

THE PEDAGOGICAL VALUE OF TRANSLATION

Experiences from a newly introduced elective course

Adrienn Károly

With the expansion of nonprofessional translation activities, language education has gradually rediscovered translation and mediation, seeing them not only as useful tools in language learning but also as transferable skills, useful in their own right. However, the pedagogical value of translation, as a practical activity, a theoretical topic, and a subject for critical discussion, has been less explored from the broader perspective of intercultural education, particularly in multicultural classroom settings where English is the shared language. This article reports the findings of a study conducted at a Finnish university on a recently introduced elective course designed and developed by the author. The course, open for both domestic and international students, focuses on translation and culture and has active and collaborative learning at its core. It promotes creativity, critical thinking, and self-reflection through discussions and practical tasks, while also considering the affective layers of meaning as well as broader social, ideological, and ethical dimensions of translation. The research presented here examines the pedagogical value of translation in the first two course implementations. Student data from surveys and reflections explored the participants' motivations for taking the course, their previous translation experiences, their initial views on translation as an activity and as a future study or career option, along with their individual learning experiences in the course. Student data were complemented by field notes recording my observations, thoughts, and development ideas. The research underscores the benefits of incorporating translation more strongly into multilingual pedagogies that promote intercultural learning. The implications are discussed from the perspectives of professional development and institutional-level curriculum design.

Keywords: Translation, culture-specific items, critical language awareness, multilingual and multicultural pedagogy, intercultural education, collaborative learning

A nem hivatásos fordítás terjedésével párhuzamosan a nyelvtanítás fokozatosan újra felfedezte a fordítást és közvetítést, melyek nem csupán a nyelvtanulás hasznos eszközei, hanem önmagukban is hasznos, átváltható készségek. Kevesebb kutatás vizsgálja azonban a fordítás pedagógiai alkalmazását az interkulturális tanulás és oktatás tágabb perspektívájából olyan esetekben, amikor a fordítás nem csupán gyakorlati tevékenység, hanem egyben elméleti téma és a kritikai megbeszélések tárgya is. Ez különösen igaz olyan multikulturális osztálytermi környezetben, ahol az angol a közös nyelv. Ebben

a tanulmányban egy pedagógiai kutatás eredményeiről számolok be, amelyet egy általam kidolgozott, újonnan bevezetett választható kurzus keretein belül végeztem egy finnországi egyetemen. A finn és a nemzetközi hallgatók által egyaránt felvehető kurzus pedagógiai vezérelvei az aktív és kollaboratív tanulás. A kurzus a fordítás és a kultúra metszéspontjában lévő témákra irányul és változatos megbeszélések, illetve gyakorlati feladatok révén segíti elő a kreativitást, a kritikai gondolkodást és az önreflexiót. A témák lefedik a jelentés érzelmi aspektusait, valamint a fordítás tágabb társadalmi, ideológiai és etikai dimenzióit. Az itt bemutatott kutatásban fordítás pedagógiai értékét vizsgáltam a kurzus első két megvalósítása során. Az adatgyűjtés felmérések és hallgatói reflexiók segítségével történt, amelyekben feltártam, hogy mi motiválja a hallgatókat a kurzuson való részvételre, milyen korábbi fordítási tapasztalatokkal rendelkeznek, milyen előzetes nézeteik vannak a fordításról mint tevékenységről, illetve mint jövőbeli tanulmányi és karrierlehetőségről, valamint feltérképeztem a kurzus során szerzett tanulási tapasztalataikat. A hallgatóktól gyűjtött adatokat a saját megfigyeléseim, gondolataim és a kurzus fejlesztésére vonatkozó ötleteim egészítették ki, melyeket terepnaplóban rögzítettem. Az eredmények alapján arra következtethetünk, hogy a fordítás értékes pedagógiai eszköz, amely hangsúlyosabb teret érdemel az interkulturális tanulási célokat kitűző többnyelvű pedagógiákban. A végkövetkeztetések levonása során kitérek mind a szakmai fejlődés, mind az intézményi szintű tantervfejlesztés szempontjaira.

Kulcsszavak: Fordítás, kultúraspecifikus kifejezések, kritikai nyelvi tudatosság, többnyelvű oktatás és multikulturális pedagógia, interkulturális nevelés, kollaboratív tanulás

Introduction

The FIFA World Cup 2022 awards ceremony was a memorable event for sports enthusiasts. Before the iconic moment when Lionel Messi, captain of the winning Argentinian team, was handed the gold trophy, Qatar's emir placed a black cloak over his shoulders.¹ The gesture was a sign of honour and celebration, intended to pay homage to a superstar and emphasise the geopolitical significance of the World Cup 2022. However, the range of responses this move triggered worldwide illustrates not only the complexity of contemporary global professional sport with its closely intertwined dimensions (local–translocal, national–transnational, and cultural–transcultural; Naha, 2017) but also the misinterpretations, misconceptions, misunderstandings, and ideological clashes arising from lacks and gaps of information we have about each other's and our own cultures and histories and from the resistance to embrace diversity. It is also common to dismiss or disregard the interconnectedness of cultures and “the ways in which cultural forms move, change and are reused to fashion new identities in diverse contexts”, an idea captured by the notion of *transcultural flows* (Pennycook, 2006, p. 6). The Messi example epitomises the intricacies of the visible–invisible and material–non-material dimensions of culture, along with the complexities of meaning-making. It reminds us to stay open to different perspectives, identities, and mindsets without forgetting that we are connected in multiple ways.

The cultural entanglements in contemporary societies foster collaboration but also bring challenges. In higher education, the original goals of *internationalisation*, including cooperation, mutual understanding, solidarity, and harmonious international relations, have largely been overshadowed by an approach that prioritises local interests, short-term goals, and measurable outcomes, particularly with the increasing global competition since the mid-1990s (de Wit & Altbach, 2021). Unfortunately, these trends see internationalisation as a goal in itself rather than as an instrument (Latorre et al., 2024) and are underpinned by a narrow, ethnocentric understanding of culture. Perhaps as an effort to realign with the initial objectives, recent discussions on the social responsibility aspects of internationalisation call for a long-term approach oriented towards mutual learning and promoting openness, respect for diversity, cultural sensitivity, and an awareness of global connectedness. *Internationalisation at home*, including *internationalising the curriculum* (Leask, 2013), along with collaborative online international learning projects (including virtual exchange) and movements to decolonise curricula, foreground these values and advocate a shift in focus from institutional to personal responsibility, which is believed to more effectively tackle the multiple urgent crises facing us today (Latorre et al., 2024).

In 2020, as I embarked on designing a course that promotes these values, I was searching for a theme that could create meaningful learning opportunities for students from diverse cultural backgrounds. As it is closely intertwined with language and culture and has intricate social, ideological, and ethical dimensions, translation emerged as an ideal option, especially because it also aligned with my professional background and interests.

Although the University of Jyväskylä (JYU) has a long history of research into language-related phenomena,² only a few practical translation courses on specific language pairs have traditionally been available, mostly for language students. Thus, the idea of a course that

1. The *bisht*, a traditional Arab garment, is worn on special occasions. Its function and appearance resemble the internationally known graduation gown.

2. Language, culture, and society forms one of the university's strategic core fields of research.

combines theory, practice, and critical discussion and approaches translation from a broader perspective was new. In Finland, translation theory is part of translator training programmes offered at certain universities. In these programmes, translation is predominantly viewed as the institutionalised and norm-governed practice of professionals although it is increasingly recognised as encompassing the everyday activities of multilingual individuals, with repercussions for the whole translation industry (Dam & Koskinen, 2016).

In language education, and parallel to the growing practice of nonprofessional translation (Pérez-González & Susam-Saraeva, 2012), multilingual pedagogical approaches have been elevated to the forefront, leading to a reassessment of the value of translation (Cook, 2010). However, translation as a pedagogical resource – seen as a practical activity, a theoretical topic, and a subject for critical discussion – has been less explored from the larger perspective of intercultural education, particularly in multicultural classroom settings where English is the shared medium of communication.

Motivated by my interest in pedagogical experimentation and my background in translation, in 2020 I designed a course that considers translation broadly and focuses on topics at the intersection of translation and culture. In 2021, the course was added to the list of electives offered by the Centre for Multilingual Academic Communication (Movi)³ and since then it has been offered to all students at the university, regardless of degree programme and student status.

In this paper, I present the findings of a study that examined the pedagogical value of translation within the context of this newly introduced course. The research addressed the following specific questions:

1. What are the students' main motivations for enrolling in the course?
2. What previous translation experience do they have?
3. What are their initial views on translation as an activity and a future study or career option?
4. How did their thinking about translation as an activity and a future study/career option change by the end of the course?
5. What are the students' individual learning experiences in the course?

The research had an overall qualitative design, and as an inquiry-based study, it incorporated analytical, interpretive, and reflective elements (Babione, 2015). Data collected from the students were complemented by field notes. Although the research did not have a systematic action research design, the findings informed the pedagogical development of the course.

In the upcoming sections, I first review real-world trends and theoretical approaches central to understanding my motivations behind designing the course. This is followed by outlining the pedagogical framework of the course and describing its first two implementations. After this, I present the methods of data collection and analysis and discuss the findings, while also incorporating the perspective of course development. Finally, I address the implications and suggest future lines of research.

3. Movi's roles and responsibilities are summarised in the Introduction of this book (Károly et al., 2024).

Shifting theoretical approaches and emerging real-world trends

Towards more critical frameworks

Contemporary scholarship in various fields highlights the dynamic and multimodal nature of interaction (e.g., Busch, 2017; Pennycook, 2017; Scollon et al., 2012). Scholars also emphasise that cultures should not be equated with homogeneous (ethnic/national) entities as they encompass rich and multilayered heritages and identities and dynamic processes of meaning-making (Komisarof & Zhu, 2016). Cultural literacy is thus to be seen as meaning negotiation and identity construction rather than as a stable set of factual knowledge about a particular group (Maine et al., 2019). Along the same lines, Kramsch and Zhu (2020) suggest that intercultural communication should not refer to communication across national borders but to “participation in fluctuating networks of individual experiences, memories, and fantasies, multiple allegiances and legitimations” (p. 1).⁴ In fact, Dervin (2022) argues that we all “do” interculturality every day, directly or indirectly. The main pedagogical implication of these ideas is to move beyond the traditional understanding of culture as a “collection of things” and the rigid dichotomies of self vs. other, and of my culture vs. your culture, and instead, engage with each other’s heritages, identities, perspectives, and values, and explore how they intertwine (Maine et al., 2019). Despite these theoretical advancements, scholars note that intercultural education still largely relies on a narrow and static understanding of culture, contributing to the reinforcement of stereotypes, biases, and prejudices (Sommier et al., 2022).

Applied language studies scholars working in the critical paradigm emphasise that language is not merely a communication tool and argue that since power is an essential dimension of interaction today, language and communication teachers cannot dismiss broader and often challenging political, social, and ethical issues (e.g., Dervin, 2023; Ennser-Kananen & Saarinen, 2022; Kramsch, 2020; Pennycook, 2018, 2022; Shapiro, 2022). As Kramsch (2011) has pointed out, language learners’ primary goal, especially at more advanced levels, is not to achieve near-native proficiency as a goal in itself, but to develop a more sophisticated *symbolic competence*, which enables them to understand the intricacies of interaction (such as underlying ideologies or multimodally and often implicitly conveyed meanings), to identify topics and perspectives that are overlooked or disregarded, and to reflect on and position themselves. These ideas foreground not just the role of the context and collective/individual worldviews in languaging and meaning-making⁵ but also the poetic function of language⁶: the material aspects of communication (such as tone of voice or silence) and the cultural and affective layers of meaning (Kramsch, 2021).

A similar shift in focus is occurring in translation studies. For example, Haapaniemi (2023) advocates the reconceptualization of translation as a broader phenomenon that recognises the role of material forms, modalities, along with the social and cognitive aspects of meaning-negotiation. Affect is receiving renewed attention (e.g., Petrilli & Ji, 2022) and is increasingly seen as the interplay between intra- and interpersonal factors, that is individual emotions (including bodily sensations) and socially/culturally acceptable emotional responses (Koskinen, 2020).

4. Holliday’s (2019) notion of *small culture formation on the go* captures these transient, everyday encounters in a variety of situations, when we position ourselves, engage in dialogue (or choose not to), and negotiate the rules of behaviour.

5. Cf. Bakhtin’s (1981) notion of *heteroglossia*.

6. Kramsch drew on Jakobson’s (1960) idea that poetics should be considered an integral part of linguistics.

Language education practices worldwide have traditionally been underpinned by a monolingual ideology, viewing languages as distinct, homogeneous, and stable entities and as code systems to master. Such a static approach, however, is disconnected from the realities of our contemporary world and disregards language users' diverse backgrounds, personal histories, identities, and individual needs. Fortunately, the growing awareness of the linguistic, social, and epistemological inequalities in education (and in academia) has sparked an interest in multilingual and culturally responsive pedagogies (e.g., Kramsch & Zhu, 2016; Laviosa, 2016; Li, 2018, 2022) and drawn attention to the mediating role of identity and emotions (e.g., Dewaele, 2010; Norton, 2013; Pavlenko, 2005). One central concept is *translanguaging*, which refers not just to switching between languages/language varieties and integrating different modalities but to creating new, hybrid meanings and identities, while still being aware of the existence and powerful impact of named languages (Li, 2011, 2018). According to Li (2018, p. 23), language learners and users bring together their personal experiences, environments, attitudes, beliefs, and ideologies, along with a range of linguistic, cognitive, and semiotic resources in “one coordinated and meaningful performance” (*translanguaging space*).

While translation as a cognitive/linguistic act takes language borders seriously and is product-oriented and linear (moving from source to target language), a translanguaging approach illuminates the creative and strategic processes involved in translation, when the translator is negotiating meaning, relying on a pool of linguistic/semiotic/sensory resources within their repertoire (Baynham & Lee, 2019). In fact, as the authors suggest, each moment during translation is a translanguaging space, where languages, language varieties, registers, discourses, cultural spaces, and semiotic modalities meet, without the translator being strongly aware of the border between them. As they argue, this approach enables us to relinquish the idea of perfect translatability and embrace the complexity of meaning and the polyphony of voices.

But most importantly, translanguaging spaces are embedded in a particular cultural and historical context with their dominant ideologies (Baynham & Lee, 2019). When considering translation as an institutionalised practice, ideologies manifest not only in policy decisions and translation norms⁷ but also in the actual translation decisions made by individual translators (Munday, 2007). These decisions are influenced by personal ideologies (ethical stance, beliefs, values, motivations, attitudes) and shaped by personal histories and contexts. Thus, a critical orientation to translation is helpful, not just when revisiting fundamental concepts like language (see Sakai, 2014) or equivalence,⁸ but also when considering larger cultural, social, political, and ideological issues, such as translation and power (e.g., Gentzler & Tymoczko, 2002), censorship (e.g., Díaz-Cintas, 2019; Valdeón, 2022), translation as resistance/activism (e.g., Baker, 2007; Tymoczko, 2010), as well as translators' visibility, roles, and agency (e.g., Meylaert, 2007; Sela-Sheffy, 2005).

In language education, as a corollary of the multilingual turn, there is a growing acknowledgement of the value of authentic and communicative translation and mediation

7. Policy decisions include, for example, what gets translated or who is selected as translator (Braden, 2021), while translation norms refer to reader/user expectations, professional standards, and ethical responsibility (Chesterman, 2016; Toury, 2012).

8. In her influential essay, Lori Chamberlain (1988) argued that the distinction between source and target text is modelled on the traditional patriarchal gender binary. She drew a comparison between the representation of women as inferior to men and the status of translated texts as lower than the “original”, as well as between faithfulness in marriage and translation.

activities,⁹ leading to a burgeoning field of research (e.g., Beiler & Dewilde, 2020; Cook, 2010; González Davies, 2004, 2014, 2015; Muñoz-Basols, 2019; Pintado-Gutiérrez, 2021). In the context of higher education, research has explored the benefits of translation for students majoring in languages (e.g., Källkvist, 2013) and for non-language students (e.g., Lo, 2016), and studies have also addressed the use of machine translation (e.g., Flanagan & Christensen, 2014; Mellinger, 2017). The findings suggest that translation as a practical activity seems to be a useful pedagogical resource with a wide range of benefits for and beyond language learning. Besides improving language competence, translation develops a range of generic skills, including critical thinking, problem solving, creativity, reflection, self-regulation, collaboration, resource use, information management, and concern for quality, along with intercultural awareness and sensitivity (Peverati, 2013). Written translation tasks also have psychological benefits, such as an intense flow experience (Mirlohi et al., 2011) and a high sense of achievement (Sewell, 2004; Washbourne, 2014). Finally, translation can connect linguistics and literary/cultural studies, the two traditionally distinct components of the modern language degree (Kemp, 2012).

The growing practice of nonprofessional translation

Voluntary and involuntary transnational population flows have resulted in unprecedented cultural and linguistic diversity in many contemporary societies.¹⁰ Coupled with technological advances and the growing influence of the media, these trends have far-reaching repercussions for social interaction. As a result, individuals with diverse profiles today engage in nonprofessional translation and mediation (Pérez-González & Susam-Saraeva, 2012).¹¹ Although they have varying degrees of translation experience, they typically lack formal training and hold no professional qualification but translate on an ad hoc and/or voluntary basis, with little or no financial compensation. According to Pérez-González and Susam-Saraeva (2012), nonprofessional translation practices contribute to the transformation of social interaction in different ways—a phenomenon that translation studies can no longer ignore. As they argue, these practices can not only be seen as an emerging form of civic engagement, but they are also changing the media and publishing industry amid the transition to digital culture, and result in new models of mediation in emerging spaces of cultural contact. The authors thus suggest that

9. The CEFR Companion Volume by the Council of Europe (2018) now includes mediation as a basic communicative language activity, in addition to reception, production, and interaction: “In both the receptive and productive modes, *the written and/or oral activities of mediation make communication possible between persons who are unable, for whatever reason to communicate with each other directly*” (italics added, p. 32). Mediation is used in a broad sense, referring to the activities of mediating texts (including written/oral translation), concepts, or communication (pp. 103–104), each with its own descriptors.
10. Note that multilingualism as a social, institutional, and individual phenomenon has a long history and was the norm in most societies before the development of (mostly) monolingual nation states (see Pavlenko, 2023).
11. In translation studies, several terms are used to describe these emerging forms of nonprofessional translation in various settings: *volunteer* or *fan translation* (e.g., of cartoons, TV shows, films, video games, comics, popular fiction, song lyrics), a term overlapping with *crowdsourced translation* (e.g., of TED talk subtitles), (*online*) *collaborative translation*, *activist translation* (an individual/community endeavour with a political/social agenda, e.g., resistance to censorship, (self-)translation of political blog posts or tweets), *volunteer interpreting* (typically in crisis situations, often as a form of advocacy, humanitarian action, or civic engagement, but also in multilingual family or workplace settings), and various types of *community/public service interpreting* (ad hoc assistance provided by untrained staff or companions, including children, to facilitate communication, typically in asylum and migration contexts or in legal, educational, or health and social care settings). Other terms referring to this type of interpreting are (*child*) *language brokering*, *intercultural mediation*, or *dialogue interpreting* (see Baker & Saldanha, 2020; Pérez-González & Susam-Saraeva, 2012). *Self-translation* is another growing practice, both in literary and academic contexts (e.g., Pisanski Peterlin, 2019).

instead of trying to control these activities for fear that it damages the prestige of the profession and lowers the status of professional translators, translation studies should examine them more thoroughly.

Despite clear evidence that translation competence develops with training (e.g., Göpferich & Jääskeläinen, 2009; Toury, 2012), it is also generally acknowledged that bi- and multilingual individuals have an innate predisposition for translating and can learn it without explicit training (e.g., Toury, 2012). Research has suggested that professional translator training is not the only path for achieving expertise (e.g., Jääskeläinen et al., 2011; Sirén & Hakkarainen, 2002). The work of professional translators may not always exhibit superior quality, while untrained individuals can produce high-quality translations, especially when undertaking complex tasks requiring “non-routine mediation approaches”, typically in unfamiliar circumstances or in unexpected situations that demand critical thinking, creativity, and the ability to adapt (Jääskeläinen, 2010; Jääskeläinen et al., 2011). Pérez-González and Susam-Saraeva (2012) consider nonprofessionals as even “more prepared to ‘innovate’, play around with the material in hand, retell it in a way that is likely to be more interesting and intelligible for their audience—often because they are themselves part of the audience” (p. 158).

Notwithstanding these findings, general views about translation and translation competence are often overly simplistic (Pérez-González & Susam-Saraeva, 2012). In professional contexts, those who commission translators typically require expertise (qualification/training), but outside this context, the complexity of translation can easily be downplayed, with practical considerations taking precedence. Especially those without formal training or experience (both commissioners and translators) may not fully understand the challenges involved in different types of translation and may assume that a good level of language proficiency is sufficient. In doing so, they overlook the intricacies of meaning-making and interpretation and/or important ideological or ethical considerations. Thus, it seems to be beneficial for everyone, but especially for future language professionals, to have a deeper understanding of translation as a complex activity beyond the linguistic level.

The pedagogical design of the newly developed course

The new course embraces translation as a pedagogical resource (e.g., Carreres et al., 2021; Galante, 2021; González-Davies, 2017), seeing it not just as a practical activity but also as a theoretical topic and a subject for critical discussion. With active learning (Børte et al., 2023) and student engagement at its core, including support for autonomy, relevance, and enthusiasm¹², the course promotes collaboration, self-reflection, and discussion, while also relying on student-generated discussion questions (Aflalo, 2018). One main goal is to help students explore multiple layers of meaning during translation, especially when addressing the challenges involved in the translation of culture-specific items. Additionally, the course addresses larger cultural, social, ethical, and ideological issues inherent in translation. Regarding criticality, it is crucial for teachers teaching culturally diverse groups to examine their own expectations and be aware that students’ language competence, family circumstances, educational experiences, and the sociopolitical environment in their home country strongly influence their familiarity and comfort with critical thinking (Aston, 2023; Bali, 2015).

12. These elements are emphasised in theories of achievement motivation, such as expectancy-value theory (Eccles & Wigfield, 2020) and self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2020). For an overview of these theories, see Robinson et al. (2024).

The course design is grounded in *Critical Language Awareness (CLA)* pedagogy (Curtis et al., 2023; Shapiro, 2022), while also incorporating principles of *culturally relevant pedagogy* (e.g., Ladson-Billings, 2014) and *culturally responsive teaching* (Gay, 2018). These are reflected in the consideration of the students' diverse backgrounds, identities, and experiences, and in the inclusion of culturally/personally relevant topics. Such a learning environment is expected to create meaningful opportunities for intercultural interaction, leading to transformative learning experiences (Fielding et al., 2023). By engaging in discussions and collaborative project work in culturally diverse teams, students can also increase their cultural awareness and sensitivity.

Shirley and Hargreaves (2021) emphasise five aspects of student engagement. *Intrinsic value* is tied to nurturing and sustaining students' curiosity and enthusiasm – aspects strongly linked to teacher emotions/attitudes (Cavanagh, 2016; Keller, 2016). Initial motivation is not a concern as the course is elective, and I try to maintain students' interest by using activities that require creativity, critical thinking, or problem-solving, along with a range of discussions that build on prior knowledge and allow sharing personal examples, stories, views, perspectives. *Importance* is connected to personal and societal relevance. The course invites students to discuss personally and socially meaningful topics and reflect on their future career. *Association*, linked to the feeling of inclusion and belonging, is essential throughout the whole course, but especially during the collaborative project work, while *empowerment* refers to making the students feel heard and valued, and giving them agency through choices. Finally, *mastery* is tied to a sense of accomplishment through commitment and persistence – key elements of the project work.

Although the focus on culture-specific items may imply a traditional, narrow approach to culture, this is not the case. Without denying the powerful impact of the current global geopolitical system based on nation-states and defined borders, the course problematises the idea of cultures as isolated, static, and homogeneous entities, highlighting the issues with such an oversimplified approach.¹³ Rather than seeing the students as representatives of a particular (national) culture, I consider their diverse, multilayered, and dynamic identities and the complex emotions attached to them. Admittedly, implementing this in practice can be challenging. As Lee (2015) pointed out, even when our aim is to move beyond essentialising discourses, in informal classroom talk, teachers and students tend to (unconsciously) return to monolithic and reductionist approaches, leading to stereotyping and othering (“doing race” through “doing culture”). Therefore, I need to be mindful of my language use and the way I apply the concept of culture, while also encouraging students to do so in their classroom interactions and beyond. This is crucial as we also discuss culture-specific items, which are traditionally approached from a narrow, ethnocentric understanding of culture. The idea is to move beyond merely discussing cultural similarities/differences and utilise culture-specific items as tools to explore and reflect on the richness of cultures, the dynamic and complex nature of meaning, cultural entanglements as well as deeply ingrained beliefs and assumptions (such as cultural uniqueness).

Culture-specific items¹⁴ are mostly lexical items, including proper names, which have additional shared meanings within a culture, and which often lack a referential equivalent in

13. For an overview of the various approaches to culture from the perspective of translation studies, see Katan (2020).

14. Several other terms are used to refer to these elements (sometimes with differences in scope), such as *culture-/culturally bound references/elements*, *cultural references*, *cultural (key)words*, *cultural bumps*, or *realia*, but Agar's (1994) term *rich points* also captures this idea. Note that culture-specificity is not an absolute category but is determined by the two cultures in question and cultural contact also influences how well a cultural reference is known outside the “source” culture (*transculturality*; Pedersen, 2011).

a particular other culture (Heltai, 2013; Pedersen, 2011; Pusztai-Varga, 2022; some examples from the Finnish language are *penkkarit*, *pakkoruotsi*, *takatalvi*, or *Huuhkajat*). Since their meaning is closely tied to a specific cultural context, including the material/visible/tangible and/or nonmaterial/invisible/intangible dimensions of culture, they frequently cause communication problems, surprise, or misunderstanding in intercultural interaction and pose considerable challenges for translators (Heltai, 2013). Encapsulating the knowledge, experiences, material objects, concepts, and the cognitive/emotional schemes of a cultural community, they require linguistic, historical, cultural, or social knowledge about this community (Valló, 2002). In fact, translators need a deeper understanding of both the source and target language and cultural context. Note that not just its denotative meaning can make an item culture-specific but also its intricate web of connotations, sociocultural associations, or intertextual references (Heltai, 2013; Pusztai-Varga, 2022). In short, these items invite students to consider multiple layers of meaning, including embodied meaning (Gibbs, 2003), and the interplay between the personal and sociocultural dimensions of meaning (Koskinen, 2020). Since their translation presents an authentic problem-solving task and requires creativity, they are well suited for analysis and discussion in multicultural classrooms (González Davies & Scott-Tennent, 2005).

The first two course implementations

Due to the restrictions during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2021, the course was first arranged remotely, consisting of eight 90-minute synchronous online weekly sessions. Of the 30 students registering for the course, I accepted 25, of whom 23 completed the course. The course mainly attracted language and communication students, 19 of whom were domestic students in language-oriented degree programmes at the bachelor's or master's level. The four international exchange students were studying in various programmes in the humanities and social sciences. Applying the labels “domestic” and “international” was not always straightforward as some students had a bi- or multilingual/cultural background or belonged to a linguistic/cultural minority. Also, some domestic students had studied outside their home country and had rich intercultural experiences.

In 2022 the course was organised face-to-face and consisted of ten 90-minute weekly sessions. Twenty-two students registered for it, all of whom were accepted. Of the 21 students who successfully completed the course, 12 were domestic students studying predominantly at the master's level in language-oriented programmes, while the nine exchange students studied in various programmes in the humanities and social sciences.

Key content

The central topics addressed in the course are summarised in Appendix A. Besides the two general reference sources (Baker & Saldanha, 2021; Munday, 2016), I use scholarly and popular articles along with a range of multimodal resources (short movies, TED talks, images, songs, interactive online resources). I also recommend practical tools for translators (dictionaries, terminology databases, online resources) as well as scholarly journals, books, and articles focusing on translation. Students' examples of culture-specific items are collected in an online collaborative whiteboard (Flinga).

Throughout the course, students work in culturally diverse teams on a longer project focusing on the translation of culture-specific items in self-selected authentic texts written in their first languages, and at the end of the course, they present their projects to the others. Several genres have been explored so far, including poems, fiction, folklore, movies, and songs. Students also brought examples from minority and popular cultures, which were particularly noteworthy as they were characterised by specific linguistic features and a high degree of transculturality and intertextuality. In the final presentation, the groups provide background information about the texts (e.g., author, genre, topic, language/language variety, date, lexical/stylistic features, texts with a similar function in another culture, related literary/artistic works, or other relevant information), explain the layers of meaning of the selected culture-specific words and phrases, specify the translation challenge, and provide a translation solution for each (into English and the languages spoken in the group), with a specific target audience in mind. Students are expected to justify the chosen translation strategies, describe the processes of meaning-negotiation and problem-solving, and indicate the tools and resources they consulted (general/specialised dictionaries, etymological or cultural dictionaries). I also encourage them to discover whether the meaning has travelled across languages.

At the end of the course, students submit a written reflection on their overall learning experience.

The value of practitioner research

Developing a course that aligned with my professional background and interests allowed me to enact my professional agency in its three key aspects: influencing at work, developing work practices, and negotiating professional identity (Vähäsantanen et al., 2020). Additionally, conducting research on my practice offered a unique opportunity for research-based development of my teaching through pedagogical experimentation, leading to a stronger feeling of being an “agent of change” (Kusters et al., 2023). Edwards (2021) highlighted several benefits of pedagogical action research for language teachers from the perspective of professional development. Although the research reported here did not have a systematic action research design, it proved to be a highly valuable experience, the implications of which are discussed at the end of this paper.

Methods

Setting and participants

Data were collected from the first two course implementations (2021 and 2022). All 47 students who attended them (25 and 22 respectively) were invited to participate in the research. In the first offering of the course, 10 students returned the pre-course survey (40% response rate [RR], seven domestic and three international students), and 13 filled in the end-of-course survey (56.5% RR, 11 domestic and two international students). In the second iteration, 17 students gave permission for me to use their reflection papers (77.2% RR, ten domestic and seven international students). Participation in the research was voluntary, and students were shown the research notification describing the study and the privacy notice informing them about the processing of personal data.

Instruments of data collection

In the first course, data were first collected by an online survey sent to the students before the start of the course. It comprised 10 questions (open- and closed-ended), five eliciting demographic background information, and five focusing on previous studies related to translation, translation experiences, motivations to take the course, initial views on translation as an activity, and plans on studying translation in the future (Appendix B).

At the end of the first course, data were collected through the official anonymous Webropol course feedback survey. Three open-ended questions (Appendix C) were added to the survey template used at the university to explore students' learning experiences and the changes in their thinking about translation as an activity and future career option.

In the second iteration, data were collected only at the end of the course. As a main assignment, all students taking the course wrote a reflection based on six guiding questions (Appendix D) focusing on positive and negative learning experiences in the course, changes in thinking about translation as an activity and a future career option, and prior translation experiences. Those who agreed to participate in the research submitted their reflections in a separate folder on the course learning platform.

Data collected from the students were complemented by my observations, reflections, and development ideas recorded as field notes.

Methods of data analysis

Responses to the closed-ended survey questions were analysed in Webropol. On the responses to the open-ended survey questions and the student reflections, I conducted a thematic analysis. When analysing the survey questions, I followed Robinson's (2020) approach developed for brief texts. The student reflections were analysed in ATLAS.ti. Coding was done manually, by the author, guided by the specific topic asked in each question. During the initial coding, I used either an inductive (data-driven) or a hybrid (oriented by the existing literature) approach, except for one question, when I used the PACTE (2003) model of translation competence. During the analysis, I first assigned descriptive codes to segments of data related to each question addressing the same topic. In the subsequent coding cycles, the codes were reviewed, refined, and grouped into broader categories and themes. In certain instances, code frequencies were also calculated.

Results

Students' motivations for taking the course

Students cited a variety of reasons for enrolling in the course (Table 1), related mostly to personal interests, learning goals, and future career plans.

Table 1 Student motivations for taking the first course (n = 10)

Student motivations	Frequency, n
General interest in translation	8
Translation as planned/potential career path	6
Learning about other cultures	4
Exploring culture-specific words/phrases	3
Learning about practical aspects of translation	3
Interacting with students from other cultures	3
Learning about theoretical aspects of translation	2
Interest in multilingual pedagogy	1

Some international students reported that no similar courses existed at their home university, and some domestic students emphasised that the course filled a gap in the available course offerings at JYU:

I think it would be beneficial to offer some translation courses in our programme, because it is very likely that a foreign language major will encounter in the working life tasks that are related to translating.

Just wanna say that I was hoping before that a course like this would be arranged at some point, so I'm glad it finally happened!

Students' previous translation experiences

Several students had some translation experience before taking the course, mostly unpaid/voluntary forms of nonprofessional translation (Table 2). Many of them engaged in various types of mediation to help family members, friends, colleagues, or even teachers, some had translated written or audiovisual material for personal enjoyment (hobby or fan translation),¹⁵ and some mentioned having had a (side) job focusing on or involving translation.

Table 2 Students' previous translation experiences

	Frequency, n 2021 (n = 10)	Frequency, n 2022 (n = 17)
Mediation, to help others	8	16
For personal enjoyment	5	6
As a paid job/side job	2	3

Regarding previous courses, in the first course, only two students reported having taken a practical translation course on a specific language pair. In the second course, one international student was majoring in translation studies, and five other students had completed practical translation courses at JYU, the Open University, or their home university.

15. The text genres mentioned included children's stories, knitting patterns, video subtitles [TED talks, Coursera materials], anime movies, song lyrics, and poems.

Students' initial views on translation as an activity and a future study or career option

Initial views were investigated directly only in the first course ($n = 10$).¹⁶ Concerning their views on translation as an activity, all students mentioned the importance of language competence, four referred to cultural and field-specific knowledge and four emphasised translation tools/resources. Only two students mentioned cognitive/affective/attitudinal elements, citing attention to detail, curiosity, passion, interest in other cultures, creativity, resilience, collaboration skills, and commitment to lifelong learning. Knowledge about translation as an activity and professional practice was mentioned only by two students, who emphasised the importance of knowing specific translation strategies, and considering the target audience, and the influence of the larger professional context (translation commission, time pressure). While strategic competence is a key element in the PACTE (2003) model,¹⁷ only one student explicitly referred to it, highlighting organisational skills.

Regarding their future goals, two students reported being certain to pursue further studies in translation and planning to find employment in translation, to four it was highly probable, and four was undecided, without ruling out the possibility.

Changes in students' thinking about translation as an activity

At the end of both courses, nearly all students reported having gained a deeper understanding of translation, as illustrated by these two comments:

This was entirely a different experience as the translation I have done previously has always been quite “mechanical”, whereas this was a lot more creative.

I used to think very one-dimensionally that translation is just translating literally what is said or written. But there is so much more you need to take into consideration.

Specific aspects that were referred to most included becoming more aware of the complexity of meaning and acknowledging the challenges of conveying the intended meaning or interpreting meaning. Regarding translation competence, many of them reported having developed a deeper recognition of cultural background knowledge, specific translation techniques, and various tools and resources. Several students underlined the vital role of interaction and collaboration during translation, and many became more aware of the social/ideological issues linked to translation:

What never occurred to me before (and changed during the course) is that it takes a lot of time and effort to choose the “right” translator for a certain topic because a translator holds a lot of power.

Some students started thinking about the role of translation in their everyday life and in cultural exchange. Finally, a few students began reflecting on the value of translation in language education, related to their future career goals as teachers.

¹⁶ In the second iteration, in the end-of-course reflection task, students frequently referred to their initial views when discussing the changes in their thinking.

¹⁷ It encompasses the entire problem-solving process from planning to evaluation and activating the other sub-competences.

Changes in students' perspectives on translation as a study or career option

Changes in the students' study or career aspirations are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 Changes in perspectives on translation as a study/career option

Perceived change	Frequency, <i>n</i> 2021 (<i>n</i> = 13)	Frequency, <i>n</i> 2022 (<i>n</i> = 17)
Became even more interested in translation as the primary career goal	3	3
Became less sure due to the challenges recognised, but still generally interested in translation as a career option	6	5
Undecided, translation is one possible career option	4	5
Not interested in becoming a professional translator	0	4

One student reported the following:

I was considering becoming a professional translator in the future already before I attended this course, and now I am even more convinced that this would be a very fitting career choice for me.

The four students in the second course who had no interest in becoming a professional translator cited various reasons: the work being too demanding and the field too competitive, lacking genuine passion, or not speaking additional languages. However, they added that their future job may still involve translation/mediation.

Students' individual positive and negative learning experiences

Students' positive learning experiences were related to three dimensions of course design: structure, learning events, and learning materials and environments (Appendix E).

In terms of the course structure, almost all the participants named the opportunities for intercultural interaction as the most highly valued aspect. Students highlighted that these opportunities enhanced their critical thinking, self-reflection, and expanded their knowledge about other languages and cultures. Students also liked the elective format and emphasised that the content was personally relevant to them and aligned with their interests.

Students identified the project work as the most valuable learning event. It was described as "exciting", "intriguing", "educational", "insightful", "motivating", "productive", "fun", and "different". As one Finnish student wrote:

I often find group work very tiring and without a purpose (group work just for the sake of having something to do), but this time it felt very purposeful as everyone on the team had something to actually contribute.

Some international students reported that this was the first time they ever did group work or expressed their own views.

The class discussions were generally considered engaging and thought-provoking, and many students appreciated the small pre-tasks asking them to look into a real-world case, activate prior knowledge, or brainstorm ideas. On the other hand, students differed in their preferred

learning approach. Some favoured practical tasks and sharing personal experiences, while others valued conceptual discussions and exchanging views. This was also reflected in topic preferences. Many found Pedersen's model of transfer strategies the most useful, especially due to the illustrative examples and the opportunity to apply the theory in the project work. Others, however, liked discussions on the notion of culture, the social/ideological/ethical aspects of translation, or translation as a professional practice:

This was the first course where Hofstede's ideas were questioned. In [the student's minor], his ideas are pretty much taken at face value, and we were not encouraged to question them.

The conversation about who gets to translate or is allowed to translate something was also very eye-opening.

It was fascinating to learn more about the reality of translation work and look at the different ways translation competence has been defined by researchers.

The discussion on dubbing and subtitling was seen as particularly illuminating due to the diversity of perspectives addressed:

As someone who really enjoys hearing the original voices of actors and voice actors and grew up with mostly subtitled shows, I had never really thought about the positive sides of dubbing.

Concerning learning materials/environments, students appreciated multimodal materials and the use of Flinga. In addition, the extra materials, tools, and resources shared during the course were valued highly, especially by those planning further studies in translation.

Students also brought up the affective/attitudinal dimension of learning. For example, they mentioned that the relaxed class atmosphere and the conversational tone during open discussions increased their overall engagement. Another frequently mentioned aspect was the interplay between teacher and student emotions and motivation:

The teacher seemed to be really enthusiastic about the topic which I think always enhances the overall course atmosphere. . . [it] made me more interested in the topics discussed.

The course positively influenced some students' international mindset as well. A few of them reported having made international friends and agreeing to keep in touch even after the course. One student wrote the following:

It was because of the people I met during this course that I had the courage to apply for an exchange in Japan. If that dream comes true, I'll credit it partly to this course.

The course made some participants think about the importance of speaking many languages, and a few of them noticed becoming more positive towards English as a lingua franca. Some students appreciated the opportunity to practise their English and even other languages, a few acknowledging that the course helped them address their language anxiety. Being allowed to bring in their own language/culture also triggered positive emotions:

It was a completely new experience for me to use my [student's first language] in an "English class" and talk about my culture or just freely say what I think.

All in all, the course was generally well received. As one student evaluated it:

All in all, the course was very informative, and it made me want to learn about translation even more. I believe the amount of information taught was good for an introductory course. It gave a good overview about what translation is actually about and how it is done, and the group project also worked very well with the content of the course.

Students, however, also reported less positive learning experiences, mostly related to the course structure (low amount of credits, short duration of the course).¹⁸ Challenges also arose from the size of the project teams and the design of certain learning events. The next section addresses these issues, which are directly related to the pedagogical adjustments already implemented or planned.

Discussion

The pedagogical value of translation

The findings support previous observations about the popularity of translation courses among language students (Sewell, 2004). Translation and mediation, especially in informal situations and/or linked to personal interest, seem to be a natural part of students' everyday life and are largely seen as personally fulfilling, creative activities with a real-world value. Translation is also an attractive or possible career option especially for students who study for a language degree but do not plan to become teachers. Being aware of the competition characterising the translation market, these students commonly feel the need to study further, in professional training programmes, to become a "good"/professional translator. These findings are particularly interesting in light of the current discussion in translation studies on the status of professional "insiders" and nonprofessional "outsiders" (Pérez-González & Susam-Saraeva, 2012). The debate is linked to the shifting views on translation competence and the development of expertise, reflecting the changing landscape of the translation industry (Jääskeläinen et al., 2011) and the growing practice of nonprofessional translation (Pérez-González & Susam-Saraeva, 2012). The findings also point to the issue that only a few translation courses are available at JYU (mainly practical courses on specific language pairs), suggesting that a course that approaches translation more broadly is highly useful for students in various degree programmes oriented towards languages and cultures, especially because translation can serve as a bridge between these two themes (Kemp, 2012).

The results also confirm previous observations that those without formal translation training often have a relatively narrow view of translation competence with a focus on linguistic aspects and cultural background knowledge (Göpferich & Jääskeläinen, 2009; Toury, 2012). However, a single and relatively short course seems to be able to bring about changes in the students' approach: rather than viewing translation as automatic linguistic transfer, they began to see it as a creative and problem-solving endeavour embedded in complex social/cultural/ideological contexts (Baynham & Lee, 2019).

The findings on student learning experiences suggest that the course, by aiming to move beyond an essentialising and power-evasive approach (Ennser-Kananen & Saarinen, 2022), seems to encourage students to consider/do culture from a more critical perspective (Kramsch & Zhu, 2020). It also challenges them to examine ingrained patterns of thought and

18. These issues were addressed in the most recent update of the curriculum. The changes will apply from the 2024–25 academic year.

previously acquired knowledge (such as Hofstede's [1984] framework,¹⁹ which, apparently, may still remain unproblematised). Discussions related to the social, political/ideological, and ethical dimensions of translation seem to effectively promote critical language awareness (Shapiro, 2022) and self-reflection, key aspects of intercultural learning, which are essential in today's crises-laden climate that requires individuals to act responsibly (Latorre, 2024). When discussing culture, however, teachers need to be mindful of their language use and avoid racialising, stereotyping, and othering discourses (Lee, 2015).

Using translation as a resource in culturally responsive/relevant pedagogies (Gay, 2018; Ladson-Billings, 2014) seems to have multiple benefits, especially when the principles of active, collaborative, and problem-based learning are applied. Making students feel that their diverse (and dynamic) identities are acknowledged and respected (Komisarof & Zhu, 2016; Peskoller, 2022) contributes to transformative intercultural experiences (Fielding et al., 2023). In the translanguaging spaces (Baynham & Lee, 2019; Li, 2018) created, students can examine and negotiate multiple viewpoints and meaning, reflect on themselves, and develop their symbolic competence (Kramsch, 2011). The focus on culture-specific items enables students to zoom in on the microdetails of the translation process and illuminates the complexity of meaning along with the intricate creative and dynamic processes involved in meaning negotiation. However, since some students may be unfamiliar with certain pedagogical approaches/methods and thus experience discomfort, even if they do not explicitly bring this up, there is a need for caution when using teamwork or when expecting students to openly exhibit critical thinking in culturally diverse classrooms (Bali, 2015).

The results also confirm previous findings about the importance of considering multiple aspects of student engagement (Shirley & Hargreaves, 2021) and the relationship between teacher and student attitudes and emotions (Cavanagh, 2016; Keller et al., 2016).

Course development

The basic pedagogical design of the course seems to be effective, but there is certainly room for improvement. In the current update of the curriculum (2024), I have made changes to both the structure and content. Besides revising the course description and learning outcomes, I have raised the number of credits from two to three, added more class sessions, and extended the duration of the course. The aim is not to delve more extensively into translation theory but to enable deeper critical discussions based on topics currently discussed in translation studies and recent real-world cases as well as offer a broader range of tasks with even more opportunities for interaction. I also removed the phrase "culture-specific items" from the name of the course because it may suggest a traditional, limited approach to culture and imply a narrower perspective than what the course actually has.

While the project work was generally well received, a few students did not particularly enjoy it, partly due to their learning preferences and partly linked to various issues within the group, particularly time management. In the future, I will dedicate some time in the regular class sessions to the project work, thus reducing the need for students to arrange meetings beyond the course schedule. Determining the group size and team composition has also

19. Hofstede aimed to understand cultural differences based on six key dimensions: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism–collectivism, masculinity–femininity, and time orientation. His theory has been widely criticised not just on the grounds of research methodology but also for its oversimplified, static, and deterministic approach to culture.

posed challenges as these are often dependent on the number of domestic and international students in the actual course. Still, I found it important to set a maximum of four as the group size. Extending the time frame for each group presentation is expected to allow a deeper examination of the topic and more meaningful post-presentation discussions without feeling pressed for time. To address the issue of teamwork being an unfamiliar learning method to some students and to increase the transparency of teamwork, I have introduced the CATME rating tool to help students evaluate themselves and their peers (Ohland et al., 2012).

One specific activity that needs more careful planning is the discussion on dubbing and subtitling. While not designed as a traditional debate, in the second course this activity had a competitive tone. This may have to do with the face-to-face format or the nature of the pre-task, in which students were divided into two groups and collected arguments for one mode and against the other. Anyhow, since debates have social and cognitive risks resulting from the competitive atmosphere (Asterhan & Babichenko, 2015; Asterhan & Schwartz, 2016), I need to change the instructions and ensure that the discussion remains collaborative and constructive with the overall goal of comparing and contrasting ideas, exploring perspectives, and/or reaching a consensus.

Although the course is not a translation course per se, and students are not translating longer passages of text,²⁰ many students expressed the wish to do more actual written translation. One concrete idea is to translate short texts into English, the shared language, and/or from English into the participants' first languages. In this activity, students could also try out free machine or AI-assisted translation tools (e.g., Google Translate, Bing Microsoft Translator, DeepL, Reverso; see Flanagan & Christensen, 2014), and we could discuss their value and limitations. Such a task could be particularly motivating if participants' own texts are used as source materials (e.g., a poem, a short story, song lyrics, or anything they are willing to share) or when attempting to translate intralinguistic cultural references, such as idioms, proverbs, sayings, collocations, jokes, or puns. A similar idea was piloted by Łoboda and Mastela (2023), where students evaluated and post-edited machine-translated culture-bound texts (Polish legends).

It would also be beneficial to invite a guest – an experienced translator/interpreter with/without professional qualification or a someone from a minority culture in Finland – and have an interactive discussion about their work and their views on expertise/competence, about languages and cultures, and about social/political/ideological issues they encountered.

Finally, although the principle of multimodality is already reflected in the course, I am planning to highlight the semiotic diversity of meaning-making even more (Pennycook, 2016). For example, students could bring thought-provoking pieces of art/music related to their cultures (again, in a broad sense), which could trigger intriguing discussions about the complexity of culture, identity, and (intersemiotic) translation. As Lautenbacher (2024) has pointed out, engaging with images and multimodal texts is an increasingly common aspect of translation today (translating image titles/captions, audiovisual translation, audio description, etc.), but translators need to be aware of the effect of their own personal interpretations of the visual message. In the course, we could try this out by utilising students' own photographs, which, evoking personal emotions and experiences, could provide material for meaningful conversations.

20. Since the participants (and the teacher) do not necessarily speak each other's first languages, assessing longer written translations could be challenging. Regarding live oral translation/mediation activities, even though they would be highly useful, I do not plan to use them as they may cause unnecessary anxiety in some students.

Conclusions

The research presented here offered insights into the pedagogical value of translation. Given its complex cultural, social, ethical, and ideological dimension, I argue that to harness its full pedagogical potential, translation should not be considered only as a practical activity but also as a theoretical topic and a subject for critical discussion. Approached like this, translation deserves a more prominent place in multilingual pedagogies that also incorporate intercultural learning objectives.

Since the research reported here was a small scale, localised study, focusing on a single course, the findings cannot be automatically generalised to other contexts or settings. The research was also limited in several ways. Due to various factors, the data collection methods differed in the two iterations. Moreover, since I conducted the research on my own practice independently, I must acknowledge the potential influence of my personal involvement. To avoid confirmation bias, I tried to remain mindful of my position, perspective, and biases and to actively reflect on the results, while also discussing them with a colleague. Another limitation, inherent in practitioner inquiry, is that the participants were my own students, making transparency and commitment to ethical principles crucial. To minimise social desirability bias, I emphasised that participation in the research was voluntary and reassured the participants that their perspectives would not influence their course assessment in any way. I also underscored the importance of providing balanced and critical feedback with a view to improving the learning experiences of future course participants.

From the viewpoint of my professional development, engaging in pedagogical experimentation and inquiry-based research provided an extremely rewarding experience. The benefits can be identified mostly at the individual level, including increased cultural sensitivity, motivation, and enthusiasm, a higher sense of autonomy, self-efficacy, and agency, and a stronger identity as a teacher–researcher. However, as Edwards (2021) highlighted, the benefits of practitioner research go beyond the level of individual professional development. The course has generated interest among my colleagues and has paved the way for potential future collaborations.

In short, translation appears to be a valuable resource and is well-aligned with the pedagogical approach embraced by *Movi*. It also seems to be beneficial to integrate translation, as a practical activity and/or a critical discussion topic, into the curriculum of various degree programmes. In addition to language and communication studies (including journalism), translation has relevance for music, art, and culture studies, programmes within the social sciences, education, IT, history and ethnology, sport and health sciences, public administration, and business and economics.²¹

In the future, research could more extensively explore students' views on translation as an activity and future study/career option, students' and faculty members' nonprofessional translation experiences, as well as lecturers' perspectives on translation as a pedagogical resource. Systematic action research could assess the value of integrating translation into pedagogical practices at various levels, even in monocultural classrooms. Finally, design-based studies could focus on creating and evaluating innovative and evidence-based pedagogical solutions, including courses or programmes utilising translation as a pedagogical resource, whether limited to a single field or encompassing multiple fields or disciplines.

21. I have already incorporated the topic of translation in research and publishing in multilingual academia into the content of my doctoral courses (Károly, 2022).

References

- Aflalo, E. (2021). Students generating questions as a way of learning. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 22(1), 63–75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787418769120>
- Agar, M. (1994). The intercultural frame. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 18(2), 221–237. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767\(94\)90029-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(94)90029-9)
- Ariati, J., Pham, T., & Vogler, J. S. (2023). Constructivist learning environments: Validating the community of inquiry survey for face-to-face contexts. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 14697874231183642. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14697874231183642>
- Asterhan, C. S. C., & Babichenko, M. (2015). The social dimension of learning through argumentation: Effects of human presence and discourse style. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 107(3), 740–755. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/edu0000014>
- Asterhan, C. S., & Schwarz, B. B. (2016). Argumentation for learning: Well-trodden paths and unexplored territories. *Educational Psychologist*, 51(2), 164–187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2016.1155458>
- Aston, K. J. (2023). ‘Why is this hard, to have critical thinking?’ Exploring the factors affecting critical thinking with international higher education students. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 14697874231168341. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14697874231168341>
- Babione, C. A. (2015). *Practitioner Teacher Inquiry and Research*. Jossey-Bass.
- Baker, M. (2007). Reframing conflict in translation. *Social Semiotics*, 17(2), 151–169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330701311454>
- Baker, M., & Saldanha, G. (2020). *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315678627>
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *Dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). University of Texas Press.
- Bali, M. (2015). Critical thinking through a multicultural lens: Cultural challenges of teaching critical thinking. In *The Palgrave handbook of critical thinking in higher education* (pp. 317–334). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baynham, M., & Lee, T. K. (2019). *Translation and translanguaging*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315158877>
- Beiler, I. R., & Dewilde, J. (2020). Translation as translingual writing practice in English as an Additional Language. *The Modern Language Journal*, 104(3), 533–549. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12660>
- Børte, K., Nesje, K., & Sølvi, L. (2023). Barriers to student active learning in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 28(3), 597–615. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1839746>
- Braden, A. (2021, March 17). Translators weigh in on the Amanda Gorman controversy. *Asymptote*. <https://www.asymptotejournal.com/blog/2021/03/17/translators-weigh-in-on-the-amanda-gorman-controversy/>
- Busch, B. (2017). Expanding the notion of the linguistic repertoire: On the concept of *Spracherleben*—The lived experience of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 38(3), 340–358. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv030>

- Carreres, Á., Noriega-Sánchez, M., & Pintado Gutiérrez, L. (2021). Introduction: Translation and plurilingual approaches to language teaching and learning. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 7(1), 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/ttmc.00066.int>
- Cavanagh, S. R. (2016). *The spark of learning: Energizing the college classroom with the science of emotion*. West Virginia University Press.
- Chamberlain, L. (1988). Gender and the metaphors of translation. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 13(3), 454–472. <https://doi.org/10.1086/494428>
- Chesterman, A. (2016). *Memes of translation. The spread of ideas in translation theory* (Rev. ed.). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.123>
- Cook, G. (2010). *Translation in language teaching: An argument for reassessment*. Oxford University Press.
- Council of Europe (2018). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Companion volume with new descriptors*.
<https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989>
- Curtis, J. H., Zhang-Wu, Q., & Chang-Bacon, C. K. (2023). Introduction to the Special Issue. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 22(4), 301–307.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2023.2202582>
- Dam, H. V., & Koskinen, K. (2016). The translation profession: Centres and peripheries. *JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 25, 2–14.
https://jostrans.org/issue25/art_intro.pdf
- Dervin, F. (2022). Introduction. In F. Dervin & M. Y. Sude (Eds.), *Teaching interculturality 'otherwise'* (pp. 1–12). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003345275-1>
- Dervin, F. (2023). *The paradoxes of interculturality. A toolbox of out-of-the-box ideas for intercultural communication education*. Routledge.
- Dewaele, J.-M. (2010). *Emotions in multiple languages*. Palgrave Macmillan.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230289505>
- de Wit, H., & Altbach, P. (2021). 70 years of internationalization in tertiary education: Changes, challenges and perspectives. In H. van't Land, A. Corcoran & D.-C. Iancu (Eds.), *The promise of higher education: Essays in honour of 70 years of LAU* (pp. 119–125). Springer.
- Díaz-Cintas, J. (2019). Film censorship in Franco's Spain: The transforming power of dubbing. *Perspectives*, 27(2), 182–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2017.1420669>
- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2020). From expectancy-value theory to situated expectancy-value theory: A developmental, social cognitive, and sociocultural perspective on motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101859.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101859>
- Edwards, E. (2021). The ecological impact of action research on language teacher development: A review of the literature. *Educational Action Research*, 29(3), 396–413.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2020.1718513>
- Ennser-Kananen, J., & Saarinen, T. (2022). Can you imagine? An imaginary of Finland's higher education as anti-oppressive, intersectional practice. In M. Sommer, A. Roiha & M. Lahti (Eds.), *Interculturality in higher education* (pp. 11–26). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003322702-2>
- European Commission (2022). *European Master's in Translation – EMT competence framework*.
https://commission.europa.eu/system/files/2022-11/emt_competence_fw_k_2022_en.pdf

- Fielding, R., Galante, A., Bonar, G. J., Wang, M., & God, Y. (2023). Teaching for intercultural understanding – to what extent do curriculum documents encourage transformative intercultural experiences? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2170390>
- Flanagan, M., & Christensen, T. P. (2014). Testing post-editing guidelines: How translation trainees interpret them and how to tailor them for translator training purposes. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 8(2), 257–275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2014.936111>
- Galante, A. (2021). Translation as a pedagogical tool in multilingual classes: Engaging the learner's plurilingual repertoire. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 7(1), 106–123. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ttmc.00064.gal>
- Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 2(2-3), 87–105. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516\(00\)00016-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6)
- Gay, G. (2018). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Gentzler, E., & Tymoczko, M. (Eds.). (2002). *Translation and power*. University of Massachusetts Press.
- Gibbs, R. W. (2003). Embodied experience and linguistic meaning. *Brain and Language*, 84(1), 1–15. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0093-934X\(02\)00517-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0093-934X(02)00517-5)
- González Davies, M. (2004). *Multiple voices in the translation classroom: Activities, tasks, and projects*. John Benjamins.
- González Davies, M. (2014). Towards a plurilingual development paradigm: From spontaneous to informed use of translation in additional language learning. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 8(1), 8–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2014.908555>
- González Davies, M. (2015). Translating as translanguaging in additional language learning. *Meta: Journal des Traducteurs*, 60(2), 338. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1032889ar>
- González Davies, M. (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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23247797.2017.1407168>
- González Davies, M., & Scott-Tennent, C. (2005). A problem-solving and student-centred approach to the translation of cultural references. *Meta: Journal des Traducteurs*, 50(1), 160–179. <https://doi.org/10.7202/010666ar>
- Göpferich, S., & Jääskeläinen, R. (2009). Process research into the development of translation competence: Where are we and where do we need to go? *Across Languages and Cultures*, 10(2), 169–191. <https://doi.org/10.1556/Acr.10.2009.2.1>
- Haapaniemi, R. (2023). Translation as meaning-construction under co-textual and contextual constraints: A model for a material approach to translation. *Translation Studies*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2022.2147988>
- Heltai, P. (2013). Kultúraspecifikus kifejezések és reáliák [Culture-specific items and realia]. *Fordítástudomány*, 15(1), 32–53. <http://hdl.handle.net/10831/65019>
- Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values*. Sage.
- Holliday, A. (2019). *Understanding intercultural communication: Negotiating a grammar of culture* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351139526>

- Jakobson, R. (1960). Closing statement: Linguistics and poetics. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 350–377). MIT Press.
- Jääskeläinen, R. (2010). Are all professionals experts? Definitions of expertise and reinterpretation of research evidence in process studies. In G. M. Shreve & E. Angelone (Eds.), *Translation and Cognition* (pp. 213–227). John Benjamins.
<https://www.jbe-platform.com/content/books/9789027288110-ata.xv.12jaa>
- Jääskeläinen, R., Kujamäki, P., & Mäkisalo, J. (2011). Towards professionalism — or against it? Dealing with the changing world in translation research and translator education. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 12(2), 143–156. <https://doi.org/10.1556/Acr.12.2011.2.1>
- Katan, D. (2020). Culture. In Baker, M. & Saldahan, G. (Eds.). *The Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (3rd ed.), (pp. 133–138). Routledge.
- Källkvist, M. (2013). Language in translation tasks used in a university setting: Particular potential for student agency? *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(1), 217–238.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.01430.x>
- Károly, A. (2022). Translation and dealing with “the other” in scholarly research and publishing: A call for more reflexivity. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 16(3), 87–101. <https://doi.org/10.47862/apples.114741>
- Keller, M. M., Hoy, A. W., Goetz, T., & Frenzel, A. C. (2016). Teacher enthusiasm: Reviewing and redefining a complex construct. *Educational Psychology Review*, 28(4), 743–769. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9354-y>
- Kemp, S. (2012). Translation studies and the integrated modern languages degree. *Journal of Second Language Teaching & Research*, 2(1). 121–134.
<https://pops.uclan.ac.uk/index.php/jsltr/article/view/91>
- Komisarof, A., & Zhu, H. (2016). *Crossing boundaries and weaving intercultural work, life, and scholarship in globalizing universities*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315740041>
- Koskinen, K. (2020). *Translation and affect: Essays on sticky affects and translational affective*. John Benjamins.
- Kramersch, C. (2011). The symbolic dimensions of the intercultural. *Language Teaching*, 44(3), 354–367. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444810000431>
- Kramersch, C. (2020). *Language as symbolic power*. Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108869386>
- Kramersch, C. (2021, September 13). *The poetic function of language in intercultural education* [Online presentation]. Digital series of talks on plurilingualism and interculturality, Department of English, Germanic and Romance Studies, University of Copenhagen.
<https://engerom.ku.dk/english/calendar/2021/digital-series-of-talks-on-plurilingualism-and-interculturality/the-poetic-function-of-language-in-intercultural-education/>
- Kramersch, C., & Zhu, H. (2016). Language and culture in ELT. In G. Hall (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 38–50). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315676203-5>
- Kramersch, C., & Zhu, H. (2020). Translating culture in global times: An introduction. *Applied Linguistics*, 41(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amz020>
- Kusters, M., van der Rijst, R., de Vetten, A., & Admiraal, W. (2023). University lecturers as change agents: How do they perceive their professional agency? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 127, 104097. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104097>


- Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: A.k.a. the remix. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 74–84. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.84.1.p2rj131485484751>
- Latorre, P., Brandenburg, U., & de Wit, H. (2024). Can we still stop the end of internationalization? *International Higher Education*, 117, 22–23. <https://www.internationalhighereducation.net/api-v1/article/!/action/getPdfOfArticle/articleID/3826/productID/29/filename/article-id-3826.pdf>
- Lautenbacher, O. P. (2024). Translating what the image conveys or what it arouses? Delineating the threshold between inferability transfer and inference transfer in multimodal translation. *Babel*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.00381.lau>
- Laviosa, S. (2020). Language teaching. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (3rd ed., pp. 271–275). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315678627-58>
- Leask, B. (2013). Internationalizing the curriculum in the disciplines: Imagining new possibilities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(2), 103–118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315312475090>
- Lee, E. (2015). Doing culture, doing race: Everyday discourses of ‘culture’ and ‘cultural difference’ in the English as a second language classroom. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 36(1), 80–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2014.892503>
- Li, W. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1222–1235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035>
- Li, W. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>
- Li, W. (2022). Translanguaging as a political stance: Implications for English language education. *ELT Journal*, 76(2), 172–182. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab083>
- Lo, S. W. (2016). *Using translation in L2 classrooms: An empirical study on non-language major students’ engagement in class discussions and improvement in language usage* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Leicester]. University of Leicester Research Repository. <https://hdl.handle.net/2381/39094>
- Łoboda, K., & Mastela, O. (2023). Machine translation and culture-bound texts in translator education: A pilot study. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2023.2238328>
- Maine, F., Cook, V., & Lähdesmäki, T. (2019). Reconceptualizing cultural literacy as a dialogic practice. *London Review of Education*, 17, 383–392. <https://doi.org/10.18546/LRE.17.3.12>
- Mellinger, C. D. (2017). Translators and machine translation: Knowledge and skills gaps in translator pedagogy. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 11(4), 280–293. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2017.1359760>
- Meylaerts, R. (2008). Translators and (their) norms: Towards a sociological construction of the individual. In A. Pym, M. Shlesinger, & D. Simeoni (Eds.), *Beyond descriptive translation studies: Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury* (pp. 91–102). John Benjamins.
- Merriam, S. B., & Grenier, R. S. (Eds.). (2019). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.

- Mirlohi, M., Egbert, J., & Ghonsooly, B. (2011). Flow in translation: Exploring optimal experience for translation trainees. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 23(2), 251–271. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.23.2.06mir>
- Munday, J. (2007). Translation and ideology: A textual approach. *The Translator*, 13(2), 195–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2007.10799238>
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Muñoz-Basols, J. (2019). Going beyond the comfort zone: Multilingualism, translation and mediation to foster plurilingual competence. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 32(3), 299–321. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2019.1661687>
- Naha, S. (2017). ‘Over the border and the gates’? Global and transnational sport. *Sport in Society*, 20(10), 1347–1353. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17430437.2016.1221049>
- Norton, B. (2013). Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation (2nd ed.). *Multilingual Matters*. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783090563>
- Ohland, M. W., Loughry, M. L., Woehr, D. J., Bullard, L. G., Felder, R. M., Finelli, C. J., Layton, R. A., Pomeranz, H. R., & Schmucker, D. G. (2012). The Comprehensive Assessment of Team Member Effectiveness: Development of a behaviorally anchored rating scale for self- and peer evaluation. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(4), 609–630. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2010.0177>
- PACTE. (2003). Building a translation competence model. In F. Alves (Ed.), *Triangulating translation: Perspectives in process-oriented research*, (pp. 43–66). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.45.06pac>
- Pavlenko, A. (2005). *Emotions and multilingualism*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511584305>
- Pavlenko, A. (Ed.) (2023). *Multilingualism and history*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009236287>
- Pedersen, J. (2011). *Subtitling norms for television: An exploration focussing on extralinguistic cultural references*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.98>
- Pennycook, A. (2006). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203088807>
- Pennycook, A. (2017). Translanguaging and semiotic assemblages. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 14(3), 269–282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2017.1315810>
- Pennycook, A. (2018). *Posthumanist applied linguistics*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315457574>
- Pennycook, A. (2022). Critical applied linguistics in the 2020s. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 19(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2022.2030232>
- Pérez-González, L., & Susam-Saraeva, Ş. (2012). Non-professionals translating and interpreting: Participatory and engaged perspectives. *The Translator*, 18(2), 149–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2012.10799506>
- Peskoller, J. (2022). Unity in diversity. Exploring intercultural teaching and learning practices in secondary education and teacher training in Austria. In F. Dervin & M. Yuan & Sude (Eds.), *Teaching Interculturality ‘Otherwise’* (pp. 34–54). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003345275-4>
- Petrilli, S., & Ji, M. (Eds.). (2022). *Intersemiotic perspectives on emotions: Translating across signs, bodies and values*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003056652>
- Peverati, C. (2013). Translation in modern language degree courses: A focus on transferable generic skills. *InTRAlinea*, 15. <http://www.intraline.org/archive/article/1932>

- Pintado Gutiérrez, L. (2021). Translation in language teaching, pedagogical translation, and code-switching: Restructuring the boundaries. *The Language Learning Journal*, 49(2), 219–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2018.1534260>
- Pisanski Peterlin, A. (2019). Self-translation of academic discourse: The attitudes and experiences of authors-translators. *Perspectives*, 27(6), 846–860. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1538255>
- Pusztai-Varga, I. (2022). *Mézescsók, dögcédula, szauna. A finn költészet fordításának kulturális dimenziói* [“Mézescsók”, “dögcédula”, “szauna”. Cultural dimensions of Finnish poetry translation]. HTSART-Ú.M.K.
- Robinson, O. C. (2022). Conducting thematic analysis on brief texts: The structured tabular approach. *Qualitative Psychology*, 9(2), 194–208. <https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000189>
- Robinson, K. A., Zheng, Q., Shankar, S., Lee, S. Y., & Christiaans, E. (2024). Beyond self-report surveys: A comparison of methods for directly observing motivationally supportive teaching practices. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 76, 102254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2023.102254>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>
- Sakai, N. (2014). Language as a countable and the regime of translation. In S. Sato & N. M. Doerr (Eds.), *Rethinking language and culture in Japanese education: Beyond the standard* (pp. 35–60). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783091850-004>
- Scollon, R., Scollon, S. W., Jones, R. H. (2012). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach* (3rd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sela-Sheffy, R. (2005). How to be a (recognized) translator: Rethinking habitus, norms, and the field of translation. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 17(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.17.1.02sel>
- Sewell, P. (2004). Students buzz round the translation class like bees round the honey pot—why? In K. Malmkjær (Ed.), *Translation in undergraduate degree programmes* (pp. 151–162). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.59.11sew>
- Shapiro, S. (2022). *Cultivating critical language awareness in the writing classroom*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003171751>
- Shirley, D., & Hargreaves, A. (2021). *Five paths of student engagement: Blazing the trail to learning and success*. Solution Tree Press.
- Sirén, S., & Hakkarainen, K. (2002). Expertise in translation. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 3(1), 71–82. <https://doi.org/10.1556/Acr.3.2002.1.5>
- Sommier, M., Lahti, M., & Roiha, A. (2021). From ‘intercultural-washing’ to meaningful intercultural education: Revisiting higher education practice. *Journal of Praxis in Higher Education*, 3(2), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.47989/kpdc130>
- Toury, G. (2012). *Descriptive translation studies – and beyond* (Rev. ed.). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.100>
- Tymoczko, M. (2010). *Translation, resistance, activism*. University of Massachusetts Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt5vk35x>
- Valdeón, R. A. (2022). Latest trends in audiovisual translation. *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, 30(3), 369–381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2022.2069226>

- Valló, Zs. (2002). *“Honosított” angol drámák a magyar színpadon* [Domesticating practices in the translation of English drama for the Hungarian stage]. Presszió Kft.
- Vähäsantanen, K., Paloniemi, S., Räikkönen, E., & Hökkä, P. (2020). Professional agency in a university context: Academic freedom and fetters. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 89, 103000. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.103000>
- Washbourne, K. (2014). The self-directed learner: Intentionality in translator training and education. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 22(3), 373–387. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2013.827225>

Author

Adrienn Károly, PhD, Senior Lecturer, Centre for Multilingual Academic Communication, University of Jyväskylä.  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3218-3206>

Adrienn Károly is Senior Lecturer at the Centre for Multilingual Communication at the University of Jyväskylä. She teaches English research communication courses for doctoral students and is a member of a team responsible for a pedagogical professional development programme for staff. Her professional and research interests include critical, multilingual, and culturally responsive/sustaining pedagogies and broader issues related to societal impact as well as linguistic and epistemological equity in academia.

Appendices

Appendix A

Key Topics Addressed in the Course

- Translation studies as an independent discipline: main approaches, major turning points
- Types of translation, professional vs. nonprofessional translation
- The concepts of translation and mediation
- Approaches to culture in intercultural communication and translation studies, visible and invisible layers of culture, culture and identity, translators and interpreters as cultural brokers/mediators
- Common (mis)conceptions about translation ability, the relationship between language competence and translation competence, translation competence models; the development of translation competence: novice vs. experienced translators; translation competence and generic competences
- Understandings of culture, approaches in various disciplines including intercultural communication studies and translation studies
- Recent trends in researching audiovisual translation, dubbing & subtitling, cultural norms and individual preferences, practical, ethical, ideological aspects
- The multilayered nature of meaning, including the role of the sociocultural context and personal dimensions, translation and affect
- Culture-specific items: conceptualisations, taxonomies, translation strategies
- Translation as a profession, translation norms, breaking the norms, translators' roles, translation, resistance, and activism
- Choosing the translator, translator identity and (in)visibility, the Amanda Gorman case, exclusion in translation as a profession, translation and authorship, relationships between translators and authors
- The multilingual turn in language education, symbolic competence and the multilingual mindset, the value of translation and mediation in language learning and teaching

Appendix B

Pre-Course Online Survey Questions in the First Course Implementation (Following Demographic Questions)

1. What is your age?
2. What is your current study right at the University of Jyväskylä?
 - Degree student (BA level)
 - Degree student (MA level)
 - Exchange student
3. What are you currently studying (main subject, specialisation, minor)?
4. What is your nationality?
5. What is/are your first language(s)?
6. Have you previously taken any course related to translation?
 - Yes (please specify)
 - No (please specify)
7. Do you have any real-world, oral or written translation experience outside of your studies?
 - Yes (please specify)
 - No (please specify)
8. Why did you decide to take this course? What aspects of the course or topics captured your interest?
9. What do you think makes a good translator in general?
10. Are you planning to pursue further studies related to translation in the near future (in the next five years)?
 - Definitely not
 - Probably not
 - Maybe
 - Very probable
 - Definitely yes

Appendix C

Additional Questions Used in the JYU Official Webropol Course Feedback Survey at the End of the First Course Implementation

1. What topics, activities, and modes of learning did you find interesting, enjoyable, thought-provoking, or useful for your own learning?
2. Is there a topic that you would have liked to discuss but was not covered in the course?
3. Has your thinking about translation as an activity and as a future career option changed in any way during the course? If so, how?

Appendix D

Questions in the Reflective Task Used at the End of the Second Course Implementation

1. What were the most positive aspects of the course? What helped you to learn / what worked particularly well for you?
2. What topics, activities, or modes of learning did you find most interesting, enjoyable, thought-provoking, or useful for your learning?
3. How did the group work go?
4. What aspects of the course did you like the least / what issues did not support your learning?
5. Has your thinking about translation as an activity and a future career option changed in any way during the course? If so, how?
6. Did you have any real-world translation experience before taking this course?

Appendix E

Main Aspects of Student Learning Experiences

