

CHAPTER 1

MAPPING TRANSLATION IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING: DEMYSTIFYING THE CONSTRUCT

LUCÍA PINTADO GUTIÉRREZ

1. Introduction

In today's globalised world boundaries between disciplines become more porous and this is certainly true in the field of modern languages, where monolingualism and prescriptive principles have started to change in favour of bi-, multi-, or plurilingualism. The reasons for this increased interdisciplinarity are multifarious, though an important factor is a socio-cultural reality that is characterised by greater international mobility, and can be felt linguistically in many educational contexts. The heterogeneous linguistic background of diverse populations has led to new needs and challenges in the foreign language classroom, with the mother tongue (L1) and foreign language (L2) occupying different positions to those they were accorded previously; this has been matched in foreign language (FL) studies with new perspectives being offered on bilingualism, multilingualism and plurilingualism. Thus the reintroduction of translation into the foreign language classroom has generated a considerable level of interest among teachers, scholars and practitioners in recent decades. Similarly, this change of focus is also the result of significant advances in the fields of translation studies mostly and FL pedagogy to a lesser extent, where translation is regarded as much more than a bilingual activity and is considered as an overall beneficial and increasingly accepted practice.

This has an immediate effect on how the boundaries between languages are perceived and consequently on the status of translation in the FL classroom. The native speaker is no longer regarded as an omnipotent authority in the FL classroom. The implication of this is that the bilingual speaker is a plurilingual person, but that a FL learner's

communicative competences cannot be compared to those of a monolingual speaker (V.Cook, 1999; Coste, Moore and Zarate, 2009; García, Ibarra Johnson and Seltzer 2017). This, together with the development of research at the crossroads of FL studies and translation studies has resulted not only in recognising translation as a valuable element, but also in the necessity of looking for specific ways of introducing translation into the FL curriculum.

However, no consensus on the practice of L1/L2 or translation in the FL class exists in relation to curriculum development, pedagogical practices or liaison with neighbouring disciplines; often the plurality of attitudes is aggravated by histories of factional enmity. Similarly, the lack of agreement between various theoretical and pedagogical frameworks and practice renders the role of translation in the FL classroom even more complex. So far insufficient attention has been paid to the distinction in FL pedagogy between the use of the student's mother tongue (which may not necessarily involve a translation task), and translation as an actual classroom activity. While this appears to suggest that translation and L1 use are part of a *continuum*, it gives a distorted perception of reality and prevents a fully operative conception of translation in FL teaching being adopted (as a tool, a strategy, and as a skill) or TILT, term coined by Cook (2010) and which I use in this chapter.

My aim is therefore to explore the issues discussed above upon with reference to “mediation,” in line with the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR, 2001) and the CEFR *Companion Volume* (2018) offering an insight into conceptualisations and the use of translation in FL education. The objective will be to provide a sound analysis of the role of translation within mediation, drawing special attention to the most recent development of the descriptors for mediation (2014-2016). The advances promoted by the European Council and the prevailing zeitgeist of contemporary translation studies sees translation as an activity to which mediation is integral. I will subsequently discuss the latest pedagogic approaches to TILT that indicate how translation may be brought into the language classroom in an informed way.

2. Progress and challenges in FL teaching and learning

Over the last few decades we have seen major changes in language teaching methodology. The once arduous prospect of learning a FL based on repetition, grammar rules, writing and translation, developed towards newer forms of teaching a FL: from those which focused on a scientific

basis for teaching (e.g. the oral approach, or the audiolingual method) to the most recent communicative approaches that aim for “real life communication” (such as communicative language teaching, or task-based language teaching) (Howatt and Smith, 2014). This has given way to FL teaching and learning and language policies that have welcomed a plurilingual approach as part of real-life communication. The focus is no longer on strict but on flexible premises, pointing towards a more holistic consideration of the learner and the contexts in which the FL will be used (see the report on plurilingual education in Europe 2007, 46).

These attempts to shift and challenge unsustainable patterns and practices of translation in FL pedagogy place teachers and educators, researchers and life-long FL learners in a privileged position: having endured, tolerated or even adopted a variety of teaching and learning methods in the modern FL classroom but also for classical languages, the time has come to reassess and promote new interdisciplinary methodologies. The overall claim is that an eclectic approach will cater for the different teaching and learning environments and needs. This means that there is room for a renewed conception of translation in FL teaching, transitioning gradually from “the antagonist” of communicative teaching methodologies—as a reaction against the grammar translation method—into a new element that facilitates communication and interaction.

Despite the advances, however, translation in the language classroom still seems to retain the echoes of a negative reputation overall. There is no single accurate definition of what translation in FL means (discussed in detail in a report on translation and language learning carried out for the Directorate-General for Translation by Pym, Malmkjaer and Gutiérrez-Colón Plana (2013)): does it entail the inclusion of the L1 in the FL classroom? Or perhaps it suggests the use of both codes, the L1 and the FL? It is not very clear either whether it refers to the use of oral or written skills, there is ambiguity as regards whether the translation in question is L2 to L1 or L1 to L2, what activities entail translation, whether the agency of translation in the language classroom belongs to the teacher, or to the student, or to both. These are some fundamental questions that need further clarification.

3. Attempts to shift the focus of the debate

In order to explore these issues fully, I suggest that the issue of translation in the language classroom should be approached from a variety of disciplines and angles: TILT must be explored from both the fields of

language pedagogy and from translation studies; mediation has become a fundamental part of the CEFR and translation is to be debated within this framework due to the impact it has on FL teaching and policy; translation may be analysed as a competence, but also as a skill, and it may embrace a number of tasks or specific activities. What is of particular value, however, is that as a notion mediation embraces the current realities of plurilingual classrooms and multilingual societies in language pedagogy.

Insofar as mediation has grown in importance in the approach to language teaching and learning in recent years (multilingualism and plurilingualism being particularly important actors in this regard), the definition of the student in relation to mediation skills is also different. The student “does not keep these languages and cultures in strictly separated mental compartments, but rather builds up a communicative competence to which all knowledge and experience of language (...) interrelate and interact” (CEFR 2001, 4).

The significance of translation in the language classroom is revealed also in translation studies, both with reference to FL teaching and learning, and in translation theories and translator training. The relevance of translation in the FL classroom has been acknowledged by Hurtado Albir (1999) under the “applied studies” strand that the author proposes. Translation at the core of communication was explored by Colina (2002), who reveals communication as a necessary paradigm by which language teaching and translation share a common network of interests. Kiraly’s socio-constructivist approach (1995, 2000), a multidisciplinary approach, advocates scaffolding learning so that students develop the necessary competences to carry out translation tasks. Other work in translation studies relevant to a revision of TILT includes the theory of sense, where translation is regarded as discourse rather than a contrastive analysis and it focuses on expressing the sense of the message rather than focusing a transcoding as a linguistic operation.

These frameworks for translation theory and for translation pedagogy are of special relevance as they recognise or at least give space to the demands for communicative language teaching and learning and the relevance of the role of translation therein.

The reality is that translation in language teaching has traditionally reflected the divide between translation studies and FL pedagogy, but in recent years there has been a tendency to bridge the gap between both fields reflected, for instance, in Cook’s (2010) proclaimed defence of the bilingualism revival allowing for a place for translation in the FL classroom. This vindication has not been an isolated case: Carreres (2014), Carreres and Noriega (2011) and Leonardi (2010) also defend and develop

the positive role of pedagogical translation in the FL classroom; Laviosa (2014) brings translation in the FL classroom beyond as an ecological practice; and González Davies works on the implementation of translation activities in the FL classroom (2004), or on the concept of translation in other learning contexts (TOLC) (2014). These are only some of the most significant lines of research which point to a promising future for TILT. This trend among individual researchers is replicated in European projects –like that of the European Commission’s *CEFR Companion Volume*, which has been developed as a more sophisticated mediation construct in the past decade (*CEFR Companion Volume*, 2018).

These theories and approaches are aligned to the interests in latest developments in the CEFR in relation to translation and L1/L2 use. It appears, nonetheless, that research lines across different fields sometimes run rather in parallel, hence the necessity to streamline research and ensure the optimisation of different fields of study.

4. Mediation and the CEFR

The Council of Europe’s CEFR in 2001 became an indispensable instrument for professionals working in the field of modern languages. It has served as a common basis for providing teaching and examination guidelines, acting as a forum for practitioners and researchers and determining what language learners have to learn so as to become successful communicators in social, educational and professional domains.

This was an ambitious and comprehensive project that covers a wide range of aspects on language teaching and learning, the emphasis being on the use of language for effective communication, explaining what knowledge and skills learners need to develop and describing their progress at different learning stages—in view of the fact that the CEFR sees language learning as a life-long activity.

Mediation is presented as a language activity that “make[s] communication possible between persons who are unable, for whatever reason, to communicate with each other directly” (2001, 15). As such the language user “simply act[s] as an intermediary between interlocutors who are unable to understand each other (...)” (2001, 87). Mediation is portrayed as a “simple” act and mediating activities refer mostly to interpreting (oral mediation) or other forms of written mediation like translation, although written mediation also includes other tasks such as summarising and paraphrasing. Mediation is therefore established as a

communicative language activity and a strategy. As a communicative activity it works alongside production, reception and interaction. As a strategy, mediation includes how to access meaning in order to establish equivalent meanings in processing and delivering information. While mediation in the 2001 CEFR is presented as a key element, its development is limited to a rather simplified general notion of its role in FL teaching and learning.

5. Translation/mediation in the 2001 CEFR: Accessing text processing

The 2001 CEFR acknowledges the relevance of translation and L1/L2 use with regard to accessing the meaning of written or spoken texts, along with the processing and production of texts. In the first instance (accessing meaning), language users are supposed to learn from texts beyond basic exposure; this thus includes such activities as inferencing material, monitored comprehension etc. but also translation and L1/L2 use: “comprehension tests in L1; explanations in L1; explanations (including any necessary *ad hoc* translation), in L2; systematic pupil/student translation of text into L1; (...), etc” (2001, 145). These guidelines assume that translation and L1/L2 usage may not necessarily be the same as largely claimed by Leonardi (2010), among others.

Translation is also mentioned among the learners’ textual processing and production activities and is regarded as one of the possibilities mentioned alongside “dictated passages; written exercises; essays; written reports; project work; letters to penfriends; contributions to class links using fax or e-mail” (2001, 146).

Based on the above, and even though the inclusion of translation under the notion of “mediation” in the CEFR is welcome, references to, and discussion of, translation seem rather limited. Similarly, it is unreflective of earlier discussions of translation in language teaching. Thus, the burgeoning interest in translation in language teaching remains outside the scope of this important work of reference.

6. New descriptors for mediation

A new volume complementing the 2001 CEFR with new descriptors for mediation was launched in 2018. This follows several reports and initiatives that give greater attention to the notion of mediation and how to

integrate it into FL teaching in a more comprehensive manner, according to the CEFR. In this vein, the 2014-2016 Council of Europe's Language Policy Unit report (*Developing descriptors of mediation in the CEFR* authored by North and Piccardo 2016) revisits the notion of mediation under a newer approach whereby this conception is no longer reduced to just translation and interpreting. This wider approach departs from a revision of the 2001 CEFR model and aims to readjust the conceptual proposal of the CEFR "repositioning the basic model within a more all-embracing view of social agents' learning trajectory and personal development" (Coste and Cavalli 2015, 6). Greater value is therefore given to mediation, exploring various angles in addition to cross-linguistic mediation: it also encompasses mediation related to communication and learning, along with social and cultural mediation.

In the new CEFR *Companion Volume*, mediation is still regarded as a communicative language activity and strategy but under a much wider approach called "Overall Language Proficiency". Written or oral translation are still part of the activities related to mediating with a text, though other mediating activities are also listed in some detail, many of which do not necessarily involve a direct reference to translation or interpretation (see CEFR *Companion Volume* 2018, 30, 103).

In 2001, interaction and mediation were presented alongside reception and production to account for the language activities that were not covered by reception and production. Interaction was introduced as an activity that involved more than just adding reception and production; it involved the co-construction of meaning "underlining the constant link between the social and individual dimensions in language use and language learning" (CEFR *Companion Volume* 2018, 4). Mediation expanded the nature of meaning, bringing this co-construction in interaction to a whole new level of meaning through the nexus between the social and the individual dimensions in the use of language. Despite "mediation" not having been fully developed as an operative notion, this initial contribution already established the relevance of the language user as a social agent (Piccardo 2012). Both concepts are central in two different views on learning, the socio-constructivist and the socio-cultural (Lantolf 2000, Schneuwly 2008) in which mediation is a key concept. North and Piccardo alert us to the fact that the CEFR does not reduce the concept of mediation exclusively to cross-linguistic mediation, as section 8.4.2 acknowledges situations in which different practices are often combined: working with texts, engaging in face-to-face interaction, mediating between different cultural phenomena or using a speaker's pluricultural and plurilingual repertoires in a conversation where various languages are employed.

“Many people appear to associate mediation in the CEFR solely as a cross-linguistic mediation—usually conveying the information given in a text, and to reduce it to some form of (more or less professional) translation and interpretation.” (North and Piccardo 2016, 11).

If we look back at the history of the conception and the development of the CEFR, mediation replaced the original notion of “processing” and the descriptors came under a section called “text” (section 4.6.3), rather than one called “mediation”, as North and Piccardo indicate. Of course, a historical perspective also pinpoints the overruling of monolingualism in the FL classroom where “separation of languages was seen as a core value” (2016, 11)—and the turn towards a positive vision of bilingualism and its translation into pedagogical reflection and classroom practice (see Baker 1988) had not taken place yet. As well as a proclaimed monolingualism, there was a widespread reluctance to interact with translation studies, which, by the mid-1990s, had already become a robust discipline claiming a well-deserved status. The difficult relationship between translation and language teaching and learning impeded what could have been a natural and positive exchange between areas in contact.

The innovative proposal of mediation comprises four dimensions: linguistic, cultural, social and pedagogic mediation. Each dimension provides a complimentary angle to a full operational concept. According to North and Piccardo’s proposal (2016, 13-15):

- Linguistic mediation deals with the inter- and intralinguistic dimensions more or less formally, transferring one text into another. This may happen between two or more different languages but also within one language (L1 or L2) and tasks suggested include translating, summarizing, clarifying and/or expanding information, etc. But when cultural implications are considered in the transference of the message, they add another dimension to mediation: cultural mediation.
- Cultural mediation looks at the need to assist in the understanding between different languages and/or cultures, particularly with regard to conveying meaning. When we transfer meaning from one language into another we are also transferring one culture into another and cultural awareness is key to this operation. Idiolects and sociolects, as well as text genre, are categories considered in this dimension of mediation, but sub-cultures are also included (for instance social and professional). This leads to the third dimension: social mediation.
- Social mediation relates to language users as mediators between speakers who do not have access to meaning without an

intermediary. Mediators facilitate communication and reconstruct meaning, although the multi-layered nature of social mediation is based on Kramsch's "third space" (1993) whereby understanding a person from another culture involves translating situations and perspectives:

Understanding someone from another culture requires an effort of translation from one perspective to the other that manages to keep both in the same field of vision. The "third space" is a "heterogeneous, indeed contradictory and ambivalent space in which third perspectives can grow in the margins of dominant ways of seeing"¹

- Pedagogic mediation: includes the facilitation of access to knowledge, that is, the encouraging others to develop their thinking skills; the co-construction of meaning within a group; the creation of the situations mentioned "by organizing and controlling space for creativity."

As already claimed by the 2001 CEFR even by passing, mediating activities "occupy an important place in the normal linguistic functioning of our societies" (2001, 14). Mediation involves facilitating communication or (re)constructing the meaning of a message and it is this process of the (re)construction of meaning that leads to mediation becoming a developing notion.

7. Mediation: A new landscape for translation in TILT

The extended notion of "mediation" leads naturally to a much richer landscape, where language users and language learners embrace a holistic spectrum of language use, where a full network of interactive agents is revised. What had been a nearly exclusively linguistic focus on mediating activities in the 2001 CEFR (written translation, paraphrasing, (re)formulation of a source text, (re)processing an existing text, etc) has gradually become multifaceted where notions generate a more comprehensive paradigm including: "alternation between languages in professional contexts," "considering idiolects, sociolects and the links between styles and textual genres," "bridging and exchanging between

¹ Kramsch cited in North and Piccardo (2016, 14).

different elements and spaces, where the individual and the social interact,” or “collaborative dialogue” (for a detailed list see North and Piccardo 2016, 20-25).

The new descriptors do not presume mediation as an *exclusively* linguistic activity and may be applied to a variety of educational contexts:

Notions like native speaker/non-native speaker were already questionable at the time the CEFR descriptors were developed (Kramersch, 1993) but were preserved in half a dozen descriptors inherited from older scales. Nowadays, given the level of mobility and migration and the variety of ethnicities in city classrooms, the notion of native speaker and even the dichotomy language of schooling /foreign language, let alone mother tongue / foreign language, loses its validity. This is one of the main reasons that expressions like mother tongue, second language, source language, target language, etc. are not used in the mediation descriptors. It is simply suggested that the user should name the precise languages involved.²

Of course, this is not to say that mediation (and translation as a mediating element) is not relevant in FL teaching. The revision of the descriptors may on the one hand be inviting to keep FL pedagogy and translation apart, if terminology in translation studies and FL pedagogy is not aligned, but it may also involve translation achieving a greater status in FL pedagogy, one that goes beyond transferential models and contrastive analysis.

Mediation in language pedagogy, according to these European reports and projects, underpins (and is based to a great extent on) the importance of newly shaped societies and demographic changes (multilingualism and plurilingualism as new realities; migrant populations and host countries; language education policies; new trends in citizenship; etc). These are discussed in a European report discussing linguistic diversity upon the premise that “language teaching/learning differs from other subjects (...) in that language acquisition is not a school subject but a human competence.” (2007, 46)

8. Bringing translation activities to the classroom

The development of the new framework and descriptors in the 2018 CEFR *Companion Volume* is undoubtedly significant in providing an insightful overview of the concept of mediation, the scales by which it

² North and Piccardo (2016, 47).

may be assessed, and its role in the creation of the language learner as a social agent. Nonetheless, it may still remain opaque for many practitioners: while many different mediation activities are described (see CEFR *Companion Volume* 2018, 107-130), these are not matched by material to illustrate the tasks envisaged.

The threefold nature of translation—linguistic, cultural and social mediation—and the latest trends of FL teaching and learning and translation studies allow proposing innovative pedagogical frameworks that present translation in the FL under a broader spectrum. This is of prime interest in this chapter if a firm commitment is to be made to bring to the curriculum and the classroom the most informed pedagogical practices. Insightful works that advocate bilingualism or code-choice and that discuss and include translation tasks or ways to use translation or LI/FL use efficiently as a strategy include those by Levine (2010), Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) and Kerr (2014).

Thus, this chapter explores the educational potential of tasks and activities focusing on translation as *mediation*, rather than as merely code switching. The variety of activities developed in recent decades are discussed, particularly in terms of how they explore different pedagogical aspects and mark the need to develop further specific tasks or activities involving TILT.

Relevant contributions that have dealt with the pedagogy of translation within the FL classroom or TILT in an attempt to bridge a highly conspicuous pedagogical gap include: González Davies's *Multiple Voices in the Translation Classroom* (2004) is an innovative and pragmatic approach that provides ideas on translation teaching that can be adapted to different teaching and learning environments and that cover various levels—from basic tasks to more sophisticated projects; Guy Cook's (2010) call to revisit translation in language teaching in the wake of a bilingual revival brought the complex nature of the debate of TILT to the fore; Leonardi's (2010) volume legitimises the nexus between translation and language learning at the intersection of second language acquisition (SLA) and translation studies (TS) through a general model of a pedagogical translation framework that shows how translation may be introduced into the FL classroom; and Laviosa's work (2014), framed within an ecological perspective, proposes a holistic pedagogy of translation in language teaching opening a dialogue between both fields—this proposal draws from recent developments such as the revival of translation (rather than the bilingual revival) and principles related to both SLA and TS and that merge in what she terms “holistic pedagogical translation”.

There has been further progress in this field more recently. Of particular interest are the works by González Davies. In 2014 the author explored the use of translation in other learning contexts (TOLC) and additional language learning (ALL) in the classroom through an ecological approach. The framework for TOLC is informed by linguistics, psychology, pedagogy and translation studies and supports socio-constructivist learning environments. This approach analyses learning strategies, educational objectives and translation competences which question monolingual approaches (see González Davies 2014; Wilson and González Davies, 2017, 209-210). A later work on the pedagogy of TOLC is that of Corcoll López and González Davies (2016), where two plurilingual strategies are compared: pedagogically based code-switching (or PBCS, as “a code-switching pattern designed by the foreign language teacher as an informed language learning strategy applied in a formal setting”, 2016: 70) and TOLC (which draws from translation). The authors claim that informed translation activities could be of benefit for ALL at all levels of linguistic competence, thus creating “explicit and informed routes to move between languages” (2016, 73). Examples of PBCS tasks include working with flashcards and chants, while TOLC tasks include working with false friends, role-plays, and working with critical and creative thinking through riddles.

Finally, *Mundos en palabras* (Carreres, Noriega-Sánchez and Calduch 2018), in line with many of the other works discussed in this section, is a practical handbook that proposes the use of translation in FL teaching (for advanced Spanish learners with English as a source language, in this case). The manual shows how translation can be brought to the language classroom where students will learn to reflect on theoretical aspects, and develop their linguistic and critical skills. It aims to maximise the potential of translation in language teaching and learning by applying the didactics of professional translation. The authors work on the assumption that working on translation will improve the FL learner’s language and translating skills. The first three chapters are an introduction to translation and the remaining sections are based on translation, textual genres and text-type approach. This manual is of a predominantly practical focus and it is a rare example of a comprehensive guide that addresses key issues concerning FL and translation.

All the proposals mentioned above represent avenues that explore the implementation of TILT/TOLC/pedagogic translation/pedagogical translation in the ALL/FL classroom in various manners. Regardless of the intrinsic differences of the individual approach or the practical proposal(s) all contributions advocate a plurilingual paradigm in the FL classroom

where the boundaries between the learner's languages are revisited through an array of specific practices where translation is revisited as a mediating skill.

9. Further thoughts and conclusions

As seen throughout the chapter, there still seems to be a lack of interaction between fields that share a common area of interest such as that of translation in the FL classroom. The *CEFR Companion Volume* (2018) claims that previous works like the CEFR in 2001 were probably not yet ready for a broader and more dynamic vision of mediation, as language teaching was still confined in the 1990s to a strict monolingual paradigm where separation of languages was regarded as a core value (North and Piccardo 2016, 11). The situation today is very different and the potential of translation in the FL classroom is being re-evaluated positively. It is important that attempts to do this take stock of empirical and theoretical research in the relevant fields.

The adoption of a common agenda among stakeholders will allow translation in the FL classroom to achieve its full potential. In fact, the interplay between different fields and a holistic vision like that of González Davies, Leonardi, Cook or Laviosa offers a better perception of the various concerns regarding translation tasks and an informed use of translation in the FL classroom.

However, general practices of TILT still seem to be divorced from pedagogical developments. There needs to be some degree of consensus as regards the practical choices to be made so as to reflect “the increasing awareness of the need for an integrated approach to language education across the curriculum” (*CEFR Companion Volume* 2018: 22). The 2001 CEFR and its 2018 companion have become key in that they represent a social and educational driving force of change at an institutional level. The paradigm adopted by the CEFR, and reflected by the contributors above, represent the promotion of plurilingual and pluricultural competences and bring different linguistic repertoires into play (*CEFR Companion Volume* 2018, 27-28).

There is a need to break down the boundaries imposed by the previously dominant monolingual perspective in FL teaching and learning in order to open up new avenues of working with translation through the paradigm of mediation. As Wilson and González Davies (2017) point out, “the plurilingual paradigm continues to gain momentum and voices are increasingly heard in favour of the use of the students' first language (L1)

in informed ways, through different manifestations, from translanguaging to pedagogically based code-switching and translation”.

Ideally, translation tasks may be used in different learning contexts like additional language learning and translation courses for students to boost linguistic and intercultural competence, as well as to develop communicative strategies and effective communication. The fact that translation is at the crossroads of various disciplines implies that it can be flexible and be implemented in different contexts: “Translation is in fact basic to human cognition, active in the pursuit of intelligibility and in the negotiation of linguistic and cultural differences (...) insofar as issues of cosmopolitanism, globalization, and transnationalism have become persistent themes in humanistic study, the urgency to recognize translation as a key practice of intercultural communication has never been greater” (Venuti 2017, 11).

The proposals discussed in this chapter offer an overview of the wide range of possibilities to implement translation in the FL. They serve as a base to apply the most innovative principles relating to translation in the language classroom which promote the use of the learner’s communicative resources and are in line with the latest developments in the didactics of translation and FL teaching and learning from an inclusive approach.

Works Cited

Baker, C. 1988. *Key Issues in Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Butzkamm, Wolfgang, and John AW Caldwell. 2009. *The Bilingual Reform. A Paradigm Shift in Foreign Language Teaching*. Gunter Narr Verlag: Tubingen.

Carreres, Ángeles, Noriega, María, and Carme Calduch. 2018. *Mundos en palabras. Learning Advanced Spanish through Translation*. London: Routledge.

Carreres, Ángeles. 2014. “Translation as a Means and as an End: Reassessing the Divide.” *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 8(1): 123-135. doi: 10.1080/1750399X.2014.908561

Carreres, Ángeles, and María Noriega. 2011. "Translation in Language Teaching: Insights from Professional Translator Training." *Language Learning Journal* 39(3): 1-17. doi: 10.1080/09571736.2011.567356

Colina, Sonia. 2002. "Second Language Acquisition, Foreign Language Teaching and Translation Studies." *The Translator* 8(1): 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2002.10799114>

Cook, Guy. 2010. *Translation in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cook, Vivian. 1999. "Going Beyond the Native Speaker in Language Teaching." *TESOL Quarterly* 33(2): 185-209. doi: 10.2307/3587717

Corcoll López, Cristina, and González Davies, Maria. 2016. "Switching Codes in the Plurilingual Classroom." *ELT Journal* 70(1): 67-77. <http://eltj.oxfordjournals.org/content/70/1/67>

Coste, Daniel, Danièle Moore, and Geneviève Zarate. 2009. *Plurilingual and Pluricultural Competence*. Strasbourg: Language Policy Division. <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=090000168069d29b>

Council of Europe. 2001. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Strasbourg. https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/source/framework_en.pdf

Council of Europe. 2007. *From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education: Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe*. Strasbourg. <https://rm.coe.int/16802fc1c4>

Council of Europe. 2018. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment Companion Volume with New Descriptors*. Strasbourg. <https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989>

García, Ofelia, Susana Ibarra Johnson, and Kate Seltzer. 2017. *The Translanguaging Classroom. Leveraging Student Bilingualism for Learning*. Philadelphia: Caslon.

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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2014.908555>

González Davies, Maria. 2004. *Multiple Voices in the Translation Classroom*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Howatt, A.P.R., and Richard Smith. 2014. The History of Teaching English as a Foreign Language, from a British and European Perspective. *Language and History* 57(1): 75-95. doi: 10.1179/1759753614Z.00000000028

Hurtado Albir, Amparo. 1999. *Enseñar a Traducir*. Madrid: Edelsa

Kerr, Philip. 2014. *Translation and Own-language Activities*. Cambridge: CUP.

Kiraly, Donald. 2000. *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Training*. London: Routledge.

Kiraly, Donald. 1995. *Pathways to Translation: Pedagogy and Process*. Ohio: Kent University Press.

Laviosa, Sara. 2014. *Translation and Language Education. Pedagogic Approaches Explored*. Routledge: London.

Leonardi, Vanessa. 2010. *The Role of Pedagogical Translation in Second Language Acquisition*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Levine, Glenn N. 2010. *Code Choice in the Language Classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

North, Brian, and Enrica Piccardo. 2016. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Developing Illustrative Descriptors of Aspects of Mediation in the CEFR*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/168073ff31>

Pym, Anthony, Kirsten Malmkjaer, 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. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Venuti, Lawrence (Ed.). 2017. Teaching Translation. Programs, Courses, Pedagogies. New York: Routledge.

Wilson, Jaclyn, and Maria González Davies. 2017. "Tackling the Plurilingual Student/Monolingual Classroom Phenomenon." TESOL Quarterly 51(1): 207-219. DOI: 10.1002/tesq.336