

Introduction

How to learn to teach multilingual learning

Eva Vetter & Nikolay Slavkov

University of Vienna | University of Ottawa

Some musings on multilingualism and the rationale behind this special issue

Today multilingualism (re-)appears as a fundamental condition and aim of learning as well as the use of languages in education and in multiple other contexts. Present scholarly contributions rarely link up with historical multilingualism. Investigations into multilingualism in the past are, however, insightful and highly relevant. Let us take Mary Louise Pratt's prominent discussion of the Guaman Poma's *New Chronicle and Good Government* from 1613 (Pratt, 1991) or Rindler Schjerve's volume on language policy in the 19th century Habsburg Empire as an example (Rindler Schjerve, 2003). Among many other insights, these works remind us that multilingualism is neither a recent phenomenon, nor a characteristic restricted to modern globalized societies. Multilingualism, in its widest sense, is and has always been a fundamental feature of human life in society.

We would like to point out two implications of this observation: First, the study of language cannot be separated from the conditions of human life. The opposite also holds true: social research cannot ignore language. Second, the insights from historical multilingualism re-confirm that research in multilingualism brings out big issues of humanity such as power, equity, or identity. This comes to the forefront even more when the context is education, since the distribution of chances for a good (or better) life and access to resources is closely related to education. Hence, it comes as no surprise that research into multilingualism and education is particularly prolific. There is an impressive number of recent publications that stimulate the field and inspire new questions (e.g. Man Chu Lau & Van Viegen, 2020; Tian et al., 2020 or Sánchez & García, 2021 in the field of translanguaging) or reaffirm decades of previous research (e.g. Cummins, 2021). Even these few examples show an important fact about the state of multilingualism research: knowledge about the complexities of multilingual learning and teaching has increased tremendously. Moreover, research has provided

a myriad of concepts (plurilingualism, translanguaging, metro-, poly- and other-lingualisms) which may refer to important conceptual discrepancies. Tensions originating from divergent conceptual positions might come down to fundamental questions such as “Do languages exist?”, “What if the overarching construct of language that currently dominates our thinking, research paradigms, and description of daily practices is replaced by the construct of multilingualism?”, and “What would education and ultimately the world look like if such shifts were to take place?”. Against the background of this growing, insightful and, at the same time, discrepant research context, readers of this introduction might silently ask themselves “Why another publication on multilingualism in education?”

One reason to add another edited collection on multilingualism in education refers to the specific focus of the present themed issue, which narrows down the whole endeavour to the simple question of learning to teach “multilingually”. The title we chose, *Multilingual education or How to learn to teach multilingual learning*, is meant to be playful and at the same time trigger some deeper reflection. If the cognitive processing load of the string ‘How to learn to teach multilingual learning’ seems high and you stumble over the title, have to pause to think it over, or have to reread it, we have achieved the desired effect. In line with many other scholars in the field, we recognize that the complexities and challenges of multilingual education make it imperative that teachers pause and reflect on how they can learn to teach multilingually or to teach multilingual learners. Learners themselves also need to pause and reflect as multilingual learning is not always automatically taken in or even accepted. That is, learners themselves may be conditioned by deeply entrenched monolingual ideologies and practices and may need to learn how to learn multilingually, as some of the contributions to this issue demonstrate.

Another aspect of our motivation behind this special issue is that all contributions share a certain kind of resistance towards dominant norms and ideologies that reduce plurality. In the context of education, language is conceived as a means and an aim that continuously oscillates between ideologies of uniformity and ideologies of plurality. The current issue’s bias is, of course, in the direction of approaches towards plurality and hence towards opening education both based on and for plural languages and resources. All kinds of “language” are included, that is, foreign/second languages as well as the languages present in the classroom through learners’ previous trajectories and experiences. In relation to this plurality versus uniformity divide, all contributions stand for plurality and against monolingual educational traditions or monoglossic academic practices. As such, the contributions provide a partial answer to the question of how learning to teach multilingually can be successful. In other words, they offer different small pieces of the big puzzle that multilingualism research is trying to solve.

What are some of the aspects of multilingual learning that make it hard to achieve both from a teacher and from a learner perspective? First, ideologies, which can be seen as sets of values and beliefs that govern our behaviours and the way we create individual and societal structures within which we operate, need to support rather than preclude a multilingual perspective on learning. Second, conceptual and theoretical frameworks are needed in order to provide ways of interpreting or predicting various behaviours and phenomena from a multilingual perspective. Third, teaching strategies or methodologies, compatible with multilingual ideologies and conceptual frameworks, need to be developed and applied. Fourth, practical tools and resources supporting multilingual perspectives must be made available to learners, in order to empower them to draw on multilingualism in their educational journey. Fifth, multilingual learning includes both learning languages as well as learning through languages, two facets of the learning process that sometimes engage in a complex interplay. Of course, the list of these multifaced and complex factors is much longer than what we list in this article or in the entire special issue. But we are pleased that the collection of articles that we have curated touch on many of these aspects of multilingual complexity.

The third incentive for the creation of this special issue of the *AILA Review* is the very context that gave birth to the collection. The special issue focuses on multilingual teaching and learning, a subfield of Applied Linguistics research that revealed itself as particularly prominent at the 2021 AILA Congress. Most of the contributions are based on a thematic symposium on multilingual teaching and learning that we organized at the Congress. One contribution is based on work presented at another symposium on multilingualism in higher education, organized by the European Civil Society Platform for Multilingualism (ECSPM), also in 2021. With this context in mind, the overarching goal of this issue is to explore and to connect different aspects of multilingual education, encompassing theoretical, teacher, and learner perspectives. The inspiring and stimulating discussions in the two above-mentioned symposia ultimately motivated us to envisage a publication. The shared conviction that uniformity needs resistance and the particular focus on learning to teach provided the final impetus for realising this project.

One could assume, on the basis of what has been said so far, that the present issue leans towards homogeneity due to the shared convictions of the contributors and the editors. However, this is not the case. The contributions are differently positioned along some of the main lines of the multi-faceted complexities of multilingual learning and teaching, such as learning trajectories, power issues, and identities, to name but a few. As we already know from Blommaert & Backus (2011, p.21), individual repertoires are the result of polycentric learning experiences that involve diverse learning trajectories. The current special issue presents

informal trajectories of a grassroots initiative with tutors that were not formally trained as teachers (Haim & Kedar) as well as more formal learning within traditional educational institutions (Potts & Cutrim-Schmid). With respect to power, all contributions articulate transformative claims, although to quite different degrees. The transformation of power relations can be explicit and encompass ‘transknowledging’ (Heugh et al.) or remain more implicit as in the focus on metacognition (Jessner & Allgäuer-Hackl). The same holds true for the issue of identity: The negotiation of identities can be foregrounded, when the most fundamental condition of living together in peace is not to be taken for granted (Haim & Kedar) or remain more implicit in the brick mosaic used to better describe and evaluate the individual linguistic repertoire (Strasser & Reissner).

A glimpse at the contributions to the special issue

The contribution by Ulrike Jessner and Elisabeth Allgäuer-Hackl serves as both a conceptual-theoretical article and a descriptive overview of a 5 *Building Blocks* framework of holistic multilingual education. The article draws on previous work on metacognition and multilingual awareness, explaining the importance of this aspect of human cognition in achieving successful outcomes at the linguistic, interpersonal, educational, and societal levels. Grounded in Complexity and Dynamic Systems and Theory (CDST), the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism Theory (DMM) (Herdina & Jessner, 2002) is presented as a conceptual point of departure. The authors then discuss metacognition in childhood, including references to the bilingual (and multilingual) advantages literature. Furthermore, they discuss how to teach multilingual awareness to children in an educational context, and how to train teachers to teach such awareness, responding directly to the core theme of the special issue ‘How to learn to teach multilingual learning.’

Jessner and Allgäuer-Hackl also remind us of still prevalent deficiency-based perspectives of language learning and the need to overcome them. They offer rich examples from the Austrian context as well as from South Tyrol, Hungary, and France, among others. Overall, they build the argument that metacognitive strategies and awareness are crucial in supporting and fostering multilingualism and may ultimately result in higher language proficiency in all the languages of a child’s developing repertoire, not just in the dominant language(s) of instruction and the foreign languages taught as subjects at school. The authors also offer a link to recent insights into language attrition, suggesting that higher levels of metacognitive awareness may serve as a counteragent to attrition (see also Jessner 2018; Jessner, 2021).

Jessner and Allgäuer-Hackl underscore that monolingual approaches at educational institutions generally favour the separation of languages aiming to achieve high results in the L1 and/or the language of schooling. In their 5 *Building Blocks* framework of holistic multilingual education, they illustrate how teachers and researchers can reflect on lesson planning, teaching content, school activities, and teaching methodology. As the authors insist, teaching majority, foreign, or family languages must draw on the rich multilingual and intercultural resources that learners may already bring with them to school. This focus on integration rather than segmentation of the use of one's linguistic repertoire offers a connection to the next contribution in the volume, which addresses intercomprehension.

The contribution by Margareta Strasser and Christina Reissner defines the concept of intercomprehension (IC), offers some history and a brief overview of previous relevant literature, and then moves on to present an IC model of competence with associated descriptors. 'Who needs yet another model, framework of reference, and set of descriptors?', one might legitimately ask in the context of several well-known existing ones. The authors, however, convincingly argue that intercomprehension, while generally well-known as a concept and valued as a general approach, has remained somewhat outside the scope of existing frameworks and descriptors and thus deserves special attention.

Strasser and Reissner explain that existing frameworks with descriptors, such as the Common European framework of reference for languages (CEFR) (Council of Europe, 2001) and its Companion Volume (2018, 2020), the Cadre de référence pour les approches plurielles des langues et des cultures (CARAP) / Framework of reference for pluralistic approaches to languages and cultures: Competences and resources (FREPA) (Candelier et al., 2007, 2010, 2012), and the Modularising multilingual and multicultural academic communication competence project (MAGICC) (Natri & Räsänen, 2015; Räsänen, Natri, & Forster Vosicki, 2013) do not sufficiently and explicitly enough address IC. As such, Strasser and Reissner propose a model of competence and descriptors based specifically on intercomprehension, grounded in the EVAL-IC Erasmus + project. The proposed IC competence model contains six levels of intercomprehension that correspond to the CEFR levels used to describe single language competences. As the authors explain, the descriptors as well as internationally validated tools for assessment of IC competences for Romance languages are available online through the project's website. What makes the framework particularly interesting and innovative is its assessment tasks that involve reading and comparing texts in several Romance languages, and then presenting and discussing them in front of a multilingual jury. That is, instead of evaluating an individual learner in a single language, isolated from others, the evaluation tasks allow for assessing the com-

plex and dynamic nature of plurilingual IC competence that involves several languages at the same time.

The Strasser and Reissner contribution addresses the core theme of this special issue by approaching language teaching and learning through several languages at the same time, as part of a whole, rather than in an isolated, singular manner. This is not a trivial matter, considering that teaching or assessing more than one language at the same time remains a conceptual or abstract approach rather than common practice, due to the numerous questions about how one may be able to leverage such ideas in practical terms. Thus, the concept of inter-comprehension with its goals and practices on the individual learner level, the teacher tools that it provides, and the promise of assessment opportunities of multiple languages at the same time are more than stimulating in advancing a global agenda of finding ways to foster and promote multilingual learning.

Moving on to the next contribution in the special issue, Diane Potts and Euline Cutrim-Schmid take us to the realm of teacher education and innovative curriculum design from a plurilingual perspective. The authors begin by reminding us that “Despite decades of research supporting the pedagogic value of learners’ plurilingual resources to linguistic and academic development, teacher-candidates often arrive at university inculcated in ‘target language only’ practices underpinned by monolingual mythologies” (p.63). Using this statement as a point of departure, Potts and Cutrim-Schmid orient towards the Douglas Fir Group’s (DFG) transdisciplinary framework (Douglas Fir Group 2016) which, as they explain, offers an opportunity to integrate social perspectives on second language learning and theorize language in a socially embedded context. The framework uses three levels, the micro, meso, and macro, and provides a resource for making sense of the emerging, clashing, and changing stances and identities of the participants described in the article.

The authors focus on curriculum design and innovation by describing a three-way collaboration between a UK and a German university and a German secondary school. These three institutions were involved in a pilot project where undergraduate students prepared and delivered lessons to an English as a foreign language (EFL) secondary school classroom using plurilingual portraits. Master’s students then interviewed the pupils about their experiences and their portraits. Potts and Cutrim-Schmid analyzed both undergraduate and graduate student reflections through student journals, term papers, and informal discussions (among others) and provided rich examples of two students’ experiences, personal growth, identity formation, and internal conflicts regarding plurilingual pedagogies.

The article reveals the complexity and importance of curricular design, and the realization that (pre-service) teachers’ own previous language experiences as

well as their current reflections may be at odds with how they may be expected to teach in a plurilingual pedagogical approach. For example, as the reflections of one of the Master's students discussed in the article illustrate, the use of the highly regarded and innovative plurilingual portrait approach is seen as counterproductive and even as a tool that may reinforce nationalist language representations among pupils. This strikes a cord with the main theme of the volume: on the one hand, plurilingual learning is closely aligned with the values of integrating multiple languages, promoting equality, and acquiring knowledge in a non-hierarchical or discriminatory way; on the other hand, achieving this in reality is highly challenging and involves a number of personal and professional hesitations stemming from previously instilled values and ideological standpoints, personal experiences, current understanding of theory and practice, and expectations of the future. As the authors conclude, in all of this, pedagogical design truly matters.

The contribution by Kathleen Heugh and colleagues takes us to Australia and dives into another aspect of multilingual learning: the use of human language translation technology (HLT). The authors draw on a multi-phase project with a series of studies that exemplify various ways and contexts in which HLT can be and is used by university students to support and enhance their learning. Heugh et al. describe linguistic, cultural, and knowledge exchanges, dubbed 'transknowledging' (Heugh, 2021) that can be facilitated by common technological applications for translation and by other digital tools. The authors see this not only as a viable way of supporting the use of academic English in an Australian, largely monolingually-oriented, English-speaking institution but also as an opportunity for students to access information and knowledge in other languages and incorporate it in their learning. For example, international or domestic students who may be speakers of languages other than English, may benefit from HLT in accessing information in their different languages, and then using translation tools to help them prepare academic work in English. At the same time, domestic students who may speak only English, do not need to restrict themselves to information coming only from English sources but can access world knowledge available in multiple languages, using automatic translation engines or add-ons. This process also applies to researchers and administrators, potentially enriching people's attitudes and knowledge, and countering existing monolingual, English-only, ideologies and practices.

Heugh et al. use a mixture of survey data, samples of student tasks and assessments, focus groups, interviews, and reflexive feedback from project team members, among other methods, to present rich and detailed findings related to both the benefits and challenges of HLT use. To give you a flavour of some of the benefits discussed by the authors, language learning, content learning, critical think-

ing, and appreciation for world knowledge were among the many positive aspects listed. In addition to increased skills and knowledge, the authors also showed evidence of students feeling more respected and validated, a sign of general well-being, when they were allowed or encouraged to learn multilingually (i.e. draw on a variety of languages) using technological resources, rather than being forced to use only English and discouraged or prevented from using translation tools. On the other hand, Heugh et al. also point to the potentially damaging view of considering the use of translation tools as plagiarism, mandating blanket discouragement, or prohibition of such resources by teachers or administrators. The authors also include the appropriate level of caution which is needed in the discussion of HLT. This relates to judicious and thoughtful incorporation of digital resources, with necessary reviewing, editing, and evaluating the automatic output rather than relying entirely on the technology itself.

The next article in this special issue takes us to Israel and connects multilingualism to informal learning in a conflict-ridden area of the world. Orly Haim and Yarden Kedar describe in detail the challenging and complex context of a Jerusalem neighbourhood and a grassroots initiative, a language learning café, aiming to facilitate language and cultural learning exchanges between Hebrew and Arabic speakers. The authors walk the reader through the sociolinguistic and sociopolitical context, and then offer details of what they call a bilingual pedagogy model that emerged organically at the café. Using a mixture of observations of tutoring sessions at the café, interviews with participants (both tutors and learners), and sample teaching materials, Haim and Kedar illustrate both teaching practices and learner experiences from this context.

Haim and Kedar also tell the reader about the worries, personal motivations, and sociopolitical tensions that are at play in Israel and relate them to the café's activities and participants' experiences. Against this backdrop, some participants felt that through the language and culture exchanges offered at the café, feelings of fear and mistrust towards 'the other' diminished and the desire for intergroup contact increased. As such, the article indicates that multilingual learning in this context offers some hope for improving relations between members of opposing groups in conflict-ridden areas of the world. The authors call for more and larger-scale grassroots initiatives to be conceived and supported.

Last but not least is the concluding article of this special issue. Larissa Aronin and Susan Coetzee-van Rooy provide stimulating discussion and synthesis of all contributions, integrating the various themes and issues raised by the different authors, and providing a sense of completeness to the work. In offering our heartfelt thanks to Larissa and Susan for accepting to serve as discussants, we invite the reader to pay special attention to the conclusion article in order to fully benefit from the entire special issue.

Limitations of this special issue

While we are enthusiastic about the theme and about the rich and complex ways in which the contributions intersect with one another and represent the various aspects of multilingual teaching and learning that we initially set out to explore, we must acknowledge that the overall scale and scope of this special issue are nonetheless limited. The relatively small number of contributions that a special issue can accommodate offers just a flavour of the myriad perspectives on multilingualism. For example, the collection does not provide solutions for some of the major conceptual discrepancies that we mentioned in the beginning of this article (i.e. the conceptual, existential questions about our perceptions of language and multilingualism, the potential paradigmatic changes in how we would do research if we were to challenge existing assumptions about language as a psychological and linguistic reality, and so on). Moreover, this special issue is by far not as radically decolonising as postulated in the *Short Manifesto* by Alison Phipps (2019). This relates to another important limitation, that is, the geographical coverage of the research presented in the issue. While contexts from Europe, Australia and Israel are included, the collection does not offer a much-needed wider focus with perspectives from more continents, and perhaps even more importantly from the Global South. Such perspectives can bring numerous new insights into multilingualism and multilingual learning but remain mostly outside our current scope and are left for future work. It is our sincere hope that the scholarly community will be able to promote more and more such work as the field of applied linguistics continues to evolve.

Without further ado, we wish you happy reading!

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank the contributors to this special issue for their hard work, for their patience with our repeated requests for revisions and modifications of the articles, and for meeting the tight deadlines that we all had to work with. We also thank the *AILA Review* editorial team for their prompt responses, useful guidance, and comments on the special issue proposal. Many thanks are due to the participants of the 2021 AILA Congress Thematic Symposium S099 *Multilingual education or How to learn to teach multilingual learning* as well as the organizers and participants of the 2021 ECSPM Symposium *Multilingualism in Higher Education*. We are deeply indebted to the two anonymous reviewers of the issue who showed extreme generosity in offering two rounds of reviews for the articles, in providing detailed, insightful, and constructive feedback, and in working with exemplary timeliness. Our final word of thanks goes to Valéria Schörghofer-Queiroz. The publication of this special issue would not have been possible without the competence, energy, and generosity that she brought in managing this project.

References

- Blommaert, J., & Backus, A. (2011). *Repertoires revisited: 'Knowing language' in superdiversity* (Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies, Vol. 67). Retrieved on 13 June 2022 from: https://www.ntnu.edu/documents/1263498481/1275096220/Blommaert_and_Backus_2011.pdf/2d95fae3-c7de-4fa6-bf33-7f3a7a3126b0
- Candelier, M., Camilleri-Grima, A., Castellotti, V., de Pietro, J.-F., Lörincz, I., Meißner, F.-J., ... Noguerol, A. (2007). *CARAP: Cadre de référence pour les approches plurielles des langues et des cultures*. Conseil de l'Europe. Retrieved on 13 June 2022 from http://carap.ecml.at/Portals/11/documents/C4pub2007F_20080228_FINAL.pdf
- Candelier, M., Camilleri-Grima, A., Castellotti, V., de Pietro, J.-F., Lörincz, I., Meißner, F.-J., ... Noguerol, A. (2010). *FREPA/CARAP. Framework of reference for pluralistic approaches to languages and cultures*. Council of Europe/European Center of Modern Languages. Retrieved on 13 June 2022 from http://carap.ecml.at/Portals/11/documents/C4pub2007F_20080228_FINAL.pdf
- Candelier, M., Camilleri-Grima, A., Castellotti, V., De Pietro, J.-F., Lörincz, I., Meißner, F.-J., ... Schröder-Sura, A. (2012). *FREPA. A framework of reference for pluralistic approaches to languages and cultures: Competences and resources*. Council of Europe, European Centre for Modern Languages. Retrieved on 13 June 2022 from <https://www.ecml.at/Portals/1/documents/ECML-resources/CARAP-EN.pdf>
- Council of Europe (Ed.). (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Council of Europe Publishing. Retrieved on 13 June 2022 from <https://rm.coe.int/16802fc1bf>
- Council of Europe, (Ed.). (2018). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Companion volume with new descriptors*. Council of Europe. Retrieved on 13 June 2022 from <https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989>
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment; companion volume*. Council of Europe Publishing. Retrieved on 13 June 2022 from <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809eaod4>
- Cummins, J. (2021). *Rethinking the education of multilingual learners: A critical analysis of theoretical concepts*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800413597>
- Douglas Fir Group. (2016). A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(S1), 19–47. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12301>
- Herdina, Philip, & Jessner, Ulrike (2002). *A Dynamic Model of Multilingualism. Perspectives of Change in Psycholinguistics*. Multilingual Matters, 121. Clevedon: Cromwell Press Limited.
- Heugh, K. (2021). Southern multilingualisms, translanguaging and transknowledging in inclusive and sustainable education. In P. Harding-Esch & H. Coleman (Eds.), *Language and the sustainable development goals* (pp. 33–43). British Council.
- Jessner, U. (2018). Metacognition in multilingual learning. A DMM perspective. In Å. Haukås, C. Björke, & M. Dypedahl (Eds.), *Metacognition in language learning and teaching* (pp. 31–47). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351049146-3>
- Jessner, U. (2021). Use it or lose it! Was bleibt von den Fremdsprachenkenntnissen nach der Schule? *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht*, 26(2), 119–142.

- Man Chu Lau, & Van Viegen, S. (2020). *Plurilingual Pedagogies?: critical and creative endeavors for equitable language in education*. Springer.
- Natri, T., & Räsänen, A. (2015). Developing a conceptual framework: The case of MAGICC. In J. Jalkanen, E. Jokinen, & P. Taalas (Eds.), *Voices of pedagogical development: Expanding, enhancing and exploring higher education language learning* (pp. 85–102). Research-publishing.net. <https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2015.000288>
- Phipps, A. (2019). *Decolonising multilingualism: Struggles to decreate*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788924061>
- Pratt, M.L. (1991). Arts of the contact zone. *Profession 91* (pp. 33–40). MLA.
- Räsänen, A., Natri, T., & Forster Vosicki, B. (2013). *MAGICC conceptual framework. Modularising multilingual and multicultural academic communication competence for BA and MA level*. Retrieved on 13 June 2022 from https://www.unil.ch/files/live/sites/magicc/files/shared/Revised_Conceptual_Framework_MAGICC.pdf
- Rindler Schjerve, R. (2003). *Diglossia and power. Language policies and practice in the 19th century Habsburg empire*. Mouton De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197204>
- Sánchez, Maite T., & García, O. (2021). *Transformative translanguaging espacios: Latinx students and their teachers Rompiendo Fronteras sin Miedo*. Multilingual Matters <https://doi.org/10.21832/SANCHE6058>
- Tian, Z., Aghai, L., Sayer, P., & Schissel, J.L. (2020). *Envisioning TESOL through a Translanguaging Lens*. Springer.

Address for correspondence

Eva Vetter
 Language Teaching and Learning Research Unit
 University of Vienna
 Zentrum für LehrerInnenbildung, Sprachlehr- und -lernforschung
 Porzellangasse 4, Stiege 1, 3. Stock
 1090 Wien
 Austria
eva.vetter@univie.ac.at

Co-author information

Nikolay Slavkov
 Canadian Centre for Studies and Research in Bilingualism and Language Planning
 (CCERBAL)
 Official Languages and Bilingualism Institute (OLBI)
 University of Ottawa
 Canada
nikolay.slavkov@uottawa.ca