

## **Introduction: Translation and plurilingual approaches to language teaching and learning**

Ángeles Carreres, María Noriega-Sánchez and Lucía Pintado Gutiérrez

University of Cambridge / University of Cambridge / Dublin City University

As we enter the second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the challenges and possibilities surrounding the role of translation in language learning appear both in some ways similar and rather different from what they were twenty or even ten years ago. Much progress has been made in integrating translation as a key component in language education. In recent years, an increased interest in the multilingual dimension has offered further opportunities for reflection and experimentation around the role translation can play as part of plurilingual pedagogies. At the same time, some of the old misconceptions have lingered in some quarters and continue to hold back further advances.

The articles in this volume set out to explore the possibilities that open up, and the challenges that arise, as translation transitions from a relatively marginal place towards becoming normalised as an integral part of language teaching practice. A number of contributions foreground plurilingual approaches and seek to articulate the place of translation within them. It has been our intention as editors to bring together a variety of perspectives and methodological approaches, and to include both the secondary and the higher education settings across countries in Europe and North America.

It is worth highlighting that, in discussing contemporary pedagogical practices and how they reflect current notions of translation and language learning, this volume wishes to emphasise the dynamic nature of those practices and the fluidity of the boundaries between them. The once hard divide between translation for professional purposes and for language learning has gradually given way to a more mature relationship between the two fields that

recognises the strong links that connect them. A growing number of scholars now work in the intersection of the two areas (González-Davies 2004, 2014, 2018; Carreres and Noriega-Sánchez 2011; Pintado Gutiérrez 2012, 2018, 2019; Laviosa 2014; Carreres, Noriega-Sánchez, and Caldach 2018; Pym 2018; Enríquez Raído, Austermühl, and Sánchez Torrón 2020). The explicit questioning of the divide between translation as a means and as an end that was taking place about a decade ago (Cook 2010, xx, 55; Carreres 2014) has now, in effect, been incorporated into much current research and practice. While this fluidity of boundaries has brought about welcome synergies, it has also resulted at times in conceptual inconsistencies and terminological ambiguities (Pintado Gutiérrez 2018) that often conceal reductive — and sometimes conflicting — notions of translation.

In Europe, the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR) (Council of Europe 2001), later expanded in the *Companion Volume* (Council of Europe 2018), introduced the notion of mediation as one of the four key language activities. The place of translation — reconceptualized as cross-linguistic mediation — in language pedagogy became established, and research in the field shifted its focus towards investigating best practice and exploring possibilities for implementation in various learning contexts. Linked to mediation, the Council of Europe documents have placed an increasing emphasis on the notion of plurilingual competence. The CEFR defines plurilingualism as “the dynamic and developing linguistic repertoire of an individual user/learner” (Council of Europe 2001, 4), and sets it apart from multilingualism, which it defines as “the coexistence of different languages at the social or individual level” (Council of Europe 2018, 28). It must be noted, however, that multilingualism is often used in the literature as synonymous with plurilingualism as defined in the CEFR, i.e., as an individual’s ability to operate in more than one language. While there has been considerable research activity on pluri- and multilingualism, studies that explore the practical implementation of plurilingual approaches

to language learning are still relatively few — see Corcoll López and González-Davies (2016) for an exploration of plurilingual learning strategies; González-Davies (2014) on the informed use of translation in additional language learning; González-Davies (2017, 2018, 2020) for a discussion of the Plurilingual Integrated Approach (IPA); and Muñoz-Basols (2019) on the integration of multilingualism into the foreign language curriculum. The present volume seeks to make a contribution to this burgeoning area of research.

The CEFR and the *Companion Volume* are not the only curricular documents that put an emphasis on the value of plurilingual competence. *A Framework of Reference for Pluralistic Approaches to Languages and Cultures* (FREPA) (Candelier et al. 2012) serves as a guide towards a paradigmatic change in language education where pluralistic approaches — defined as those that employ learning activities that involve several varieties of languages or cultures — are key in constructing the plurilingual and the pluricultural competence of language users/learners. Plurilingualism is also central in the report carried out by the Directorate-General for Translation (DGT) on the role of translation in language teaching (Pym, Malmkjær, and Gutiérrez-Colón 2013, 1). Beyond Europe, the report published in 2007 by the Modern Language Association of America explores new ways of looking at L2 education in HE in globalised societies. This document only mentions in passing the need to lay a road map towards a multilingual future for students in the United States (Modern Language Association 2007, 9). However, it contains explicit references to the need to develop deeper cultural and linguistic competences in order to promote understanding across communities (Modern Language Association 2007, 1). Moving forward in this direction, the Australian Curriculum for Languages issued in 2014 by the Australian Curriculum, Assessment, and Reporting Authority (ACARA) signalled a landmark in the reinstatement of translation in the National Curriculum, hitherto absent for the previous forty years (Scarino 2016). This development of the Australian Curriculum provided an opportunity to

reconceptualise the nature and scope of language learning, and articulated a deliberate conceptual move from communicative language teaching to intercultural language learning. It introduced a number of shifts for language learning in Australian education, from Foundation to Year 12, with an interlinguistic and intercultural orientation which included translation. Writing from the perspective of an applied linguist and educator who initiated such reinstatement in Australia, Scarino (2016) argues that it is a reconceptualisation of translation as intercultural mediation that allows for its value in language learning to be fully realised and mitigates contestation by teachers who still view it as a return to grammar-translation approaches:

The value of translation in the curriculum resides in its place as a real-world activity of mediating the intercultural exchange of meaning in the context of linguistic and cultural diversity, and where it expands access to new worlds through language use and languaging (i.e., articulating the practices of intercultural language use). Fundamentally, it enables students to understand that we are all situated in our own languages and cultures and that there is no one common place from which meaning can be mediated.

(Scarino 2016, 482)

The notion of mediation, and the position of translation within it, merit closer attention in the introduction to this special issue. In the CEFR, mediation is defined as a language activity that aims to “make communication possible between persons who are unable, for whatever reason, to communicate with each other directly” (Council of Europe 2001, 14). Mediation activities, therefore, always involve a “(re)processing [of] an existing text” (ibid.). Translation and interpretation are explicitly quoted as examples of mediation activities, together with paraphrasing or summarizing. While the term mediation has at times been used in the

literature as synonymous with translation, the CEFR is quite clear that, in their framework, translation is one of the forms mediation activities can take. The *Companion Volume* (Council of Europe 2018) came to enhance the first edition of the CEFR by broadening the notion of mediation and providing detailed descriptors. The almost exclusive focus on the textual features of mediating activities in the 2001 CEFR (written translation, paraphrasing, (re)formulation of a source text, (re)processing an existing text, etc.) has become multi-layered, and a more comprehensive paradigm of mediation activities includes, amongst others, “alternation between languages in professional contexts,” “considering idiolects, sociolects and the links between styles and textual genres,” “bridging and exchanging between different elements and spaces, where the individual and the social interact,” or “collaborative dialogue” (for a fuller discussion, see North and Piccardo 2016, 20-25). The social role of the learner, as well as their learning trajectory, and their personal development are taken as integral to the learner/user’s interactive agency. In mediation activities, “the user/learner acts as a social agent who creates bridges and helps to construct or convey meaning, sometimes within the same language, sometimes from one language to another (cross-linguistic mediation)” (Council of Europe 2018, 103). The extended notion of mediation and the new descriptors that accompany the revised construct provide a much richer landscape where practitioners can use mediating tasks in different educational contexts (Pintado Gutiérrez 2019, 33). The newly developed spectrum of language use around the agency of language learners and the addition of descriptors, however, seems to remain somewhat unclear or ambiguous to practitioners as the description of mediation activities is not entirely correlated with examples of the tasks described.

Undoubtedly, additional work that narrows the gap between the newly reshaped construct of mediation, the descriptors, and the tasks expected to illustrate this revised landscape is in order. The forthcoming volume *Enriching 21<sup>st</sup> Century Language Education:*

*The CEFR Companion Volume, Examples from Practice* (North et al. 2021, in press) is set to address this limitation and follows on from previous works with proposals that include hands-on mediation lessons and tasks, a welcome advance for practitioners wishing to apply mediation activities in their classrooms. Fortunately, research that explores pedagogical approaches, including this special issue, is currently multiplying, pointing towards a promising future in this area.

Notwithstanding these promising signs, some outstanding issues remain. While the revision of the descriptors confirms the place of mediation (and of translation as a mediating activity) as a relevant element in language teaching, a word of caution is added in the *Companion Volume* to keep language pedagogy and translation training separate, or at least to discern the two fields of knowledge, in particular in the section devoted to “Mediating a text”:

It is also important to underline that the illustrative descriptors offered in this section are not intended to describe the competences of professional interpreters and translators. Firstly, the descriptors focus on language competences, thinking of what a user/learner can do in this area in informal, everyday situations. Translation and interpretation competences and strategies are an entirely different field. As mentioned in the introduction, the language competence of professional interpreters and translators is usually considerably above CEFR Level C2.

(Council of Europe 2018, 107)

While attitudes towards translation have shifted towards greater acceptance, the fact remains that, in many learning settings, translation is often still associated with isolated use of the students’ L1 by the teacher in order to clarify a particular word or grammatical structure. This limited view of translation leaves its pedagogical potential largely untapped (Pintado

Gutiérrez 2019, 23-24; González-Davies 2020, 436). It is perhaps in this sense that Pym can state that translation “is very probably not what many language teachers think it is” (Pym 2018, 218). Indeed, if one looks back at the criticisms levelled against translation over time, the underlying problem was often not so much that translation was unfairly blamed, but that the very notion of what translation is was distorted. This may also be partly the reason why the notion of mediation has met with such wide acceptance. It gives the use of translation, which many teachers intuitively perceive as useful, a rubber stamp of approval by providing a less negatively connotated label than ‘translation,’ which, for many, is still reminiscent of grammar-translation practices. This is perfectly illustrated in the study commissioned by the Directorate-General for Translation, where experts in the German context were set against the use of translation in language teaching, but they saw mediation as good practice. This reflects a perception of mediation and translation as two completely separate practices where ‘mediation’ embraces anything which is done to communicate across languages, while ‘translation’ would be seen as a form of linguistic transfer constrained by word-for-word equivalence (Pym, Malmkjær, and Gutiérrez-Colón Plana 2013, 62-63).

The current focus in the field on mediation and translation has come hand in hand with a foregrounding of the plurilingual dimension, both in the CEFR and more generally. Advances in neuroscience have shown that humans possess a single linguistic repertoire they draw on in order to communicate (Cook 2011). As explained in the *Companion Volume*, “the fundamental point is that plurilinguals have a *single*, inter-related, repertoire that they combine with their general competences and various strategies in order to accomplish tasks” (Council of Europe 2018, 28). The current focus on plurilingual competence within language pedagogy is therefore predicated on the premise that knowledge of language — of *any* language —, is an asset in the process of learning an additional language. This comes with the acknowledgement that resorting to one’s own language is a natural learning strategy that

learners spontaneously engage in, no matter how intent a particular teacher might be to ban the L1 from the classroom. The foregrounding of multilingualism also comes supported by a growing awareness of the link between language and identity (Norton 2013).

This vision is in stark contrast to the tenets that underpinned strictly monolingual approaches, according to which any language other than the target language is seen as a potential source of interference and, therefore, as a hindrance (for a historical perspective on the monolingual approach see González-Davis 2020, 435-437). Approaches such as the Integrated Plurilingual Approach (IPA), pioneered by González-Davis and her research group, seek to embrace the potential afforded by the learners' prior languages in the process of learning an additional language (González-Davis 2014, 2017, 2018, 2020; Corcoll López and González-Davis 2016; Wilson and González-Davis 2017).

In the debate around plurilingualism, we are dealing with two distinct — albeit closely related — questions: one, to what extent developing the learner's plurilingual competence will mean that he/she will be better equipped to function successfully in today's increasingly multilingual societies; two, to what extent the development of the learner's plurilingual competence will lead to greater success in the acquisition of a particular additional language. The answer to the first question appears evident: the more languages an individual can operate in, and the more he or she is aware of the connections between them, the better he/she will be able to function in a multilingual environment. In this sense, the case for a plurilingual approach to language learning could be taken as settled. The answer to the second question is perhaps less obvious — further research will have to determine the extent to which developing the learner's plurilingual competence can lead to better outcomes in terms of the acquisition of a particular language.

This twofold perspective on the role of plurilingualism in language pedagogy — as a goal worth pursuing in and of itself, and/or as a means to acquisition — is perhaps not



dissimilar to a parallel debate that has been taking place regarding translation and its place in language learning. As we and others have argued for over a decade now, the role of translation in the language classroom cannot and should not be limited to its use as a tool (Cook 2010, 55; Carreres 2014). Just as the learner is expected to be able to communicate orally and in writing (production), to understand texts and speech (reception), and to hold successful interactions, so should he/she also be expected to acquire the ability to translate, in other words, to mediate between people who do not have a shared language.

The focus on plurilingual competence in the CEFR — even more so in the *Companion Volume* —, and in the field more generally, has been one of the contributing factors in the reinstatement of translation. In that sense, one could view the ‘translation turn’ we have advocated (Carreres, Noriega-Sánchez, and Caldach 2018) as part of a wider ‘plurilingual turn’ (González-Davies 2018). As explained in the CEFR, plurilingual competence “involves the ability to call flexibly upon an inter-related, uneven, plurilinguistic repertoire” (Council of Europe 2001, 28) in order to perform a variety of communicative acts, including moving between different language varieties (e.g., dialect, register), using one language variety while understanding a person using another, making sense of text by deploying one’s knowledge of other languages, mediating between people who do not have a shared language, etc. (see section 1.3 in Council of Europe 2001). Looking at the components of plurilingual competence as detailed in the CEFR, it is easy to see how translation would have a significant role to play in a plurilingual approach to language learning. By its very nature, translation engages our plurilingual abilities and contributes to their development. However, at the same time, if translation is to deploy its full potential in contributing to the enhancement of plurilingual competence, we as teachers and researchers are going to have to think creatively, and possibly look with a new critical eye at some of the ways we have been using translation in the classroom. As González-Davies has said: “[t]ranslation is a key mediation skill whose

complexity is not usually dealt with even in (well-intentioned) plurilingual approaches to language learning, where the students are asked simply ‘to translate’” (González-Davies 2020, 445). The typical — or rather, the traditional — translation class usually assumes that students share an L1 (source language) and a roughly comparable level in their L2 (target language). Increasingly, however, many teachers find themselves teaching multilingual classes in which two, three, or more L1s are found among students. This can be seen as a difficulty, but it can also become a rich resource if we find ways to harness the potential for plurilingual awareness that it brings.

The monolingual focus — or monolingual bias — in second language acquisition (SLA), and in language teaching, has been the object of robust criticism from both outside and within the field of SLA for some time now (Bley-Vroman 1983; Firth and Wagner 1997). In monolingual approaches, the figure of the native speaker as the ultimate authority looms large. As Ortega puts it:

The bias results from the assumption that monolingualism is the default of human communication and from valuing nativeness as a superior form of language competence and the most legitimate relationship between a language and its users.

(Ortega 2014, 32)

As many have pointed out, monolingually-biased research and teaching practices raise serious validity and ethical issues. Critics point to the fact that it is highly problematic to use native speaker competence as the yardstick to measure attainment, given that, for the vast majority of learners, that goal is not within reach (Cook 1997).

The questioning of the supremacy of the native speaker, and the focus on multilingualism as the new norm, opens up the exciting opportunity for a paradigm shift in the

field (May 2014, 1). However, there is still some way to go to make that promise a reality. Criticism of the monolingual and native speaker biases, however persuasive, have not yet permeated through to actual teaching and assessment practices. If native speaker competence is no longer seen as a realistic goal of language learning for most learners, what can replace it? In the introduction to his edited volume *The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual Education*, May (2014, 2) expresses some frustration at the time it is taking for the field of second language acquisition to take on board these developments. As Rampton put it as early as 1987, “What is regularly described as code-switching in sociolinguistics somehow winds up as interference in SLA” (Rampton 1987, 55). More recently, Vivian Cook expresses a similar frustration:

Overall, it cannot be said that language teaching has yet given a passing glance to linguistic relativity. To the extent that it bases itself on the idea of the independent L2 user rather than the monolingual native speaker, language teaching will have to take into account L2 learners’ differences from monolinguals and explore ways of fostering students’ distinctive ways of thinking: the pay-off from language teaching should not be limited to the ability to use the new language to communicate with others, but should be extended to the transformation of the mind that learning a second language involves for the individual.

(Cook 2011: 516)

The agenda for language learning that Cook succinctly sets out here is no doubt an ambitious one, and we are certainly not quite there yet. While it is easy to see the benefits on multiple levels of debunking the monolingual, native speaker myth, it is not immediately obvious how this paradigm shift can be fully implemented in the language classroom beyond anecdotal

winks to multilingualism. Implementing a plurilingual approach will necessitate, as well as a significant shift in mentality for both teachers and learners (Esteve 2020, 147), considerable investment in training and resource development. Several of the papers in this volume report on studies that deal with precisely the question of the practical implementation of a plurilingual approach, from a variety of perspectives and in different learning contexts (Baños, Marzá and Torralba; Galante; González-Davies and Soler Ortínez).

While language pedagogy may have been slow to incorporate paradigm-changing findings in neuro- and sociolinguistics, a similar resistance can be observed on the part of some advocates of the pluri/multilingual turn in SLA with regard to the role of translation in this new paradigm. To a large extent, much research into plurilingualism also remains uninterested in and unperturbed by translation (Muñoz-Basols 2019: 4). To readers of this volume, the value of translation within a plurilingual approach may appear self-evident. Yet a review of much of the SLA literature on plurilingualism reveals that translation is often either completely ignored or presented in such reductive terms — reminiscent of the grammar-translation method — that it is no wonder that it should be seen as irrelevant. It is perhaps symptomatic of the sidelining of translation that in May's excellent volume, the word 'translation' does not appear in the index, whereas 'translanguaging' and 'code-switching' do (May 2014). In view of this, one of the challenges ahead is for second language acquisition to come to recognise translation for the complex phenomenon that it is, and to acknowledge its value for the development of plurilingual competence. By showing how translation can be deployed in multilingual approaches, this special issue wants to make a contribution in this direction.

The terms 'translanguaging,' 'code-switching,' 'use of the L1,' 'translation' are sometimes employed with a lack of precision that does not help advance the discussion (see Pintado Gutiérrez 2018 for a detailed analysis on the use of these terms). In some cases, as

pointed out above, ‘translation’ is used to refer to an almost automatic transfer of meaning from one language into another, not unlike the notion reflected in the grammar-translation method. In contrast, ‘translanguaging,’ ‘code-switching,’ or ‘own-language use’ are seen as more dynamic, richer processes, and, as such, are accorded a more prominent place in a plurilingual pedagogy. A notion that deserves particular attention in our research context is that of translanguaging. The term is defined by Canagarajah as “the ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system” (Canagarajah 2011, 401). Translanguaging, according to Canagarajah (2011), acts as an umbrella for terms that embrace language practices in multilingual contexts. Plurilingualism, code-switching and translingual writing are but some of the dynamic practices that may take shelter under this term. Some of the literature on plurilingualism sets translanguaging against translation, viewing the former as the more dynamic, productive, and inclusive concept, while translation is identified as perpetuating a static, compartmentalized notion of language use (see for example García, Aponte, and Le 2020). In our view, this dichotomous approach to the two phenomena needs to be taken with caution. It is predicated on a markedly narrow understanding of translation as an almost automatic transfer of equivalent meanings across languages, a notion that we have long moved past. We would argue that the two should not be seen in opposition, but rather as equally valid processes that can each have their place in plurilingually-focused pedagogies.

Turning to the pedagogical questions that this special issue addresses, there are a number of practical challenges related to the use of translation within a plurilingual framework. Beyond the practical complexities involved in the design of tasks for multilingual classrooms with no single shared L1 and the reshaping of pedagogical practices, there will be hurdles to overcome as regards teachers’ and learners’ attitudes. For some teachers, operating within a plurilingual framework may entail taking a significant step outside their comfort

zone, and collaborative projects between researchers, teachers and students with a practical focus, such as the ones described in the article by Maria González-Davies and David Soler in this volume, can pave the way ahead. Furthermore, in many teaching contexts where instruction time is limited, we may wonder how to justify to our students spending contact time discussing languages other than the one they are supposed to be learning. Alternatives may need to be considered, such as offering dedicated modules aiming to develop plurilingual competence, or making the most of multilingual classrooms by devising translation tasks that enhance conceptual as well as linguistic knowledge, as demonstrated in the proposal presented in this volume by Angelica Galante. Developing the curriculum in a more creative and dynamic way seems at the core of any attempt at reframing classroom practices, for instance by integrating audiovisual translation tasks that promote plurilingual and pluricultural competence, as described in the articles by Rocío Baños, Anna Marzà and Gloria Torralba, and Anna Vermeulen and María Ángeles Escobar-Álvarez. It seems therefore essential that the value of translation as a key element in plurilingual pedagogies is (re)considered in language teacher training in a variety of educational settings. The excellent volume edited by Laviosa and González-Davies in 2020 includes a comprehensive range of chapters that discuss translation in pedagogical contexts from preschool through to higher education, including special education and teacher training.

Another key factor worth mentioning is the question of assessment. The *CEFR Companion Volume* gives us valuable descriptors we can use to guide us in this area, but questions remain open as to how to assess plurilingual competence. By its very nature, plurilingual competence is uneven and difficult to quantify, which presents particular challenges in contexts where formal assessment is required. As regards the assessment of translation, even in its more traditional forms, this also presents us with difficulties that threaten to destabilise some of the gains made in promoting its presence in language

education, as Katrina Barnes discusses in her paper in this volume. It seems therefore crucial to develop assessment frameworks that consider translation as a skill in itself and capture its full complexity, not only — or merely — as a tool for assessing comprehension or application of lexical and grammatical knowledge, but also for evaluating the wide range of metapragmatic and stylistic decisions and competences (critical thinking, intercultural awareness, problem solving, collaboration, etc.) involved in plurilingual communicative translation tasks.

In sum, high on the agenda is the need to continue to explore creative approaches to curriculum development and more holistic evaluation methods that encourage a realistic and socially relevant view of translation. In so doing, we should continue to work towards bridging the gap between teacher training and classroom practice. The articles in this volume provide valuable insights in this direction, identifying current challenges and discussing the vast possibilities of integrating translation in plurilingual pedagogies.

In their contribution to this volume, **María González-Davies** and **David Soler Ortínez**, present a pedagogical framework for the implementation of an Integrated Plurilingual Approach (IPA) to language learning. Building on previous research by the authors on the IPA (González-Davies 2017, 2018, 2020), discussion here focuses on three interconnected projects involving learners and teachers in three Catalan high-complexity secondary schools. The projects had a practical focus in that their main purpose was to engage the participants' plurilingual repertoires in order to bring about a reframing of their classroom practices, from a monolingual and compartmentalised approach towards a plurilingual and holistic one. Translation was one of the practices used to help learners connect their linguistic repertoires and develop mediation skills. The article provides a thought-provoking account of the extent to which an explicit acknowledgment and integration of the plurilingual dimension can be transformative for both teachers and learners. It also offers valuable insights into the

role of translation as an integral part of a plurilingual pedagogy in contexts other than professional translator training.

Writing from the perspective of a researcher and current teacher in a British secondary school, **Katrina Barnes** presents an insightful overview of past and present perceptions of translation as a pedagogical tool in the teaching of Modern Foreign Languages in the UK. She then explores ways to redefine and use translation as a communicative and creative activity in the language learning process and offers a cogent defence of Dynamic Translation to promote intercultural communicative competence, as well as critical engagement and collaboration amongst learners, through task-based translation projects. Notwithstanding the restrictions imposed by rigid assessment practices and overloaded exam-focused curricula, Barnes's persuasive proposal is a breath of fresh air that outlines the possibility of a more dynamic future for translation in school settings.

In "Promoting plurilingual and pluricultural competence in language learning through audiovisual translation," **Rocío Baños**, **Anna Marzà** and **Gloria Torralba** establish illuminating links between audiovisual translation (AVT) modes, CEFR transfer/mediation skills, and the descriptors developed within the *Framework of Reference for Pluralistic Approaches to Languages and Cultures* (FREPA) (Candelier et al. 2012). They focus on the PluriTAV research project (2017-2019), in which they took part and that was aimed at developing a set of activities involving the use of AVT for the acquisition of plurilingual and pluricultural competence (PPC) in the language classroom. Through a comprehensive presentation of the underlying theoretical framework of the PluriTAV project and some illustrative examples of AVT activities (subtitling and dubbing), the authors draw refreshing connections between translation competence, mediation strategies and transfer skills in AVT and PPC, that not only demonstrate its potential as an area for fruitful comparative research,



but also offer practitioners concrete ideas for the use of AVT in the multilingual classroom from a pluralistic approach to language teaching and learning.

Also firmly rooted in classroom practice is the contribution by **Anna Vermeulen** and **María Ángeles Escobar-Álvarez**. The authors present an empirical study that focuses on the complex area of clitic pronoun use in two separate mediation tasks carried out by Dutch-speaking intermediate learners of Spanish in a university in Belgium. The two tasks included the production of a written audio description of a film sequence for the visually impaired, and of a translation of the original English-language script of the same sequence into Spanish (dubbing script). By analysing the outputs of the group of learners and comparing them with those of a control group formed by Spanish native speaker students, the authors draw interesting conclusions both concerning the use of clitic pronouns by learners more generally, as well as about how the nature of the mediation task — intermodal vs. interlingual mediation — impacts on accuracy and idiomaticity. The post-task questionnaire completed by the experimental group reveals that the students' perception of the learning and motivational potential of mediation tasks was markedly positive.

**Angelica Galante** delves into how multilingual societies provide practitioners with unique opportunities in the L2 classroom, particularly in Canada, where an increasingly diverse linguistic landscape has permeated educational settings. Her study is part of a larger quasi-experimental research project examining plurilingual instruction in an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) programme at a university in Toronto (Galante 2018; Galante et al. 2019, 2020) that focused on a sample of teachers who did not speak or were not proficient in their students' L1s. The nature of the multilingual classrooms in the EAP programme require the use of plurilingual pedagogical approaches that exploit the international students' linguistic repertoire in order to advance learning English as an additional language. The goal of this stimulating study is to explore the use of translation in the multilingual classroom, and

more specifically to what extent translation tasks engage students' language repertoires, and the students' perceptions of translation.

## References

- Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA). 2014. "The Australian Curriculum: Languages." Accessed October 15, 2020. <http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/download/f10>
- Bley-Vroman, Robert. 1983. "The Comparative Fallacy in Interlanguage Studies: The Case of Systematicity." *Language Learning* 33: 1-17.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. 2011. "Translanguaging in the Classroom: Emerging Issues for Research and Pedagogy." *Applied Linguistics Review* 2: 1-28.
- Candelier, Michel, Antoinette Camilleri-Grima, Véronique Castellotti, Jean-François de Pietro, Ildikó Lörincz, Franz-Joseph Meissner, Anna Schröder-Sura, and Artur Noguerol. 2012. *Framework of Reference for Pluralistic Approaches to Languages and Cultures*. Edited by Council of Europe. Graz: European Centre for Modern Languages.
- Carreres, Ángeles. 2014. "Translation as a Means and as an End: Reassessing the Divide." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 8 (1): 123-135.
- Carreres, Ángeles, and María Noriega-Sánchez. 2011. "Translation in Language Teaching: Insights from Professional Translator Training." *The Language Learning Journal* 39 (3): 281-297.
- Carreres, Ángeles, María Noriega-Sánchez, and Carme Calduch. 2018. *Mundos en palabras. Learning Advanced Spanish through Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Cook, Guy. 2010. *Translation in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, Vivian. 1997. "Monolingual Bias in Second Language Acquisition Research." *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 34: 35-50.

- Cook, Vivian, 2011. "Linguistic Relativity and Language Teaching." In *Language and Bilingual Cognition*, ed. by Vivian Cook, and Benedetta Bassetti, 509-518. New York: Psychology Press.
- Corcoll López, Cristina, and Maria González-Davies. 2016. "Switching Codes in the Additional Language Classroom." *ELT Journal* 70 (1): 67-77.
- Council of Europe. 2001. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe. 2018. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume with New Descriptors*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Enríquez Raído, Vanessa, Frank Austermühl, and Marina Sánchez Torrón. 2020. "Computer-Assisted L2 Learning and Translation (CAL2T)." In *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Education*, ed. by Sara Laviosa, and Maria González-Davies, 278-299. London: Routledge.
- Esteve, Olga. 2020. "Teacher Agency in Plurilingual Learning Contexts." In *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Education*, ed. by Sara Laviosa, and Maria González-Davies, 417-433. London: Routledge.
- Firth, Alan, and Johannes Wagner. 1997. "On Discourse, Communication, and (Some) Fundamental Concepts in SLA Research." *The Modern Language Journal* 81 (3): 285-300.
- García, Ofelia, Gladys Y. Aponte, and Khanh Le. 2020. "Primary Bilingual Classrooms: Translations and Translanguaging." In *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Education*, ed. by Sara Laviosa, and Maria González-Davies, 81-94. London: Routledge.
- González-Davies, Maria. 2004. *Multiple Voices in the Translation Classroom: Activities, Tasks and Projects*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- González-Davies, Maria. 2014. "Towards a Plurilingual Development Paradigm: From Spontaneous to Informed Use of Translation in Additional Language Learning." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 8 (1): 8-31.
- González-Davies, Maria. 2017. "The Use of Translation in an Integrated Plurilingual Approach to Language Learning: Teacher Strategies and Best Practices." *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching* 4 (2): 124-135.
- González-Davies, Maria. 2018. "The Integrated Plurilingual Approach (IPA): A Case Study in Barcelona," *CEFR-QualiMatrix: A Quality Assurance Matrix for CEFR Use: Examples of Promising Practices*. European Centre for Modern Languages of the Council of Europe. Accessed October 15, 2020. <https://www.ecml.at/ECML-Programme/Programme2016-2019/QualityassuranceandimplementationoftheCEFR/PromisingPractice/tabid/3091/language/en-GB/Default.aspx?&q=Barcelona>
- González-Davies, Maria. 2020. "Developing Mediation Competence through Translation." In *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Education*, ed. by Sara Laviosa, and Maria González-Davies, 434-450. London: Routledge.
- Laviosa, Sara. 2014. *Translation and Language Education. Pedagogical Approaches Explained*. London: Routledge.
- Laviosa, Sara, and Maria González-Davies, eds. 2020. *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Education*. London: Routledge.
- May, Stephen, ed. 2014. *The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Modern Language Association (MLA). Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. 2007. *Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World*. The

- Modern Language Association of America. Accessed October 15, 2020.  
[http://www.mla.org/pdf/forlang\\_news\\_pdf.pdf](http://www.mla.org/pdf/forlang_news_pdf.pdf)
- Muñoz-Basols, Javier. 2019. "Going Beyond the Comfort Zone: Multilingualism, Translation and Mediation to Foster Plurilingual Competence," *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 32 (3): 299-321.
- North, Brian, and Enrica Piccardo. 2016. *Developing Illustrative Descriptors of Aspects of Mediation for the CEFR*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- North, Brian, Enrica Piccardo, Tim Goodier, Daniela Fasoglio, Rosanna Margonis, and Bernd Rüschoff, eds. 2021 (in press). *Enriching 21<sup>st</sup> Century Language Education: The CEFR Companion Volume, Examples from Practice*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Norton, Bonny. 2013. *Identity and Language Learning: Extending the Conversation*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Ortega, Lourdes. 2014. "Ways Forward for a Bi/Multilingual Turn in SLA." In *The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges*, ed. by Jean Conteh, and Gabriela Meier, 32-53. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Pintado Gutiérrez, Lucía. 2012. "The Use of Translation towards Foreign Language Autonomous Learning." In *Translation, Technology and Autonomy in Language Teaching and Learning*, eds. Pilar Alderete-Díez, Laura Incalcaterra McLoughlin, and Labhoise Ní Dhonnchadha, 175-195. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Pintado Gutiérrez, Lucía. 2018. "Translation in Language Teaching, Pedagogical Translation, and Code-Switching: Restructuring the Boundaries," *The Language Learning Journal* <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09571736.2018.1534260>
- Pintado Gutiérrez, Lucía. 2019. "Mapping Translation in Foreign Language Teaching: Demystifying the Construct." In *Translating and Language Teaching. Continuing the*

- Dialogue*, ed. by Melita Koletnik, and Nicolas Frélinger, 23-38. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Pym, Anthony. 2018. "Where Translation Studies Lost the Plot: Relations with Language Teaching." *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts* 4 (2): 204-222.
- Pym, Anthony, Kirsten Malmkjær, and María del Mar Gutiérrez-Colón Plana. 2013. *Translation and Language Learning: The Role of Translation in the Teaching of Languages in the European Union. A Study*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Rampton, Ben. 1987. "Stylistic Variability and Not Speaking 'Normal' English: Some Post-Labovian Approaches and their Implications for the Study of Interlanguage." In *Second Language Acquisition in Context*, ed. by Rod Ellis, 47-58. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Scarino, Angela. 2016. "Reconceptualising Translation as Intercultural Mediation: A Renewed Place in Language Learning," *Perspectives. Studies in Translatology* 24 (3): 470-485.
- Wilson, Jaclyn, and Maria González-Davies. 2017. "Tackling the Plurilingual Student/Monolingual Classroom Phenomenon," *TESOL Quarterly* 51 (1): 207-219.

### **Address for correspondence**

Ángeles Carreres  
Section of Spanish and Portuguese  
Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics  
Sidgwick Avenue  
University of Cambridge  
Cambridge CB3 9DA  
United Kingdom  
ac289@cam.ac.uk

### **Co-authors information**

María Noriega-Sánchez  
Section of Spanish and Portuguese  
Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics  
Sidgwick Avenue  
University of Cambridge  
Cambridge CB3 9DA  
United Kingdom  
mn316@cam.ac.uk

Lucía Pintado Gutiérrez  
School of Applied Language and Intercultural Studies  
Dublin City University  
Glasnevin Campus  
Dublin 9, D09 V209  
Ireland  
lucia.pintado@dcu.ie