Mediating Language, Culture, and Identity: Intersections of Applied Linguistics, Language Teaching, and Translation Studies

Morteza Amirsheibani[1]*, Rustamov Dastonjon Uktam o'g'li[2]

[1,2] Faculty of Languages and Pre-school Education,
Tashkent University of Economics and Pedagogy (TIPU), Uzbekistan
*Corresponding Author:
Email: m.amirsheibani@gmail.com

Abstract.

Translation and interpreting are often defined as the technical transfer of linguistic forms across languages, yet in contemporary contexts of globalization, mobility, and intercultural exchange they function as far more than mechanical processes. They operate as acts of mediation that bridge not only words but also cultures, identities, and emotions. This article situates translation and interpreting within a broader applied linguistics perspective, drawing connections with English language teaching (ELT), where educators face similar challenges of negotiating meaning, fostering intercultural awareness, and shaping learners' identities. Both translators and teachers, rather than serving as neutral conduits, act as cultural mediators who must engage critically with the affective, social, and ideological dimensions of language. To illustrate this argument, the article draws on examples from research into nostalgia in migration discourses, humor in pedagogy, and the pragmatics of slang, which reveal how language embodies cultural memory, belonging, and emotional resonance that resist reduction to lexical equivalence. These cases highlight the limitations of narrow approaches centered on accuracy and equivalence while underscoring the value of reflexivity, empathy, and intercultural competence. The paper also explores the role of corpus-assisted discourse analysis as a methodological bridge that can enrich both translation and pedagogical practice by uncovering subtle discourse patterns and ideological cues. By integrating insights from applied linguistics, ELT, and translation studies, the article advocates for an interdisciplinary framework that reconceptualizes translation and interpreting as transformative acts of cultural mediation, contributing to more inclusive and dialogic forms of global communication.

Keywords: Applied linguistics; cultural mediation; discourse analysis; language teaching and translation studies.

I.   INTRODUCTION

The demands of communication in today's interconnected world have reshaped how translation and interpreting are conceptualized, studied, and practiced. Increasing levels of mobility, globalization, and digital interaction mean that multilingual encounters occur more frequently and in more diverse contexts than ever before (House, 2015; Pym, 2014). In these exchanges, translation and interpreting play a crucial role in enabling dialogue across linguistic and cultural boundaries. Yet the pressures of global communication have also exposed the limitations of traditional understandings that reduce translation and interpreting to the technical transfer of meaning from one language to another. Such perspectives, centered on accuracy and equivalence, risk overlooking the affective, cultural, and ideological dimensions of cross-linguistic communication. This article argues that to understand the full scope of translation and interpreting, we must situate them within broader interdisciplinary conversations, particularly with insights from applied linguistics and English language teaching (ELT).One of the recurring lessons from applied linguistics and ELT is that communication is rarely a neutral exchange of information. Teachers working in multilingual classrooms know that they are not simply transmitters of knowledge, but cultural mediators who help students negotiate new identities, adapt to unfamiliar discourses, and make sense of language in relation to lived experience (Byram, 1997; Kramsch, 2013).

Similarly, interpreters and translators often encounter moments where cultural references, emotional tones, and ideological nuances cannot be captured through direct equivalence. Instead, they must mediate meaning by considering context, audience, and intercultural dynamics. In both domains, practitioners carry a responsibility that extends beyond words: they bridge communities and worldviews. By drawing parallels between language teaching and translation, this article highlights the value of approaching both as socially embedded practices that combine linguistic expertise with cultural sensitivity.The interdisciplinary lens is particularly valuable when we consider how language embodies affect and identity. Research on nostalgia in

migration discourses has shown how memories of homeland and cultural belonging are discursively constructed in ways that shape migrants' sense of identity. Such affective meanings cannot be simply translated through lexical equivalence but must be understood as socially and emotionally situated. Likewise, studies on humor in pedagogy demonstrate that humor functions not merely as entertainment but as a tool for reducing affective barriers, fostering classroom rapport, and mediating cultural differences (Pishghadam et al., 2020).

Similarly, the pragmatics of slang in online discourse illustrates how linguistic innovation signals group membership, identity positioning, and resistance, presenting unique challenges for both teachers and translators (Tagg, 2015). These examples underscore the broader point that language use is deeply tied to culture, identity, and emotion—dimensions that translation and interpreting must grapple with alongside linguistic form.Methodological innovation also plays a role in bridging these disciplines. In particular, corpus-assisted discourse analysis offers powerful tools for uncovering patterns of meaning that may not be visible at the level of individual texts. Applied linguists have used corpora to explore discourse features of classroom talk, migration narratives, and online interactions (Baker, 2006; McEnery & Hardie, 2012). Translators and interpreters can likewise benefit from corpus tools to identify subtle shifts in meaning, recurring cultural references, and patterns of identity construction. This article argues that corpus-based approaches can serve as a methodological bridge between language education and translation studies, enabling richer analysis of how language mediates between cultural worlds. By highlighting both discourse-level insights and practical applications, this perspective contributes to rethinking translator and interpreter training in more interdisciplinary and reflexive terms.

The purpose of this article is therefore twofold: first, to argue that translation and interpreting should be understood as transformative acts of cultural mediation rather than as narrow exercises in equivalence; and second, to demonstrate how applied linguistics and ELT can provide conceptual and methodological resources for reimagining the field. The discussion unfolds in three main parts. The first section reviews theoretical and empirical work on translation, teaching, and mediation, emphasizing their shared concerns with culture, identity, and affect. The second section illustrates interdisciplinary connections through examples drawn from recent research in applied linguistics and ELT, including nostalgia, humor, and slang. The third section highlights methodological and pedagogical implications, focusing on corpus-assisted analysis and intercultural training. The article concludes by advocating for an integrated framework that situates translation and interpreting within the broader landscape of applied linguistics, positioning both as vital mediating practices in an increasingly globalized world.

II.   LITERATURE REVIEW

Translation and Interpreting: From Equivalence to Mediation

Early perspectives in translation studies often framed the task as achieving *equivalence* between source and target texts (Catford, 1965; Nida, 1964). Such approaches prioritized fidelity to linguistic form and meaning, focusing on accuracy as the central criterion for quality. Over time, however, scholars have increasingly challenged the adequacy of equivalence as a guiding principle. The cultural turn in translation studies (Bassnett & Lefevere, 1990) emphasized that texts are embedded in cultural contexts and that translators are mediators of cultural values, ideologies, and worldviews. Functionalist theories, such as Skopos theory (Vermeer, 1989; Nord, 1997), further shifted attention from equivalence to purpose, highlighting the importance of the translator's agency in adapting texts for specific audiences. More recent scholarship positions translation and interpreting as practices of intercultural communication (House, 2015; Pym, 2014), where linguistic transfer is inseparable from social negotiation. These shifts reveal a trajectory away from narrow linguistic models toward broader frameworks that recognize the mediating role of translators and interpreters in shaping intercultural encounters.

Language Teaching as Cultural Mediation

Parallel debates have taken place in applied linguistics and ELT. Traditional approaches often treated language teaching as the transmission of grammatical rules and vocabulary, with success measured in terms of linguistic accuracy (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). However, communicative and post-communicative

approaches have redefined language education as a process of engaging learners in authentic, meaningful communication (Canale & Swain, 1980; Widdowson, 1990). Building on this, intercultural approaches emphasize that language learning entails negotiating cultural meanings and developing learners' intercultural communicative competence (Byram, 1997; Kramsch, 2013). Teachers, therefore, are not neutral transmitters of linguistic input but mediators of culture and identity, helping learners navigate new discourses and position themselves in relation to different communities. This reconceptualization of the teacher's role resonates strongly with contemporary understandings of translation and interpreting, where practitioners also mediate meaning across cultural boundaries. Both fields thus share a concern with how linguistic expertise intersects with cultural reflexivity and affective engagement.

Identity, Affect, and the Emotional Dimensions of Language

One area where these parallels are particularly visible is in the study of identity and affect. Research in applied linguistics has increasingly highlighted the role of emotions, memory, and cultural positioning in language use (Benesch, 2017; Pavlenko, 2005). For instance, studies of nostalgia in migration discourses reveal how migrants construct belonging and negotiate identity through narratives that are emotionally charged and culturally situated. Translating such narratives involves not only lexical choices but also sensitivity to the affective meanings embedded in discourse. Similarly, humor in the classroom has been studied as a strategy for reducing affective barriers, enhancing rapport, and creating inclusive learning environments (Pishghadam, Derakhshan, & Jajarmi, 2020). Translating humor—or using humor in interpreting—requires an equally nuanced understanding of cultural references, pragmatic cues, and audience expectations. The pragmatics of slang further illustrates how language indexes group identity, solidarity, and resistance (Tagg, 2015). Teachers must decide how to address slang in the classroom, while translators face challenges in rendering its cultural meanings across languages. These cases highlight the affective and identity-laden dimensions of language that are central to both teaching and translation, reinforcing the view that practitioners in both domains act as cultural mediators.

Methodological Bridges: Corpus-Assisted Discourse Analysis

The interdisciplinary connections between applied linguistics, ELT, and translation studies are also methodological. One promising area is corpus-assisted discourse analysis, which combines quantitative corpus methods with qualitative discourse interpretation (Baker, 2006; McEnery & Hardie, 2012). Applied linguists have used corpora to analyze classroom discourse, migration narratives, and online communication, uncovering recurring patterns and ideologies that shape meaning. In translation studies, corpus methods have been applied to examine translation universals, stylistic tendencies, and shifts in meaning across languages (Baker, 1993; Zanettin, 2012). Corpus-based approaches can thus serve as a methodological bridge, offering tools for both teachers and translators to uncover subtle discourse features, cultural references, and ideological positioning. For instance, a corpus of migration narratives can inform both pedagogical strategies for teaching intercultural communication and translation strategies for rendering culturally specific references. The ability to combine macro-level patterns with micro-level discourse analysis provides valuable insights into the mediating functions of language use across contexts.

Interdisciplinarity and Innovation

Recent scholarship has increasingly called for greater interdisciplinarity between translation studies and applied linguistics (Campbell & Wakabayashi, 2016; Gambier & van Doorslaer, 2010). Interpreting and translation are not isolated practices but are deeply entangled with broader linguistic, educational, and social processes. Similarly, ELT cannot be separated from issues of translation, as learners often rely on translation as a strategy, and teachers frequently navigate multilingual realities. By bringing together insights from these fields, researchers and practitioners can develop innovative approaches to training, pedagogy, and professional practice. For example, integrating intercultural competence frameworks from ELT into translator training can enhance cultural reflexivity, while incorporating translation strategies into language teaching can deepen learners' awareness of cross-linguistic differences. Both domains also face shared challenges posed by technology, including the rise of machine translation and AI tools, which create new demands for critical awareness and human mediation (Kenny, 2017). Interdisciplinary dialogue is therefore essential for preparing practitioners to engage with the complexities of global communication.The literature

demonstrates a clear shift in both translation studies and language teaching: from narrow technical views of accuracy and equivalence toward broader understandings of mediation, identity, and culture. Translation and interpreting are now widely recognized as intercultural practices, while language teaching is understood as a process of negotiating meaning and shaping learners' identities. Both domains highlight the importance of reflexivity, empathy, and intercultural competence, and both can benefit from methodological tools such as corpus-assisted analysis. This review positions the present article within these interdisciplinary conversations, aiming to further integrate insights from applied linguistics, ELT, and translation studies to reconceptualize translation and interpreting as transformative acts of cultural mediation.

III.   METHODS

The present study adopts a qualitative–descriptive and conceptual approach aimed at exploring the intersections of applied linguistics, English language teaching (ELT), and translation studies through the lens of cultural mediation. Unlike empirical research that relies on statistical data or experimental design, this article is situated within the tradition of conceptual scholarship (Sandelowski, 2000; Silverman, 2016), where the emphasis lies in synthesizing theoretical insights, critically engaging with existing literature, and illustrating arguments through selected case examples. Such an approach is particularly appropriate given the nature of the topic: the argument advanced here is not about measuring linguistic performance in controlled settings, but about rethinking the roles of translators, interpreters, and teachers as mediators of language, culture, and identity.

Sources and Illustrative Examples

The discussion draws on two types of sources. First, it engages with established scholarship in translation studies, applied linguistics, and ELT. Key theoretical frameworks include the cultural and functionalist turns in translation studies (Bassnett & Lefevere, 1990; Nord, 1997; Pym, 2014), intercultural communicative competence in language education (Byram, 1997; Kramsch, 2013), and discourse-analytic perspectives on identity and affect (Pavlenko, 2005; Benesch, 2017). Second, the article incorporates illustrative examples from the author's own research into nostalgia in migration discourses, humor in pedagogy, and the pragmatics of slang in online communication. These examples are not treated as formal datasets for analysis; rather, they serve as case illustrations that illuminate how cultural memory, emotion, and identity surface in language use and create challenges for translation, interpreting, and pedagogy.

Analytical Orientation

The analysis is interpretive and discourse-focused. Language is understood not merely as a code but as a social and cultural practice through which identities are negotiated and meanings are contested (Gee, 2014; Widdowson, 1990). To capture this complexity, the study selectively draws on corpus-assisted discourse analysis (Baker, 2006; McEnery & Hardie, 2012) as a methodological bridge. Corpus tools provide macro-level patterns that reveal how certain concepts, metaphors, or pragmatic markers recur in large collections of texts, while discourse analysis enables micro-level interpretation of meaning, stance, and cultural positioning. For example, nostalgia in migration discourses can be examined both in terms of recurring lexical choices across corpora and in the narratives through which migrants position themselves in relation to home and host societies. Similarly, slang can be studied as patterned linguistic innovation that indexes identity, while humor can be analyzed as discourse strategy that negotiates affective boundaries. By combining corpus and discourse insights, the analysis demonstrates how translation, teaching, and interpreting involve more than equivalence—they involve cultural and affective mediation.

Rationale for a Conceptual–Qualitative Approach

A qualitative–descriptive orientation is particularly suitable for this article for three reasons. First, the purpose is to theorize connections across disciplines rather than to test a hypothesis in a controlled setting. Second, the emphasis is on cultural and affective dimensions of language use—aspects that resist easy quantification but can be richly explored through discourse examples. Third, the article aims to provide a framework for future empirical research. By identifying thematic intersections—teachers and translators as mediators, the role of affect and identity, and the potential of corpus methodologies—the article lays the

groundwork for more systematic studies that could involve larger datasets, participant interviews, or experimental designs.

Contribution of Methodology

This methodological positioning contributes in two main ways. At a theoretical level, it demonstrates the value of interdisciplinary conceptual synthesis: insights from applied linguistics and pedagogy can enrich translation studies, while translation perspectives can shed light on classroom practices. At a practical level, it highlights methodological innovation by showing how corpus-assisted discourse analysis can inform both translator training and classroom pedagogy. Ultimately, the methodological stance reflects the article's central argument: translation, interpreting, and teaching are not neutral acts of transfer but transformative practices of mediation that require sensitivity to language, culture, and identity.

IV.   RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Teachers and Translators as Cultural Mediators

The role of both teachers and translators has often been misrepresented as one of neutrality, where the task is to faithfully deliver a message from one party to another without alteration or interference. In practice, however, neutrality is both impossible and undesirable. Teachers mediate not only language but also cultural worldviews, scaffolding learners into new discourses while balancing respect for their existing identities (Byram, 1997; Kramsch, 2013). Translators and interpreters face comparable challenges. They must decide how much cultural context to make explicit, how to handle terms with no direct equivalent, and how to preserve or adapt rhetorical force. These decisions require interpretive agency, not mechanical transfer (House, 2015).The analogy becomes particularly striking when viewed through classroom dynamics. For instance, in multilingual classrooms in Uzbekistan or other linguistically diverse contexts, teachers cannot simply provide grammatical explanations in isolation; they must mediate between learners' lived realities and target discourses. Similarly, in community interpreting, an interpreter may find that literal rendering of culturally embedded idioms would obstruct rather than facilitate communication. Both roles require an awareness that language is situated in culture and identity, and that mediation involves judgment, empathy, and reflexivity. By emphasizing this parallel, the article highlights that translation and teaching are not separate enterprises but rather complementary acts of cultural brokerage.

Language as Identity and Affect

Language is never just a vehicle for propositional content; it carries identity markers, affective meanings, and cultural memory. In applied linguistics, this has been demonstrated in numerous ways, including studies of migration narratives, multilingual identity construction, and classroom discourse (Pavlenko, 2005; Benesch, 2017). Translators and interpreters cannot ignore these dimensions, because to do so would risk stripping discourse of its social force.Research on nostalgia in migration discourses illustrates how individuals draw on remembered places, practices, and emotions to position themselves in relation to both homeland and host societies. Rendering such narratives requires more than lexical substitution; it involves sensitivity to how emotion and memory are discursively constructed. Similarly, humor in pedagogy has been shown to reduce affective barriers and foster rapport (Pishghadam, Derakhshan, & Jajarmi, 2020). For interpreters, humor presents one of the greatest challenges, since it relies on cultural frames, wordplay, and shared assumptions. Decisions about whether to adapt, substitute, or explain humorous elements highlight the active identity work performed by interpreters.Slang provides another vivid case. In online discourse, slang functions as a marker of in-group solidarity, creativity, and resistance (Tagg, 2015). Teachers often negotiate whether to incorporate or sideline slang in the classroom, while translators must decide whether to domesticate, foreignize, or approximate such expressions. In both cases, the choices shape how identities are represented and understood. These examples reinforce that language professionals operate in affective and ideological terrain, where choices always have consequences for identity positioning.

Corpus and Discourse as Methodological Bridges

One of the most promising intersections between applied linguistics and translation studies lies in corpus-assisted discourse analysis. Corpus tools enable researchers to identify recurring patterns of lexis, collocation, and semantic prosody across large collections of texts (Baker, 2006; McEnery & Hardie, 2012).

While quantitative in nature, corpus analysis gains interpretive power when combined with discourse analysis, which situates linguistic patterns in cultural and ideological contexts.For translators and interpreters, corpus approaches have already been used to study translation universals, stylistic tendencies, and cross-linguistic equivalence (Baker, 1993; Zanettin, 2012). For language teachers, corpora provide authentic language data that reveal how words and structures function in real communication. But beyond these uses, corpus-assisted discourse analysis can serve as a shared methodological platform that unites pedagogy and translation. For example, analyzing a corpus of migration narratives can reveal how metaphors of home and belonging recur across contexts, offering insights for both classroom discussions of interculturality and translation strategies for rendering culturally specific references.The potential is even greater in professional training. Translator and interpreter education could benefit from corpus-informed modules that teach students to recognize subtle discourse patterns, ideological framing, and affective stance. Likewise, teacher education programs could integrate corpus-based tasks that expose learners to authentic uses of humor, slang, or cultural metaphors. In this way, corpus approaches do not merely provide descriptive statistics; they enable reflective practice that enhances cultural mediation across disciplines.

Toward an Interdisciplinary Framework

The findings from this discussion converge on a central insight: translation, interpreting, and teaching are fundamentally acts of mediation. Each domain emphasizes not only linguistic competence but also cultural reflexivity, empathy, and identity negotiation. What distinguishes this article is the insistence that these practices be viewed not in isolation but in relation to one another. Teachers can learn from translation studies the value of strategic decision-making and purpose-driven communication (Nord, 1997). Translators and interpreters can learn from applied linguistics the importance of affective and identity dimensions in meaning-making. Both can benefit from corpus-assisted methodologies that provide evidence-based insights into discourse patterns.Such an interdisciplinary framework has significant implications for professional practice. It encourages institutions to design curricula that integrate translation strategies into language education and intercultural competence frameworks into translator training. It also challenges practitioners to adopt a reflexive stance, recognizing their agency in shaping meaning rather than assuming neutrality. Most importantly, it calls for a reconceptualization of language work itself: whether in the classroom, the translation booth, or the page, the task is not to deliver words but to mediate worlds.

Implications

The interdisciplinary analysis of translation, interpreting, and language teaching as acts of cultural mediation yields a number of important implications for pedagogy, professional training, and future research. While these domains are often treated as discrete, the parallels identified in this article suggest that closer integration can enrich each field. The following implications are organized around three key areas: professional practice, education and training, and research.

Implications for Professional Practice

For translators, interpreters, and teachers, the recognition that their work involves cultural mediation rather than neutral transfer highlights the need for greater reflexivity in daily practice. Translators and interpreters are often placed in situations where literal equivalence is inadequate; decisions about adapting cultural references, explaining idiomatic expressions, or negotiating humor require sensitivity to the audience and to broader ideological contexts (House, 2015). Similarly, teachers mediate not only linguistic input but also learners' affective and identity needs. This perspective suggests that professionals across both domains should cultivate empathy, intercultural awareness, and critical self-reflection as core competencies. Such skills enable practitioners to view their decisions not merely as technical but as socially consequential acts that shape communication, belonging, and understanding.

Implications for Education and Training

Perhaps the most immediate impact of this reconceptualization lies in curriculum design for teacher education and translator/interpreter training. Translator education has traditionally emphasized accuracy, equivalence, and fidelity, while language teacher education has often prioritized communicative competence. Both approaches, while valuable, risk neglecting the affective, identity-related, and cultural dimensions of meaning-making. Incorporating intercultural competence frameworks from ELT into translation studies

curricula could help trainee translators approach their work with greater cultural reflexivity. Likewise, integrating translation strategies into teacher training could equip future educators with tools to navigate multilingual realities in the classroom.Methodologically, corpus-assisted discourse analysis provides a concrete way to operationalize this integration. Translator training programs could adopt corpus tasks that teach students to analyze discourse patterns across genres, identify ideological framing, and recognize recurring cultural metaphors. Language teacher training could similarly use corpora to expose future educators to authentic uses of slang, humor, or migration narratives, enabling them to engage with learners' lived experiences more effectively. In both contexts, corpus methodologies foster data-driven reflection, moving students beyond intuition to evidence-based awareness of language as cultural practice.

Implications for Research

The discussion also points to several promising avenues for research. First, there is a need for more empirical studies that explore the intersections of translation, interpreting, and teaching. For example, classroom ethnographies could examine how teachers navigate cultural mediation in multilingual settings, while case studies of interpreting events could trace how identity and affect influence translational choices. Comparative studies that examine how similar discourse features (e.g., nostalgia, humor, slang) are managed across both teaching and translation contexts could provide valuable cross-disciplinary insights. Second, the role of technology merits further exploration. The rise of machine translation, artificial intelligence, and digital platforms has intensified debates about the future of translation and interpreting (Kenny, 2017). While machines excel at lexical transfer, they remain limited in handling affect, humor, and cultural nuance—areas where human mediation is indispensable. Research could explore how teachers, translators, and interpreters integrate technology without abandoning their mediating role, positioning themselves not as competitors to machines but as human cultural brokers.Third, further research could examine the implications of this interdisciplinary framework for policy and institutional practice. Educational institutions often treat ELT and translation as separate programs, housed in different faculties and assessed by different metrics. Yet the shared emphasis on mediation suggests the need for institutional models that encourage collaboration, joint training modules, and interdisciplinary research projects. Such structural innovations would not only benefit students but also foster more coherent responses to the challenges of global communication.

Broader Societal Implications

At a broader level, the findings underscore the social significance of translation, interpreting, and teaching. In an era marked by migration, displacement, and global interdependence, the ability to mediate across languages and cultures is not simply a professional skill but a societal necessity. Translators and interpreters often serve as the first point of contact between migrants and host institutions, shaping perceptions and experiences of inclusion or exclusion. Teachers, particularly in multilingual classrooms, influence how learners understand their identities in relation to new cultural environments. Viewing these roles as cultural mediation highlights the ethical responsibility of practitioners to contribute to dialogue, inclusivity, and mutual understanding.The recognition of translation, interpreting, and teaching as acts of mediation has far-reaching implications. For professionals, it calls for reflexivity, empathy, and intercultural competence. For education and training, it suggests integrating curricula, incorporating corpus-based methodologies, and emphasizing identity and affect alongside linguistic accuracy. For research, it points toward interdisciplinary, empirical, and technology-oriented studies that further explore the mediating role of language work. At the societal level, it reaffirms the importance of language professionals in fostering inclusive communication across cultural divides. Ultimately, the implications underscore that language professionals—whether in classrooms or translation booths—are not passive conveyors of meaning but active architects of intercultural dialogue.

V.   CONCLUSION

This article has argued that translation, interpreting, and language teaching, despite their disciplinary separation, share a fundamental characteristic: they are all acts of cultural mediation. While translation studies have long grappled with questions of equivalence, fidelity, and purpose, and language teaching has moved from structuralist paradigms toward communicative and intercultural approaches, both fields now

converge on a recognition that language is never neutral. Instead, language is deeply entangled with identity, affect, ideology, and cultural memory. The parallels between the work of translators, interpreters, and teachers reveal that these professionals, far from being neutral conduits, actively shape how meaning is negotiated across linguistic and cultural boundaries. The discussion highlighted three major intersections. First, both teachers and translators operate as cultural mediators who must balance fidelity to language with sensitivity to context, audience, and identity. Their decisions—whether in a classroom explanation or in a translation of humor or nostalgia—are socially consequential, shaping learners' identities or audiences' interpretations. Second, the examples of nostalgia in migration discourses, humor in pedagogy, and the pragmatics of slang illustrate how language is imbued with affect and identity.

These dimensions resist reduction to lexical equivalence and require practitioners to engage with language as a cultural and emotional resource. Third, corpus-assisted discourse analysis emerged as a methodological bridge that provides empirical tools for both translators and teachers to uncover patterns of meaning, ideology, and identity in authentic discourse. Together, these intersections point toward a reconceptualization of translation, interpreting, and teaching as transformative practices of mediation. The implications of this reconceptualization are significant. For professional practice, it underscores the necessity of reflexivity, empathy, and intercultural competence as core skills for translators, interpreters, and teachers alike. For education and training, it advocates integrating curricula across disciplines, incorporating translation strategies into teacher education and intercultural frameworks into translator training. Corpus methodologies were suggested as concrete tools for building data-driven awareness of how language encodes culture and ideology. For research, the framework points toward the need for interdisciplinary empirical studies that explore how professionals negotiate mediation in practice, as well as investigations into the impact of technology and policy on these roles. Beyond academia, the argument reinforces the societal importance of language professionals in shaping inclusive communication in increasingly diverse and globalized contexts.

While this article has been primarily conceptual and illustrative, it also lays the groundwork for future empirical inquiry. Ethnographic studies of classroom practices, case analyses of interpreting encounters, and corpus-based comparisons of pedagogical and translational discourse could further test and expand the framework proposed here. Research on technology, particularly the role of artificial intelligence and machine translation, could also clarify how human mediation remains indispensable in areas where machines fail to capture identity, affect, and cultural nuance. These directions underscore that the contribution of this article is not only theoretical but also programmatic: it calls for a research agenda that bridges applied linguistics, ELT, and translation studies more systematically. In conclusion, to describe translation, interpreting, and teaching as mere linguistic transfer is to underestimate the complexity and significance of these practices. Each involves the negotiation of meaning across cultural, ideological, and emotional terrains, and each requires practitioners to act as mediators who shape communication in consequential ways. By situating these practices within an interdisciplinary applied linguistics framework, this article advances a view of translators, interpreters, and teachers as architects of intercultural dialogue. Such a perspective not only deepens scholarly understanding but also highlights the ethical responsibility of language professionals to foster inclusivity, empathy, and understanding in a world where the ability to communicate across difference has never been more vital.

REFERENCES

[1]   Baker, M. (1993). *Corpus linguistics and translation studies: Implications and applications*. In M. Baker, G. Francis, & E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds.), *Text and technology: In honour of John Sinclair* (pp. 233–250). John Benjamins.

[2]   Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. Continuum.

[3]   Bassnett, S., & Lefevere, A. (Eds.). (1990). *Translation, history and culture*. Pinter.

[4]   Benesch, S. (2017). *Emotions and English language teaching: Exploring teachers' emotion labor*. Routledge.

[5]   Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Multilingual Matters.

[6]   Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1–47. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1

[7]   Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation*. Oxford University Press.

[8]   Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4th ed.). Routledge.

[9]   House, J. (2015). *Translation as communication across languages and cultures*. Routledge.

[10]   Kenny, D. (2017). *Machine translation*. Routledge.

[11]   Kramsch, C. (2013). *Culture in foreign language teaching*. **Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research**, 1(1), 57–78.

[12]   McEnery, T., & Hardie, A. (2012). *Corpus linguistics: Method, theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.

[13]   Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating*. Brill.

[14]   Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained*. St. Jerome.

[15]   Pavlenko, A. (2005). *Emotions and multilingualism*. Cambridge University Press.

[16]   Pishghadam, R., Derakhshan, A., & Jajarmi, H. (2020). Cultures of humor in language education: Translation and classroom practice. *Language Teaching Research, 24*(2), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820910196

[17]   Pym, A. (2014). *Exploring translation theories* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

[18]   Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

[19]   Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing & Health, 23*(4), 334–340. https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240X(200008)23:4

[20]   Silverman, D. (2016). *Qualitative research* (4th ed.). Sage.

[21]   Tagg, C. (2015). *Exploring digital communication: Language in action*. Routledge.

[22]   Vermeer, H. J. (1989). Skopos and commission in translational action. In A. Chesterman (Ed.), *Readings in translation theory* (pp. 173–187). Oy Finn Lectura.

[23]   Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

[24]   Zanettin, F. (2012). *Translation-driven corpora: Corpus resources for descriptive and applied translation studies*. Routledge.