

## Reflections on the Practicability of Translation Proper in Foreign Language Classes

**Youcef BENAMOR**

Department of English, Faculty of Foreign Languages  
Abdelhamid Ibn Badis University, Mostaganem, Algeria

### **Abstract:**

Foregrounding the paramount role of translation to boost foreign language learning at all educational strata, this reflective paper investigates whether translation is deemed a means to teach foreign languages or an end to prepare foreign language learners as prospective professional translators. Precisely, this reflective analysis aims to discuss these two research questions: do foreign language teachers simply use some amateur translation activities to upgrade their learners' linguistic proficiency? Or do they find it necessary to teach translation models and techniques proper, targeting translational proficiency along with linguistic ability? Drawing on the researcher's experience and specialist authorship, translation approaches and techniques as related to foreign language teaching/learning and 2) translation pedagogy types that govern the appropriate selection of translation techniques are the foundational units of this analytic endeavour. This analysis revealed that the basics of most well-known translation approaches and techniques are genuinely present in diverse foreign language classes. Additionally, teaching these translation approaches and techniques for general linguistic aims and for specific professional purposes are two different contexts where the former is shaped by presenting some mere language-based translation techniques and the latter by teaching much more specialist and profession-related ones. This categorisation inescapably determines the quality and quantity of translation practice and the nature of the teacher-learner pedagogical contract, aiming at foreign language learning *per se*, translation proficiency or both. According to either context, teachers should be aware of translation basics or translation proper to avoid *ad hoc* instruction and 'translationese.'

**Keywords:** Foreign language teaching, translation approaches, translation pedagogy

**Cite as:** BENAMOR, Y. (2017). Reflections on the Practicability of Translation Proper in Foreign Language Classes. *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies*, 1(4). DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol1no4.11>

**Introduction**

Translation is concomitantly present in most, if not all, life activity; feelings are translated into actions, thoughts into words and, in short, every physical action is a translation from one state to another. However, the most frequent form, probably of all human activities, is the fact of translating from one language to another. Transmitting meanings from one linguistic code to another connects people and assists them to share their cultures; therefore, they become aware of what they have in common.

Due to the current multilingualism and globalization, this paramount role of translation can be demonstrated by the constant existence of two, three or even more different varieties both to establish and back up a communicative message in various contexts of situation: to name but a few, the United Nations, business, meetings, courts, hospitals, schools and even families. In addition, this simultaneous occurrence of linguistic diversity, as such, adds on understanding notices, labels, menus, films, news and interviews – of course this list can be enriched. In this respect, the above discussion asserts that translation is first and foremost a means to support linguistic understanding and cultural reconciliation. Nevertheless, one may wonder whether other areas to which translation can bring assistance exist. After all, translation, in its formal sense, is a language-oriented activity, i.e. rendering a text necessitates knowing about all the lexicogrammatical and pragmatic systems of both the source and the target languages (SL & TL). This implies that either linguistic code has to be learnt with in-depth mastery; the role of pedagogical institutions in general and foreign language teaching/learning classes in particular.

Now, the issues that can be raised are: if translation is a servant in the business of language exchange and conversion, can this flaunting service bring much more assistance to learn about the currency from and to which the rendering is carried out, language? Besides, if pedagogues and applied linguists supply the plantations of foreign language (FL) teaching/learning with translation booster, will language learners reap the best product or will they harvest the worst outcome? For sure, pertaining to the implementation of translation in language teaching/learning process, either question yields a twofold opinion, pros and cons, by which either party exhibit strong arguments to uphold their views. Nevertheless, this paper gives prominence to those who adhere to the usefulness of using translation in foreign language pedagogy because the core of this discussion lies in the fact of whether translation is deemed a means to teach foreign languages or an end to prepare foreign language learners to become prospective professional translators. In other words, taking the first view, do foreign language teachers simply rely on just using some superficial amateur translation activities as a tool for upgrading their learners' linguistic proficiency? Or, adhering to the other opinion, do they find it necessary to teach translation models and techniques proper in a foreign language learning environment, targeting translational proficiency along with linguistic ability? Henceforth, the following broad context of discussion will target no matters but to con the aforementioned issues of which a pursuit of using translation in language teaching will be at the outset of this analysis.

**Proponents of Translation in Language Teaching**

Apparently, those who demonstrate complete allegiance to the use of translation in teaching/learning a foreign language have won considerable battles in the FL field of pedagogical theory. Thus, there is a coming back and change in attitudes towards translation which is regarded

as a legitimate pedagogical tool, and which deserves rehabilitation. To back up this claim, the researcher's twenty-two-year experience as a middle school teacher of English and some opinions of authorities in the field are to be included.

Accepting it or not, students do translate directly or indirectly: that is in most if not all the witnessed English learning environments, students use the mother tongue (Arabic in our case) in their peer correction or explanation of a linguistic point or an instruction; they also employ transliteration to remember words' pronunciation ( "وات" for "what"); and in most corrected paragraphs, even fourth year students, who are supposed to finish their four years of studying English in the middle school, rely on thinking in Arabic as a starting point then attempt to translate in English. The phrase, "**in last year...**," which the researcher came across when correcting the last term exam, is a striking instance of converting the Arabic version ("في السنة الماضية"). This may be in compliance with the fact that to question whether FL learners do or do not translate is obsolete; most of them do (Stern, 1992). Teachers, do translate as well when instructions are not grasped by all students, the meaning of abstract lexemes are not reached, some grammatical rules are intricate or when the teacher's aim is to check concepts' understanding. It is no longer a pedagogical taboo to come across bilingual lists of vocabulary and written tasks, where students are asked to translate an English sentence into Arabic, in official documents. The Algerian English course book "Spotlight on English One" (Riche *et al.*, 2003) for first year middle school students can be a striking example. Besides, in terms of learning styles and strategies, teachers need to know their learners' preferences through using the technique of thinking aloud which is more likely to be in the mother tongue. Additionally, the use of the host tongue is of utmost importance to highlight some cultural aspects of the guest code. The researcher admits that being a teaching technique, translation plays a pivotal role in boosting learning a foreign linguistic code provided that the teacher determines what related learning objectives are on target, selects appropriate translating tasks as well as clear contexts of use. In short, the appropriateness of using translation judges its usefulness; Widdowson confirms this thought thus: "I want to argue that translation, **conceived in a certain way**, can be a **very useful pedagogic device** (my emphasis)" (Widdowson, 1979, p.61).

Following the same line of thought, a long list of scholars who are in favour of translation as a teaching technique and language learning enhancement can be provided (e.g. Duff, 1989; Nunan & Lamb, 1996; Ross, 2000). Duff (1989) affirms that translation is a tool by which a teacher can lessen the degree of students' embarrassment to grasp some difficult linguistic aspects and therefore develop their accuracy in the other tongue. Aligning with the former opinion, a set of problems would occur if teachers stuck to the ban of translation from their lesson plans. These can be summed up as follows: explanations are awkward, time consuming and, to worsen matters, not grasped; a bit of translation would easily speed up the learning process (Nunan & Lamb, 1996). More precisely and at the outset of the twenty-first century, Ross (2000) highlights the crucial role of using the mother tongue with the foreign language, which enables foreign language learners to compare various language points (i.e., grammar, vocabulary and the like) of their mother tongue and those of the foreign linguistic. A priori, this pro-translation presentation calls for at least an introduction to translation approaches and techniques and for whether their implementation in teaching and learning a language other than the mother tongue is necessary or redundant. This is to be unveiled throughout the following print.

### **A Succinct Presentation of Translation Types and Approaches**

As any other concept or field of study, translation has witnessed a significant evolution fuelled by various categorisations and different opinions according to the perspective from which this area of enquiry is viewed, and the discipline to which it shows adherence.

#### ***Translation Categories***

Scrutinising the literature of this field discloses various binary translating types even though some overlapping encounters are unavoidable; these can be summed up as follows: ‘literal’ vs. ‘free’, ‘literary’ vs. ‘non literary’, ‘semantic’ vs. ‘communicative’ and ‘static’ vs. ‘dynamic’, among others (As-Safi, 2011). In this respect, it is worth noting that the aforementioned classifications are based on some criteria of which ‘mode’ and ‘code’ will be unveiled. Regarding mode, rendering any piece of language is either written or oral; the former represents the act of translating and the latter of interpreting. In spite of this flaunting difference, both translating and interpreting acts share a common ground highlighted by the fact that in either manoeuvre, the aim is to seek the closest natural equivalent meaning and style of the SL message in the TL. Thus, the outcome of a translating act should at least display the nearest grammatical correctness, semantic accuracy, stylistic efficiency and textual coherence to those of the source input. Analogically, the interpreter has to convey in the receptor tongue the closest accurate natural equivalence of the SL oral message. According to the second criterion, code, Jakobson (1959/2000) defines translation as the fact of converting a sign into another equivalent or alternative verbal/non verbal sign. Jakobson (1959/2000) sets borders between three types of translation:

- (1) Intra-lingual translation: It is interpreting verbal signs using other linguistic signs within the same language. Put simply, it is rewording what has already been written or said by means of the same linguistic code; paraphrasing and summarizing, among others, can be two salient examples of this type.
- (2) Inter-semiotic translation: Language is not the only semiotic system as others do exist to ease communication; chief among them, language signs or even traffic signals. This type concerns the interpretation of verbal signs by means of non verbal ones or the other way round. Respectively, the conversion of a story into an artistic tableau and the oral or written explication of graphs and tables do pertain to this category.
- (3) Inter-lingual translation: Actually, it denotes the proper sense of translation; in other words, the reproduction of verbal signs using another language. (p.114)

#### ***Translation Approaches and Strategies***

Basically, approaches and strategies are not but the sequel of a particular theoretical bearing. As such, translation is approached by means of different, though sometimes overlapping strategies, according to their theoretical backgrounds which mainly subsume linguistic and functional approaches.

#### ***Linguistic Approach to Translation***

According to Nida (as cited in As-Safi, 2011, p.24), the linguistic approach to translation is based on the comparison of the structures of both source texts (STs) and target texts (TTs). Bearing in mind that in this context linguistic means structural, this approach centers on the semantic and syntactic analyses of the ST, the basis for forming equivalents in the TT. Within the

same line of thought, Catford (1965) states that translation is simply a replacement of the SL textual material by its equivalent in the TL. Similarly, Nida and Tiber (1969) aver that the linguistic translation can be faithful, for the existing source elements can be directly derived from the ST wording. Nida thought of analyzing the underlying structures of the ST and then reconstructing them in the TT, so that the same echo on the ST audience be preserved for the TT recipients (Nida & Tiber, 1969). He provides three stages for the process of translation: *analysis*, *transfer* and then *reconstruction* (Nida & Tiber, 1969). To begin with, the surface structure (grammar, meaning and connotations) of the ST is analysed into kernel sentences which Nida considers as “basic structural elements out of which language builds its elaborate surface structures” (Nida & Tiber, 1969, p.39). Then, these kernels are transferred to the target language and finally reconstructed to form the TT surface elements. As the displayed structures provide meanings, Nida (as cited in Nida & Tiber, 1969) includes semantic and even pragmatic analyses in the process of translation. As arranged by Hodges (2009, online), these include:

- (1) Hierarchical structures: relation within the context of super-ordinates and hyponyms are to be taken into consideration when translating because it would happen that translating the hyponym *sister* is impossible, so the super-ordinate, *sibling* can be used instead.
- (2) Componential analysis deals with the characteristics of the semantic constructs of words and how they can be connected; for example, the lexeme *brother* has a different meaning in an Afro-American context from that denotatively stated.
- (3) Semantic structural differences by which connotative and denotative meanings of homophones are identified; for instance, the lexemes *bat* referring to animal and *bat* denoting sport equipment in baseball.

### ***Functional Approach to Translation***

No doubt, translation has evolved and thus changed adherence according to the constant linguistic development, for the fact that language is the main material in any translation process. Therefore, advocating the functional view of approaching language stimulated scholars in the field of Translation Studies to change camps from structural to functional perspectives to underpin their theory. The 1970s and 1980s are considered the hallmarks of the functional and communicative approaches to translation in Germany. This line of thought includes a number of theories of which only two are to be explained namely, *Text Type Theory* and *Skopos Theory*.

1) *Text Type Theory*: The foundation of this theory is also equivalence that is not at the level of words or sentences, but at the level of text which is considered the most communicative linguistic unit, where a function is performed and a purpose is achieved. One of the German pioneers advocating this line of thought, Reiss (as cited in Munday, 2001) claims that the choice of translation methods is determined by the function of text types. Therefore, she identifies four functions of text types and proposes methods of rendering them as well. These subsume:

- (1) Informative concerning stating facts explicitly and clearly, for the purpose is the content and topic; thus the TT of this type should display a total representation of the ST, avoiding omission and including further explanation if needed.
- (2) Expressive where the aesthetic dimension of language is used as in the case of poems; the TT should preserve the same effect that the author of the ST endeavoured to achieve.

- (3) Operative – designed to persuade and convince the receiver to act in a certain way as a response of, say, advertisements. The TT has to keep the same impact on its reader as that on the ST recipient.
- (4) Audio-medial – films, television advertisements and the like. Rendering such products necessitates moving beyond seeking mere equivalence at the linguistic level towards the inclusion of the paralinguistic elements affecting communication such as music and images. (p.75)

2) *Skopos Theory*: In the 1970s, Vermeer introduced the Greek expression *skopos*, meaning purpose or aim, to translation theory. Skopos theory centers on the purpose of translation and the function of the TT in the target culture, which may not necessarily be the same as that of the ST in the source culture. This implies that the same ST would generate different TTs according to the desired functions that fit the target cultures. (Vermeer, 2000)

### **Translation Contexts and Foreign Language Teaching Loci**

After this journey through different theoretical stations of translation, the following discussion attempts to summon to the debate panel diverse opinions concerning the obligatory or unnecessary presence of pure translation techniques in a foreign language learning environment. Initially, it is worth noting that the basic units of the intended analysis are: 1) the translation approaches and techniques themselves as related to foreign language teaching/learning and 2) the type of translation pedagogy that governs the appropriate selection of translation techniques. Both are fuelled by arguments whose foundations lie in vivid experience and erudite authority.

#### ***Translation Approaches in Foreign Language Classes***

The aim behind this section is to clarify that there is no harm to include the formerly listed translation approaches and techniques in instructing foreign language learners, who, via this kind of direct instruction, can boost their linguistic competence and simultaneously gain some translation basics. As a middle school English teacher of a twenty-two-year experience, the researcher suggests that most of translation techniques are purely linguistic and common in teaching/ learning a tongue other than what is naturally acquired.

To begin with, Jakobson's trio (intra-linguistic, inter-semiotic and inter-linguistic translations) is the most widely used in foreign language context. The first of the three is characterised by summarising and paraphrasing, which both are taught to foreign language learners who are accustomed to tasks where they are asked to produce oral or written summaries of texts and dialogues, to convert conversations into texts and vice versa, and even to paraphrase their understandings. The second represents converting from and to different semiotic systems. In fact, in a foreign language teaching context, these translation techniques are mostly considered as learning strategies which learners are equipped with in order to state an oral or written description of a picture, to explicate the content of tables and charts and to alter their understanding of a linguistic point into a diagram or even a drawing. The last type, dubbed translation proper, is the nub of the pedagogical dispute and the purview of most research in the field of translation studies. As said earlier, foreign language instruction and translation approaches share some common points which unify them much more than make them apart; pertaining to the aforementioned approaches, translation strategies are all based on understanding and analysing the ST in the first place, then

examining the linguistic and the cultural circumstances of both the TT and its recipients. In other words, a linguistic and contextual decoding/encoding takes place whenever a translating act is carried out. Hence, when introducing translation techniques to foreign language learners, teachers are in fact presenting linguistic components. To back up this statement, there may be no better than illustrating this co-existence through analysing linguistic and functional approaches to translation mentioned above.

Nida's three-stage translating strategy initiates with the analysis of the grammatical construct and the semantic content of the ST; this cannot be realized unless reading acts are performed to comprehend both gist and details, and then to grasp both syntactic and semantic components. These *de facto* pertain to what is known in language pedagogy as, respectively, reading comprehension through a series of tasks to check learners' global and detailed understanding; and intensive reading in which the focus of instruction is on explicating the choice of particular syntactic combinations such as tense and subject-verb accordance, and discovering suitable lexical ties (synonyms, antonyms, and the like). Congruent with this line of thought, intricate and complex structures are simplified by means of what is technically dubbed *kernel sentences* in which sentence constituents are determined according to parts of speech and their functions. The second stage is to transfer these simplified sentences into the target language, which are ultimately exploited to reconstruct the TT. The last two levels of translation process are meant to be efficient techniques to test and assess learners' intake and to check their understanding of the presented linguistic concepts. Said differently, being the language of the TT, L1 is a tool to check learners' assimilation of the linguistic competence of L2, the foreign language in the ST.

Reiss's text type theory and Vermeer's skopos theory are no exception in that the textual typology and function are dealt with in the realm of foreign language teaching, so the core of the corresponding translation techniques brings nothing new because at some levels of language learning, learners are presented different sorts of linguistic functions and/or purposes via different kinds of texts, representing the self and the foreign cultures. Accordingly, the communicative language teaching and the intercultural communicative approaches have turned out the current FL learning environment into a much more vivid learning sphere where learners should be familiar to communicative and authentic texts that more or less depict reality and flaunt cultural diversity. Now, FL learners read informative texts such as newspapers' articles where the information is of utmost importance, and obviously has to be kept without any distortion in the TT; they are accustomed to poems with their high degree of expression and feeling, which logically has to be preserved in the TT, so that the same artistic echo is felt; albeit their possible ignorance of the terminology *operative texts*, they are, at least, familiar to what is meant by advertisements as well as their strong impact that must be transferred according to the designed audience. Additionally, films, music and images are part of the authentic materials used in language pedagogy, so although learners may ignore pure interpreting processes such as dubbing, no doubt they genuinely know that rendering such products necessitates blending both linguistic and paralinguistic attributes. In either of the above cases, and as evoked earlier, along with knowing that textual typology determines both function and purpose, learners are, though implicitly, aware of the fact that cultural diversity and purposeful intentions govern linguistic choices.

In compliance with the above discussion, it is clear that this postulation centers on the tendency of an inescapable natural integration of some translation basics in a foreign language learning environment. Consciously or unconsciously, this inclusion pervades all spheres of constructing linguistic communicative competence; translation is bound to and dependent on the four skills (reading, writing, speaking and listening) and on language aspects (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation). In this respect, Malmkjaer (1998) avers that translation is “in fact dependent on and inclusive of them [the four skills], and language students who are translating will be forced to practice them” (p.8). In this context, it is but a teaching means even though some translation preliminaries are presented throughout the learning process. To cut it short, this section attempts to clarify that some translation techniques are unavoidably taught to foreign language learners and are necessary to boost their language proficiency. As this long debate is about to breathe its last, it seems that the highlighted topic is exhaustively dealt with, yet it is not the end of the story.

### ***Types of Translation Pedagogy***

As this paper revealed, the present subtitle depicts the second pillar of the current debate’s foundation. At the outset of what follows, it is worth noting that this categorisation in itself can be considered as a proof for the existence of contexts where translation techniques proper are taught to train prospective translators, and learning situations in which just mere basics are transferred; these two types, so Klaudy (2003, p.133), are respectively “*real translation*” and “*pedagogical translation*” in which either category is founded on a different “*object*”, “*function*” and “*addressee*”.

To start with, the *object* of *real translation* is the real-world information that the ST contains, but in the realm of *pedagogical translation*, it is the data collected to construct and assess the learners’ language proficiency. Regarding *function*, *real translation* is the end and the very goal of the learning process through which translation trainees – at more specific tertiary educational stages – take in pure translation skills to build up their translational competence, which is conditioned by the availability of two major abilities. According to Pym (1990), these can be summarised as 1) the ability to produce much more TTs (a series of T1, T2...Tn) for only one ST and 2) the ability of a quick and extremely confident selection of only one TT amongst the series as a replacement of the ST according to both specified purpose and reader. It is obvious that their union concerns nothing but a translation class in which emphasis is on the process whereby a translation is achieved because translation itself is a know-how activity: a know-how ability to generate and select between alternative texts (Pym, 1990). Contra the former, pedagogical translation is an instrument to build up the learners’ linguistic competence and evaluate to what extent the construction has been done. In this *milieu*, the outcome of translation attempts is but to upgrade and test the learners’ foreign language proficiency. The distinction is also based on the identity of the *addressee* who is the targeted reader, waiting to be given reality-referred information to fulfil a specified function and purpose, in real translation; and the language teacher or the examiner, needing to know about the learners’ linguistic intake, in pedagogical translation.

In the light of this analysis, one can infer that there actually exist two contexts of teaching translation with different degrees of specialty and difficulty. Training future translators calls for more detailed and practical instructions shaped by specific syllabi and tasks as well as by authentic

and communicative corpora which bring assistance to trainees so as to discover the intricacies and the probable problems facing their profession, and simultaneously help trainers assess precisely their prospective translators' translational competence and proficiency in addition to some remarks concerning language usage and use. In this respect, needless to clarify that at this professional level, trainees are supposed to master source and target languages as well as cultures, as this mastery is a paramount precondition for learning translation proper; Nord (1991) states that reaching a certain level of competence in L1 and L2 can be considered as a prerequisite for acquiring translation competence. On the other hand, instructing students for linguistic purposes where translation basics are employed to ease the achievement of foreign language proficiency is technically different, for the use of whatever translation technique at all attempts cannot make these learners professional translators unless the teaching aim is modified and thus an independent translation class, where they are guided by a set of 'translation briefs', is created because the aim governs the quality and quantity of materials. To back up this opinion, Klaudy (2003) claims that we can talk about real translation "only if the aim of translation is to develop translation skills" (p.133).

Thus, some translation basics that should be implemented and thus given importance in a foreign language learning environment are mainly training learners how mono- and bilingual dictionaries are exploited to look up words, so that they enrich their dormant stock with bilingual lexico- semantic luggage, and importantly be aware of the fact that lexical and grammatical equivalents are governed by both language and context of use. The other is to teach students at all levels with gradual difficulty how discourse is analysed and therefore comprehended, and how it differs according to the linguistic code being used and the textual genre displaying the discursive message. As a suggestion, the teacher can start by what is universally known; for example, a simplified version of a bilingual presentation of fables and short stories such as Snow White or Blanche Neige / بياض الثلج. This kind of activities serves as a preliminary comparative demonstration of differently encoded texts, for the reason that any translation act begins by reading, analysing and then understanding the text being rendered as well as the circumstances of its transfer.

On the basis of this thought, one may assume and wonder whether this translation groundwork has to be presented at all because translation is naturally and intuitively practised to back up communication in different social settings; thus, there is no need to bother the foreign language teacher's time table and his/her lesson plans or to disturb the teaching and learning process altogether. However, teachers in general and foreign language teachers in particular, are totally aware of the fact that no testing assignment is given to learners unless demonstrative presentations and in depth explanations are carried out beforehand. Accordingly, teaching some translation techniques is no exception in that it would be ridiculous and even 'translation abuse' to ask learners to translate without being equipped by what is known in didactics as *performance, condition and criteria* (PCC): learners should perform a translating act of a given sentence or text conditioned by using the already learnt translation's 'what' and 'how' accompanied by their awareness of the designated criteria for their products' assessment. In fact, it is a sort of pedagogical dictatorship which does exist not only in schools but even in foreign language departments where a subject or a module of Translation Techniques is incorporated in the syllabus regardless of whether it is essential, supplementary or just put in to load the modules' list. The

researcher still recalls that although there was a module of Translation Techniques, the majority if not all students in the English department were not entirely sure of the correctness of their translations because gloomy and confused were their understandings of the presented lectures. As a dire consequence, most of their translation acts in most cases derived from the academic technical path. Instead, these students relied on their own intuition to produce what is dubbed *translationese*, for the aim was not translation proficiency but the grade (mark). Of course language teachers are not to blame, as most of them have been trained to teach language *per se* without any supplementary courses on translation techniques; English language teachers in Algerian middle and secondary schools can be striking examples. The other reason centres on the fact that some teachers are given modules (about translation in our case) in which they are neither well versed nor specialized.

To teach efficiently some translation techniques, instructors, so Newmark (1991, pp. 42-59), need to 1) have translator's skills, and 2) be more confident and flexible in order to accept mistakes as well as diverse renderings. Godayol (as cited in Macau, 2003, p.74) suggests other requirements, chief among them: 1) teachers should differentiate pedagogical and professional translations, 2) have a good command of the target and the source languages and 3) consider translation as a form of linguistic exploration. Being a crucial part of the pedagogical contract, learners should also show evidence of some abilities that would guarantee a successful transfer of these techniques.

### **Conclusion**

On the basis of the former analysis, the researcher argues that the aforementioned translation approaches and techniques have to be transferred to foreign language learners at all levels, but with gradual difficulty. This presentation, at all attempts, should never reach the level of those practised in professional settings. As said earlier, the context and the learning objective guide the appropriateness of the employed technique. Furthermore, those translation basics cannot make foreign language learners professional translators because this aim is governed by much more in-depth and specialized practice. Analogically, what is learnt by a physician in general medicine alone can never make him/her a professional in, say, plastic surgery unless superior studies in this specialty are deliberately carried out. Although these basics do not lead to professionalism in translation, they should be given total consideration in foreign language learning settings at all levels. This cannot be practical unless teachers are equipped by and trained to use a clearly designed syllabus, demonstrating both the quantity and quality of the applied translation techniques according to learners' needs, interests and abilities. In other words, the spotlight should be on some practical suggestions of moment-to-moment operations where these technical basics can be utilized, and on the conditions that govern their efficiency. All that comes from the achievements of translation studies and of foreign language didactics would prove its efficiency as these two are in a give-and-take relation. Translation studies provide a set of translation techniques that are subsequently adapted and adopted according to the different requirements of foreign language learning which in turn boosts language proficiency that is a precondition for getting access to the world of professional translators. "Translator training starts where foreign language teaching ends" (Klaudy 2003: 133).

**About the Author:**

**Youcef BENAMOR** is an inspector in charge of middle school English teachers. He earned an MA in Applied Linguistics and Didactics of English from Abdelhamid Ibn Badis University, Mostaganem, Algeria and a Teaching Knowledge Test (TKT) Certificate from the British Council. Currently, He is conducting a doctoral research in the same specialism. Applied Linguistics, Didactics, Discourse Analysis, Teacher Education, Professional Development and Translation Studies are the main areas of his interests.

**References**

- As-Safi, A., B. (2011). *Translation Theories, Strategies and Basic Theoretical Issues*. Amman: Petra University.
- Catford, J., C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Duff, A. (1989). *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press..
- Hodges, P. (2009). *Linguistic Approach to Translation Theory*. Retrieved from: <http://www.translationdirectory.com/articles/article2019.php>
- Jakobson, R. (1959/2000). On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In Venuti, L. (ed.). *The Translation Studies Reader*. pp. 113-118. London & New York: Routledge.
- Klaudy, K. (2003). *Languages in Translation*. Budapest: Scholastica.
- Macau, M., C. (2003). *Teaching foreign languages through translation: considering multiple intelligences*. Open Educational Resources (OER). (Doctoral Thesis) Retrieved from: <http://www.recercat.cat/bitstream/handle/2072/4828/tesinamallol.pdf?sequence=1>
- Malmkjaer, K. (ed.) (1998). *Translation and Language Teaching*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and Applications*. London: Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1991). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Nida, E., A., & Taber, C. (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill
- Nord, C. (1991). *Text analysis in translation: theory, methodology, and didactic application of a model for translation-oriented text analysis*. Amsterdam & New York: Rodopi.
- Nunan, D., & Lamb, C. (1996). *The Self-Directed Teacher: Managing the Learning Process* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pym, A. (1990). *A Definition of Translational Competence, Applied to the Teaching of Translation*. Paper presented to the 12th World Congress of the FIT, Belgrade.
- Riche *et al.* (2003). *Spotlight on English One*. Algiers: ONPS
- Ross, N., J. (2000). *Interference and Intervention: Using Translation in the EFL Classroom*. *Modern English Teacher*, 9 (3), 61–66.
- Stern, H., H. (1992). *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vermeer, H., J. (2000). Skopos and Commission in Translational Action. In Venuti, L. (ed.). *The Translation Studies Reader*. pp 221-232. New York: Routledge
- Widdowson, H. G. (1979). The Deep Structure of Discourse and the Use of Translation. In Brumfit, C. & Johnson, K. (eds.). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. pp. 61-71. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press