activities for language learners". *The Interpreter and Translation Trainer* 3/2: 209–224.
- Żmudzki, Jerzy (2013). "Holizm funkcjonalny w perspektywie translatoryki antropocentrycznej". *Linguistyka Stosowana* 8: 177–187.



Adam Jarosz  
ORCID iD: 0000-0001-5335-9365  
Institute of Applied Linguistics  
Faculty of Languages  
University of Gdańsk  
Wita Stwosza 51  
80-308 Gdańsk  
Poland  
adam.jarosz@ug.edu.pl

Jolanta Hinc  
ORCID iD: 0000-0003-2119-6578  
Institute of Applied Linguistics  
Faculty of Languages  
University of Gdańsk  
Wita Stwosza 51  
80-308 Gdańsk  
Poland  
jolanta.hinc@ug.edu.pl