

# Applying Innovative Translation Approaches In Efl Teaching To Enhance Academic Lyceum Learners' Communicative Competence

Nargiza Yusupova

PhD student, International Nordic University, Uzbekistan

**Received:** 17 August 2025; **Accepted:** 13 September 2025; **Published:** 15 October 2025

**Abstract:** Translation has traditionally been viewed as a secondary or outdated method in foreign language classrooms. However, recent research highlights that innovative approaches to translation can significantly enhance learners' communicative competence, particularly in context where English is taught as a foreign language (EFL). This article explores how translation, when applied through innovative methods such as communicative translation, back-translation, dynamic equivalence, and translanguaging integration can become a powerful pedagogical tool. The paper outlines theoretical foundations, provides classroom strategies, and demonstrates the pedagogical implications of integrating translation into modern foreign language teaching.

**Keywords:** Peter Newmark's translation methods, communicative translation, free translation, semantic translation, adaptation, communicative competence, foreign language teaching, translanguaging.

**Introduction:** The rapid globalization of education and communication requires learners not only to acquire linguistic accuracy but also to develop communicative competence – the ability to use language appropriately in various real life-contexts (Hymes, 1972; Canale and Swain, 1980). While traditional communicative approaches emphasize interaction, translation is often marginalized. Yet, innovative translation methods can serve as effective bridges between linguistic form and communicative function. This article argues that translation, when redefined and innovatively applied, is not an outdated relic of Grammar-Translation Method, but a modern pedagogical strategy for fostering communicative competence. Translation methods are proposed by Peter Newmark, who first puts forward that texts should be divided into expressive, informative and vocative texts and distinguishes semantic translation and communicative translation based on this. The traditional semantic translation focuses on the source text, the formation of it and the intention of the source text producer. It often suits expressive text, authoritative documents, technical texts and those emphasizing the thoughts and emotion of the author without much consideration for the

readers. While the communicative translation focuses on the reader and aims to produce the same effect. The emphasis of the Communicative Translation Theory is on the vocative texts such as advertisement, public signs, news and so on, thus it not only analyzes the words of the source text but also the readers of the target text so as to achieve the best translation.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Translation having attracted wide publicity can be traced back to the end of the 1960s when many scholars were at odds over literal translation or liberal translation. From the perspective of Peter Newmark, "the argument was theoretical: the purpose of the translation, the nature of the readership, the type of text, was not discussed." [5], and there should not be one suitable method for all types of text analysis. He pointed out: "semantic translation is for 'expressive' texts, communicative for 'vocative' texts" and the translator should take the translator's purpose, the nature of readership and text typology into account".

What's more, Newmark took a unique perspective on the study of translation and his translation theory has its own distinctive characteristics. He always emphasized the close connection of translation theory

and practice. However, scholars and translators have different judgments on his translation theory. Translation researchers in the west made an overall evaluation of Newmark's translation approach:

Eugene A. Nida, the developer of the Dynamic-equivalence Bible-translation theory, stated in the fore word of *Approaches to Translation: Semantic and Communicative translating* is Newmark's major contribution to the translation field.

German professor, Wolfram Wilss, one of the representatives of translation field, he relegated Newmark's translation theory to the text-linguistic approach because he maintained that translator must use specific translation strategies to deal with specific text-type.

Roger T. Bell [7], well known in the field of linguistics and translation studies for his book *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*, indicated that Newmark didn't use the concept "theory" appropriately and that what Newmark advocated was a summarization of superficial common sense of translation.

Jeremy Munday, a professor in Spanish and translation studies at the University of Leeds, criticized Newmark's strong prescriptivism and his language of evaluation deviated from his "prelinguistic era" of translation studies, but at the same time, he acknowledged that examples in Newmark's works provided ample guidance and advice for the trainee [2].

Another famous interpreter scholar, Sergio Viaggio holds the opinion that Newmark's theory is a wrong and didactically dangerous one for the reason that Newmark refused to distinguish linguistic semantic meaning from extra-linguistic sense while Viaggio regards sense as the aim of translation.[8]

Hatim& Mason declares that the benefits of Newmark's Communicative and Semantic Translation Theory over Nida's Formal and Dynamic Equivalence Theory is that the former is not inclined to extremism so that the translator can choose in between but is not always inclined to be in one side. [1]

## METHODOLOGY

This research employed mixed-methods aimed at exploring how innovative translation approaches integrating with translanguaging can improve academic lyceum learners' communicative competence in teaching English. The study was conducted over a 12-week period in an academic lyceum in Tashkent involving a purposive sample of 24 first-year students (ages 16–17) with an intermediate level (B1) of English proficiency, as determined by an internal diagnostic test. The research integrated translanguaging to build

skills in mediation, critical thinking, and flexible communication, while translation methods were used for collaborative activities such as interviewing, role-playing, translating science-related, real-life texts, idioms, proverbs, and subtitling short video clips. To evaluate the impact of these strategies on students' communicative competence, both quantitative and qualitative data were collected. The quantitative data included results from pre- and post-tests designed to measure speaking fluency, grammatical accuracy, terminology use, translation appropriateness. These tests were scored using CEFR-aligned rubrics. Qualitative data were gathered through students' translation samples, diaries, classroom observations, teacher/peer feedback notes, and audio/video recordings of tasks. The triangulation of multiple data sources helped to ensure the reliability and validity of the findings. Data analysis involved descriptive statistics and paired-sample t-tests to assess measurable improvement, while thematic analysis was used to identify emerging patterns and student attitudes toward the translation methods. All ethical considerations were followed during the study. Participants' identities remained anonymous, their participation was voluntary, and the data were collected solely for research purposes. The overall aim of this methodology was to develop academic lyceum learners' communicative competence in English through the purposeful use of translation methods that combine linguistic accuracy with communicative effectiveness, particularly in the context of exact sciences education.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of data collected throughout the 12-week action research cycle revealed meaningful improvements in the students' communicative competence as a result of the innovative translation approaches integrating translanguaging in exact sciences context. Quantitative data from the pre- and post-tests were analyzed using descriptive statistics and paired-sample t-tests to measure students' development in four key areas: speaking fluency, grammatical accuracy, terminology use, and translation appropriateness. The mean scores increased significantly in all categories. For instance, the average score for speaking fluency improved from 2.9 to 4.1, and grammatical accuracy rose from 2.7 to 4.3, both on a five-point CEFR- based rubric. These improvements were statistically significant with p-values less than 0.01. Students showed greater control over terminology use, vocabulary use, and the ability to translate ideas according to the context in both oral and written tasks. In particular, students' use of discourse markers, topic transitions, and audience-

appropriate language improved in their speaking responses, while their written outputs displayed stronger argumentation and clarity. The qualitative data reinforced these findings. Classroom observations showed increased student engagement and confidence in communicating in English. Translanguaging served as a dynamic space for students to give peer feedback, and collaboratively create texts without challenges.

Student journals and a post-study questionnaire revealed that learners appreciated the interactive, creative, and flexible translation methods. The triangulation of quantitative and qualitative data provides strong evidence that translation methods, when thoughtfully implemented, can serve as a powerful strategy to develop communicative skills in academic lyceum settings.

**Table 1. Pre- and Post-Test Scores on Communicative Competence Components (N = 24)**

| Component       | Pre-Test<br>Mean-Score | Post-Test<br>Mean-Score | Mean<br>Gain | Significance<br>(p-value) |
|-----------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Speaking        | 2.9                    | 4.1                     | +1.2         | p < 0.01                  |
| Fluency         |                        |                         |              |                           |
| Grammatical     | 2.7                    | 4.3                     | +1.6         | p < 0.01                  |
| Accuracy        |                        |                         |              |                           |
| Terminology     | 3.0                    | 4.1                     | +1.1         | p < 0.01                  |
| Use             |                        |                         |              |                           |
| Translation     | 2.8                    | 4.0                     | +1.2         | p < 0.01                  |
| Appropriateness |                        |                         |              |                           |

\*Note: Scores are based on CEFR-aligned 5-point rubrics. Statistical analysis used paired-sample t-tests.

## DISCUSSION

The findings of this study support the growing body of research that innovative translation approaches when thoughtfully implemented can significantly enhance communicative competence among English language learners. The integration of translanguaging provided not only increased exposure to the English language but also allowed students to engage in meaningful, interactive, and personalized learning experiences. The quantitative improvement in learners' performance across all four areas—speaking fluency, grammatical accuracy, terminology use, and translation appropriateness—indicates that translation learning environments offer more opportunities for students to use the language in authentic context, and reflect on their progress. Translation methods such as back translation, dynamic equivalence facilitated structured yet flexible task management and enabled teacher-student and peer interaction beyond the classroom walls. This constant access to materials and feedback appears to have had a direct influence on learner responsibility and self-monitoring. Meanwhile, communicative translation encouraged creativity and risk taking in communication tasks, allowing students to visually and collaboratively construct meaning in less pressurized environments. One key insight from the qualitative data is that students felt more confident in using English for communication as the translanguaging reduced the fear of making mistakes in front of their peers. This suggests that innovative translation strategies also support effective factors of language learning, such as motivation and self-esteem—critical in the development of communicative

competence. Furthermore, student reflections showed that the multimodal nature of translation tasks (text, video, audio, and images) supported different learning styles and helped deepen language comprehension and expression. However, the study also revealed certain limitations. Some students initially struggled with translating scientific texts including terminology use or lacked vocabulary in exact science context. While these issues were managed over time, they point to broader infrastructural and training needs if translation method is to be sustained and scaled effectively in the context of academic lyceums in Uzbekistan. Additionally, the study focused on one group of learners in a specific setting, so the results may not be generalizable without further replication in other contexts and with larger samples.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the present study provides compelling evidence that innovative translation approaches, incorporating translanguaging can significantly improve the communicative competence of academic lyceum learners. The integration of translanguaging provided not only increased exposure to the English language but also allowed students to engage in meaningful, interactive, and personalized learning experiences. The measurable gains in speaking and writing proficiency, coupled with increased student engagement and positive attitudes toward learning, underscore the value of translation methodologies in English language teaching. These findings contribute to the existing literature by offering a practical model of modern translation methods tailored to the needs of lyceum students in Uzbekistan. They also highlight the

importance of teacher readiness, and appropriate task design for all levels of learners in achieving communicative learning outcomes through modern translation strategies. As education systems continue to grow up, this study affirms that modern translation approaches can serve as a bridge between traditional instruction and present English language teaching.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Hatim,B.& Mason,I. Discourse and the Translator [M]. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001.
2. Jeremy, Munday. Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications [M]. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001.
3. Liao Qiyi. Contemporary Translation Studies in the UK[M]. Hubei: Hubei Education Press, 2014.
4. Lin Xiaoqin. Newmark's Semantic Translation and Communicative Translation [J]. Chinese Translators Journal. (1987(01): 50-51).
5. Newmark, Perter. A Text Book of Translation [M]. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001.
6. Newmark, Perter. Approaches to Translation [M]. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001.
7. RogerT. Bell. Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice [M]. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 2001.
8. Wang Lina. An Eclectic and Ethical Approach to Translation --Newmark's Translation Theory Reexamined [D]. Shanghai: Fudan University, 2009.
9. Wang Zongyan. Newmark's Translation Theory and Translation Skill [J]. Chinese Translators Journal, 1982(1):11-17.
10. Xu Cuimin, Liu Zequan. Culturally-loaded Words in Hong Lou Meng and Their Translations in Its Three English Versions[J]. Educational Research on Foreign Languages and Arts, 2008(3):