Multilingual socialisation in education:
Introducing the M-SOC approach

Gabriela Meier, University of Exeter

Abstract

This article provides an overview of monolingual norms, which are considered pervasive in education (Ortega, 2014, Cruickshank, 2014; May, 2014) and proposes a multilingual socialisation approach. Various monolingual practices have been observed, recognised and discussed by applied linguists, language educators and socio-linguists for the last 30 plus years (May, 2014; Conteh & Meier, 2014), and have been referred to as "damaging deficit approaches" (Ortega, 2014, p. 32). This has led to a call for collective research action (Ortega, 2014) and for greater teacher guidance (Weber, 2014; Meier, 2017) in order to question monolingual thinking.

The theoretical review, here presented, draws on literature related to monolingual norms as well as alternative multilingual approaches, and links these to language socialisation perspectives. The result consists of 96 guiding statements combined in a theory-informed approach that can be used for reflection, practice and research in the field of multilingual socialisation in education.

Cognisant of the important role teachers play in their learners' language socialisation (Friedman, 2010), this article is an invitation for educators and teacher educators to engage with theory, actively join the debates, and participate in a collective international research project based in Exeter. The latter has the aim of developing deeper understandings of what, how, where and why multilingual approaches may work, and equally important what approaches do not work in certain contexts, and why not.

Keywords: monolingual norms, «damaging deficit approaches», multilingual socialisation, role of teachers

Abstract

Dieser Aufsatz bietet eine Übersicht über einsprachige Normen, die im Bildungssektor weit verbreitet sind (Ortega, 2014, Cruickshank, 2014; May, 2014), und macht einen Vorschlag für einen mehrsprachigen Sozialisationsansatz. Unterschiedliche einsprachige Praktiken werden in der angewandten Linguistik, im Sprachbildungswesen und in der Soziolinguistik seit rund 30 Jahren beobachtet, beschrieben und diskutiert (May, 2014; Conteh & Meier, 2014), und werden als „schädliche Defizitansätze" (Ortega, 2014, p. 32, meine Übersetzung) bezeichnet. Diese Situation führte zum Ruf nach kollektiver Forschungsaktivität (Ortega, 2014) und nach entsprechenden Handreichungen für Lehrkräfte (Weber, 2014; Meier, 2014), um einsprachige Denkweisen zu hinterfragen.

Die hier präsentierte theoretische Übersicht stützt sich auf Literatur über ein- und mehrsprachige Ansätze und bringt diese in Verbindung mit Perspektiven der Sprachsozialisation. Das Ergebnis sind 96 Leitsätze, die in einem theoretisch fundierten Ansatz zusammengefasst werden und Reflexion, Praxis und Forschung im Bereich der mehrsprachigen Sozialisation im Bildungswesen ermöglichen.

Im Anbetracht der Tatsache, dass Lehrpersonen eine wichtige Rolle in der sprachlichen Sozialisation von Lernenden spielen (Friedman, 2010), ist dieser Aufsatz als Einladung für

Language Education and Multilingualism
LEM 1/2018, pp. 103-125.

103

Lehrpersonen in Bildungsstätten und in der Lehrerbildung gedacht, die sich so aktiv an dieser Debatte sowie an einem in Exeter situierten internationalen Forschungsprojekt beteiligen können mit dem Ziel, unser Wissen in Bezug auf was, wo, wie, warum und in welchem Kontext funktioniert, und gleichermaßen warum etwas nicht funktioniert, zu vertiefen.

Schlüsselbegriffe: einsprachige Normen, »schädliche Defizitansätze «, mehrsprachige Sozialisation, Rolle der Lehrenden

1.   Introduction

This article takes the multilingual turn (May, 2014; Conteh & Meier, 2014) as a starting point, specifically its critique of the monolingual norms that have influenced second language acquisition (SLA), Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) and applied linguistics, as well as wider political and societal mind-sets and individual practices. This monolingual bias has been described as pervasive (Ortega, 2014, Cruickshank, 2014; May, 2014), widely shared (Gajo, 2014), and ongoing (May 2014). It is argued that this is based on misconceptions (May, 2014) and on implicitly held beliefs (Ortega, 2010), taking monolingual understandings as the norm (Gajo, 2014; May, 2014), the default (Ortega, 2014) and natural organising principles, which are uncritically embraced (Ortega, 2014). Ortega's contribution is of particular interest here, as she views these pervasive monolingual norms as amounting to an ideological siege and a straitjacket (Ortega, 2014) that poses "serious validity and ethical problems", and as such, "damaging deficit approaches become unwittingly entrenched in many practices found in classrooms and schools" (Ortega, 2014). This article, thus, not only responds to Ortega's (2014) call for an "epistemic reorientation through concerted collective disciplinary action", noting that "viable alternatives must be offered to replace predominant monolingual theories, constructs, and research practices" (Ortega, 2014), but also to the call for "user-friendly pedagogic guidance as part of more critical, cross-curricular, context-sensitive and flexible multilingual pedagogies" (Meier, 2017, p. 152).

Alternative multilingual understandings, suggest that educational environments can be understood as places where everyone can develop and become aware of their emerging *linguistic repertoire*. The term, as understood by Busch (2012, p. 9), includes "the codes, languages, the means of expression and communication that play a role in their [the learners'] lives". These "means of expression" include all languages a person can use in society and learns inside and outside of educational environments, including language varieties, dialects, signed languages and partial languages. This is based on the idea of *plurilingualism*, which indicates personal bi/multilingual language competences as defined by the Common European Framework of Reference (Council of Europe, 2001).

In educational institutions more often than not linguistic repertoires are not taken fully into consideration, and individual language competences are kept separate, assessed monolingually and compared to so-called native-speaker standard-language norms. I will show in the following how this practice can have a negative impact on those with minority, migrant or non-standard language backgrounds *and* those learning foreign languages, including language teachers themselves. The widely shared monolingual norms mean that learners and teachers often either feel that some languages need to be left outside the classroom doors as they are thought to disturb the learning (Jessner, 2009) or learners, and teachers feel guilty or inadequate when they draw on, or allow, other languages in their classrooms (Moore, 2013). This has led to a consensus "in favour of a kind of

monolingualism with small concessions" (Butzkamm, 2003: 29). This view "has prevented scholars from appreciating plurilingualism" (Canagarajah & Liyanage, 2012, p. 50) as they considered other languages as a problem (Young, 2014). Moreover, this monolingual paradigm has even limited the type of research that has been conducted, and the type of research questions that have been asked (Pavlenko, 2007). This monolingual research bias in SLA (Block, 2014) means that progress in this field has been relatively slow. Having said this, there seems to be an increasing number of scholars who challenge this bias at various levels, and this article aims to add to this developing critical mass.

Indeed, existing theoretical evidence based on multilingual approaches to education (May, 2014; Gajo, 2014) is slowly being translated into practice – albeit often with local or regional contexts in mind. This evidence is based on projects such as those funded by the European Centre for Modern Languages programme (ECML, 2015) with a European focus, and projects with a focus on English dominant regions (García & Sylvan, 2011: Stille & Cummins, 2013), as well as proposals for integrated language curricula (e.g. FREPA, 2017; Meier, 2014a; Piccardo, 2013). All of these are highly relevant, as they suggest cross-linguistic or plurilingual approaches to language learning and education more widely and are aimed at teachers, parents and policy makers. This article will add to this body of research and guidance, by translating theory into practical suggestions that can potentially be used by educational stakeholders and researchers in a variety of geographical, socio-political and linguistic contexts.

This article is a theoretical review, insofar as I "examine the corpus of theory that has accumulated in regard to an issue, concept, theory, phenomena", in which "the unit of analysis can focus on a theoretical concept or a whole theory or framework" (University of Alabama Libraries 2017: 1). In my case this is a framework combining theories related to a critique of monolingual norms from multilingual education, sociolinguistic and language socialisation perspectives. I thus develop the argument that it is important to examine how people use and present languages in education, and combine this with research that indicates what people could do to understand current social representations and bring about change – should this be desired. The aim of this review is to examine relevant bodies of literature and show the links between them. This will question and at the same time consolidate existing perspectives on monolingual and multilingual approaches to language socialisation, and develop ideas of how to support all educational stakeholders to become more aware of what linguistic norms and choices mean for people and societies. The findings are combined into the multilingual socialisation in education (M-SOC) approach that is designed to work towards a "viable alternative" (Ortega, 2014) and consists of five domains. In order to operationalise the M-SOC domains and make these more user-friendly, I develop a number of guiding statements, which can be found in the Appendix. These 96 statements are based on existing frameworks, literature and my own experience as explained in section 4. This framework is neither conclusive nor definitive, as there must be much good practice in educational settings that is yet to be discovered, but it can be used to get the ball rolling, and hopefully attract wider interest to conduct research in this field.

In the following, I show my thinking behind the M-SOC approach that is appended to this article. I first review literature that enables me to unpack the various types of monolingual norms and potential multilingual alternatives and the domains in which they occur. I then draw on language socialisation literature to present the previously under-developed concept of multilingual socialisation in education (M-SOC), identify domains or subcategories as part of a definition, and translate these into guiding statements. The last step is to issue a call for educational colleagues in research and practice to participate in collective research action.

2.   Monolingual norms recognised and challenged

In this section, I will provide an overview of tensions that exist between monolingual norms and their alternative, multilingual approaches to understanding education. As outlined above, the monolingual bias arguably pervades social representations (Gajo, 2014; Grosjean, 1982), including mind-sets in governments (Cruickshank, 2014), nation building (Wright, 2004), educational politics (May, 2014), schools (Gogolin, 1994; Conteh, Copland & Creese, 2014), language education (May, 2014: Ortega, 2014), and individuals' beliefs (Conteh, Copland & Creese, 2014). Lengyel's (2017) review of multilingual research shows that the monolingual bias must be fictional, at least to some extent, as multilingualism can similarly be found in society (existence and vitality of several languages in a society), as social functions (functions of languages in a society), in institutions (multilingual practices in organisations) and in individuals (as a state, as dynamic linguistic development and as communicative repertoire). My review has shown that the literature relating to monolingual and multilingual understandings can be found at different levels, from supra-national organisations to educational institutions and practice, including the development of self-concepts, as explained in the following sections.

2.1   Supra-national and national domain

Interestingly, at supra-national level, specifically at European and UN level, we can find promotion of multilingualism (European Commission, 2008a, 2008b), multilingual education (UNESCO, 2010), explicit articles against discrimination based on language (UNESCO, 2001), and protection of language diversity (Council of Europe, 2007). In contrast, countries and regions and mainstream educational systems are often constructed as monolingual, based on various historical developments; above all, based on the nation-building projects in the 19th and early 20th century, during which education was established as a promoter of the "one-nation-one-language" doctrine (Wright 2004). Nowadays, we can observe similar tendencies, which can be associated with an assimilationist or exclusive approach to the integration of diverse linguistic groups, especially those with a migrant or indigenous background, such as in the USA "where mainstream interests try to suppress or downplay multilingualism and multiculturalism" (Watson-Gegeo, 2004). In a similar vein, variations of the standard school language, such as dialects, have in many contexts been associated with uneducated classes (Soto & Kharem, 2010) and are therefore stigmatised as "other". This is related to Lamb's (2001) argument that some types of bi/multilingualism are welcomed and others are denigrated by society, suggesting that monolingualism and bi/multilingualism are not linguistic categories, but political or ideological ones.

2.2   Educational institutions

Following from the above, some authors argue that the way people deal with languages in schools can be based on racist (Lindholm-Leary, 2001), nationalist (Edwards, 2004), or classist (Soto & Kharem, 2010) agendas. This means that the way educational institutions present themselves linguistically says something about a hidden ideology, or perhaps that they take monolingualism for granted. Such a monolingual approach, thus, constructs monolingual speakers of the dominant standard language as the norm, and effectively constructs some people, some languages and some dialects as less valuable. Some argue that organising school and learning around the dominant standard language amounts to institutionalised discrimination (Cummins, 2001; Gomolla & Radtke,

2007; Stanat & Christensen, 2006) that systematically disadvantages children with non-standard or non-dominant language backgrounds. Depending on an individual's world view, some people would, therefore, welcome linguistic diversity based on inclusive values, while others may see this as a threat to their children's learning and society more widely (Baker 2006). Others might reproduce monolingual norms, as this is what they have experienced themselves through their own language socialisation (Kubota & Lin, 2010). Regardless of ideology or socialisation, teachers may also support monolingual practices because it appears a practical and easy option, because there is a lack of guidance (Weber, 2014, Meier, 2017, Young, 2014), or because the use of multilingual methods goes "against the grain for language teachers who are used to supporting learners to master the intricacies of a single language" (EAL, 2016).

Nowadays, societies and teachers have largely recognised that school populations are often multilingual (Gajo 2014; Young, 2014) due to globalisation and migration, as well as in officially or unofficially multilingual regions. Some education authorities, schools, teachers and researchers have responded to this with multilingual projects, such as bilingual programmes, e.g. CLIL (Breidbach, Viebrock & Meehisto, 2012) or two-way immersion programmes (Meier, 2012), multilingual curricula (Meier, 2014a), plurilingual education models (Esteve et al., 2017) or innovative projects (e.g. Anderson & Chung, 2014). In many countries, however, monolingual school practice, with a foreign language component, similar to my schooling in the 1970s in Switzerland, is still the norm, and in some instances, the use of children's home languages at school may be seen as a problem (Young, 2014) or even be prohibited (Stubbs, 1985). Even in bi-/multilingual programmes languages are sometimes separated into two distinct monolingual streams (Cummins 2008).

Language education is based on the way we understand languages, and how we view the people who speak these. The idea that languages are homogenous and territorially anchored has been uncovered as a myth, based on the observation that there are many varieties of a language, of which standard language is just one. Along those lines, English, for instance, has been redefined as World Englishes (Jenkins, 2006), as influenced by other locally spoken languages (Farr, 2011) and as a pluricentric language (Kachru, 1997) that does not belong to one particular country, but is owned by those who use it as first or additional language. Of course, this is also the case for other languages, such as German and Spanish, or indeed any language, as they are used in different ways within and beyond national boundaries. Furthermore, the idea that languages are discrete and stable is a misconception, since languages influence, and are in contact with each other, rather than developing in a vacuum (Winford 2002). English is, again, a case in point as this has been influenced by many different languages. However, awareness of the historic evolution and dynamic nature of a language and its varieties is not often part of language education, and languages are largely treated as fixed and stable, based on a certain standard variety (Dunstan & Jaeger, 2015). This reinforces the position of the dominant standard language and the monolingual mind-set from a linguistic point of view.

2.3   Cognitive development and language learning

The notion of bilingualism as harmful to the cognitive development of children, which was commonly believed to be the case up to the 1960s (Baker 2006), has been disproven by recent developments in neuroscience. These have shown that bilinguals can in fact have cognitive advantages (Kroll et al., 2013; Bialystok & Craik, 2010). Furthermore, the idea that a bilingual person can be compared to two monolinguals in one has also been rejected by research that shows that "users of two languages possess not only knowledge and ability in each language, but also an added knowledge that comes

from knowing two language systems" (Lantolf &Peohner, 2008: 352). Indeed, the assumption that languages can be separated in the brain of a learner has been deemed untenable by sociolinguists (Blommaert & Backus, 2011) and neuroscientists (Kroll et al. 2013; Lowie et al. 2014). Their argument is that plurilinguals possess an added linguistic awareness that monolinguals do not. However, as will be seen below, I query the validity of separating learners into monolinguals and multilingual/plurilinguals, as this could lead to problematic and reified essentialist representations or labels (Sarroub & Quadros, 2015, Kibler & Valdes, 2016).

Depending on beliefs about how language learning works, teaching methods have changed over the years. If the goal of language education is so-called native-speaker competence, which is still widely upheld (Holliday & Aboshiha, 2009), language education is largely modelled on the assumption that first and second language acquisition are similar. In this case monolingual input is assumed to be most efficient to learn a new language (Krashen, 1985). "The efficacy of [monolingual] immersion as an approach to foreign language learning" (Schuler, 1987, p. 21) has been critiqued (Selvi, 2014) since then, namely that attention to linguistic form is neglected, and that other previously learnt languages are disregarded as a resource for learning (Cummins, 1979; Kumaravadivelu, 2005; Moore, 2013). Alternatively, if we understand learning in a constructivist way, namely that learners build on what they know already when they deal with new knowledge, either understood through schema theory (Piaget, 1964; McVee et al., 2005) or socio-cultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978; Lantolf, 2011), we need different teaching methods that logically incorporate all previous language and language learning knowledge. Having said that, a multilingual approach to learning and teaching neither means that all monolingual practice needs to be shunned, as this may well have its place, especially in foreign language education, nor that a laissez-faire approach should be adopted, where individuals use any language they like (Moore, 2013). Instead, I argue that any linguistic choices should be guided by an awareness of what this might mean for learners.

2.4   Teaching practice

Indeed, there have been developments away from language separation towards what Jessner (2009, p. 123) refers to as "a sort of cross-fertilization" between languages. The cross-fertilisation that Jessner has in mind can be between the first and second, or between any languages a person knows. This means that the learner's first language is "a naturally occurring phenomenon in the L2 classroom at the levels of external, private, and inner speech, and it may be drawn on either explicitly or implicitly for a variety of reasons" (Moore, 2013, p. 243). Some even argue that "the mother tongue [or first language] is the greatest asset people bring to the task of foreign language learning and provides a language acquisition support system" (Butzkamm, 2003, p. 29). From this it follows that the first language, and other languages, can play a positive role in learning a new language. However, this cross-fertilisation does not happen automatically (Elsner, 2011; Wilden & Porsch, 2015), and teachers and learners need guidance. Based on this, the understanding of monolingual and sequential language acquisition have been challenged by new fields of research, namely multilingual learning strategies (Dimitrenko, 2017; Kemp 2007; Psaltou-Joycey & Kantaridou, (2009), language transfer (Kemp, 2007; Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008), multilingual awareness (Hawkins, 1984; Jessner, 2009; FREPA, 2013), translanguaging (García & Leiva, 2012), intercomprehension (FREPA, 2013), and multilingual education (Cenoz, 2012) that builds on existing linguistic and language learning knowledge. These approaches suggest that language learning can be a multilingual parallel, and is not necessarily a monolingual sequential, pursuit, and that multilingual awareness and multilingual

learning strategies may facilitate the process. However, as outlined above, learners, teachers and teacher educators may still understand learning of a new language as a monolingual activity, which is hindered by prior language knowledge. An additional complication regards skills evaluation, as this is usually conducted monolingually, and the additional knowledge that bilinguals may develop (Lantolf & Peohner, 2008), such as bi/multilingual strategies to education or language learning is not routinely recognised or assessed. Gorter & Cenoz (2011, p.445) point out that there are some indications of how multilingual assessment could be done in practice but that "there is still a long way to go". Be this as it may, monolingual teaching is still widespread, e.g. through using English as a medium of instruction (van der Walt 2013), the communicative approach and immersion education (Hu, 2008), and the native-speaker norm (Holliday & Aboshiha, 2009) as described below.

2.5   Self-concepts and identity

The idea that native-speakers are the ultimate role models for language learners is particularly ingrained, perhaps based on the fact that a whole workforce of so-called native-English speaking teachers are advantaged by this understanding (Kubota & Lin, 2006). For language teachers this can negatively affect employment prospects if they are not considered as a native speaker of the language they are employed to teach (Holliday & Aboshiha, 2009). The un-reflected acceptance of this can negatively affect the self-concepts of teachers (He & Zhang, 2010), a phenomenon that is rather common in international English teachers (Bernat, 2008). Similar to my own biography, Ortaçtepe (2015) found that an opportunity to reflect on this and develop as professional teachers, as English users and as scholars can lead to more confident professional identities. Furthermore, the native-speaker model has been challenged in several ways (Jenkins, 2009; Canagarajah, 2005; Davies, 2003): it is difficult to define what native-speaker competence is, language learners are more likely to speak to other non-native speakers, for many learners a foreign-accent free pronunciation may be difficult to achieve, or not even desirable, and being a native speaker is no pedagogic qualification. This critique led to the idea of English as an International Language or lingua franca (Jenkins, 2006), suggesting that there are certain features of a language that are required to enable comprehension. In sum, the native-speaker norm is one of the most persistent monolingual assumptions that is widely accepted among learners, teachers, employers and the wider society (Lee & Sze, 2015).

In the literature, I identified interrelated factors that can lead to the development of negative self-concepts as a plurilingual person, based on monolingual norms, such as language achievements being graded in isolation from one another and multilingual knowledge not normally being assessed (Meier, 2014a). Furthermore, simplistic, and essentialist categorisations of people into bilinguals and monolinguals with different linguistic needs is highly problematic but widespread (Meier, 2017). Upholding the un-reflected native-speaker goal for modern foreign languages can be frustrating and can lead to feelings of inferiority and lack of legitimacy as linguistic experts (McKay, 2002), even at high levels. Understanding 'culture' as linked to a language, e.g. US or UK 'culture' linked to English, is also problematic, as this can reinforce the feeling of inferiority in 'non-native' speakers (Schirmer Reis, 2011). The assumption that 'native'-speakers 'own' the language, and that without knowing the respective 'cultures' one cannot be a legitimate language teacher (McKay, 2002) can further strengthen the negative self-evaluation of learners and teachers. This means that monolingual assumptions in education can lead to deficit identities and self-concepts.

3.   Language socialisation

In the overview above, I showed that there are ideological, theoretical, pedagogical, practical and academic tensions between mono- and multilingual approaches to education. This means that depending on our assumptions and ideological view points, societies, educational institutions, teachers, learners and researchers can either perpetuate or transform the way we represent the world to young people, and the messages we convey through this.

Concerns of ideology, social representations, norms, practices and identities are also a concern of language socialisation perspectives (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). There is agreement that language socialisation is about production and reproduction, as well as about change and transformation of social reality (Garret & Baquedano-López, 2002; Watson-Gegeo, 2004; Friedman, 2010). Language socialisation can be understood as "meaningful action that occurs routinely in everyday life, is widely shared by members of the group, has developed over time, and carries normative expectations about how it should be done" (Moore, 2005, p. 72). Thus, educational environments socialise learners into seeing the world in a certain way through every-day practice, which is based on prevailing ideologies (Duff & Talmy, 2011), as for instance the preference for monolingual or multilingual practice. Duff (1995) argues that there is a reciprocal relationship between what people do (language practices and social interaction) and how people think, behave and feel about what they do (domains of knowledge, beliefs, emotions, roles, identities and social representations).

There is the idea that structural constraints may dictate certain behaviours and understandings, but that individuals also have agency or power to consciously accept, reject or overcome the structural norms and expectations imposed. Some recent research suggests that linguistic identities are not imposed, but that they are "defined, negotiated, and resisted" in social environments (Norton & McKinney, 2011, p. 77). An important problem in relation to this, however, is that such "social structures are often hidden and taken for granted" (Watson-Gegeo, 2004, pp. 338-339). This means that potential agents are often not conscious of the structures or norms that exist, and thus may not be able to consciously recognise any structural limitations or expectations, let alone resist these. In order to gain agency and make potential changes, individuals need to be aware that norms and structures exist. To this end, it is important for teachers to become aware of prevalent linguistic norms.

Friedman (2010) describes the powerful roles of teachers in the linguistic socialising process of students which, she argues, can lead to social change. Indeed, research shows that teachers can transform their own beliefs through reflection on "biographical factors (e.g. the teacher's personal history, experience as a learner), contextual factors (e.g. interactions with students and institutional resources), and dialogic factors (e.g. the teacher's knowledge of theories of teaching and learning)" (Uzum, 2017 p. 241), as well as through intensive dialogue between researchers and language teachers, such as through teacher education. Thus, they can "counteract the perceived inferiority" of international English teachers (Schirmer Reis, 2011, p. 47; Pavlenko, 2003) and thus enable more positive self-concepts as plurilingual teachers with greater awareness.

My literature review indicates that *multilingual socialisation* is not often used as a research perspective and not well defined, with the notable exception of Garret & Baquedano-López (2002). Their anthropological review found that relevant research was conducted in small-scale societies in particular contexts: post-colonial contexts; ties with distant metropoles; indigenous, urban and diasporic communities; and schools, workplaces and family interactions as embedded in larger socio-political contexts. Multilingual socialisation, according to them, is about languages (real or perceived)

and how they constitute or reinforce notions of "ethnicity, nationality, race, class, gender, religiosity, and generation" (p. 350), as well as about language change, shift, maintenance and loss. However, they did not specifically examine the role of educational institutions and/or teachers in this, which is the focus of this article.

4.   Developing a multilingual socialisation in education approach

The way I define multilingual socialisation in education starts with Garret & Baquedano-López's (2002, p. 355) idea that language socialisation can be evident "in language as a formal system, of social structures, and of cultural knowledge and practices" and that it can be "central to – and in some cases a driving force in – dynamic processes of transformation and change" (Garret & Baquedano-López, 2002, p. 355). There are important parallels between this definition and the literature I reviewed under point 2, which shows that monolingual – or multilingual – norms can be represented in domains of socio-political ideologies, wider school, school practice, language itself, learning and teaching, as well as identity and self-concepts. These domains resonate with Duff's (1995) domains of language socialisation, roles and social representations, practice, knowledge and beliefs, as well as emotions and identity, and with Duff & Talmy's (2011) notion of every-day practice. Based on this I see multilingual socialisation in education as a driving force for change, in the form of an alternative structure for holistic reflection and potential transformation. Based on my literature review, I suggest that a multilingual socialisation approach for educational settings needs to consider language socialisation in five domains.

Domain 1: Normalising multilingualism in educational environments

As shown in 2.2, understanding educational settings as multilingual institutions can be beneficial to reduce linguistic discrimination, and develop more inclusive social structures that welcome linguistically diverse learners, teachers and parents. I suggest that by combining thoughts on creating positive learning environments (Dörney, 2001) and the understanding of multilingual learning environments (e.g. Edwards, 1998, Piccardo, 2013) can potentially make the learning environment more holistically inclusive, where learners, teachers and parents can belong because they speak various languages and not despite this. The guiding statements 1-18 (Appendix) incorporate the normalisation of plurilingualism or personal multilingualism (Conteh, Begum & Riasat, 2014; Piccardo, 2013; Edwards, 1998), relationships between teachers, learners and parents (Dörnyei, 2001; Edwards, 1998) and a pleasant and cohesive school climate (Dörnyei, 1997; 2001; García & Slyvan, 2011) to affect the social representation of languages in the wider school environment.

Domain 2: Multilingual educational practice and multilingual awareness

Multilingual awareness is about activities that foster curiosity and reflection on different languages, including those "which the school does not intend to teach", e.g. languages spoken in the local society, at home and in the world (FREPA, 2013, p. 31). These are not recent ideas; in fact, Hawkins (1984) proposed similar ideas more than 30 years ago. Meta-linguistic awareness is also about being aware of other people's developing plurilingual repertoires, such as those of teachers and peers, family members and other role models such as celebrities (Edwards & Pritchard Newcombe, 2006). Two types of language awareness have been identified: linguistic awareness is "one of the key factors

of multilingual proficiency", and metalinguistic awareness refers to the understanding of language and language learning (Jessner, 2009, p. 120). Drawing on Dörnyei's (2001) and Oxford's (2011) frameworks in combination with literature from the field of multilingualism (e.g. Jessner, 2009; Klein, 1995), statements 19-41 (Appendix) were developed. These focus on the promotion of initial enthusiasm (Dörnyei, 2001), interest and curiosity in languages and multilingualism (Jessner, 2009). They also suggest activities to enable reflection on what languages and multilingualism mean to people (Galling, 2010; Hawkins, 1999) and societies (Pennycook, 2001). In addition to this, they incorporate ideas on teachers' and learners' understanding language learning (FREPA, 2013; Lantolf & Peohner, 2008) and strategies (Oxford, 2011), linguistic repertoires (Galling, 2010; Klein, 1995), and the wider organisation of language use in society (Pennycook, 2001), in school (Dörneyi, 2001), and the planning (Dörnyei, 2001; Dörneyi & Hadfield, 2013) of multiple language learning.

Domain 3 and 4: Cross-linguistic approach to form and communication

Based on Griffiths (2008) and Nassaji (2000), I will make a distinction between form-focussed and communication-focussed learning, but readers need to bear in mind that they cannot be separated neatly in practice (Canagarajah, 2009). Having said this, in a language lesson it needs to be clear whether the objective is to understand certain linguistic features (form) or to get across meaning (communication). Consequently, I build on Oxford's (2011) largely monolingual strategy approach and on Dimitrenko's largely cognitive M-SILL framework (2016), and add social and affective domains to develop form- and communication-focussed strategies.

Cross-linguistic form-focussed strategies build on prior language knowledge that enables learners to compare and contrast different languages and gain awareness of any similarities and differences, thus developing a more integrated and cross-linguistic understanding of languages (Jessner, 2006). In terms of the M-SOC, Dimitrenko's M-SILL (2016, 2017) is of great value. Her framework suggests the use of many multilingual cognitive strategies to analyse and reason about languages, including transfer, interconnections, contrasting, translation and association between features of different languages. Statements 42-57 (Appendix) are designed to promote reflection on connections between languages (Dimitrenko, 2016) to enable a deeper understanding of how languages work, how they can be used as resources for learning (Oxford, 2011), how analytical abilities can be transferred from one language to another (Kemp, 2007).

Communication, for the purpose of this article, is about using languages for real communicative purposes to develop receptive (reading, listening) and productive (writing, speaking) fluency and automaticity. Besides the monolingual communicative model of indirect language acquisition through extensive exposure to the new language (Krashen, 1985), there have been other communication-focussed bi-/multilingual approaches, such as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010), intercomprehension (FREPA, 2013; EuroCom, 2012; Galanet, 2014), and translanguaging (García & Leiva, 2012). These have been conceived for different purposes and learning contexts, and they have different learning objectives. Sceptics may argue that the aim of language learning is communication in one language. This is no contradiction, as preparatory processes, e.g. through translanguaging, may be multilingual but final products are normally expected in one language only. While these models highlight strategy development, there is a controversy about whether communication strategies can indeed be taught (Dörnyei, 1995). To this end, we need to find out to what extent and to what effect multilingual communication strategies can or cannot be taught in diverse learning contexts in different parts of the world, as suggested in

statements 58-78 (Appendix). These suggest the activation of prior linguistic and world knowledge (Coyle et al., 2010) through various techniques (Adamson & Coulson, 2015; García & Leiva, 2012; Rahmani Doqaruni, 2015), opportunities for real-life communication in one or more languages (García & Leiva, 2012; Coyle et al., 2010; Elsner, forthcoming), production and acceptance of communication in more than one language (Meier, 2014b; Carrasco Perea; 2010; Gajo, 2012; Meyer et al., forthcoming), focus on communication rather than correct language use (Canagarajah, 2009) and receptive understanding in related languages (FREPA, 2013).

Domain 5: Encouraging positive self-evaluation

This domain is inspired by the reminder that we should not underestimate the power of teachers to determine how students interpret their achievements and see themselves (Dörnyei, 2001) and the role they play in the language socialisation of learners (Friedman, 2010). This is based on the idea of supporting learners to take on autonomous roles, for instance as language researchers, explorers, detectives, analysts, collaborators, guides, local experts (Pohl, forthcoming), rather than focusing on achievements and deficits in one language alone. Statements 80-96 (Appendix) are based on the ideas of validating emerging and developing plurilingualism (Conteh & Meier, 2014), and the celebration of achievements (Dörnyei, 2001; Dörnyei & Hadfield, 2013), specifically plurilingual achievements (Dimitrenko, 2017) and identities (Conteh, Begum & Riasat, 2014; Jessner, 2009).

5.   Conclusion and implications

In this article, I combined understandings from the field of multilingualism in education with language socialisation perspectives to develop the multilingual socialisation in education (M-SOC) approach, which led to the recognition that there are five relevant domains: educational environments, language awareness, form- and communication focus, and (self-) evaluation. Thus, I developed the educational aspect of multilingual socialisation that had been mentioned only marginally by Garret & Baquedano-López (2002), and produced the M-SOC framework, which contains 96 guiding statements (see Appendix). These are designed to promote reflection, research and potential for social change, by suggesting a multilingual point of view where all languages and language varieties, including dominant, migrant, foreign, minority and signed languages, as well as dialects, are legitimised means of expression, and as potential resources for learning. This view understands educational environments as spaces, where all learners, teachers and parents feel they can potentially belong as legitimate members, whatever their linguistic backgrounds.

The M-SOC approach has, however, a potentially wider remit than making people more legitimate members of educational environments. In the world marked by conflicts and social divisions, as witnessed at the time of writing, it might be helpful to develop the idea of a common human condition as plurilingual citizens. Whether or not this is desirable in certain contexts depends on prevailing ideologies (Duff & Talmy, 2011) and other reasons, as discussed above. This means that the M-SOC approach may not be acceptable to all groups, but it may help a bottom-up movement to encourage greater linguistic consciousness to enable stakeholders to make more informed linguistic choices, rather than perpetuating monolingual norms without being aware of this.

To conclude, it is important to note that the M-SOC approach and the statements in the Appendix have not been validated through research yet, and educators need to use their understanding of the local circumstances to decide for themselves which M-SOC statements, plus any of their own ideas,

could possibly and practically be implemented for which purpose in their local classrooms without offending local sensitivities. Alongside any informal trials, we now need collective research so we can validate, reject and adapt the current version of the M-SOC framework in the future. For this purpose, I invite any interested teachers of languages and other subjects at all levels of education and in different geographical locations to get in touch with me, so they can find out more about how they can participate in the international M-SOC research project set up at the University of Exeter. Together we might then make a difference in terms of how we understand ourselves as language learners and teachers and how we socialise future generations linguistically – and potentially more inclusively.

Acknowledgements

References

Adamson, J., & Coulson, D. (2015). Translanguaging in English academic writing preparation. International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning, 10(1), 24-37.

Anderson, J., & Chung, Y.-C. (2014). Transforming Learning, Building Identities, Arts-based Creativity in the Community Languages Classroom. In J. Conteh & G. Meier (Eds.), The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges (278-291). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (2006). Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism (4thd Edition). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bernat, E. (2008). Towards a pedagogy of empowerment: The case of 'impostor syndrome' among pre-service non-native speaker teachers in TESOL. ELTED, 11, 1-8.

Bialystok, E., & Craik, F. I. M. (2010). Cognitive and linguistic processing in the bilingual mind. Curr.Dir. Psychol.Sci., 19, 19-23.

Block, D. (2014). Moving beyond "Lingualism": Multilingual Embodiment and Multimodality in SLA. In S. May (Ed.), The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual Education (54-77). New York: Routledge.

Blommaert, J., & Backus, A. (2011). Repertoires revisited: 'Knowing language' in superdiversity. Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies, Paper 67.

Breidbach, S., Viebrock, B., & Meehisto, P. (Eds.). (2012). Special issue on CLIL in Germany.

Busch, B. (2012). The Linguistic Repertoire Revisited. Applied Linguistics, Advance Access, 1-22. Retrieved Oct., 20, 2017, from: http://www.heteroglossia.net/fileadmin/user_upload/ publication/2012-Busch-Applied_Ling.pdf.

Butzkamm, W. (2003). We only learn language once. The role of the mother tongue in FL classrooms: death of a dogma. The Language Learning Journal, 28, 29-39.

Canagarajah, A. S. (Ed.). (2005). Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Canagarajah, S. (2009) Multilingual strategies of negotiating English: From conversation to writing. JAC, Vol. 29, No. 1/2 (2009), 17-48.

Canagarajah, S., & Liyanage, I. (2012). Lessons from precolonial multilingualism. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge, & A. Creese (Eds.), The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism (49-65). London: Routledge.

Carrasco Perea, E. (Ed.) (2010). Intercompréhension(s) : repères, interrogations et perspectives (Vol. 5): Gerflint.

Cenoz, J. (2012). Third language acquisition. In The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Conteh, J., & Meier, G. (Eds.). (2014). The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Conteh, J., Begum, S., & Riasat, S. (2014). Multilingual Pedagogy in Primary Settings: From the Margins to the Mainstream. In J. Conteh & G. Meier (Eds.), The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges (211-233). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Conteh, J., Copland, F., & Creese, A. (2014). Multilingual Teachers' Resources in THree Different contexts: Empowering Learning. In J. Conteh & G. Meier (Eds.), The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges (158-178). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Council of Europe. (2001). The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR): Cambridge University Press.

Council of Europe. (2007). European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, CETS, no. 148. Retrieved March, 2, 2018, from: http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/ ChercheSig.asp?NT=148&CM=&DF=&CL=ENG.

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning. Cambridge: CUP.

Cruickshank, K. (2014). Exploring the -lingual Between Bi and mono: Young People and Their Languages in an Australian Context. In J. Conteh & G. Meier (Eds.), The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges (41-63). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic Interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. Review of Educational Research, 49, 222-251.

Cummins, J. (2001). Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Cummins, Jim (2008). Teaching for Transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education. In J. Cummins & N. H. Hornberger (Eds). Encyclopedia of Language and Education Vol. 5: Bilingual Education (2nd edition edition). Boston: Springer Science + Business Media.

Davies, A. (2003). The Native Speaker: Myth and Reality. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Dmitrenko, V. (2016). Language Learning Strategies for the Development of Plurilingual Competence in European Languages in Adult Learners. Unpublished PhD thesis. Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra.

Dmitrenko, V. (2017). Language learning strategies of multilingual adults learning additional languages. International Journal of Multilingualism, 14(1), 6-22.

Dörnyei, Z. (1997). Psychological processes in cooperative language learning: Group dynamics and motivation. The Modern Language Journal, 81(4), 482-493.

Dörnyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. TESOL Quarterly, 29(1), 55-85

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom. Cambridge: CUP.

Dörnyei, Z., & Hadfield, J. (2013). Motivating Learning. London: Routledge.

Duff, P. (1995). An ethnography of communication in immersion classrooms in Hungary. TESOL Quarterly, 29, 505-537.

Duff, P., & Talmy, S. (2011). Language socialization approaches to second language acquisition: Social, cultural, and lingusitic development in additional languages. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), Alternative Approaches to Second Languge Acquisition (95-116). Abingdon: Routledge.

Dunstan, S. B. & Jaeger, A. J. (2015). Dialect and influences on the academic experiences of college students. The Journal of Higher Education, 86(5), 777-803.

EAL (2016) What is translanguaging? EAL Journal, 26 July. Retrieved Dec. 23, 2017, from: https://ealjournal.org/2016/07/26/what-is-translanguaging/.

ECML (2015) ECML programme 2012-2015: "Learning through languages – Promoting inclusive, plurilingual and intercultural education". Retrieved Aug. 30, 2017, from: http://www.ecml.at/Portals/1/mtp4/ECML-publications-4mtp-EN.pdf.

Edwards, V. (1998). The Power of Babel: Teaching and Learning in Multilingual Classrooms. London: Trentham Books Limited.

Edwards, V. (2004). Multilingualism in the English-speaking World: Pedigree of Nations. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Edwards, V., & Pritchard Newcombe, L. (2006). Back to basics: Marketing the benefits of bilingualism to parents. In O. García, T. Skutnabb-Kangas, & M. E. Torres-Guzman (Eds.), Imagining Multilingual Schools: Languages in Education and Glocalization (Linguistic Diversity and Language Rights) (137-149). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Elsner, D. (2011). Developing multiliteracies, plurilingual awareness & critical thinking in the primary language classroom with multilingual virtual talking books. In EncuentroJournal 2/ 2011-12, 1-12. Retrieved March 2, 2018 from: http://ww.encuentrojournal.org/textos/Elsner.pdf.

Elsner, D. (forthcoming). CALL in Multilingual Settings. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Esteve, O., Fernández, F, Martín-Peris, E, & Atienza, E (2017). The integrated plurilingual approach: A didactic model providing guidance to Spanish schools for reconceptualizing the teaching of additional languages. Language and Sociocultural Theory 4(1), 1-24.

EuroCom (2012). Mehrsprachigkeit: Sprachen ohne Grenzen. Goethe-Institut. Retrieved Dec., 20, 2017, from: http://www.goethe.de/ges/spa/prj/sog/mud/en9227869.htm.

European Commission (2008a). Multilingualism, Intercultural Dialogue and Globalisation. Retrieved April, 30, 2009, from: http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/news/news3134_en.htm.

European Commission. (2008b). Multilingualism: an asset for Europe and a shared commitment. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Retrieved Sept., 7, 2009, from: http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/pdf/com/2008_0566_en.pdf.

Farr, M. (2011). Urban plurilingualism: Language practices, policies, and ideologies in Chicago. Journal of Pragmatics, 43(5), 1161-1172. DOI:10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.008.

FREPA (2013). Discovery module. ECML. Retrieved Aug., 29, 2017, from: http://carap.ecml.at/Teachertraining/Discoverymodule/tabid/2963/language/en-GB/Default.aspx.

FREPA (2017). FREPA in Europe … and beyond. ECML. Retrieved Aug., 30, 2017, from: http://carap.ecml.at/CARAPinEurope/tabid/3045/language/en-GB/Default.aspx.

Friedman, D. (2010). Becoming National: Classroom Language Socialization and Policial Identities in the Age of Globalization. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics. 30, 193-210.

Gajo, L. (2012). Intercompréhension, didactique intégrée et didactique du plurilinguisme : quels rapports, quelle hiérarchie, quelles compétences visées ? Paper presented at the Colloque IC 2012 : compétences, corpus, intégration - 21/23 juin 2012 Université Stendhal Grenoble 3 (France).

Gajo, L. (2014). From Normalization to Didactization of Multilingualism: European and Francophone Research at the Crossroads Between Linguistics and Didactics. In J. Conteh & G. Meier (Eds.), The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges (113-131). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Galanet (2014). Plateforme de formation à l'intercompréhension en langues romanes. Retrieved Dec., 20, 2017, from: http://deste.umons.ac.be/galanet/.

Galling, I. (2010). Sprachenporträts im Unterricht. Eine Unterrichtseinheit über Mehrsprachigkeit. In Fürstenau, S. & Gomolla, M. (Eds.), Migration und schulischer Wandel: Mehrsprachigkeit. 1-27.

García, O., & Leiva, C. (2012). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In A. Creese & A. Blackledge (Eds.), Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy (199-216). Dordrecht: Springer.

García, O., & Sylvan, C. E. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. The Modern Language Journal, 95(iii), 385-400.

Garrett, P.B. & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. Annual Review of Anthropology, 31, 339-361.

Gogolin, I. (1994). Der monolinguale Habitus der multilingualen Schule. Münster/New York: Waxman.

Gomolla, M., & Radtke, F.-O. (2007). Instiutionelle Diskriminierung: Die Herstellung ethnischer Differenz in der Schule (2nd Ed). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Gorter, D., & Cenoz, J. (2011). A multilingual approach: Conclusions and future perspectives: Afterword. The Modern Language Journal, 95(3), 442-445.

Griffiths, C. (2008) Strategies and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.) Lessons from Good Language Learners. Cambridge: CUP.

Grosjean, F. (1982). Life with Two Languages. An Introduction to Bilingualism. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hawkins, E. (1984). Awareness of Language: An Introduction. Cambridge: COP.

Hawkins, E. (1999). Foreign language study and language awareness. Language Awareness, 8(3&4), 124-142.

He, D., & Zhang, Q. (2010). Native speaker norms and China English: From the perspective of learners and teachers in China. TESOL Quarterly, 44(4), 769-789.

Holliday, A., & Aboshiha, P. (2009). The denial of ideology in perceptions of 'nonnative speaker' teachers. TESOL Quarterly, 43(4), 669-689.

Hu, G. (2008). The misleading academic discourse on Chinese-English bilingual education in China. Review of Educational Research, 78(2), 195-231.

Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2008). Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition. New York: Routledge.

Jenkins, J. (2006). Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA. International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 16(2), 137-162.

Jessner, U. (2006). Crystallizing linguistic awareness in multilingual education. In U. Jessner, (Ed.), Linguistic Awareness in Multilinguals: English as a Third Language. Edinburgh University Press. (Chap. 5: Crystallizing linguistic awareness in multilingual education, 120-139). Retrieved March, 2, 2018, from: http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1r27nr.

Kachru, B. B. (1997). World Englishes and English-using communities. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 17, 66-87.

Kemp, C. (2007): Strategic processing in Grammar learning: Do multilinguals use more strategies?. International Journal of Multilingualism, 4(4), 241-261.

Kibler, A. K., & Valdés, G. (2016) Conceptualizing language learners: Socioinstitutional mechanisms and their consequences. Modern Language Journal, 100(Supplement), 96-116.

Klein, E. C. (1995). Second versus third language acquisition: Is there a difference? Language Learning, 45(3), 419-466.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications. New York: Longman.

Kroll, J. F., Gullifer, J. W., & Rossi, E. (2013). The multilingual lexicon: The cognitive and neural basis of lexical comprehension and production in two or more languages. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 33, 102-127.

Kubota, R., & Lin, A. (2006). Race and TESOL: Introduction to concepts and theories. TESOL Quarterly, 40(3), 471-493.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2005). Understanding Language Teaching: From Method to Postmethod. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lamb, T. (2001). Language policy and multilingualism in the UK. Language Learning Journal, Summer 23(Multilingualism and the UK), 4-12.

Lantolf, J. P. (2011). The sociocultural approach to second language acquisition: Sociocultural theory, second language acquisition, and articial L2 development. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), Alternative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition (24-47). Abingdon: Routledge.

Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2008). Sociocultural Theory and the Teaching of Second Languages. London: Equinox.

Lee, I., & Sze, P. (2015). Being nonnative teachers and learners of English. In Voices from the Frontline: Narratives of Nonnative English Speaking Teachers (1-36). Sha Tin, N.T., Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.

Lengyel. D. (2017). Stichwort: Mehrsprachigkeitsforschung. Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft, 20(2), 153-174.

Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). Dual Language Education. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Lowie, W., R. Plat & K. de Bot. (2014). Pink noise in language production: A nonlinear approach to the multilingual lexicon. Ecological Psychology 26(3), 216-228.

May, S. (2014). The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual Education. New York: Routledge.

McKay, S. L. (2002). Teaching English as an International Language: Rethinking Goals and Approaches. Oxford: OUP.

McVee, M., Dunsmore, K., & Gavelek, J. (2005). Schema theory revisited. Review of Educational Research, 75(4), 531-566.

Meier, G. (2014a). Our mother tongue is plurlingualism: an orientation framework for integrated multilingual curricula. In J. Conteh & G. Meier (Eds.), The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges (132-157). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Meier, G. (2014b). "Cette entraide et ce tutorat naturel qui s'organise entre eux": A research framework for two-way bilingual immersion programmes. In N. Morys, C. Kirsch, I. de Saint-Georges & G. Gretsch (Eds.), Lernen und Lehren in multilingualen Kontexten: Zum Umgang mit sprachlich-kultureller Diversität im Klassenraum (Vol. 22, 47-68). Frankfurt a.M.: Lang.

Meier, G. (2017). The multilingual turn as a critical movement in education: assumptions, challenges and a need for reflection. Applied Linguistics Review, 8(1), 131-161.

Meier, G. (Ed.) (2012). Éducation bilingue en Europe et ailleurs: statu quo et itinéraires de recherche possibles (Vol. 7). Sylvains-les-Moulines: Gerflint.

Meyer, O., Coyle, Do, & Schuck, K. (forthcoming). Learnscaping – creating next-gen learning environments for pluriliteracies growth. In D. Elsner (Ed.), CALL in Multilingual Settings. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Moore, L. C. (2005). Language socialization. In Linguistic Anthropology, A. Sujoldzic (Section Ed.), Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems (EOLSS). Oxford: UNESCO.

Moore, P. J. (2013). An Emergent perspective on the use of the first language in the English-as-a-foreign-language classroom. The Modern Language Journal, 97(1), 239-253.

Nassaji, H. (2000). Towards integrating form-focused instruction and communicative interaction in the second language classroom: Some pedagogical possibilities. The Modern Language Journal, 84(2), 241-250.

Norton, B., & McKinney, C. (2011). An identity approach to second languge acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), Alternative Approaches to Second Languge Acquisition (73-94). Abingdon: Routledge.

Ortaçtepe, D. (2015). EFL teachers' identity (re)construction as teachers of Intercultural Competence: A language socialization approach. Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 14(2), 96-112.

Ortega, L. (2014). Ways forward for a bi/multilingual turn in SLA. In S. May (Ed.), The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual Education (32-53). New York: Routledge.

Oxford, R. (2011). Teaching and Researching Language Learning Strategies. Applied Linguistics in Action Series. Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited.

Pavlenko, A. (2003). "I never knew I was bilingual": Reimagining teacher identities in TESOL. Journal of Language Identity & Education, 2(4), 251-268.

Pavlenko, A. (2007). Emotions and Multilingualism. Cambridge: CUP.

Pennycook, A. (2001). Critical Applied Linguistics: A Critical Introduction. London: Lawrence Erlbaum associates.

Piaget, J. (1964). Development and learning. In R. E. Ripple & V. N. Rockcastle (Eds.), Piaget Rediscovered (7-19). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

Piccardo, E. (2013). Plurilingualism and curriculum design: Toward a synergic vision. Special topic issue: Plurilingualism in TESOL: 600-614.

Pohl, M. (forthcoming). (A) CALL for Slavic intercomprehension: The promotion of minority languages in the modern foreign language classroom. In D. Elsner (Ed.), CALL in Multilingual Settings. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Psaltou-Joycey, A., & Kantaridou, Z. (2009). Plurilingualism, language learning strategy use and learning style preferences. International Journal of Multilingualism, 6(4), 460-474.

Rahmani Doqaruni, V. (2015). A critical look at communication strategies: possibilities for future research, innovation. Language Learning and Teaching, 9(2), 130-142,

Sarroub, L., & Qudros, S. (2015). Critical pedagogy in classroom discourse. In M. Bigelow & J. Ennser-Kananen (Eds.), The Routledge Handbook of Educational Linguistics (252-260). New York & Abingdon: Routledge.

Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (Eds.). (1986). Language Socialization Across Cultures. Cambridge: CUP.

Schirmer Reis, D. (2011). I'm not alone. Empowering non-native English-speaking teachers to challenge the native speaker myth. In K. Johnson & P. Golombek (Eds.), Research on Second Language Teacher Education (31-41). Abingdon: Routledge.

Schuler, M. (1987). La ville et le cours: Bringing community resources into the French classroom. The French Review, 61(1), 21-32.

Selvi, A. F. (2014). Myths and misconceptions about Nonnative English speakers in the TESOL (NNEST) movement. TESOL J, 5, 573–611.

Soto, L., & Kharem, H. (2010). CHAPTER ONE: Engaging the world of teacher preparation on behalf of bilingual/bicultural learners. Counterpoints, 371, 7-18.

Stanat, P., & Christensen, G. (2006). Where immigrant students succeed: A comparative review of performance and engagement in PISA in 2003. Retrieved March, 4, 2018, from: http://www.pisa.oecd.org/dataoecd/1/57/36667942.doc.

Stille, S. & Cummins, J. (2013). Foundation for learning: Engaging plurilingual students' linguistic repertoires in the elementary classroom. TESOL Quarterly, 47(3), Special topic issue: Plurilingualism in TESOL: 630-638.

Stubbs, M. (1985). The Other Languages of England: Linguistic Minorities Project. London: Routledge.

UNESCO. (2001). Déclaration Universelle de l'UNESCO sur la diversité culturelle. Retrieved March, 4, 2018, from: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127160m.pdf.

UNESCO. (2010). Mother-tongue based multilingual education – a key to quality education Retrieved March, 4, 2018, from: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iJAatN4PMBA.

University of Alabama Libraries (2017). How to Conduct a Literature Review: Types of Literature Reviews. Retrieved Aug., 29, 2017, from: http://guides.lib.ua.edu/c.php?g=39963&p=253698.

Uzum, B. (2017). Uncovering the layers of foreign language teacher socialization: A qualitative case study of Fulbright language teaching assistants. Language Teaching Research 21(2): 241-257.

Van der Walt, C. (2013). Multilingual Higher Education: Beyond English Medium Orientations (Vol. Bilingual Education and Bilingualism). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30(6), 1024-1054.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Mind and Society: The Development of Higher Psycholigcal Processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Watson-Gegeo, K. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. Modern Language Journal, 68, 331-350.

Weber, J.-J. (2014). Flexible Multilingual Education: Putting Children's Needs First. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Wilden, E., & Porsch, R. (2015). Die Hör- und Leseverstehensleistungen im Fach Englisch von Kindern am Ende der Grundschulzeit unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von lebensweltlicher Ein- und Mehrsprachigkeit. In M. Kötter & J. Rymarczyk (Eds.), Englischunterricht auf der Primarstufe: Neue Forschungen - weitere Entwicklungen (59-80). Frankfurt a.M.: Lang.

Winford, D. (2002). An Introduction to Contact Linguistics. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Wright, S. (2004). Language Policy and Language Planning: From Nationalism to Globalisation. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Young, A. (2014). Looking through the language lens: Monolingual taint of plurilingual tint? In J. Conteh & G. Meier (Eds.), The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges (89-110). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Appendix: Multilingual socialisation in education (M-SOC) approach

It is neither expected nor necessary that teachers address all statements, but I invite teachers to select a small number of these to start with, guided by their knowledge of the local circumstances and their learners, and what they feel comfortable with. Furthermore, these statements may need adapting and expanding according to learner age, language level, languages present, interest, lesson purpose, etc. These statements were operationalised based on relevant literature as described in section 4 if this article.

Purpose	Teachers can…	
Domain 1: Creating a multilingual educational environment		
Develop a personal relationship with students	1.	Show interest in the languages, dialects and varieties learners speak, or are learning.
	2.	Invite students to bring in artefacts in different languages (music, posters, books, etc.)
	3.	Share language learning experiences with your learners.
	4.	Remind learners that people have different language repertoires and expertise, and that sometimes teachers can learn from students.
Develop a collabo-rative relationship with the students' parents/families	5.	Keep parents informed about all linguistic progress.
	6.	Show interest in languages parents can speak.
	7.	Ask parents for their assistance with multilingual homework where appropriate.
	8.	Give homework that requires engaging with relatives/neighbours who speak different first or additional languages.
	9.	Display multilingual artefacts to communicate the multilingual approach to education community.
Create a pleasant and supportive atmosphere in the classroom	10.	Establish a norm of tolerance of and interest in other languages.
	11.	Encourage trying out different and new languages.
	12.	Encourage the learners to personalise their classroom by putting up artefacts in different languages (not just those spoken or studied by learners).
	13.	Encourage learners to help each other using different languages.
Promote the development of group cohesiveness	14.	Use multilingual ice-breakers at the beginning of a course.
	15.	Regularly use small group tasks, where learners can interact in whichever languages are most useful.
	16.	Encourage, and if possible, organise extracurricular activities in different languages.
	17.	Include activities that lead to successful completion of both monolingual and multilingual group outcomes.
	18.	Promote the building of a multilingual group identity, based on all language (varieties) spoken and studied.
Domain 2: Thinking about languages, language ideologies and attitudes		
Demonstrate personal enthusiasm	19.	Refer to your own on-going language learning biography.
	20.	Share with students how knowing more than one language enriched your life and helps you to make sense of things.
Value developing multilingualism	21.	Discuss what languages mean to people, including 'languages I want to learn'
	22.	Have high expectations that all will work on expanding their linguistic repertoire.
Formulate language group norms explicitly	23.	Following language awareness activities, establish rules together with learners about when it is ok to use different languages and when not.
	24.	Put the group rules on display.
	25.	Make sure that you yourself observe the established norms consistently.
	26.	Never let any violations go unnoticed.

Promote under-standing of politics of language	27. Encourage learners to find out about the languages spoken in contexts they are familiar with (incl. minority, migrant, varieties of languages etc.). 28. Encourage learners to understand the rationale of language curricula in contexts they are familiar with. 29. Encourage learners to reflect on what status different languages have and why.
Promote pragmatic management of the language learning process	30. Promote awareness that both form-focussed study and extensive engagement is required to develop fluency and language development. 31. Encourage understanding that learners have an advantage if they learn a language similar to languages they know already. 32. Encourage learners to find out about the nature and difficulty of new languages they are interested to learn. 33. Encourage comparison of progress between a new language and achievements in other previously learnt languages.
Promote multilingual goal setting	34. Promote clear goal setting for each language learners are developing, including the level and the purpose. 35. Promote the development of a plan of how language goals can be achieved.
Promote under-standing of how languages can be learnt	36. Discuss with learners how they can be a better learner of languages. 37. Promote awareness of language learning techniques that are transferable to the learning of further languages. 38. Promote awareness that students develop several languages in parallel. 39. Encourage learners to talk to other multilinguals about how they have learnt their languages.
Promote emotional management of the language learning process	40. Remind learners to think about positive experiences in their other languages, when they feel tense or anxious about learning/using a new language. 41. Encourage understanding that using a new language is about trial and error, to encourage them to use their languages even when they are afraid of making mistakes.
Domain 3: Multilingual approach to form-focussed language learning	
Relate & compare new & prior language knowledge	42. Encourage the establishment and use of correspondence between a new language and the learners' other languages, in terms of grammar, sounds, vocabulary. 43. Encourage learners to think how they would express something in other languages.
Develop awareness of positive and negative transfer	44. Encourage the comparison of elements (sounds, vocabulary, grammar, structures) of a new language with the elements of other languages in order to recognise similarities and differences. 45. Encourage translation of new words into other languages to enable understanding and transfer. 46. Promote caution about transferring words and concepts directly from one language to another. 47. Promote understanding of interference between languages (for example, when applying grammatical rules from a first language which conflict with those of a new language). 48. Promote understanding that avoiding negative transfer requires an effort. 49. Promote understanding of English as a language influenced by many other languages, so that by knowing English a person has advantages in learning Germanic and Latin-based languages.

Develop deductive reasoning skills	50. Encourage learners to divide words or sentences they cannot understand into parts. 51. Encourage inferring the meaning of new words by analogy with words in other languages (for example, if nación = nation, then relación = relation). 52. Encourage learners to try to find rules or patterns in the target language to generate their own understanding. 53. Encourage learners to notice their errors and use that information to improve. 54. Encourage learners to gain awareness of morphology and etymology of words (e.g. Greek/Latin pre/suffixes).
Multilingual memory skills	55. Encourage memorising of new words or structures by relating them to words and structures known in another language (e.g. international or loan words).
Encourage the use of monolingual and multilingual resources	56. Encourage the use of both monolingual and bilingual dictionaries and grammar books and discuss the difference. 57. Encourage learners to ask other bi/multilingual people to explain if they are uncertain about a grammar or other language point.
Domain 4: Multilingual approach to communication-focussed language practice	
Activate prior knowledge in preparation of extensive language use	58. Encourage the use of resources in different languages to activate prior knowledge and prepare for extensive exposure in the new language. 59. Encourage inferring the meaning in a conversation or text using prior knowledge of languages, the topic, the situation or the world. 60. Encourage the use of all available information in the text to comprehend unfamiliar words (e.g., title, type and structure of the text, topic, and context). 61. Encourage learners to guess the meaning, when they don't understand all the words in a conversation, by using their knowledge of languages, the topic, the situation, and world knowledge.
Generate opportunities for exposure and practice	62. Generate and raise awareness of opportunities to use different languages. 63. Encourage use of educational (e.g. games, story apps) and authentic sources (e.g. TV, books, digital media). 64. Encourage reading in different languages without looking up every word. 65. Encourage internet use, blogging or broadcasting in a new language. 66. Encourage learners to socially interact with peers, and as they become more confident, with other multilingual and international people. 67. Encourage learners to think in a new language. 68. Encourage learners to think of many ways they can to use their languages (with peers, friends, relatives, through activities, internet, etc.).
Encourage acceptance of partial/integrated understanding	69. Encourage understanding the gist of spoken or written texts rather than word-for-word translation. 70. Encourage guessing based on other known languages.
Encourage acceptance of partial/integrated production	71. Encourage using words from other languages when learners don't know or can't remember a word in the required language. 72. Accept incorrect or incomplete production if the meaning is clear.
Encourage help seeking in social interaction situations	73. Encourage multilingual help seeking (clarifications, translation, paraphrasing) 74. Encourage use of all scaffolding available (audio, dictionaries, peers, contextual). 75. Encourage learners to ask their interlocutor to repeat in any other joint language when they don't understand something (to switch to another language).

Comparing languages for understanding	76. Encourage the use of other languages (e.g. words, concepts, structures) in order to understand or communicate in a new language. 77. Encourage the comparison with words from other languages when learners encounter unknown words. 78. Encourage the use or adaptation of words from other languages (e.g. adapt pronunciation or endings) when learners need these to express themselves.
Raise awareness of receptive language use	79. Encourage learners to try and get the gist from texts in a language similar to the one they know or are learning (e.g. read Italian texts, when learning Spanish).
Domain 5: Plurilingual approach to (self)evaluation	
Recognise learners' linguistic repertoires	80. Provide opportunities for learners to become aware of all the languages they can use and understand (plurilingual repertoire). 81. Discuss with your learners the limited usefulness of comparing oneself to so-called native speakers. 82. Notice and react to any positive contributions from your students, in all languages. 83. Provide regular feedback about the linguistic progress your students are making in all languages, and about the areas which they should particularly concentrate on.
Increase learner satisfaction	84. Monitor student accomplishment and progress in all languages, and take time to celebrate all language learning achievements. 85. Make student progress in all languages tangible by encouraging the production of visual records and arranging regular events using more than one language. 86. Regularly include tasks that involve the public display of all of the students' linguistic skills, however limited these are. 87. Include tasks that require creative goal-oriented behaviour and offer novel multilingual experiences.
Recognise multilingual awareness, strategy use and development	88. Provide grades/feedback that reflect effort and improvement, regarding metacognitive, cognitive and communication achievements. 89. Encourage accurate student self-assessment of plurilingual development by providing various self-evaluation tools.
Legitimate and validate all languages	90. Praise all curiosity about languages. 91. Recognise and celebrate as achievement all language knowledge a person has, including dialects and varieties as legitimate languages. 92. Regularly remind learners of their developing plurilingual repertoire.
Enable reflection on linguistic and meta-linguistic achievements	93. Recognise languages a learner would like to learn in the future and help create opportunities. 94. Encourage learners to claim ownership of new languages as legitimate users and members of the multilingual community. 95. Enable learner awareness of their own performance by reflecting on what went well or not so well. 96. Make learners feel they are special in being multilingual.