Title	第4回 RIWL セミナー開催について
Author(s)	河野, 彰
Citation	大阪大学世界言語研究センター論集. 2012, 7, p. 313-336
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/10715
rights	
Note	

第 4 回 RIWL セミナー開催について
The 4th RIWL Symposium on Non-Native Approaches to World Languages and Literatures

河　野　　彰[＊]
KONO Akira

　世界言語研究センターの発足に伴い，「特別交流研究支援制度」が設けられた。この制度により，本センターに属す教員が，学術上の交流のある海外の研究者を本センターへ短期間，招へいすることができるようになった。私（河野，ポルトガル語学専攻）と清水政明准教授（ベトナム語学専攻）の二人はこれまで数回にわたり，この制度を利用して，海外の研究者を本センターに招き，有意義な学術交流を行うことができた。今年度（2011 年）は，Non-Native Approaches to the Study of World Languages and Literatures を共通テーマとして，2011 年 11 月 21 日〜27 日の期間に第 4 回 RIWL セミナーを開催し，研究会やシンポジウムなど多彩なプログラムを実施した。今回，招へいした海外の研究者は Seoul National University の Robert J. Fouser 氏と California State University の Piers Armstrong 氏の 2 名であった。Fouser 氏はアメリカ人で日本語と朝鮮語（韓国語）の専門家。流暢に日韓両言語を操る。Armstrong 氏はオーストラリア生まれでアメリカ在住。フランス語，スペイン語，ポルトガル語などを操り，ブラジル文学研究を中心に多彩な分野に関心を持つ。これらお二人に清水，河野両名が加わり，2011 年 11 月 26 日（土）13 時 30 分〜16 時 30 分，豊中キャンパス内の「大阪大学会館」で，シンポジウム，Non-Native Approaches to World Languages and Literatures を開催した。このシンポジウムの目的は，いずれもそれぞれの専攻文化圏の言語については non-native speaker である我々 4 人がどのように言語や文学，文化の研究に貢献できるかを話し合うものであった。当日のプログラムは以下の通りである。

<div align="center">プログラム</div>

　Moderator: Akira Kono (RIWL, Osaka University)

1.　Masaaki Shimizu (RIWL. Osaka University)

　　"Non-Native Approaches to World Languages and Literatures – Japanese Contribution to Teaching and Studying Vietnamese"

2.　Akira Kono (RIWL, Osaka University)

　　"Non-Native Approaches to World Languages and Literatures – Non-Native Speakers' Contribution to Portuguese Linguistics"

＊　大阪大学世界言語研究センター・教授

3. Robert J. Fouser (Seoul National University)

   "Non-Native Approaches to World Languages and Literatures – Defining Effective Roles for Non-Native Speaker Teachers of Korean as a Second Language"

4. Piers Armstrong (California State University)

   "Non-Native Approaches to World Languages and Literatures – The Multidimensional Continuum of Language, Culture and Circumstance"

今回は，お二人の招へい研究者に，当日の発表をもとに原稿を寄せていただいた。「特別交流研究支援制度」の発足にご尽力いただいた高橋明前センター長ならびに海外からの研究者招へいに際し，事務的な面で色々とご尽力いただいたセンター事務部とりわけ研究協力係にも感謝の意を表したい。

Non-Native Approaches to World Languages and Literatures: Defining Effective Roles for Non-Native Speaker Teachers of Korean as a Second Language

Robert J. FOUSER*

This paper focuses on the role of non-native-speaker teachers of Korean from the following perspectives: approaches to teaching, learner awareness, and role modeling within social learning theory. The paper begins with a discussion of the history of native and non-native teachers in second language education and then discusses relevant issues for KSL through an extensive review of the literature, mostly in ESL, but also in KSL and JSL.

Keywords : non-native Korean as a second language (KSL), non-native ESL teachers, teachers, social learning theory and second language teaching, bilingual and bicultural KSL teachers

Introduction

The roles of native and non-native teachers in second language teaching remain controversial. Drawing on the tradition of linguistic relativity, experts in second language teaching assert that native speaker and non-native speaker teachers are essentially equal, whereas learners and employers often prefer native speaker teachers. Much of the debate centers on English, the most commonly taught second language in the world, because the preference for native speaker teachers has put non-native speaker teachers at a disadvantage in the employment market.　The low status of non-native speaker teachers in ESL stimulated the growth of the "Non-Native Speaker Movement" in the late 1990s, which has helped to raise the status of non-native speaker teachers of English (Braine, 2010).

The "Non-Native Speaker Movement" in ESL is important for Korean as a second language (KSL) because the increase in the number of learners of Korean around the world will inevitably lead to an increase in the pool of potential non-native speaker teachers as the number of learners who reach a high level of proficiency increases.　To date, native speaker teachers have remained overwhelming dominant in KSL because the number of qualified non-native speaker teachers has

---

＊　Associate Professor, Department of Korean Language Education, Seoul National University, Korea.
　　Email: fouser@snu.sc.kr.

remained small. As the situation changes, however, KSL will face the challenge of how best to involve non-native speaker teachers into the field.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the literature on non-native speaker teachers in ESL and other languages to gain insight into desired role of non-native speaker teachers in KSL. Specifically, the paper will focus on three perspectives that run through the literature: teaching approaches and learner awareness of teacher language. Within teaching approaches, the use of the native and target languages in different methods has remained controversial. Within language awareness, leaner and teacher perceptions of "nativeness" and "non-nativeness" and differences in teaching styles have received much attention in the literature (for comprehensive overviews, see Moussru and Llurda, 2008; Braine 2010) To expand the discussion, the paper will include a discussion of importance of role models as derived from social learning theory. The paper will conclude with recommendations on effective roles for non-native speaker teachers in KSL. At the outset, it must be noted that the paper does not aim to discuss definitions of native and non-native speakers. It assumes the distinction between the two that is commonly found in the literature on second language education.

Historical Overview of Native and Non-Native Speaker Teachers in Second Language Teaching

To frame the discussion, a review of the concepts of native and non-native speaker as they relate to second language education is in order. Until the rise of the Direct Method at the end of the 19th century, the native language of the teacher received little attention. The dominant teaching method was grammar-translation, which put a premium on understanding the second language text and translating it the learner's native language. The teacher's ability to translate was critical to the success of this method. The Direct Method emerged as part of broader moves to reform foreign language education in the late 19th century. These efforts changed the parameters of second language education from written language to spoken language. The emphasis on using only the target language in the classroom, which was truly revolutionary at the time, naturally led to a focus on the oral language proficiency of the teacher. The Direct Method, however, did not specifically specify the need for a native speaker teacher, but the emphasis on teaching in the target language assumed high-level or native proficiency in the target language. The Direct Method became popular in language schools in Europe, but it made little headway in "school language education," where grammar translation remained the dominant form of teaching (Howatt, 1984). Non-native teachers, many of whom lacked high-level proficiency in the target language were more comfortable with grammar translation.

The middle of the 20th century saw a series of waves in second language teaching that directly affected views of native speaker and non-native speaker teachers. Though World War I and the Great Depression that followed had a negative effect on second language learning, theoretical

linguistics continued to advance in the early years of the 20th century. In the United States, Leonard Bloomfield dominated the field with his copious recording of the grammar of Native American languages. In his influential textbook Language, Bloomfield (1933) defined "native speaker" as follows: "The first language a human being learns to speak is his native language; he is a native speaker of this language" (p. 43). The definition is interesting because of its simplicity; there is no assumption of a unique native speaker intuition or sensibility.　Indeed, Bloomfield argued that, although rare, non-native speakers could reach native fluency. "In the extreme case of foreign-language learning the speaker becomes so proficient as to be indistinguishable from the natives round him. In the cases where this perfect foreign-language learning is not accompanied by loss of the native language, it results in bilingualism, native-like control of two languages" (pp. 55-56).

Bloomfield's ideas are important because they deeply influenced the intellectual milieu from which the Audiolingual Method, the most controversial and dominant method of the 20th century, emerged. As has been documented elsewhere (see Richards and Rogers, 2001), the Audiolingual Method drew heavily on Behaviorist learning theory to assert that language learning was a process of habit formation and that the development of good habits would lead to fluency in the language. The emphasis on good habits brought native speaker teachers into focus as never before as native speaker speech became the desired standard. Flawed pronunciation and minor grammar errors had no place in the Audiolingual Method because they offered learners a flawed model. A closely related concept was the idea of native speaker proficiency as the ultimate goal of second language learning. Through repetition of native speaker modeled speech, learners were expected to reach near native speaker proficiency at the end of the learning process.

The lack of native speaker teachers limited the spread of the Audiolingual Method at first, but the invention of the tape recorder and language laboratory lead to rapid expansion on the 1950s and 1960s.　The job of non-native speaker teachers was to manage the language laboratory and evaluate students rather than providing model language to learners. Non-native speaker teachers who wanted to do more than press buttons in the language laboratory naturally resisted the method, mostly by clinging to grammar-translation. By the late 1960s, the Audiolingual Method faced increasing criticism because the number of students who learned successfully using the method remained very small (Richards and Rogers, 2001).

The 1960s were also the decade of Chomsky's generative grammar, which brought a true paradigm shift in linguistics as the locus of study shifted from morphology to syntax.　Though Chomsky opposed Behaviorist notions of language as a series of habits, his emphasis on the innateness of language as manifested in "native competence" reinforced native speakers as modelers of language. Chomsky (1965: 3-4) stated:

Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely

317

homogeneous speech-community, who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge to the language in actual performance. This seems to me to have been the position of the founders of modern general linguistics, and no cogent reason for modifying it has been offered.

Here, Chomsky adopted what he perceived to be the dominant view of language at the time. Chomsky adhered to the uniqueness of native speaker competence, which differed from Bloomfield's idea that native-like proficiency can be acquired by learning.

The 1960s also witnessed the rise of another important paradigm that affected second language education: Sociolinguistics. Unlike Chomsky, who focused exclusively on linguistic competence, sociolinguists were interested in real-life language-use situations and in how language use reflected society. Because of its interest in the relationship between society and language use, sociolinguistics focused on the diversity of language as manifested in dialect, class, and social differences among members of the speech community (for example, Labov, 1969). Native speakers were interesting not for their perfection, but for their diversity.

The rise of sociolinguistics at a time of increasing dissatisfaction with the Audiolingual Method formed the background for Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which continues to dominate second language teaching today. As Littlewood (1981: 4) stated clearly,

> The most efficient communicator in a foreign language is not always the person who is best at manipulating its structures. It is often the person who is most skilled at processing the complete situation involving himself and his hearer, taking account of what knowledge is already shared between them…, and selecting items which will communicate his message effectively.

By emphasizing language use, sociolinguistics shifted the discussion in second language education away from mastery of grammar (Audiolingual) and the state of knowledge (Chomsky) to language use situations. Indeed, as Hymes (1974) noted, "Rules of appropriateness beyond grammar govern speech, and are acquired as part of conceptions of self, and of meanings associated both with particular forms of speech and with the act of speaking itself" (p. 94).

The sociolinguistic turn in second language teaching, however, brought with it interest in the appropriateness of language use. The interest in appropriateness, in turn, case native speakers in a new light as arbiters of appropriateness, giving rise to native-speaker-based sociolinguistics norms. Unlike grammar and pronunciation, which were used to define native versus non-native, sociolinguistic norms were accessible to non-native speakers; they could be perfected, and

"mastered." The notion, however, that native speaker teachers were more fluent in sociolinguistic norms lead to the notion that they were more effective teachers.   As Kramsch (1998: 16), put it:

> The learning and teaching of foreign languages has traditionally been predicated on the distinction between native speakers and non-native speakers… Native speakership brings to its speakers a certain authority associated with authenticity and legitimacy of language use… As a rule, native speakers are viewed around the world as the genuine article, the authentic embodiment of the standard language.

CLT's emphasis on developing effective oral communication ability assumed target language use in the classroom and a communicative repertoire in the target language. Indeed, the method emerged in the United Kingdom in an environment in which native English speaker teachers dominated (Richards and Rogers, 2001). Thus, from its genesis, CLT assumed that native speaker teachers would engage learners in lively lessons that created opportunities to develop communicative ability.

Taken together, the mid-20th century dominance of the Audiolingual Method and Chomskyian linguistics placed the native speaker in the historically new position of being superior to non-native speakers in the teaching of second languages. Native speakers become models of correctness. Many teachers of the later 20th century were influenced by these ideas and they, in turn, have influenced the next generation of teachers. Though the rise of sociolinguistics and CLT shifted the emphasis away from rigid native-speaker-based models to authentic language use, they also put native speakers in the position of being arbiters of sociolinguistic and "cultural" appropriateness. As Widdowson (1994: 387) noted, "The notion of authenticity, then, privileges native-speaker use (inappropriately, I have argued) as the proper language for learning.   But it also, of course, privileges the native speaker teachers of the language."

Native and Non-Native Speakers and Teaching Approaches

Most research on native and non-native speaker teachers has focused on two lines of inquiry: differences between the two groups and empowerment on non-native speakers. The first line of inquiry offers more direct insight into how differences between the two groups affect teaching practice than the politically-oriented second line of inquiry inspired by Phillipson's (1992) work on linguistic imperialism. Though interesting and relevant to ESL teaching, the assumption that non-native speakers of Korean are a marginalized minority is difficult to discuss objectively because the percentage of non-native speaker teachers is much smaller than in English. In addition, the deeper notion of native speakers as reflecting superiority and linguistic imperialism does not fit well with KSL because Korea does not have a history of imperial conquest and most learners of Korean do so by choice, not because of curricular mandates.

For KSL, then, ascertaining the differences in how native and non-native speakers teach is important because it highlights areas that each group can contribute to an overall Korean-language program.   Developing effective Korean language programs, in turn, is critical to establishing Korean language programs firmly in educational institutions.   Medgyes (1994) was the first book to compare native and non-native speaker ESL teachers, particularly as they relate to classroom teaching. Medgyes (1994: 27) argued that native and non-native speaker teachers were essentially "two different species," with the difference in language proficiency accounting for differences in teaching behaviors. He discerned six positive characteristics of non-native speaker teachers (adapted from Moussu and Llurda, 2008: 322):

1) They provide a good learner model to their students

2) They can teach language strategies very effectively

3) They are able to provide more information about the language to their students

4) They understand the difficulties and needs of the students

5) They are able to anticipate and predict language difficulties

6) In EFL settings, they can use the students' native language to their advantage.

A more detailed list of the differences discerned between the two groups is given in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Perceived Differences in Teaching
between Native and Non-Native Speaking ESL Teachers

	Native	Non-Native
Own Use of English	Speak better English	Speak poorer English
	Use real English	Use "bookish" English
	Use English more confidently	Use English less confidently
General Attitude	Adopt a more flexible approach	Adopt a more guided approach
	Are more innovative	Are more cautious
	Are less empathetic	Are more empathetic
	Attend to perceived needs	Attend to real needs
	Have far-fetched expectations	Have realistic expectations
	Are more casual	Are more strict
	Are less committed	Are more committed
Attitude to Teaching the Language	Are less insightful	Are more insightful
	Focus on: fluency, meaning, language in use, oral skills, colloquial registers	Focus on: accuracy, form, grammar rules, printed word, formal registers
	Teach items in context	Teach items in isolation

	Prefer free activities	Prefer controlled activities
	Favor groupwork/pairwork	Favor teacher-fronted work
	Use a variety of materials	Use a single textbook
	Tolerate errors	Correct/punish for errors
	Set fewer tests	Set more tests
	Use no/less L1	Use more L1
	Resort to no/less translation	Resort to more translation
	Assign less homework	Assign more homework
Attitude toward Teaching Culture	Supply more cultural information	Supply less cultural information

Árva and Medgyes (2000) sought to include data taken from actual classroom behavior of ten non-native speaker ESL teachers in Hungary.　The research was designed to expand on the work of Medgyes (1994) by investigating actual classroom behavior. In the analysis, they focused on the following areas: competence in the target language, knowledge of grammar, competence in the local language, and other aspects of professional behavior. Results largely confirmed the differences given in the table, but two additional observations emerged. Native speaker teachers had a positive effect on motivation because students had to use English with them, whereas non-native speaker teachers were more copious in lesson planning and more "professional" in their teaching.

Medgyes's pioneering work is important for KSL because it provides an object appraisal of the strengths and weakness of native and non-native speaker teachers. The overwhelming dominance of native speaker teachers in KSL suggests that KSL programs could benefit from some of the positive aspects that non-native speaker teacher offer. Of the six advantages of non-native speaker teachers discussed in Medgyes's (1994), two are particularly relevant to KSL: providing a good learner model for students and understanding various difficulties involved in learning Korean as a non-native language. Native speaker KSL teachers are different from ESL teachers in that many have a high proficiency in the native language of the students and have lived and worked in the educational system for many years. Questions about proficiency in the learners' native language(s) and professionalism are more applicable to younger teachers who are sent to countries that speak languages not commonly taught in Korea.

Because grammar occupies a large portion of the syllabus in most KSL programs, particularly those in universities outside of Korea, the strengths and weaknesses of native and non-native speaker teachers regarding the teaching of grammar is important. Ava and Medgyes's (2000) noted native speaker teachers were not confident in explaining grammar, whereas non-native speaker teachers took pride in being able to do so effectively. Other studies show that non-native speaker teachers prefer to explain grammar in the native language of the students rather than in the target

language. In a study on use of the target language in the classroom by 42 high school Spanish teachers in the United States, Wing (1980) noted that "teachers who say that they conduct their classes entirely in the target language often add the disclaimer: 'but not grammar, of course'" (1980: 202). A study of attitudes toward methodology of 881 Japanese high school English teachers, Gorsuch (1999) found that grammar-dominated university entrance examinations had paramount influence on classroom instruction. "The English language sections of university entrance examinations seem to be the single driving force behind English instruction in Japanese high schools today" (1999, p. 370). Korean is not a required language for entrance exams and is not commonly taught in secondary schools, but frequency of grammatical syllabi in KSL programs suggests that native and non-native speaker teachers need to be competent in explaining grammar in the learners' native language(s), and that the prevalence of grammar reduces the use of the target language in Korean classes. Whether and how this limits the development of communicative skills is an important question for future research. To date, only a few studies, such as Árva and Medgyes (2000), have included data taken from observation of actual classroom behavior of native and non-native speaker ESL teachers, and no such studies have been conducted in KSL. More research, not only on ESL, but also on languages other than English, on differences in how the two groups actually teach is needed to draw firmer conclusions.

Learner Awareness of Native and Non-Native Speaker Teachers

   Learner awareness of differences between native and non-native speaker ESL teachers has received attention in the literature (Braine, 2010; Moussu and Llurda, 2008). In a study of student attitudes toward non-native ESL teachers in a university language program in the U.S, Moussu (2002) found that Chinese and Korean students had the strongest negative attitudes toward non-native teachers and that teachers who sounded and acted more like native speakers were accepted more easily. In a study of students in an intensive ESL program, Mahboob (2003) found results that mirrored Moussu (2002) and Medgyes (1994) in that students perceived native speakers as better in teaching oral skills and culture, whereas non-native speakers were consider better in teaching grammar, answering questions, and empathizing with student difficulties. He concluded by arguing that team teaching and other forms of collaboration between the two groups would improve the quality of teaching overall. Tajino and Tajino (2000) analyzed the common practice of team teaching school English classes in Japan and argued that " that team-teaching should be re-interpreted as team-learning, in which all the participants are encouraged to receive information, and to learn from other team members through the target language" (p. 9). A study of 420 university ESL learners in Hong Kong by Cheung (2002) revealed similar results as the above studies: native speakers were viewed positively for their language proficiency and cultural knowledge, whereas non-native speaker teachers were appreciated for their ability to emphasize, shared cultural background, and higher expectations.   Research on ESL learners in Thailand by

Todd and Pojanapunya (2009), however, state that they prefer native speakers of English, but that at a deeper level, they do not have a strong preference and feel closer emotionally to non-native teachers. This suggests that the differences between the two groups may exert a much influence over learner attitudes and learning outcomes. Finally, in a study of non-native teachers of German, Neil (1997) found that learners were generally satisfied with the amount of German their teachers used, but, if given a choice, more learners wished that their teachers would use less German. They were also aware of differences between non-native teachers and native speaker assistants, but expected different things from each group.

To date, only two studies have been conducted on learner attitudes toward native and non-native speaker teachers of Korean. Using data from student evaluations, Damron (2009) surveyed students at Bringham Young University and found that they rated non-native speakers higher overall than native speakers because learners perceived non-native teachers as more empathetic, particularly in explaining grammar and other areas of difficulty with Korean. In a study of Chinese learners of Korean in a language program in Korea, Fraschini (2010) found that native speakers where viewed positively for teaching oral skills and for cultural knowledge, whereas non-native speakers are preferred for teaching grammar and empathizing with learner difficulty. In a study of learner subjective states, Fouser (2009) interviewed advanced-level learners of Korean about their learning experience and found that some of them commented on differences between native and non-native speaker teachers that they had encountered in learning Korean. Learners who learned Korean outside Korea, in particular, evaluated native speakers positively as sources of motivation and cultural information. Learners who learned Korean in Korea, however, did not experience non-native teachers, and did not comment on the issue.

The number of studies on learner awareness of differences between native and non-native speaker KSL teachers is too small to draw firm conclusions, but results have much in common with those from the much larger body of literature on similar issues in ESL. Interestingly, learner awareness largely mirrors findings in the literature discussed in the preceding section on teaching approaches in that native speaker teachers are seen as stronger in teaching oral skills and culture, whereas non-native speakers are viewed as better at teaching grammar and empathizing with learner difficulty. These findings are important for KSL, particularly outside of Korea, where native speaker teachers may be the only Koreans that students meet. In such cases, they are indispensable in teaching oral language and in helping students learn about Korean culture. The large role for grammar in most KSL programs means that non-native speaker teachers can play an important role in helping students learn grammar through their native language and, more importantly, empathize with their difficulty learning Korean.

Research on non-native teachers in Japanese as a second language (JSL) education is limited, but the findings reflect those of KSL and ESL. JSL research is relevant to KSL because both languages are used in limited geographical areas by a largely homogeneous ethnolinguistic group.

Abe and Yokoyama (1991) surveyed 46 non-native JSL teachers and found that most of them were worried most about their Japanese proficiency, but that they thought non-native speaker teachers had three advantages: 1) same native language as the learners, 2) same or similar cultural background, 3) experience learning Japanese as a second language. Ishii (1996) found similar results, but also found that non-native speaker teachers provide social context and meaning to the act of learning Japanese, and are thus a source of motivation for learners.   Beyond these studies, most of the literature on non-native speaker JSL teachers addresses the needs of non-native speakers in teacher development and refreshment programs.

Social Learning Theory and Role Models in Second Language Teaching

   The literature contains a number of references to the important of non-native speaker teachers as potentially positive role models for language learners. Edge (1988), for example, argued early on that non-native speakers are "real models" because they have the same language and cultural background as the students, whereas native speakers are more remote "foreign models." Cook (1999) helped shift the discussion away from the native speaker to the L2 user, an important change that helps cast fluent non-native speaker teachers as positive role models. "Going beyond the native speaker lies not so much in following the specific suggestions as in adjusting the perspectives about models that underlie language teaching. If students and teachers see L2 learning as a battle that they are fated never to win, little wonder they become dispirited and give up" (p. 204), thus suggesting that role model of L2 use can help overcome this problem. Likewise, Hong Kong, Tang (1997: 579) emphasized the roles of ESL teachers: "NNESLTS [non-native English as second language teachers] not only play a pedagogical role in their classrooms, but they also serve as empathetic listeners for beginning and weak students, needs analysts, agents of change, and coaches for public examinations in the local context." Many of the references to the potential benefits of non-native speaker teachers as role models, however, occur as somewhat speculative conclusions and no substantial empirical research on the topic has been conducted to date.

   The idea of a role model is rooted in social learning theory that evolved from the work of Julian Rotter (1954) in the mid-20th century.   The theory is based on the idea that social context and environment create expectations regarding behavior and that people are more likely to engage in behavior that they expect will bring a positive outcome.   Building on Rotter, Albert Bandura (1977) expanded theory to argue directly that human beings model their behavior after others, and that rigid Behaviorist notions of reward and punishment for behavior were inadequate. The theory posits three factors for learning and modeling behavior: retention, reproduction, and motivation. To succeed in modeling behavior, people need to remember what they observed, be able to reproduce it, and be motivated to do so. His later work includes a stronger cognitive bent, but in which he argues for the importance of self-efficacy in explaining behavior. Role models in social

learning theory, then, demonstrate the outcome of certain type of attitudes and behavior and can thus motivate people to engage in various types of behavior. It must be noted that social learning theory can be used to explain negative as well as positive behavior. The influence of negative role models is important in explaining deviance that causes criminal behavior.

The potential for language teachers, both native and non-native speaker as role models to motivate learners to achieve a positive outcome has yet to be investigated. Applying Bandura's theory (1977) to language learning would mean that learners need to retain what they observe teachers doing, be able and motivated to reproduce what they retain. Rotter's (1954) concept that the expectation of a positive outcome implies that seeing a fluent user of the target language, as Cook (1999) argued, represents a positive outcome and that it will help motivate learners to see that their efforts can yield a positive result. It is here that non-native speakers have much to contribute as role models, provided, of course, that learners make a distinction between native and non-native speakers. Though most studies discussed in this paper so far indicate that learners perceive differences between native and non-native speaker teachers, some studies (see Liang, 2002; Todd and Punjaporn, 2009) suggest that the differences are small. Clearly more research into how teachers affect learners as role models before concluding that non-native speakers have more to offer in this regard.

Given the lack of research on teachers as role models, any discussion of the teachers as role models in KSL is speculative.　Because the overwhelming majority of KSL teachers are native speakers, the discussion of role models must consider the potential of native speakers as well as non-native speakers. As discussed earlier, many native speaker KSL teachers have spent many years living in the country where they teach and are highly proficiency in the language of the learners and at ease in the native-language culture. Fluency in the learners' language and high level of acculturation may also put them in the position serve as positive role models not as learners of Korean, but as language learners and, perhaps more important, culture learners. By showing learners that they are comfortable in the learners' culture and language, they are also in a position to offer learners a positive role model. The distinction between essentially bilingual and bicultural native speaker KSL teachers and native speaker teachers who lack such experience maybe be as important as the distinction between native speaker teacher and non-native speaker teacher.

The discussion here is relevant for non-native speaker KSL teachers because, to become effective role models for students in this context, they need to achieve and maintain fluency in Korean and need to interact well with native speakers. The entire assumption of a positive role model is based on the concept of positive outcome, which, in second language education, is defined largely as linguistic and cultural fluency. In short, they need to be as bilingual and bicultural as the group of bilingual and bicultural native speaker KSL teachers.

Conclusion

The bulk of the research discussed in this paper comes from ESL, which is natural, given the dominance of English as an international language. There is, however, a fundamental difference between KSL and ESL: Korean is taught as an elective language mainly to post-secondary school and adult learners, whereas the bulk of ESL teaching takes place in the context of curricular requirements at the primary and secondary levels. To prosper as an elective language amid the hegemony of English and competition from other languages, KSL must attract learners. Anyone who has taught KSL overseas where programs face the danger of staff reductions and even elimination because of low enrollment understands the importance of attracting students. To survive and prosper, then, KSL must provide a rewarding experience for learners who, it must be remembered, have the choice not to learn Korean. To do so, teachers need to overcome the native/non-native distinction found in ESL to cover areas that are not necessarily their strength. Native speaker KSL teachers, for example, need to develop expertise in teaching language, particularly grammar, in the learners' native language and greater empathy with learner problems. Likewise, non-native KSL teachers need to develop and maintain high-level proficiency and become competent interpreters of Korean culture.

The bilingual and bicultural KSL teachers discussed in the previous section offer an effective standard for both native speaker and non-native speaker KSL teachers because they are defined by their professional competence and capacity for understanding. The brief review of history at the beginning of this discussed the recent rise in reverence for the native speaker in second language teaching. Professional competence and the capacity for understanding are, in fact, older qualities that lie at the heart of successful teaching, not just of second languages, but all subjects. Though interesting, the native/non-native dichotomy may be better suited to ESL where empowerment of non-native speaker teachers reflects larger issues of empowerment stemming from a history of imperialism and global inequality. The more relevant parameters for KSL are how varying degrees of professional competence and understanding on the part of both native and non-native speaker teachers affect teaching and how, in turn, that teaching effects learners positively. In the end, native and non-native KSL teachers cannot coexist as "two different species" as they have been able to do so far in ESL. Rather, they must work together to become "one species" of competent, empathic, and professional language teachers so that "the whole can be greater than the sum of the parts."

References

Abe, Y. and Kiko Y., 1991, 'Kaigai Nihongo kyōshi chōki kenshū no kadai: Gaikokujin Nihongo kyōshi no riten wo ikashita kyōjuhō wo motomete [Issues facing long-term Japanese language training overseas: Developing teaching methods that take advantage of the strong

points of non-native teachers of Japanese], *Nihongo Kokusai Sentā Kiyō* [Japan Foundation Japanese-Language Institute, Urawa Bulletin], 1: 53–74.

Árva, V. and Péter M., 2000, 'Native and non-native teachers in the classroom', *System*, 28: 355–372.

Bandura, A., 1977, *Social learning theory*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bloomflield, L., 1933, *Language*, New York: Henry Holt.

Braine, G., 2010, *Native speaker English teachers: Research, pedagogy, and professional growth*, London: Routledge.

Cheung, Y. L., 2002, *The attitude of university students in Hong Kong towards native and nonnative teachers of English*, Master's thesis, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Chomsky, N., 1965, *Aspects of the theory of syntax*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cook, V., 1999, 'Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching', *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2): 185–209.

Damron, J., 2009, 'A comparison of native and on-native college Korean teachers', Paper presented November 20, 2009, Korean SIG, ACTFL 2009 Annual Convention and Language Expo, San Diego.

Edge, J., 1988, 'Natives, speakers, and models', *Japan Association of Language Teachers Journal*, 9(2): 153–157.

Fouser, R. J., 2009, '"Multiculturalization" of Korean Language Education', *Gugeo gyoyuk yeongu* [Seoul National University Studies in Korean Language Education], 24: 119–142.

Fraschini, N., 2010, 'Korean as a second language students' perceptions of Korean nonnative teachers', *Bilingual Research*, 43: 345–370.

Gorsuch, G. J., 1999, *Exploring the relationship between educational policy and instruction in Japanese high school EFL classrooms*, Doctoral dissertation, Temple University Graduate School, Tokyo.

Howatt, A. P. R., 1984, *A history of English language teaching*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hymes, D., 1974, *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Inc.

Ishii, E., 1996, 'Hibogowasha kyōshi no yakuwari' [Role of Non-Native Speaker Teachers], *Nihongogaku*, 15(2): 87–94.

Kramsch, C., 1998, 'The privilege of the intercultural speaker', in M. Byram and M. P. Fleming (eds.) *Language learning in intercultural perspective: Approaches through drama and ethnography* (pp. 16–31), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Labov, W., 1969, 'The logic of non-standard negro English', In *Linguistics and the Teaching of Standard English* (Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, No. 22). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Liang, K. Y., 2002, *English as a second language (ESL) students' attitudes towards nonnative English speaking teachers' accentedness*, MA thesis, California State University, Los Angeles.

Littlewood, W., 1981, *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mahboob, A., 2003, *Status of nonnative English-speaking teachers in the United States*, Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Medgyes, P., 1994, *The non-native teacher*, London: Macmillan.

Moussu, L., 2002, *English as a second language students' reactions to nonnative English-speaking teachers*, Master's thesis, Brigham Young University, Provo (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 468 879).

Moussu, L. and Llurda, E., 2008, 'Non-native English-speaking English teachers: History and research', *Language Teaching*, 41(3): 315–348.

Neil, P. S., 1997, *Reflections on the target language*, London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.

Phillipson, R., 1992, *Linguistic imperialism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. C. and Theodore S. R., 2001, *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd edition), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rotter, J. B., 1954, *Social learning and clinical psychology*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Tajino, A. and Tajino, Y., 2000, 'Native and non-native: What can they offer?: Lessons from team teaching in Japan', *ELT Journal*, 54(1): 3–11.

Tang, C., 1997, 'On the power and status of nonnative ESL teachers', *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3): 577–580.

Todd, R. W. and Punjaporn, P, 2009, 'Implicit attitudes towards native and non-native speaker teachers', *System*, 37: 23–33.

Widdowson, H. G., 1994, 'The ownership of English', *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2): 377–389.

Wing, B. H., 1989, *The languages of the foreign language classroom: A study of teacher use of the native and target languages for linguistic and communicative functions*, Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus.

(Pre-)Production, composition and reception in the life of the (translated) text: replacing the concept of *auteur* with a pragmatic alliance of subject positions

Piers ARMSTRONG[*]

The text included here corresponds to the first part of a lecture at the Research Institute for World Languages in the symposium which was the base for the present collection. The lecture covered three distinct topics: translation theory, legal interpreting practice, and language teaching methods. I argued that these seemingly disparate topics can be seen through a unifying perspective based on the key idea that purist notions of 'best practices' and associated truisms in each field distort and grossly misinform our understanding of each, and that against this, in particular ways in each case, more useful insight is afforded by representing the target praxis as a situational continuum affected by the strategic interests of diverse stakeholders and additionally by arbitrary external circumstances, whether these be the limitations of 'how things happen to be,' (typically and traditionally) or the more dynamic effects of unexpected 'chance' developments. I also argued that not only stakeholder interests and circumstances but also the target language objects of each field are unstable and dynamic entities.

This is best illustrated in the case of English, as imagined in the teaching of English as a foreign (or second) language. All taught languages have traditionally been imagined hierarchically favoring native speakers over non-native speakers, and a command of native idiomatic eccentricities over a neutral use of the language, and within the native speaker pool by referencing a favored subgroup. The nuances of how this plays out vary case by case, as seen, for example, in notions of 'correct' French or 'traditional' Japanese, of Taiwanese versus mainland China agendas for literacy in Mandarin, or the question in English of whether the social prestige of BBC English or the socioeconomic centrality of 'mid-West' U.S. English bears more weight in the choice of a model form. In the case of English the traditional lay-of-the-land has shifted with the growth of English as a lingua franca and the growing proportion of non-native speakers and teachers of English. There is applied linguistic interest in non-native-English-speaking teachers (NNESTs). The relevance of the textual artefacts with the greatest cultural prestige (for example, of Shakespeare, taken as shorthand for 'Literature') diminishes with the utilitarian applications of the lingua franca. Eventually, the uses of English lead to changes in the constitution of the 'object' called 'English.' The linguistic interest in NNESTs as an object (of study) evolves into the

＊　California State University, Los Angeles,
　　Coordinator of Extension Programs　College of Extended Studies and International Program

empowerment of NNESTs as subjects and the existence of a movement defending their pedagogical and linguistic legitimacy, and eventually to a sort of constituency of NNESTs as a dynamic subject and a movement (a party of interest). Non-native users of English, meanwhile, are also re-imagined, defended, empowered as subjects and acknowledged as central protagonists instead of being cast as an 'outer-circle' subaltern caste, i.e. as passive vessels to be filled with (pure) knowledge dispensed by BBC or American 'inner-circle' mandarins. Given that the present text deals with translation, the point to retain from the TESOL field here is simply that this arena of lingual entities is a political arena, where objects become subjects and vice-versa, where individuals signify as tokens of interest groups, and that our apprehension of the obvious political nature of TESOL will reverberate in our understanding of all other taught languages though the politics may be less patent and the difference of stake-holders and interests more subtle.

The field of legal interpreting, meanwhile, illustrates a different aspect of the same process. A peculiar feature of legal interpreting (particularly in the simultaneous mode, but also in the consecutive mode, both of which are routinely used in courts) is the following paradox. On the one hand, because of the sheer difficulty of the task, it is fraught with mistranslations, that is, the real performance of legal interpreting is inevitably a maelstrom of minor misrepresentations and gross imperfections. On the other hand, the guiding philosophical precepts of the court demand impartiality, equity and discursive accuracy. While the court process is in fact dynamic, unpredictable and thus quasi political, the contradictions with its philosophical stability are not disturbing because they are familiar and have been organically conjoined in praxis through the centuries. Legal interpreting creates a problem: it has only been substantively addressed institutionally under modern globalization, so that the rules of the game have been only recently extrapolated; this has required the articulation of specific standards, which should make the gulf with actual practice more patent. Instead, however, the gap is rarely scrutinized or prosecuted. Rather, what is said about legal interpreting is typically a reiteration of putatitve standards, and not a description of actual cases (which would in many cases reveal grave flaws) , nor a critical measurement of the size of the gap between the real and the ideal. This gap is so great and so little acknowledged that one could suspect a conspiracy of silence – by various stakeholders, including persons employed under various contractual terms as legal interpreters, but perhaps more importantly by higher level government bureaucrats given the prohibitive cost of funding substantive reform in the provision of interpreter services (which are usually provided free, per legal philosophy, so that the cost is born by the state). Regardless, another explanation is certainly material: the power of legal authorities typically functions in a monolingual context to which foreign language issues are peripheral so that foreign language problems or potential problems are rarely grasped; when noticed, the persons bearing legal authority rarely consider that they have linguistic expertise, and thus defer to experts (usually interpreters, not linguists) who are actually vested stakeholders in the process and thus, per legal philosophy, not reliable or appropriate

referees. The peculiarity of legal interpreting, then, is that it highlights the non-disclosure of a fundamental contradiction of interests, which is generally invisible both to legal scholarship (because foreign language issues are inherently peripheral) and to linguistics and applied linguistics (both of which are concerned with discourse rather than omission or non-discourse, and with structure rather than truth or equity).

With those two topics outlined just enough to see the connection with translation theory, let us leave them and attend to translation, and focus on literary translation, the domain which has been most substantively addressed academically. The present treatment dispenses with the details of those academic approaches precisely because they generally have been conceived by literary scholars from a language-centered point of view. Such approaches offer valid insights into language phenomena, but, because they hold the text as the primary object, they offer little insight into the receptive fortune of the same. In contrast, sociological theories of communication scrutinize the mechanics and the circulation of discourse. This is more in line with the present view, but there are two points on which communication theories seem inadequate. First, they are not concerned with language per se and are scarcely sensible to the stylistic nuances which make all the difference between exceptional and mediocre verbal artistry, so that they fail to inform inquiry as to aesthetics and as to the peculiarities of a given text (indeed, their interest is on a general message or agenda rather than on any single text). Second, because their interest is in the circulation and dissemination of a discourse object their focus is on the posterior phase of a text's existence and neglects the anterior phase of the generation of that object, its coming into being. The disparate field called 'Cultural Studies' redresses this by taking an interest in both sides of the coin – the cultural milieu which gives rise to the creation of a particular text (or, more usually, a writer, a group of writers or a genre), and its impact. Further, 'cultural studies' often attempt to balance attention to objective conditions and subjective peculiarities. Perhaps for this reason actual instantiations of 'cultural studies' (scholarly articles and books), despite the impressive theoretical baggage of the scholars, typically examine a particular work, artist, movement or event rather than attempting a theoretical synthesis, a theory of culture. Most of the best 'cultural studies' are a brilliant balancing act between historical knowledge, literary (or cultural) sensibility and subjective insight, and are averse to structuralist reductions.

The table proposed in the present text is an attempt at a structural synthesis. It is reductive, and, in it, circular processes are arranged into rectangles with a concern for the convenience of symmetry. It forces the three or four dimensions of spatially and temporally dynamic processes into the two available on the page. It is pseudo-scientific. I would defend it by referencing the study of politics. Politics itself is the radical merging of theory (abstract principles as expressed in tracts and agendas) and arbitrary circumstance. 'Political Science' attempts to systematize processes and to track concrete historical instantiations which are replete with surprising and crucial factoids beyond the scope of the systematic tracings of systems. Many of the best political

science studies are sensible to the situational vagaries which determined outcomes in the chapter of political history under study. This is not to suggest that paradigms or laws of process as outlined in political science are illusionary or a false referential authority. They must simply be balanced with awareness of the arbitrary and the subjective.

This whole Gordian knot was reduced by a foundational political theorist, Niccolo Macchiavelli, to the assertion that there are two complementary and contrary requisites for political success, personal ability (*virtù*) and luck (*fortuna*). Because Macchiavelli was concerned with individuals (princes, or autocrats), whereas modern political science is concerned with groups (parties) and messages (ensembles of discourse, platforms), we should recast personal ability as organizational capacity and rhetorical efficacy. If we do, Macchiavelli's radical reduction remains a strong hermeneutic. But Macchiavelli was also a great humanist, and an excellent playwright. While it was not his own intent (he vigorously separated his various intellectual pursuits), the present viewpoint applies Macchiavelli's political reduction to literary fortune, retaining his sense of the individual as the viewpoint addresses the figure of the author (and the translator), and applying the modern collectivist adaptation just outlined to the groups at play (first the publication team, then the receptive community at large). Fortune, meanwhile, should also be understood at two levels, that of the overall historical outcome and that of external circumstantial minutia. Macchiavelli is concerned with the good luck needed by the autocrat for success. The historic trajectory (fortune) of an individual, a group, a political party or a text hinges in part on good luck (the good fortune of fortuitous circumstances) along the way.

The study is concerned particularly with translation and secondary reception as much as with original genesis of the work and initial reception because in this perspective there is no inherent primacy (other than chronological) to the latter, and because the secondary genesis (the translation) and its reception serve as a model for subsequent or alternate iterations of re-articulation and reception. The literary work itself is not the singular protagonist of the adventure of literary fortune. The 'subject' here does not exclusively correspond to any single subject position (generative environment, the author, the work itself, the receptive audience). The subject does exist as an axis joining these entities; the subject is the effective life (or lives) of the book and not its potential. While anti-purist, this pragmatic approach does not deny the pertinence of traditional methods of literary scholarship, including, for example, the currently active school of author-centric genetic criticism which seeks hermeneutic clues by tracing the changes through pre-publication versions of a text from embryonic sketches to final alterations.

Traditional literary scholarship overlooks pragmatic obstacles to the dissemination of ideas and the distribution of literary product, as if, through some felicitous centripetal cultural gravity, great works, anchored by the immanence of 'high' culture, are destined to 'fall to earth' rather than remaining lost in the ether, and to be apprehended by an audience comprised of the broader mass of human culture. Such a mentality may once have been practical in a context of cultural

homogeneity, unchallenged authority, and unity of moral, aesthetic and material legitimacy. The modern age is marked by cultural heterogeneity where the alien is likely to be encountered and mis-recognized, by cultural abundance such that official apparatuses are insufficient to critically filter all cultural product and deliver it appropriately to a preponderant audience, by the eroding authority of official organs of critical evaluation, and, finally, by the movement by literature per se away from its former privileged central status as cultural expression.

In such a context, the evaluation of the reception and even the production of literary works must be assessed essentially as a political phenomenon, subject to a promiscuous interaction of asserted truth, perceived beauty, and effective utility. The trajectory or career of the book is analogous to that of the politician and his/her platform. The politician's fate depends on the public's subjective apprehension of his mix of content and form, eventually subject to the litmus test of elections, where there are more losers than winners. Further, the same formula may win at one national moment and lose at another. Similarly, in the world of translations and publications, there are more petitions than commissions, and more flops than revenue generators, significant fluctuations in the public's apprehension of and receptivity to a given work. In this spirit, to analyze the successful literary project I will use here Macchiavelli's terms, *virtù* and *fortuna*, denoting, respectively, the necessary combination of inherent quality and pragmatism (*virtù*, as used by Macchiavelli, has more to do with strength, advantage virility than with　moral 'virtue'), and those external circumstances to the person, which, if propitious, aid his or her success.

Another dimension of complication in modern analysis of the production and reception of literary text lies in the decline of the notion of the author as subject, as creator of the unique text. Of course, the very notion of the pertinence of reception as opposed to production implies the substitution of the idea of a solitary moment of creation, singular and eternal, by a diachronically and synchronically diffused process, or axis of production, whereby the text lives only in a series of unpredictable trajectories from writer to reader, passing by publishers, translations, book shops, unexpected echoes and resurgences of relevance of themes in the work, and so on.

Evidently, there is not one uniquely necessary finale to any trajectory. But with the decline of the author, one can also argue that neither is there any clear beginning to the creative process. If we ascribe at least partial legitimacy to the materialist notion of artistic expression as a predictable reflection of a given external historico-material reality, the text should not be seen as genetically begotten, as it were, by a controlling author, but rather as a discourse with some objective meaning in the world, produced by the collision of the author's idiosyncratic subjectivity and external circumstances facilitating production. These external circumstances vary from the portentous entities of *zeitgeist* in a Lucacsian sense to accidents such as the author learning to read, getting a certain education, encountering certain elements of the literary tradition(s) not being hit by a tram, being born with or without an Y-chromosome and so on. The extremes or fringes of both external and internal reality are realms of potential rather than existing reality, and can be

inscribed within the vagaries of *fortuna*.

To resume: the trajectory of the political career, governed by both idealist aspiration and pragmatism, affords the best analogy for the success or not of a literary text; the necessary pre-requisites for propitious production and publication in the first language are repeated as a process in the second language, without any guarantee of the same result, given the inconstancy of pertinent variables; not only the reception but also the production of the text occur as a fortuitous interaction of internal and external realities.

The tables below should be considered not as a definitive theoretical model but rather as an argument, illustrated diagramatically, for the replacement of the usual view of a unique and pure object ('the text'), with the idea of a socio-psychologically malleable process. These tables nominate stages and relevant variables in the process of creation-production-reception-recreation. The first table pertains to the author's language, the second to the target language. The terms are deployed symmetrically so as to underline correspondences. The horizontal categories ('stages') mark sequential moments in the process; 'genesis' suggests initial conception, 'articulation' the process of composition in a given language or cultural discourse; 'existence' the final textual product; 'recognition' concerns consequential status; 'integration into external cultural heritage' records the tangible instances of dissemination. The vertical categories, ('domains'), distinguish points along a continuum from the author's subconscious to his/her manipulable conscious and thence to the external world (acquaintances, publishers, historical moment, universal forms..). This multiplicity is indicated schematically with three zones - internal, external and intermediate. Fortuitous circumstances (*fortuna*) constitute a separate order. The Saussurean terms, *langue* and *langage* are adapted, connoting here, respectively, linguistic (objective and abstract) and discursive (subjective and instantiated) levels.

The schema creates a profile of a subject constituted by a movement of contraction and expansion, at the center of which is the source text, which remains the only relatively constant material object in the process. The first movement is from the abstract to the concrete, in the original confection of the work as it consolidates from an author's subjective awareness of a collective cultural sensibility, into a narrative intution, then a narrative proposal and then into a text). The second movement is back to the abstract, in the 'rewriting' of the narrative in the mind of the reader, in the inevitable mixing of the key ideas forged in the text with other ideas in the mind of the reader, and, at the collective level, if there are enough readers, in the ways that the work impacts the general culture (and becomes partially known even to persons who have not read the text).

This movement can be conceived as a trajectory with a direction and a motive energy. As for any other moving object in the atmosphere, the text's energy is subject to dispersion by opposing energies or to redirection by extraneous energies, whether they be negative (for example, lack of interest by the audience in the topic, or loss of memory by the reader, or bad translation) or

positive (for example, powerful re-interpretation, or even felicitous mistranslation). Here, the sense of volatility is crucial; a text can live long or die according to circumstantial factors; otherwise put, the life of the text is very different from the text itself, and what matters more is its effective life, though this may seem serendipitous, arbitrary and unreliable. A literary work is a tree which falls in the forest – if not heard, it is as if had not existed. This has happened to those literary great works which were never published (many of which, by the law of probability, we can assume have existed). The same obtains for works in less-used languages, in proportion to their disappearance and their quantitative rarification, and, in the end, to those languages. Wai palya.

The emergence and reception of the original text (gestation, creation, reception): writer > text > book > audience (> public domain culture)

↑ ↑ ↑ stages ↑ ↑ ↑

(⇓ domains ⇓)	origin	textual articulation (by writer or reader)	existence	objectification & recognition	integration into external cultural heritage
(internal reality) - <> cognitive domain	author's sensibility and idiosyncrasy	gradual conception & textual articulations	final textual articulation		
Intermediary interface of: - idea and thing - subject and object - internal and external	*langue* - <> language as potential resource	*langage* - <> provisional articulations	manuscript - as extended textual utterance; - still subject to 'interventions'	publication of text (book or other textual artifact)	extrapolations & transpositions of original text into other discursive formats - films, *telenovelas*, songs, national parks, academic research, etc.
external reality	socio-historic context	narrative theme	publisher support	reviews etc.	sales and other forms of dissemination
(fortuna)	random experiences whereby author 'finds' idea	literate society - adequate pool of (potential) readers	relative publisher resources (marketing & distribution, etc.)	cultural kudos of author, if it transfers to text	pragmatic cultural relevance of text <> pragmatic power of discursive current

⇑ original text ⇑ ⇒ ⇒ ⇓ translated text ⇓

(⇑ domains ⇑)	origin	textual articulation (by translator)	existence	recognition	integration into external cultural heritage
(internal reality)	translator's idiosyncrasy				
Intermediary interface of: - idea and thing - subject and object - internal and external		*langue & langage* issues: - lexical mapping - comparative syntax - possible resolutions of idioms, neologisms, etc.	manuscript (actual resolutions)	published text	extrapolations & transpositions of original text into other discursive formats - films, *telenovelas*, songs, national parks, academic research, etc.
(external reality)	- translator's education - literary knowledge - cultural frame of target community	mapping cultural *langage* - socio-historic context: - strategic question: authenticity via preservation of original or by adaptation to target?	publisher support	reviews etc.	sales and other forms of dissemination
(fortuna)	- potential interest of narrative topic	Translator's linguistic *virtù* (knowledge and talent)	resources (power) of publisher	- 'resonance' of text	pragmatic cultural relevance of text <> pragmatic power of discursive current

↑ ↑ stages ↑ ↑ ↑

The emergence and reception of the translation (creation, reception): translator > text > book > audience (> public domain culture)

⇑ domains ⇑

original text ⇑ translated text

(2012. 02. 08 受理)