

THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF EDUCATION: (RE)THINKING LANGUAGE DIDACTICS AND PLURILINGUALISM



Ana Maria de Jesus Ferreira Nobre

Open University (UAb), Lisbon, Portugal

ana.nobre@uab.pt



Paula Alexandra Valente da Silva

Open University (UAb), Lisbon, Portugal

paula.alexandra.valente@gmail.com

Abstract: This article analyses the evolution of language didactics in the context of the internationalization of education, from monolingual teaching to plurilingualism and translanguaging. Using a narrative research approach, it explores pedagogical adaptations and emerging innovative practices in this field. The findings highlight the need for strategies that foster plurilingual competence and intercultural integration.

Keywords: Language Didactics; Internationalization of Education; Plurilingualism.

A INTERNACIONALIZAÇÃO DA EDUCAÇÃO: (RE)PENSANDO A DIDÁTICA DAS LÍNGUAS E DO PLURILINGUISMO

Resumo: Este artigo analisa a evolução da didática das línguas no contexto da internacionalização da educação, desde o ensino monolíngue até ao plurilinguismo e à translanguagem. Por meio de uma pesquisa narrativa, analisam-se as adaptações pedagógicas e as práticas inovadoras que emergem nesse cenário. Os resultados apontam para a necessidade de estratégias que promovam a competência plurilinguística e a integração intercultural.

Palavras-chave: Didática das Línguas; Internacionalização da Educação; Plurilinguismo.

LA INTERNACIONALIZACIÓN DE LA EDUCACIÓN: (RE)PENSANDO LA DIDÁCTICA DE LAS LENGUAS Y EL PLURILINGÜISMO

Resumen: Este artículo analiza la evolución de la didáctica de las lenguas en el contexto de la internacionalización de la educación, desde la enseñanza monolíngüe hasta el plurilingüismo y la translanguaje. A través de una investigación narrativa, se examinan las adaptaciones pedagógicas y las prácticas innovadoras emergentes en este ámbito. Los resultados destacan la necesidad de estrategias que fomenten la competencia plurilingüe y la integración intercultural.



Palabras clave: Didáctica de las lenguas; Internacionalización de la Educación; Plurilingüismo.

Received on: 2024-06-21

Accepted on: 2024-11-30

1 INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, education and language didactics have undergone significant transformations driven by theoretical advances and the demands of a globalized world. This article analyzes the evolution of language didactics, from traditional monolingual instruction to the promotion of plurilingualism and translanguaging, and emphasizes the necessary adaptations to address global social and cultural changes. The article explores how the internationalization of education has influenced language didactics, promoting inclusive approaches that value diverse linguistic and cultural interactions. The growing importance of plurilingualism in educational policies and school curricula demonstrates the relevance of this topic, as it prepares students for multicultural and multilingual environments (Depperu, 2012).

Language didactics has moved away from linear models that privileged native-speaker competence, adopting more inclusive paradigms. This change reflects the acknowledgment of plurilingualism and the incorporation of interdisciplinary approaches that consider the cognitive and emotional aspects of learning (Mesquita; Pinho; Andrade, 2016). The internationalization of higher education has prompted a reevaluation of teaching practices, emphasizing the preparation of students for multicultural and multilingual contexts. Implementing curricula that promote multilingual competence and student mobility are crucial strategies for responding to the demands of a globalized market (Silva; Sarmiento, 2015).

This study examines the political and ideological aspects of language didactics in an international context, as well as the associated methodology. The dominance of English as a global common language raises questions about preserving linguistic and cultural diversity, challenging educators to promote plurilingual education that values all involved languages and cultures (Hogetop, 2019). In the 21st century, internationalization permeates all sectors, including higher education and research, with institutions seeking to create a global community of knowledge.

To address these issues, this article is based on narrative research, integrating recent studies and theories on language didactics and the internationalization of education. Narrative research allows for an in-depth understanding of experiences and practices in education (Clandinin; Connelly, 2000). The study aims to identify effective practices for promoting plurilingualism and intercultural integration in education. Therefore, language didactics in an internationalized educational context requires a flexible and reflective approach that can integrate contributions from different disciplines

and respond to the needs of a constantly changing global society. This challenge implies adopting new methodologies and reconfiguring educational objectives to promote plurilingual competence and intercultural integration.

2 HISTORY OF LANGUAGE DIDACTICS: FROM MONOLINGUISTIC TEACHING TO PLURILINGUIISM

2.1 Historical, Epistemological, and Theoretical Developments Language Didactics

Since the 1990s, language didactics has evolved significantly, moving away from implicit positivism (Narcy, 1990). A complexity-based paradigm has been progressively adopted, reflecting a more integrated and interdisciplinary perspective (Condamines; Narcy-Combes, 2015). This transformation has been influenced by researchers from various academic backgrounds, ranging from Anglo-Saxon methodological studies (Seliger; Shohamy, 1989; Ellis, 1998) to French epistemological approaches, which have highlighted the importance of considering the sociocultural context in the production of knowledge (Bailly, 1997; Narcy-Combes, 2005).

Contemporary language didactic thinking is part of a broader epistemology of complexity framework that rejects positivist determinism and emphasizes context's influence on knowledge construction (Bourdieu, 1987; Morin, 2000). This theoretical framework is based on the notion that science is not a fixed set of truths but rather a continuous process of problem solving (Popper; Shearmur, 2000). From this perspective, challenges arise that require reassessing teaching practices, particularly concerning the validity of theoretical models and their social and educational implications (Macaire; Portine; Narcy-Combes, 2010; Liddicoat; Zarate, 2009).

The humanistic approach to education has also contributed to this transformation by highlighting the importance of affective dimensions in learning (Rogers, 1969). According to this paradigm, effective learning involves emotional and social factors in addition to an isolated cognitive process (Damásio, 1999; Aden, 2012). Therefore, language teaching must consider not only the acquisition of linguistic skills but also how individuals construct meaning and establish relationships on their educational journeys.

The growing complexity of language teaching has prompted researchers to take a more systemic approach, acknowledging that knowledge is not formed in a linear way but rather through

interaction with various sociocultural and institutional elements. This perspective emphasizes the importance of interdisciplinarity in research and pedagogical practice by articulating different areas of knowledge to address the needs of language teaching in a globalized world (Claverie, 2010).

2.2 From Applied Linguistics to Dynamical Systems Theory and Emergentism

Language teaching has moved away from traditional monolingual approaches and evolved toward models that incorporate interactive and nonlinear dynamics. According to Saussure (1967, apud Narcy-Combes, 2005), language stems from the interplay between the language faculty and the code that describes it. Initially, language didactics was closely linked to applied linguistics (Hymes, 1972; Wilkins, 1976; Coste; Moore; Zarate, 1997) and was based on enunciative theories (Bailly, 1997) and the native speaker model (Narcy, 1990). However, the implementation of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) marked a turning point by replacing this ideal with levels of linguistic competence (Mangiante; Parpette, 2004; Dalton-Puffer, 2007).

The development of neuropsychology has reinforced the idea that mental processes result from physicochemical interactions in the brain (Changeux, 1983; Buser, 1999), which has led to the distinction between assimilation and accommodation, or nativization and denativization (Anderson, 1993). While Chomsky (1965) argued for universal grammar as an innate mechanism, emergentist approaches suggest that language acquisition stems from intricate interactions between biological, cognitive, and social elements (Ellis, 1998). Rejecting the strict modularity of the brain and the parallel activation of linguistic codes in an individual's repertoire challenges the concept of monolingual learning (Herdina; Jessner, 2016).

The transition from the symbolic to the functional was accentuated by the contributions of dynamic systems theory and emergentism, which consider language acquisition a process of constant reorganization without a preestablished program (De Bot *et al.*, 2013; O'Grady, 2010). Thus, linguistic knowledge is progressively constructed through tasks adapted to individual contexts (Bygate; Skehan; Swain, 2001).

The introduction of Digital Information and Communication Technologies (DICT) has facilitated the management of complexity in language teaching (Lancien, 1998), promoting collaborative learning and the distributed construction of knowledge (Hutchins, 1995; Mangenot, 2001; Bertin, Grave; Narcy-Combes, 2010). These tools are associated with multilingual education

(Kalantzis; Cope, 2007) and multiliteracies (Molinié; Moore, 2012), and contribute to the development of metalinguistic awareness (Cenoz; Gorter, 2019) and the automation of cognitive processes (Penloup, 2012).

Emergentism and Dynamic Systems Theory help us understand how discourse structuring can be facilitated, highlighting the importance of social interaction in learning (O'Grady, 2010; De Bot *et al.*, 2013). These theories engage with Vygotskian and post-Vygotskian contributions, which emphasize the role of the sociocultural context in language acquisition (Lantolf, 2007; Van Lier, 2004; Peharek-Doehler, 2000).

3 INTERNATIONALIZATION OF EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE DIDACTICS

3.1 Current Context

The growing interdependence of nation-states is evident in the increased global flow of goods, capital, and information, as well as the emergence of transnational issues such as climate, health, and security crises. Reinforced in recent decades by globalization and the "digital revolution" (Mattelart, 2007; Rasse, 2005; Heinderyckx, 2015), this structural interconnection has profoundly changed social and professional practices, including those in education.

In higher education, these transformations have made internationalization a strategic priority for institutions (Beacco *et al.*, 2022; Cosnefroy *et al.*, 2020). Internationalization has taken various forms, including the harmonization of national systems (Bologna Process), the anglicization of courses, promoting student and teacher mobility (physical and virtual), inter-university cooperation, creating transnational academic networks, and developing local internationalization strategies (Beelen; Jones, 2015). Meanwhile, distance education and MOOCs have contributed to the globalization of training provision by promoting new dynamics in hybrid, flexible teaching and learning processes.

3.2 Approaches to Internationalization

Education has become a global phenomenon that transcends national borders, taking on the characteristics of a transnational education system and market. This process is articulated in multiple

dimensions—economic, technological, geopolitical, and international mobility—consolidating education as a driver of economic growth and a strategic instrument of global influence. Multinational education companies and international investments promote educational standards that tend to be uniform while driving student and teacher flows. As a form of soft power, education alters geopolitical balances and redefines relations between traditional and emerging powers.

3.2.1 Internationalization - an evolving concept

The internationalization of higher education is a dynamic process that is constantly redefined by the global context. Significant geopolitical transformations over the past fifty years, such as the end of colonial hegemonies, the collapse of the Cold War, and the rise of new economic powers, have reshaped the objectives and strategies of internationalization.

Globalization is currently the main driving force behind this process, promoting growing interdependence between countries in the economic, political, social, and cultural spheres. The mobility of goods, services, and people, as well as the advancement of information and communication technologies, facilitates the circulation of knowledge and intensifies transnational academic collaboration.

Internationalization takes different forms over time and across space. In the past, it meant the forced relocation of students to institutions of colonial powers. More recently, initiatives such as the Bologna Process have promoted coordinated structural reforms in European higher education. These examples demonstrate how internationalization responds to different objectives and brings its benefits and challenges.

The concept of internationalization has evolved to encompass a broader set of actors and purposes, reflecting the increasing complexity of the global landscape. Preserving institutional values and missions while balancing the multiple challenges and opportunities of this process requires continuously reassessing the approaches, terminologies, and conceptual frameworks that underpin it.

3.2.2 The changing nature of internationalization in the context of globalization

Internationalization has become central to defining the quality of higher education, prompting institutions around the world to expand their international activities. The academic benefits of this

process are well-recognized and include improved teaching, learning, and research; greater engagement with global challenges; and better preparation of students for an interconnected world. Additionally, internationalization facilitates access to innovative programs, promotes faculty development, and reduces the risk of academic "inbreeding" through international mobility.

Transnational collaboration strengthens research by enabling the exchange of knowledge and experience between scholars from different regions while improving institutional governance and student services. However, internationalization has also fostered competition among universities, where factors such as prestige, talent, and resources are increasingly important. National and international university rankings encourage institutions to adopt policies aimed at improving their global positioning. In some cases, this makes internationalization an instrument of competitiveness rather than a means of academic collaboration.

As higher education takes on the characteristics of a global "industry," the tension between commercial interests and academic values becomes evident, threatening to replace the cooperation that has historically sustained the process of internationalization.

3.2.3 Possible negative consequences of internationalization

Although internationalizing higher education has its benefits, it also presents significant challenges, including uneven distribution of benefits, cultural homogenization, and increased global competition. The predominance of English threatens linguistic diversity and makes it difficult to preserve other languages in higher education (Knight, 2002). Furthermore, adopting a single model of excellence centered on research can concentrate resources in a few institutions, which harms a diversified national system. This is a particular concern in developing countries (Knight, 2003).

Brain drain exacerbates these inequalities, hindering the academic and socioeconomic development of disadvantaged regions. The large-scale recruitment of international students, which is sometimes conducted through unethical practices, can create negative perceptions about the lack of opportunities for local students and obscure the intellectual and intercultural contributions of these students (Knight, 2002).

The rise of transnational programs and foreign campuses raises questions about the quality of education offered and its long-term impact on the educational development of host countries (Knight, 2003). The prestige associated with the presence of foreign institutions can weaken local universities,

and regulatory challenges make it difficult to monitor the quality of these programs.

The quest for institutional prestige and international rankings can cause universities to prioritize strategic partnerships based on global recognition, which excludes high-quality institutions with fewer resources (Knight, 2002; 2003). This asymmetry in access to international networks reinforces unequal relationships, favoring universities with greater financial capacity.

In the face of these challenges, it is crucial for higher education institutions to balance their academic, financial, and prestige objectives while ensuring that their internationalization efforts respect fundamental values such as cooperation, equity, and academic integrity. Continuously assessing the impact of global strategies is crucial to mitigating negative effects and ensuring that internationalization contributes to diversity and inclusion in higher education.

Internationalization, globalization, and the globalization of higher education reflect different levels of the integration of intercultural and international dimensions within institutions (Knight, 2002; 2003). Until the Bologna Process (1998), university cooperation was limited. Currently, three strategic approaches can be identified: (1) an absence of a defined strategy, (2) a flexible model granting autonomy to institutions, and (3) a more directive approach. In addition to enhancing a university's ranking, internationalization is recognized as a critical factor in improving the quality and relevance of teaching and research.

4 FROM THE LINEAR DIDACTIC MODEL TO PLURILINGUALISM AND TRANSLANGUAGING

4.1 Plurilingualism

The relationship between internationalization and multilingualism is inextricable. It's hard to imagine academic exchanges without knowing multiple languages. How could one participate in an international project, scholarship, co-supervision, or mobility program using only their native languages? We always refer to "foreign languages" in the plural because it is crucial to resist monolingualism and protect linguistic diversity. This is an unavoidable necessity. To better understand this issue, we will analyze multilingualism from two perspectives: the traditional and the contemporary.

Languages do not exist in isolation; they only make sense in relation to one another. As Dahlet

(2008) points out, a linguistic sign only assumes value in relation to another. For instance, when comparing Spanish and French, we see that the Spanish word "cáscara" is broader than the French equivalents: *côdea*, *casca*, *pele*, *concha*, and *casco*. Likewise, "poisson" has a more general meaning than "pez" and "pescado," since in Spanish, it is necessary to distinguish between live and dead fish. Another classic example is the French word "aimer", whose meaning becomes more precise when compared to "amar" and "gustar" (Klett, 2015, p. 7).

According to the traditional definition, plurilingualism refers to an individual, community, or country's ability to use multiple languages. However, this definition does not specify the required level of proficiency. Often, plurilingualism and equilingualism (balanced proficiency in multiple languages) are confused, which does not reflect the reality for most speakers, who use their languages asymmetrically and adaptively.

A study of 100 students (aged 18–24) examined social representations of multilingualism (Klett, 2015). The results showed that 60% of the respondents defined being multilingual as "knowing several languages well." The verbs used—such as to know, to study, to learn, and to master—were often accompanied by adverbs that emphasized a high level of competence, suggesting that, for many, multilingualism only exists when there is a solid command of languages.

However, there are different ways of understanding plurilingualism. Vigner (2008) distinguishes between elitist plurilingualism and plurilingualism out of necessity. In the former, it is found among cosmopolitan and globalized social classes, such as diplomats, artists, executives, and researchers, for whom mastery of several languages represents a competitive advantage. The latter involves migrants and refugees who develop adaptable and irregular linguistic repertoires shaped by the demands of everyday life. While the former is planned and valued, the latter emerges as a survival strategy. Adopting this broader view helps us understand why Vigner (2008) describes plurilingualism as a metacompetence, whereby the speaker learns to switch between languages according to life circumstances.

Conversely, Coste (2001) introduces the sociolinguistic concept of "linguistic repertoire." This concept describes the set of linguistic varieties that a speaker masters to varying degrees and uses according to the situation. Thus, Coste (2001) defines multilingual competence as the set of knowledge and skills that allow one to mobilize the resources of a multilingual repertoire, which contributes to its construction, evolution, and eventual reconfiguration. This perspective is reinforced by the Common European Framework of Reference (Concelho da Europa, 2001, p. 129, translated by

us), which defines multilingual and multicultural competence as “the ability to communicate linguistically and interact culturally, mobilizing a repertoire of several languages and cultures, managing it in an integrated way”.

The ideas of Vigner, Coste, and the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) converge on one essential point: language skills are not homogeneous. Each speaker's repertoire consists of languages developed at different levels. Thus, several researchers argue for asymmetry in language learning. They consider the real needs of learners to be a priority and believe that language teaching can focus on specific skills without requiring total mastery.

Hyperpolyglots, individuals who master 10 to 50 languages, are an exceptional phenomenon. Examples include the singer Georges Moustaki, the actor Yul Brynner, the professor Claude Hagège, and the writer Elias Canetti. However, the reality of language learning in schools is different. Most students learn one or two foreign languages. However, if the focus were on specific skills, it would be possible to acquire functional knowledge of several languages.

Lüdi (2000) argues,

Miquel's observation of Strubell is in favor of imperfection. In particular, we must have the courage to learn a language solely for the purpose of understanding it, even if we are unable to use it productively. Doubly asymmetrical bilingual communication, in which each person speaks and understands their own language, is of a completely different quality than communication in which each person bypasses the common lingua franca (Lüdi, 2000, p. 82, author's emphasis, our translation).

Similarly, Calvet (2004, p. 48, translated by us) suggests using passive understanding as a strategy to facilitate communication: "It is possible to train European employees to passively understand certain languages. Swedes and Danes, for example, would easily understand each other if they spoke their languages, just as Germans and Dutch or Italians, French, Portuguese, and Spanish speakers do." Eco (1994 [1993], p. 38, translated by us) elaborates on this concept, stating, "A Europe of polyglots is not a Europe of people who speak many languages fluently, but rather, a Europe of people who can meet each other, each speaking their language and understanding the others', without being able to speak them fluently".

4.2 Translanguaging

Currently, language didactics is undergoing a period of great turmoil, marked by scientific and

pedagogical debates that sometimes take on controversial overtones. For example, in French-speaking and European contexts (cf. Maurer, 2011), these debates have become particularly heated. The concept of translanguaging is part of this debate and refers to the fluid and simultaneous use of multiple languages and linguistic varieties. Initially developed in linguistics and language teaching, translanguaging has influenced teacher training and could potentially influence pedagogical practice.

As researchers and educators in multilingual settings, we acknowledge the potential of pedagogical translanguaging (Cenoz; Gorter, 2022), particularly in promoting linguistic diversity in the classroom. However, its global diffusion presents challenges. The term, imported from English without translation, risks becoming a "slogan," disregarding previous research on language teaching (Schmenk; Breidbach; Küster, 2019). Furthermore, the growing dominance of English in scientific and academic discourse reinforces linguistic asymmetries, influencing not only research but also educational policies.

Translanguaging approaches, such as those of García, Flores and Seltzer (2021), have ideological implications that can negatively impact institutional teaching. Uncritically applying these approaches in classrooms can harm students with smaller "linguistic repertoires," making it difficult to structure learning. Therefore, it is essential to critically reflect on the concept and its pedagogical repercussions to prevent it from becoming a generalized imposition unrelated to the real needs of educational contexts.

4.3 Translanguaging: A Worldwide Success

The effervescence of language didactics is reflected in the proliferation of neologisms associated with linguistic plurality (Marshall; Moore, 2018; Moore, 2020). Among the many terms created, the following stand out: heteroglossia (Bakhtin, 1982; Blackledge; Creese, 2016); transidiomatic practice (Jacquemet, 2005); flexible bilingualism (Creese; Blackledge, 2011); codemeshing (Young, 2013); polylingual languaging, polylinguaging, and polylingualism (Madsen, 2011); contemporary Urban Vernaculars (Rampton, 2011); Metrolingualism (Otsuji; Pennycook, 2011); Multilanguaging (Nguyen, 2012); Translingual Practice (Canagarajah, 2013); Multicompetence (Cook & Wei, 2016); Functional Multilingual Learning (Avermaet *et al.*, 2018); pedagogical translanguaging (Cenoz; Gorter, 2019; 2022); and crosslinguistic practices (Cummins, 2022). This list, far from being exhaustive, reflects the complexity and terminological diversity of the

field.

In Europe, research that underpins the study of plurilingualism and plural linguistic practices continues to be based on concepts such as plurilingualism (Coste; Moore; Zarate, 1997; Conselho da Europa, 2001; Lüdi; Py, 2009; Beacco *et al.*., 2016), plural approaches (Candelier, 2012), code-switching (Blom; Gumperz, 1972; Dabène; Moore, 1995), code-mixing (Muysken, 2005), interlinguistic influence (Cenoz; Hufeisen; Jessner, 2001), transcoding marks (Lüdi, 1995), code alternation or linguistic alternation (Billiez; Simon, 1998; Castellotti; Moore, 1999; Causa, 2002; Coste, 2000; Moore, 1996; Py, 2007).

Despite this conceptual diversity, translanguaging has emerged as the dominant concept. The term originates from the Welsh "trawsieithu" (Williams, 1994) and was first translated as "translanguaging" by Baker (2001), initially referring to a pedagogical practice in which students worked on content in one language and presented a final product in another. However, it was García's publication (2008, p. 42-51) that popularized the concept, introducing definitions that broadened its scope:

Translanguagings are multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds (p. 45);

[It] includes but extends what others have called language use and language contact among bilinguals (p. 46);

The notion [...] makes obvious that there are no clear-cut boundaries between the languages of bilinguals (p. 47) (= a languaging continuum);

[It] shifts the lens from cross-linguistic influence, proposing that what bilinguals do is to intermingle linguistic features that have hereto been administratively or linguistically assigned to a particular language or language variety (p. 51).

Prior to that, Grosjean (1982) described language alternation as a set of modes of bilingual functioning (bilingual and monolingual modes). Similarly, Lüdi and Py (2009) investigated the discursive practices of Spanish-speaking bilingual communities in Neuchâtel. However, García, Flores and Seltzer (2021, p. 214) criticized approaches based on distinct linguistic codes, rejecting the notions developed in Europe over the past two decades: "In line with the code- centered view of cross-linguistic transfer that we reject is a code- centered view of what is seen as the simultaneous use of multiple named languages that has typically been referred to in the literature as codeswitching."

We recognize the importance of García's research (2009 and subsequent publications) and the contributions of Cummins and Early (2011), Canagarajah (2013), and Kramsch (2010), who advocate for the pedagogical and identity-related valorization of multilingual students' languages. However,

emphasizing the application of translanguaging to the American migratory context reflects a specific perspective rooted in debates on race and discrimination in the United States (Little; Kirwan, 2019). While it is a valuable contribution, the concept of translanguaging does not introduce novel elements to existing European approaches.

Language teaching and bilingual education in Europe are based on over 70 years of scientific research (Weinreich, 1953) and decades of practical experimentation (Cavalli, 2005; Cenoz, 2008; Di Meglio; Cortier, 2016). The growing adoption of translanguaging, often disconnected from this body of knowledge, is concerning. As Gentil (2020) notes, it is yet another Anglicism imported into scientific discourse without translation, thereby reinforcing the predominance of English.

Furthermore, translanguaging has been used as a "slogan" (Schmenk; Breidbach; Küster, 2019), a term imposed due to its media impact, as described by Pavlenko (2019, p. 145-146, translated by us) "attention-grabbing and catchy words or phrases used to distinguish a brand, a product, a cause or an individual and create demand for the things they refer to".

The "sloganization" of translanguaging can be interpreted as a phenomenon of historicity (Pavlenko, 2019), in which a concept is reformulated to appear innovative while ignoring previous scientific production. This process reflects the increasing commodification of academia, in which universities and researchers compete for prestige and funding within a market logic that prioritizes apparent innovation over the continuity of knowledge (Schmenk; Breidbach; Küster, 2019, p. 169).

There is an evident paradox, however: while translanguaging is promoted as a means of promoting linguistic diversity, it has been disseminated exclusively in English, thereby reinforcing the hegemony of this language in global scientific discourse.

5 IMPACT OF INTERNATIONALIZATION ON PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE

Internationalization has become a central element of higher education, transforming pedagogical practices and improving the quality of education. It involves multiple dimensions, including the exchange of ideas and educational values, as well as the implementation of new methodologies that reflect the cultural and linguistic diversity of global educational contexts. Furthermore, internationalization plays a crucial role in the professionalization of education by fostering pedagogical reflection and innovation.

According to Wassem, Pereira and Finardi (2020), exposure to foreign educational systems

and different pedagogical approaches encourages teachers to reflect on their practices, resulting in an enrichment of their pedagogical, contextual, sociological, and social knowledge, as well as fostering innovation. This perspective underscores how interaction with diverse educational contexts can cultivate a more reflective and innovative teaching approach.

International cooperation also strengthens collaboration in pedagogical research. Dudka and Chumak (2020) emphasize that international comparative research provides valuable insights that help overcome destabilizing processes and promote pedagogical innovation by analyzing educational practices in different countries. This type of research allows us to better understand the political, social, and cultural influences on educational development, promoting greater global integration and cooperation.

Academic mobility and the circulation of knowledge are also essential factors in the internationalization of higher education. As Liu and Willis (2021) explain, the experience and beliefs of teachers who move between different educational contexts deeply influence pedagogical practices. While this mobility can pose challenges, it also creates opportunities for creativity and self-reflection, enabling the continuous adaptation and improvement of these practices.

In teacher education, internationalization plays a pivotal role in preparing educators for multicultural and multilingual settings. Rapisheva and Kaliakparova (2021) argue that modern pedagogical technologies and tools can facilitate a student-centered approach by providing more personalized and differentiated learning. This methodological adaptation is essential for preparing future teachers to work in diverse educational environments and promoting a more inclusive and dynamic pedagogical approach.

Furthermore, internationalization directly affects the language policies of higher education institutions. Ferreira (2022) asserts that institutionalizing the teaching and learning of additional languages is crucial for the success of international initiatives. Without adequate support for developing the necessary language skills, however, these initiatives may become ineffective, limiting the reach of mobility programs and international academic collaboration. Thus, internationalization transforms pedagogical practice by promoting the professionalization of teaching, encouraging pedagogical innovation, strengthening international collaboration in educational research, stimulating academic mobility, enabling more diverse learning, preparing educators for multicultural and multilingual environments, and influencing the language policies of higher education institutions. This process is essential to guarantee quality education, capable of responding to the demands of a

globalized and constantly changing world.

6 METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a narrative research methodology, a qualitative approach that focuses on analyzing experiences to understand the evolution of language teaching in the context of the internationalization of education. This approach is particularly well-suited for capturing the richness and complexity of pedagogical practices and their transformations over time.

According to Clandinin and Connelly (2000), narrative research involves collecting and interpreting personal experiences to provide a deep understanding of the meanings subjects attribute to their educational practices. Using this approach, we explored how teachers integrated plurilingualism and translanguageing into their teaching methodologies.

Several data sources were used to carry out this study, including a review of existing literature and an analysis of academic articles. The literature review included studies on language didactics, the internationalization of education, and innovative teaching methodologies. The documentary analysis focused on scientific articles discussing the internationalization of language teaching and curricula in higher education, incorporating multilingual practices.

The literature review, which followed Creswell's (2013) guidelines, was essential for providing context for the study and for identifying trends and challenges. The documentary analysis focused on publications addressing the internationalization of language teaching in higher education. As Polkinghorne (1995, p. 7, translated by us) points out, "narrative research allows us to explore how people experience the world and transform these experiences into meaningful accounts." Additionally, the narrative methodology was employed to reconstruct and interpret the experiences of educators and researchers who have contributed to the evolution of language didactics. This process involved identifying and analyzing narratives published in academic articles, focusing on the challenges and successes described by the authors.

Data analysis followed Braun and Clarke's (2006) approach, which proposes using thematic analysis to identify patterns and categorize emerging issues in pedagogical practices. Triangulation of data from different sources ensured the validity and reliability of the results.

This research relied heavily on analyzing and interpreting documented narratives, providing a comprehensive and multifaceted view of teaching practices in multilingual and multicultural contexts.

Recently, Wassem, Pereira and Finardi (2020) and Liu and Willis (2021) have reinforced the value of narrative research in understanding educational practices, highlighting the importance of collecting educators' experiences and reflections in the context of internationalization.

7 CONSIDERATIONS

The current epistemology of language teaching pushes researchers to transition from a monolingual approach to one that acknowledges plurality in all its complexity, including diverse contexts, social actors, and plurilingualisms. Initially, studies of applied linguistics in Canada revealed the existence of two distinct monolingualisms. However, in the current European context, plurilingualism presents substantial challenges to society. This shift reflects a transition from applied linguistics to a more comprehensive approach that can address the complexity of contemporary human and social issues. As researchers, we have reformulated problems and approached research differently as a result of this evolution.

Multilingualism underscores the importance of considering context and engaging all educational stakeholders in developing an effective learning program. A project may be theoretically sound, but its viability is not guaranteed if the beliefs and perspectives of the various social stakeholders are not considered. The individuals involved—both students and teachers—are unique and complex beings, and their needs vary widely.

The narrative research methodology employed in this study revealed that no theory is self-sufficient; recognizing the complementarities and limitations of theories helps avoid dogmatism. As Clandinin and Connelly (2000) and Liu and Willis (2021) have noted, narrative research is essential for collecting and interpreting the experiences of educators in the context of internationalization. Therefore, researchers have a social and ethical role to play: opening educational programs that consider plurilingualism and multiliteracies allows each individual to find their identity and place in society.

In order to address the diverse challenges in this field, it is crucial to design flexible teaching methods grounded in valid theoretical and human frameworks. Recognizing the limitations and potential of different theories contributes to a richer, more adaptable educational approach. Translanguaging, for example, which was introduced by Cenoz and Gorter (2019), appears to be a promising pedagogical approach. However, criticisms regarding its "sloganization" and the risk of

English predominance in scientific discourse cannot be ignored.

Programs based on multilingualism and multiliteracies promote the development of multilingual skills and intercultural integration. This model, which appreciates linguistic and cultural diversity, is essential for ensuring inclusive education adapted to the demands of a globalized world.

REFERENCES

ADEN, J. La médiation linguistique au fondement du sens partagé: vers un paradigme de l'enaction en didactique des langues. In: ADEN, J.; WEISSMANN, D. (dir.). **La médiation linguistique**. ELA, 2012. p. 267–284.

ANDERSON, J. **Rules of the Mind**. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1993.

AVERMAET, P. V. *et al.* **The Multilingual Edge of Education**. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.

BAILLY, D. **Didactique de l'anglais: objectifs et contenus de l'enseignement**. Paris: Nathan, 1997.

BAKER, C. **Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism**. 3. ed. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2001.

BAKHTIN, M. M. **The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays**. HOLQUIST, M. (ed.); EMERSON, C. (trad.). Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982.

BEACCO, J.-C.; BERTRAND, O.; HERRERAS, J.-C.; TREMBLAY, C. (dir.). **La gouvernance linguistique des universités et établissements d'enseignement supérieur**. Palaiseau: Éditions de l'École Polytechnique, 2022.

BEACCO, J.-C. *et al.* **Guide pour le développement et la mise en œuvre de curriculums pour une éducation plurilingue et interculturelle**. Estrasburgo: Conseil de l'Europe, 2016. Available at: <http://www.cairn.info/guide-pour-le-developpement-et-la-mise-en-oeuvre--9789287182333.htm>. Accessed on: Aug. 5, 2024.

BEELEN, J.; JONES, E. Europe calling: a new definition for internationalization at home. **International Higher Education**, n. 83, p. 12–13, 2015. Available at: <https://ejournals.bc.edu/index.php/ihe/article/view/9080>. Accessed on: Aug. 12, 2024.

BERTIN, J.-C.; GRAVE, P.; NARCY-COMBES, J.-P. **Second Language Distance Learning and Teaching: Theoretical Perspectives and Didactic Ergonomics**. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2010.

BILLIEZ, J.; SIMON, D. L. (dir.). **Alternance des langues: enjeux socio-culturels et identitaires** (Bd. 18). Grenoble: Univ. Stendhal Lidilem, 1998.

BLACKLEDGE, A.; CREESE, A. **Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy**. 20. reimp. Springer, 2016.

BLOM, J.-P.; GUMPERZ, J. Social meaning in linguistic structures: code switching in northern Norway. In: GUMPERZ, J.; HYMES, D. (dir.). **Directions in Sociolinguistics**. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

BOURDIEU, P. **Le sens pratique**: choses dites. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1987.

BRAUN, V.; CLARKE, V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. **Qualitative Research in Psychology**, v. 3, n. 2, p. 77–101, 2006.

BUSER, P. **Cerveau de soi, cerveau de l'autre**. Paris: Odile Jacob, 1999.

BYGATE, M.; SKEHAN, P.; SWAIN, M. (eds.). **Researching Pedagogic Tasks**: Second Language Learning, Teaching and Testing. Harlow: Longman, 2001.

CALVET, L.-J. **Essais de linguistique**: la langue est-elle une invention des linguistes? Paris: Plon, 2004.

CANAGARAJAH, A. S. **Translingual Practice**: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations. London: Routledge, 2013. Available at: <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/edit/10.4324/9780203120293/literacy-translingual-practice-suresh-canagarajah>. Accessed on: Aug. 20, 2024.

CANDELIER, M. **Le CARAP**: un cadre de référence pour les approches plurielles des langues et des cultures: compétences et ressources. Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe, Centre européen pour les langues vivantes, 2012.

CASTELLOTTI, V.; MOORE, D. (dir.). **Alternances des langues et construction de savoirs**. Lyon: ENS Éditions, 1999.

CAUSA, M. **L'alternance codique dans l'enseignement d'une langue étrangère**: stratégies d'enseignement bilingues et transmission de savoirs en langue étrangère. Berna: Peter Lang, 2002.

CAVALLI, M. **Éducation bilingue et plurilinguisme des langues**: le cas du Val d'Aoste. Paris: Éditions Didier, 2005.

CENOZ, J. Achievements and challenges in bilingual and multilingual education in the Basque Country. **AILA Review**, n. 21, p. 13–30, 2008. Available at: <https://www.jbe-platform.com/content/journals/10.1075/aila.21.03cen>. Accessed on: Jul. 30, 2024.

CENOZ, J.; GORTER, D. (eds.). A Holistic Approach in Multilingual Education: Introduction. **The Modern Language Journal**, v. 95, n. 3, p. 339–343, 2019.

CENOZ, J.; GORTER, D. **Pedagogical Translanguaging**. 1. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022. Available at: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/elements/pedagogical-translanguaging/67802C1E5AE4A418AE3B8E2DEFBAD30A>. Accessed on: Aug. 16, 2024.

CENOZ, J.; HUFSEIN, B.; JESSNER, U. **Cross-linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic Perspectives**. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2001.

CHANGEUX, J.-P. **L'Homme neuronal**. Paris: Fayard, 1983.

CHOMSKY, N. **Aspects of the Theory of Syntax**. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1965.

CLANDININ, D. J.; CONNELLY, F. M. **Narrative Inquiry: Experience and Story in Qualitative Research**. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

CLAVERIE, B. Pluri-, inter-, transdisciplinarité: ou le réel décomposé en réseaux de savoir. **Projectics / Proyética / Projectique**, v. 4, n. 1, 2010. Available at: <https://shs.cairn.info/revue-projectique-2010-1-page-5?lang=fr>. Accessed on: Aug. 21, 2024.

COOK, V.; WEI, L. (dir.). **The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Multi-Competence**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. Available at: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-handbook-of-linguistic-multicompetence/8B394FC4BBDFABCC5A1EE6A2DAE67471>. Accessed on: Jul. 25, 2024.

CONDAMINES, A.; NARCY-COMBES, J.-P. La linguistique appliquée comme science située. In: CARTON, F. *et al.* **Cultures de recherche en linguistique appliquée**. Paris: Riveneuve Éditions, 2015.

CONSELHO DA EUROPA. **Quadro europeu comum de referência para as línguas: aprendizagem, ensino, avaliação**. Porto: ASA Editores II, 2001.

COSNEFROY, L. *et al.* **L'internationalisation de l'enseignement supérieur: le meilleur des mondes?** Bruxelles: De Boeck Supérieur, 2020. Available at: https://shs.cairn.info/l-internationalisation-de-l-enseignement-superieur--9782807329034?site_lang=fr. Accessed on: Jul. 22, 2024.

COSTE, D. Immersion, enseignement bilingue et construction des connaissances. In: DUVERGER, J. (dir.). **Actualité de l'enseignement bilingue**. Paris: Hachette, p. 86–94, 2000.

COSTE, D. **La notion de compétence plurilingue**. Paris: Eduscol, Ministère de l'Éducation nationale, 2001.

COSTE, D.; MOORE, D.; ZARATE, G. **Compétence plurilingue et pluriculturelle**. Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe, 1997.

CREESE, A.; BLACKLEDGE, A. Separate and flexible bilingualism in complementary schools: Multiple language practices in interrelationship. **Journal of Pragmatics**, v. 43, n. 5, p. 1196–1208, 2011. Available at:

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0378216610003243?via%3Dihub>. Accessed on: Jul. 22, 2024.

CRESWELL, J. W. **Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches**. 3. ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2013.

CUMMINS, J. Pedagogical translanguaging: Examining the credibility of unitary versus crosslinguistic translanguaging theory. **OLBI Journal**, v. 12, p. 33–55, 2022. Available at: <https://uottawa.scholarsportal.info/ottawa/index.php/ILOB-OLBI/article/view/6073>. Accessed on: Jul. 22, 2024.

CUMMINS, J.; EARLY, M. (dir.). **Identity Texts: The Collaborative Creation of Power in Multilingual Schools**. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books, 2011.

DABÈNE, L.; MOORE, D. Bilingual speech of migrant people. In: MILROY, L.; MUYSKEN, P. (dir.). **One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching**. 1. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. p. 17–44. Available at: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/one-speaker-two-languages/864B8AA6972F95CB5603629264CF8324>. Accessed on: Aug. 16, 2024.

DALTON-PUFFER, C. **Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Classrooms**. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2007.

DAHLET, P. Les identités plurilingues: enjeux globaux et partages singuliers. In: MARTINEZ, P.; MOORE, D.; SPAËTH, V. (dir.). **Plurilinguismes et enseignement**. Paris: Riveneuve, 2008.

DAMASIO, A. R. **Le sentiment même de soi**. Paris: Odile Jacob, 1999.

DE BOT, K. *et al.* DST as a comprehensive theory of second language development. In: GARCIA MAYO DEL PILAR, M.; GUTIERREZ MANGADO, M. JUNKAL; MARTINEZ ADRIAN, M. (eds.). **Contemporary Approaches to Second Language Acquisition**. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2013. p. 199–220.

DEPPERU, M. Learning and teaching Italian in a plurilinguistic approach. **Multilinguism Review**, v. 1, n. 2, p. 360–371, 2012.

DI MEGLIO, A.; CORTIER, C. **La langue corse comme socle d'une éducation bi-plurilingue**, 2016. Available at: <https://www.uni-frankfurt.de/62191522/Cortier-et-Di-Meglio.pdf>. Accessed on: Aug. 11, 2024.

DUDKA, T.; CHUMAK, M. Pedagogical potential of international comparative research. **Science and Education**, 2020. Available at: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/PEDAGOGICAL-POTENTIAL-OF-INTERNATIONAL-COMPARATIVE-Dudka-Chumak/2bd0382182778cb46334eaf779c90478df0cdf05>. Accessed on: Jul 21, 2024.

ECO, U. **La ricerca della lingua perfetta**. Tradução de Jean-Paul Manganaro. Roma: Editori Laterza Fare l'Europa; Paris: Seuil, 1994.

ELLIS, N. C. Emergentism, connectionism and language learning. **Language Learning**, v. 48, n. 4, p. 631–664, 1998.

FERREIRA, M. M. The internationalization of higher education in Brazil and its linguistic demands: a petition for English (additional languages) learning institutionalization. **Letras**, p. 13–22, 2022. Available at: <https://periodicos.ufsm.br/letras/article/view/68091>. Accessed on: Sep. 1, 2024.

GARCÍA, O.; FLORES, N.; SELTZER, K. Rejecting abyssal thinking in the language and education of racialized bilinguals: A manifesto. **Critical Inquiry in Language Studies**, v. 18, n. 3, p. 203–228, 2021.

GARCÍA, O. Translanguaging of Latino Kindergarteners'. In: POTOWSKI, K.; ROTHMAN, J. (eds.). **Bilingual Youth: Spanish in English Speaking Societies**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011. p. 33–55.

GARCÍA, O. **Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective**. Malden, MA; Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

GARCIA, V. A. O papel da questão social e da educação não formal nas discussões reações educacionais. In: II Congresso Internacional de Pedagogia Social. **Anais [...]**, Faculdade de Educação da USP, São Paulo, 2008.

GENTIL, G. Translanguaging and multilingual academic literacies: how do we translate that into French? Should we? **OLBI Working Papers**, v. 10, 2020. Available at: <https://uottawa.scholarsportal.info/ottawa/index.php/ILOB-OLBI/article/view/3831>. Accessed on: Aug. 2, 2024.

GROSJEAN, F. **Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism**. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

HEINDERYCKX, F. Reclaiming the high ground in the age of onlinement. **Journal of Communication**, v. 64, n. 6, p. 999–1014, 2015.

HERDINA, P.; JESSNER, U. **A Dynamic Model of Multilingualism: Perspectives of Change in Psycholinguistics**. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2016.

HOGETOP, M. As expressões idiomáticas nos livros didáticos de LE/LA e interculturalidade: uma discussão a partir da perspectiva sociocultural. **Web Revista Sociodialeto**, v. 9, n. 27, p. 64–78, set. 2019. Available at: <http://sociodialeto.com.br/index.php/sociodialeto/article/view/199>. Accessed on: Jul. 27, 2024.

HUTCHINS, E. **Cognition in the Wild**. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995.

HYMES, D. On communicative competence. In: PRIDE, J.-B.; HOMMES, J. (eds.). **Sociolinguistics**. Hammondsworth: Penguin, 1972.

JACQUEMET, M. Transidiomatic practices: language and power in the age of globalization. **Language & Communication**, v. 25, p. 257–277, 2005. Available at: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0271530905000248>. Accessed on: Jul. 29, 2024.

KALANTZIS, M.; COPE, B. Language education and multiliteracies. In: MAY, S. *et al.* (eds.). **Encyclopedia of Language and Education**: Vol. 1: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education. New York: Springer, 2007. p. 195–211.

KLETT, E. Editorial. **Revue de la SAPFESU**, n. 38, p. 7, 2015.

KNIGHT, J. The impact of GATS and trade liberalisation on higher education. In: UVALIC-TRUMBIC, S. **Globalisation and the Market in Higher Education**: Quality, Accreditation and Qualifications. Paris: UNESCO, 2002. p. 191–209.

KNIGHT, J. Interview de Jane Knight. **IMHE Info**, n. 1, OCDE, Paris, p. 2, 2003.

KRAMSCH, C. Theorizing Translingual/Transcultural Competence. In: LEVINE, G.; PHIPPS, A. (eds.). **Critical and Intercultural Theory and Language Pedagogy**. Boston: Heinle, 2010. p. 15–31.

LANCIEN, T. **Le multimédia**. Paris: Clé International, 1998.

LANTOLF, J. P. Sociocultural source of thinking and its relevance for second language acquisition. **Bilingualism: Language and Cognition**, v. 10, n. 1, p. 31–33, 2007.

LIDDICOAT, A.; ZARATE, G. (coord.). **La circulation internationale des idées en didactique des langues. Recherches et applications**, supplément au Français dans le Monde, n. 46. Paris: CLE International/FIPF, 2009.

LIU, T.; WILLIS, K. Cut and paste pedagogy? Academic mobility, teaching practices and the circulation of knowledge. **Geoforum**, v. 119, p. 11–20, 2021.

LITTLE, D.; KIRWAN, D. **Engaging with Linguistic Diversity**: A Study of Educational Inclusion in an Irish Primary School. London: Bloomsbury, 2019.

LÜDI, G. Synthèse de la Table ronde: facteurs sociaux et économiques susceptibles de favoriser ou d'entraver la diversité linguistique. In: CONSEIL DE LA COOPÉRATION CULTUREL; COMITÉ DE L'ÉDUCATION (org.). **La diversité linguistique en faveur de la citoyenneté démocratique en Europe**: vers un document-cadre pour des politiques linguistiques éducatives. Strasbourg: Éditions du Conseil de l'Europe, 2000. p. 67–82.

LÜDI, G. Parler bilingue et traitements cognitifs. **Intellectica: Revue de l'Association pour la Recherche Cognitive**, v. 20, n. 1, p. 139–156, 1995. Available at: https://www.persee.fr/doc/intel_0769-4113_1995_num_20_1_1479. Accessed on: Jul. 31, 2024.

LÜDI, G.; PY, B. To be or not to be... a plurilingual speaker. **International Journal of Multilingualism**, v. 6, n. 2, p. 154–167, 2009. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14790710902846715>. Accessed on: Aug. 12, 2024.

MACAIRE, D.; PORTINE, H.; NARCY-COMBES, J.-P. Interrogations épistémologiques. **Recherches et Applications**, n. 48, 2010.

MADSEN, L. M. Social status relations and enregisterment in contemporary Copenhagen. **Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies**, Paper 72, 2011.

MANGENOT, F. (dir.). **Interactivité, interactions et multimédia**. Notions en Questions, 5. ed. Lyon: ENS Editions, 2001.

MANGIANTE, J.-M.; PARPETTE, C. **Le français sur objectifs spécifiques**. Paris: Hachette FLE, 2004.

MARSHALL, S.; MOORE, D. Plurilingualism amid the panoply of lingualisms: addressing critiques and misconceptions in education. **International Journal of Multilingualism**, v. 15, n. 1, p. 19–34, 2018. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14790718.2016.1253699>. Accessed on: Aug. 5, 2024.

MATTELART, A. **La globalisation de la surveillance, aux origines de l'ordre sécuritaire**. Paris: La Découverte, 2007.

MAURER, B. **Enseignement des langues et construction européenne: le plurilinguisme, nouvelle idéologie dominante**. Paris: Edition des Archives Contemporaines, 2011.

MESQUITA, L.; PINHO, A. S.; ANDRADE, A. I. Trabalho colaborativo docente e educação plurilingue: que subversões a uma gramática da escola? **Revista Internacional de Educação**, v. 70, p. 201–222, 2016.

MOLINIÉ, M.; MOORE, D. Les littératies: une Notion en Questions (NeQ) en didactique des langues. **Les Cahiers de l'Acedle**, v. 9, n. 2, p. 3–15, 2012.

MOORE, D. Bouées transcodiques en situation immersive ou comment interagir avec deux langues quand on apprend une langue étrangère à l'école. **Acquisition et interaction en langue étrangère**, n. 7, p. 95–121, 1996. Available at: <https://journals.openedition.org/aile/4912>. Accessed on: Aug. 1, 2024.

MOORE, D. Conversations autour du plurilinguisme. Théorisation du pluriel et pouvoir des langues. **OLBI Working Papers**, n. 10, 2020. Available at: <https://uottawa.scholarsportal.info/ottawa/index.php/ILOB-OLBI/article/view/3828>. Accessed on: Jul. 27, 2024.

MORIN, E. **Les Sept savoirs nécessaires à l'éducation du futur**. Paris: Le Seuil, 2000.

MUYSKEN, P. **Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

NARCY, J.-P. **Apprendre une langue étrangère**. Paris: Editions d'organisation, 1990.

NARCY-COMBES, J.-P. Conflits éthiques et épistémologiques au niveau des interventions. In: BABAULT, S. *et al.* (dir.). **Actes du Colloque international contexte global, contextes locaux: tensions, convergences et enjeux en didactique des langues**. Paris: Université Sorbonne Nouvelle-Paris 3, 2015. p. 25–40.

NARCY-COMBES, J.-P. **Didactique des langues et TIC, vers une recherche-action responsable**. Paris: Ophrys, 2005.

NGUYEN, H. H. The multilingualing of a Vietnamese American in South Philadelphia. **Working Papers in Educational Linguistics**, v. 27, n. 1, p. 65–85, 2012.

O'GRADY, W. Emergentism. In: HOGAN, P. (dir.). **The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Language Sciences**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. p. 274–276.

OTSUJI, E.; PENNYCOOK, A. Social inclusion and metrolingual practices. **International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism**, v. 14, n. 4, p. 413–426, 2011. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13670050.2011.573065>. Accessed on: Jul. 27, 2024.

PAVLENKO, A. Superdiversity and Why It Isn't: Reflections on Terminological Innovation and Academic Branding. In: SCHMENK, B.; BREIDBACH, S.; KÜSTER, L. (dirs.). **Slogанизation in Language Education Discourse**. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2019. p. 142–168. Available at: <https://chooser.crossref.org/?doi=10.21832%2F9781788921879-009>. Accessed on: Aug. 12, 2024.

PEKAREK DOEHLER, S. Approches interactionnistes de l'acquisition des langues étrangères: concepts, recherches, perspectives. **Acquisition et Interaction en Langue Étrangère**, Lyon, n. 12, p. 9–32, 2000.

PENLOUP, M.-C. Littératies numériques: quels enjeux pour la didactique de l'écriture-lecture? Réponse à Jeannine Gerbault. In: GERBAULT, J. (org.). **Notions en Questions (NeQ) en didactique des langues – Les littératies**. Les Cahiers de l'Acedle, v. 9, n. 2, p. 129–140, 2012.

POLKINGHORNE, D. E. Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. **International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education**, v. 8, n. 1, p. 5–23, 1995.

PY, B. Apprendre une langue et devenir bilingue: un éclairage acquisitionniste sur les contacts de langues. **Journal of Language Contact**, v. 1, n. 1, p. 93–100, 2007. Available at: https://brill.com/view/journals/jlc/1/1/article-p93_6.xml. Accessed on: Jul. 27, 2024.

RAMPTON, B. From 'Multi-ethnic adolescent heteroglossia' to 'Contemporary urban vernaculars'. **Language & Communication**, v. 31, n. 4, p. 276–294, 2011. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0271530911000024?via%3Dihub>. Accessed on: Jul. 27, 2024.

RAPISHEVA, ZH.; KALIAKPAROVA, N. Modern pedagogical technologies in teaching a foreign language in primary school. **Bulletin of the Innovative University of Eurasia**, v. 81, n. 1, p. 38–43, 27 mar. 2021. Available at: http://vestnik.ineu.edu.kz/files/articles/article_id714.pdf. Accessed on: Aug. 1, 2024.

RASSE, P. **La rencontre des mondes**: Diversité culturelle et communication. Paris: Armand Colin, 2005.

ROGERS, C. **Freedom to Learn**. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1969.

SAUSSURE, F. de. **Cours de linguistique générale**. Edição crítica por MAURO, T. de. Paris: Payot, 1967.

SCHMENK, B.; BREIDBACH, S.; KÜSTER, L. **Sloganization in Language Education Discourse**: Conceptual Thinking in the Age of Academic Marketization. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2019.

SELIGER, H. W.; SHOHAMY, E. **Second Language Research Methods**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

SILVA, L.; SARMENTO, S. A escolha do livro didático de língua estrangeira do Programa Nacional do Livro Didático. **Revista de Humanidades e Letras**, v. 14, p. 1–14, 2015.

VAN LIER, L. **The Ecology and Semiotics of Language Learning**: A Sociocultural Perspective. Boston: Kluwer Academic, 2004.

VIGNER, G. Vers une compétence plurilingue: apprentissage ou enseignement? **Le Français dans le Monde**, n. 355, p. 42–43, 2008.

WASSEM, J.; PEREIRA, E. M. de A.; FINARDI, K. R. **A internacionalização na educação superior**: pressupostos, significados e impactos. ETD - Educação Temática Digital, Campinas, v. 22, n. 3, p. 520–528, jul./set. 2020. Available at: <https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/etd/article/view/8660914>. Accessed on: Aug. 14, 2024.

WEINREICH, U. **Languages in Contact, Findings and Problems**. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York, 1953.

WILKINS, D. A. **Notional Syllabuses**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.

WILLIAMS, C. **Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgu yng Nghyd-destun Addysg Uwchradd Ddwylleithog**. Bangor: Bangor University, 1994. Available at: <https://research.bangor.ac.uk/portal/files/20574535/null>. Accessed on: Aug. 12, 2024.

YOUNG, V. A. Keep code-meshing. In: CANAGARAJAH, A. S. (ed.). **Literacy as Translingual Practice**: Between Communities and Classrooms. New York: Routledge, 2013. p. 139–140.



Available at: <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/edit/10.4324/9780203120293/literacy-translingual-practice-suresh-canagarajah>. Accessed on: Jul. 29, 2024.

