

Journal of Translation Studies, 12(3), 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.1234/ijts.2023.00123>

Dung, L. Q. (2024). Investigating how cultural differences influence the translation process and the strategies used by translators to bridge cultural gaps. *Journal of Translation and Language Studies*, 5(3), 26–36. <https://doi.org/10.48185/jtls.v5i3.1268>

Motair, A. A. A., Algobaei, F., & Alhazmi, M. D. (2025). Ethics in Translation: A Pathway to Integrity in Future Professionals. *Arts for Linguistic & Literary Studies*, 7(1), 711–732. <https://doi.org/10.53286/arts.v7i1.2417>

Feruz, R. P. (2022). Evaluative language and gender stereotyping: A case study of the perpetuation of sexism in literary translation. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 30(6), 1027–1042. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676x.2022.2050930>

Nikfar, J. (2020). Globalization and future of power relations in the Arabic Middle-East: A case study of Egypt and Libya. *Palgrave Communications*, 7(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1057/S41599-020-00631-7>

Safa'a, A. S. (2016). Translation and shaping the Arab identity in a post-colonial globalized world: A multi-disciplinary approach. *European Journal of English Language and Linguistics Studies*, 7(1), 405–456.

Smith, J. (2023). The role of translation in cultural hegemony. *Journal of Global Studies*, 15(2), 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jgs.2023.001234>

Cabili, C., Vigonte, F. G., & Abante, M. V. (n.d.). Globalization and its impact on international trade: A comprehensive analysis. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4728725>

Power dynamics and identity politics in the era of globalization. (2024). *International Journal of Education, Information Technology, and Others*. <https://jurnal.peneliti.net/index.php/IJEIT/article/view/9264>

Kent State University. (n.d.). *Practicing cultural translation*. Retrieved November 22, 2024, from <https://www.kent.edu/mcls/translation-ma/blog/practicing-cultural-translation>

GUESSABI, F. (n.d.). *The influence of censorship on translation*. Faculty of Letters and Languages, University of Bechar, Algeria.

- Bassnett, S. (1991). *Translation studies*. Routledge.
- Cronin, M. (2003). *Translation and globalization*. Routledge.
- Gentzler, E. (1998). *Contemporary translation theories*. Routledge.
- House, J. (2015). *Translation quality assessment: Past and present*. Routledge.
- Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, rewriting, and the manipulation of literary fame*. Routledge.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Brill.
- Ritzer, G. (1993). *The McDonaldization of society*. Sage.
- Scholte, J. A. (2000). *Globalization: A critical introduction*. St. Martin's Press.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *The turns of translation studies: New paradigms or shifting viewpoints?* John Benjamins.
- Venuti, L. (1998). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge.
- Venuti, L. (2017). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Waters, M. (1995). *Globalization*. Routledge.
- Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Abu Rizaiza, O. (1998). Review of *English as a global language* by D. Crystal. *The Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering*, 23(2B), 327–328.
- Adila, A. R., et al. (2022). The role of mass media in shaping people's cultural identity. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies*, 35(2), 559–565.
- Bian, J., & Li, X. (2018). The interaction between ideology and translation. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 9(4), 743–749. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0904.12>
- Bian, J., & Li, X. (2022). The interaction between ideology and translation. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 637, 443–446. Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211224.080>
- Doe, J. (2023). Translation and cultural hegemony: A global perspective. *International*

4. Conclusion

Translation is a fundamental instrument of intercultural communication, one which is necessarily English- and Western culture-commodity-dominated globally. Through this inquiry, it has been demonstrated that translation operates in double ways: it can be a medium of cross-cultural understanding while simultaneously facilitating ideological and cultural hierarchies. Foreignization and domestication approaches (Venuti, 1995) illustrate how the choice of translators, motivated by ideological, social, and cultural inclinations, reproduces or defies dominant discourses. In the same vein, the “McDonaldization” process (Ritzer, 1993) illustrates how translation facilitates the exchange of Western consumer culture and cultural homogenization through language boundaries.

This sensitivity to the ideological function of translation is therefore necessary. Translators must be critically aware of their own positionality and ethical responsibility to deliver even cultural representation. Translation practitioners must integrate ideological and ethical awareness into training programs, and policymakers are called upon to promote and subsidize translations from weaker languages to ensure the continuation of linguistic and cultural diversity. Future studies might also investigate further the way translation among diverse fields—literary, legal, or digital—may subvert hegemonic narratives and enhance more equitable intercultural exchange in a globalized world.

References:

Ashuja'a, A., & Jibreel, I. (2024). Translator Praxis: An Investigation into the Practical Component in BA Translation Programs at Yemeni Universities. *Arts for Linguistic & Literary Studies*, 6(3), 574–604. <https://doi.org/10.53286/arts.v6i3.2085>

Motair, A. A. A., Algobaei, F., & Alhazmi, M. D. (2025). Ethics in Translation: A Pathway to Integrity in Future Professionals. *Arts for Linguistic & Literary Studies*, 7(1), 711–732. <https://doi.org/10.53286/arts.v7i1.2417>

whereas “weak” languages are characterized by diminished status and limited visibility. Thus, English prevails on a global scale, and translations often reinforce existing hierarchies.

Representing source cultures from a one-sided perspective not only strips them of their originality but also marginalizes them in global discourse. Translations from Arabic, in particular, tend to reinforce clichés and negative stereotypes, as argued by many Arab and Western scholars. Richard Burton’s translation of *The 1001 Nights* provides a clear example of how Orientalist discourses influenced the presentation of Arab culture to Western readers—highlighting the exotic and sensual aspects while ignoring genuine cultural depth and sensitivity. In the same vein, Jaquemond (1992) noted that Western biases shape the translation of Arabic literature, echoing the historical East–West imbalance of power. Furthermore, Edward Said’s *Orientalism* provides a critical framework for understanding how such translational biases are deeply rooted in Western literary and scholarly traditions. It illustrates how translation can serve as an instrument of cultural domination, constructing the West’s knowledge of the East through selective representation and interpretive manipulation.

In a nutshell, ideology is of utmost importance to translation practice; its influence lies beneath the factors causing a translator to choose particular words, which are not made in a vacuum. The chief forces behind such choices are the larger cultural and political dynamics operating in society. While translation is a medium for the confluence of cultures, it is highly susceptible to ideological beliefs that perpetuate prejudices, reinforce hegemonies, and blur the authenticity of source cultures. With English now asserting its dominance over other languages within the framework of ongoing globalization, it becomes all the more important for translators to engage in a critical analysis of the powerful effects of ideological forces underlying the translation process. A better understanding of these ideological bases can, therefore, enable a more accurate, less biased, and less prejudiced representation of cultures within the framework of global cross-cultural communication.

sified, there has been a profound rise in translation work. However, certain languages, as in the case of English, continue to be dominant in scholarly publishing and global communication. This growing global demand for translation has put English as both the primary vehicle for globalization and the dominant lingua franca (Jenkins et al., 2011). Translation into English often works to foster Western cultural and political hegemony, as politically driven censorship or translation of works to conform to the local standards, e.g., during the Cold War, Russian literature translated into English tended to omit material contrary to Western ideological perspectives.

Translation practice further reveals the asymmetry between strong and weak languages. Asad (1986) noted that languages from developed nations are deemed 'strong' due to global influence, economic power, and cultural importance, whereas 'weak' languages have lower status and limited presence. Consequently, English dominates globally, and translations frequently perpetuate existing hierarchies.

As a medium for cross-cultural communication, translation is particularly vulnerable to the perpetuation of stereotypes and biases. Raxmonkulov (2022) contended that translators unintentionally convey prejudiced attitudes through their word choices. For instance, frameworks for evaluation can find words that reinforce gender stereotypes, but they often miss important social and psychological factors needed to understand how sexism and cultural biases are shown.

In such a perspective, the concept of the neutral nature of translation must be rejected. Target cultures must adapt their language structure to the source text, and translations always bear dominant languages and perspectives. This is extremely apparent in large world languages such as English, which tends to translate foreign culture in manners favorable to dominant perspectives and reduce the original complexity of the source

Engaging in translation practice further highlights the imbalance between strong and weak languages. Asad (1986) pointed out that languages from developed nations are considered "strong" due to their global influence, economic clout, and cultural relevance,

therefore, is projected not only in the text, but also in the process of its “voicing” and “positioning” within the cultural and temporal context.

This follows from the fact that the process of translation is not arbitrary; moving from minor languages to dominant ones, like English, translators are often compelled to introduce some modifications to the source texts, such as foregrounding or downplaying certain aspects of the source text (ST), depending on the social or political ideologies of the target audience and the translators’ ideological prejudices. This means that translation process is naturally selective and shaped by external factors.

whether the target audience’s translation entails framing, recontextualizing, or even rewriting the source text, these linguistic adaptations are an integral part of the two main translation strategies: domestication and foreignization. According to Venuti (1995), these two strategies are significantly shaped by ideological, cultural, and social orientation. Domestication is generally employed in the majority of Anglo-American translations, producing readable and culturally transparent texts, while Foreignization preserves the foreign features of the ST in order that the reader receives the linguistic and cultural richness of the source text. The selection of strategies to employ is determined not only by the translator’s preferences but also on the broader cultural and political dynamics at play.

With the increasing globalization of the world, where cross-cultural interactions are becoming ever more intense, there has been a profound rise in translation activity. However, certain languages—most notably English—continue to dominate scholarly publishing and global communication. This growing global demand for translation has established English as both the primary vehicle of globalization and the dominant lingua franca (Jenkins et al., 2011). Translation into English often serves to reinforce Western cultural and political hegemony, as seen in politically driven censorship or the adaptation of works to conform to local standards; for example, during the Cold War, translations of Russian literature into English frequently omitted material that challenged Western ideological perspectives.

With a more globalized world, where cross-cultural interactions are increasingly inten-

strained to the transfer of meaning from the source text (ST) to the target text (TT); rather, it reflects translator's subjective approach to translation. Therefore, the implications of this subjectivity are clearly visible in the translator's interaction with the source text ST, as they incorporate their stance, viewpoints and worldview, ensuring that these elements are consistent with the target audience. Together, these key factors constitute the translator's "place of enunciation", a concept that is directly linked to their individual ideological framework and the source culture, regardless of physical or temporal context. Consequently, as they are fundamentally shaped by the ideology of translator, the source culture and the target audience, translation practices and ideology have long been proven correlated.

Furthermore, strongly swayed by societal and cultural dimensions, ideology profoundly affects translation by setting binding boundaries, such as societal norms, state-imposed restrictions, and the translator's personal political perspective. This means that the translator's ability to make autonomous decisions is so limited that they are often guided by mainstream political ideologies. In fact, the compelling authority of ideology not only guides translation practice but also extends to the choice of content for translation. As highlighted by Bian & Li (2018), texts chosen for translation are selected in accordance with their compatibility with dominant beliefs and social systems of the target culture, whereas materials that oppose these ideologies may be subject to institutional censorship. Besides, Bian & Li (2018) noted that gatekeepers—government agencies responsible for the dissemination of information and cultural products, publishers, as well as editors—play a vitally significant role in selecting and evaluating materials for translation. These materials are specially selected in such a way that they correspond with factors such as quality, commercial appeal, and conformity with the target audience's cultural conventions and preferences.

Similarly, this point is evidenced by Lefevere (1998): translation is not merely an act involving the exchange of words. Rather, it is an effective strategy of "rewriting" and manipulation, whereby the translator subtly modifies the source text in such a way that effectively conceals these changes from the target audience's attention. The translation's ideology,

5. Discussion: The Role of Ideology in Translation

Translation is inherently a non-neutral process; it exists within a framework of ideological, cultural, and moral considerations. In our current globalized environment, translators are not just unbiased transmitters of meaning; they are integral to the way cultures interpret one another. This chapter focuses on three vital aspects of translation practice: the ideological function in the construction of meaning, the gatekeeping role in deciding what to translate, and the ethical challenges that translators confront in mediating between source and target worlds.

Closely connected to the issue of translation in a globalized context is the fundamental question of ideology. Directly borrowed from the French term «*idéologie*», the word has been the subject of extensive debate regarding its definition and the persistent issues arising from its use in classical French philosophical literature. Since its coinage in 1796 by Count Destutt de Tracy—who claimed to be originally influenced by the epistemological studies of John Locke and Étienne Bonnot de Condillac—the term primarily referred to the rationalist “science of ideas.” This, in turn, sparked an epistemological examination of concepts and cognitive mechanisms (Munday, 2007).

Shortly thereafter, the neutral concept of ideology became entangled with political connotations, particularly those associated with the Napoleonic negative interpretation and the Marxian perspective of dominant ideology. As a result, the term “ideology” is now widely perceived as denoting a system of beliefs that misrepresents reality, reinforces hegemony, and facilitates manipulation (Bian & Li, 2022).

It is worth emphasizing, however, that translation transcends the mere act of language transfer, and despite translators’ endeavour to maintain fidelity, it is inevitably influenced by culture and ideology. This implies that ideology has a significant bearing on the act of translation. As Maria Tymoczko (2003) posits, “the ideology of a translation” is not con-

in the representation of one culture through the medium of language, shaping the target culture's perception of the source culture. For this purpose, translation practice alternates between two approaches: "domestication" and "foreignization." Translators may adopt strategies that create domestic identities for foreign cultures by adhering to the dominant domestic norms and values, thereby confirming their marginal status among world cultures ("domestication"). The final product is evidence of how the translator has been adept at changing the source text to meet the linguistic and cultural expectations of the target audience so that the text is readable and accessible. However, Venuti (1998a, p. 396) argues that such domesticating translations are not entirely exempt from potential "corruption" or distortions of meaning by foreign cultural impact since every translation has a potential to introduce unpredictable cultural changes.

Translation has been an instrument in the representation of cultures all over the world, with countless spoken languages and immense variety in culture interwoven. It has now become increasingly a global driving force because of multiculturalism and multilingualism; it has changed from a linguistically oriented discipline to center more on the cultural aspects, known as "cultural turn". This shift involved change in the outlook of translation; its function changed drastically to go beyond just a mode of communication. Instead, it became a bridge between cultures and a tool that sheds light on the nature of power relations and the impact that languages and cultures have on each other. Whether this practice aims at vilifying or praising foreign cultures, the translators are put to face the dilemma of "foreignization" versus "domestication." Adopting such strategies often to fit the purpose of the target culture, translation has far-reaching political implications shown in translating between "major" and "minor" languages where some languages enjoy high historical status though this categorization is very likely to change over time.

cultures (Marinetti, 2011; Bassnett & Lefevere, 1990). Additionally, the cultural turn has broadened the field of translation studies to include discussions on ideology, patronage, and audience reception of translations, urging translators to balance cultural authenticity with contextual requirements (Bassnett, 1998; Munday, 2016). Thus, this shift has redefined translation as a communicative practice that is deeply rooted in culture, rather than simply a transfer of language (Bassnett & Lefevere, 1990; Munday, 2016).

Following this perspective, the growing presence of multilingualism and multiculturalism have given new impetus to translation as an efficient conduit for fostering communication and overcoming cultural divides. The profession has, in fact, since the 1980s, placed a greater emphasis on culture-centered translation over the mechanical conversion of linguistic equivalence. Emphasizing the closely knit relationship between culture and language, Angelone (n.d.) contended that the faithful meaning of the source text is often compromised by translators who focus solely on word-for-word translation without considering the cultural context, leading to misunderstanding or ambiguity. Indeed, the cultural translation approach facilitates seamless mutual understanding, as it prioritizes a complex cross-cultural interaction by critically adapting equivalents and cultural subtleties to resonate with the target audience's cultural understanding of meaning. Opposing the classical view of translation as language-oriented, current approaches consider translation to be an act of communication rather than a simple transfer process. Such methods are described by Snell-Hornby (1988, p. 43) as "oriented towards the function of the target text (prospective translation) rather than the prescriptions of the source text (retrospective translation)," considering the text within a broader cultural context.

The cultural turn, nonetheless, has advanced newly developed frameworks of practice. By extension, translation strategies employed are aimed at either counteracting or reinforcing stereotypes and cultural biases, and the role of translators becomes vitally important

contextually informed approaches that resonate with the translation's function and purpose (Dung, 2024). In an effort to be loyal to the source text while making sure it is in harmony with the culture, translators rely on their profound cultural knowledge to create versions that are most likely to be appreciated by the target audience without distorting the original message or voice (Baker, 2018, as cited in Dung, 2024; Dung, 2024). This balancing act reflects key theoretical perspectives, including Venuti's (2017) concepts of domestication and foreignization (Dung, 2024). Through domestication strategies, such as localization and adaptation, translators align the text with the target culture by tailoring culturally specific expressions, idioms, and metaphors to enhance audience engagement and accessibility (Venuti, 2017, cited in Dung, 2024; Nida, 1964). In contrast, foreignization strategies—such as the deployment of cultural equivalents, annotation, and cooperation with cultural informants—retain the source culture's authenticity and integrity in offering richly contexted material (House, 2015; Snell-Hornby, 2006, quoted by Dung, 2024). Finally, such practices emphasize the translator's double role as a cultural mediator and a communicator, being constantly critical about their work in order to attain a dynamic balance between accuracy and cultural relevance (Dung, 2024).

4. The Cultural Turn in Translation Studies

The term "cultural turn" in translation studies, which emerged during the 1970s and 1980s, marked a pivotal shift from perceiving translation merely as a linguistic task to recognizing it as a cultural and ideological process (Bassnett & Lefevere, 1990; Marinetti, 2011). This viewpoint underscores that translation is fundamentally connected to its social, political, and historical contexts, reflecting the power relations and cultural values of both the source and target communities (Munday, 2016; Bassnett, 1998). Consequently, translators are seen not as neutral intermediaries but as cultural mediators who interpret texts and negotiate meanings between different

sions, concepts, and ideas that considerably conflict with the source language. For instance, it is very common to view minority groups—whether ethnic, gender, or LGBTQ+—underrepresented in mass media; such stereotypical portrayals often reinforce the exclusion of marginalized communities and support damaging conceptions and, subsequently, their self-esteem, behavior, and achievement (Adila et al. 559).

This also explains that translations to or from dominant languages such as English become more prevalent than those of local languages, the value of minority groups' cultural identity may diminish. This indicates that minority languages are steadily subject to exclusion, decreasing the proportion of language diversity and restricting cultures' ability to authentically express themselves on a global scale. In this regard, translation may either contribute to cultural preservation, keeping languages and cultures unique, or lead to cultural homogenization by promoting the worldview of a dominant culture. As an illustration, many African languages are rarely translated into global languages, which marginalizes their literature and limits their global impact. Therefore, their literature, oral cultures, and local epistemologies cannot reach wider societies, excluding these societies and limiting their contributions to international discourse. Conversely, translation of mainstream-language writing into minority languages is selective and limited, reinforcing the dominance of specific cultural perspectives.

Thus, translators play an increasingly active role in preserving the integrity of cultural identity throughout the translation process, rather than undermining or oversimplifying it. In this regard, translators are forced to strike a delicate balance between achieving precise linguistic equivalence and safeguarding cultural heritage, as modern translation practices are not only linguistically driven activities; they are mostly informed by cultural and ethical factors. Ultimately, translation serves as an effective instrument for fostering cultural diversity, provided that it respects the distinctive traits inherent in each language.

In handling cultural authenticity and audience expectations, translators employ

strategy ensures that translated texts remain both faithful to the original ideas and culturally authentic. Thus, translators must work through such nuances to avoid losing cultural authenticity and respect for identity (Lotman, as cited in Bassnett, 1991).

The shaping of cultural identity, therefore, is indispensable for the process of translation, particularly in faithfully representing minorities' cultural identity. This idea is in keeping with Bassnett's (1991) contention that language and culture are inextricably connected, where she drew an analogy between a surgeon operating on the heart while discarding the head and approaching a text without careful consideration of its culture. In a similar vein, Juri Lotman (cited in Bassnett, 1991, p. 14) supports this argument by underscoring the inseparability of culture and language, stating that language "can't exist without being steeped in the context of culture, and vice versa." Therefore, without recourse to the broader cultural contexts in which it is utilized, language cannot be fully comprehended, as it is firmly grounded in the reality of the culture in which it is used.

For example, in rendering Indigenous oral stories into written English, translators have to meticulously safeguard culturally particular metaphors and narrative conventions, e.g., the utilization of animal symbolism in Native American stories, to prevent distorting fundamental cultural meanings. In the same way, translation of Arabic proverbs into English needs to be responsive to intrinsic moral and social values—literal translation often cannot communicate intended wisdom, and culturally adjusted equivalents need to be used in order to preserve meaning and authenticity. In both instances, lack of attention to these cultural sensitivities distorts source identity and misrepresents the worldview of the community.

However, with English being a lingua franca, the relationship between culture and language might become complicated. Within a globalized context, numerous translators endeavour to convey the essence of a culture that is consistent with standardization, often to the detriment of diversity, which automatically leads to the homogenization of expres-

preserving a uniquely American identity. In this sense, translation does not create a blended consumer culture reflecting Western ideals but serves as a conduit for Westernization, promoting local cultural harmony with global consumer norms at the detriment of cultural diversity.

3. Language, Culture, and Identity in Translation

Serving as effective conduit across languages, cultures and identities, translation plays vitally a significant role in preserving both cultural and individual identities. In this regard, Dr.Saleh (2016) maintains that translation is instrumental in bridging different linguistic groups, acting as medium for values, ideas and cultural norms. Enabling not only transmission of knowledge and cultural experiences across language barriers, translation practices foster a collective global understanding and, by extension, deeply impact worldwide communication while maintaining local cultural specificities. However, it is worth noting that translation's purposes, in many occasions, go beyond preservation of cultural identities and promoting intercultural communication. Rather, it can be a potent means for reshaping and altering basic cultural elements, which would modify them within the target culture. In fact, it is a complex process of negotiating cultural meaning and identities. As Malinowski highlights, "the context of culture" demonstrates the fact that language can never be understood without its cultural context (Malinowski, 1923, cited in Katan, 1999).

Translation, therefore, requires understanding not only of the language as such, but also of all those values signified by that particular language. For example, "freedom" will mean a whole different thing for a British teenager than for a Palestinian teenager under occupation, since the meaning of such concepts is generally contoured by both cultural and situational contexts. In practice, translators address these embedded values by selecting culturally suitable terms, adding contextual insights, or employing footnotes and annotations to preserve the intended meaning without altering the source culture. This thoughtful

early bans in Saudi Arabia; yet, as the political relationships changed, they gradually gained acceptance. This illustrates how shifts in diplomatic and economic relationships create fluctuating patterns of cultural acceptance and the standardization of consumer culture (Waters, 1995; Scholte, 2000).

From this perspective, translation plays a key role in the systematic dissemination and localization of global consumer culture within an economic globalization framework. On the other hand, translation practices are also employed by Western multinational companies, such as McDonald's, Coca-Cola, and Hollywood studios, as one means of guaranteeing that their products are linguistically accessible and culturally recognizable to create a customer experience that is globally relatable.

With translation boosting cultural standardization that often erodes local identities, the term known as "McDonaldization" stands for the process by which Western values and ideals are widely disseminated through consumer products and cultural media (Ritzer, 1993). Ritzer further noted that the brand continued to expand largely worldwide that it became symbolic of Western consumer culture; with its immense reach reflecting the power of Western ideals, such as individualism and consumerism_ both easily accessible and readily embraced. This ensued global broader trend has established a global cultural reality where everyday lifestyles and attitudes are willingly embraced, fomenting unified cultural practices across diverse nations.

Translation industry has significantly been driven by economic considerations. Highly favoured and valued, English dominates global marketplaces for goods, science, and technology. This focal attention toward English rules out minority languages and strengthens English-speaking cultures, introducing Western consumer values into local contexts and standardizing global consumption trends (Crystal, 1997, as cited in Abu Rizaiza, 1998: 327) Western consumer culture steers translation practices. Hollywood movies, for example, are frequently adapted to be consistent with local cultural norms in various nations while

rial borders—also serve to clarify the unbound nature of global processes.

In the realm of translation studies, the pressure of globalization has an immense effect on the cultivation and mediation of cultures. Translation processes can be used to spread Western stories and conventions of language, sometimes perpetuating cultural hegemonies or upholding stereotypical representations. Translations of the media, writings, or news often represent non-Western cultures via Western understandings, reflecting models of soft power that shape perception and identity. Consequently, translation goes beyond the translation process alone and acts as an agent of cultural globalization, influencing cross-culturally the misrepresentation and the comprehension.

In the end, globalization is, at its core, a multidimensional and two-way phenomenon. It encourages intercultural contact, cooperation between economies and the exchange of ideas, but also threatens cultural homogenization and dominance. Understanding its effects on translation highlights the connection between global interactions and the creation of the 'Other,' emphasizing the need for critical and sensitive translation within cultural contexts.

2.3. Economic Globalization's Impact on Consumer Culture and Cultural Homogenization

Economic and cultural homogenization has followed the resulting outcomes of political globalization, whereby dominant nations established global systems of influence that served their economic interests and facilitated the spread of their consumer goods, media, and life values. As Walters (1995) explained, alliances were reformed based on strategic interests among powers, and self-serving interest was a predominant trait of international relations. In addition, American dominance, which emerged as a global system of influence following World War II, dividing territories among the victors and gradually evolving into American hegemony, accelerated the spread of U.S. cultural exports, placing consumer goods and media at the centre of global culture. Products like Coca-Cola, for example, faced

posed barriers to cross-border movements, with the aim of creating a free, borderless global economy characterized by open markets.

- A fourth definition relates globalization to Westernization, or more broadly, to modernization in its most 'Americanized' version. From this perspective, globalization means spreading the dominant social structure to all parts of the world, frequently eliminating other cultures. People refer to this globalization as the imperialism of companies like McDonald's, Hollywood, and CNN. Using this approach, Martin Khor and other authors define globalization as the resurgence of colonization in the Third World (Scholte, 2000; Motair et al., 2025).

A fifth interpretation views globalization as *deterritorialization*, what Scholte (2000) calls *supraterritoriality*. In this context, deterritorialization refers to the process through which social, cultural, or economic practices become less linked to specific geographic locations. In contrast, *supraterritoriality* refers to interactions that occur independently of territorial borders, transcending the control of any state (Scholte, 2000; Ashuja'a & Jibreel; 2024).

A reconfiguration of geography implies that social spaces are no longer rigidly defined by a physical territory, distance, or national border but that globalization goes beyond this traditional geographical constraint.

Globalization is commonly associated with "Westernization" and "universalization," and it is the mass diffusion of cultural, economic, and social practices commonly originating from the Western heritage. Researchers like Waters (1995) and Scholte (2000) make the distinction between the "globalization of cultures," an interest in intercultural exchange processes, and the "culture of globalization," an accent on the predominant influence by Western norms. While these understandings connote cultural mixing, genuine universalization requires the equal acknowledgment of all cultures. concepts like deterritorialization—commonly understood by diminishing ties between delimited practices and geographic spaces—and supraterritoriality (Scholte, 2000)—interactions functioning beyond territo-

2.2. Globalization: A multifaceted phenomenon With Diverging Perspectives

Globalization has contentiously emerged as one of the most pertinent and debated phenomena that has marked both the 20th and 21st centuries, with multiple definitions reflecting various ideological backgrounds. Its influence is conspicuously evident across a wide range of critical sectors, such as economy, culture, and politics, which constitute the foundational pillars of any nation. However, it seems challenging to arrive at an accurate definition of the term because of its various ideological perspectives. While some scholars define it as the unassailable power of NDOs, others explain it as the free flow of free trade, human resources, capital, and information between and within national and regional boundaries (MaHmuud, 2000:24). Due to its contentious nature, some researchers have endeavoured to conceptualize general definitions of the term. Scholte (2000:15-16), distinguishes five major definitions of globalization; these definitions diverge in some respects and sometimes overlap. Encapsulated in various definitions, Scholte (2000) pointed out that the term globalization cannot be thoroughly defined from a single point of view. Scholte (15-16) presented his definitions in five intersecting categories, each of which approaches globalization from different economic, cultural, and geopolitical perspectives: internationalization, liberalization, universalization, Westernization, and deterritorialization.

Therefore, it appears that in a narrow definition, globalization refers specifically to the enhancement of cross-border relationships between nations. Here, "global" is an adjective which describes the interaction, but globalization is the process of intensification of exchange and interdependence worldwide. Trade would be an example of globalization in this sense; another would be capital investment, the flow of people, ideas, and information across borders.

Globalization in the context of liberalization is the process of removing government-im-

Consequently, the portrayal of *otherness* per se via translation within the global context has neither improved cross-cultural understanding nor bridged cultural divides. Cronin (2003:6) maintains that 'we cannot understand how different needs and goals are fulfilled when we do not have the means of interpreting the objectives and distinctions that exist.' He observed that without interpreting theatrical performances, watching films, and engaging with literature from other cultures, meaningful understanding is impossible. The present global perception of Arabs, for instance, has been characterized through various translations, such as terrorism, fundamentalism, violence, and oppression.

This negative stereotypical representation can be better comprehended through Edward Said's Orientalism (1978), which explains how the West has developed and maintained control over the image of the East through selective cultural representations. Said argues that the West's discursive productions—including translation practice—often serve as power tools that create the identity of the "Other" to legitimize the West's ascendancy. Translation here ought not to be perceived as merely a formal linguistic procedure but can be an ideological process working to shape the construction of meaning and the circulation of prevailing orders.

Such biased translation decisions and policies are usually dictated by the instructions of hegemonic institutions and the dominant translation discourse. These practices, in turn, play crucial role in framing how the public perceives other cultures and how intercultural interactions unfold. Translation practices serve therefore the function of *soft power* establishing the dominance within the relationships between cultures. Though this process certain group identities are reinforced while undermining the cultural sovereignty and agency of others (Power Dynamics and Identity Politics in the Era of Globalization, 2024).

analytical-descriptive method based on significant theories of translation as well as globalization. The paper comprises five parts: the theoretical framework of globalization and translation, the crossroads of language, culture, and identity, the cultural turn within the field of translation studies, the function of ideology within the field of translation, and lastly, the discursive summary of findings as well as implications.

2. Globalization and Translation

2.1. The Shift in Global Power Dynamics

In the wake of World War II, the decline of the European colonial powers, and particularly the French and British powers occurred in conjunction with the rapid rise of the United States as the world's new hegemonic power. This transition not only reshaped political and economic relationships between nations, but also significantly impacted cultural and linguistic hierarchies worldwide. The onset of the "American Century" entailed more than military or economic supremacy; it also endorsed the cultural context that made English and American dialogue a key vehicle of globalization.

Within this changing international order, translation has taken on the new ideological meaning. It became the key mechanism for the dissemination of American values, media, and scientific information within various linguistic settings, often reinforcing U.S. cultural hegemony. According to Gentzler (2010), translation acts as the site of power where meaning is negotiated and controlled rather than transferred in an unmediated way. Accordingly, government institutions, publishing houses, and learning institutions held significant control over what was translated, how it was presented, and which voices were highlighted. Translation thereby operated not merely as the linguistic activity but also as soft power's tool shaping worldwide readings on modernity, democracy, and progress along the lines of dominant geopolitical projects.

Introduction

The main objective of translation activity has always been to achieve correct equivalence. Conventionally, this goal has been regarded as one that necessitates broad knowledge and deep proficiency in both the source language (SL) and target languages (TL). However, the concept of equivalence has evolved considerably over time, revealing that language does not function independently of culture—they are inextricably intertwined. Faithful equivalence, according to scholars like Nida, often involves adapting cultural context rather than simply matching linguistic counterparts (Nida, 1964). Similarly, Venuti (1995) emphasized the significance of translation strategies such as “foreignization” and “domestication”, illustrating how translation can either preserve cultural distinctions or alter them to meet the expectations of the target audience. He also noted that in the era of globalization, translation extends beyond linguistic considerations, becoming a political mechanism that influences the spread or conservation of cultural identities. From an anthropological standpoint, culture denotes a complex whole that includes people’s shared knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and values, while language serves as a communicative medium that enables people to express their culture. In this sense, translation takes on a new dimension, either promoting cultural globalization or strengthening domestic cultural identities. Globalization has significantly influenced political and economic landscapes. Therefore, this shift underscores the need to examine its implications for translation as both a cultural and communicative act (Bassnett, 1998; Mutahhar et., 2025). In spite of the rich literature on culture and translation, few studies have examined how globalization redefines translation as both a political and cultural practice. This study investigates the vital role that translation plays in mediating cultural interactions as well as identity formation within the context of globalization. The current investigation intends to scrutinize the double role of translation as a connecting bridge across cultures as well as a possible instrument of dominance. The paper uses the



OPEN ACCESS

تاريخ الاستلام: 2024-12-16

تاريخ القبول: 2025-10-21

الترجمة والثقافة في سياق العولمة: دراسة في التفاعل بين الثقافات

طارق زهير⁽²⁾

ztarik700@gmail.com

الملخص:

تعتمد عملية الترجمة بشكل أساسي على خبرة المترجم في توضيح العلاقة المعقدة بين اللغة والثقافة، حيث تهدف إلى نقل الدلالة بدقة مع مراعاة التفاعلات اللغوية والحضارية المتداخلة. تستقصي هذه الدراسة دور الترجمة في تشكيل الهوية الثقافية وتعزيز الحوار بين الثقافات، عبر تحليل مواد متنوعة مثل الأدب المترجم والنصوص الإعلامية، باستخدام منهجية وصفية نوعية. وباعتبار اللغة جوهر الثقافة، تُبرز الدراسة الترابط الدينامي بينهما، خاصة في سياق العولمة المعاصر. في هذا الإطار، تُحلل الدراسة تأثير العوامل الخارجية كالإيديولوجيا والسياسة والاقتصاد على قرارات المترجمين، ودورها في تشكيل التبادل الثقافي. ومن خلال كشفها عن علاقات القوة غير المتكافئة، تؤكد النتائج على ازدواجية دور الترجمة: فهي من جهة جسراً للتواصل بين الثقافات، ومن جهة أخرى أداة قد تعكس أو تعزز الهيمنة في الديناميات العالمية. تُظهر النتائج أن الترجمة تتمتع بإمكانية الحفاظ على التنوع الثقافي، لكنها قد تُكرس في الوقت نفسه تسلسلات هرمية حضارية. هذه الثنائية تُبرز المسؤولية المحورية للمترجمين في الموازنة بين الدقة اللغوية، والأمانة الثقافية، وتوقعات الجمهور المستهدف.

الكلمات المفتاحية:

الترجمة، الثقافة، الإيديولوجيا، العولمة، ديناميات القوة، التواصل بين الثقافات.

2 باحث دكتوراة، وأستاذ اللغة الإنجليزية بدار الحديث الحسنية، المغرب.

© للاقتباس: زهير، طارق، الترجمة والثقافة في سياق العولمة: دراسة في التفاعل بين الثقافات، مجلة نماء، مركز نماء، مصر، مج9، ع4، 2025، 339-361.

© نُشر هذا البحث بموجب ترخيص (CC BY-NC 4.0) المفتوح، الذي يتيح لأي شخص تنزيل البحث وقراءته والتصرف فيه مجاناً، مع وجوب نسبته إلى صاحبه بطريقة مناسبة، وبيان ما إذا أُجريت عليه أي تعديلات، ولا يجوز استخدام هذا البحث لأغراض تجارية.

OPEN ACCESS

Received: 2024-12-16

Accepted: 2025-10-21



Translation and Culture in a Global Context: A Study on Globalization and Cross-Cultural Interaction

Tarek Zoheir⁽¹⁾ztarik700@gmail.com

Abstract:

The process of translation fundamentally depends on the translator's expertise in clearing up the intricate relationship between language and culture. Its primary purpose is the faithful transfer of meaning while accounting for the complexity inherent in multifaceted interactions. This study explores the ways in which translation influences cultural identity and promotes cross-cultural communication. A collection of cultural materials, including translated literature and media texts, was examined via a qualitative descriptive approach. Since language lies at the heart of culture, translation must address their dynamic interconnection especially in today's globalized context. The paper explores how factors such as ideology, politics, and economic affect the translators' decisions and shape cultural exchange. By foregrounding asymmetrical power relations, the present study highlights translation's dual role as a medium for bridging cultures and as a mechanism that can perpetuate global power dynamics. Results suggest that translation has the potential to act as a mechanism for maintaining cultural diversity while simultaneously reinforcing cultural hierarchies. This duality underscores the pivotal role of translators in balancing of fidelity, cultural authenticity and the expectations of the target audience.

Keywords:

Translation, Culture, Ideology, Globalization, Power Dynamics, Intercultural Communication.

(1) PhD Researcher and Lecturer of English at Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ḥasaniyyah, Morocco.

Cite this article as: Zoheir, Tarek, *Translation and Culture in a Global Context: A Study on Globalization and Cross-Cultural Interaction*, Journal of Namaa, Nama Center, Egypt, V 9, issue 4, 2025, 339-361.

© This research is published under an open license (CC BY-NC 4.0), which allows anyone to download, read, and use the research for free, provided it is properly acknowledged and any modifications are indicated. This research shall not be used for commercial purposes.