

The Common European Framework of Reference: Transcending perspectives

ARIADNA STRUGIELSKA
Nicolaus Copernicus University

KATARZYNA PIĄTKOWSKA
Nicolaus Copernicus University

EWA KOŚCIAŁKOWSKA-OKOŃSKA
Nicolaus Copernicus University

Abstract

Stressing a balanced and constrained interplay between the individual and the collective and tending towards transdisciplinarity as a consequence, a socio-cognitive perspective prevails in second language acquisition research (Larsen-Freeman 2018). Advancing several theories, including the task-based approach, the ecological approach as well as sociocultural and socio-constructivist theories, the latest version of the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) has adopted a transdisciplinary perspective. However, the nature of the transdisciplinary approach declared by the Framework (Council of Europe 2020) remains an empirical question. Thus, the present paper explores the extent to which the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) abides by the principles of a motivated socio-cognitive perspective. The structure of the paper is the following. First, it outlines a transdisciplinary approach to second language development basing on cognitive linguistics, intercultural pragmatics and elements of the teaching learning process. Then, this socio-cognitive approach is sought in the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020). The analysis of the document demonstrates that the social and the individual perspective are symmetrical but not fully integrated, i.e. there is no common denominator linking the two approaches.

Key words: CEFR, transdisciplinary perspective, socio-cognitive approach

1. Introduction

Larsen-Freeman (2018) notices that second language acquisition (SLA) research is dominated by a socio-cognitive perspective which emphasizes an interplay between the collective and the individual. Simultaneously, however, researchers are cautioned that by merely combining the two elements, they run the risk of joining components that are not necessarily related (Larsen-Freeman 2018: 30). In other words, those concerned with second language development should concentrate on how the social and the cognitive are related in language use, including language learning, instead of just stating that they are (Larsen-Freeman 2018: 58).

Criticisms along the lines of overlaps and dichotomies have been levelled at the CEFR (2001). For example, Louis (2004) and Alderson et al. (2006) criticize the document (Council of Europe 2001) for its unintelligibility in defining key constructs (e.g. knowledge, competence or attitude). In the same vein, Martyniuk

and Noijons (2007) emphasize the need to clarify theoretical concepts of the Framework (Council of Europe 2001), while Louis (2004) claims that the main disadvantage of the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001) lies in its duality of concepts derived from a fundamental distinction between general and communicative language competences.

Importantly, such problems can be overcome, or at least minimized, if the social and the cognitive are viewed from a transdisciplinary perspective which involves dialogical coordination of approaches. Thus, a reciprocal interplay lies at the heart of transdisciplinarity, leading to the emergence of a metatheory (Larsen-Freeman 2018: 63). Examples of complementarities in SLA research can be found in the form of convergences drawn between usage-based linguistics, cognitive linguistics, connectionism, theories of grounded cognition, cognitive psychology and intercultural pragmatics (Strugielska and Piątkowska 2017). Still, while dialogical interaction and creative emergence seem perfectly in consonance with the present era of transformation, transnationality and translanguaging (Larsen-Freeman 2018), transdisciplinarity needs to be motivated, i.e. built on the principles of balance and convergence, to be felicitous.

The attitude of balance urges for mutual dependencies to be symmetrical in that neither the individual nor the collective is more fundamental in the socio-cognitive approach. In other words, maintaining an equilibrium between attitudes, or "avoiding postulating the superiority of one approach over the other", should go hand in hand with explorations of "potential convergences and points of compatibility" between contemporary theories of cognition (Langlotz 2015a: 56). As summarized by Overmann and Malafouris (2018), the mind can currently be viewed from (at least) one of the following perspectives: embodied (recognizing the role of human physiological and sensorimotor capacities in negotiating an individual's functioning in the world as well as forming mental representations of this experience), embedded (highlighting the impact of the natural and sociomaterial environment upon behavioral and psychological responses of members of communities, including their conceptual systems and languages), enactive (accentuating the interactive nature of cognition and equating thinking with doing), extended (seeing the mind as externalizing its functions through recruiting and incorporating resources and processes outside the brain, such as artifacts or technologies), dynamical (viewing the mind as a complex system made up of a number of related variables interacting on many levels), and distributed (involving networks of interacting agents and objects engaged in situated practices and problem-solving activities in order to collaboratively complete a task). From a broader angle, the six views upon cognition can be placed along a continuum between universal and relative, given and mediated, product- and process-oriented, internal and external, or individual and communal, with embodied approaches situated closer to the left endpoint of the axis and embedded, enactive, extended, dynamic and distributed views positioned nearer the right extreme of the spectrum. Essentially, these two general perspectives upon the mind, i.e. the individual (cognitive/embodied) and the social (constructivist/distributed), should be viewed

on a par in that each is justified, if leading to accentuating various elements of the cognitive system. In a way, then, we can see cognition through different lenses, flipping back and forth between its various pictures, with mental states getting more or less confined (or extended) in consonance with our aims, purposes and perspectives (Chalmers 2007).

If different perspectives on the mind should be “viewed as peas in the same pod, as variants of situated cognitive science” (Shapiro & Spaulding 2021), finding convergence between them involves looking for “the underlying continuity that connects our physical interactions in the world with our activities of imagining and thinking” (Johnson 2017: 131) and lies at the nexus of the two perspectives, i.e. the social and the individual, at the very bottom of a third space (Kramersch 2009). Such continuity is not to be taken as premature unity or imposed permanence; instead, it should be understood as the ground of creativity or a constellation of emerging points of stability within a system involved in interaction. In other words, continuity provides constraints to the multiplicity of meanings that can surface from a dialogue as well as satisfying those constraints (Hutchins 2005).

2. Theories of cognition in relation to the CEFR (2020)

The Companion Volume to the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) is a product of dialogical collaboration among scholars representing a variety of perspectives upon cognition, particularly those along the enactive-extended-dynamical-distributed cline (Piccardo 2017), guided by the need to focus on “certain innovative areas of the CEFR [underdeveloped in the 2001 publication] (...) which have become increasingly relevant over the past 20 years, especially mediation and plurilingual/pluricultural competence”. If indeed “[w]e are all (potential) plurilinguals” (Piccardo 2019), convergence is the ability to operate between languages, which is based on “developing an awareness of semiotic codes and modes and trying not to let oneself be caught up in any one system of thought” (Kramersch 2013: 32). Moreover, since understanding in communication does not take place through “the visible symbols we use but through the invisible conceptual structures they encode”, i.e. image schemas, which are “rooted in our embodied experience” (Kramersch 2013: 22), continuity between the mind and the world is achieved via the body, which constitutes a natural bridge between the individual and the collective.

A socio-cognitive approach to second language development requires a transdisciplinary research orientation which combines the individual and the collective in a balanced and constrained way. As mentioned above, the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001) has been criticized for adopting a socio-cognitive stance which failed to conform to the metatheoretical principles of symmetry and convergence. In 2020, an extended version of the document was published, with the Framework’s theoretical foundations duly expanded. In other words, the socio-cognitive approach of 2001 was made “compatible with several recent approaches to second language learning, including the task-based approach, the ecological approach and in general all approaches informed by sociocultural and socio-

constructivist theories" (Council of Europe 2020: 32). Clearly, then, the CEFR (2020) has adopted a transdisciplinary approach.

Still, an important question remains and this concerns the nature of transdisciplinarity declared by the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020), i.e. the degree to which the Framework abides by the principles of balance and continuity outlined above. The remaining part of the article is therefore devoted to discovering the extent to which the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) can be viewed as founded on a motivated socio-cognitive approach. This overall aim determines the structure of the paper in the following way. First, a symmetrical and constrained transdisciplinary perspective on second language development is outlined.¹ This model, while obviously just one of the possible ways of bridging the social and the individual, is nevertheless well-grounded in that it embraces both disciplines relevant for metatheorizing SLA research, such as cognitive linguistics or intercultural pragmatics (Larsen-Freeman 2018), and elements constitutive of the teaching-learning process (Kramsch 2013), including cognition, language, meaning making or context. Next, this systematic and motivated socio-cognitive approach is sought in the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) in order to demonstrate the extent to which the 2020 version of the Framework – unlike its original formulation (Council of Europe 2001), which, as some claim (e.g. Louis 2004), does not take into consideration the contribution that cognitive sciences have made in the area of language development – reflects advances in mind-related studies.

3. Towards a transdisciplinary perspective in SLA-related research

3.1 The socio-cognitive continuum in second language development

As demonstrated above, contemporary theories of the mind assume that both ends of the embodied-distributed continuum are equally important for theorizing cognition. A need for balance between cognitive involvement and social interaction is also seen within SLA-related research (see Atkinson 2011 for an overview). Inspired by this demand as well as insights from cognitive psychology, cognitive linguistics, social cognitive linguistics, interactional sociolinguistics and cognitive pragmatics, we integrate notions from Barsalou's perceptual symbol systems, Langacker's cognitive grammar, Talmy's cognitive semantics, Johnson's epistemological framework of experiential realism, Fauconnier and Turner's blending theory, Langlotz's socio-cognitive theory of situated social meaning with basic concepts from Kecskés' model of intercultural pragmatics to construct a framework encompassing both ends of the socio-cognitive continuum (see Table 1).

¹ In consonance with the socio-cognitive paradigm, the notion of language development blurs the boundary between language acquisition and language learning, on the one hand (Larsen-Freeman 2018), and language learning and language use, on the other hand.

Table 1. Insights from theories of individual and social cognition employed in the transdisciplinary perspective

individual cognition		social cognition
experiential realism, cognitive grammar, cognitive semantics	perceptual symbol systems, blending theory	socio-cognitive theory of situated social meaning, intercultural pragmatics

The combination of the theoretical frameworks mentioned above results in a comprehensive architecture of concepts, contexts, meanings and language. Importantly, the proposed socio-cognitive perspective is systematically referred to plurilingual settings so that its relevance for the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001, 2020) is duly accentuated.

As already stated above, the process of language development involves two kinds of pressure: apriori (individual) and actual (social). The outcome of this competition, i.e. meaning, depends on which type of influence is stronger in a given situation. Despite this declared symmetry, much current research contributing to disentangling the complexity of second language development overemphasizes contexts in which the impact of the social is manifested (Kecskés 2014, Larsen-Freeman 2018). As a result, the body’s role as an interface between the mind and the world is marginalized and the scope of the cognitive environment is external rather than internal. This minimally-internalized system is maintained by local interactions between interlocutors and supported by materials, artefacts and language. It involves the on-line mode of cognition, reliant on fast processing and immediate input characteristic of smoothly-flowing linguistic actions (Corr 2006: 468). However, plurilingual communication is seldom unproblematic since, as Kecskés (2016: 15) demonstrates, it is full of novel expressions, e.g. “it is almost skips from my thoughts, you are not very rich in communication, [or] take a school”, which require extra processing effort.

Thus, on-line cognition does not seem to sufficiently support the process of meaning making in plurilingual settings where language does not necessarily function as a tool to be automatically used and linguistic meanings cannot be taken for granted but often consciously and painstakingly (re-)interpreted. Hence, translanguaging² appears to be significantly dependent on off-line cognition, which is slower, more reflexive, involving purpose-neutral information and going beyond the here-and-now into the complex architecture of the conceptual system.

3.2 The conceptual system in plurilingual interactions

According to Barsalou (1999, 2016), the conceptual system is composed of multimodal simulators (concepts), which comprise perceptual, motor, affective, introspective, social and linguistic data, and situated simulations (situation-bound

² In consonance with the CEFR’s (2020: 31) stance, *pluri* and *trans* compounds are taken as roughly equivalent.

conceptualizations), in which pre-existing repertoires and newly-occurring contextual elements are intertwined to form an ad hoc representation controlling a particular interaction.

The above-delineated conceptual system is built on cognitive abilities, including memory, attention, gestalt, comparison, perspective, and processes, e.g. categorization, elaboration, abstraction, framing, or viewpoint preference, all of which constitute construal operations. These perception-based construals constrain the conceptual system as well as permeating it. Thus, meaning – understood as a result of an interplay between a simulator and its context (Barsalou 2016) – inevitably involves construing, predominantly through spatialization.

The power of space as a comprehensive cognitive mechanism derives from its unique status in perception. As Langacker (1987: 148) explains, space is “a basic field of representation grounded in genetically determined physical properties of the human organism and constituting an intrinsic part of our inborn cognitive apparatus”. Due to this inherent spatialization of meaning, concepts and (situated) conceptualizations are imbued with construal operations and thus “likely to comprise image schemas” (Langlotz 2015b: 92).

Derived from basic cognitive abilities, the 27 image schemas distinguished by Johnson (1987), including PATH, FORCE, CONTAINMENT, UP-DOWN, SEPARATION, BLOCKAGE or PART-WHOLE, are often first experienced in the womb to be subsequently used for the exploration of the physical world and deployment “in all varieties of human culture” such as “sports contests, musical events, dramatic performances and religious rituals” (Maconachie 2016: 81-82). In other words, all social phenomena, understood as interactions among the same species, seem to arise “out of recurrent structural couplings that require the coordinated participation of multiple organisms” (Johnson 2007: 148).

In plurilingual interactions, image schemas influence the interpretation of social reality since situated conceptualizations, controlling a given speech activity, are coordinated by multifaceted identities and connections that individuals have constructed with the aid of spatial coordinates. For instance, both individuals and groups are conceptualized as CONTAINERS, i.e. bounded regions with inherent characteristics which “define the self/or the other-concept” and are responsible for “notions of in-group and out-group” (Langlotz 2015b: 24). The UP-DOWN schema, in turn, underlies social hierarchies and concepts of SUPERIORITY and INFERIORITY, while manifestations of the FORCE gestalt, e.g. ATTRACTION or REPULSION, metaphorize interactions between social agents in terms of gravity. Importantly, these underlying spatial representations are foundational for joint communicative practices since role reversal imitation, for instance, is facilitated through the individuals’ “mutual awareness of their perspectival conceptualizations of social reality” (Langlotz 2015b: 217). Consequently, situated conceptualizations, directly exploiting image schemas, can lead to momentary reversals of the “normal” social hierarchy (Langlotz 2015b: 337).

Crucially, such departures from the norm lead to confusion and a sense of uncertainty, which, in turn, tend to be overcome by resorting to conventions. In

other words, if the actual situational context becomes unruly, "[...] the common feature is the need to generate an additional internal state whose information-processing adaptive role is to guide behavior despite the effective unfriendliness of the ambient environmental signals (either there are none, or they require significant computation to yield useful guides for action). In these representation-hungry cases, the system must, it seems, create some kind of inner item, pattern, or process whose role is to stand in for the elusive state of affairs. These, then, are the cases in which it is most natural to expect to find system states that count as full-blooded internal representations" (Clark 1997: 168).

In monolingual communication, such internal representations come in the form of sociocultural (dimensions) of simulators and encompass "knowledge and beliefs that usually belong to a certain speech community as a result of prior interactions and experience" (Kecskés 2014: 160). Thus, while communicative acts are always situation-specific, they also always "make manifest aspects of culturally constituted routines and ways of seeing the world" (Linell 1998: 48), which prompt default interpretations. In plurilingual communication, however, participants have different first languages and sociocultural models and hence the facilitating function of socially-shared elements seems limited (Kecskés 2014: 19). In fact, the rich sociocultural frames which interactants bring into translanguaging can easily become communicative obstacles. For instance, in an intercultural dialogue discussed at length by Kecskés (2014: 117), one participant uses the formula "Why don't you sit down?", assuming that the other interactant is able to access relevant elements of sociocultural competence, or simply evoke an appropriate script. The other person, however, interprets the utterance with reference to the sensori-motor frame, and answers: "Because you did not tell me to". Consequently, the flow of the exchange falters since the interlocutors refer to (apparently) incompatible parts of the simulator. In fact, though, such mismatches can be reconciled, or mediated, through blending.

Fauconnier and Turner's (2002) blending theory proposes that linguistically-mediated meaning making is conducted via mental spaces – partial cognitive representations "that proliferate when we think and talk, allowing a fine-grained partitioning of our discourse and knowledge structures" (Fauconnier 1997: 111).³ However, as Langlotz (2015b: 140) observes, "to structure the content of a mental space conceptually, the cognizer must activate a frame that is able to link different conceptual elements". In other words, and as already stated above, when plurilingual speakers communicate, each brings a part of their cognitive world into play and all these concepts are integrated to yield a third space – the blend. Still, in order for the blend to arise there must be a generic space which captures similarities between input spaces and enables selective integration of seemingly incoherent conceptualizations. Importantly, elements of the generic space are mapped onto their counterparts in all contributing conceptualizations. In other words, structures

³ The concept of a mental space, upon which Blending Theory was developed, was introduced by Giles Fauconnier in 1997.

taken from the frame (level of simulators) are reinstated in input mental spaces (level of simulations) as well as (running) the blend itself (level of situated conceptualization). These recurrent structures are stable and abstract schematic categories, or image schemas (Hedblom et al. 2015), which in fact guide concept invention since they not only constitute the structure of the generic space but also provide heuristics for the merger, i.e. the development of the blend, or the construction of a situated conceptualization.

3.3 Schematicity and the plurilingual mind

If, to handle actual situational contexts, plurilingual speakers substantially rely on the mental context, the off-line mode of processing, construal operations and schematic (dimensions) of simulators, and if all these aspects are unified through image schemas, schematic categories seem central to plurilingual minds.

A similar view is expressed by Hall (2017: 79), who states that plurilingual speakers, ELF-users, to be more specific, "engage successfully in joint cognition because of shared communication strategies, a collaborative disposition, and the deployment of linguistic resources shaped by similar Englishing experiences (possibly in the form of overlapping sets of abstract rules distilled from these experiences)". These abstract rules are, in turn, compared to abstract (grammatical) constructions (Hall 2017: 81), whose validity is confirmed by a number of data from translanguaging communication. For instance, invariant tag questions, interchangeable use of *which* and *who* pronouns as well as infinitive and *that* clauses, or frequent use of shell verbs (Seidlhofer 2004) indicate that pluricultural interlocutors have neutralized grammatical distinctions typical of the English language into more schematic linguistic representations.

Much in the same vein, Höder (2017: 15) posits that users of more than one language form diaconstructions – conventionalized and highly schematic patterns generalizing over structural elements of all languages or varieties available to an individual speaker and/or shared by a specific community. These abstract assemblies resemble construal operations and image schemas and are commonly found in "grammatical notions [which can be] plausibly described as subjective counterparts of basic aspects of everyday experience" (Langacker 2008: 538-539). To exemplify, Langacker (2008: 538) describes the meaning of the English possessive with reference to "the conceptual operation of invoking a reference point to mentally access a target", which inheres in the PART-WHOLE image schema. Likewise, Talmy (2000) argues for a collectively available inventory of schematic concepts encoded by grammatical categories. For instance, basic sentence patterns, e.g. ergative (*The door opened and he walked in*) or monotransitive (*He opened the door and walked in*), specify the perspective from which one views a scene, i.e. being inside or outside the room respectively, which evokes the CONTAINMENT schema. Next, the CENTER-PERIPHERY schema, residing in the cognitive operation of focusing attention, is brought to the fore through juxtaposing syntactic patterns in, for example, *The clerk sold the vase to the customer* and *The customer bought the vase from the clerk* (Talmy 2000: 87-88). Importantly, schematic

meanings are also encoded by "overt closed-class elements" (Talmy 2000: 23), e.g. intonation patterns.

(Near-)universal grammatical meanings provide language users, including language learners, with a cognitive map which helps them navigate through a given communicative situation. In other words, then, "the distribution of grammatical constructions in discourse is governed by the speaker's decision to express her conceptualization in specific ways" (Archard 2008: 436), and this decision should be motivated by both "the knowledge of the specific parameters that guide the selection of competing constructions" (Archard 2008: 436) and the conditions of a particular communicative context. Learning is thus as much an individual success, whereby a person is able to choose an optimal construal, as a social achievement since whatever is construed needs to be coordinated with "on-line conditions" provided by the other interactants. In the case of plurilingual communication, these conditions, or affordances, are clearly (image-)schematic in nature (Galton 2010: 1).

Meaning making among plurilinguals is scaffolded by schematic representations that are unspecified for language and result from integrating structural elements from all available languages into one neutral "repertoire" (Matras 2009: 308). As shown in Table 2 below, schematic content resides in virtually all categories characterizing, at least in the integrated model advanced here, second language development in transcultural settings. Thus, the proposed transdisciplinary perspective is built on the principles of balance and continuity. The former is established via consistently linking communal and individual aspects in each of the approaches evoked. The latter, in turn, is achieved through pointing to a common denominator underlying all the theories evoked – image-schemas – the ultimate link between the social and the individual.

Table 2. Integrating the social and the individual in the socio-cognitive perspective

social	individual	integrated through
cognition as developed and (co-)constructed	cognition as partly innate and retrievable	image schemas
relativity	universality	
situated conceptualizations	concepts and conceptualizations	
external context and affordances	internal context and representations	
on-line processing	off-line processing	
interaction and communicative mechanisms (e.g. turn-taking)	perception and attentional mechanisms (e.g. perspectivizing)	
social practices	construal operations	
learning as participating	learning as developing attention-directing mechanisms	
language as (trans)languaging reflecting recurrent patterns of language use	language as a system of symbolic units reflecting (near-)universal cognitive abilities	

Table 2 above depicts a balanced and convergent socio-cognitive perspective upon translanguaging. However, by tapping to a range of categories relevant for plurilingual and pluricultural interactions, from general cognitive abilities and processes through different though integrated levels of the mind to the linguistic stratum itself, we have attempted to construct a systematic approach to translanguaging (cf. Kramsch 2013).

The CEFR (Council of Europe 2020), in its approach and enunciation of key concepts, seems to be built on similar premises. However, to strengthen this impression and the much-criticized foundations of the Framework (Council of Europe 2020), a detailed analysis needs to be conducted. Possible lines along which this kind of exploration could evolve are sketched below.

4. A transdisciplinary perspective in the CEFR (2020)

4.1 A socio-cognitive approach to plurilingualism

Defined as “the dynamic and developing linguistic repertoire of an individual user/learner” (Council of Europe 2020: 30), plurilingualism (Piccardo 2019) discussed in the previous section is central in the Framework’s (Council of Europe

2020) model. A fundamental characteristic of plurilingualism is that it is a dynamic and changing competence whose capacities, although different in various languages, make up a communicative competence "to which all knowledge and experience of language contributes and in which languages interrelate and interact" (Council of Europe 2001). Consequently, the languages we know are not kept in separate mental compartments but build a holistic repertoire (Council of Europe 2001: 4).

Plurilingualism is based on the assumption that competence in all languages is unbalanced. Therefore, plurilingual competence as presented in the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) is progressive and decompartmentalized (Piccardo & North 2019). Above all, it is "the ability to call flexibly upon a holistic, integrated, interrelated, uneven, plurilingual repertoire in which all linguistic abilities have a place, and which the user/learner mobilizes to blend, mix and translanguage" (Piccardo & North 2019: 218). A plurilingual repertoire, available to the user in a communicative situation, is defined as the sum of linguistic, sociolinguistic, metalinguistic and (socio)cultural knowledge which refers to the languages the user/learner knows and which are mastered at a different degree and for different language use (Coste 2002: 117, Hélot 2012: 220-221 & Lüdi, 2006). Furthermore, Busch (2012) as well as Kramsch (2003, 2006, 2009) are of the opinion that a plurilingual repertoire goes beyond cognitive aspects, embracing affective and abstract aspects such as identity and subjectivity. Thus, when communicating in various languages and cultures, the individual mobilizes not only linguistic and cultural knowledge but also emotions evoked by these languages and cultures.

Consequently, in the CEFR's (Council of Europe 2020) action-oriented approach the user/learner mobilizes a plurilingual repertoire in communication, which involves not only general competences but also pragmatic and sociolinguistic competences (Council of Europe 2001). Thus, in plurilingualism there is an interplay of language competences and other than language competences. Consequently, general and language competences build plurilingual competence. As the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020: 251) states the boundaries between knowledge of the world, sociocultural knowledge and intercultural awareness as well as the boundaries between practical skills and know-how, including social skills, sociocultural knowledge and intercultural skills and know-how are blurred so that there is an overlap of categories. Furthermore, the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020: 251) assumes that the learner/user mobilizes the above-mentioned categories merging them with appropriate communicative language competences in meaning making in communication.

To conclude, plurilingual competence appears to be an encompassing framework in the CEFR's (Council of Europe 2020) model which unifies all competences and in which social and cognitive aspects have their place. Therefore, in the analysis of the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) which follows, we examine the extent to which the aspects related to plurilingual competence can be viewed as founded on a socio-cognitive perspective. We take into consideration the latest version of the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020), however, we also make references to the original version

of the document (Council of Europe 2001), especially in cases where there is no change in position in the latest document.

4.2 A socio-cognitive perspective on the notions related to plurilingualism

The Framework (Council of Europe 2001, 2020) aligns the concept of translanguaging (Larsen-Freeman 2018, Kramsch 2013) (see the discussion of the notion in sections 3.1 and 3.2) with plurilingualism. The document invokes translanguaging by assuming that "in different situations, a person can call flexibly upon different parts of this (plurilingual) competence to achieve effective communication with a particular interlocutor" (Council of Europe 2001: 4) through "switching from one language or dialect (or variety) to another", "calling upon the knowledge of a number of languages (or dialects, or varieties) to make sense of a text" and through "bringing the whole of one's linguistic equipment into play, experimenting with alternative forms of expression in different languages or dialects, exploiting paralinguistics (mime, gesture, facial expression, etc.) and radically simplifying use of language" (Council of Europe 2001: 4). Thus, in translanguaging practice, the user participates in intercultural communication, drawing on resources from linguistic repertoire and shaping meaning in the target language. Consequently, translanguaging in the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001, 2020) is understood as a form of languaging activated to communicate meaning in a multilingual environment, which points to a social view of language. On the other hand, the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001: 116) recognizes language as a set of symbolic units, which points to the cognitive approach. However, it has to be stressed that the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001, 2020) does not view language as a fully-fledged repertoire of form-meaning pairings, limiting the cognitive approach to phonology, where intelligibility of (often highly abstract) forms, e.g. intonation patterns, comes to the fore (Council of Europe 2020: 47).

Embracing a plurilingual vision inevitably involves mediation as discussed by Piccardo (2017) (see section 2), which calls for plurilinguaging, i.e. an activity of plurilingual individuals (Piccardo 2017). Piccardo and North (2019: 245) notice that "plurilinguals are constantly mediating: to (co)construct meaning, to enable communication across linguistic and cultural barriers, or to make sense of a text". Presenting various aspects of mediation, the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) emphasizes certain characteristics that these aspects share, i.e. the fact that the individual is concerned with the needs, ideas and expressions of those for whom the individual is mediating. Thus, the notion of mediation is viewed as "a social and cultural process of creating conditions for communication and co-operation, facing and hopefully defusing any delicate situations and tensions that may arise" (Council of Europe 2020: 91). Consequently, mediation involves not only social competence, but also cultural and plurilingual competences. Furthermore, involving the transfer of information from one language to another, mediation is considered in the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) as a form of translanguaging, which points to a social approach to the notion. One of the consequences of the vision of mediation as translanguaging is that the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) shifts attention from

languages to resources, clearly stressing blurred boundaries between languages. Thus, in its social interpretation of mediation, the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) views the mediator as a plurilingual user, who draws on source language content and constructs meaning in the target language when engaged in intercultural communication.

However, there is also an individual dimension of mediation in the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020), reflected in one of the types of mediation, i.e. mediating concepts essential in meaning construction and makes a reference to "the process of facilitating access to knowledge and concepts for others, particularly if they may be unable to access this directly on their own" (Council of Europe 2020: 91). Thus, the role of mediating concepts is twofold: on the one hand it helps to construct and elaborate meaning and on the other it facilitates conditions conducive to the construction of meaning (Council of Europe 2020: 91). Consequently, there are two types of mediation involved in mediating concepts, i.e. relational mediation (establishing conditions) and cognitive mediation (developing ideas) (Council of Europe 2020: 108), which are in constant interaction.

The CEFR (Council of Europe 2001, 2020) views plurilingual foreign language learners as social agents collaborating with other learners in a given situation, i.e. "members of society who have tasks (not exclusively language-related) to accomplish in a given set of circumstances, in a specific environment and within a particular field of action" (Council of Europe 2001: 9). Thus, the notion of the social agent may speak to the fact that the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001, 2020) is committed to the social approach. However, through its vision of a learner as an individual conceptualizer (Council of Europe 2001: 9), the document also implies the individual approach. At the same time the CEFR embraces a more synergetic view by stressing an interplay between the individual and the social agent by emphasizing "the two key notions of co-construction of meaning in interaction and constant movement between the individual and social level in language learning" (Council of Europe 2020: 36) (see Atkinson 2011 mentioned in section 3.1 for the discussion of interaction in language learning).

The CEFR (Council of Europe 2001, 2020) is committed to the social perspective in its definition of plurilingual cognition as co-constructed and situated (Langlotz 2015b), which is reflected in the collaborative nature of the co-construction of meaning in order to accomplish a task. This is accomplished through mobilizing competences (linguistic and non-linguistic) and strategies which are further developed through the experience of the task. On the other hand, the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020: 39-40) recognizes the existence of partly innate cognition by making a reference to general competences as inherent abilities, which may speak to the fact that the document assumes the individual approach.

The CEFR (Council of Europe 2001: 44-47) stresses the importance of the social context (see section 3.3. for the discussion of the role of context in a communicative act by Archard 2008) in which the plurilingual user acts, which may imply the social approach. The document assumes that language use varies depending on the context in which it is used, where context refers to mental and external events and

situational factors (both physical and others) which embed acts of communication. The need for communication always reflects a specific situation; the form and the content of the message mirrors this situation. Thus, acts of speech take place within language activities, which form the social context. The elements of the context include domains, situations as well as conditions and constraints. Every act of language use is contextualized in a specific situation within a particular domain, i.e. a sphere of action in which social life is organized.

Not only does the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001: 50-51) focus on the importance of the external context (independent of the individual) of plurilingual language use in which the user operates, but it also presupposes the existence of the mental context and other cognitive mechanisms such as memory, knowledge, imagination and internal cognitive processes, referred to as construal operations in section 3.2, that interpret and filter the external context through the user's perceptual apparatus, attention mechanisms, long-term experience, affecting memory, associations and connotations, practical classification of objects, events, etc. and linguistic categorization. The document emphasizes that these are the factors affecting the user's observation of the context, which can be further determined by the user's intentions in entering onto communication, line of thought, the stream of thoughts, ideas, feelings, sense, impressions attended to in consciousness, expectations of previous experience, reflection, the operation of thought processes on experience, needs, drives, motivations, interests, conditions and constraints which limit and control the choices of action, state of mind, and health as well as personal qualities (Council of Europe 2001: 50-51). However, it has to be stressed that the role of the mental context is not to reduce the information content of the external context. Thought is influenced by memory, previous knowledge, imagination and other cognitive and emotive processes as stated by the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001: 51), in which case the language produced is only to some extent related to the external context observed by the user.

As argued in the first section, the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001: 50) recognizes the concepts of both universality and relativity. By maintaining that "language use varies according to the requirements of the context in which it is used" and by further assuming that "the need and the desire to communicate arise in a particular situation and the form as well as the content of the communication is a response to that situation" (Council of Europe 2001: 44), the CEFR observes that language use depends on its users and a specific situation in which the user acts. Thus, the document emphasizes the importance of relativity typical of the social perspective. However, by stating that there exists the external context "closely reflected in the language of the community concerned and acquired by its speakers", the document suggests that the language user is viewed as a passive recipient of reality who acquires language as opposed to an active individual engaged in the construction of meaning. The above-mentioned statement entails that the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001, 2020) embraces universality characteristic of the cognitive perspective.

The Framework (Council of Europe 2001) stresses the role of socio-cultural interaction (Kecskés 2014), on the one hand, and the importance of perception

(Barsalou 2016) on the other hand. The former may be treated as a reflection of the social perspective and the latter of the individual perspective. Socio-cultural interaction is central to pragmatic competences (Council of Europe 2001), which are concerned with the functional use of linguistic resources based on scripts of interactional exchanges. Furthermore, pragmatic competences relate to the mastery of discourse, cohesion and coherence, the identification of text types and forms, irony, and parody. As the document explains the above-mentioned abilities are constructed in interactional and cultural environments (Council of Europe 2001: 13). Perception, in turn, is central to phonological competence (similar to "overt closed-class elements" evoked in section 3.3), which involves "a knowledge of, and skill in the perception and production of: the sound-units (phonemes) of the language and their realization in particular contexts (allophones); the phonetic features which distinguish phonemes (distinctive features, e.g. voicing, rounding, nasality, plosion); the phonetic composition of words (syllable structure, the sequence of phonemes, word stress, word tones); sentence phonetics (prosody) - sentence stress and rhythm, intonation; phonetic reduction (vowel reduction, strong and weak forms, assimilation and elision" (Council of Europe 2001: 116-117).

The CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) recognizes the existence of two different modes of cognition, i.e. on-line and off-line discussed by Corr (2006) (see section 3.1 for the explanation of the notion), which mirrors the social and individual approach respectively. The inclusion of spontaneous production and interaction exemplified by oral production and interaction activities (Council of Europe 2020) proves the importance of here-and-now tasks which require fast processing. Thus, these activities require the activation of on-line cognition. On the other hand, including the analysis and criticism of creative texts (including literature), which refers to more intellectual reactions as well as more careful considerations and thus slower processing, the latest version of the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) emphasizes the centrality of off-line cognition.

The CEFR's (Council of Europe 2020) approach to language learning is both social and individual. Referring to social aspects of language learning, the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001, 2020) considers learning as a social accomplishment and interactional practice. One of the approaches to language learning that the document mentions is that apart from exposure to comprehensible input, active participation in a communicative interaction is fundamental (or even sufficient) in language learning. The perspective goes so far as to suggest that explicit teaching or study of the target language may be of no relevance (Council of Europe 2001: 140). Consequently, the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001, 2020) puts a strong focus on language learning, which is operationalized in activities emphasizing that this process in turn results in the promotion of the use of tasks in interaction (i.e. group work), problem solving and discovery learning. The other perspective which the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001) invokes is the conviction that language learning is an individual achievement, which shifts attention to the cognitive approach to language learning. This is best reflected in the assumption that the human information processing abilities are strong enough for the learner to acquire the

target language in order to be able to use it efficiently for understanding and production. Thus, exposure to understandable target language input is a sufficient condition for language learning to take place. In this view conscious manipulation such as teaching or studying do not facilitate language learning. Thus, the role of the teacher is to provide the students with a rich linguistic environment where language learning takes place without formal teaching (Council of Europe 2001: 139). Furthermore, the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) refers to the cognitive approach to language learning by embracing the ability to shift between and adopt the perspective of a particular referent, which is part of signing competences. Consequently, the inclusion of perspective may lead one to the conclusion that the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) acknowledges that learning a language involves learning attention-directing mechanisms (see Table 1 above).

The view of plurilingual language use that the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001, 2020) promotes is explicitly both social and individual. On the one hand, the document endorses the centrality of interaction and communicative mechanisms and, on the other hand, it stresses the relevance of construal operations (Langlotz 2015b), as discussed in section 3.2. The importance of interaction is emphasized in the treatment of turn-taking, which is an essential part of pragmatic competence and interaction strategies and refers to the ability to take the initiative in discourse (Council of Europe 2020: 88). Thus, before being internalized, language develops through construction of meaning in interpersonal communication in collaborative real-life tasks. Furthermore, the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001, 2020) approach is action-oriented, where the user is viewed as a member of society with a task to perform under certain circumstances and in a specific environment. The execution of tasks is carried out in the act of communication (Council of Europe 2001: 9). Therefore, the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001, 2020) highlights a pragmatic and functional view of language use reflected in its vision of pragmatic competences concerned "with the user's knowledge of the principles according to which messages are: a) organized, structured and arranged ('discourse competence'); b) used to perform communicative functions ('functional competence'); c) sequenced according to interactional and transactional schemata ('design competence')" (Council of Europe 2001: 123). Consequently, functional competence, central to the action-oriented approach, focuses on "the use of spoken discourse and written texts in communication for particular functional purposes" (Council of Europe 2001: 125). This component assumes that "participants are engaged in an interaction, in which each initiative leads to a response and moves the interaction further on, according to its purpose, through a succession of stages from opening exchanges to its final conclusion" (Council of Europe 2001: 125). Thus, functional competence is concerned with knowledge and ability to use patterns of social interaction (schemata), which are the basis of communication such as verbal exchange patterns (Council of Europe 2001: 126). Discourse competences make a reference to the user's ability to "arrange sentences in sequence so as to produce coherent stretches of language (Council of Europe 2001: 123). Apart from functional and discourse competence, pragmatic competences include one other

crucial aspect, i.e. design competence, which includes the praxeologic culturally-dependent dimension of language use, i.e. schemas and roles about what is actually performed in a given language and culture (Council of Europe 2001: 126-128).

The CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) recognizes the centrality of construal operations (e.g. viewpoint or perspective) in language use, which implies the individual perspective. A key aspect of pragmatic competence in signing languages is adopting the perspective of a particular referent by the signer in constructed dialogue (Council of Europe 2020: 161). Moving between referential loci, e.g. through a body shift, signers shift between perspectives. The viewpoint in signing languages is that of the signer. The perspective includes the following abilities: "the ability to envisage signing space and to memorize the relations for the subsequent text; the ability to recognize a new setting, change of scene, topic, etc.; comprehension of an action, event or issue that is presented from the perspective of different people or different points of view; the ability to follow constructed action (role shifts, shifts of perspectives), constructed dialogue (reported speech), and to recognize the different techniques in doing so, e.g. by body posture, line of vision or other non-manuals" (Council of Europe 2020: 161). Consequently, the competences include shifting between perspectives by "leveraging the potential for moving between referential loci (via a body shift or a shoulder shift), or in more reduced forms (e.g. with eye gaze shifts to mark a change in point of view)" (Council of Europe 2020: 161). However, despite the aspects indicating the importance of space and body, image schemas (discussed in sections 2 and 3) as a type of construal operations do not have their place in the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020).

The above analysis demonstrates that the CEFR's (Council of Europe 2020) socio-cognitive approach includes social and individual aspects (see table 3 below for a summary of the socio-cognitive approach in the Framework).

Table 3. *The socio-cognitive approach in the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020)*⁴

social	individual
translanguaging as a social practice	language as a system of symbolic units
mediating communication	mediating concepts
foreign language users as social agents	foreign language users as individual conceptualizers
constructed and situated cognition	mental context
relativity	universality
sociocultural interaction	perception
on-line processing	off-line processing
language learning as a social accomplishment and interactional practice	language learning as an individual achievement
the role of interaction (e.g. turn-taking)	the role of construal operations (e.g. perspectivizing)

5. Conclusions

Understanding in communication is based on image schemas stemming from embodied experience as the above discussion demonstrates. Thus, the body is an aspect unifying the social and the individual. Researchers (e.g. Larsen-Freeman 2018) call for a transdisciplinary approach to second language development which integrates the individual and the collective in a balanced way. The CEFR (Council of Europe 2001) has been criticized for the lack of such a motivated socio-cognitive approach, i.e. for its obscurity of concepts and integrating the social and the cognitive without specifying a common denominator. Combining the task-based approach, the ecological approach as well as a sociocultural and socio-constructivist theories, the latest version of the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) declares a socio-cognitive approach. The analysis of the Framework (Council of Europe 2020) presented above demonstrates the presence of the social and individual perspectives in the document .

The two perspectives in the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) appear to be symmetrical and balanced but not fully integrated, i.e. the social and the individual are linked without specifying the common ground. Consequently, there is a balance at the level of cognition, language and learning in the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) but not at the level of image schemas. The only schemata that the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) mentions are interactional and transactional schemata defined as design competence. They are part of pragmatic competence and are introduced under the notion of sociocultural competence and sociolinguistic appropriateness, which belong to functional competence. Schemata are also invoked with reference to reception, which involves receiving and processing input,

⁴ The aspects in the table appear in the order in which they are discussed in the analysis of the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020).

i.e. "activating (...) appropriate schemata in order to build up a representation of the meaning" (Council of Europe 2020: 47). However, the document does not refer to embodied image schemas and hence cannot take advantage of their role in unifying the individual and the collective.

There is also a tendency towards a transdisciplinary perspective where the interplay between the social and the cognitive appears to be motivated (e.g. the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020) introduces the notion of schemata, however, it does not refer this element to image schemas, which are fundamental in plurilingual communication). Consequently, in the light of the previous criticism voiced against the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001) as well as the Framework's (Council of Europe 2020) commitment to creating a common metalanguage in the area of second language development, it appears that the Framework (Council of Europe 2020) should seek more integration especially that the socio-cognitive perspective, which emerges in the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020), strives to unify such contrasting elements as the cognitive and the social. Given this trend, which is in line with recent developments in SLA research, it appears justified to include the insights of cognitive linguistics, intercultural pragmatics and elements of the teaching learning process, which with their tools may bring insightful contribution to the socio-cognitive approach of the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020). Therefore, we suggest that the approach in the Framework (2020) should be more integrated, i.e. the links which we identify in the previous sections should be strengthened at the level of theory and praxis. For example, the expansion of the descriptors of linguistic competence appears indispensable. Furthermore, the socio-cognitive perspective as delineated in this paper requires a better integration of the components of signing competences (special attention should be paid to the development of the components of communicative competence).

References

- Alderson, Charles, Neus Figueras, Henk Kuijper, Günter Nold, Sauli Takala, & Claire Tardieu (2006), "Analysing tests of reading and listening in relation to the Common European Framework of Reference: The experience of the Dutch CEFR construct project", *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 3(1):3–30.
- Archard, Michel (2008), "Teaching construal: Cognitive Pedagogical Grammar", in Robinson, Peter & Nick Ellis (eds.), *Handbook of cognitive linguistics and second language acquisition*. London: Routledge, 432–455
- Atkinson, Dwight (2011), "A Sociocognitive approach to second language acquisition: How mind, body, and world work together in learning additional languages", in Atkinson, Dwight (ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition*. London: Routledge, 143–166.
- Barsalou, Lawrence (1999), "Perceptual symbol systems", *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22:577–660.

- Barsalou, Lawrence (2016), "Situated conceptualization: Theory and application" in Coello, Yann & Martin H. Fischer (eds.), *Foundations of embodied cognition*. East Sussex: Psychology Press, 1–17.
- Busch, Brigitta (2012), "The linguistic repertoire revisited", *Applied Linguistics*, 33(5):503–523.
- Chalmers, David J. (2007), "Phenomenal concepts and the explanatory gap", in Alter, Torin & Sven Walter (eds.), *Phenomenal concepts and phenomenal knowledge: New essays on consciousness and physicalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 167–194.
- Clark, Andy (1997), *Being there: Putting brain, body, and world together again*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Corr, Philip J. (2006), *Understanding biological psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Coste, Daniel (2002), "Compétence à communiquer et compétence plurilingue", *Notions en Questions (NeQ)*, 6:115–123.
- Council of Europe (2001), *The Common European Framework of Reference*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe (2020), *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Fauconnier, Gilles (1997), *Mappings in thought and language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fauconnier, Gilles & Mark Turner (2002), *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. New York: Basic Books.
- Galton, Antony (2010), "The formalities of affordance", in Bhatt, Mehul, Hans W. Guesgen & Shyamanta M. Hazarika (eds.), *Spatio-Temporal Dynamics: the 19th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ECAI 2010) Workshop Proceedings*. Lisbon, Portugal, August 16-20, 2010, 1–6.
- Hall, Christopher J (2017), "Cognitive perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca", in Jenkins, Jennifer, Martin J. Dewey, & Will Baker (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a Lingua Franca. Routledge handbooks in applied linguistics*. London: Routledge, 74–84.
- Hedblom, Maria M., Oliver Kutz & Fabian Neuhaus (2015), "Choosing the right path: Image schema theory as a foundation for concept invention", *Journal of Artificial General Intelligence*, 6(1):21–5.
- Hélot, Christine (2012), "Linguistic diversity and education", in Martin-Jones, Marylin, Adrian Blackledge & Angela Creese (eds.), *Routledge handbook of multilingualism*. New York/London: Taylor and Francis, 214–231.
- Hutchins, Edwin (2005), "Material anchors for conceptual blends", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37: 1555–1577.
- Höder, Steffen (2017), "A constructional approach to language in contact: Background and basic concepts of Diasystematic Construction Grammar." Paper presented at PLIN-day, Louvain-la-Neuve, 12/05/2017.
- Johnson, Mark (1987), *The body in the mind: the bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Johnson, Mark (2007), *The meaning of the body. Aesthetics of human understanding*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Johnson, Mark (2017), *Embodied mind, meaning, and reason: How our bodies give rise to understanding*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kecskés, István (2014), *Intercultural pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kecskés, István (2016), "Bilingual pragmatic competence", in Reif, Monika & Justyna A. Robinson (eds.), *Cognitive approaches to bilingualism*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 39–64.
- Kramersch, Claire (2003), "The multilingual subject", in de Florio-Hansen, Inez & Hu, Adelheid (eds.), *Mehrsprachigkeit und multikulturelle Identität*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 107–124.
- Kramersch, Claire (2006), "The multilingual subject", *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 16(1):97–110.
- Kramersch, Claire (2009), *The multilingual subject. What language learners say about their experience and why it matters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kramersch, Claire (2013), "Culture in foreign language teaching", *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 1(1):57–78.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (1987), *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (2008), *Cognitive Grammar: A basic introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Langlotz, Andreas (2015a), "Language, creativity, and cognition", in Jones, Rodney H. (ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and creativity*. London: Routledge, 40–60.
- Langlotz, Andreas (2015b), *Creating social orientation through language. A socio-cognitive theory of situated social meaning*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Larsen-Freeman, Diane (2018), "Looking ahead: Future directions in, and future research into, second language acquisition", *Foreign Language Annals*, 51:55–72
- Linell, Per (1998), *Approaching dialogue: Talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspectives*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Louis, Vincent (2004), "Compétence communicative et savoirs culturels en didactique des langues étrangères: analyse critique du Cadre européen commun de référence pour les langues", in Greenfield, John (ed.), *Proceedings of the symposium Ensino das Línguas Estrangeiras: Estratégias Políticas e Educativas (13-15 December 2001)*. Porto: Faculdade de Letras da Universidad do Porto, 41–50.
- Lüdi, Georges (2006), "Multilingual repertoires and the consequences for linguistic theory", in Bühlig, Kristin & Thijs, Jan D. Ten (eds.), *Beyond misunderstanding: Linguistic analyses of intercultural communication*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 11–42
- Maconachie, Bruce (2016), *Evolution, cognition, and performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Martyniuk, Waldemar & José Noijons (2007), Executive summary of results of a survey on the use of the CEFR at national level in the Council of Europe Member States. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Matras, Yaron (2009), *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Overmann, Karenleigh A, & Lambros Malafouris (2018), "Situated Cognition", in Callan, Hillary (ed.), *International encyclopedia of anthropology: Anthropology beyond text*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell, 1–8.
- Piccardo, Enrica (2017), "Plurilingualism as a catalyst for creativity in superdiverse societies: A systemic analysis", *Frontiers of Psychology*, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02169>
- Piccardo, Enrica (2019), "'We are all (potential) plurilinguals': Plurilingualism as an overarching, holistic concept", *Translanguaging: Opportunities and Challenges in a Global World*, 10:183–204.
- Piccardo, Enrica & Brian North (2019), *The Action-oriented Approach: A dynamic vision of language education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara (2004), "10 Research perspectives on teaching English as a Lingua Franca", *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24:209–39.
- Shapiro, Lawrence and Shannon Spaulding, "Embodied cognition", *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Winter 2021 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), forthcoming URL: <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2021/entries/embodied-cognition/>>
- Strugielska, Ariadna & Katarzyna Piątkowska (2017), "Towards a unified approach to language-mediated intercultural competence in educational context", *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 15(1):224–252.
- Talmy, Leonard (2000), *Toward a cognitive semantics*. Cambridge: MIT Press.