Before presenting my analysis of translation in situated case studies, I want to provide analytical lenses from which to view translation through both microlevel and macrolevel vantage points. As I demonstrate in this chapter, A Revised Rhetoric of Translation serves as a macrolevel orientation to studying language transformation, a framework from which to recognize the ways in which translation work is always situated within a specific cultural-rhetorical situation. By discussing A Revised Rhetoric of Translation, I aim to set up the analytical framework from which we can understand translation moments in the case studies that follow.

To understand how writers, particularly writers from marginalized communities, leverage and layer semiotic practices as they compose across contexts, Michelle Hall Kells explains that we must consider more than what is visible at the time of composition, noting how contextual factors influence both how and what we write, as well as what we use to write in a specific rhetorical situation (87). Kells elaborates,

"Every human interaction—whether in person, print text, cyberspace, or visual media—is a form of intercultural communication. Region of origin, family position, gender, ethnolinguistic identity, nationality, age, and religion are only a few of the variables that constitute one's culture or systems of belonging. Students cannot begin to reconcile differences in cultural systems beyond their own circles of affiliation if they have not critically reflected on their own. (87)"

Kells’s explicit linking of culture, community, and communication is critical to my own presentation of translation as a culturally situated, multimodal practice, one that requires multilinguals to blend and work across contexts, platforms, and modalities to make meaning both for themselves and for diverse audiences. To illustrate how multilinguals exhibit expertise in multimodal communication, I have to account for all
factors involved in translation activities. This includes the writing tools and artifacts involved in translation (e.g., computers, digital translation tools, and word-processing software), as well as the embodied and material conditions that prompt and sustain the translation work. In this way, I can account for multilingual/multimodal interactions at several co-constituted and interwoven levels, including digital and material interfaces as well as physical interactions with tools, technologies, and people. Further, doing this work requires that I rely on the trust and the relationships built with my communities of multilingual participants, those individuals who allowed me to engage with and analyze their practices and experiences through our relationality.

To better understand how multilingualism and multimodality connect through translation, it is important not only to recognize the composing practices of the individual translator but also to acknowledge how these practices are situated in a broader rhetorical context. Conversations about linguistic fluidity often focus entirely on individuals and their linguistic repertoires, without necessarily recognizing the rhetorical situatedness of these languages in (and outside) institutions (Bloom-Pojar; Guerra). As Rachel Bloom-Pojar describes in distinguishing between language orientations in linguistics and in rhetoric, “Saying one ‘speaks English’ or ‘speaks Spanish’ acknowledges the importance of an outsider’s perspective, reflecting social norms with how others perceive us . . . , and while this may not be the focus of study for linguistics, it is the focus of rhetoric” (19; Bloom-Pojar references Otheguy, García, and Reid, 293). In other words, in rhetoric and composition, we pay attention to the languages that our students speak, not only to understand the individual linguistic histories of students but also to assess and facilitate how these languages are (or are not) leading to effective communication with specific audiences in specific rhetorical contexts. However, it is not enough to ask, welcome, or even require our students to blend languages and modalities in our classrooms; it is important that teachers of writing and rhetoric understand, recognize, and teach how communicative repertoires may be deployed to various degrees for different purposes. This is important whether we are enacting language justice in classrooms settings or building professional practices outside the classroom.

In chapters 5 and 6, I present narratives, visualizations, and examples of how, why, and where multilingual communicators work across language and modes to translate information for their communities, both in academia and in a professional space. To help researchers and teachers recognize how languages and modes are deployed by translators in specific con-
texts, as well as to help ground the examples that I present in chapters 5 and 6, I further define, in this chapter, what I have come to call “A Revised Rhetoric of Translation.” As I describe in the next section, A Revised Rhetoric of Translation, building on our understanding of how multilingual communicators navigate communicative discrepancies during translation moments (chapter 1) and on our acknowledgment of translation as a multimodal activity (chapter 3), furthers our reorientation to language difference and fluidity, specifically by contextualizing the multilingual/multimodal aspects of translation in their surrounding contexts. If we are to understand translation as a multilingual/multimodal practice, it is important for us to acknowledge how linguistic transformations motivate and are influenced by relevant cultural and material elements.

Defining “A Revised Rhetoric of Translation”

A Revised Rhetoric of Translation is a model that I developed (with help from Rebecca Zantjer) through my work with student and professional translators and that I use to present the work of each case study in this project. This model can help us understand language transformation rhetorically, speaking against traditionally held notions of translation as a static, mechanical activity that is disassociated from cultural and historical motivations (what might be described as “a traditional rhetoric of translation”). A Revised Rhetoric of Translation purposely works against the idea that translation can be outsourced or embedded as an afterthought to the intellectual labor of knowledge creation. Rather than thinking of translation as a task that happens only after content is created or developed in one language, this reorientation positions translation as an iterative activity that happens constantly within specific cultures and communities (Agboka; Sun). Further, the revised framework presented in this chapter shows how translation activities are tied to the broader goals and objectives of people and organizations. Through this discussion, A Revised Rhetoric of Translation helps us consider not only the multilingual/multimodal elements that we see taking place during translation moments but also how these visible practices are situated in the histories and experiences of the communities enacting linguistic transformations to meet their goals and objectives.

A Revised Rhetoric of Translation has three pillars that directly speak against traditionally held notions of language as static, isolated, and culturally neutral. These three pillars were developed directly with the partici-
pants represented in the case studies within this book in chapters 5 and 6. I here further elaborate on each of the three pillars of this revised rhetoric to illustrate how this reorientation to language diversity can help researchers and teachers not only to theorize policies but to develop methodological frameworks and pedagogical practices that center linguistic diversity in and across cultural-rhetorical contexts.

**Pillar 1: Translation is a culturally neutral situated process**

Historically, when people talk about translation, they reference the process of taking a word from one language and pairing it with a corresponding word in another language (Batova and Clark). In this model, translation becomes an act of neutral substitution, with the goal being an accurate one-to-one replacement of words in the first language with words in the second language. In the case studies presented in chapters 5 and 6, I break away from this assumption and analyze translation as a culturally situated (rather than neutral) practice, one that expands conceptions of translation from substitution to community-based, rhetorical contextualization.

For example, at my first research site, Knightly Latino News (discussed in chapter 5), student translators illustrate how digital translation software programs such as Google Translate often provide inaccurate and inefficient translations on their own. Digital software only becomes effective through rhetorical manipulations completed by multilingual users who are part of or familiar with the community for whom they are translating. Thus, access to digital dictionaries does not guarantee accurate and culturally situated translations localized for specific communities. To accurately and effectively complete translation work, translators have to navigate digital and material tools within their specific communities, seeking feedback and adjusting their practices to meet the constantly evolving ways through which languages represent the values and ideologies of particular cultures (Gonzales and Zantjer).

In analyzing translation through this revised rhetoric, it is important for us to consider what tools are available in the moment of translation and to understand how these tools both influence and are impacted by translators and the local communities navigating this work. Just like, as scholars in multimodality remind us, we cannot abstract digital tools from their cultural-rhetorical contexts (Banks; Haas), we also cannot abstract language practices from their racial and cultural underpinnings (Gilyard; Guerra). To analyze translation through this revised framework, we need to understand the linguistic transformations taking place
during translation moments, as well as the cultural context in which these moments are experienced. To do so, we must consider the tools being used during translation, the specific translation moments experienced in that context, and the lived experiences and history of the particular translators engaging in this work. All of these elements impact the success of the translation project and the experience of the people creating and receiving the translated work.

Pillar 2: Translation is a linear cyclical process

Just as, due to constantly shifting rhetorical practices, translation is not culturally neutral, (effective) translation is also never a “once and done” event. Translation processes are far from linear and involve multiple instances of negotiation and localization (Agboka; Jacquemond; Gonzales and Turner; Ketola; Sun). These cycles of negotiation are exhibited in multiple ways, evidenced through movements that take place on computer screens as well as in physical spaces while translators negotiate language with their bodies.

For example, in my second research site, the Language Services Department at the Hispanic Center of Western Michigan (discussed in chapter 6), Sara (a translator and the director of the office) moves words across the screen to test out various translation options, while simultaneously moving her fingers back and forth on her computer screen. During this process, Sara envisions various sentence structures and thinks about how these sentences will be perceived by Spanish-speaking readers, moving recursively, both in her writing and with her gesturing, to make sense of these translation options. In addition to the recursive practices of individual translators, translation processes within larger-scale projects undergo several writing and revision cycles, as a project moves from the initial quoting phase to proofreading and editing phases (Dimitrova). Throughout these processes, translators coordinate resources as they move recursively through digital platforms and material spaces, shifting from online dictionaries, to Spanish-language news sites such as Univision, to having a conversation with other translators in the office. These recursive practices are the rhetorical work embedded in translation—work often left invisible and often experienced only within the translation office. As I further demonstrate in my case studies, analyzing translation through this revised rhetoric model requires accounting for the recursivity embedded in language transformation and valuing the movement and coordination of digital and linguistic practices as critical to the success of culturally situated translation work.
Orienting to translation through cultural-rhetorical frameworks can help us understand the movement and the pauses in translation as part of the rhetorical labor embedded in these activities, rather than dismissing this work as a means to an end in language transformation. By understanding translation as a cyclical process, we can also see how translators’ training and previous experiences may impact their approaches to and successes with specific translation projects.

Pillar 3: Translation is a mechanical creative act

In rhetoric and composition, technical communication, and related areas, the work of translation often remains hidden, visible only to the people engaged in translation activities (Maylath, Muñoz Martín, and Pacheco Pinto). For example, when texts and technologies are being developed for use with international, multilingual audiences, translation is frequently outsourced to translation professionals who “take care” of the language transformation, often without being given any authorship or intellectual credit (Batova and Clark; Walton, Zraly, and Mugengana). In classroom contexts, while we may acknowledge the “myth of linguistic homogeneity” (Matsuda) by recognizing that language diversity is a contemporary reality in all settings, we frequently ignore the translation work in which students are engaging as they make sense of our assignments, expectations, and assessment methods. In all of these cases, translation is positioned as an automated, mechanical activity that is separate from the creative, intellectual work of writing and communication. In other words, translation work is frequently deemed a tangential service to or a separate activity from the creative work embedded in content creation.

As the case studies in this book demonstrate, accurate and effective translations require highly creative, rhetorical work that is embedded at several parts of the translation process. For example, to navigate rhetorical choices during translation moments, translators have to manipulate and coordinate multiple modes simultaneously. In addition to manipulating language to fit the particular goals and interests of their specific communities, translators have to adapt and creatively navigate several digital platforms (Pym), leveraging their understanding of digital algorithms (e.g., those embedded in Google Translate) within their knowledge of language, culture, and community. In turn, as translators make decisions during translation moments, they make intellectual contributions to the information being disseminated across languages, as well as providing the labor needed to translate and redesign information for multilingual users.

To achieve accurate translations, multilingual communicators cre-
atively layer and repurpose meaning, developing solutions to navigate translation moments so that meaning can be not only replaced but also accurately repurposed and localized across languages. Due to shifting cultural values and histories, linguistic elements like metaphors, jokes, and technical language frequently cannot be easily translated from one language to another (Newmark). Thus, to convey all linguistic elements and their implications across languages, translators engage in extensive creative and intellectual processes that require rhetorical negotiation and technical expertise. Analyzing translation through this revised orientation and paying attention to the specific ways through which translators navigate translation moments can help us better account for, understand, and leverage the creativity and rhetorical dexterity that drives successful language transformation. In addition, by acknowledging the creativity encompassed in translation, we can continue to recognize the intellectual labor in which students and professionals engage as they make sense of information in English-dominant contexts.

A Revised Rhetoric of Translation gives us an orientation through which we can approach our analysis of translation moments in situated contexts. Through this framework, we can remain aware of both the visible and invisible elements influencing translation, noting the rhetorical work that is taking place as translators navigate various influences. In the chapters that follow, I use this reorientation to linguistic adaptation as I present examples of how translation was enacted at my two research sites. As I mention in chapter 2, I chose to study translation at these two particular sites for several reasons. First, I was interested in working with community-driven, Latinx translators who use their linguistic and cultural skills to provide language accessibility and to advocate for their communities. In addition, I chose to work with these two organizations due to the drastic differences in their work and objectives.

While both translators at Knightly Latino News (KLN) and those in the Language Services Department at the Hispanic Center of Western Michigan translate across Spanishes and Englishes for their communities, translation at KLN is driven mostly by student translators—undergraduate students enrolled in a public relations and communication program in a large public state university in central Florida. Although students at KLN have training in news broadcasting, they have no formal training in translation. Hence, their translation practices are driven primarily through their experiential learning, as they learn to adapt information into Spanish for a predominantly South American and Central American audience in Florida.

At my second research site, the Language Services Department, transla-
tors undergo different types of training focused on their specific area of interest. In this professional context, the term *translation* references the written adaptation of words across languages, while the term *interpretation* references verbal translation. Each translator or interpreter in the Language Services Department completes training workshops and works to attain national certification at several different levels. These certifications require them to pass examinations through national organizations such as the American Translators Association, the Certification Commission for Healthcare Interpreters, and the National Council on Interpreting in Healthcare, among many others. For this reason, the rhetorical strategies and the modes and modalities from which translators and interpreters draw to complete their work are based both on their individual experiences with language transformation and on the formal training that they complete as part of their job.

In chapters 5 and 6, I further describe the translation work taking place at KLN and in the Language Services Department, paying close attention to how translators in these organizations work simultaneously across modalities and languages to translate information. Enacting A Revised Rhetoric of Translation that accounts for different dimensions of language transformation, I use visuals, video montages, and narrative to provide a contextualized illustration of how translation moments are navigated in practice. In this way, I provide examples of specific translation moments, paying attention to how modalities and languages are deployed in situated contexts, and I also intricately describe the environments surrounding this translation work. Thus, in each chapter presenting a case study, I provide (1) an introduction to the specific research site in which I studied translation, noting the histories and lived experiences of the people involved in each organization; (2) a story of how I came to build relationships with the individuals at the research site, grounding this relationship as a critical component to my analytical framework; (3) specific examples of how multimodal elements are deployed in the translation moment activities of the translators at the research site; and (4) a more contextualized description of how this multimodal/multilingual work influences both the specific translators at the site and the surrounding community for whom the translation work is completed. By providing this context around translation and by intricately explaining the strategies developed and used to navigate translation moments in each situation, I continue to illustrate how translation encompasses practices useful for guiding how we theorize, research, and teach multimodal/multilingual communication.