Colloquium Area "The Role of Translation in Language and Literature Education"

THE LIVING TEXT: INVESTIGATING COLLABORATIVE TRANSLATION AS A SOCIAL PEDAGOGY IN LITERATURE STUDIES



Irin BAZAROVA, PhD
(Free International University of Moldova (ULIM))

bazarovairina28@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2446-3005

Received: January 9th, 2026 | Reviewed: January 9th, 2026 | Accepted: January 9th, 2026
UDC 81.19 | https://doi.org/10.62413/cqm.2026.43

Abstract

This paper investigates "The Living Text," a pedagogical framework that positions collaborative translation as a vital social pedagogy within literature studies. In an era dominated by generative AI, this study argues that the communal negotiation of meaning restores "human value" and artistry to the classroom. By synthesizing recent research on human-centered AI literacy, translanguaging, and emotional intelligence, the paper demonstrates how group-based translation projects transform static literary works into dynamic social workshops. Ultimately, the "Living Text" approach bridges the gap between language acquisition and literary criticism, fostering a collaborative environment where students move beyond "robotic" decoding toward deep, intercultural meaning-making.

Keywords: *collaborative translation, social pedagogy, the living text, human-centered ai, deep meaning-making, literary artistry, ai literacy, translanguaging, socio-constructivism, intercultural empathy*

I. Introduction

The traditional conceptualization of the literary text in educational settings has often leaned toward the "Closed Text"—a finished, static "museum piece" whose primary purpose is to be decoded and preserved by the student. In this paradigm, translation is frequently reduced to a mechanical transfer of fixed meanings, stripping the work of its vitality. However, this study posits a shift toward the "Living Text", an evolving social event that exists through continuous engagement, interpretation, and collective transformation. By viewing the text as a dynamic entity, the classroom transcends the passive consumption of literature, evolving into a space where linguistic and cultural boundaries are actively negotiated through the collaborative act. This perspective aligns with current research suggesting that the areas of translation, literature, and language teaching must be integrated to fully complement each other within the pedagogical framework (Canarinos & Pereira, 2024).

This pedagogical shift faces a significant modern conflict as technological advancements reshape the humanities. The rapid integration of machine translation and artificial intelligence into foreign language education has fundamentally altered how students interact with foreign literature. While these tools offer efficiency, they often contribute to a "crisis of meaning" within literature departments, where the nuance of the original work is sacrificed for algorithmic convenience (Urlaub & Dessein, 2022). This crisis is compounded by the necessity of developing AI literacy among novice translation students, who must navigate the ethical and practical implications of automated systems while maintaining their own critical agency (Zhang, 2025). Without a robust pedagogical framework, the pervasive use of AI risks reducing literary study to a surface-level exchange, stripping the text of its inherent depth and socio-cultural resonance.

To counteract this erosion of depth, this paper introduces the framework of Social Pedagogy. Within this framework, the classroom is reimagined as a "social workshop"—a collaborative environment where meaning is not simply "found" or extracted but is collectively negotiated through dialogue and shared intellectual labor. Social pedagogy emphasizes that learning is a communal process, particularly when dealing with the complexities of literary language that defy binary, machine-led interpretation. This approach allows for a qualitative meta-analysis of how diverse educational models can be synthesized to create a more holistic learning environment (Anvarhaghighi, 2024). It shifts the focus from individual mastery to collective inquiry, ensuring that the classroom remains a vibrant site of cultural production.

The central thesis of this study is that collaborative translation serves as a vital social pedagogy capable of restoring "human value" to the translation process (Cook, 2025). By engaging in a collective struggle with literary nuance, students are forced to move beyond the "robotic" outputs often generated by uncritical AI use, moving instead toward human-centered intelligence augmentation (Jiménez-Crespo, 2025). Collaborative translation demands an active, multi-vocal engagement with the text, where the artistry and deep meaning-making essential to literature are preserved. Ultimately, by treating translation as a social event rather than a solitary task, educators can realign literature studies to prioritize human agency, creative artistry, and the ethical responsibility inherent in linguistic mediation.

II. The "Human Value" Framework

The Artistry of Meaning: From Accuracy to Deep Meaning-Making

In the contemporary landscape of translation education, the traditional focus on "accuracy"—defined as a functional, one-to-one linguistic equivalence—is increasingly insufficient. As automated systems become adept at replicating surface-level syntax, the pedagogical objective must shift toward "deep meaning-making" and artistry. This framework suggests that translation is not merely the transmission of information but a creative act of interpretation that requires the human translator to engage with the text's subtext, cultural resonance, and aesthetic intent. By prioritizing these artistic dimensions, educators can foster a level of exper-

tise that Artificial Intelligence (AI) cannot replicate. The "human value" in this context is found in the ability to navigate ambiguity and perform complex intellectual labor that transcends the binary logic of algorithms (Cook, 2025).

This shift toward artistry is particularly crucial in literary translation, where the "living" nature of the text demands more than a static output. Deep meaning-making involves a holistic understanding of the author's voice and the socio-historical context of the work. When students are encouraged to view translation as an artistic endeavor, they move beyond the role of a technician and become active cultural mediators. This transformation is essential for the survival of the profession in an era of automation; it distinguishes the human translator as a specialized practitioner whose value lies in their unique capacity for creative synthesis and profound linguistic empathy (Cook, 2025).

Human-Centered AI (HCAI): Collaboration as a Safeguard

The rise of sophisticated Machine Translation (MT) tools has introduced a pedagogical risk: the tendency for students to "translate like robots." When learners rely excessively on automated outputs without critical intervention, they often produce texts that are grammatically correct but devoid of stylistic nuance or rhetorical purpose. To address this, the framework of Human-Centered AI (HCAI) emphasizes "intelligence augmentation" rather than replacement. In this model, technology serves to enhance human capabilities, ensuring that the translator remains at the center of the decision-making process. By realigning education to focus on HCAI, students learn to use AI as a tool for research and drafting while retaining final authority over the artistic and ethical dimensions of the work (Jiménez-Crespo, 2025).

Within the classroom, collaborative translation acts as a vital safeguard against the "robotic" tendencies of individual AI use. When students work collectively, they are forced to justify their choices to their peers, breaking the cycle of passive acceptance that often accompanies MT outputs. This social negotiation creates a "human-centered" filter; the group acts as a collective intelligence that evaluates the AI's suggestions through the lens of human experience and literary sensitivity. Collaboration thus transforms the act of translation from a solitary interaction with a screen into a multi-vocal debate that reinforces human agency and critical thinking (Jiménez-Crespo, 2025).

Emotion as a Compass: The Psychological Labor of the Group

One of the most significant limitations of algorithmic translation is its inability to experience or process emotion. Literary translation, however, is a deeply affective process that requires an understanding of the psychological nuances embedded in the source text. Translators must engage in emotional labor, sensing the "mood" or "tone" of a passage and attempting to recreate that emotional impact in the target language. This psychological perspective highlights that translation is not just a cognitive task but an emotional one, where the translator's own sensibilities serve as a compass for navigating literary complexity (Shadman & Khoshsaligheh, 2020).

In a collaborative social pedagogy, the group "feels" the impact of a literary passage in a way that an algorithm cannot replicate. Through dialogue and shared reading, students can discuss the emotional resonance of specific linguistic choices, weighing how a word might evoke nostalgia, tension, or irony. This collective emotional engagement allows the group to align their translation with the intended affective state of the original work. While an algorithm can calculate word frequency or probability, it cannot understand the visceral impact of a lyric or the subtle sorrow of a prose passage. By centering emotion within the social workshop, translation education reaffirms the irreplaceable role of human feeling in the creation and interpretation of literature (Shadman & Khoshsaligheh, 2020).

III. Translation as Social Pedagogy

The Collaborative Workshop: The Reflective-Cooperative Model

The implementation of translation as a social pedagogy necessitates a departure from the traditional "master-apprentice" classroom toward a more horizontal, collaborative workshop environment. Central to this transition is the "Reflective-Cooperative" model, which emphasizes the interdependence of learners within the translation process. In this framework, the pedagogical focus shifts from the final product to the communicative and reflective processes that occur during the act of translation. By adopting a qualitative approach to classroom interaction, educators can facilitate a space where students engage in meta-cognitive reflection on their own translation strategies while simultaneously cooperating with peers to solve complex linguistic puzzles. This model ensures that translation is treated not as a repetitive drill, but as a sophisticated professional and intellectual exercise that thrives on collective input (Anvarhaghighi, 2024).

Social Constructivism: Building a Shared Reality

At the heart of social pedagogy lies the principle of social constructivism, which posits that knowledge is actively constructed through social interaction rather than passively received. When applied to literature studies, this means that the "Living Text" becomes a shared reality built by the students. Rather than attempting to uncover a single "correct" meaning hidden within the source text, students participate in a communal construction of the text's significance in the target language. This process transforms the classroom into a micro-society where linguistic choices are negotiated through the lens of shared cultural and literary understandings. By working together to breathe life into a foreign text, students develop a sense of ownership over the material, recognizing that the "Living Text" is a product of their collective intellectual and social labor.

Negotiation as Learning: The Value of Social Friction

The true "pedagogy" of collaborative translation is often found in the moments of "social friction"—the disagreements and debates that occur when two or more students diverge on a specific word choice or stylistic nuance. In a solitary translation task, a student might choose a synonym based on habit or machine suggestion without further thought. However, in a collaborative setting, a disagreement forces the participants to externalize their internal reasoning. This friction requires

students to defend their interpretations using literary theory, stylistic analysis, and cultural context. They must articulate why a specific metaphor resonates more effectively or how a particular syntax better preserves the author's tone. This act of defense and negotiation is where the most profound learning occurs, as it necessitates a deep, critical engagement with the mechanics of both the source and target languages.

Bridging the Gap: Linking Acquisition and Appreciation

One of the persistent challenges in humanities education is the divide between language acquisition and literary appreciation. Students often perceive language learning as a functional, grammatical task, while literature is viewed as a separate, abstract domain. Collaborative translation serves as the bridge between these two spheres, demonstrating how the three areas of translation, literature, and language teaching essentially complement and reinforce each other. Through the social pedagogy of the workshop, students realize that linguistic proficiency is the tool through which literary depth is accessed, and conversely, that literary analysis provides the necessary context for sophisticated language use (Canarinos, Pereira, 2024). This integrated approach allows learners to move beyond surface-level fluency toward a more profound, nuanced mastery of the language that is rooted in the "living" reality of literary expression.

IV. The "Living Text" in Practice

Case Study 1: Song and Lyrics—The Pedagogy of "Tuning"

The collaborative translation of lyrics provides a definitive example of the "Living Text" in action, as it requires the translation to perform socially and aesthetically beyond the printed page. In a classroom setting, song translation moves the objective from semantic equivalence to "tuning"—a process where students must collectively harmonize linguistic meaning with rhythm, rhyme, and singability. This practice forces students to recognize that a literary text is not a static artifact but a rhythmic event that must function within the constraints of a specific medium (Tsai, 2024).

When students work together to "tune" a lyric, they engage in a high-stakes social negotiation. The collective must decide which metaphors to sacrifice to maintain the meter and which phonetic choices best evoke the emotional resonance of the original melody. This collaborative struggle transforms the translation into a "performance," where the success of the work is judged by its ability to be sung and felt by others. By treating the text as a living, breathing musical entity, students develop a sophisticated understanding of the artistic trade-offs inherent in all forms of translation (Tsai, 2024).

Case Study 2: Digital Tools—DIY Corpora as Collective Evidence

While technology is often viewed as a solitary or "robotic" influence, the use of "Do-It-Yourself" (DIY) corpora and text-mining approaches can actually enhance the social pedagogy of the translation workshop. Rather than relying on the isolated suggestions of an algorithm, students can collectively build and query corpora—specialized databases of existing translations or literary works—to inform

their "artistry." This data-driven approach allows the group to move beyond subjective intuition and base their creative decisions on empirical linguistic patterns found in similar literary contexts (Wu *et alii*, 2025).

In this context, the digital screen does not replace human interaction; instead, it becomes a campfire around which the group gathers to discuss data. For example, when text-mining reveals how a specific author uses a recurring motif, the students must collectively interpret that data to decide how to mirror that frequency in their own translation. This process bridges the gap between technical "text-mining" and human "meaning-making," showing that digital tools can provide the evidence needed to fuel the group's creative debates. The "Living Text" thus becomes a synthesis of human critical thinking and digital augmentation (*ibidem*).

Case Study 3: Translanguaging—The Multilingual Breath of the Text

The "Living Text" is fundamentally a multilingual phenomenon, fueled by the diverse linguistic identities that students bring to the classroom. This is best exemplified through the concept of translanguaging pedagogies, where students are encouraged to use their entire linguistic repertoire—including their native languages, dialects, and third languages—to navigate the translation process. By developing morphological awareness across different linguistic systems, students can draw connections between languages that an automated tool might overlook (Leonet, 2019).

When students engage in translanguaging during a collaborative task, they are not just translating from "Language A" to "Language B"; they are using their "whole linguistic identity" to breathe life into the text. This approach recognizes that the translator's brain is a dynamic, multi-vocal space. In a group setting, this results in a richer, more nuanced translation as students compare how different grammatical structures or cultural connotations in their various languages might influence the final literary product. Translanguaging ensures that the "Living Text" is not a sterile linguistic transfer but a vibrant cross-cultural exchange that honors the complex identities of the translators themselves (Leonet, 2019).

V. The Ethics of the Living Text

Decolonization: Collaboration as a Defense Against Erasure

The ethical dimension of the "Living Text" is perhaps most visible in the effort to decolonize literature and language education. When engaging with texts by Black and Indigenous writers, the translation process faces the constant risk of "erasure"—the flattening of cultural specificities, dialects, and historical traumas into a standardized, dominant-culture linguistic form. Collaborative translation serves as a vital pedagogical defense against this linguistic imperialism. Within a social workshop, a group is significantly more likely to identify, debate, and challenge the colonial biases that might otherwise go unnoticed by a solitary student or a purely statistical AI model. By centering these marginalized voices, the group must grapple with the "untranslatability" of certain cultural experiences, ensuring that the translation respects the original's resistance to easy assimilation (Mota-Pereira, 2024).

Furthermore, the social pedagogy of the "Living Text" encourages students to reflect on their own positionality and power as translators. When translating literature by marginalized writers, the group acts as a collective ethical monitor. For instance, if a machine translation suggests a word that carries an unintentional colonial connotation, the social friction of the group debate allows for a critical intervention. This collaborative scrutiny ensures that the act of translation becomes an act of advocacy and preservation rather than one of appropriation. In this sense, the "Living Text" is an ethical commitment to maintaining the diverse "voices" of the global South and Indigenous communities within the classroom, fostering a more responsible and inclusive linguistic future (Mota-Pereira, 2024).

Challenges in Literary Translation: Sharing the Pedagogical Burden

Literary translation is inherently a craft of high difficulty, characterized by complex challenges ranging from the loss of untranslatable metaphors to the navigation of contradictory linguistic registers. For a solitary student, these obstacles can often lead to a sense of "translation despair" or burnout, as they face the seemingly impossible task of replicating the artistry of a master author. This is where the importance of translation studies as an academic discipline becomes clear—it provides the theoretical tools to address these challenges, yet the intellectual "burden" remains heavy (Kumar, 2025).

By implementing a social pedagogy, this burden is redistributed across the group. When the difficulties of the craft are shared socially, the psychological weight of "getting it wrong" is diminished. The collaborative workshop transforms individual frustration into collective problem-solving. As students brainstorm solutions to the challenges highlighted by Kumar (2025), they realize that the pursuit of the "perfect" translation is less important than the shared journey of linguistic discovery. This social support structure prevents burnout and encourages students to persist in the difficult work of literary mediation. Ultimately, the "Living Text" is a resilient text—one that survives the complexities of translation because it is sustained by the combined intellectual and emotional labor of a community of learners (Kumar, 2025).

VI. Critical Synthesis & AI Literacy

The Role of AI Literacy: The Collective Auditor

In the contemporary translation landscape, the "Living Text" pedagogy does not advocate for the exclusion of technology; rather, it reconceptualizes the classroom as a critical space for the development of comprehensive AI literacy. By integrating the foundational insights of Zhang (2025), it becomes evident that novice students must develop more than functional proficiency with automated tools; they require a robust, critical awareness of the ethical and practical limitations inherent in algorithmic systems. Within the framework of the collaborative workshop, the student group serves as a collective auditor of AI-generated content. This social setting becomes the primary site where learners collectively identify instances where a machine is "hallucinating" stylistic nuances or flattening the rich, polysemic layers of literary expression that define high-level creative work (Zhang, 2025).

The "Living Text" approach ensures that students do not descend into the role of passive consumers of algorithmic outputs. Instead, the "social friction" produced by peer debate allows them to scrutinize machine-generated suggestions against their own intellectual, emotional, and cultural benchmarks. When the collective identifies a failure in the machine's logic—such as its inability to navigate complex cultural idioms or its tendency to misinterpret subtle ironies—it reinforces the students' sense of critical agency. This engagement transforms Artificial Intelligence from an unquestioned source of authority into a point of departure for deeper human discussion and analytical rigor.

Intelligence Augmentation (IA): Refined by the "Literary Eye"

The future of literature and translation studies lies not in the replacement of the human practitioner, but in the paradigm of Intelligence Augmentation (IA). Drawing on the work of Jiménez-Crespo (2025), this paper argues for a human-centered AI model where technology is utilized to sharpen, rather than dull, the student's perception. The collaborative group functions as the essential mechanism for this augmentation; the social group provides the "literary eye" necessary to refine the raw efficiency of the algorithm into a polished, artistic work (Jiménez-Crespo, 2025).

By employing the social workshop to augment the human ability to perceive literary nuance, educators ensure that translation remains a deeply humanistic endeavor. IA in a collaborative context means that while the machine provides the linguistic "skeleton" of a draft, the social body provides its breath, vitality, and ethical grounding. This synthesis confirms that the most sophisticated form of intelligence in the translation classroom is not the algorithm in isolation, but the community of learners engaged in the ethical, emotional, and artistic labor of interpreting the "Living Text." Consequently, AI literacy becomes an exercise in human empowerment, ensuring that technology serves the artistry of the translator rather than dictating the limits of the text.

VII. Conclusion

The conceptualization of the "Living Text" serves as more than a pedagogical framework; it represents a vital resistance movement against the "mechanization" of the humanities. As Artificial Intelligence and Machine Translation continue to proliferate, there is an escalating risk that literary study will be reduced to a series of functional, data-driven transactions. By treating the text as a dynamic, evolving social event rather than a static object for decoding, the collaborative translation workshop reclaims the territory of "deep meaning-making and artistry" (Cook, 2025). This resistance is not a rejection of technology, but a refusal to allow the "robotic" flattening of human culture to become the educational standard (Jiménez-Crespo, 2025). It asserts that the nuances of literature—the emotional resonances, the historical echoes, and the creative friction of language—are fundamentally human domains that require collective, multi-vocal engagement.

To remain relevant in 2025 and beyond, literature studies must undergo a profound pedagogical shift. The discipline must embrace "translation as performance"

and the "translation social workshop" as its core methodologies. This approach ensures that students are not merely observers of linguistic artifacts but are active participants in a socioconstructivist building of reality. Through Case Studies in song "tuning" (Tsai, 2024), translanguaging (Leonet, 2019), and the collective auditing of AI literacy (Zhang, 2025), the classroom becomes a site of ethical and artistic empowerment. By sharing the "burden" of translation's inherent challenges (Kumar, 2025), we prevent the despair of isolation and foster a resilient community of scholars.

Ultimately, the "Living Text" framework realigns the humanities with its original purpose: to investigate what it means to be human in an increasingly complex and interconnected world. By prioritizing social pedagogy over solitary consumption, and intelligence augmentation over automation, we ensure that the study of literature remains a vibrant, necessary, and deeply human endeavor. The future of translation education lies in the "social workshop," where the negotiation of a single word becomes a powerful act of cultural preservation, decolonization, and creative discovery.

References

Cook, A. (2025). Exploring the goals of translation education: adding human value to literary translation through deep meaning making and artistry. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 19(3-4), 254-276, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1750399X.2025.2543208?src=.

Canarinos, A. K., Pereira, W. P. (2024). Translation, literature, and language teaching: do these three areas complement each other? *Trab. linguist. apl.*, 63 (1), https://www.scielo.br/j/tla/a/szH8Z6kdgc46JyFzSnGs6hg/?lang=en.

Jiménez-Crespo, M. A. (2025). "If students translate like a robot …" or how research on human-centered ai and intelligence augmentation can help realign translation education. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 19(3-4), 277-295. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1750399X.2025.2542022.

Wu, Y., Feng, H., Mau, B. (2025). Didactic potential of working with DIY corpora and text mining approaches in literary translation training. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 19(2). https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1750399X.2025.2488714

Zhang, J. (2025). Investigating novice translation students' AI literacy in translation education. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 19(3-4), 234-253, https://www. tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1750399X.2025.2541478.

Anvarhaghighi, M. (2024). Common Themes and Trends in Four Models of Translation Education: A Qualitative Meta-Analysis. *Academic Research Paper*, 21(84). https:// journal.translationstudies.ir/ts/article/view/1157.

Urlaub, P., Dessein E. (2022). Machine translation and foreign language education. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, Natural Language Processing*. https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/artificial-intelligence/articles/10.3389/frai.2022.936111/full.

Shadman, N., Khoshsaligheh, M. (2020). Translation and Emotion. A Psychological Perspective. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*. https://www.researchgate.net/ publi-

cation/392820122_Hubscher-Davidson_Severine_Translation_and_Emotion_A_Psychological_Perspective.

Tsai, Y. (2024). Tuning language and lyrics: a case study of song translation in the translator training classroom. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1750399X.2025.2507541?af=R.

Mota-Pereira, F. (2024). Decolonizing english language education with literature by black and indigenous writers. *Trab. linguist. apl.*, 63 (1). https://www.scielo.br/j/tla/a/BkRD4b3JFxPhLh4Gw8Kjdxn/?format=html&lang=en.

Kumar, M. (2025). Importance of translation studies and challenges in literary translation. *Journal of Literature and Culture Studies,* 3(2). https://www.researchgate.net/ publication/395744029_IMPORTANCE_OF_TRANSLATION_STUDIES_AND_CHALLENGES_IN_LITERARY_TRANSLATION

Leonet, O. (2019). Developing morphological awareness across languages: translanguaging pedagogies in third language acquisition. *Language Awareness*, 29(1). https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09658416.2019.1688338.