

Incorporating Translation and Interpreting into the Business Language Classroom

Christopher D. Mellinger
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Follow this and additional works at: <https://gbl.digital.library.gwu.edu/>

Recommended Citation

Mellinger, C.D. (2023). Incorporating Translation and Interpreting into the Business Language Classroom. *Global Business Languages*, 23, 58-73.

Available at (DOI): <http://doi.org/10.4079/gbl.v23.5>

Copyright © 2023 Christopher D. Mellinger. *Global Business Languages* is produced by The George Washington University.

This is an Open Access journal. This means that it uses a funding model that does not charge readers or their institutions for access. Readers may freely read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of articles. This journal is covered under the [CC BY-NC-ND license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Incorporating Translation and Interpreting into the Business Language Classroom

Abstract: This article presents a research-based proposal on how to integrate translation and interpreting into the business language classroom, focusing on both text-based and interactional approaches to language pedagogy in specialized domains. As a point of departure, the article first reviews the pedagogical possibilities of integrating translation and interpreting into the language classroom more generally. Then, the article specifically advocates for their integration in business language classrooms to support language learning outcomes while also developing what has been termed translation and interpreting literacy. Text-based and interactional approaches to pedagogy are suggested as potential ways the practice of translation and interpreting naturally dovetail with business language education. The article concludes with a call for additional research on these interlingual practices in business language studies to support domain-specific language learning that aligns with the professional realities encountered by students upon graduation.

Keywords: interaction-based pedagogy, interpreting, language for specific purposes, text-based pedagogy, translation

Introduction

Renewed interest in translation and interpreting (TI) and their place in language learning has led to discussions of their utility and relationship with language instruction (Laviosa, 2014; Mellinger, 2017; Pym, 2018). No longer associated exclusively with the grammar-translation method of language instruction in which translation is used primarily as a comprehension check, translation more recently has been characterized as a fifth skill that ought to be situated alongside the traditionally-taught language skills (i.e., reading, writing, speaking, and listening) commonly found in second language classrooms (Colina & Lafford, 2017). How translation skills are integrated into language teaching has taken many forms, from pedagogic translation (Laviosa, 2014, 2018) and text analysis of genre conventions (e.g., Baer & Mellinger, 2020), to socio-constructivist approaches to translation in plurilingual classrooms (González-Davies, 2017), to machine translation for language learning (Anderson, 1995; Garcia & Pena, 2011). In addition, there is increasing recognition of the role of translanguaging and codeswitching, activities previously eschewed in these learning contexts, and how they might dovetail with translation and interpreting (Laviosa, 2018; Pintado Gutiérrez, 2021).

Reflection on how TI can support the teaching of languages for specific purposes (LSP) has received less attention to date, with research on LSP teaching focusing on sociocultural, sociocognitive, and second language acquisition instructional paradigms (Sánchez-López, 2018) or content-based language instruction and learning (CLIL) to support language learning (Gaballo, 2023; Klee, 2014). TI skills are not incongruent with these approaches, yet their explicit integration remains a topic that merits further investigation. A recent contribution by Laviosa (2022) illustrates the potential of bringing these two areas of discussion into dialogue, invoking pedagogic translation in a European context to describe how specific educational

models adopted in research-based textbooks might be implemented in plurilingual educational contexts.

This article seeks to explore the possibility of TI integration into another LSP context, namely business language courses. To do so, the article first establishes a rationale for TI to be included in business language courses. While a sizable body of scholarship illustrates the importance of business language learning and advocates for its inclusion in business education, recent scholarship has documented the disconnect between international business programs and their curricular implementation of language learning (Hanson, 2022). Consequently, this article seeks to bridge LSP teaching and TI pedagogy to offer a research-informed perspective on how TI skills can augment student learning in LSP courses. A brief overview of teaching language for business purposes is provided to contextualize the possibility of integrating translation and interpreting into these courses. Next, translation and interpreting are suggested as a means to integrate text-based and interactional approaches to pedagogy into the business language classroom. While the suggestions are not an exhaustive account of all the possible configurations, the research-informed approaches provide points of reflection and integration for these courses. The article concludes with several suggestions on the development of materials and future avenues of investigation.

Language for Business Purposes: Pedagogical Possibilities

Research in business language studies has called for language learning specifically tailored to the specific needs of business communication, in recognition of the unique communicative features demanded when working in specialized domains (Doyle, 2012, 2019). These pedagogical appeals have occurred not only in specific courses, but also at the curricular level in an effort to align language programs with the realities faced by graduates in professional contexts (Doyle, 2019). Similar recognition comes from scholars working in international business, particularly with regard to the role that language plays in global commerce (Piekkari et al., 2014). This scholarship extends multilingual communication beyond direct interaction in different languages to cross-language practices such as translation and interpreting, which figure into organizational language policies and practices of multinational corporations (Hanson & Mellinger, 2021; Piekkari et al., 2020; Tietze et al., 2022).

The importance of translation and interpreting studies in business contexts has been recognized by TI trainers and educators, particularly when preparing students for work in specialized domains (e.g., Rudvin & Tomassini, 2011). To provide but a few examples, task-based approaches (Li, 2013) and project-based approaches for teaching business translation (Li et al., 2015) have been suggested as ways to support teaching specialized translation, while a range of business specific textbooks have developed to teach business translation (e.g., Pérez Román & Michel Ferrie, 1985; for an overview of interpreting textbooks, see Li, 2019).

Alongside calls for business language education in business programs and specialized translation and interpreting training, an emerging line of scholarship acknowledges translation and interpreting as regular features of communication in any setting in which intralingual communication is needed. As such, scholars have called for explicit education in what has been termed translation literacy (Takeda & Yamada, 2019) and interpreting literacy (Mellinger, 2022b), in which users of these language services are able to interface effectively with language professionals without needing to be professional translators or interpreters themselves. In a similar vein, intralingual communication that may be mediated by technology requires an

understanding of how machine translation (MT) can be used and to what effect. This MT literacy has been explored in a range of domains (Bowker & Ciro, 2019) as have use cases in which MT has been used to access different health and legal services (Vieira et al., 2021). Additional technological literacy is called for with respect to these language professionals themselves, such as interpreters who need to work with different platforms or tools to provide their services (Drechsel, 2019).

Despite calls from multiple academic disciplines for this type of cross-disciplinary collaboration, the points of intersection of business language studies remain limited to international business and TI research. Curricular responses have been mixed and slow to respond to the scholarly evidence advocating for their integration, with language programs responding more readily to these identified needs as opposed to international business programs (Hanson, 2022). As Hanson (2022) attests, a disconnect remains between program descriptions and top-level programmatic goals of international business programs with the curricular implementation of language learning requirements. Colina (2015) directly notes the potential for business language studies and translation to be connected, yet concedes that considerable gaps remain. Doyle (2008) explicitly links these two areas in a call for curricular development; however, to date programs that expressly bridge business and translation are limited.

While the disconnect is not easily resolved, language programs that seek to incorporate TI into the LSP classroom, and more specifically the business language classroom, can do so in ways that allow a multi-pronged approach to education that enables multiple learning paths for students that will have to interact with and use TI in professional settings. This article sets out to provide a research-informed approach to integrating TI into the language for business purposes classroom to enable TI to be developed as a fifth skill (Colina & Lafford, 2017), TI literacy (Mellinger, 2022b; Takeda & Yamada, 2019), and as a pedagogical means to raise textual and discursual awareness (Baer & Mellinger, 2020).

To structure this discussion, the sections that follow will adopt two broad perspectives: text-based approaches and interaction-based approaches. At first glance, these seem to map neatly to translation and interpreting, respectively; however, there is potential for overlap of these skills. Text-based approaches will focus primarily on written communication and the production or use of textual materials when working with language for business purposes. Interaction-based approaches, in turn, will focus primarily on circumstances in which multiple parties are engaged (be it signed or spoken) to accomplish a specific communicative outcome.

Text-based Approaches

Research has documented efforts to integrate translation into language for specific classrooms (e.g., Ahmad & Rogers, 2007; Gotti & Šarčević, 2006; Litzler & Martín Monje, 2017), and the utility of pedagogic translation has already been shown in L2 language learning generally (e.g., Gasca Jiménez, 2017). This research covers a broad range of domains, including medical, legal, and technical domains as well as English for academic or specific purposes, all of which can parallel discussions of business specific language courses. This section on text-based approaches incorporates translation and interpreting into the business language classroom. However, the case could be made for its applicability to a broad range of LSP courses.

Prior to a discussion of these text-based approaches, it is important to be cognizant of the fact that students possess some familiarity and conceptualizations of how texts and communication work in the context of business, be they explicitly taught or implicitly assumed

(Baer, 2016). As such, text conventions presented in a business course are not wholly novel, but rather are situated alongside previous perspectives on language usage. That being said, they still require explicit instruction in textual analysis and genre conventions (Colina, 2003; Gasca Jiménez, 2022).

Textual analysis of genre conventions and categorization of text typologies are common approaches to language teaching, insofar as students often learn to draft and author texts directly in a particular language (e.g., Bargiela-Chiappini & Nickerson, 2014). This pedagogical approach stems from an understanding of LSP as a specialized genre (Borja Albi et al., 2014; Gotti, 2018). As a consequence, researchers and teachers alike have examined genre-specific conventions that might be incorporated into language teaching for texts used in business settings. Detailed accounts of specific textual features and cultural elements that appear in a single genre or text type, such as Spanish business letters (Candia, 2010), can provide specific guidance to students on how these texts can be both understood and drafted. Broader, corpus-based approaches allow scholars to identify macro-level document features of business or legal texts to enhance student awareness of their writing conventions (e.g., Borja Albi et al., 2014).

Increasing textual awareness of micro- and macro-level genre conventions is also typical in translation classrooms, yet text analysis in these courses also includes cross-language elements to prepare students to render texts from one language into another. Researchers have investigated text typologies generally in the practice of translation (e.g., Trosborg, 1997), how these can be taught (e.g., Baer, 2016), and how genre familiarity impacts translator behavior (e.g., Hvelplund & Dragsted, 2018). Technological configurations that enable collaboration can augment the teaching of specialized translation and genre conventions (Arnó Macià et al., 2014). The similar efforts of both translation and LSP instructors to integrate textual awareness in their respective courses suggests that translation is a natural fit in the business language classroom.

The present article suggests three specific translation-related activities to complement language learning activities in the business language classroom: interlingual translation (sometimes referred to as ‘translation proper’), intralingual translation, and sight translation. It should be noted that the activities and tasks described here are not an effort to prepare professional translators or interpreters who can render these services. Rather, the goal is to leverage these activities in order to highlight specific characteristics of languages for specific purposes and textual features intrinsic to business communication. Additionally, these activities may pique the interest of students interested in pursuing more formal academic training in translation and interpreting.

Interlingual Translation

Interlingual translation is the written rendition of a text from one language into another. As noted in the review of the extant scholarship, skills in textual analysis and an awareness of genre conventions and text types is of primary importance in order to adequately render a text in another language. Translation textbooks often incorporate this type of textual analysis as a pre-translation stage (e.g., Baer & Mellinger, 2020; Colina, 2003, 2015; Washbourne, 2009) in order to highlight differences between textual features in the source and target languages (i.e., the languages from which and into which one will translate). In doing so, students are able to approach translation as an act of drafting in the target language rather than as a mechanical reproduction of source language structures and features. Moreover, this textual analysis allows

both micro-level and macro-level features of a text to be examined in both languages, thereby underscoring divergent aspects that would need to be accounted for in the target language text.

A recent coursebook on translation and text formation provides an illustrative case of the analysis of specific textual features that support teaching translation. Drawing on corpus-based methods to identify specific discourse moves and features of texts in various languages, Baer and Mellinger (2020) group micro-level and macro-level textual conventions into six categories – vocabulary and phraseology; grammatical forms; syntax; coherence and cohesion; discourse organization; and cultural dimensions. As the authors suggest, this configuration pushes against an understanding of texts as a collection of disembodied words or phrases to instead consider texts as a whole, in which decisions that are made at micro-level can have implications at broader levels of discourse and function. Moreover, translation conceptualized in this manner avoids decontextualized lists of words and phrases that students utilize to render a target language version. Instead, translation provides a vector through which specific business-language content and texts can be understood within a broader communicative context, making the case that their transformation is necessary for these texts to be appropriate in the new language.

In the case of business language courses, any number of texts could be translated as an exercise in textual analysis to foster greater awareness of genre-level conventions. By no means exhaustive, translations of the following documents, or portions thereof, might be useful for inclusion in a course: business letters and correspondence; memos; annual reports; press releases; meeting agendas; accounting balance sheets; business plans; non-disclosure agreements; financial and transactional documents; compliance and regulatory information. Of course, the list could be amended or extended to accommodate any number of specialized areas of business, such as marketing, accounting, finance, logistics, or information systems. However, what remains constant is to foreground texts commonly found in business settings that would allow students to compare source and target language versions based on a range of textual features such as those suggested above. Business scholars have also reflected on text types that constitute a central component of professional business writing (Hutchins, 2015) along with their discourse counterparts (Ortiz et al., 2016), which may provide further guidance on which text might be incorporated. As noted previously, the goal of translating these texts is not to produce a perfect target language version, but rather to provide students authentic materials that can be viewed holistically prior to drafting or writing their own versions in the target language. In essence, translation in this scenario serves as a scaffold upon which students can use to inform their future work.

Intralingual Translation

A second type of translation activity is intralingual translation, in which students are asked to translate a text within the same language. In other academic contexts, this practice might be referred to as paraphrasing, but the intralingual moniker affords a specific conceptual understanding with respect to the new text to be created (for a discussion of the theoretical foundation of intralingual translation, see Mossop, 2016). Whereas paraphrasing might be more closely associated with a rewording of a text, intralingual translation takes the form of rewriting a text based on a specific set of instructions or criteria—commonly referred to in translation pedagogy as a translation brief (Nord, 1997; Kvam, 2014; Washbourne, 2012)—so that specific textual features, such as those described previously, are altered. By way of example, one might

consider rewriting a legal text into plain legal English using specific guidelines as an intralingual translation rather than a paraphrase or summary of the document. In any event, intralingual translation is often considered a broad concept that encompasses reformulation, rewording, or paraphrasing using the same language (Whyatt, 2017).

In the business language classroom, the utility of intralingual translation lies in the ability for instructors to focus on the task of writing a new version of a document within the constraints or parameters of a set of instructions (i.e., intralingually translating the text) rather than focusing on the specific content of the source text. In essence, intralingual translation allows a source text to provide the necessary material that will be transformed in the new version of the text without requiring students to simultaneously generate new domain-specific knowledge while attending to writing conventions. By focusing the task squarely on writing, instructors are able to teach genre conventions based on their function and emphasize the textual analysis skills that are also necessary to interlingual translation.

As an example, instructors of business language courses might incorporate intralingual translation by asking students to rewrite a company annual report in the style of a press release. This task is not outside the realm of possibilities in a future working context, and it provides an opportunity to compare and contrast textual conventions in both documents. As with interlingual translation, this type of task moves away from a tendency to focus on terminological issues and instead focuses on writing style, formality, tone, and structure. An awareness of language-specific conventions in different genres ultimately provides a complementary point of discussion about the texts themselves rather than focusing solely on the content of the document.

One need not limit these tasks solely to those plausible in a workplace context; intralingual translation might also be a rich means to integrate creativity into the classroom. For instance, intralingual translation of a compliance document into a human resources brochure might stretch the imagination of what constitutes a task for the future graduate, but nevertheless allows texts to be framed in a new context and with a new audience. As with interlingual translation, the translation brief addresses pragmatic and functional aspects of a text that would need to be altered on the basis of the set of instructions or requirements established for the target language version of the text. While translation briefs are scarce in actual translation practice, they serve a pedagogical function to highlight the ways in which a text might need to be altered in order to satisfy a specific purpose or function. In the case of business language communication, the options are broad as to what types of writing brief might be used to challenge students to rewrite a text within the same language to satisfy this new set of conditions.

Sight Translation

Sight translation (sometimes referred to as sight interpreting) is a third text-based activity that is complementary to business language courses. This task will be taken up again in the section on interaction-based approaches; however, the nature of this task arguably makes it a text-based activity that would complement language learning activities. As the name might suggest, sight translation is the oral rendition of a document into another language (e.g., a memo written in English would be read aloud in French without first preparing a French-language version). This version is rendered immediately in the presence of individuals who do not have the ability to read the document in its original language. (Professional interpreters are often required to provide this type of rendition for interpreting services users who cannot access a document directly by reading in a specific language.) Sight translation figures into interpreter

training programs in a variety of configurations, not only as a task to acquire for professional interpreting situations but also as a means to develop the requisite skills for other modes of interpreting (Lee, 2013; Weber, 1990).

As an educational activity in the business language classroom, this task allows instructors to situate a text within a broader communicative context in which a document is the primary point of discussion. Of particular interest as a text-based activity, the content that appears in the document is not a disembodied list of terminology, but rather represents a coherent text in which the various elements appear in a specific structure and order. As such, students are confronted with the reality that the text itself ought to read as though it were originally written in the other language, with the different elements cohering with each other. The situated nature of this text re-embeds the text in a specific setting and as an integral part of communication and refutes any potential viewpoint that the text itself is not a necessary element of the interaction. In addition, the temporal dimension of the task creates pressure since there is insufficient time to consult references or look up terminological questions that arise.

As with any task, considerable care is needed when integrating sight translation into the business language classroom. Sight translation is challenging for interpreters given the syntactic complexity of documents and the visual interference of a text written in a different language with the oral rendition in another (e.g., Shreve et al., 2010). As such, instructors who wish to integrate sight translation may want to focus on commonly encountered texts that are not overly technical or syntactically difficult to avoid making the task too challenging. For instance, students might be asked to sight translate a business memo or formal email communication in class in pairs, such that the texts are recognizable, while still maintaining the time pressure typical of sight translation tasks. In doing so, the text can serve as the starting point for potential discussions on appropriate grammatical structures or textual features that would need to be adjusted in the target language.

In all three text-based activities (i.e., interlingual translation, intralingual translation, and sight translation) the overarching premise of including these tasks in business language courses is to complement current learning activities by highlight the cross-linguistic challenges of written texts. Rather than asking students to immediately produce a text in the target language based on genre-specific conventions, translation in these various forms provide a starting point from which students can work. These initial texts help to bridge what students already know about textual conventions from their own experiences and coursework with new writing conventions under discussion in this new domain-specific context. In the section that follows, additional cross-language tasks are discussed from the perspective of interaction, which, as in the case of text-based approaches, provide potential points of connection between content-specific material and task-oriented communication.

Interaction-based Approaches

Interaction-based approaches to pedagogy naturally lend themselves to translation and interpreting in the classroom. These interactions can take multiple forms, be they among students within the same class or with content-specific courses in related areas. In this section, the focus lies primarily on the business language classroom; however, there are opportunities in which interprofessional education and training may benefit students as part of this discussion, particularly in light of ethical dimensions of communication. This section is organized using the three modes of interpreting, namely sight translation, consecutive interpreting, and simultaneous

interpreting.¹ This opening section revisits sight translation from an interactionist perspective, followed by different types of activities that facilitate interlingual communication via interpreting. An additional section dedicated to collaborative teaching approaches follows these three modes.

Sight translation is a natural bridge between text-based approaches and interaction-based approaches. As noted previously, sight translation requires acknowledgment that a text is embedded in a communicative context in which two or more people who do not share the same language are attempting to communicate. Consequently, the sight translation of a text ultimately implies an interaction in a multilingual communicative event. In the business language classroom, the textual content impels language use in a unique space about the topic at hand, such that this task creates novel opportunities for communication among students. This type of communication and interaction can ultimately lead to additional interaction and conversation in the target language, allowing students to integrate textual material into these communicative events. The introduction of a text into these interactions also necessitates an awareness of multiple types of discourse in a single space; written text conventions differ from oral production of language, requiring students to use both in order to be effective in the communicative task at hand.

Consecutive Interpreting

A second mode of interpreting is consecutive interpreting, in which two or more people who do not share the same language communicate by means of an interpreter who renders the oral or signed communication of one person into another language after the first person has finished communicating. In many cases, this type of communication is bidirectional—that is, an interpreter facilitates a dialogue between two people in a conversation (for an extended review, see Tipton & Furmanek, 2016). In conference settings, consecutive interpreting can also take the form of longer stretches of discourse or speeches rendered by the interpreter; however, for the purposes of this article, the focus will remain on dialogue interpreting.

Conversations and dialogues between two parties are often spontaneous interactions that are situated within a specific context. Business communication runs the gamut in terms of topic, from informal conversation to build rapport with colleagues to more formal settings in which business negotiations are conducted. Business language classrooms seek to prepare students to engage directly in the target language with their counterparts, relying on interpreters for communication only in instances in which there is not a shared language among the participants. Nevertheless, exposure to the practice of consecutive interpreting, however rudimentary, has several benefits in the language classroom.

One important benefit is related to accommodating the needs of heritage language learners taking courses alongside second language learners. While some universities have courses and programs specific to heritage language learners, it is relatively unlikely for a program to have heritage language courses specific to business language instruction. As such, the demographics in the business language classroom are likely rather heterogeneous, demanding that instructors differentiate learning to account for this range of students. Heritage language learners have a unique demographic profile, often including previous knowledge and experiences

¹ A full review of interpreting and interpreting studies lies beyond the scope of this article. For an overview of interpreting as a practice, see Mellinger (2022a). For a thorough review of interpreting studies as a discipline, see (Pöchhacker, 2016).

that can be leveraged to support language learning in these specific contexts. Mellinger and Gasca Jiménez (2019) have discussed how informally developed interpreting skills and peer-to-peer instruction can benefit heritage language learners in interpreting, which in turn could be extended to LSP contexts.

As part of interpreter education, there is considerable attention paid to preparation for interpreting for a specific interpreter-mediated event. Much in the same way that translation precipitates textual analysis and genre awareness, so too does interpreting provide an opportunity to analyze discourse patterns and preparation of glossaries and terminological resources to support interpreters prior to their work. Rudvin and Tomassini (2011) describe possible preparatory activities to generate glossaries and brainstorming the types of information that might be encountered during specific interpreting scenarios for consecutive interpreting in the workplace. This type of pre-analysis mirrors the benefits of written textual analysis, identifying terminology in a plausible context of communication in preparation for interpreting. Discourse awareness is certainly a benefit for business language students, preparing them for future dialogues in multilingual business settings.

A third benefit is a recognition of the challenges inherent to interpreting, so that these students will be better prepared to work with interpreters in specialized settings. Although students enrolled in LSP courses cannot be prepared to work as professional interpreters in a single course, the ability to interface with these language professionals is of paramount importance. Teaching the various modes of interpreting is one means by which TI literacy can be developed, as the performance of these skills is likely to inspire an appreciation for the complex skills required to perform quickly and effectively between two languages.

Simultaneous Interpreting

Simultaneous interpreting is a highly-specialized language activity that requires an interpreter to provide a nearly immediate rendition of signed or spoken communication from one language into another signed or spoken language. Often associated with conference or court interpreting, this type of interpreting is one that requires considerable practice and training to develop at a professional level. As such, in its unaltered form, simultaneous interpreting is perhaps not appropriate for a business language course in which students are still developing language proficiency. That said, simultaneous interpreting may figure into these LSP courses via a skill-building exercise called shadowing that is used to build the requisite foundation to simultaneously interpret could have demonstrable benefits as a language learning activity.

Shadowing is an exercise in which students listen to a speech and then repeat what is heard in the same language at the same time. Rather than listening for comprehension in order to provide a consecutive rendition in another language (as in the case of consecutive interpreting), shadowing is performed quasi-simultaneously to the original speech and remains in the same language. In interpreting studies, shadowing is often one of the first tasks that students learning to simultaneously interpret will practice in order to develop the necessary listening and comprehension skills needed to interpret (Nicholson, 1990). There are several ways in which shadowing can be practiced, with both fluent texts and disparate words and phrases. In the case of business language courses, it would seem most appropriate to have students focus on coherent discourse.

Previous scholarship has shown that shadowing is an exercise that can aid language production and listening comprehension, particularly when listening to language variants that are

different from what students are accustomed to hearing (for a discussion, see Ghiselli, 2021). Requiring students to intensely focus on listening comprehension and immediately act on what was understood challenges students to become active listeners rather than passively comprehending language being used in the classroom. At the same time, this activity disrupts students' typical speaking patterns insofar as shadowing entails repeating what was said at the same time and in the same manner as another speaker. In doing so, research has demonstrated that shadowing in the same language can improve the speed with which language is produced and the ability to listen, while also providing comprehensible input that can aid pronunciation and the acquisition of new turns of phrase or expressions (Foote & McDonough, 2017).

For business language students, the task of shadowing may feel unsettling since it moves beyond language activities that are typically encountered in daily interactions or in business settings. Nevertheless, the incorporation of shadowing as a complement to other communicative activities might support listening comprehension and speech production tasks, which, apart from an intrinsic motivation on the part of the student to engage, may be otherwise difficult to teach. As in the case of other translation and interpreting activities, the material used for shadowing needs to be carefully considered. The speed of delivery, language variety, and content are all of considerable importance, as is the language used to express this material.

Shadowing can be incorporated into the business language classroom in multiple ways, including online learning management systems in which students can access audio files and as part of in-class activities in which students can listen to audio on their own devices (or, if available, audio transmission equipment commonly used by interpreters or for the hard of hearing). In either case, students would listen to an audio clip selected by the instructor and should then record their own output as they shadow so that they can review their own rendition at the conclusion of the activity. The types of audio that could be used are numerous, including podcasts and news clips on business-related topics, speeches from business professionals and leaders, motivational pep talks, or industry lectures, and could be selected for specific features, such as a language variety or style of speech or specific terminology. These audio clips should not exceed a few minutes in length, particularly since this type of activity can be difficult for students who are not used to shadowing. Self-assessment of their own recordings provides tangible evidence of their strengths and weaknesses, while allowing students to revisit challenging points in the audio for future improvement. This type of self-assessment has been shown to be effective in the TI classroom (Lee, 2005; Li, 2018).

Interprofessional Education

While the primary goal of any of the activities described in the previous sections on sight translation, consecutive interpreting, or simultaneous interpreting do not presuppose the ultimate goal of preparing professional interpreters, these activities do provide another means by which to develop specific language skills that are of considerable utility to business language students. Taking a broader view of interpreting as a cross-language activity that is embedded in multilingual communication, another possibility emerges in which global business language students can interact with students specializing in business with translation and interpreting serving as a means by which interprofessional education can occur.

Scholars have conducted research in a range of professional settings in which translation and interpreting students are able to engage with students in other disciplines to develop an awareness of how interpreter-mediated communication occurs. As noted at the outset, TI literacy

is an emerging area of inquiry, and interprofessional education is one way to develop this skillset. For instance, scholars have demonstrated how this type of training can be conducted with the health professions (Balogh et al., 2018; Hlavac et al., 2022; Showstack et al., 2021). There are obvious parallels with business disciplines as well. As Hanson & Mellinger (2021) note, translation and interpreting regularly figure into corporate language policies as a means of mitigating or maintaining information asymmetry. This type of multilingual negotiation and interaction is regularly encountered in multinational corporations and is used to varying effect. By bringing together language and business students, both groups are able to gain a mutual understanding of specific needs of each profession.

A still broader consideration that merits mention for interprofessional education is the question of ethics, not only in the content area under discussion, but also in the mediation across languages and cultures. Translators and interpreters ascribe to codes of ethics promulgated by professional associations and legal entities, but these standards of practice are largely unknown outside of this community of practice. Consequently, interprofessional education provides an opportunity for business language students to understand the onus on translators and interpreters to be ethical in their own work, performance, and their approach to social responsibility (Drugan, 2017). In addition, these codes of ethics are an opportunity to reflect on the role and agency of interpreters and translators, given that interpreters are not merely conduits of information, but rather have a central role in communication. Their centrality in multilingual communication affords them agency and an ability to affect the flow of communication, yet is simultaneously circumscribed by agreed upon codes of ethics and standards of practice (Pokorn & Južnič, 2020). In some respects, questions related to agency hinge on the presupposition of neutrality or impartiality. While a full review of these challenges lies beyond the scope of this article, one might consider Lambert's (2018) assertion that an illusion of neutrality is used as a means to "sell" translation and assuage "buyers" that these language professionals function as nothing more than neutral conduits. While much of the extant scholarship on interpreting would challenge such claims, this assertion raises broader questions of the language industry and the means by which translations are produced. As Lambert (2018) suggests, a more cogent approach would be to advocate for an understanding of translation and interpreting as a multi-faceted activity that acknowledges the potential for bias and manipulation.

Conclusion

Based on a review of current scholarship on translation and interpreting pedagogy in specialized domains in tandem with domain-specific learning instruction, this article advocates for the inclusion of translation and interpreting in the business language classroom. Their inclusion is viewed as a complement to current pedagogical practices, particularly as a means to enhance awareness of text type and genre conventions in written texts and discourse organization in interactions. In addition, these practices maintain an explicit link to realia that might be encountered in the workplace, allowing students to explore the potential of TI as a career path worthy of additional study as well as to develop TI literacy to engage with these language professionals. The article also makes the case for interprofessional education in relation to translation and interpreting in order to develop broader discussions of business culture and interaction in multilingual spaces. The situatedness of both text and interaction naturally lend these language activities to translation and interpreting in business contexts, thereby enhancing

the applicability of business language education for students working professional contexts upon graduation.

This research-informed pedagogical proposal raises the visibility of translation and interpreting in business communication, and in doing so, raises the need for additional materials to be developed to support their inclusion in these courses. Materials development is of particular importance, since the curricular landscape of LSP education in the United States remains such that TI being taught primarily by experts in the topic may be an elusive goal. While specialized translation and interpreting materials have been and continue to be developed, there remains considerable room to develop TI resources that might be incorporated into business language materials. While there are corpus-based approaches to materials development across languages and domains that have been proposed (e.g., Baer & Mellinger, 2020), additional efforts are still needed to enable the inclusion of TI in business language education. In a similar vein, further research on the effectiveness of TI-related activities as pedagogical interventions in the business language classroom are necessary to determine if the proposals made in this article hold in these contexts. As an initial step toward a research-based pedagogy that complements current business language instructional practices, this article seeks to align classroom practices with the realities of multilingual business communication.

References

- Ahmad, K., & Rogers, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Evidence-based LSP: Translation, text and terminology*. Peter Lang.
- Anderson, D. D. (1995). Machine translation as a tool in second language learning. *CALICO Journal*, 13(1), 68–97. <https://doi.org/10.1558/cj.v13i1.68-97>
- Arnó Macià, E., Isohella, S., Maylath, B., Schell, T., Verzella, M., Minacori, P., Mousten, B., Nusacchio, M. T., Palumbo, G., & Vandepitte, S. (2014). Enhancing students' skills in technical writing and LSP translation through tele-collaboration projects: Teaching students in seven nations to manage complexity in multilateral international collaboration. In G. Budin & V. Lušický (Eds.), *19th European Symposium on Languages for Special Purposes, 8–10 July 2013, Vienna, Austria* (pp. 249–259). University of Vienna.
- Baer, B. J. (2016). Teaching translation through text types. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *Teaching translation* (pp. 63–70). Routledge.
- Baer, B. J., & Mellinger, C. D. (Eds.). (2020). *Translating texts: An introductory coursebook on translation and text formation*. Routledge.
- Balogh, K., Salaets, H., & Van Schoor, D. (Eds.). (2018). *Interpreter-mediated child interviews: Tools for interprofessional training*. Lannoo Campus.
- Bargiela-Chiappini, F., & Nickerson, C. R. (2014). *Writing business: Genres, media and discourses*. Routledge.
- Borja Albi, A., Juste Vidal, N., Ordóñez López, P., & Conde, T. (2014). A genre-based approach to the teaching of legal and business English: The GENTT specialized corpus in the LSP classroom. In E. Bárcena, T. Read, & J. Arús (Eds.), *Languages for specific purposes in the digital era* (pp. 177–196). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02222-2_9
- Bowker, L., & Ciro, J. B. (2019). *Machine translation and global research: Towards improved machine translation literacy in the scholarly community*. Emerald.

- Candia, R. (2010). The business letter in Spanish: A cultural perspective. *Global Business Languages*, 6, article 9.
- Colina, S. (2003). *Translation teaching, from research to the classroom: A handbook for teachers*. McGraw-Hill.
- Colina, S. (2015). *Fundamentals of translation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Colina, S., & Lafford, B. A. (2017). Translation in Spanish language teaching: The integration of a “fifth skill” in the second language curriculum. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching*, 4(2), 110–123. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23247797.2017.1407127>
- Doyle, M. S. (2008). Innovations in curriculum and programs: Business Spanish and TTS (Translating and Translation Studies). *Hispania*, 91(1), 237–238.
- Doyle, M. S. (2012). Business Language Studies in the United States: On nomenclature, context, theory, and method. *Modern Language Journal*, 96(s1), 105–121. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2012.01276.x>
- Doyle, M. S. (2019). Curriculum development activism (CDA): Moving forward with Spanish for the professions and specific purposes (SPSP). *Hispania*, 102(4), 475–480. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hpn.2019.0130>
- Drechsel, A. (2019). Technology literacy for the interpreter. In D. B. Sawyer, F. Austerlühl, & V. E. Raído (Eds.), *The evolving curriculum in interpreter and translator education: Stakeholder perspectives and voices* (pp. 259–268). <https://doi.org/10.1075/ata.xix.12dre>
- Drugan, J. (2017). Ethics and social responsibility in practice: Interpreters and translators engaging with and beyond the professions. *The Translator*, 23(2), 126–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2017.1281204>
- Foot, J. A., & McDonough, K. (2017). Using shadowing with mobile technology to improve L2 pronunciation. *Journal of Second Language Pronunciation*, 3(1), 34–56. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jslp.3.1.02foo>
- Gaballo, V. (2023). Translation in CLIL: Mission impossible? *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 9(1), 72–95. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ttmc.00102.gab>
- García, I., & Peña, M. I. (2011). Machine translation-assisted language learning: writing for beginners. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 24(5), 471–487. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2011.582687>
- Gasca Jiménez, L. (2017). Las posibilidades de la traducción pedagógica en la enseñanza del español como segunda lengua. *Estudios de Lingüística Aplicada*, 35(66), 205–232. <https://doi.org/10.22201/enallt.01852647p.2017.66.837>
- Gasca Jiménez, L. (2022). *Traducción, competencia plurilingüe y español como lengua de herencia (ELH)*. Routledge.
- Ghiselli, S. (2021). Cognitive processes and interpreting expertise: Autonomous exercise of master’s students. In J. Pinto & N. Alexandre (Eds.), *Multilingualism and third language acquisition: Learning and teaching trends* (pp. 3–23). Language Science Press.
- 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). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23247797.2017.1407168>
- Gotti, M. (2018). LSP as specialised genres. In J. Humbley, G. Budin, & C. Laurén (Eds.), *Language for special purposes: An international handbook* (pp. 3–25). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110228014-001>
- Gotti, M., & Šarčević, S. (Eds.). (2006). *Insights into specialized translation*. Peter Lang.
- Hanson, T. A. (2022). Language requirements in the international business classroom. *Global*

- Business Languages*, 22, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.4079/gbl.v22.2>
- Hanson, T. A., & Mellinger, C. D. (2021). An information asymmetry framework for strategic translation policy in multinational corporations. In O. Carbonell i Cortés & E. Monzó-Nebot (Eds.), *Translating asymmetry – Rewriting power* (pp. 77–99). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.157.04han>
- Hlavac, J., Harrison, C., & Saunders, B. (2022). Interprofessional education in interpreter training. *Interpreting*, 24(1), 111–139. <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.00072.hla>
- Hutchins, T. D. (2015). A new approach to teaching business writing: Writing across the core – A document based curriculum. *American Journal of Business Education*, 8(2), 131–138. <https://doi.org/10.19030/ajbe.v8i2.9135>
- Hvelplund, K. T., & Dragsted, B. (2018). Genre familiarity and translation processing: Differences and similarities between literary and LSP translators. In I. Lacruz & R. Jääskeläinen (Eds.), *Innovation and expansion in translation process research* (pp. 55–76). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ata.18.04tan>
- Klee, C. A. (2014). Content-based programs and Spanish for the professions. In M. Lacorte (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of Hispanic applied linguistics* (pp. 200–217). Routledge.
- Kvam, S. (2014). Text linguistics and the translation brief: On the relevance of conversation analysis as an operational tool in a pragmatic text linguistic approach to translation. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 22(1), 21–38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2012.710243>
- Lambert, J. (2018). How ethical are codes of ethics? Using illusions of neutrality to sell translations. *JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 30, 269–290.
- Laviosa, S. (2014). *Translation and language education: Pedagogic approaches explored*. Routledge.
- Laviosa, S. (2018). Translanguaging and translation pedagogies. In H. V. Dam, M. N. Brøgger, & K. K. Zethsen (Eds.), *Moving boundaries in translation studies* (pp. 181–199). Routledge.
- Laviosa, S. (2022). LSP teaching within a plurilingual perspective. *Scripta Manent XV*(2), 3–15.
- Lee, J. (2013). What skills do student interpreters need to learn in sight translation training? *Meta*, 57(3), 694–714. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1017087ar>
- Lee, Y.-H. (2005). Self-assessment as an autonomous learning tool in an interpretation classroom. *Meta*, 50(4). <https://doi.org/10.7202/019869ar>
- Li, D. (2013). Teaching business translation: A task-based approach. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 7(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2013.10798841>
- Li, X. (2018). Self-assessment as ‘assessment as learning’ in translator and interpreter education: validity and washback. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 12(1), 48–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2017.1418581>
- Li, X. (2019). Analyzing translation and interpreting textbooks: A pilot survey of business interpreting textbooks. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 14(3), 392–415. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.19041.li>
- Li, D., Zhang, C., & He, Y. (2015). Project-based learning in teaching translation: Students’ perceptions. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 9(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2015.1010357>
- Litzler, M. F., & Martín Monje, E. (2017). Editors’ introduction: Linguistics, translation and teaching in LSP. *Revista de Lenguas para Fines Específicos*, 23(1), 9–11. <https://doi.org/10.20420/rlfe.2016.326>

- Mellinger, C. D. (2017). Translation, interpreting, and language studies: Confluence and divergence. *Hispania*, 100(5), 241–246. <https://www.doi.org/10.1353/hpn.2018.0059>
- Mellinger, C. D. (2022a). Interpreting. In A. Ferreira & J. W. Schwieter (Eds.), *Introduction to translation and interpreting studies* (pp. 43–69). Wiley.
- Mellinger, C. D. (2022b). Preparing informed users of language services in public service interpreting courses: Differentiated learning outcomes for a diverse student population. In R. Moratto & D. Li (Eds.), *Global insights into public service interpreting: Theory, practice and training* (pp. 171–183). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003197027-14>
- Mellinger, C. D., & Gasca Jiménez, L. (2019). Challenges and opportunities for heritage language learners in interpreting courses in the US context. *Revista Signos: Estudios de Lingüística*, 52(101), 950–974. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-09342019000300950>
- Mossop, B. (2016). ‘Intralingual translation’: A desirable concept? *Across Languages and Cultures*, 17(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1556/084.2016.17.1.1>
- Nicholson, N. S. (1990). The role of shadowing in interpreter training. *The Interpreters’ Newsletter*, 3, 33–37.
- Nord, C. (1997). Defining translation functions. The translation brief as a guideline for the trainee translator. *Ilha do Desterro: A journal of English Language, Literatures in English and Cultural Studies*, 33, 39–54.
- Ortiz, L. A., Region-Sebest, M., & MacDermott, C. (2016). Employer perceptions of oral communication competencies most valued in new hires as a factor in company success. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, 79(3), 317–330. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2329490615624108>
- Pérez Román, C., & Michel Ferrie, F. (1985). *Introduction to business translation: A handbook in English-Spanish contrastive linguistics*. Editorial de la Universidad de Puerto Rico.
- Piekkari, R., Welch, D. E., & Welch, L. S. (2014). *Language in international business: The multilingual reality of global business expansion*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Piekkari, R., Tietze, S., & Koskinen, K. (2020). Metaphorical and interlingual translation in moving organizational practices across languages. *Organization Studies*, 41(9), 1311–1332. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840619885415>
- 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>
- Pöschhacker, F. (2016). *Introducing interpreting studies, Second edition*. Routledge.
- Pokorn, N. K., & Južnič, T. M. (2020). Community interpreters versus intercultural mediators: Is it really all about ethics?. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 15(1), 80–107. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.20027.koc>
- Pym, A. (2018). Where translation studies lost the plot: Relations with language teaching. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 4(2), 203–222. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ttmc.00010.pym>
- Rudvin, M., & Tomassini, E. (2011). *Interpreting in the community and workplace*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Sánchez-Lopez, L. (2018). Español para las profesiones. In J. Muñoz-Basols, E. Gironzetti, & M. Lacorte (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of Spanish language teaching* (pp. 519–532). Routledge.

- Showstack, R., Nicks, S., Woods, N. K., & Martínez, G. (2021). Interprofessional education for students of translation/interpreting and the health professions. *Hispania*, 104(3), 485–501. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hpn.2021.0098>
- Shreve, G. M., Lacruz, I., & Angelone, E. (2010). Cognitive effort, syntactic disruption, and visual interference in a sight translation task. In G. M. Shreve & E. Angelone (Eds.), *Translation and cognition* (pp. 63–84). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ata.xv.05shr>
- Takeda, K., & Yamada, M. (2019). “TI literacy” for general undergraduate education. In D. Sawyer, F. Austermühl, & V. Enríquez Raído (Eds.), *The evolving curriculum in interpreter and translator education: Stakeholder perspectives and voices* (pp. 53–73). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ata.xix.03tak>
- Tietze, S., Koskinen, K., & Piekkari, R. (2022). Translation approaches within organization studies. In K. Marais (Ed.), *Translation beyond translation studies* (pp. 119–141). Bloomsbury.
- Tipton, R., & Furmanek, O. (2016). *Dialogue interpreting*. Routledge.
- Trosborg, A. (Ed.). (1997). *Text typology and translation*. John Benjamins.
- Vieira, L. N., O’Hagan, M., & O’Sullivan, C. (2021). Understanding societal impacts of machine translation: A critical review of the literature on medical and legal use cases. *Information, Communication & Society*, 24(11), 1515–1532. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2020.1776370>
- Washbourne, R. K. (2009). *Manual of Spanish-English translation*. Pearson.
- Washbourne, R. K. (2012). Active, strategic reading for translation trainees: Foundations for transactional methods. *Translation & Interpreting*, 4(1), 38–55.
- Weber, W. K. (1990). The importance of sight translation in an interpreter training program. In D. Bowen & M. Bowen (Eds.), *Interpreting: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow* (pp. 44–52). <https://doi.org/10.1075/ata.iv.10web>
- Whyatt, B. (2017). Intralingual translation. In J. W. Schwieter & A. Ferreira (Eds.), *The handbook of translation and cognition* (pp. 176–192). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119241485.ch10>