

Multilingualism in Academic and Educational Constellations

Introduction

Stefan Sudhoff & Jan D. ten Thije

The composition of this book¹ on multilingualism in academia and education illustrates its content and purpose. This book contains chapters in two languages: eight chapters are written in English and five are in German. By choosing to publish in both English and German, we want not only to show that multilingualism is the subject of the presented research, but also to illustrate that multilingualism itself contributes to the discussion about this scientific subject. The contributions underpin the fact that multilingualism is a stimulus for the acquisition of more linguistic knowledge by individual or groups of language users as well as an engine of scientific knowledge expansion as such. Most contributions take Functional Pragmatics (Ehlich, 2007; Ehlich & Rehbein, 1986; Redder, 2008) as their theoretical framework. The contributions illustrate that comparing communicative practices between various languages creates new knowledge regarding the acquisition and processing of linguistic representations of reality. Consequently, these analyses could influence language policies that strive for more equality and justice in education, academia, and society in general. The fact that this book appears in open access means that there are no barriers to a worldwide digital readership and, moreover, contributions are accessible to search and processing software. The appearance in print allows for a traditional reading as well. The accessibility and processing of knowledge by leafing through a printed book works differently than by scrolling through a digital document. This edition facilitates both ways of reading. The bilingual abstracts and the bilingual subject register facilitate both multimodal and multilingual readership.

1 Most of the contributions have been presented in an earlier version at the *12th International Conference on Functional Pragmatics* at Utrecht University, July 14–15, 2016. We thank Emmeline Besamusca, Tessa van Charldorp, and Mariëlle Hilkens for co-organizing this conference and for starting up this book with the editors. We thank the student assistants Hilco Elshout and Myrthe Dijkstra for their support in editing this book, Madison Steele for comments on this introduction, and the publisher Waxmann for their support in publishing this book. Finally, we thank Utrecht University, in particular the Utrecht University Library and the Institute of Languages Sciences, as well as the Münstersche Stiftung für Interkulturelle Kommunikation and Jochen Rehbein for their generous contributions to enable the open access publication of this book.

The book is made up of four parts and illustrates the aim of researching multilingualism in a multilingual way. Part 1 concerns educational policies and communicative practices facilitating multilingual understanding in academic settings. Part 2 presents concepts for analyzing multilingual understanding in educational discourses. Part 3 focuses on academic writing for multilingual purposes, and Part 4 addresses procedural analyses for multilingual understanding. In other words, the book begins with the analysis of overarching socio-political developments and, through the introduction of new theoretical linguistic concepts and the educational practices of academic writing, concludes with the microanalysis of linguistic procedures. In the following, we will briefly introduce the articles and reflect on their interdependence.

Part 1: Educational policies and communicative practices facilitating multilingual understanding in academic settings

In the first paper, ADELHEID HU provides an overview of the discussion on internationalization and multilingualism. She criticizes the neo-liberal approach to internationalization that mainly represents economic interests. In contrast to this English-centric approach to internationalization, she quotes Konrad Ehlich in his approach to multilingual internationalization. Ehlich claims that “multilingualism is not the folklore of scientific practice but a crucial part of the cognitive process itself. The experience of otherness of foreign language thinking is an important, even fundamental hermeneutic experience. It deserves explicit attention in teaching as well as research” (Ehlich, 2000: 49, translation by Hu). Hu illustrates this multilingual approach through an analysis of how master’s students at Luxembourg University take lecture notes in their first language, which helps them to process a lecture in their second language. This example shows how students use their entire linguistic repertoire to understand and comprehend the quintessence of a lecture. Hu concludes with a plea to pay more attention to the development of various multilingual didactics for teachers and (international) students that use and deepen the hermeneutic experience of coping with otherness.

Subsequently, ANGELIKA REDDER presents the results of three projects on multilingualism in German, Italian, and multilingual academia: *euroWiss* (Heller et al., 2013), *Offensive Sprachwissenschaft*, and *MuM-Multi* (Redder et al., 2018). She discusses various forms of multilingual didactics, such as multilingual working groups and a first-year science communication course in which students learn to explore, problematize, process, understand, and use multilingualism. She also discusses the requisite design and implementation of a multi-

lingual center for scientific comparison of academic languages. As an example, Redder compares German discursive and Italian textual academic traditions of knowledge processing, where the Italian tradition puts more emphasis on persuasion-oriented argumentation and the German tradition focuses more on self-discovery-oriented argumentation and criticism. She underscores Hu's critique of internationalization, which initially reflected a multilingual perspective between national languages of European countries, but soon narrowed to the use of English as a *lingua franca*. In this context, it is important to recognize which types of multilingualism are relevant for (international) students and teachers, such as migrant languages, regional variants, bilingual standards, code-switching, receptive multilingualism, or English as a *lingua franca*.

AHMAD KAFFASH KHOSH and ÇIĞDEM SAĞIN-ŞİMŞEK analyze the effects of the language policy on international students at Middle East Technical University in Turkey, which offers academic programs with English as the language of instruction. Their study investigates whether international students' language backgrounds have an effect on their choice of language strategies in institutional communication situations such as in the post office, the Registrar's/International Cooperation Office, the pharmacy, and an instructor's office. The data were collected from international students who speak Indo-European languages and from those who speak Turkic languages. The analysis differentiates between various modes of inclusive multilingualism (Backus et al., 2013), such as English as a *lingua franca*, receptive multilingualism, code-switching, or combinations of these modes. The researchers make a distinction between students who speak Indo-European languages as L1 and students who speak Turkic languages as L1. For the international students who speak Indo-European languages, English as a *lingua franca* appears to be used most in their multilingual conversations with Turkish employees. In contrast, the Turkic-speaking group applies different modes of inclusive multilingualism, such as receptive multilingualism and code-switching. The study concludes that the concept of inclusive multilingualism creates a practical and theoretical framework that overcomes the shortcomings of the English-centric approach to internationalization (see also the contributions of Hu and Redder in this volume).

STEFAN SUDHOFF and JAN D. TEN THIJE also focus on the language choice of students in academic education, but in a different manner and context. They describe an innovation project at Utrecht University in the Netherlands that introduces the concept of *lingua receptiva* as a form of inclusive multilingualism in the academic education of the Department of Languages, Literature and Communication. *Lingua receptiva* (ten Thije, 2019) is a form of multilingualism in which two interactors speak a different language and understand each other

based on their receptive proficiency in the other's language. In the pilot, this multilingual mode is used as a strategy to open up courses to students who have elaborated scientific knowledge about the course content, but only receptively master the language of instruction of the course. Consequently, the communication in these courses is multilingual: The teacher and the majority of the students speak the language of instruction, whereas a minority of students use a different language for their spoken and written contributions. This project is a good example of the multilingual expansion of the international classroom, and it also contributes to solving the general problem that fewer and fewer students at European universities choose language and culture studies (e.g., Dutch, German, Italian, French, and Spanish). Courses of these programs were traditionally only accessible to students of the program in question. Now, they are open to students of other programs and are a concrete result of an interdisciplinary and multilingual development for language studies that could attract more students.

The final contribution of Part 1 focuses on another important aspect of multilingualism in educational constellations, namely the schooling of newcomers. ELKE G. MONTANARI and ROMAN ABEL compare the two well-known strategies for learning the national language (e.g., German in Lower Saxony). In the first strategy, language education is organized in separate classes, and in the second strategy, language training is combined with the teaching of content. The authors chose monolingual schools to conduct their research. The countries of origin of the newcomers as well as their first languages are very diverse, the languages include Arabic, Italian, Kurdish, Pashto, and Urdu. The youngest students in the study are 10 years old, and the oldest are 17. Their common characteristic is that they belong to the group of *students with limited or interrupted formal education* (abbreviated as SLIFE). With regard to the multilingual didactics, the study identifies a continuum of forms combining parallel schooling options focusing on German as a second language with integrative elements. The methods used to assess the progress of the acquisition of German are a vocabulary test and a writing task. The outcome of the study is that there are no clear differences between the two approaches, but a need is identified among teachers for an individual approach to deal with the large differences between various newcomers. Moreover, it appears that there is still a great discrepancy between academic discussions about novelties of multilingualism such as *lingua receptiva* and intercultural competences on the one hand, and the educational practices of monolingual schools on the other.

The first five contributions provide insight into the relevance of the three central language functions that are distinguished within Functional Pragmatics (Ehlich & Rehbein, 1986) for research on language in general and multilingual-

ism in particular. With respect to language, and certainly with respect to multilingualism, it is important to see a connection between the knowledge-processing function, the interactive function, and the identity-forming function of language. Although the contributions focus on specific language functions, they always argue for the coherence between these functions. The chapters in Part 2 present and reflect upon central theoretical concepts that elaborate on multilingual education.

Part 2: Concepts for analyzing multilingual understanding in educational discourses

In the contribution of WILHELM GRIESHABER, we find a deepening of the concept that is briefly mentioned in the previous chapter, namely *students with limited or interrupted formal education* (SLIFE). This term refers to the way in which preschool and extracurricular knowledge play a crucial role in the success of the multilingual acquisition in schools. The term SLIFE indicates that children have received too little education to successfully learn a second language. This paper addresses the theoretical concepts that have been proposed to describe the influence of the children's social and cultural background on their successful participation in monolingual and multilingual education. Grieshaber begins by discussing Cummins' (1979) well-known terms *Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills* (BICS) and *Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency* (CALP). With this distinction of cognitive skills, Cummins tried to explain the limited school success of working-class children at the time. The question is to what extent these concepts are also suitable for understanding successful multilingual participation. To this end, the author introduces the concept of *language of education* (*Bildungssprache*), which goes back to the theory of Habermas (1977). Contrary to Cummins' differentiation of cognitive skills, the term *language of education* focuses on properties of a national language (e.g., German) that are non-transferable surface properties. The point is that children often already acquire the interconnectedness of interactional structures, linguistic actions and the linguistic complexity of utterances before and outside school. This mastery influences the way in which they can or cannot learn languages at school. For children with a migration background who are confronted with multilingualism at school, it is very important that they master these aspects of linguistic and discourse structures outside school in order to successfully participate in an educational discourse at school. The third concept Grieshaber discusses in this context is *literacy*. For multilingual children, *family literacy* in the language of the family is of great importance. If they have successfully acquired this form of literacy,

they can also apply these skills when learning a new language at school. This theoretical argument around the concepts of *BICS*, *CALP*, *language of education* and *literacy* draws attention to the cognitive skills that underpin and facilitate multilingual development at school or in academia. The argument is substantiated with examples from media and educational discourse.

The contribution of SAFIYE GENÇ and JOCHEN REHBEIN introduces the notion of *nexus* as a concept to investigate learning processes involving two languages in detail. *Nexus* refers to the process of multilingual action that establishes an interrelation between languages and/or varieties in various dimensions of verbal communication. The authors use discourse from a literature class in a German-as-a-foreign-language program at a Turkish university with 25 second-year students. The general hypothesis behind the analyses is that *nexus* improves the students' understanding of L2 German through their L1 Turkish and that *nexus* can contribute to the conceptual development of German and even of Turkish itself. The research question asks how learning is pre-structured via multilingual teaching and in accordance with multilingual reception. *Nexus* may concern all kinds of linguistic structures that may function as a bridge between two languages. The teacher starts this process by anticipating specific comprehension difficulties on the part of the students and posing a "comprehension requirement". If the students' learning process does not start automatically and they must actively organize this process, then *nexus* can be helpful. By relating two specific structures of the two languages to each other, the comprehension process is enhanced in both directions. In a series of examples, the authors show how "resistance" to understanding arises and how the teacher and the students, using both languages, bridge this resistance and thus create understanding based on multilingual action. The analyses are convincing because they show that multilingual action is not a one-way street from L1 to L2, but rather it involves the interweaving of L1 and L2 to create substantive understanding. The examples illustrate that *nexus* concerns a broad spectrum of linguistic phenomena.

In the final contribution of Part 2, JOCHEN REHBEIN and MERYEM ÇELIKKOL reflect upon the well-known concept of *translanguaging* in the field of multilingual education research (García & Wei, 2014; Wei, 2018) and propose an alternative concept *multilanguaging*. Both concepts make use of the productivity of languaging: the idea that language users can creatively deal with multilingualism and develop new linguistic forms which can violate regular monolingual language norms, but because of this very fact achieve multilingual understanding. According to the authors, the difference between trans- and multilanguaging is that universal translatability between languages is presupposed by translanguaging, whereas with multilanguaging it is assumed that a conscious co-action

of speaker and hearer is needed to achieve mutual understanding. The authors' analyses exemplify how the interaction between teacher and students in bilingual German-Turkish mathematics education realizes such multilingual co-actions. The paper investigates a whole range of linguistic, pragmatic and mental structures of the variants of multilingualism used. The relevant variants include – with different emphasis – Turkish, German, code-switching, German-Turkish, and Turkish-German, as well as their relationships to each other. The authors introduce another concept that is innovative for the analysis of multilingualism, namely *thinking language* (*Denksprache*). This concept is particularly relevant to mathematics education because it shows how verbalizing thinking can be distinguished from verbalizing thought processes. This is a useful distinction for understanding, solving, and reflecting on mathematical problems in two languages. Using the concept of *thinking language* helps to reconstruct this solution process in multilingual educational discourse. The developed conceptual apparatus is then used to compare two different multilingual teaching strategies of mathematics teachers. The first teacher uses multilingualizing to create nexus so that students understand and solve mathematics problems in and through both languages by exploiting a thinking language. The second teacher only uses multilingualizing to show the parallel structures between L1 and L2 and thus helps the students find a solution in their L2 (German).

The contributions in Part 2 illustrate the claim from the beginning of this introduction that research into multilingualism is an engine for scientific knowledge expansion. Theoretical concepts such as thinking language, nexus, and multilingualizing could only be developed by analyzing multilingualism. The functional-pragmatic perspective makes it possible to consider multilingualism not only as contact, but also as interaction between languages that results in structures that transcend monolingual features.

Part 3: Academic writing for multilingual purposes

Part 3 consists of papers demonstrating that academic writing plays an important role in knowledge acquisition and processing across languages. In his contribution, WINFRIED THIELMANN shows how academic writing in a second language requires students to understand how new scientific knowledge can be marked against established scientific knowledge. To this end, various typical academic linguistic structures (e.g., the use of *also* in German or perspectivizing expressions such as *according to*) are examined. Thielmann shows that these structures are crucial for understanding scientific language, as they subtly make statements about the coherence or relevance of scientific knowledge presented in articles. In

many cases, however, they are not explicitly addressed for students with a multilingual background, and they do not occur in widely used writing courses for German as a foreign or second language. The distinction between *everyday scientific language* and *disciplinary scientific language* (Ehlich, 1995) is the basis of this discussion. Building on international comparative projects (cf. the contribution of Redder), Thielman introduces the theoretical concept of *epistemicity* that underlies this subtle but crucial skill in dealing with multilingualism in academia. This concept makes it possible to reflect on the relationship between science as a universal process of knowledge acquisition on the one hand and as a culturally determined implementation of this process on the other.

The article by STEPHAN SCHLICKAU and NICOLA HOPPE takes a different approach to multilingual academic writing. This study is not about (international) students who learn to write academically in multilingual constellations, but about an international academic project team discussing the preparation of the annual report for the subsidy provider. It is a multilingual and multicultural team that uses English as a lingua franca for communication. The authors show that the discussion about the content and formulations of the final report does not follow the everyday or academic rules of argumentation. Rather, there is a focus on a common consensus that appears to be based on hidden cross-cultural agreement. This agreement is stronger than the various interpretations that the use of English as a lingua franca entails. The authors mention *discursive interculture* (Koole & ten Thije, 2001) as a theoretical concept that can explain the emergence of a team-oriented consensus based on sustainable cooperation in an intercultural context. Within an intercultural team, the members develop their own cultural and linguistic conventions that become self-evident in the team. The team has knowledge of the institutional goals and interests it wants to achieve with the project report for the subsidy provider. Agreement on this common interest makes it possible to effortlessly bridge everyday and academic language differences in academic formulations and arguments.

The final article in Part 3 approaches academic writing from yet another perspective. The article by ANTONIE HORNUNG compares the didactics of academic writing with that of translation studies and claims that in academic programs, students are too quickly confronted with both forms of writing. This leads to many students being forced to produce word-for-word translations, which fall short of adequately conveying linguistic and cultural characteristics. After all, an important objective of translation is to achieve functional equivalence of the texts in source and target language. In order to transfer the content to another language, it is sometimes necessary to choose completely different formulations, syntactic and textual constructions, idiomatic expressions or speech actions. Lit-

eral translation also means that language acquisition itself in the target language lags behind. According to the author, learning to translate is only possible once students have acquired level C1 in the target language. This argument is substantiated with an analysis of the Modenese Tesine corpus that documents scientific writing skills of foreign languages students in German (and Italian) and that was built in collaboration between the Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia and the University of Aarhus.

The contributions in Part 3 illustrate how academic writing is crucial to academic institutions in different ways. It concerns the formulation of knowledge development and knowledge itself, the accountability of scientific research towards local and international principals and subsidy providers, and the dissemination of scientific knowledge in various languages around the world. The analyses show that multilingualism not only stimulates knowledge development but can also lead to pitfalls. The papers demonstrate the importance to assess both in balance.

Part 4: Procedural analyses for multilingual understanding

The first three parts of this book focus on the coherence of the three language functions (knowledge transfer, interaction, and identity construction), the introduction of and reflection on multilingual theoretical concepts (e.g., educational language, nexus, and multilinguaging), and the discussion of the possibilities and limitations of multilingual discourse genres such as academic writing. In Part 4, the focus is on the microlevel of multilingualism. Within Functional Pragmatics, linguistic procedures are the communicative minimum units of analysis for discourse analysis. Bührig and ten Thije (2023) give an overview of the *communicative maximum units* (CMA) and *communicative minimum units* (CMI) used by different approaches to discourse pragmatic description (such as Conversational Analysis, Linguistic Anthropology, Critical Discourse Analysis, and Functional Pragmatics). The linguistic procedure is placed next to the utterance, the sentence, and the turn. What is special about the linguistic-mental procedure is that it makes it possible to analyze language in use. Functional Pragmatics (Ehlich & Rehbein, 1977; Ehlich, 2007) distinguishes between five different types of procedures, namely appellative procedures, expeditive procedures, deictic procedures, expressive procedures, and operative procedures.² The two contributions in the

2 Bührig and ten Thije (2023: 55) summarize the procedures as follows: “Ehlich (1991) distinguishes five different types of procedures: by means of the ‘appellative procedure’ or ‘symbolic procedure’ the speaker causes the updating of knowledge particles in the listener. By means of the ‘deictic procedure’ the speaker causes listeners to orientate

last part of the book analyze how multilingualism can be reconstructed as different combinations of the aforementioned linguistic procedures.

ANNETTE HERKENRATH's contribution analyzes academic writing in Kurmanji Kurdish. This variety of Kurdish, which is mainly used in Turkey and Northern Syria, is an example of recent scientific internationalization as it is used for academic writing in this region and elsewhere in the world. However, this variety has not previously been the subject of comparative academic writing research. The author's analysis is in line with Thielmann's contribution on multilingual academic writing and the specific importance of epistemicity, addressing the distinction between universal and culturally specific interpretations. Herkenrath analyzes causal connectivity in academic writing and the way in which writers can purposefully connect individual thoughts within an argumentation, i. e., how the writer formulates new and potentially controversial knowledge and relates it to knowledge that has already been accepted. More precisely, the contribution attempts to reconstruct within a functional-pragmatic framework how linguistic procedures work together to enable categorial gradation and multi-element combinability and allow a flexible handling of clausal-nominal transition in academic writing. The author concludes that Functional Pragmatics has the theoretical potential to reconstruct the discussed multilingual processes in an insightful way.

The last contribution in this book also discusses Kurmanji Kurdish, but in a different multilingual constellation, in a different discourse genre, and in a different interactive phenomenon. ORHAN VAROL analyzes the multilingual academic discourse with Kurmanji Kurdish-Turkish bilingual academic staff and students in the universities of Eastern Anatolia/Turkiye. His research focuses on discourse markers in college discussions and media events. Discourse markers have the function of clarifying the hearer's interpretation of what the speaker is saying during another person's turn. These are typical oral interaction structures that are also important in academic debates, including within universities where the Turkish and Kurmanji Kurdish language come into contact with each other. Not all individual speakers master both languages at the same level, but students and teachers do use both languages interchangeably. In general, discourse markers are highly transferable elements from L2 to L1, and they often lead to

themselves towards extralinguistic facts. By means of the 'expeditive procedure', such as interjections, the speaker intervenes directly in the listener's activities. By means of the 'expressive procedure' the speaker communicates an affective state in order to create a comparable state in the listener. By means of the 'operative procedure' the speaker works on the knowledge shared with the listener, which is necessary for communication."

code-switching from L1 to L2. The author shows that such code-switching not only marks a certain cultural identity, but also that the markers realize a function they have in L1, but which is not always adequate in the L2 used at that time. Varol's contribution shows the potential of multilingualism for academic constellations and at the same time which pitfalls are present. The phenomena exhibited by Kurmanji Kurdish-Turkish bilinguals could also occur in other multilingual academic constellations elsewhere in the world. In conclusion, we see in detail how knowledge transfer, interaction, and identity construction are closely related and how these functions can lead to multilingual (mis)understanding.

This volume addresses a wide variety of multilingual constellations in various countries (including Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Austria, Turkey, Luxembourg, and many others). Both English and German are used as scientific languages in the contributions. In addition, attention is paid to many different oral and written discourse genres in academia (including recitations, explanations, lectures, assignments, translations, workshops, proficiency tests, small talk, administrative conversations, and media appearances). An important constant is that many contributions have chosen the functional-pragmatic approach as their theoretical framework. As a result, a common approach is recognizable in their text and discourse analyses in which the basic functions of language (knowledge transfer, interaction, and identity construction) are constantly linked. Moreover, the contributions show a hermeneutical argumentation in which macro-structures (institutional purposes and policies) are linked to meso-structures (text and discourse genres) and micro-structures (speech actions and linguistic-mental procedures). The articles of this volume demonstrate that a further substantiation of the research into multilingualism in academia and education is a promising venture.

With this book, we honor the memory of our colleague Meryem Çelikkol, who passed away unexpectedly in November 2021. In all her scientific and political work, including in Hamburg, she put forward the idea of multilingualism as a link to social and individual diversity in many countries. Çelikkol's activities in the field of multilingualism cover various areas of life: political, scientific, personal, social, and transnational. The obituary illustrates how she is a representative of the core values to which this book seeks to contribute.

References

- Backus, A., D. Gorter, K. Knapp, R. Schjerve-Rindler, J. Swanenberg, J. D. ten Thije, and E. Vetter. 2013. "Inclusive Multilingualism: Concept, Modes and Implications." *European Journal for Applied Linguistics* 1 (2): 179–215. <https://doi.org/10.1515/eujal-2013-0010>
- Bührig, K., and J. D. ten Thije. 2023. "Discourse-Pragmatic Description." In *The Riches of Intercultural Communication. Volume 1: Interactive, Contrastive, and Cultural Representational Approaches*, edited by R. Supheert, G. Cascio, and J. D. ten Thije, 27–68. Leiden: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004522848_003
- Cummins, J. 1979. "Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children." *Review of Educational Research* 49: 222–251. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543049002222>
- Ehlich, K. 1995. "Die Lehre der deutschen Wissenschaftssprache: sprachliche Strukturen, didaktische Desiderate." In *Linguistik der Wissenschaftssprache*, edited by H. L. Kretzenbacher, and H. Weinrich, 325–352. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Ehlich, K. 2000. Deutsch als Wissenschaftssprache für das 21. Jahrhundert. Retrieved from: <http://www.gfl-journal.de/1-2000/ehlich.html> (Access: June 7, 2023).
- Ehlich, K. 2007. "Funktional-pragmatische Kommunikationsanalyse: Ziele und Verfahren." In *Sprache und sprachliches Handeln 1. Pragmatik und Sprachtheorie*, edited by K. Ehlich, 9–28. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110922721.1.9>
- Ehlich, K., and J. Rehbein. 1977. "Wissen, kommunikatives Handeln und die Schule." In *Sprachverhalten im Unterricht*, edited by H. C. Goeppert, 36–114. München: Fink.
- Ehlich, K., and J. Rehbein. 1986. *Muster und Institution. Untersuchungen zur schulischen Kommunikation*. Tübingen: Narr.
- García, O., and L. Wei. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. New York: Palgrave. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765_4
- Habermas, J. 1977. "Umgangssprache, Wissenschaftssprache, Bildungssprache." *Jahrbuch der Max-Planck-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaften*, 36–51.
- Heller, D., A. Hornung, A. Redder, and W. Thielmann. 2013. "The euroWiss-Project. Linguistic Profiling of European Academic Education (Germany/Italy)." *European Journal for Applied Linguistics* 1 (2): 317–320. <https://doi.org/10.1515/eujal-2013-0018>
- Koole, T., and J. D. ten Thije. 2001. "The reconstruction of intercultural discourse. Methodological considerations." *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 571–587. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(00\)00035-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(00)00035-7)
- Redder, A. 2008. "Functional Pragmatics." In *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication*, edited by G. Antos, and E. Ventola, 133–178. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Redder, A., M. Çelikkol, J. Wagner, and J. Rehbein. 2018. *Mehrsprachiges Handeln im Mathematikunterricht*. Münster: Waxmann.
- ten Thije, J. D. 2019. "Receptive multilingualism." In *Twelve Lectures on Multilingualism*, edited by D. Singleton, and L. Aronin, 327–362. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788922074-014>
- Wei, L. 2018. "Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language." *Applied Linguistics* 39 (1): 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>