Abstract: In this paper, I will discuss the idea of teachers as knowledge translators, not in a pedagogical or didactical sense, but in a “professional” one. A professional practice is supposed to be theoretically informed by academic research. In the name of effectiveness and efficiency, current policies in teaching and higher education repeatedly ask for research-based practices that legitimize the adoption of an instrumental view of knowledge. This tends to reduce knowledge to "informational goods”, where knowledge is detached from the context in which it was produced and becomes a commodity that can be mobilized by the researcher or the teacher at any time. This instrumental conception of knowledge is based on the idea that language is a direct and transparent vehicle of thought. But this idea fail to recognize that language endlessly translates and produces new meanings, which implies that “knowledge users” have a responsibility with regards to the meaning they give to the researches, policy documents or professional accounts they are “mobilizing” for practice. In this presentation, I will discuss this translation framework, using fruitful ideas developed in the field of translation studies. Then I will put the framework to work through the analysis of concrete, and somewhat unfortunate, translations that Donald Schöns’s influent work on reflective practice underwent. These observations lead to an exploration of some concrete implications of an ethic of translation, which would require fostering some translational dispositions in teachers and the creation of translational spaces for teachers’ “professional development”.

INTRODUCTION

As others have argued before, teachers’ work is in some regards comparable to the work of translators. Translators are in a similar delicate position between having to preserve the meaning of a source text while having to adapt it in order to take the target language’s specificities into account. Literal translations generally fail to give a real sense of the meaning of the source text because each language has different ways of expressing similar ideas and none can convey everything that the source text could potentially express. This is the reason why many translation scholars prefer to conceive of the work of translation as creative work (“œuvre”). In his famous essay on the task of the translator, Walter Benjamin argues that translation is not the transmission of an original text but its realisation: a translation constitutes
the transformation and renewal of a living thing and creates a new system of signs that does not imitate the original but complements it.¹

Some philosophers of education have been reflecting on the translational nature of teachers’ work. Dobson for example is interested in what translation pedagogy has to offer for developing elementary and secondary school pedagogy.² He argues that “translators of knowledge, events and experiences are to be understood as facilitators rather than instructors, and together with pupils they collaborate in learning and the making of meaning in acts of translation.”³ In other words, teaching as translation is less about transmitting accurately than about adapting to students and facilitating their learning and discovery through feedback and guidance.⁴ Translation here is understood as a pedagogical approach. Higgins and Burbules explore in a similar direction.⁵ According to them, teaching resembles an act of translation because it functions through reformulation, explanation, elaboration, etc., the purpose of which is not to transmit information with closed meaning, but rather to participate “in the ongoing line of thought” and to leave students the possibility to participate in the elaboration of new meanings.⁶

In this paper, I would like to expand on this metaphor and develop the idea of teachers as knowledge translators, not in a pedagogical or didactical sense, but in a “professional” one. A professional practice is supposed to be theoretically informed by academic research. In the name of effectiveness and efficiency, current policies in teaching and higher education repeatedly ask for research-based practices that legitimize the adoption of an instrumental view of knowledge. This tends to reduce knowledge to "informational goods": an "input" that can be optimized for a better "output" to ensure the performativity of the system. Knowledge is detached from the context in which it was produced and becomes a commodity that can be mobilized by the researcher or the teacher at any time. This instrumental conception of knowledge is based on the idea that language is a direct and transparent vehicle of thought. It assumes that it is possible to extract a research’s meaning and to communicate it clearly and transparently, in such a way that it will be received perfectly intact. It assumes that if the message is distorted when it is received, it must be because there was a defect in the transfer process. But language is not a transparent vehicle of thought, it endlessly translates and produces new meanings, which implies that “knowledge users” have a responsibility with regards to the meaning they give to the researches, policy documents or professional accounts they are “mobilizing” for practice.

In the following pages, I develop a translation framework borrowing fruitful ideas developed in the field of translation studies. I then put this framework to work through the analysis of concrete, and somewhat unfortunate, translations that Donald Schön’s influential work on reflective practice underwent. These observations lead to an exploration of some concrete implications of an ethic of translation, which would require fostering some translational dispositions in teachers and the realization of a distinctively pedagogical language.
SOME CONSIDERATIONS ON TRANSLATION

The translation perspective seems particularly fruitful because it attends directly to the very functioning of language in the process of interpreting theories and transforming them into practices. The translation approach is based on a particular conception of language, largely inspired by Jacques Derrida and his critique of Saussure's conception of logic of the sign, according to which the sign has as a closed structure, comprising a signifier and a signified. On the contrary, signs are always open to new meanings, to new appropriations, and thus to transformation. As Paul Standish puts it: “Derrida reveals the way in which any utterance, any sign, is characterized by dissemination, iterability and the structure of the trace.” Dissemination refers to the fact that the destination of a sign is unpredictable in the same way as the dissemination of seeds. Iterability means that it is in the nature of signs to be repeated and that this repetition makes their reception and interpretation uncontrollable. The notion of trace refers to the fact that any sign bears the traces of past meanings, and since we cannot know all the past uses of a sign, it is impossible to retrace a so called essential meaning. We cannot fully master language. But this lack of control and certainty is not to be regretted. Rather, it is an essential aspect of language, and it opens the possibility of creating new meanings in the future, and the possibility of natality.

There has been a dominant view among translation scholars to consider the difference produced through translation is necessarily a defect to be controlled and that this defect comes from ancillary position of any translation. This view has been challenged by several scholars such as Henri Meschonic and Antoine Berman who elaborated theories of translation inspired by Benjamin and the German tradition as a creative act of writing in its own right. According to Meschonic, for example, the idea of restitution opposes the original and the translation, which limits the meaning of an always plurivocal text to monosemy, that is to say to a unique meaning. Translation, he claims, is an exercise in language, and also the realisation of an “œuvre” (artwork). Both dimensions of work and art are important here. This is also the word Berman uses, following Derrida, to describe the ultimate principle of translation as an ethical task, because there is no good translation without attentive work and there is no good translation without the creation of a third language that transcends the source and target languages: the translation should leave traces of the forgotten layers of meaning in the text and these imports should enrich the new language.

Translation studies contributed to the development of analytic tools that enable the understanding of the inter-discursive processes inherent to the translator’s work. Translating is a delicate task. Traditional accounts of translation rely on notions of linguistic equivalence and ideas of gain and loss, but new attention to translation in postcolonial contexts for example have helped sensitize translators to the reality of an in-between space of translation. Rainer Grutman coined the term heterolinguism to define the presence in a text of multiple languages. Many cultures and citizens live between languages and this necessarily
complicates the translation work. In the bilingual city of Montreal, for example, “La Main” is a fairly common way of calling one of the city’s main arteries: Saint-Laurent avenue. This comes from the time when English was the dominant language, but is sometimes used by French speaking people, especially of an older generation, to refer to the avenue. In French, “main” generally means “hand”, so if one says “Je vais sur la Main”, it would literally mean: “I’m going on the Hand”. But clearly what would be meant is “I’m going on Main Street”, and of course this has deep historical connotations. This example shows the complex nature of translation, the layers of meaning that history and context brings in an in-between language.

Translation scholars have also pointed out how this in-between reality creates renewed spaces of indecisiveness for the translator. When walking in the street of Montreal, and reading the word PAIN on a wall, how should we translate? “Pain” in French means “bread”. Is someone asking for bread? Is someone in pain? Or is it both? This anecdotal remark helps reconfigure our relationship with signs: there is no clearly opposed source language and target language, only in-between spaces of constant indecisiveness that call for the realisation of a third language. The meaning one shall give should be influenced by many factors such as prior knowledge (I know about the historical bilingual reality of Montreal); incidents that happened on that day (there was a bread distribution event earlier that day); health or state of mind (My back hurts); the way the text was introduced (someone told me we were going to the bakery), but one should also try to transcend them in order to open the possibility of realizing a third language.

I want to make the case for an approach to teaching as translation as a way to put forward the posture of the teacher as a mediator between past meanings that circulate among teachers, and meanings that still remain possible and for which they have a responsibility. This requires taking a distance from theoretical work and attending to the translations themselves, to their modes of enunciation, their interdiscursivity, through heterolinguism. It is interesting to analyse translation processes empirically, because it allows us to see that these processes are far from being linear and also very unpredictable. We mistakenly tend to take the meaning of the concepts we use for granted. As translators, perhaps we should rather assume the responsibility of defining different possible meaning and consider their educative value.

REFLECTIVE PRACTICE LOST IN TRANSLATION

Saying that a teacher needs to reflect on his practice does not say much about the content of his or her reflection. The concept of reflective practice acts as a substrate that is open to new assignations of meaning (or translation) in a particularly obvious way. It could denote a spontaneous action, an organized intervention, teachers’ general work or more specifically their work as a professional practice (as one could speak of a medical practice). In a more abstract sense, reflective practice could also denote a practice, in
opposition to theory, and there more than ever, the concept would act as an undefined substrate, the meaning of which is endlessly slipping from our hands.

There is no doubt that Donald Schön has had a crucial role in the assignation of meaning that penetrated the world of education in the 1990’s. In The reflective Practitioner, published in 1983, he criticizes professional education for relying exclusively on a positivist epistemology. He shows that an important part of a professional’s knowledge comes directly from practice and not science. He asserts that practitioners are not executants nor experts who resolve predetermined problems, but that on the contrary, they are constantly committed to improvisation whenever they seek creative and spontaneous solutions for each situation. In order not to fall into habits or routines, they must reflect on their work during the action and after the action and constantly build on their experience.

Although this conception of reflective practice is stimulating and useful, it has been criticized widely since its inception. For example, Maurice Tardif argues that Schön’s reflective practice evacuates longstanding and valuable traditions of thought, and its fixation in a reductive model in teacher education programs is deplorable. Schön’s framework is essentially cognitive, individual and private: it excludes the dimensions of reflection as a social experience, as inter-subjective, and as a critique of ideology and domination. In sum it excludes all social or political considerations from the teacher’s work. Moreover, the focus on individual reflectivity also poses fundamental epistemological and normative problems. Ben Kotzee argues that any individual practice is always already socially constituted, and that there is therefore no individual practice on which it is possible to reflect. He adds that even if it was possible to conceive of an entirely private practice based solely on one’s own experiences, it would still fail to recognize another fundamental social dimension of teaching, which stems from the fact that teaching is essentially a normative practice. It is not enough for a teacher to reflect on his or her practice, that reflection still needs to be oriented in a certain direction.

Despite criticisms, Schön’s conception of reflective practice has been tremendously influential in education and has undergone further processes of translation. The most determinant translation is primarily visible in the latest curricular reform for teacher education. The capacity for reflective practice is now a requirement, actually it is one of the central competences that the teacher needs to develop in order to be a good professional and is defined as “knowing how to reflect methodically, using well-defined objectives, frameworks, and tools in order to enhance one’s practice.” This definition already shows a certain tendency to instrumentalize reflective practice as a tool for teacher effectiveness, leaving aside many other ways of understanding its meaning.

A concrete “practical” translation can be found in the increasingly popular use of portfolios in teaching and teacher education: a collection of a teacher’s best work that testify to his or her accomplishments, for example lesson plans, course plans, student works, teacher’s notes regarding these
documents. According to Georgette Goupil, an influential Quebec researcher, portfolios are a great tool for developing reflective practice because they provide a cognitive and organizational structure that give teachers a framework to help them reflect on their experiences. In describing how to use portfolios purposefully, Goupil explains that good organization is crucial: the content should be chosen according to clear predefined criteria that stem from the competences to be acquired otherwise the portfolio could simply become a storage device. Clearly, going back to reflect on past experiences is important for any form of practice and reflecting on whether we reached our objectives is relevant. That is not to put into question. What is more puzzling here is how portfolios have been created as a form of reflective device or apparatus that can become overly constraining. The use of portfolios has been widely theorized and researched, it has taken many forms, and to some extent it is possible to say that it has acquired a life of its own. If, as I said, it is clear that this type of framing is useful in order to organise and structure teachers’ reflection, it can also be said that such a tool can easily limit possibilities of (reflective) thought. Reflective practice, even in Schön’s view, has dimensions of spontaneity, of creativity, as well as criticism. In predefining material to include in the portfolio through criteria and competence requirements, portfolios accentuate values of conformity, servility and order. Those aspects that do not fit in the predefined structure of the portfolio are excluded from expected patterns of reflection. The teacher enters a closed verification process.

The distinction drawn by Roland Barthes between “écrivant” (a writer writing, who fulfils a function) and an “écrivain” (a writer, who accomplishes an activity) can be illuminating here. An écrivant works in a world where the purpose of the text is predefined by the purpose of the activity in question. The world of the écrivant is said to be totalizing because the act of writing is oriented by criteria established in advance. This limits the ability to do or say something that is outside the original plan and reduces any new attempt to say or do something else to what has already been thought of. However, the écrivain sculpts his words and language in the writing process. He works in an open world where the text he produces, although it has some initial aims, has no exact predetermined goals. He questions what he is doing and is free to exercise his imagination and intelligence in a responsible way. He recognizes that he is a translator, and that this comes with the responsibility of the meaning of what he or she is doing, creating.

Another interesting and common example of translation can be found in the following table.
Schemas, tables, lists and graphics are common knowledge transfer tools. They adapt knowledge in order to make it more accessible: easier to access both materially and cognitively through synthetized and simplified articles in professional journals. The example above is typical. The linear and recursive structures give an impression of totality, as if reflective practice was an ongoing process consisting of three reflection phases: observation, analysis and synthesis. This image, where incidents, errors, doubts and hesitations are suppressed, is fixed on the paper, naturalizing a completely artificial conception of reflective practice. Also, the repetition of bullet points in the schema strengthens this impression of totality. Bullet points allow the juxtaposition of short sentences without requiring explicit links or explanations. This produces an impression that there is only one possible meaning and that everyone is supposed to understand it implicitly. It gives an impression of unquestionable truth about the essence of reflective practice. It also helps the reader internalize the information. Like children songs, they are constituted of short sentences and repetition. They circulate easily and get absorbed without one even noticing, in a way that they finally appear natural, true.

What is important to keep in mind is the way a notion with as much plasticity as «reflective practice» gets assigned fairly reductive meanings and acquire a particular aura or force. What produces this aura or force does not come from the theoretical content or the quality of the argument that justifies the translations, but more certainly from their rhetorical efficiency. Although their authors probably have no
intention of doing so, they participate in the legitimation of a techno-scientific and managerial view of reflectivity, one that, as I have argued in previous work\textsuperscript{xiii}, tend to block the intuitive dimension of teaching and its critical and emancipatory potentials. Portfolios and tables such as the one presented above are widely used in faculties of education and tables such as the one showed above are abundant in professional journals. The fact that they come through these legitimate spaces of knowledge makes them even more attractive and vulnerable to passive appropriation. They invoke the language and imagery of efficient management, professional rectitude as well as rigorous science to package their presentation of good reflective practice. But these inter-discursive practices are not without consequences, they tend to reduce all forms of discourses to these dominant frameworks and languages and to exclude other possibilities of thought.

TOWARDS AN ETHICS OF TRANSLATION

What is needed then, is a third space, or a third language perhaps. The same way the Montrealer might be perplexed by the graffiti PAIN, the teacher should find himself in a position where the meaning of reflective practice should be problematized. This third language is fundamentally ethical. Administrators tend to think that if we produce good research, and good policies, and if teachers understand and apply them well, then the system will naturally be efficient. But the translation approach assumes differently. If it is in the nature of language to translate indefinitely, we cannot safely assume that a statement will generate the expected effects of its producer. Indeed, reforms, research, educational programs, lesson plans, etc. rarely produce the expected effects of their designers. There are often shifts in meaning and these shifts are natural and depend on a multitude of factors. Teachers should be able to recognize that they occur and be able to address them in a responsive and responsible way. As such, teachers have a responsibility for the meaning they give to research, policies and other requirements that are made to them. As Paul Ricoeur argues, the translator’s work entails both a responsibility of memory (to preserve meaning) and of letting go (to renounce the ideal of perfect translation and accept that it is open to change)\textsuperscript{xxiii}.

As Walter Benjamin has brilliantly expressed, the main problem of translation is generally one of aesthetics: how is it possible to preserve the aesthetic of a text when transposing it in a different linguistic space?\textsuperscript{xxiv} Each culture develops its own ways of seeing, saying and feeling, and much of what goes on in a language cannot be exactly replicated in another. Interestingly, it is precisely this impossibility that enables the creation of new meanings: when confronted with the task of preserving the aesthetic dimension of a text, translators have to be creative and adapt the language, which opens up a space for new concepts to emerge and for transformation to occur.

The fact that translation is always transformative entails a responsibility of preserving and remembering past meanings. According to Benjamin, a translation is part of the afterlife of a text and the interpretations they propose should be informed by a history of reception\textsuperscript{xxv}. A good translator should be
concerned about whether his translation actually preserves enough the aesthetic dimension (the aura Benjamin would say) of a text in the specific context of its reception. In other words, if Schön’s work was a strong criticism of positivism at the time of production, this “aesthetic” dimension should be preserved in the translation process. And this implies transforming some dimensions of the original to maintain its critical dimensions in the new context, which would be a particularly technocratic one in today’s age. This responsibility of the translator, to be able to translate in a responsive and responsible way, implies a deep understanding of the sociocultural context in which one is living, but also an understanding of the contexts in which influential educational theories were produced. This entails a responsibility to read the pedagogical texts in question and a responsibility to think about their meaning in different socio-historical contexts. There are many ways to conceive the notion of reflective practice that would contribute to preserve and sharpen the original’s critical dimensions in the contemporary educational world. For example, Chris Higgins suggests we could enrich the vocabulary we use for discussing reflective practice by going back to the concept of phronesis or practical wisdom, which implies not only the capacity to reflect on a situation, but also the ethical capacity to perceive the moral demands of that situation. This dimension could certainly help teachers translate their responsibility to be reflective in less technical terms, in a way that is more sensitive to their intuitions and experiences, which were indeed central focuses in Schön’s “original” work.

However, although translation should preserve something of the original text, it also inevitably transforms it. This shouldn’t be understood as a defect since, as noted earlier, this transformative dimension is precisely what creates the possibility for new meanings to emerge. This openness of language entails particular responsibilities for teachers as translators with regards with the meaning they attribute to educational discourses, whether they come from research or official programs. It entails a certain posture of openness from the teacher where he or she is receptive to the possibility of different meanings to emerge from the encounter of particular discourses with concrete classroom realities. Understanding reflective practice in terms of practical wisdom only serves as a slogan if it is not located in a specific context of reception, where meaning can be each time reattributed. Reflective practice, or practical wisdom, acquires its meaning from the specific requirements of the pedagogical moment. It might be influenced by something that happened earlier that day in the school, from a particular social or political context, from the personal background of a student, or other contextual factors. Like the light or the heat that is reflected on a surface, it can take a multiplicity of relatively unpredictable directions and for this reason, the teacher should be prepared to let go of his will for control and certainty. Reflectivity, in this sense, also means a spontaneous reaction emerging from an encounter or a resistance: there is an unpredictable dimension to it that calls the teacher to be alert, ingenious, cunning.
SOME PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Again, as Ricœur puts it, an ethics of translation implies both a capacity to remember (the prescriptions of research and policies) and a capacity to let go. Current teacher education programs generally concentrate on introducing students to texts objectively without necessarily requiring the exercise of translation, that is to say to show evidence that students have actually understood the “spirit” of a text and are capable of making sense of it in different pedagogical contexts. Developing translational capacities does not occur by itself and I want to suggest that perhaps it should be a more serious preoccupation for teacher educators, policymakers and researchers. How can we concretely prepare teachers to be good translators?

An ethics of translation requires from those who produce the “knowledge base” for teacher preparation to refrain from the tendency to present student with predefined and straightforward prescriptions for practice. Even if students often crave for quick recipes, it might be doing them (and their future students) a disservice to satisfy this urge. Daily practice is made of doubt, uncertainty and vulnerability. And if prescriptive texts can help reduce these discomforts by providing rigorous guidelines and solutions, they also can block the development of the teachers’ or future teachers’ capacity to react or reflect adequately to unexpected events that occur in a classroom. We cannot expect students to develop the dispositions to face complexity if we provide predefined answers, rigid norms, linear teaching plans, where there is nothing unclear or unpredictable that requires the capacity to solve practical or ethical dilemmas. On the contrary, teacher educators should help students develop a posture of translation: a sensibility to the opacity of meaning, an acceptation of the uncertainty of action, a capacity to transpose knowledge creatively according to the audience, a commitment to an open future. This implies that they provide knowledge that is not always immediately clear, that is challenging, that leaves something unresolved, which would force students to discipline their spirit differently and develop a capacity or disposition for creative interpretation. In other words, it requires confronting students to difficult texts, ones that are not immediately digestible, and that give them the experience of puzzlement and uncertainty. To some extant, this implies an education that only the humanities can provide, that is to say an education that sensitize students to the history, diversity and complexity of human languages and cultures, to the multiple ways of apprehending the problems they encounter. This responsibility is also, in some way, about preserving the wealth of our world and not resigning to the colonizing power of economic and technocratic discourses. As such, it is also about opening the possibility for new languages and cultures to emerge.

The implications for policymakers and researchers are important as well. Most notably, they should be sensitive to the way their texts might be interpreted and used, and reflect on the languages they use and the contexts in which they will be received. The current Quebec framework for teacher education describes reflective practice as a ‘competence’ to develop without ever problematizing its meaning, without even providing references for what it could possibly mean, as if the meaning was transparent. The consequence
is that reflective practice is most generally understood as a skill in applying a three or five steps process in order to assess the effectiveness of teachers’ planned interventions. Researchers as well should be sensitive to the way their texts will be received by teachers or future teachers. Advocating for predefined contents in portfolios or creating tables to represent reflectivity are examples of translations that may well contravene the development of translational dispositions. More fruitful perhaps would be to refrain from using an overly prescriptive language, or to refrain from overly specified guidelines in order to leave space for translation, or to put it differently for adaptation to particular situations.

Also, for a translation approach and ethics to grow, it would be useful to open time and space for teachers and future teachers to analyze and discuss actual practices and problems together. Traditional networks of knowledge dissemination or transfer such as mainstream university courses, journals, conferences, professional workshops, etc., are generally hierarchical and often encourage subordination and compliance instead of encouraging openness, sensibility, and experimentation. In interstitial networks, knowledge is not conceived as something detached and transferable, but as a living thing that develops through interrogation, reflection and conversation with others. Perhaps, these networks would resemble “communities of practice” as theorized by Jean Lave and Étienne Wenger xxvii, before the idea was instrumentalized and became a tool of knowledge management. The idea of community of practices, as theorized in Situated learning, is a learning theory primarily centered on the apprenticeship of the social, informal and situated knowledge (the identity and knowing how) of a community. It represents a form of learning through practice, free conversation and participation and exists at the periphery of formal learning settings. It is a space where teachers can share their thoughts, experiment with them, and progressively evolve to understand what kind of teachers they are, why they are so, and consequently put words on their experience, meaningful words that represent their work adequately and purposefully. To an important extant, communities of practices allow a real appropriation of the craft by those practicing it. What also differentiates these interstitial networks is that they have an open structure. The concept of rhizome, developed by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattarixxviii might help specify this. It opposes the more traditional concept of the tree, which grows in a linear, causal and hierarchical direction (from the roots to the top), to the rhizome, which has no center and grows in a multiplicity of unpredictable directions. Learning through conversation in a community of practice allows new possibilities of thought and practice. Such spaces exist in teachers’ offices during breaks, in the lunchroom, sometimes on the web, in spaces outside the centralized knowledge transfer mechanisms. Professional blogs or chat rooms offer particularly interesting opportunities to develop this type of conversational space, one that is at the same time non-hierarchical and uninterrupted, allowing the users to explore freely. Of course, as noted earlier, an ethics of translation also implies translating or discussing original texts, not only discussing spontaneous dilemmas or practices that occur in daily practices. It implies confronting these practices to outside ideas, namely theoretical ideas, in
order to contextualize, question, assess, deepen them. In other words, texts serve as triggers to reflect on actual practices, on their meaning and their value.

Finally, an ethics of translation would require much more autonomous institutions where problematizing, questioning, deviating, doubting, hesitating would be valued, and not just resolving problems, achieving objectives and meeting standards. Spaces where teachers could discuss freely, be destabilized by the complexity of their task, seek to make sense of it, and better understand what they are doing or should be doing.
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