

УДК 81'36.811.111

**N.V. ZINUKOVA,**  
*PhD in Pedagogy, Associate Professor,  
Head of English Philology and Translation Department  
of Alfred Nobel University in Dnipropetrovsk*

## **TRANSLATION STUDIES IN MULTILINGUAL SOCIETIES: ACQUISITION OF TRANSLATION SKILLS**

This article deals with psychological approach to the translation process in multilingual society, considers the psychological model of translation because this model reflects the real actions of the translator and describes all translation processes. Such approach determines the direction of translator's internal thinking and shifting stages from the original text to the target one.

*Key words: translation, bilingualism, multilingual, language control, switching asymmetry.*

**T**ranslation played the major role in bridging the physical gap between all nations. It is also evident that speaking the foreign language does not help too much in the transfer of knowledge to human communities as translation does. Nowadays it is evident that translation is considered as the fifth language skill.

Translation studies proliferation from the second half of the twentieth century until now has produced a multitude of approaches, models, concepts and terms. Translation studies have become a labyrinth of ideas and findings in which it is difficult to find the way and about which explicit consensus has been formulated fairly rarely.

The transition to the multilingual society, intercultural integration at different levels (national and international) globalization, cultural and linguistic diversity cause new challenges in the field of translation studies, in particular while searching to find a new sense for the cardinal categories on the basis of bilingualism.

Recent surveys of the field's contents can be found in the works of E. Gentzler [7], D. Gile [8], M. Baker [1,2], R.T. Bell [4], D. Robinson [18], B. Hatim [13], S. Bassnett [3], J. Munday [17], I.D. Melamed [15], A. Chesterman [5], A. Lefevere [3], S. Tyulenev [21] and many others. These overviews are very incongruent, however: the few subdivisions of types of translation studies areas that are marked clearly differ from one another, and, taken together, these contributions result in a collection of fairly long lists of translation studies approaches that lack a consistent basis.

Consequently, one still turns to concepts and different approaches to translation studies to build some coherence into the complex collection of theories and findings about translation. The present article tries to present the view on translation in a new multilingual world, outline its shortcomings and develop an alternative.

Modern education needs new open knowledge about man. Openness of scientific pedagogical knowledge as its main characteristic reflects an investigative demand for widening the perceptions of specific personality development, its inner world, meanings, and deep experiences in communication with another person. In this connection the formation of new pedagogical thinking by means of analysis of existential psychology ideas receives new meaning in relation to problems of personality self-fulfillment, creativity, foreign languages acquisition, acquisition of freedom and the skill to be responsible for it, spirituality development, conscience education, ability to love.

Now you can often meet a question: Is man by nature a monolingual or multilingual creature? D. Crystal: answered this question by stating that people, brought up within a western society often think that monolingualism that firms a routine part of their existence is the normal way of life [6]. But these people are wrong as he said because multilingualism is the natural way of life for hundreds of millions all over the world. This fact will determine that multilingualism is the main feature of human community, and should be the focus of language educators to recognize this fact to develop modern language education.

This realization of language diversity should create positive understanding among human beings. Multilingual situation can develop for many reasons, although it is often the situation of the people's own choosing; but may also be forced upon them by other circumstances. According to D. Crystal we could see that politics annexations and other political or military acts can have immediate linguistic effects [6]. People may become refugees and have to learn their new homes language. Other factors may come from religion where some people wish to live in country because of its religious significance [6].

We have to realize that there are other factors such as culture, when people want to learn about others. To add more there are also economic factors where people leave their homes looking for better jobs and pay. They will have to adopt the language of the new homes and their ways of life. Natural causes such as drought, volcanic eruptions, and fires cause major movements of people from one place to another. New language contact situations will emerge as people are resettled in their new places.

No wonder the realization of multilingualism situations aroused many questions about language issue all over the world. It made individual person and government authorities aware of the fact of diversity to begin language planning. Diversity is not always a source of social clashes between people who live in one geographical unit. Nor, should it be a cause behind the clashes between civilizations as some people may think. Diversity can be a factor of unity and strength if the subject is wisely tackled through language balancing. Good examples can be seen in the case of countries with more than one language in use, in which both languages have social and political status in the country. Let's take Switzerland, where people speak French, German, Italian, and this country has been touted as a successful multilingual society or even as a miracle of unity in diversity. South Africa in its new indigenous ruling political system is another good example, where local languages were recognized and protected by law.

The language balancing is not an impossible goal, but can be achieved through wise planning and management. Multilingualism or bilingualism situations are changing to increase in some places as it is the case in Sweden after the World War II, while it is the opposite situation in the USA whereas new third generation of immigrants is becoming increasingly monolingual [6].

The language issue was and still is one of the main factors of national solidarity and unity everywhere in the world. It is as well, a factor of long discord and conflict between races since the dawn of history. This development led to language engineering and language planning proves to be a thorn in the flesh of all who governs whether at national or local level [6]. So the modern state has to interfere in planning for language as it makes plans for its strategic nationwide projects.

One final good trick to overcome this barrier is through translation, where someone is required to play the role of middleperson, to decipher meanings from the speaker to the audience and vice-versa.

However, translation was sometimes impractical due to availability of access to a translator or interpreter at the moment of the interaction, in addition to other problems that emerge from bad translation, which may sometimes lead to misunderstanding between individuals or communities.

This brings up the question: does a born and bred bilingual makes a better translator than someone who learned the second language later in life? We agree that there is no definite answer, but the following issues are important. Let's have a closer look; first of all, a born and bred bilingual often suffers from not truly knowing any language well enough to translate. Second, born and bred bilinguals often don't know the culture of the target language well enough. And last, they often lack the analytical linguistic skills to work with a text.

However, the acquired bilingual might not have the same in-depth knowledge of slang, colloquialisms, and dialect that the true bilingual has. As well, the acquired bilingual will not be able to translate as readily in both directions. Finally, true bilinguals often have a greater appreciation of the subtleties and nuances of both their languages than someone who learns their second language later in life can ever hope to have.

To promote multilingual dimensions it should be elaborated and implemented the methodological, comprehensive, integrated, and at the same time theoretical model. It certainly needs to be dealt with the methodological foundations of language teaching and learning. Thus it could provide the basis for the differentiated approach to learners.

The aim of the multilingual education and development of multilingual competence must be rationally derived from the global institutional goals. The phenomenon of national institutional subordinate bilingualism requires a more precise analyses taking into consideration the correlation of the contact languages and establishing common and specific methodological and pedagogical principles.

While learning each new language it is necessary to consider the benefit of two or three language experience. To add more, there is a certain hierarchy in the interconnected language learning process which determines the strategies of language teaching and learning as a result of psycholinguistic subordination. Any new language is efficiently learnt based on previously acquired languages.

In national institutional environment the situation gets complicated due to the particular type of bilingualism: the level of language proficiency and their interrelation as not static, it gradually changes qualitative and quantitative characteristics. Moreover the learner's performance as well as his or her linguistic and intercultural experience has its progressive character. In such a setting, learners can go through various stages of language acquisition and show various levels of general language proficiency (CE, 2001).

The analysis of the above mentioned phenomenon which is the basis of speech activities, confirms that the students need to master the core language, as an obligatory prerequisite for developing language activities.

It is important to clarify the role of the second language as an intermediate link between verbal thinking and accordingly natural development of the linguistic competence.

To find out the extent to which reserves of the students' bilingual or multilingual competence could be used in learning foreign languages, it was necessary to define the proficiency level in a second language (L2).

Potentially, the same student can «go up», passing through all the levels of bilingualism, from the lowest up to the highest. Therefore we could define the utmost methodological importance – the mobile dynamic character of the student' subordinate bilingualism. The establishment of this fact is crucial for building the performance-based specific methodology and analyzing the teaching/learning process on conceptual level in theory and practice.

The problem stated is quite important in particular while researching which of the languages (L1 or L2) should serve as a positive support in learning a new foreign language and the influence of which of them should be neutralized to avoid interference. The problem how to make an effective use of language experience the learner has already acquired is worth its further investigating.

The overcoming of inter- and intra-language transfer, the elaboration of adequate automatism of operating the language units in the process of developing multilingual competences and gaining intercultural experience can successfully be achieved by means of the didactic instruction.

Let's consider the psychological model of translation because this model reflects the real actions of the translator and describes all translation processes. It determines the direction of translator's internal thinking and shifting stages from the original text to the target one. It's evident in psycholinguistics that in bilinguals (here we refer this term to anybody who is reasonably fluent in a second language) the same word recognition system is used as in the L1. In terms of the Interactive Activation model this means that there are common letter level codes, and the word-level representations of the two languages are held in the same system.

Adults can make use of explicit awareness to facilitate communicative development due to their higher mental functions and their already existing code in L1. Thus, adults go from a visible language (learnt through L1) into automatic language (thinking in L2), while children go from automatic language (thinking in L1) into visible language (through literacy of L1). So in order to understand L2, adults may involuntarily filter the new language through L1. Consequently, one thing is to teach everything in L2 in an adult classroom, and another is to avoid their internal thinking in L1. Then, adults, having their L1 as a reference, will automatically compare L1 and L2 consciously or unconsciously. In this process they usually use translation for their private speech as a resource to internalize and retain L2 words or expressions. This is applicable mainly in beginners and intermediate students. However, mainly in an advance level, certain students could reach that level of «automatic (or unconscious) translation».

To add more we have to consider another aspect of language control in bilinguals called the «paradoxical switching effect» which has been previously documented by R. Meuter and A. Allport [16], and which is also illustrated by the M. Lee and J. Williams data [14].

It appears to be more difficult to switch from your weaker language to your stronger language than from your stronger language to your weaker one. R. Meuter and A. Allport suggest that it is simply because in order to use your weaker language you must strongly suppress your stronger one (this is understandable if between-language competition effects are real, as suggested above) [16]. But in order to use your stronger language you do not have to suppress your weaker one as much. The fact that the switching asymmetry disappears in more balanced bilinguals is consistent with this explanation.

These studies of production therefore suggest that, whereas there are clear influences from the unwanted language on production. The relevant representations are therefore able to interact, suggesting that they are contained in the same system. At the same time there is also evidence for a control mechanism which imposes global inhibition on the unwanted language.

In view of semantic influences from the unwanted language it was suggested that translation links between words provide the route by which these representations become active. Research on single word translation has also appealed to direct translation links between words.

The process of translating a word from one language (L1) into another (L2) could be performed in either of two ways:

(a) understanding the concept referred to by the L1 word and finding the best word in L2 that expresses that concept (using the mappings from concepts onto lemmas that are used in the production process). This will be referred to as *concept mediation*. Or

(b) exploiting a learned connection between the lexical representations of the L1 and L2 words. To be distinguished from (a) this connection must be non-semantic (e.g. established through the simple co-occurrence of the L1-L2 translation pair during learning). This will be referred to as *lexical association*.

Researchers reasoned that by comparing the times required to read words in L1, translate words into L2, and name pictures in L1 and L2 it should be possible to distinguish these two hypotheses. They assumed that in order to name a picture the corresponding concept must be activated and the appropriate word selected which expresses that concept.

According to the concept mediation view, translation is performed in a similar way (except that the concept is activated by a word). Picture naming in L2 and translating a word from L1 to L2 should therefore be performed in about the same time. In contrast, if translation is performed by lexical association there is no need to activate the concept and find the appropriate L2 word and so translation should be faster than picture naming.

Part of the evidence for this comes from the fact that even relatively fluent bilinguals are faster to translate from L2 to L1 than from L1 to L2 (although there are other L1 L2 concepts possible explanations for this, such as the relative ease of mapping concepts onto L1 forms). The other line of evidence comes from the «semantic blocking effect». When subjects are required to name pictures one after the other, then when a series of pictures are all drawn from the same category their naming times actually become *slower*.

J. Kroll and E. Stewart showed that the same blocking phenomenon is obtained in L1-to-L2 translation, indicating that translation is performed via the conceptual level (L2 words are activated from the conceptual level, just as in picture naming) [12]. However, the effect is not

obtained when L2-to-L1 translation is required suggesting that there is much less conceptual involvement in this process.

Why should there be this asymmetry? J. Kroll and de Groot provide two reasons: (i) when L2 words are learned for the first time they are often paired with their L1 equivalents, and (ii) the links between L1 words and concepts are obviously stronger than those from L2 words to concepts, so it makes sense for L2 words to make use of the former, especially early in learning (recall the debate over the role of phonology in accessing meaning from print) [11]. These arguments seem to apply well to the early stages of learning, but the question why the asymmetry should exist in relatively fluent bilinguals still remains.

Further problems are caused by evidence that L2-to-L1 translation is not immune to semantic influences. First, it displays effects of word concreteness (concrete words being easier to translate than abstract words [9], de Groot. Second, La Heij and others found that single word translation is facilitated by simultaneous presentation of a semantically related picture [13]. This facilitation was if anything stronger for L2-L1 than L1-L2 translation.

Third, Salamoura and J. Williams found that L2-L1 translation was facilitated when semantically related words were blocked [20] (which contrasts with J. Kroll and E. Stewart's failure to find any effect in this condition [12]). Finally, C. Price and others found no difference in brain activation according to direction of translation [18]. Thus, the asymmetry model has received little support. Whether the language backgrounds of the participants are the cause of this is not clear at present. J. Williams also provides evidence that even at the earliest stages of word learning people do not form translation connections with L1 words [14, p. 20]. Such connections would imply that L2 words initially inherit the meaning of the L1 translation equivalent, but this was found not to be the case. Rather they suggest that newly learned L2 words are immediately associated with the conceptual information that is active at the time that they are learned.

Thus, the process of developing multilingual competences is a complex, multidimensional functional system of influence on an individual, who is taught as a subject of intercultural communication, minding new specific values and becoming aware of multilingualism and multiculturalism.

### Bibliography

1. Baker M. In Other Words: A course book on translation / Mona Baker. J@L Composition Ltd, Filey, N.Yorkshire, Great Britain, 1996. – 304 p.
2. Baker M. Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies/edited by Mona Baker. Routledge. – London, 2001. – 654 p.
3. Bassnet S., Lefeverre A. (eds.) Translation, History, and Culture. – London: Pinter Publishers, 1995. – 133 p.
4. Bell Roger T. Translation and translating: theory and practice / Roger T. Bell. – London: Longman, 1995. – 298 p.
5. Chesterman A. Memes of translation: the spread of ideas in translation theory / Andrey Chesterman. – Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co, 1997. – 221 p.
6. Crystal D. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language / David Crystal. – Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996. – 336 p.
7. Gentzler E.C. Contemporary Translation Theories / Edwin Gentzler. – London: Routledge, 1993. – 224 p.
8. Gile D. Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training / Daniel Gile. – Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co, 1995. – 277 p.
9. Groot A.M.B., Kroll J.F. Tutorials in Bilingualism / Annette de Groot. – N.-Y.: Psychology Press, 1997. – 314 p.
10. Hatim B., Mason I. The Translator as Communicator / Basil Hatim, Ian Mason. – London: Routledge, 1997. – 244 p.
11. Kroll J.F., de Groot, A.M.B. Handbook of Bilingualism: Psycholinguistic Approaches. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. – 414 p.
12. Kroll J.F., Stewart E. Category interference in translation and picture naming: Evidence for asymmetric connections between bilingual memory representations / Journal of Memory and Language. – 1997. – No. 33. – P. 149–174.

13. La Heij W., Hooglander A., Kerling R., van der Velden E. Nonverbal context effects in forward and backward translation: Evidence for concept mediation / *Journal of Memory and Language*. – 1996. – No. 35. – P. 648–665.
14. Lee M.W., Williams J.N. Lexical access in spoken word production by bilinguals: Evidence from the semantic competitor paradigm // *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*. – 2001. – No. 4. – P. 233–248.
15. Melamed I.D. Empirical methods for exploiting parallel texts / I. Dan Melamed. – Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2001. – 195 p.
16. Meuter R.F.I., Allport A. Bilingual language switching in naming: Asymmetrical costs of language selection / *Journal of Memory and Language*. – 1999. – No. 40. – P. 25–40.
17. Munday J. *Introducing Translation Studies: theories and applications*. – London: Routledge, 2001. – 222 p.
18. Price C.J. et al A functional imaging study of translation and language switching / *Brain*. – 1999. – No. 122. – P. 2221–2235.
19. Robinson D. *Becoming a translator: an introduction to the theory and practice of translation* / Douglas Robinson. – London: Routledge, 2003. – 330 p.
20. Salamoura Williams J. Backward word translation: Lexical vs Conceptual mediation or 'Concept Activation' vs. 'Word Retrieval'? // *Working Papers in English and Applied Linguistics*. – London: RCEAL, 1999.
21. Tyulenev S. *Applying Luhmann to translation studies: translation in society* / Sergey Tyulenev. – London: Routledge, 2012. – 235 p.

У статті автор намагається розглянути процес перекладу в багатомовному суспільстві з точки зору психологічного підходу, аналізує психологічну модель перекладу, що відображає реальні дії перекладача та описує усі перекладацькі процеси. Такий підхід дозволяє визначити напрям внутрішніх процесів мислення та стадій переходу від тексту оригіналу до тексту перекладу.

*Ключові слова: переклад, білінгвізм, багатомовний, мовний контроль, асиметрія переходу.*

В статье автор делает попытку рассмотреть процесс перевода в многоязыковом обществе с точки зрения психологического подхода, анализирует психологическую модель перевода, которая отражает реальные действия переводчика и описывает все переводческие процессы. Такой подход позволяет определить направление внутренних процессов мышления и стадий переключения от текста оригинала к тексту перевода.

*Ключевые слова: перевод, билингвизм, многоязыковой, языковой контроль, асимметрия переключения.*

*Надійшло до редакції 24.10.2012 р.*