ATKINSON, Rebecca Frances. *Translation into a Non-Native Language: Practice, Research and Training in Brazil and Around the World*. *Revista Belas Infiéis*, Brasília, v. 10, n. 1, p. 01-21, 2021. e-ISSN: 2316-6614.
DOI: doi.org/10.26512/belasinfieis.v10.n1.2021.35294
Recebido: 22/11/2020 Aceito: 01/06/2021 Publicado: 07/07/2021

TRANSLATION INTO A NON-NATIVE LANGUAGE: PRACTICE, RESEARCH AND TRAINING IN BRAZIL AND AROUND THE WORLD

TRADUÇÃO PARA LÍNGUA ESTRANGEIRA: PRÁTICA, PESQUISA E FORMAÇÃO NO BRASIL E NO MUNDO

Rebecca Frances ATKINSON
Doutoranda
Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro
Faculdade de Letras
Programa Interdisciplinar de Pós-Graduação em Linguística Aplicada
Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil
http://lattes.cnpq.br/5806660076207799
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6269-3629
rebecca.f.atkinson@gmail.com

Abstract: This study offers a critical analysis of the state of the art on the translation of non-literary texts to a second language (L2), especially English, as an object of academic study and market practice. The literature review presented here seeks to identify: (a) how the discourse within the field of translation studies is developing with regard to L2 translation; (b) what the characteristics of English are that differentiate it from other languages in the context of translation; (c) what issues are addressed in directionality research; and (d) how the data gathered can be applied to translator training, especially in Brazil. The superiority of L1 translation is being challenged within translation studies, driven in part by research into the subject undertaken in countries with languages of limited diffusion, where L2 translation is common. As English is the most widely spoken L2 in the world, there are more materials and resources in and on it, making translation into it easier. Studies show that directionality is just one of many variables that affect translation quality, two others being the translator's experience and the text type. In Brazil, there are some studies into directionality, but as yet few options for training in L2 translation.
Keywords: Directionality. L2 translation. Inverse translation. English. Translator training.

Resumo: O presente trabalho oferece uma análise crítica do estado da arte sobre a tradução de textos não literários para língua estrangeira (L2), em especial o inglês, como objeto de estudo acadêmico e prática mercadológica. A revisão bibliográfica aqui apresentada procura identificar:(a) de que formas o discurso dentro dos Estudos da Tradução vem se construindo a respeito da tradução para L2; (b)quais as características do inglês que o diferencia de outros idiomas quando se trata da tradução;(c)que questões são abordadas em pesquisas sobre a direcionalidade; e(d) como os dados levantados podem ser aplicados à formação de tradutores, especialmente no Brasil. A superioridade da tradução para L1 vem sendo desafiada dentro dos Estudos da Tradução, devido, entre outros fatores, a pesquisas sobre o assunto oriundas de países de línguas de menor difusão, onde a tradução para L2 é praxe. Como o inglês é a L2 mais falada no mundo, há mais materiais e recursos disponíveis, facilitando a tradução para esse idioma. Estudos mostram que a direcionalidade é apenas uma das variáveis que afetam a qualidade das traduções, outras incluindo a experiência do tradutor e o tipo de texto. No Brasil, há alguns estudos sobre direcionalidade, mas ainda poucas opções de formação em tradução para L2.
Palavras-chave: Direcionalidade. Tradução para L2. Versão. Língua inglesa. Formação de tradutores.

The question of directionality — translation from a foreign language (L2) into a native language (L1) or vice-versa — is a relatively recent research topic in translation studies in the West. It only appeared on the research agenda in recent decades, particularly in the wake of the incorporation of technical and specialised translation into the field of translation studies and, more notably, the surge of globalisation triggered by the end of the Cold War. Before this, it was understood that translation should only be done into one's native language, for the purposes of quality assurance. The most notable citation in this regard is found in the introduction to the translation textbook written by Peter Newmark (1987). The book begins with a series of assumptions, the first of which is that the reader (translation student) is "learning to translate into [his/her] language of habitual use, since that is the only way you can translate naturally, accurately and with maximum effectiveness" (Newmark, 1987, p. 3).

More than thirty years on and the same message regarding translation directionality continues to be perpetuated in the discourse of professional associations and the syllabuses of translator training courses. For example, the influential American Translators Association (ATA) offers a booklet designed as a "guide to buying translation" entitled *Translation — Getting it Right*, which contains a series of guidelines for ensuring the quality of the final product. The guide has versions in eleven other languages, including Brazilian Portuguese, which features the logos of the Brazilian Association of Translators and Interpreters (ABRATES) and the National Union of Translators (SINTRA). The version in Portuguese contains the following remarks:

> The best translations are done into the professional's mother tongue.
>
> We even have a special name for this in Brazil: *versão* — when a Brazilian translates into English, for example. It can be done. But it never comes out well, because we never lose our accent. If you want to translate a company's newsletter into German or Russian, hire a German or Russian translator. Brazilians should translate into Brazilian Portuguese.
>
> In fact, it's likely that a translator who fails to abide by this basic rule will also fail to observe other quality parameters. (ATA, 2011, p. 16; own translation)

Not only does the text claim that L2 translation "never comes out well", but it goes on to make an even more worrying claim: that nobody who translates into a non-native language should be trusted, as the mere fact of doing so constitutes a violation of the "basic rule" of L1 translation and should therefore be taken as an indication of a more generalized lack of reliability.

In the university setting, particularly in the context of translator training, attitudes towards directionality can be inferred from the information contained in the websites of postgraduate diploma courses.[1] Of the three courses identified in Rio de Janeiro, two show a tendency to prioritize L1 translation: the one at PUC-Rio,[2] which is aimed at people who have a "good grounding in English and [who] write well in Portuguese", and that of Universidade Cândido Mendes,[3] whose target audience should have "reading skills in English and writing skills in Portuguese". At Estácio,[4] in terms of linguistic ability, the only requirement is "good command" of English.

In an investigation of ten bachelor's degree courses in translation (English-Portuguese) offered at public universities in Brazil, Patrícia Rodrigues Costa (2018) found that only four (at UFRGS, UnB, UEM and UFJF) offered L2 translation. In the latter two, the practical modules in L2 translation were far outnumbered by those in L1 translation, but in the former two there was an equal distribution between L1 and L2 translation. These courses, however, are the exception: according to the researcher, "only a minority offer practice in inverse translation" (Costa, 2018, p. 400).

There is as yet no published data on the prevalence of L2 translation on the Brazilian market. It can, however, be inferred from the translator databases available on the ABRATES and SINTRA websites, where searches were carried out for translators working in English, Spanish, French and Italian, and from a survey on the Facebook group "Tradutores Intérpretes e Curiosos". The data presented in Table 1 show that a significant proportion of Brazilian translators work between Portuguese and the four selected languages. English is the language for which there is most supply on the Brazilian market, with between 52% and 85% of the translators who translate from English into Portuguese also working in the opposite direction. The similarity of the data profiles of the three sources confirms the expectation that English is indeed the most prevalent language, offered by at least twice as many translators as the second-placed language, Spanish, followed by French and Italian. While a direct correspondence between supply and demand cannot be assumed, the size of the difference between English and the other languages is indicative of considerably greater demand in that language.

ATKINSON, Rebecca Frances. *Translation into a Non-Native Language: Practice, Research and Training in Brazil and Around the World*. *Revista Belas Infiéis*, Brasília, v. 10, n. 1, p. 01-20, 2021. e-ISSN: 2316-6614.
DOI: doi.org/10.26512/belasinfieis.v10.n1.2021.35294

Table 1

Number of translators who translate into and out of English, Spanish, French and Italian in Brazil

Sources of data / Languages	ABRATES[i] (552 members)	SINTRA[ii] (280 members[iii])	Facebook[iv]
English to Portuguese	393 (75.3%)[v]	268 (95.7%)	552
Portuguese to English	203 (36.8%)	229 (81.8%)	353
Spanish to Portuguese	136 (24.6%)	135 (48.2%)	215
Portuguese to Spanish	63 (11.4%)	77 (27.5%)	111
French to Portuguese	66 (12.0%)	68 (24.3%)	102
Portuguese to French	25 (4.5%)	41 (14.6%)	43
Italian to Portuguese	35 (6.3%)	37 (13.2%)	57
Portuguese to Italian	16 (2.9%)	22 (7.8%)	22

Notes: [i] Data retrieved from the website of the Brazilian Association of Translators and Interpreters (ABRATES) (https://abrates.com.br/buscar-tradutores/) on 24 Apr. 2021;
[ii] Data retrieved from the website of the National Union of Translators (SINTRA) (https://www.sintra.org.br/site/index.php?p=c&pag=trad) on 24 Apr. 2021;
[iii] Data provided in an email from SINTRA;
[iv] Data retrieved from the poll "What is(are) your language pair(s)?" on the Facebook group "Tradutores, Intérpretes e Curiosos", on 24 Apr. 2021. There are no data available on the number of respondents, and as the group is open to people who work with translation and interpreting it is impossible to give a total number;
[v] Number of translators and percentage of total number of members.

In light of the above, this paper seeks to investigate the contradictory situation whereby, on the one hand, there is strong evidence of the prevalence of L2 translation in the Brazilian market, while on the other, the discourse of some institutions and the translator training options available seem to reflect the belief that translators (should) only work into their mother tongue. Focusing specifically on the translation of non-literary texts into English, a literature review will be carried out to identify: (a) how the discourse within translation studies vis-a-vis L2 translation has developed over the years; (b) what characteristics of English make it different from other languages when it comes to translation; (c) what issues are addressed in directionality research; and (d) how the data collected can be applied to translator training, especially in Brazil.

Fundamental Concepts

In any area of knowledge, terminology is always changeable, as the creation, acceptance and establishment of new terms is a process of social co-construction involving participants in a given knowledge domain and their interactions with other disciplines (Bhreathnach, 2011, pp. 11–12). When it comes to the terminology related to directionality, there are several options in English: direct/inverse translation or direct/reverse translation; A-B/C translation (based on the language classification traditionally used in interpreting[5]); L1/L2 translation, derived from the terminology used in foreign language teaching; and others. Currently, the two most widely used options in English to refer to translation into a non-native language are *inverse translation*

ATKINSON, Rebecca Frances. *Translation into a Non-Native Language: Practice, Research and Training in Brazil and Around the World*. *Revista Belas Infiéis*, Brasília, v. 10, n. 1, p. 01-20, 2021. e-ISSN: 2316-6614.
DOI: doi.org/10.26512/belasinfieis.v10.n1.2021.35294

and *L2 translation*, with each author or research group tending to adopt one of the two terms, but not always exclusively.

The Croatian researcher Nataša Pavlović (2007, p. 3) is against the use of the terms *direct* and *inverse*, as the latter marks L2 translation as something that runs counter to the "natural" ("direct") direction, thereby reinforcing the "golden rule" of translation into the native language. Another argument against the use of these terms is offered by the Polish scholar Boguslawa Whyatt (2019), who observes that the linguistic preferences and competences of bi/multilingual people tend to vary in different contexts and according to their experience. Agreeing with these positions, I shall adopt the terms "L1/L2 translation".

Another terminological issue that deserves attention is the division of languages into mother tongue or native language versus foreign language. In the field of applied linguistics, this nomenclature has been problematised for decades, especially in the context of teaching English as a foreign language. Since the 1980s, some theorists have posited different classifications of English speakers around the world, which have evolved towards a gradual acceptance of the existence of multiple "Englishes" (Pennycook, 2007) and a rejection of hierarchies headed by the major colonising powers and the richer countries created as a direct result of colonisation. As for the status of the native speaker, several myths have been deconstructed, such as their natural intuitions about grammar and their ability to produce fluent speech spontaneously and to write and speak creatively (Mariño, 2011, p. 136), building up a far more complex picture of language competence than previously imagined (Apfelthaler, 2020, pp. 152–153). Fault lines also appear in the "native" label when marginalised linguistic identities are taken into consideration, such as those of immigrants, children of immigrants and speakers of peripheral language variants (Pokorn, 2005, p. 22). Additionally, it is worth noting that in today's world, there are more bilingual than monolingual individuals (Apfelthaler, 2020, p. 153). Taken together, these factors indicate that any binary classification, such as native/foreign, is an oversimplification of how linguistic competence actually operates in the real world.

In the context of translation, attitudes towards the concepts of native/non-native languages are not consistent. In the market, as we saw with the example of the ATA and the categorisation of working languages by the International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC), L1 translation is still seen as the norm.[6] In the European Union, professionals hired by the European Commission "usually [translate] into their main language" and must have "perfect command of all aspects and stylistic levels of [their] mother

ATKINSON, Rebecca Frances. *Translation into a Non-Native Language: Practice, Research and Training in Brazil and Around the World*. *Revista Belas Infiéis*, Brasília, v. 10, n. 1, p. 01-20, 2021. e-ISSN: 2316-6614.
DOI: doi.org/10.26512/belasinfieis.v10.n1.2021.35294

tongue/main language" and "thorough knowledge" of their other working languages (European Commission, 2020). There is still a preference for the "golden rule", but it is now tempered by recognition that the mother tongue and the main language do not always coincide. In academia, however, few researchers devoted to the empirical study of directionality actually problematise the concepts of foreign vs. native (Apfelthaler, 2020, p. 156), even though, in a world dominated by bi/multilingualism, the unqualified labelling of language users according to acquisition or competence is vulnerable to criticism.

In Brazil, as we have seen, training in L1 translation still seems to prevail in degree and postgraduate diploma courses, reinforcing the generalised belief in the "golden rule". Meanwhile, the institutions closest to the market — SINTRA and ABRATES — are silent on the issue of L2 translation. Among translators themselves, it is common for members of translators' groups on Facebook[7] to post L2 translation queries, which other members discuss and offer solutions for, often indicating many years of practice. Native speakership does not seem to be a decisive factor in the quality of the solutions offered or their reception by their peers. Even so, it is undeniable that there are differences between L1 and L2 translation, especially when the L2 is English, as we will see below.

Translation into English (as an L2)

In the book *In and Out of English: for Better, for Worse*, Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers (2005) focus on the use of English within the European Union. While this may be an exceptional situation — an economic bloc with a parliament and central bank, constituting a *translating institution* (Koskinen, 2008) — much that applies to it is also valid in other contexts. The motivation behind the book was the entrance to the economic bloc of new member states with new languages with few L1 and L2 speakers and the implications of this linguistic influx for the institution, which has always advocated cultural and linguistic diversity (Koskinen, 2008, p. 63).

The second chapter of this book, by Stewart Campbell, deals with a well-known and problematic subject: the linguistic imperialism associated with English. This dominance has been addressed by the social sciences for some decades — an influence which can often be felt as homogenising (the "McDonaldisation" of the world), but which has also catalysed local reactions ("glocalisation") (Kumaravadivelu, 2006, pp. 3–5). This ambiguity, which is felt very strongly Europe, also permeates Brazil, where learning English "as a means of access to the benefits acquired on trips to Miami to see Mickey and Minnie" (Moita Lopes in interview for

Conceição, 2015, pp. 337–338) coexists with a movement to decolonise the teaching of English as a foreign language (Moita Lopes, 2006).

This contradictory situation raises the question of who "owns" the language. In one of the best-known formulations of the use of English around the world, Braj Kachru (1985, as cited in Campbell, 2005, p. 28) conceives of three concentric circles, the most central (and privileged), the *inner circle*, being occupied by the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand, whose populations are seen as "legitimate" speakers of English. But these speakers today are far outnumbered by the speakers of English from other countries, both those where English was imposed during colonisation (*outer circle*) and those who use English as a language of international communication (*expanding circle*) (Braj Kachru, 1985, as cited in Campbell, 2005, p. 28). The fact that English has more L2 than L1 speakers is what makes it globally hegemonic, engendering the ambiguities mentioned above.

In contrast, Portuguese has far less international influence. It is mostly spoken in Brazil, with a population of over 210 million,[8] followed by Portugal, with approximately 11 million inhabitants,[9] and, on a much smaller scale, the nations colonised by this country. If we discount the foreign residents of Portuguese-speaking countries, Portuguese is mainly learned and spoken as an L2 in the Americas by Spanish speakers from South America and the United States (Ferreira & Wiedemann, 2013). In Europe, it does not feature among the six foreign languages most widely offered in secondary education (Eurostat, 2021). To sum up, the language does not have a particularly wide international reach, whose most reliable metric is the number of L2 speakers (Heilbron & Sapiro, 2007, p. 95).

The global status of English vis-a-vis other languages, including Portuguese, gives it some unique characteristics in the context of translation. According to Campbell (2005, p. 29), these are: (a) the global reach of the language and the power relations between the respective speech communities (as outlined above); (b) the fact that translation to/from English is not a neutral technical operation, but is inextricably linked to historical and cultural issues; and (c) the legitimacy of translation to/from English from outside the *inner circle* (of the UK, etc.).

The idea that translation into/out of English is inextricably linked to historical and cultural issues actually applies to every translation. The cultural turn in translation studies[10] has long highlighted the cultural aspects at play in interlinguistic operations, even if studies of this phenomenon have focused mainly on literary translation. More recently, in a deconstruction of the literary/non-literary dichotomy, Margaret Rogers (2015) shed light on the socio-historical construction of language for specific purposes. Quoting the sociologist Steve Fuller, she suggests that belief in the neutrality of scientific language sustains the idea that texts of this nature can be translated naturally, without any agency on the part of the translator. It is a belief that is also refuted by Maeve Olohan and Myriam Salama-Carr (2011), who challenge the view that science and scientific discourse are essentially universal and neutral, arguing for a more nuanced conception of the nature of technical and scientific translation. In this context, it should not be forgotten that English is the language in which most knowledge is circulated around the world, whether in publications on the Internet, where it still eclipses other languages,[11] or in the academic world. Most international academic publishers and journals have English as their default language and work with editors and reviewers whose job it is to ensure that the norms of scientific method and discourse are observed. A manuscript translated into English which does not comply with these standards will have its access to the most influential publications barred, restricting its potential readership (Thompson, 2005).

Growing hand in hand with the global dominance of English is the *expanding circle* (of "other" English speakers), whose legitimacy Campbell (2005) calls for in the context of translation. If English has already ceased to belong solely to the privileged few of the inner circle and has become the lingua franca of the majority in interlingual communications (L1-L2, L2-L2, L2-L3, etc.), the question of *which* English comes into play. This brings us back to the issue of the ambiguity, mentioned above, between the vision of a postcolonial, homogenising English (Phillipson, 1994) and the perception of English as "a language of fluidity and fixity that moves across, while becoming embedded in, the materiality of localities and social relations" (Pennycook, 2007, p. 6). How do these views influence the practice and theorisation of L2 translation into English?

In their discussion of native speakership from a translation perspective, Anderman and Rogers (2005, p. 15) call into question the "cult" still surrounding the concept of the "native", arguably even more so when it comes to English, proposing to reframe it the following terms: "if the variety of English used by the translator or interpreter is appropriate for the target audience, either ideologically . . . or functionally according to the type of text, then the native speaker issue becomes redundant" (Anderman & Rogers, 2005, p. 15). The issue of text types leads us directly to specialised translation, which we will look at here from a functionalist perspective. According to this approach, the success of a translation depends on its meeting the expectations of the target readership, as per the translation brief, which determines the intended purpose (or *Skopos*) of the new text. This will vary according to the type or genre of the source text and its communicative and pragmatic function in translation (Nord, 1997).

There are several classifications suggested in the literature, but the one proposed by Katharina Reiss (as cited in Nord, 1997) serves the purposes of this discussion. According to this threefold classification, the main function of *informative* texts is to convey information about objects and phenomena in the real world. *Expressive* texts, for their part, are marked by their aesthetic content, which can even surpass, in terms of importance, the informative content (for example, in poetry). Meanwhile, *operative* texts stand apart from other text types by the predominance of their extralinguistic effect (Nord, 1997). This has important implications when it comes to translation. For example, the translation of a business report (classified as informative) would be inadequate if it prioritised the aesthetic (expressive) aspects of the source text above its informative content. Similarly, the translation of an advertisement (primarily operative in nature) would fail to fulfil its intended purpose — to boost sales — if it conveyed the information accurately but did not produce the intended extralinguistic effect in the target market.

Bringing this discussion to the ambit of technical and specialised translation, we can see that there are a multitude of situations in which translators whose L2 is English can produce perfectly acceptable L2 translations.[12] First, it is important to bear in mind that acceptability is defined by the reader, who, in the case of globalised English, is multiple in terms of their mastery and use of the language. The readers of a translation in a specialised area of knowledge may only be familiar with the text types characteristic of that area. In this case, an acceptable translation would prioritise the accurate transmission of the informative content and the correct use of specific terminology. More than that — including idiomatic language or lexical items from outside the field of knowledge, for example — could hinder its function. Furthermore, the use of relatively simple syntactic structures would likely be welcome, while the odd linguistic slip may even go unnoticed, provided it does not disrupt the meaning of the text (Adab, 2005).

In view of the above, the use of restricted or controlled English in situations of interlingual communication is now defended in certain contexts (Adab, 2005). In the European Union, guidelines have been adopted with the aim of ensuring the clarity of the texts produced for circulation among the members of the bloc (European Commission, 2010).[13] This consideration becomes even more critical when the text — or translation — is written in English and is embedded in a multilingual context, as is the case of documents accompanying products sold on the global market (Adab, 2005, p. 148). In this situation, the text (or

ATKINSON, Rebecca Frances. *Translation into a Non-Native Language: Practice, Research and Training in Brazil and Around the World*. *Revista Belas Infiéis*, Brasília, v. 10, n. 1, p. 01-20, 2021. e-ISSN: 2316-6614.
DOI: doi.org/10.26512/belasinfieis.v10.n1.2021.35294

translation) may well serve as a basis for other texts or translations; in which case, the fewer the ambiguities and stylistic flourishes, the better.

All of this is very encouraging for any (Brazilian) translator who finds themself in the position of translating into English. The standardisation of language across many areas of knowledge means that bilingual corpora can be harnessed to ensure not just the right terminology, but the correct collocations and most widely used set expressions (Tagnin, 2015). In the case of the translation of specialised texts, when these resources are exhausted, it is often possible to turn directly to the author (or team of authors), who may well be familiar with the specialised language from their area in English (Silva, 2019). It is a resource that professionals translating out of English do not usually have at their disposal.

Another consideration is that Brazilians who translate technical, business and specialised texts into English rarely find themselves in a situation in which they have to create new terms, since a high proportion of such texts have English either as their source language (Adab, 2005, p. 149) or as an intermediate or vehicular language (Heilbron & Sapiro, 2007, p. 96; Koskinen, 2000). Unlike their colleagues who work into Portuguese, who may find themselves facing a lexical gap and having to choose between a loan (foreign word), a calque (foreign word translated literally), a neologism or a form of circumlocution (paraphrasing) (Rogers, 2015, pp. 110–135), the lexical challenge facing translators working into English (as an L1 or L2) is more a matter of finding the original term (usually in English) from which the Portuguese term was translated. It is less a matter of "how should I translate ...?" and more of "what is … in English?". One advantage associated directly with this phenomenon is the number of sources available online for research. In addition to specialised dictionaries and glossaries, there are examples of all manner of text types and genres. One skill that translators must develop, however, in view of this abundance of texts and resources, is how to distinguish which ones are most suitable for the function of the translation at hand.

One possible difficulty associated with this situation is the identification of intertextuality in the source text. In addition to specialised lexical items translated from English, technical and specialised texts in Portuguese (or other languages) may contain longer sentences or entire passages that were originally written in English and which are now incorporated into the source text in a different language, with the source of the English getting lost in this operation, leaving behind just the "flavour" of the original — a phenomenon known as "shining through" (Teich, 2003, as cited in Dai & Xiao, 2011). The ability to identify intertextuality deriving from English in a source text in Portuguese (or another language) is an

ATKINSON, Rebecca Frances. *Translation into a Non-Native Language: Practice, Research and Training in Brazil and Around the World*. *Revista Belas Infiéis*, Brasília, v. 10, n. 1, p. 01-20, 2021. e-ISSN: 2316-6614.
DOI: doi.org/10.26512/belasinfieis.v10.n1.2021.35294

important instrumental competence for any translator responsible for translating non-literary texts into English.

Finally, another resource that translators can turn to is machine translation (MT). Attitudes towards systems such as Google Translate, Bing and DeepL have already progressed from mockery and contempt, common when technologies are in their infancy, and fear that machines are going to take over, putting an end to all human translation activity, to the recognition, albeit circumspect, of their value, opening new horizons for the training, practice and research of translation. In Brazil, MT is already used by companies and other transnational entities,[14] and translators are increasingly being hired to do post-editing,[15] with or without access to the source text.

In academia, the need for scholars to publish in English in order to gain international visibility for their work has prompted some translation studies researchers to look into ways of helping such non-translators develop the skills required to post-edit their own machine-translated texts (Bowker & Ciro, 2019). A study in Spain of the quality of machine-translated texts post-edited by student translators yielded promising results (Sánchez-Gijón & Torres-Hostench, 2014). If courses in post-editing were designed and offered in Brazil, as they already are elsewhere (Arenas & Moorkens, 2019), this would enable Brazilian translators to carry out L2 translation assignments with more confidence.

Research into Directionality and Some Implications for Translator Training

The literature on directionality already encompasses a wide array of research interests and approaches. Data have been published which indicate that L2 translation is no longer the exception, but has become the rule for many translators in some European countries — Poland (Whyatt & Kościuczuk, 2013), Croatia (Pavlović, 2007), Spain (Horcas-Rufián, as cited in Horcas-Rufián & Kelly, 2019; Gallego-Hernández, 2014), Slovenia (Pokorn, 2005) — and around the world (Piróth, 2015). Although L2 translation is inevitable for languages of limited diffusion, it is not only in such settings that it occurs: in the most populous country on the planet, L2 translation is also common, motivated by necessity and by government programs (Wang, 2011). Although there is no literature on the prevalence of L2 translation in Brazil, in a preliminary analysis of data from an online survey carried out by the author in 2021, focusing on translation into English, its prevalence is in line with the data presented in the Table 1.

Translators' attitudes towards L2 translation have also been investigated elsewhere, revealing the paradoxical situation experienced by some professionals who claim to believe in

ATKINSON, Rebecca Frances. *Translation into a Non-Native Language: Practice, Research and Training in Brazil and Around the World*. *Revista Belas Infiéis*, Brasília, v. 10, n. 1, p. 01-20, 2021. e-ISSN: 2316-6614.
DOI: doi.org/10.26512/belasinfieis.v10.n1.2021.35294

the superiority of L1 translation, while simultaneously depending on L2 translation as a major source of income (Pavlović, 2007; Whyatt & Kościuczuk, 2013; Piróth, 2015). In a study of Portuguese translation companies, Fernando Ferreira-Alves (2012) found that while they advocated L1 translation, they nonetheless hired Portuguese translators to produce translations from their L1 into other languages. As for the other actors involved in the translation process, no studies were found on their attitudes with regard to L2 translation.

According to Apfelthaler (2020), aspects of L2 translation that have already been studied include quality assessments and pedagogical issues, particularly in the context of L2 translation into English (Stewart, 2013). However, it is in the realm of empirical-experimental research that most investigations of directionality have been carried out.

In Brazil, this branch of research is increasingly consolidated[16] and already includes some studies on directionality, mostly between Portuguese (L1) and English (L2). The first of these, by Augusto Buchweitz and Fábio Alves (2006), compared the performance (process and product) of two groups of translators with different profiles (novices and translators with some professional experience) in L1-L2 and L2-L1 translation tasks. The variables investigated were the time spent on each phase of the translation process, recursiveness and segmentation. The participants of both groups took longer to perform the L2 translation assignment, which they divided into more segments. Furthermore, the more experienced group performed a greater number of revisions. Replicating this study with a more homogeneous group of ten professional translators, Aline Ferreira (2010, 2013) sought to investigate the influence of time, pauses, recursiveness and segmentation on the translation process, comparing the participants' performance in L1 and L2 translations. Combining the data with think-aloud protocols, it was found that the L2 translation task was more effortful, which was corroborated by a qualitative analysis.

More recently, this same researcher led a study on decision-making in L1 and L2 translation, based on the idea that translation may be seen as a sequence of decision-making activities which depend on different strategies for the successful completion of the task. Using retrospective think-aloud protocols, the metacognitive activity of eight Brazilian translators was investigated as they undertook translations from Portuguese (L1) into English (L2) and vice versa. The expectation that they would demonstrate more verbalisations (indicating issues in the translation process) when performing the L2 translation was not confirmed (Ferreira, Gottardo & Schweiter, 2018).

ATKINSON, Rebecca Frances. *Translation into a Non-Native Language: Practice, Research and Training in Brazil and Around the World. Revista Belas Infiéis*, Brasília, v. 10, n. 1, p. 01-20, 2021. e-ISSN: 2316-6614.
DOI: doi.org/10.26512/belasinfieis.v10.n1.2021.35294

Another researcher, Norma Fonseca (2012), sought to identify differences between the productivity, editing, problem-solving and decision-making of eight professional translators in English-Portuguese and Portuguese-English translations. She identified more periods of "peak performance" in the L1 translations, but when it came to the participants' patterns of behaviour (pauses for problem-solving), the only difference in terms of directionality was what they used the pauses for, and the fact that they made more use of external resources in the L2 translation. In a more recent study with a group of eight professional Brazilian translators, the same scholar found that their translation profile — more precisely, the order in which they performed the different stages of the translation process (production and revision) — changed very little according to the direction of the task (Fonseca, 2015).

It is worth including another study here, this time from Poland, which investigates issues similar to the Brazilian research. Studying a group of professional translators who regularly worked into English (L2), Boguslawa Whyatt (2019) found that there was no significant difference in the time spent performing the tasks into and out of English, which is not consistent with the results of Buchweitz and Alves (2006) and Ferreira (2010, 2013). The fact that the research involved a different language combination and professional translators who regularly did L2 translation may partially explain this discrepancy. The same study also included an assessment of the quality of the translations produced by the participants, finding results which contradict the received wisdom that the quality of an L1 translation is always better than its L2 counterpart.

Coupling the observation of the translation process with the evaluation of the product brings another level of complexity to our understanding the phenomenon of L2 translation. In the case of this last study, it indicates that professionals who do L2 translation into English may develop the same productivity as their colleagues whose L1 is English and produce translations of comparable quality, depending on the text type in question.

In these and other empirical-experimental studies, researchers seek to detail and problematise the resources and methods used and the conclusions inferred from the results, while also explicating the limitations of the study. This is done partly with the aim of enabling them to be replicated by other researchers (Apfelthaler, 2020). It is important to emphasise that even when the results of one study are not confirmed in another, this does not invalidate them; it only demonstrates the complexity of the phenomena involved and the difficulty of creating exactly the same conditions with different human beings, whose levels and types of experience and linguistic and translation competence will inevitably be different, performing different

ATKINSON, Rebecca Frances. *Translation into a Non-Native Language: Practice, Research and Training in Brazil and Around the World*. *Revista Belas Infiéis*, Brasília, v. 10, n. 1, p. 01-20, 2021. e-ISSN: 2316-6614.
DOI: doi.org/10.26512/belasinfieis.v10.n1.2021.35294

translation tasks. Quantitative tools (eye tracking, keystroke logging, screen recording) are used together with qualitative approaches (think-aloud protocols and questionnaires) to triangulate the data, enabling more reliable results and interpretations which take subjective aspects into consideration (Alves, 2001).

The knowledge about directionality generated by researchers using empirical-experimental and other approaches has inspired some translation pedagogy scholars to propose approaches designed to develop translation skills that go beyond bilingual competence alone. Evidence from cognitive studies that translators depend more on instrumental competence when performing L2 translations draws attention to the need for learners to receive guidance in using different sources, search strategies and specialised tools (Marczak, 2018). Furthermore, with the increasing reliability of MT brought by the development of systems based on neural networks (Borges & Pimentel, 2020), the curricula of training courses could include tasks designed to develop trainee translators' competence in post-editing MT output in their L2.

Meanwhile, the evidence (Whyatt, 2019) that a given translator's L2 translation competence may depend on the text type is consistent with Allison Beeby-Lonsdale's (2003) call to incorporate genre literacy into the L2 translator training curriculum. The choice of texts for students of different levels should also be made with caution, as the readability of a given text may not necessarily correspond to its translatability (Pavlovic, 2013). Furthermore, it is important to be mindful of the fact that the same text type may have quite varied characteristics across different languages (Whyatt, 2019).

One way of overcoming these difficulties stems from the observation, made in empirical-experimental studies, that carrying out an L1 translation on a given subject will facilitate the translation of a text on the same subject into an L2 (Ferreira, 2013). This phenomenon — a potential confounding factor in a controlled research setting — could be a boon in the classroom, especially when L2 translation is first being introduced. This, in turn, suggests that approaches which combine L1 and L2 translation may be a more effective way of helping novice translators develop their skills in both directions. Finally, the longer time needed for L2 translations, at least by less experienced translators, could be addressed in the classroom in order to help students develop strategies to deal with this factor in their professional life.

This literature review on translation directionality, focusing on translation into English (L2), was motivated by a concern about the chasm that exists between this practice, so common in the Brazilian market, and the prevalence of an institutional discourse that seems to ignore or reject it, leading to a dearth of training options. In translation studies, the putative superiority of L1 translation has come under increasing scrutiny since the early 2000s. Meanwhile, the hegemony of English, coupled with the mass translation of texts to disseminate information across the globalised world, has raised questions about the unequal status of languages and the effects this has on translation, in terms of both the translation strategies available to translators and their professional practices (Baker, 2013; Venuti, 1995/2008).

Empirical-experimental research has been conducted in a bid to reveal different aspects of directionality, including between Portuguese and English. Some comparative studies on the quality of L1 and L2 translations indicate that directionality is just one of many variables capable of influencing the acceptability of translations, others including the text type and the translator's experience. As for pedagogic issues specific to L2 translation, there is an increasing body of research, in part motivated by regulatory changes (Rodríguez-Inés & Fox, 2018).

In Brazil, the study of directionality is in its infancy and translator training courses at universities still seem to offer few options for practising and reflecting on L2 translation — possibly a legacy of the traditional institutional ties of translation to comparative literature. A notable exception is the aforementioned Experimental Translation Laboratory at the Federal University of Minas Gerais, a pioneer in the study of translation processes, including L2 translation. Meanwhile, in the area of translator training, another unprecedented project is the bachelor's degree in translation at the Federal University of Uberlândia, which set up a non-profit translation agency inside the university, giving students valuable experience in managing and carrying out translation projects into and out of English.

For initiatives of this nature to succeed, they require physical infrastructure, human resources (faculty, technicians) and a guaranteed flow of financial resources over the medium to long term, which in turn requires institutional support. When translation is institutionally weak — often included as part of undergraduate and postgraduate language courses — such ambitious projects are harder to carry out. However, with the development of new IT and communications resources, enabling teams to work together remotely, smaller projects with similar goals that call for fewer resources could be developed, offering the chance for budding translators to gain a more comprehensive training experience in L1 and L2 translation which equips them with the skills and experience they need to enter and thrive in the translation marketplace.

ATKINSON, Rebecca Frances. *Translation into a Non-Native Language: Practice, Research and Training in Brazil and Around the World*. *Revista Belas Infiéis*, Brasília, v. 10, n. 1, p. 01-20, 2021. e-ISSN: 2316-6614.
DOI: doi.org/10.26512/belasinfieis.v10.n1.2021.35294

Acknowledgements

This study was financed in part by Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior — Brasil (CAPES) — Finance Code 001.

REFERENCES

Adab, B. (2005). Translating into a second language: can we, should we? In G. Anderman & M. Rogers (Eds.), *In and Out of English: For Better, For Worse?* (pp. 227–241). Multilingual Matters.

Alves, F. (2001). A triangulação como opção metodológica em pesquisas empírico-experimentais em tradução. In A. Pagano (Ed.), *Metodologias de pesquisa em tradução* (pp. 69–92). FALE/UFMG.

American Translators Association. (2019). *Translation – Getting it Right* (D. Nogueira, K. Semolini & M. Marques, Trad.). https://www.atanet.org/publications/getting_it_right_trans_br.pdf

Anderman, G., & Rogers, M. (2005). English in Europe: For Better, For Worse? In G. Anderman & M. Rogers (Eds.), *In and Out of English: For Better, For Worse?* (pp. 1–26). Multilingual Matters.

Arenas, A. G., & Moorkens, J. (2019). Machine translation and post-editing training as part of a master's programme. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, *31*, 217–238.

Apfelthaler, M. (2020). Directionality. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (3rd ed., pp. 152–155). Routledge.

Baker, M. (2013). Translation as an Alternative Space for Political Action. *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest*, *12*(1), 23–47.

Beeby-Lonsdale, A. (2003). Genre literacy and contrastive rhetoric in teaching inverse translation. In D. Kelly, A. Martín, M.-L. Nobs, D. Sánchez & C. Way (Eds.), *La direccionalidad en traducción e interpretación: perspectivas teóricas, profesionales y didácticas* (pp. 155-166). Atrio.

Bhreathnach, Ú. (2011). *A Best-Practice Model for Term Planning* [Doctoral dissertation, Dublin City University].

Borges, T. M., & Pimentel, J. M. M. (2020). Avaliação humana da tradução automática de combinações lexicais especializadas: o caso do Google Translate e do DeepL. *Belas Infiéis*, *9*(4), 21–43.

Bowker, L., & Ciro, J. B. (2019). *Machine Translation and Global Research: towards improved machine translation literacy in the scholarly community*. Emerald Publishing.

Buchweitz, A., & Alves, F. (2006). Cognitive Adaptation in Translation: an interface between language direction, time, and recursiveness in target text production. *Letras de Hoje*, *41*(2), 241–272.

Campbell, S. (2005). English Translation and Linguistic Hegemony in the Global Era. In G. Anderman & M. Rogers (Eds.), *In and Out of English: For Better, For Worse?* (pp. 27–38). Multilingual Matters.

Chernov, G. V. (1999). Simultaneous interpretation in Russia: Development of Research and Training. *Interpreting*, *4*(1), 41-54.

Conceição, C. Z. S. (2015). Linguística aplicada indisciplinar – entrevista com o Prof. Dr. Luis Paulo da Moita Lopes (UFRJ). *Grau Zero – Revista de Crítica Cultural*, *3*(2), 333–340.

Comissão Europeia. (2010). *Redigir com Clareza*. Serviço das Publicações da União Europeia. http://publications.europa.eu/resource/cellar/725b7eb0-d92e-11e5-8fea-01aa75ed71a1.0023.03/DOC_1

Comissão Europeia. (26 Oct. 2020). *Translator profile*. https://ec.europa.eu/info/jobs-european-commission/working-eu/translator-profile_en

Costa, P. R. (2018). *A formação de tradutores em instituições de educação superior públicas brasileiras: uma análise documental* [Doctoral dissertation, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina]. https://repositorio.ufsc.br/handle/123456789/188094

Dai, G., & Xiao, R. (2011). “SL shining through” in translational language: a corpus-based study of Chinese translation of English passives. *Translation Quarterly*, *62*, 85–108.

Eurostat. (24 Apr. 2021). *Foreign language learning statistics*. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Foreign_language_learning_statistics#Upper_secondary_education

Ferreira, A. A. (2010). *Direcionalidade em tradução: uma investigação do processamento cognitivo de tradutores profissionais em tradução direta e inversa no par linguístico inglês-português* [Master’s thesis, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais]. http://hdl.handle.net/1843/LETR-8SVNBP

Ferreira, A. A. (2013). *Direcionalidade em Tradução: O Papel da Subcompetência Bilíngue em Tarefas de Tradução L1 e L2* [Doctoral dissertation, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais]. http://hdl.handle.net/1843/MGSS-9BLN48

Ferreira, A. A., Gottardo, A., & Schweiter, J. W. (2018). Decision-making processes in direct and inverse translation through retrospective protocols. *Translation, Cognition & Behavior*, *1*(1), 98–118.

Ferreira, M., & Wiedemann, L. (2013). Guest Editors’ Note. *Portuguese Language Journal*, *7*. http://ensinoportugues.org/archives/archived-articles/

Ferreira-Alves, F. (2012). Translation Companies in Portugal. *Anglo Saxonica*, *3*(3), 232–263.

Fonseca, N. B. L. (2012). *Padrões Prototípicos de Segmentação na descompactação e recompactação de unidades de tradução em tarefas de tradução direta e inversa* [Master's thesis, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais]. http://hdl.handle.net/1843/LETR-96NRFX

Fonseca, N. B. L. (2015). Directionality in translation: Investigating prototypical patterns in editing procedures. *Translation & Interpreting*, *7*(1), 111–125.

Gallego-Hernández, D. (2014). A vueltas con la traducción inversa especializada en el ámbito profesional. Un estudio basado en encuestas. *Trans*, *18*, 229–238.

Heilbron, J., & Sapiro, G. (2007). Outline for a Sociology of Translation. In M. Wolf & A. Fukari (Eds.), *Constructing a Sociology of Translation* (pp. 93–105). John Benjamins.

Horcas-Rufián, S. & Kelly, D. (2019). Inverse (A-B/C) translation education in Spain under the EHEA. *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, *28*(2), 300–319.

Hurtado Albir, A. (2017). *Researching translation competence by PACTE group*. John Benjamins.

Koskinen, K. (2000). Institutional Illusions. *The Translator*, *6*(1), 49–65.

Koskinen, K. (2008). *Translating Institutions: an ethnographic study of EU translation*. Routledge.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). A linguística aplicada na era da globalização. In L. P. Moita Lopes (Ed.), *Por uma linguística aplicada indisciplinar* (pp. 128–148). Parábola.

Marczak, M. (2018). Translation Pedagogy in the Digital Age: How digital technologies have been altering translator education. *Digital Subjectivities*, *7*, 1–19.

Mariño, C. (2011). Reflecting on the dichotomy native-non native speakers in an EFL context. *Anagramas - Rumbos y Sentidos de La Comunicación*, *10*(19), 129–142.

Moita Lopes, L. P. (2006). Uma linguística aplicada mestiça e ideológica: interrogando o campo como linguista aplicado. In L. P. Moita Lopes (Ed.), *Por uma linguística aplicada indisciplinar* (pp. 13–42). Parábola.

Newmark, P. (1987). *A Textbook of Translation*. Longman.

Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity*. St. Jerome Publishing.

Olohan, M., & Salama-Carr, M. (2011) Translating Science, *The Translator*, *17*(2), 179–188.

Pavlović, N. (2007). Directionality in Translation and Interpreting Practice: Report on a questionnaire survey in Croatia. *FORUM Revue Internationale d'interprétation et de*

Traduction / International Journal of Interpretation and Translation, *5*(2), 79–99.

Pavlovic, T. (2013). Exploring Directionality in Translation Studies. *ExELL (Explorations in English Language and Linguistics)*, *2*, 149–165.

Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*. Routledge.

Phillipson, R. (1994). English language spread policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *107*, 7–24.

Piróth, A. (2015). *Translation into a non-native language – IAPTI's survey*. *January 2014–2015*. https://www.iapti.org/files/surveys/2/IAPTI_non-native_report.pdf.

Pokorn, N. (2005). *Challenging the Traditional Axioms: Translation into a non-mother tongue*. John Benjamins.

Rodríguez-Inés, P., & Fox, O. (2018). Reconciling Institutional and Professional Requirements in the Specialised Inverse Translation Class – A Case Study. *Meta*, *63*(1), 47–71.

Rogers, M. (2015). *Specialised Translation: shedding the non-literary tag*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Sánchez-Gijón, P., & Torres-Hostench, O. (2014). MT post-editing into the mother tongue or into a foreign language? Spanish-to-English MT translation output post-edited by translation trainees. In S. O'Brien, M. Simard & L. Speccia (Eds.), *Third Workshop on Post-editing Techniques and Practices* (The 11th Conference of the Association for Machine Translation in the Americas – Vancouver, 22–26 Oct.). http://www.amtaweb.org/AMTA2014Proceedings/AMTA2014Proceedings_PEWorkshop_final.pdf

Silva, I. A. L. (2019). An interactional expertise-based approach to specialized inverse translation. *Tradução em Revista*, *26*(1), 86–98.

Stewart, D. (2013). From Pro Loco to Pro Globo Translating into English for an International Readership. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, *7*(2), 217–234.

Tagnin, S. E. O. (2015). A Linguística de corpus na e para a tradução. In V. Vianna & S. E. O. Tagnin (Orgs.), *Corpora na tradução* (pp. 19–56). Hub Editorial.

Thompson, J. B. (2005). *Books in the Digital Age: The Transformation of Academic and Higher Education Publishing in Britain and the United States*. Polity.

Venuti, L. (2008). *The Translator's Invisibility: a history of translation*. Routledge. (Original work published 1995)

Wang, B. (2011). Translation Practices and the Issue of Directionality in China. *Meta*, *56*(4), 896–914.

Whyatt, B. (2019). In search of directionality effects in the translation process and in the end product. *Translation, Cognition & Behavior*, *2*(1), 79–100.

Whyatt, B. & Kościuczuk, T. (2013). Translation into a non-native language: the double life of the native-speakership axiom. *mTm Translation Journal*, *5*, 60–79.

[1] In Brazil, postgraduate diploma courses in translation have a strong practical component, as opposed to master's courses, which are academic and research-oriented. The legislation governing the former requires them to offer a minimum of 360 teaching hours and students to write a monograph or produce a final assignment.
[2] Retrieved October, 31, 2020, from http://www.cce.puc-rio.br/sitecce/website/website.dll/folder?nCurso=traducao-(ingles-(traco)-portugues):-formacao-para-o-mercado-de-trabalho&nInst=cce
[3] Retrieved October, 31, 2020, from https://www.posgraduacaocandidomendes.com.br/pos-graduacao-a-distancia/traducao-ingles-portugues/193
[4] Retrieved October, 31, 2020, from https://www.posestacio.com.br/pos-graduacao-a-distancia/traducao-de-ingles/1242/50#area-titulo-curso
[5] AIIC (International Association of Conference Interpreters) classifies the working languages of conference interpreters into active languages (into which they may work) and passive languages (out of which they may work). There are two active language categories, A and B, with the A language being the interpreter's native language (or another language strictly equivalent to a native language) and the B language being a language of which the interpreter has "perfect command". As for passive languages (C languages), interpreters must have a "complete understanding" of them. Retrieved October, 18, 2020, from https://aiic.org/document/4256/Regulation%20governing%20admissions%20and%20language%20classification%20-%20ENG.pdf
[6] In contrast, A-B and B-A interpreting has had a long tradition in Russia and Eastern Europe since the formation of the USSR (Chernov, 1999).
[7] Three very active groups are "Tradutores, Intérpretes e Curiosos", "Tradutores / Intérpretes" and "Tradutor ajuda Tradutor".
[8] Retrieved August, 9, 2020, from https://www.ibge.gov.br/apps/populacao/projecao
[9] Retrieved August, 9, 2020, from https://www.ine.pt/xportal/xmain?xpid=INE&xpgid=ine_main.
[10] See, for example: Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *The Turns of Translation Studies*. John Benjamins.
[11] Retrieved April, 29, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Languages_used_on_the_Internet
[12] There are several definitions of acceptability (and adequacy) in the translation studies literature. Here, I have adopted the definition of acceptability proposed by the Spanish research group PACTE, according to which an acceptable translation "effectively communicates the meaning of the source text; fulfils the function of the translation (within the context of the translation brief, readers' expectations, genre conventions in the target culture); and makes appropriate use of language") (Hurtado Albir, 2017, p. 119).
[13] These guidelines stem from the Plain English movement, which began in the 1970s. The aim is to make texts from technical and specialised areas understandable and accessible to non-specialists.
[14] An international NGO for which I provide translation services has to send its press releases on sensitive issues to the head office to receive approval before they are published. They now use machine translation for this purpose.
[15] Information retrieved from a discussion on the Facebook group "Tradutores, Intérpretes e Curiosos".
[16] At the Federal University of Minas Gerais, researchers from the Experimental Translation Laboratory (LETRA) have been generating knowledge on this area since 2000, in collaboration with researchers from the same branch of translation studies at institutions around the world. http://letra.letras.ufmg.br/letra/index.xml