Investigating the Cross-Cultural Impact: An Analysis of Turkish Translations of Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) through Reiss's Text Typology

Kültürler Arası Etkiyi Keşfetmek: Reiss'in Metin Türü Yaklaşımı Işığında Avrupa Ortak Başvuru Metni (AOBM) Türkçe Çevirisinin İncelenmesi

Hatice DELİBAŞ[1]

[1]Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu, Ankara
· **htcdelibash@gmail.com** · ORCİD > 0000-0003-3539-2350

INVESTIGATING THE CROSS-CULTURAL IMPACT: AN ANALYSIS OF TURKISH TRANSLATIONS OF COMMON EUROPEAN FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE (CEFR) THROUGH REISS'S TEXT TYPOLOGY

ABSTRACT

The research investigates Turkish translations of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) from the perspective of Reiss's text typology. CEFR is a comprehensive document defining language teaching, learning objectives and providing testing tools designed in 2001 with the impact of multiculturalism and multilingualism notions. The document has been translated into 40 different languages and applied globally since then. Turkish is one of the languages in which CEFR was translated. These translations, on the other hand, are crucial for informing target audience regarding development and innovation in language learning, assessment and curriculum. This study aims to shed light on the cross-cultural impact of CEFR by analyzing its Turkish translations through Reiss's text typology. The study adopts the method of document analysis to examine Turkish translations of CEFR by focusing on key terms and concepts related to language education. Based on the findings of the study, CEFR is an informative text in terms of text typology approach and transferred to Turkish aligned with source text in terms of its function and content. These results suggest that translators adopted a translation approach fulfilling the intended purpose of the text and demands of the target audience considering informative text type. Additionally, the findings of the study are also notable in that it offers a thorough understanding of the CEFR's cross-cultural impact in Turkish setting and a systematic approach for translators regarding text types. The research is expected to contribute to translation studies and enhance foreign language education practices and policies in Turkey with the insights it offers.

Keywords: Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), Text Typology, Turkish Translations of CEFR, Cross-Cultural Impact, Foreign Language Education.

❁ ❁ ❁

KÜLTÜRLER ARASI ETKİYİ KEŞFETMEK: REİSS'İN METİN TÜRÜ YAKLAŞIMI IŞIĞINDA AVRUPA ORTAK BAŞVURU METNİ (AOBM) TÜRKÇE ÇEVİRİSİNİN İNCELENMESİ

ÖZ

Bu araştırmada, Diller için Avrupa Ortak Başvuru Metni (AOBM) Türkçe çevirileri Reiss'in metin türü yaklaşımıyla incelenmektedir. Dil öğrenme ve öğretme hedeflerini belirleyen ve değerlendirme araçları sağlayan bu metin çok kültürlülük ve çok dillilik kavramlarının etkisiyle 2001 yılında ortaya çıkmıştır. AOBM, o zamandan beri dünya çapında kullanılmakta ve şimdiye kadar 40 farklı dile aktarılmıştır. Türkçe ise bu metnin çevrildiği dillerin başında gelmektedir. Bu çeviriler, dil öğrenen ve öğretenleri dil eğitimi, müfredat, ölçme ve değerlendirme çalışmalarına dönük yenilikler ve gelişmeler noktasında bilgilendirmesi açısından önem arz etmektedir. Buradan hareketle oluşturulan bu araştırma, metnin Türkçe çevirilerini Reiss'in metin türü yaklaşımıyla inceleyerek AOBM'nin kültürlerarası etkisini ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu bağlamda yabancı dil eğitimi ile ilgili terim ve kavramların karşılaştırmalı bir şekilde incelendiği araştırmada doküman analizi yöntemi benimsenmektedir. Araştırmanın sonuçlarına göre, içerdiği özelliklerle AOBM'nin bilgilendirici metin türüne ait olduğu ve erek metindeki işlevi ve içeriği bakımından kaynak metinle uyumlu bir şekilde Türkçeye aktarıldığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu sonuç, çevirmenlerin bilgilendirici metin türünün özelliklerini göz önünde bulundurarak metnin amacına uygun ve hedef kitlenin taleplerini karşılayan bir çeviri yaklaşımı benimsediklerini göstermektedir. Ayrıca, çalışmanın sonuçları AOBM'nin Türkiye bağlamında kültürler arası etkisinin kapsamlı bir şekilde anlaşılmasını sağlaması ve sistematik bir yaklaşım sunması açısından da dikkate değerdir. Araştırma sonuçlarının, çeviri bilimine katkı sağlaması ve Türkiye'deki yabancı dille ilgili eğitim uygulamalarını ve politikalarını geliştirmesi beklenmektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Avrupa Ortak Başvuru Metni (AOBM), Metin Türü Yaklaşımı, AOBM Türkçe Çevirileri, Kültürlerarası Etki, Yabancı Dil Eğitimi.

❀ ❀ ❀

INTRODUCTION

Every translation is carried out for a specific purpose. Depending on the selected text type, the translation approach may change in accordance with this specified goal. For instance, while a literary work incorporates creative language usage including rhetoric and artistic style, informative or instructional texts have a more referential style highlighting the content over the form. This distinction between form and content is also where text types have developed.

When the sentences that make up the text are linguistically analyzed, Chomsky's distinction between deep structure and surface structure in sentences becomes apparent based on the text types (1965). The point to be emphasized here is what makes the deep structure meaningful is both writer and reader. While the writer tries to make the information s/he thinks meaningful on the surface structure, the reader, on the other hand, tries to make sense of the referents with the existing world knowledge. Thus, the reader aims to uncover the deep structure based on the superficial relationship between the signified and the signifiers and to derive the meaning through contextualizing the message (Harris, 1993).

The translator, on the other hand, reshapes the text formed in the deep and surface structure spiral, taking into account some variables such as target culture and target language. This point is precisely where the role of translator is getting challenging as well. Because the translator should reform the text created in the deep and surface structure spiral while keeping in mind the aim and function of the text as well as demands of target audience. Translator, at the same time, should decide on type of the text at the beginning of the translation process as another crucial task.

The concept of text types was introduced by Katharina Reiss inspired by the studies of linguist Bühler (1879-1963). According to Reiss, texts are categorized as informative, expressive, operational and audio-visual (1989). The first type that is informative texts is for conveying the information. The second type of text is called expressive text which conveys emotions and feelings. The third type named as operational texts is for serving practical aims such as contracts, advertisements. The last text type, audio-visual texts, is related to the transmission of all kinds of text concerning visual or audio media materials (Reiss, 2000).

Considering the different types of texts described above, it could be stated that Reiss (1989) attempts to highlight the necessity of focusing on the text types in a holistic way rather than only the word or sentence level in order to convey the proper message of the text. Given that the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR, 2001) is analyzed from this point, it is observed that it has a broad content enriched with extensive terminology and innovative concepts related to the field of foreign language education.

In order to translate such a text that includes profound information and rich terminology, translators should be aware of type of the text and determine the purpose and function of it as well as target audience. Within this perspective, it might be argued that the translation of such texts related to foreign language education is a challenge on its own as these texts include all the difficulties of translation of both technical and literary texts (Aksoy, 1999). In this respect, utilizing a systematic and functional approach that presents solutions for potential problems

might be beneficial for translators. Text typology introduced by Reiss (2000) could be useful to overcome challenges and come up with solutions for possible problems that translators encounter in the process of translation of texts including wide knowledge and rich terminology related to foreign language education. In this regard, the research intends to explore Turkish translations of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) within Reiss's text typology. Some of the questions to be addressed in the study are:

1. What is the text type of CEFR within text typology approach?

2. Do the content of target text (TT) and source text (ST) align with each other in terms of text typology?

3. What are the translation strategies employed to adapt the concepts and terminology of the CEFR to the Turkish cultural and educational context?

By addressing the questions above, this research offers a novel understanding regarding intercultural transference of CEFR by offering a systematic approach. The study also provides a framework for analyzing Turkish translations of the CEFR through text type approach. Even though there is a lot of research regarding CEFR creating a paradigm shift in language education, the fact that this research deals with CEFR through the lens of translation studies makes the results of this research valuable. It is expected that the result of the study will offer a distinctive insight into the field of foreign language education and contribute to translation studies.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Text Typology

The act of translation is to reconstruct a text for target audience by taking into account its type as well as its purpose, function and cultural context. The core of such an approach in translation is functionalist translation theories. Functional approaches have created a paradigm shift in translation studies by focusing on socio-cultural context and intended purpose (Vermeer & Reiss, 2013; Venuti, 1995; Monday, 2016). Within functionalist approach context, one of the most prominent theories is text typology approach proposed by Reiss.

This approach provides a classification framework for texts depending on their functions. Based on the framework of this approach, texts are divided into four categories that are informative, expressive, operative, and audio-medial texts. In the context of these texts, Reiss claims that the choice of translation method depends on the type and content of the text (2000). According to Reiss, the type and content of the text should be at the forefront of the factors that the translator should

consider in the intercultural transfer of any text since the content of the texts varies according to their types (2000).

For instance, informative texts could be texts such as reports, reference books, or lectures that aim to convey information in different contexts and concepts. Therefore, primary approach for these texts should make the translation as simple and clear as possible. However, the fact that some texts include special terminology, technical terms or some concepts that lack equivalents in target culture could be challenging for translation of informative texts. Accordingly, translation of target text should include all theoretical details and relevant content. In order to be able to convey all significant parts of the text, translators might apply translation strategies such as *literal translation*, *explication* and *addition* to help transfer of source text accurately. Thus, translators can create a balance between being comprehensible and culturally suitable in the target language by taking into account the specific needs of target audience. The style of text, on the other hand should be "plain-prose" (Monday, 2016; Reiss, 1989).

For expressive texts such as literary work, translators should adopt a translation approach highlighting the aesthetic and creative elements of the texts. These kinds of texts require a different approach than informative texts. In this context, translators might apply strategies that preserve the tone, style and voice of author. For operative texts such as instructions, advertisements, user guides, translators should consider function of the text by meeting special expectations of target audience. The last category of the classification is audio-medial texts such as movies, radio broadcasts or other forms of visual or audio media. Translators should be aware of different elements of audio-media to transfer intended purpose for this type. In this context, translators may employ both *adaptation* and *literal translation*, along with creative techniques, to ensure that the translation becomes culturally engaging for the target audience. The following table summarizes the main features of text types (Reiss, 1989).

Table 1. *Main Features of Text Types*

Text type	Informative	Expressive	Operative	Audio-medial
Function of text	Informative (Presenting objects, information, facts)	Expressive	Representative	Informative + Expressive + Representative
Dimension of text	Rational	Artistic	Dialogic	Conversational

Focus of text	Based on content	Based on form	Based on conversation	Based on content + form + conversation as well as audio-medial material
Translation method	'Plain prose', Providing explication when needed	Engaging	Provoking the appropriate reaction	Provoking the appropriate reaction
TT should	convey relevant content	be adopting author's style	have functional equivalent	have functional equivalent

(Monday, 2016; Reiss, 1989)

As can be summarized in Table 1 above, determining the type of ST should be the primary criterion for a translator since the focus of the text, the aim of the text and the elements that determine the translation method are the type of the text. In this context, how this research was carried out based on text typology introduced by Reiss (1989) is explained in the method section of the study.

METHOD

As one of the qualitative research methods, the method of document analysis was used in the research. Turkish translations of the CEFR were examined comparatively in detail with an emphasis on key terms and concepts related to foreign language education.

The Universe and Sample of the Study

The universe of the study contains all text types related to foreign language education. The sample of the study, on the other hand, includes Turkish translations of Common European Languages Framework (CEFR).

Data Collection and Sampling

The corpus of the study includes CEFR created by Council of Europe in 2001 and its Turkish translations translated by Ministry of Education Board in 2009. It is observed that the purpose of the both corpora cover program design, describing language proficiency levels, language teaching, education and assessment. The data of the study was determined by focusing on the key concepts, terms, proficiency levels and language descriptors of the CEFR. Within this framework, the examples are determined through stratified sampling method. The basis of this sampling

depends on the universe into various substrata before selecting the sample and then samples are selected out of the strata (Creswell, 2013). After sampling, the examples are analyzed in order to reveal in-text equivalence between ST and TT in terms of text typology approach.

Data Analysis

The in-text analysis encompasses the analysis of translation of textual content and terminology of the CEFR according to the criteria suggested by Reiss (2000). These are linguistic and non-linguistic components. While linguistic features include semantic and lexical equivalence as well as stylistic and linguistic features of text, non-linguistic elements contain time, place, receiver, target culture (Monday, 2016) In this context, after determining the type of the text, the data acquired was analyzed in terms of its language usage, style, semantic and lexical equivalence comparatively considering non-linguistic features of the text. Thus, in-text equivalence is revealed between ST and TT.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

CEFR is a framework describing language proficiency levels and providing instruction for learning, teaching and testing languages (Cefr, 2001; Hazar, 2021). Given that the subject matter of CEFR analyzed deeply, it is observed that the document includes content with rich terminology and concepts related to foreign language education. In this context, the research consists of two stages: Comparative analysis of Turkish translations of content and comparative analysis of key terms of CEFR. The following examples are examined and discussed within the given context.

Comparative Analysis of CEFR in Terms of its Textual Content

Based on the general features of CEFR, it is observed that it falls in the category of informative text according to Reiss's text typology (1977). As highlighted by Reiss, the main focus of these kinds of texts are transmission of information (1977). Since these texts include terminology, the accuracy of the information transferred is crucial. Therefore, translators should provide in-text coherence between ST and TT as the main aim of "translation of any content-focused text" should be "preserving semantic equivalence" between texts (Monday, 2016, p. 118). When CEFR translations are taken into account within this context, it becomes evident how crucial to convey the content of CEFR to TT. Examples regarding analogy of TT and ST in terms of their contents and goals of CEFR are below.

Table 2. *Comparison of ST and TT in Terms of Their Contents and Goals*

ST	TT
"**The aim of these notes** is to help you to use the Common European Framework for language learning, teaching and assessment more effectively, either as a language learner or as a member of one of the professions concerned with language teaching and assessment" (2001, p. 4).	"**Bu kitabın amacı** gerek dil öğreneni olan gerekse dil öğretimi ve değerlendirilmesi ile ilgili mesleklerden biri ile ilgilenen sizlere dil öğrenimi, öğretimi ve değerlendirmesi alanlarında Avrupa Ortak Başvuru Metni'ni daha etkili kullanmanızda kolaylık sağlamaktadır" (2009, p. 4).
"**To promote**, **encourage** and **support the efforts of teachers and learners at all levels** to apply in their own situation the principles of the construction of language-learning systems" (2001, p. 3).	"Dil öğrenme sistemlerinin oluşturulmasında geçerli ilkelerin **her düzeyde öğretmen ve öğrencilerin** kendi durumlarına göre uygulanması konusundaki **çabalarını teşvik etmek, artırmak** ve **desteklemek**" (2009, p.2).
"**To promote research and development programmes** leading to the introduction, at all educational levels, of methods and materials best suited to enabling different classes and types of students to acquire a communicative proficiency appropriate to their specific needs" (2001, p. 3).	"Bütün eğitim düzeylerinde özel ihtiyaçlarına uygun iletişim yeteneğini farklı öğrenci türleri ve sınıflarına kazandırmak için gereken öğretim yöntemleri ve materyalleri ortaya koyacak **araştırma ve geliştirme programlarını oluşturmak**" (2009, p. 3).

Table 2 demonstrates that the aim of the CEFR is to offer information about "language learning, teaching and assessment", "to promote, encourage and support the efforts of teachers and learners at all levels" and "to promote research and development programmes" (2001, pp. 3-4). When the ST and TT were compared in terms of content and language usage, it was observed that the translators carried out a translation for the purpose determined in TT. From the perspective of text typology, it is apparent that translators' preference was for semantic and lexical equivalence as the correct transference of the content is the primary goal for informative texts. In relation to language usage, word choice and style of both texts, it could be stated that translators adopted a plain and clear approach. These findings indicate that the content of TT and ST are overlapped.

Table 3. *Comparison of ST and TT in Terms of Content of the Texts*

ST	TT
"The Common European Framework provides a common basis for the elaboration of **language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks, etc**. across Europe" (2001, p. 1).	"Diller için Avrupa Ortak Başvuru Metni, Avrupa ülkelerinde **dil öğretim programlarını, program yönergelerini, sınav ve ders kitapları vb.** konulardaki çalışmaları yönlendirmek için ortak bir çerçeve sunmayı amaçlamaktadır" (2009, p. 1).
"The planning of language learning programmes" (2001, p. 6).	"Dil öğrenme programlarının planlanması" (2009, p. 5).
"The planning of language certification in terms of: • the content syllabus of examinations; • assessment criteria, in terms of positive achievement rather than negative deficiencies" (2001, p. 6).	"Dil öğreniminin belgelendirilmesi 1. Sınav program içeriklerine 2. Değerlendirme ölçütlerine, (olumsuzluklardan çok olumlu özelliklerin göz önüne alı-narak) göre planlanmasıdır" (2009, p. 5).

In Table 3, when ST is compared to TT in terms of language usage and word choice, it is obvious that translators favored an approach that represents the intended meaning of the TT. In this sense, translators benefit from strategies related to explaining the specific terms of CEFR in order to convey the content accurately and completely to target culture. For instance, the expression of "**language syllables**" meaning "**dil müfredatları**" is transferred to TT as "**dil öğretim programları**" by making the meaning as comprehensible as possible for target audience. As another example, on the other hand, the expression of "**curriculum guidelines**" meaning "**müfredat yönergeleri**" is translated as "**program yönergeleri**" by providing coherence between terms in Turkish context for target audience. Based on the examples above, when the sentences are evaluated as a whole, it is observed that the principle of in-text coherence is provided between ST and TT. As a result, it can be stated that translators were able to provide a comprehensible and clear translation of ST.

Table 4. *Comparison of ST and TT in Terms of Key Concepts*

ST	TT
"The learner does not simply acquire two distinct, unrelated ways of acting and communicating. The language learner becomes **plurilingual** and develops **interculturality**. The **linguistic and cultural competences** in respect of each language are modified by knowledge of the other and contribute to intercultural awareness, skills and know-how" (2001, p. 43).	"Öğrenen kişi basit bir biçimde birbirinden ayrı hareket ve iletişim yolları edinmez. Dil öğrenen **çok dilli** bir birey olur ve **kültürlerarası farkındalık** geliştirir. **Dilbilimsel ve kültürel yetiler,** her dil bakımından diğer bir dilin bilgisi sayesinde şekil değiştirir ve bu kültürlerarası farkındalık, beceriler ve teknik bilginin gelişimine yardımcı olur" (2009, p. 42).

When the sentences in Table 4 are compared in terms of the concepts they contain, it has been observed that the translators conveyed the concepts in the source text by making use of some strategies. For instance, concepts such as **"plurilingual", "linguistic and cultural competence"** were transferred as "**çok dilli", "dilbiligisel ve kültürel yeterlik"** with *literal translation* strategy while the term "**interculturality**" is transferred as "**kültürlerarası farkındalık**" with *addition* strategy in order to transmit the meaning of term accurately and fully. Overall, it can be concluded that both TT and ST are compatible with each other, as the crucial point for informative texts is to convey important concepts and terms entirely.

Table 5. *Comparison of ST and TT in terms of Key Terms and Adopted Language Method in CEFR*

ST	TT
"A **comprehensive, transparent and coherent frame of reference** for language learning, teaching and assessment must relate to a very general view of language use and learning. The approach adopted here, generally speaking, is an **action-oriented** one in so far as it views users and learners of a language primarily as '**social agents**', i.e., members of society who have tasks (not exclusively language-related) to accomplish in a given set of circumstances, in a specific environment and within a particular field of action" (2001, p. 9)	"**Kapsamlı, saydam ve tutarlı olması istenen bir dil öğrenme, öğretme ve değerlendirme başvuru metni**, dil kullanımı ve öğrenimi konusunda çok genel bir bakış açısına sahip olmalıdır. Burada benimsenen yaklaşım, bir dili kullanan ve öğrenenleri öncelikle "**sosyal aktörler**" olarak yani, çeşitli durumlarda, belirli bir çevrede ve özel bir hareket sahasında yerine getirmeleri gereken (sadece dille sınırlı da olmayan) görevleri bulunan toplum üyeleri olarak gördüğü için genel anlamda **eylem odaklı yaklaşımdır** diyebiliriz" (2009, p. 6).
"The introduction of a **European Language Portfolio** with international currency is now under consideration. The Portfolio would make it possible for learners to document their progress towards plurilingual competence by recording learning experiences of all kinds over a wide range of languages, **much of which would otherwise be unattested and unrecognised**" (2001, p. 20)	"Şimdi **Avrupa Dil Portfolyosu'nun** uluslararası kullanımı tasarlanmaktadır. Portfolyo uygulaması, çok çeşitli diller içerisinde her tür öğrenme deneyimini kaydederek öğrenicilerin çok dilli yetiye doğru ilerleyişlerini belgelendirmeyi mümkün kılacaktır" (2009, p. 16).

When the examples in Table 5 are compared, it is observed that both texts are aligned with each other providing a shared goal of language teaching and learning. For example, the term "**action-oriented approach**" and "**social agents**" highlighting the role of learners are transferred into Turkish as "**eylem odaklı yaklaşım**" and "**sosyal aktörler**" with *literal translation* strategy. The *literal translation* is a strategy that is often preferred to convey the original meaning of the terms or concepts in

the source text since it is important to convey the source text completely and accurately in informative texts. However, when another example related to "**European Language Portfolio**" is analyzed, the notable point is that the part "**much of which would otherwise be unattested and unrecognized**" of the second sentence was not translated. It could be stated that this circumstance might result in information loss for target audience. This point could be regarded as a weak point as accurate and complete translation of the content has the ultimate significance for Reiss's text typology. In addition to these examples, another distinctive part of CEFR is that it provides language descriptors to evaluate learners' proficiency in a foreign language. Related examples are below.

Table 6. *Comparison of ST and TT in Terms Language Descriptors in CEFR*

ST			TT		
"Proficient use" (2001, p. 24).	C2	"Can understand with ease virtually everything heard or read. Can summarise information from different spoken and written sources, reconstructing arguments and accounts in a coherent presentation. Can express him/herself spontaneously, very fluently and precisely, differentiating finer shades of meaning even in more complex situations" (2001, p. 24).	"İleri Düzey kullanıcı" (2009, p. 22)	C2	"Okuduğu ve duyduğu her şeyi neredeyse bir çaba göstermeksizin anlayabilir. Farklı kaynaklardan yazılı ve sözlü olgu ve kanıtları tutarlı bir biçimde özetleyerek yeniden oluşturabilir. Doğal bir biçimde, son derece akıcı ve kesin olarak kendini ifade edebilir ve karmaşık konularla bağlantılı ince anlam farklılıklarını ayırt edebilir" (2009, p. 22)
	C1	"Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognise implicit meaning. Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions" (2001, p. 24).		C1	"Uzun ve zorlu metinlerden oluşan geniş bir basamağı anlayabilir ve örtük anlamları kavrayabilir. Sözcüklerini uzun uzadıya aramak zorunda olmaksızın doğal ve akıcı bir biçimde kendini ifade edebilir" (2009, p. 22)

"Independent user" (2001, p. 24).	B2	"Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialisation" (2001, p. 24).	"Ara Düzey Kullanıcı" (2009, p. 22)	B2	"Uzmanlık alanına ilişkin teknik bir tartışma da dahil olmak üzere karmaşık bir metin içindeki somut ya da soyut konuların özünü anlayabilir" (2009, p. 22)
	B1	"Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc." (2001, p. 24).		B1	"Açık ve standart bir dil kullanıldığında ve iş, okul, eğlence, vd. bildik şeyler söz konusu ana konuları anlayabilir" (2009, p. 22)
"Basic user" (2001, p. 24).	A2	"Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment)" (2001, p. 24).	"Temel Düzey Kullanıcı" (2009, p. 22)	A2	"Tek cümleleri ve doğrudan öncelik alanlarıyla (söz gelimi yalın ve kişisel bilgiler ve aile bilgileri, alışverişler, yakın çevre, iş) ilişkili olarak sıklıkla kullanılan deyimleri anlayabilir" (2009, p. 22)
	A1	"Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type" (2001, p. 24).		A1	"Sıradan ve gündelik deyişlerle somut gereksinimleri karşılamayı hedefleyen son derece yalın ifadeleri anlayabilir ve kullanabilir" (2009, p. 22)

Given that CEFR language descriptors are compared in terms principles of text typology approach, it is observed that both ST and TT share a similar aim and function since they both provide an understanding of foreign language levels and their complementary abilities as informative text. In relation to translation strategies, it is viewed that *literal translation* is preferred by translators to assure the accuracy of the text transferred. Overall, it could be expressed that translators conveyed the language descriptors of CEFR effectively by considering the needs of target audience in terms of cultural and educational context of Turkish language.

In light of examples illustrated above, it could be concluded that CEFR is an informative text with the features it has. Terms, on the other hand, are another significant part of informative texts. CEFR contains intensive terminology related to language education. Below is comparative analysis of CEFR's terminology.

Comparative Analysis of CEFR's Terminology

Terminology refers to a vocabulary related to a certain field. When CEFR is analyzed in terms of terminology, it is observed that it has a rich terminology on language teaching and education related to language levels, skills and assessment in different contexts. Some of the crucial terms brought by CEFR to language education field and their Turkish translations are presented below.

Table 7. *Some Key Terms in ST and TT*

ST	TT
"A1 (Breakthrough), A2(Waystage), B1(Threshold), B2(Vantage), C1 (Effective Operational Proficiency) and C2 (Mastery)" (2001, p. 30)	"A1 (Breakthrough): Başlangıç ya da keşif düzeyi A2 (Waystage): Ara düzey ya da İletişimden Kopmama Düzeyi B1 (Threshold): Eşik Düzey B2 (Vantage): İleri Düzey ya da Bağımsız Kullanıcı Düzeyi C1 (Effective Operational Proficiency): Özerk Düzey C2 (Mastery): Ustalık Düzeyi" (2009, p. 29).
"The measurement literature recognises five classic ways of linking separate assessments: **(1) equating; (2) calibrating; (3) statistical moderation; (4) benchmarking, and (5) social moderation**" (2001, p. 182)	"Ölçme literatürü, bağımsız ölçmelerin birbiriyle ilişkilendirilmesi için beş yöntem tanır: **(1) denkleştirme (equating) (2) ayarlama (calibrating) (3) istatistik ayarlaması (statistical moderation) (4) işaretleme (benchmarking) (5) sosyal ayarlama (social moderation)"** (2009, p. 167).
"For **continuous assessment** or for **summative assessment** at the end of a course" (2001, p. 180)	**"Sürekli değerlendirme (continuous assessment)** veya dönem sonu/ **düzey belirleme (summative) değerlendirmeleri** için kullanır" (2009, p. 166).
"There are three concepts that are traditionally seen as fundamental to any discussion of assessment: **validity, reliability and feasibility"** (2001, p. 177).	"Geleneksel olarak, üç kavram herhangi bir değerlendirme tartışmasının temelini oluşturur: **Geçerlilik, güvenirlilik** ve **verimlilik"** (2009, p. 163).
"Talking in terms of the series of Council of Europe content specifications, even if **Waystage** is situated halfway to **Threshold Level** on a scale of levels, and **Threshold** half way to **Vantage Level**, experience with existing scales suggests that many learners will take more than twice as long to reach **Threshold Level** from **Waystage** than they needed to reach **Waystage"** (2001, p. 17)	"Avrupa Konseyi içerik belirleme serilerine göre konuşacak olursak, **Waystage** düzeyler çizelgesinde **Threshold Level'ın** yarısında ve **Threshold** da **Vantage Level'ın** yarısında yer almasına rağmen, mevcut düzey çizelgesi ile deneyim göstermektedir ki birçok öğrenci **Waystage'**den **Threshold Level'a** ulaşmak için **Waystage'e** ulaşmaya göre iki kat daha fazla zaman harcamaktadır" (2009, p. 13).

"One influential classification, into themes, sub-themes and 'specific notions' is that presented in **Threshold Level** 1990, Chapter 7" (2001, p. 52).	**"Threshold Level** 1990, Bölüm 7 de sunulan temalar, alt-temalar ve "özellikli kavramlar" etkili bir sınıflandırmadır" (2009, p. 51).

On the basis of the examples provided in the table above, it is apparent that translators tried to transfer terms by keeping the original essence of them. In this context when examples are analysed in a detailed way, it was noticed that direct translation strategies such as *foreignization*, *literal translation* and transference of the terms in their original forms were used. For instance, language proficiency levels that are "**A1 (Breakthrough), A2(Waystage), B1(Threshold), B2(Vantage), C1 (Effective Operational Proficiency)** and **C2 (Mastery)**" were transferred as "**A1 (Breakthrough): Başlangıç ya da keşif düzeyi, A2 (Waystage): Ara düzey ya da İletişimden Kopmama Düzeyi, B1 (Threshold): Eşik Düzey, B2 (Vantage): İleri Düzey ya da Bağımsız Kullanıcı Düzeyi, C1 (Effective Operational Proficiency): Özerk Düzey, C2 (Mastery): Ustalık Düzeyi**" (p. 29) to TT by being preserved in parenthesis as well as *addition* and *literal translation* strategies.

Besides this, some terms regarding proficiency levels such as "**threshold", "vantage level"** and **"waystage"** are conveyed as their original versions with foreignization strategy. In line with these examples, it was also observed that some terms related to language assessment such as "**continuous assessment", "summative assessment**" as "**sürekli değerlendirme (continuous assessment)"** and **"düzey belirleme (summative) değerlendirmeleri**" were transferred in parentheses by preserving their original form while terms such as "**validity", "reliability**" and "**feasibility**" (p. 177, 2001) are transferred using "literal translation" strategy as **"geçerlilik", "güvenirlilik"** and **"verimlilik"** (p. 163). Based on the strategies used for the translation of terms, it can be inferred that translators adopted an approach preserving the terms as much as possible in order to achieve lexical equivalence between documents.

Another significant fact of transference of terms is to provide cohesion by using the same translation of the term consistently throughout the text as well as preserving the original form of the terms (Wallerstein, 1981; Zheng, 2017). In this sense, it is determined that there was a glossary of terms in TT in order to enhance cohesion between texts. The relevant example is presented in the table below.

Table 8. *Key Terms in ST and TT in the Glossary*[1]

ST	TT
accuracy and fluency	doğruluk ve akıcılık
action-oriented approach	eylem yönelimli / odaklı yaklaşım
communicative language competence	iletişimsel dil yetisi
discourse competence	söylem yetisi
intercultural awareness	kültürler arası farkındalık
lexical competence	sözvarlığı yetisi
native speaker	anadil konuşucusu
paralinguistic	dil ötesi
plurilingualism	çok dillilik
language user	dil kullanıcısı
functional competence	işlevsel yeti
self-esteem	Özgüven
sentential formulae	tümcesel biçimler
rhetorical effectiveness	sözbilimsel etkililik
sociolinguistic competence	toplumdilsel yeti, yetkinlik

(CEFR, 2009, pp. 242-259)

As some examples demonstrated in the table above, there is a glossary related to terms and key concepts of CEFR in TT. Creating a glossary as in the example for informative texts is beneficial since the use of the same terms throughout the text is crucial for target readers. This is also one of the factors which increase the coherence of the translation between ST and TT. Thus, target readers might comprehend complex concepts more easily as the usage of same terms in the entire text could help retention of knowledge as well as reducing ambiguity. For these reasons, it can be stated that the inclusion of a glossary is a valuable tool in terms of increasing target readers' understanding and the overall quality of translated text.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The primary aim of the research is to reveal cross-cultural impact of CEFR and shed light on translation of informative texts in foreign language education field. In this context, Turkish translations of CEFR were analyzed in a functionalist way with text typology. According to the main findings of the research, it is revealed that CEFR is an informative text and translators managed to transfer rich content of CEFR related to foreign language education into Turkish by taking into account its text type throughout translation.

---

[1]   See the full glossary on pages between 242-250 (CEFR, 2009).

Upon analyzing CEFR deeply, it was observed that the aim of the text is to create a shared understanding of foreign language education for curriculum creators, exam designers, teachers and learners (Delibaş, 2013). In this sense, it could be stated that both TT and ST have the same mission in terms of transferring knowledge about language education. In other words, transmission of the content is the main objective for both of the documents. In line with this view, findings of the study indicate that translators benefitted from strategies to convey the message of the text and also transfer the terms and concepts without any information loss.

In this regard, translation strategies such as addition, literal translation, foreignization and explication are used by translators to overcome some challenges by translators since the act of translation includes "a process of generation and selection, a problem-solving process" as well (Pym, 2003, p. 489). In terms of stylistic and grammatical features, it is noteworthy to express that translators adopted "plain prose" method and used concise and clear language as the mission of translation is to convey referential context of CEFR.

Given how crucial it is for informative texts to transmit accurate content and complete terminology, it has been viewed that the translators especially took decisions to preserve the terms, and accordingly, they transferred the terms to the target text either in their original form or by preserving them in parentheses or translating them with "literal translation" strategy. The reason why foreignization strategies are preferred often for translation of terms could be due to the fact that most of terms and concepts of CEFR have not had any equivalent in Turkish context yet. Therefore, translators might have chosen "imported" terms (Even-Zohar, 2002, p.169). Even though this circumstance creates challenges for translators, it also has positive cross-cultural impact in that it informs and updates target audience about recent developments and innovations in language education field (Günday & Aycan, 2018). Considering the results of the research, it could be stated that the study is noteworthy in that it offers a distinctive perspective on cross-cultural impact of CEFR within Turkish context from the perspective of translation studies even though there are several studies on CEFR related to paradigm shift it caused in foreign language education (Byram & Parmenter, 2012; Çelik, 2013; Hazar, 2021; Sahib & Stapa, 2021).

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The CEFR has contributed to bringing all aspects of language learning on a common basis by giving rise to numerous new concepts and ideas regarding language education. One of the key goals of the CEFR is to introduce these principles and deepen language education through the concepts and ideas it includes. Based on the objectives of CEFR, primary purpose of the research is to shed light on how

the cross-cultural impact of CEFR is achieved in Turkish setting. In this sense, Turkish translations of CEFR were analyzed and described with Reiss's text typology.

According to findings of the study, translators adopted a translation approach that overlaps with the information contained in the source text and target text by considering informative text type features. In line with translation of key terms and concepts of CEFR, it is revealed that translators benefitted from strategies such as foreignization, literal translation, addition. This result suggests that translators made an effort to prevent knowledge loss as some of the terms could be novel or unfamiliar in Turkish context.

This study provides valuable insights as it highlights the necessity of determining text type and linguistic features of the texts at the beginning of translation process. Another essential result of the study is that translators should adapt their translation approaches and strategies according to content of the text. Last but not least, translators should consider and put into practice the principles of Reiss's text typology in that it serves as a systematic framework and comprehensive guideline for translators to overcome potential translation problems.

Conflict of Interest

There is no personal or financial conflict of interest between the authors of the article within the scope of the study.

REFERENCES

Aksoy, B. (1999). Sosyal bilimler metinleri çevirisi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi,* 16(2), 21-27.

Bühler, K. (1984). Theory of language: The representational function of knowledge. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Byram, M., & Parmenter, L. (2012). The common European framework of reference. The Globalisation of Language Education Policy. Bristol: Multilingual Matters

Chomsky, N. (1965). Aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge/ Massachusettes: M.I.T press.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed approaches. New York: Sage.

Çelik, S. (2013). Plurilingualism, pluriculturalism, and the CEFR: Are Turkey's foreign language objectives reflected in classroom instruction? *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 1872-1879.

Delibaş, M. (2013). Yabancı dil öğretiminde ortak eylem odaklı yaklaşıma göre sınıf içi hedef ve etkinliklerin hazırlanması (Yenilenmiş Bloom Taksonomisi). *Turkish Studies - International Periodical for The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic,* 8(10), 241-249.

Europe, C. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Europe, C. (2009). Diller için Avrupa ortak başvuru metni öğrenme-öğretme-değerlendirme. Ministry of National Education Board of Education.

Even-Zohar, I. (2002). The making of culture repertoire and the role of transfer. S. Paker içinde, Translations: (s. 166-175). İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press.

Günday, R., & Aycan, A. (2018). Yabancı dil öğreniminde kültürlerası iletişim becerisi edinimi. *International Journal of Languages Education and Teaching,* 6(3), 533-545.

Harris, R. A. (1993). The linguistic wars. Oxford University Press.

Hazar, E. (2021). The influence of the CEFR in Turkish national curriculum. *African Educational Research Journal,* 551-561.

Lefevere, S. B. (1990). Translation, history and culture. London: Pinter.

Monday, J. (2016). Introducing translation studies. London & New York: Routledge.

Pym, A. (2003). Redefining translation competence in an electronic age. In defense of a minimalist approach. Meta, XLVIII, (4), 481-497.

Reiss, K. (1989). Text types, translation types and translation assessment. A. Chesterman, Readings in Translation Theory (A. Chesterman, Trs., 105-115). Helsinki: Finn Lectura.

Reiss, K. (2000). Text types, translation types and translation. L. Venuti in, the Translation Studies Reader (160-171). London & New York: Routledge.

Reiss, K. (2000). Translation Criticism: Potential and limitations. (E. Rhodes, trns.) Manchester: St. Jerome.

Sahib, F. H., & Stapa, M. (2021). The Impact of Implementing the Common European Framework of Reference on Language Education: A Critical Review. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 11(11), 644–660.

Venuti, L. (1995). Translator's invisibility: A history of translation. New York: Routledge.

Vermeer, H. J. (1996). A skopos theory of translation. Verlag: Heidelberg.

Vermeer, H. J., & Reiss, K. (2013). Towards a general theory of translational action. Routledge.

Wallerstein, I. (1981). Concepts in the social sciences: problems of translation. G. Rose (Dü.) in, Translation Spectrum: Essays in Theory and Practice (88-98). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Zheng, W. (2017). Translation strategies for text of science and technology. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research,* 96, 32-36.