

Multilingual Testing and Assessment for Plurilingual Education

Bessie Dendrinis

Abstract

This paper argues that, despite the 'multilingual turn' in (language) education, testing and assessment continue to be, by and large, monolingual enterprises and attempts to explain why. The few research projects which have recently been appearing in different parts of the world – projects targeting the development of approaches and the design/use of multilingual instruments of testing and assessment – have not developed a common discourse and their characteristics are often dissimilar, even if they aspire to serve a similar goal. There is inadequate substantial dialogue between researchers resulting in multilingual testing and assessment being a fragmented and somewhat incohesive disciplinary area, evinced in how terms and notions are used, and in how the agency of research participants is viewed. Given that research in the field is underlined by similar social concerns and that the construction of suitable instruments is quite challenging, multilingual testing and assessment – as an academic field of research and as a politically defined action – may profit immensely if research units worked collaboratively to explore and investigate a variety of issues, and to create tools and instruments in cooperation and by learning from one another.

Keywords: multilingualism; plurilingualism; monolingualism; translanguaging; testing; assessment

1. Introducing the state of affairs

Mainstream applied linguistics and language didactics have kept languages apart from one another for a long time – whether these are the foreign languages in the school curriculum or the official school language as a school subject. They have looked upon each language as a separate, self-contained system (Dendrinis 2004, Garcia, *et al.* 2012). The compartmentalization of languages for teaching, learning and particularly for assessment are still deeply entrenched in society, in the educational system and stakeholders (Shohamy 2011).

Didactic programmes, such as TESOL MA courses around Europe and beyond, still urge for the provision of maximum input in each foreign language so that students become proficient in it¹, and continue to promote the 'cultural island' effect² in the second or foreign language classroom, believing that it will rectify students' linguistic behaviour (the ultimate goal being for learners to acquire 'native-like' proficiency in the target language).³ Of course, as discussed even in the early 90s (Dendrinis 1992, Pennycook 1994, Phillipson 1992), the motivation especially for TESOL pedagogy but also for all the didactic models for all dominant European languages has not been ideologically and politically innocent, nor void of the separatists' desire for economic profit as well as for symbolic power and control.

In the official/national language classroom in most European schools, which are bound to their single language policies, pedagogic approaches continue to be largely based on the linguistic purism ideology (Bourdieu 1991), linked to one language/one-nation political principal and theories of linguistic-cultural

¹ Based on Krashen's language input theory for best learning outcomes.

² Based on Skinner's behaviour modification principles.

³ Understanding 'native speaker' as a well-read, intelligent, university educated social subject who has skills to produce wonderfully orally and in writing.

homogenization (Dendrinis 2003). In this line of thought, the national/official standard language should be *protected* from other languages (foreign or minority) and from dialects that may sneak in and contaminate it (cf. López-Gopar & Sughrua 2014; Palmer *et al.* 2014; Turner 2017; Vaish & Subhan 2015). Moreover, separatist language teaching approaches are to secure a monoglossic or monolingual environment in which language contact is prevented so that it will not cause learners to be cognitively confused and to mix up the languages producing linguistic jumbles.

Social conditions have always motivated new didactic paradigms and they are doing so now in the field of language education, with its ‘multilingual turn’ (Hélot 2014). Monolingualism is out, and multilingualism is in – keeping in line with today’s multilingual societies of our globalized world, with increasingly accelerated mobility, and consequently linguistically diverse classrooms. In the European context, in particular, where multilingualism is promoted as ‘a powerful symbol of the EU’s aspiration to be united in diversity’ and as a basic factor for ‘mobility, employability and growth’ (Dendrinis 2016), the Europeans’ ability to speak more than two foreign languages is an agreed upon policy motivating the European Commission to recommend [a new comprehensive approach to language education](#) (Dendrinis 2018) and to sign an agreement for cooperation with the European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML) of the Council of Europe for actions to support multilingual classrooms and to relate language curricula, tests and examinations to the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR), the underlying goal of which is the development of plurilingual competence – something which becomes more clear in the *CEFR Companion volume* (2018). Plurilingual competence, as defined by the CEFR and understood by Dendrinis & Gotsouliia (2015) refers to students’ ability to communicate effectively using their entire linguistic repertoire to create meanings in ways whereby the totality of learners’ semiotic resources (the languages, discourses, dialects and modalities) that they have are brought into play for effective intercultural communication and are thus not treated as separate entities, but as interrelated and interactive.

Policies, research results, and sheer necessity are changing language teaching and learning in some schools, in some European countries with [whole-school language policies](#), [pluralistic didactic approaches](#), and [CLIL](#), being promoted by the Council of Europe and the European Commission, as well as by the use of translanguaging techniques in Europe, the USA and Canada, and other means employed to develop cross-language (and intra-language) mediation skills. As a matter of fact, the CEFR Companion (pp. 105-129) contains detailed descriptors of mediation activity and strategies for the development of mediation skills and plurilingual competence.

Despite the “multilingual turn” in (language) education, which is beginning to consider the principles of multilingual pedagogies and curricula, leading to plurilingual and intercultural education (Conteh & Meier 2014; May 2013; Ortega 2013, 2014), language competence assessment and testing practices remain monolingual (Dendrinis 2013a, Shohamy 2009). As Gorter & Cenoz (2017) also maintain, the absence of multilingual approaches in assessment and testing is striking because they believe, and they are perhaps right, that to make the multilingual turn in the field of testing and assessment is more challenging than it was to introduce it in teaching practices. Classroom assessment activities and test tasks, school language examinations and high-stakes language proficiency testing continue to be exclusively monolingual. Tests and exams are designed to measure the competences and skills that learners have developed in *one language at a time*.

Multilingual assessment and testing continue to be marginalised and the ostracism is largely due to the authority of the major testing and assessment paradigm, which has been hegemonized by the

international conglomerates for English language testing⁴ -- those that grew alongside the hegemony of English (cf. Macedo, Dendrinis & Gounari 2003) – with its overwhelming concern with psychometric accuracy and its overpowering interest to downplay the politically powerful role of testing (Shohamy 2011). However, it is also due to earnest resistance, which is ideologically motivated and often challenged on account of the symbolic and economic profit that the international language testing industry stands to gain (Dendrinis 2013a). Nevertheless, along with newly emerging trends in language pedagogy, there is an increasing tendency to question the value of the ‘one-size fits all’ approach adopted by international tests (Karavas and Mistikopoulou 2018: 328) and advocate the importance of including local content, norms and values into teaching materials and tests (Canagarajah 2006; Dendrinis 2013a, 2015; Tsou 2015).⁵

However, even if present conditions favour the use of localised tests (Karavas & Mitsikopoulou 2018)⁶, which are best suited for the use of more than one language (Dendrinis 2013a), there are also practical reasons for keeping to the tradition of monolingual tests and other assessment practices. Firstly, language teachers still strongly believe that the separation of languages in the classroom is of major importance (Bravo Granström 2019, Haukås 2016) and, secondly, language teachers and testers do not know *how* to assess language skills or content knowledge using languages in combination, or different genres and distinct semiotic modes in combination with one another. Furthermore, there are very few education policies favouring multilingual assessment practices, an absence of curricular requirements for bi- or multilingual testing and a serious insufficiency of evidence-based research arguing in favour of the positive backwash effect multilingual testing will have on multilingual education. For teachers and testers to be

⁴ The international English language testing industry, controlled by corporations with head offices in the UK and the US, made sure that its global reach grows continually. Cambridge ESOL, for example, reported (or rather boasted) on its website (CambridgeEnglish.org), about its tests in March 2018: “Over 5 million Cambridge English exams are taken each year in 130 countries. Around the world, more than 20,000 universities, employers, government ministries and other organisations rely on Cambridge English qualifications as proof of English language ability.” The IELTS (International English Language Testing System) is another highly marketed product, which is advertised on its website (<https://www.ielts.org/>) as being “accepted for migration to Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United Kingdom.” The test-takers rapidly grew from the 14,000 when the test was administered in 1989 to more than 2.7 million in 2015.

⁵ Nevertheless, even one intending to present localized tests as a constructive alternative, the cultural politics of English Language Testing have so infiltrated the social subjects involved, that they end up presenting the qualities of international tests. I became fully conscious of the when Cyril Weir contacted me after reading my chapter on glocal testing (2013a), asking me to read and give him feedback on the chapter he had just written, entitled “Global. Local and Glocal Pathways in Language Test Development”, for a book he was editing about Language Testing in Asia. This was in 2018, a few months before his unfortunate and untimely death. Despite his effort to discuss favourably the rationale of moving forward with glocalised tests, his chapter focuses more on the attractions of taking part in the “well respected global [English] examinations” as “they are general, broad spectrum proficiency tests based on clear specifications of the level of proficiency that is being targeted...” and, in addition, “they are professionally produced and validated by a world leading, well-resourced examination board with much history, expertise and experience; they are internationally transportable qualifications with high “cash in value”; they are administered securely and efficiently across the world by a respected and prestigious international organisation and in many cases an online version of the examination is available; they are systematically linked to international standards like the CEFR and ALTE; they are developed with the support of effective quality management systems; each of the Cambridge examinations’.

⁶ The Karavas & Mitsikopoulou 2018 volume discusses the idea of the Greek national foreign language exams being a ‘glocal’ construct (global+local), a term I coined for this multilingual examination suite of which I am president of the exam board.

convinced that bi- or multilingual tests and exams do not necessarily lack validity and that, on the contrary, they could prove fairer for learners, they need to see how this is done. They need to be shown how to construct multilingual test/assessment tasks and exams, by being presented with good practices and guidelines and, more importantly, by becoming fully involved in workshops.⁷

Given the washback effect of testing and assessment on teaching and learning (Cheng 2005; Tsangari 2011) and the control that tests have for redefining knowledge (Shohamy 2001), changes in language teaching require changes in language testing and assessment practices as well. This being acknowledged, and concern with fairness and validity when testing/assessing students, whose home language is different than the school language, especially immigrants (Blackledge & Creese 2010, Shohamy 2011), more recently some research-based actions have come to light introducing alternative assessment and testing practices.

2. Multilingual testing and assessment research

Research linked to multilingual testing and assessment is beginning to appear in different social and educational contexts – in different continents even. Often, the research projects which are slowly surfacing involve some form of experimentation and trialling of bi- or multilingual instruments designed to fulfil a socially informed educational purpose and to justify a theoretical assumption, which is socially, politically and ideologically based. As the research design, the theoretical artillery supporting the projects, and outcomes are disseminated through publications by researchers involved, useful practical ideas come to light about how to develop valid multilingual testing and assessment tools and how these may impact on literacy education. Below, I have listed ‘multilingual testing and assessment’ projects which have come to my attention, categorised according to the purpose they are to fulfil. Though they are distinct from one another, they are all grounded on language contact theories, as well as on the notions of codeswitching (González-Vilbazo *et al.* 2013) and especially translanguaging (Garcia 2009).

A. Fairer testing and assessment in multilingual environments

Projects included in this category provide context-related proof of what, according to Shohamy & Menken (2015) several other studies indicate; i.e., for reasons of social justice and equity in multilingual educational environments, it is necessary to engage in multilingual assessment, which ‘significantly contributes to higher scores on academic tasks and more accurately reflects the knowledge of multilingual test takers’ (p. 421). The research projects presented here, therefore, aim at documenting that bi- and/or multilingual learners are disadvantaged by assessment tools designed for monolinguals and argues that, if these learners are somehow accommodated (by making use of the language they are more familiar with – as in the case of immigrant students who are obliged to access knowledge in a language which is different from the language(s) they carry with them to school), the assessment and testing instruments

⁷ My collaborators at the RCEl of the University of Athens (www.rcel.enl.uoa.gr) and I experienced this strong need first-hand, as we have been offering training seminars to Spanish language teachers, through Erasmus+ funded projects, to teach and test their students using classroom activities and test tasks for the development of cross-linguistic and intra-linguistic mediation skills – as this component has been introduced in the new curricular policies across Spain. The teachers feel somewhat confused and disoriented as is the case when a reform of some sort takes place, expecting teachers to implement the new policy without prior professional training of what it is they should put into action.

will be fairer and thus constitute more valid apparatuses with which to judge the learners’ linguistic or subject-related knowledge.

- 1) One such project is entitled Multilingual Assessment in Education (MuAE) and it is being carried out in Belgium (Flanders) by the Centre for Diversity & Learning of the University of Ghent. Fauve Da Backer, writing her PhD thesis on the issue, acquired her data from an experiment involving two groups of fifth grade elementary school students participating in a computer-based science test.⁸ The experimental group get the test in two languages (Turkish/Dutch or Polish/Dutch) and the control group get the test with the items only in Dutch. The fact that the test is online allows the research team to log the number of switches from one language to the other, how long they stay at which page and language. One of the aims of the MuAE-project is to cope with validity issues through multilingual testing methods.
- 2) Similar concerns, about how unfair it is for students whose home language is different than the official school language, are being addressed by Shohamy (2011). From what I understand, through personal contact with her, a team of researchers are collecting data in Israel by testing students in a single language (Hebrew only) on the one hand, and in two language (Hebrew and Arabic or Hebrew and Russian in combination) on the other. The subjects are immigrant students and Hebrew speakers whose home language is a minority language.
- 3) Though the concerns of the third research project match those of the previous two, Heugh *et al.* (2016) draws attention to multilingual education policies, practices and assessment in South Africa. The bi-/multilingual design of large-scale assessment measures student knowledge in two or three languages and permits students to make use of their bilingual or multilingual repertoires in high-stakes examinations. The research team demonstrates that, while it is quite challenging to design and administer multilingual examinations, students’ multilingual repertoires can be brought into the design of large-scale assessment. Longitudinal data from system-wide assessment further indicate that code-switching and translanguaging are promising only when used to increase students’ repertoires for both horizontal purposes and vertical access to language/s of power.
- 4) Addressing the needs of linguistically and culturally diverse immigrant and international students in New Zealand, Sachtleben (2015) in her article ‘Pedagogy for the multilingual classroom: interpreting education’ discusses how she uses the many languages in the local community as a resource for ‘interpreting students’ so as to develop pedagogically appropriate strategies which originate from understanding: (a) the classroom structure itself and the dynamic that develops within it; (b) the academic requirements for rigour and content assessment; (c) meeting the professional demands that will be put on the graduates on completion of their course.

B. Providing proof of bi- multilingual competence

More than one language has been used for testing and assessment instruments being developed to document test-takers’ ability to use two languages in combination for professional purposes.

- 5) One of the projects in this category aims at creating a bilingual test for those who wish to secure an academic post in Flanders in order to provide proof that test-takers are able to teach university-level courses using either or both the majority language in Northern Belgium, and the

⁸ Many thanks to Piet Van Avermaet of *the Centre for Diversity & Learning* of the University of Ghent for sharing with me information regarding this project.

language of globalisation – English. Therefore, a test devised by the Flemish Interuniversity Testing Consortium (ITACE) was used with lecturers in higher education who were required by the Ministry to provide proof that they can teach subjects in either the Dutch or the English curriculum. Researchers (van Splunder & Verguts 2017) investigated how the top-down implementation of the test was counterproductive in stakeholders’ acceptance of this test as a means to ensure the quality of teaching and improve employability.

- 6) A somewhat similar bilingual test has been developed (and recently revised) at the University of Ottawa, Canada – as reported by Baker & Hope 2017 – with a very different purpose: to provide proof that the academic staff can make adequate use of both French and English in all university functions, including socializing on campus. Candidates are to demonstrate their plurilingual competence (where resources from more than one language are employed in meaning making) and show that they can use languages in combination with one another in an academic context. The team, whose theoretical references derive from notions of translanguaging, is developing a languages competency profile, and experimenting with their instruments, while raising a series of questions, which they are attempting to answer on the basis of their investigation. Questions, such as ‘What was the extent of translanguaging used by candidates in their responses?’ or ‘Do the candidates perceive that the English co-text has provided support for prediction when completing the items of the subtest?’ and ‘What other impressions did the candidates have regarding the use of English during the test?’
- 7) A third project resembles the first two in certain ways but deviates from them significantly too, in that the output or ‘deliverable’ of the case organized was not an instrument for the certification of competences or skills but a tool for the assessment and pedagogic use of plurilingual practices. The project carried out in the linguistically and culturally diverse state of Oaxaca, Mexico, involved 40 language teachers who were asked to draw from existing translanguaging practices in their classrooms and to extend these strategies for integrating translanguaging into classroom assessments, Schissel *et al.* (2018) report. The teacher-participants completed two reading and writing tasks. While Task 1 was intentionally designed to engage learners’ English and Spanish languages resources, Task 2 was restricted to English-only. Analyses of data indicated that pre-service English teachers performed better on the multilingual task than the monolingual task and that integrating multilingual resources within assessment design can allow test-takers to demonstrate more complex or high-order thinking skills in the language they are learning.
- 8) A fourth project under this category also involved teachers in a teacher preparation programme, as did the previous one, but for a different purpose. Makalela (2015) explains that this project constituted an assessment of the efficacy of a teacher preparation programme that introduced the teaching of African languages to speakers of other African languages in order to produce multi-competent and multi-vocal teachers. A mixed method approach was used to elicit from a pool of 60 (30 experimental; 30 control group) multilingual pre-service teachers the participants’ storied reflections and their reading and vocabulary achievement scores. The results of the study showed that translanguaging techniques used in the experimental class afforded the participants affective and social advantages as well as a deep understanding of the content. Similarly, a paired t-test has shown a statistically significant differential performance in favour of the experimental group after three months of a translanguaging intervention programme.

C. Assessing multilingual competence to support minority languages

In the projects of this category, multilingual assessment is viewed as a means for enhancing multilingual or plurilingual approaches to education, ultimately aiming to support minority languages being marginalized by the dominant language.

- 9) The first is a project currently conducted in the Basque Country, aiming at the development of students’ language and metalinguistic awareness by integrating and relating Basque, Spanish and English. Based on a ‘Focus on Multilingualism’ approach, students’ writing skills in the three languages are assessed. As reported by Gorter & Cenoz (2017), the researchers are adopting holistic perspective by looking at patterns across languages and at learners’ metalinguistic awareness, in order to understand to what extent learners are aware of the way they use their whole linguistic repertoire.
- 10) In a project which was carried out in Wales, and reported on by Lewis, Jones & Baker (2012), Welsh and English alternate for different parts the same pedagogical activity in different school subjects. For instance, one of the languages is used for input and the other for output; that is, students watch a video in English and discuss its content and write a summary in Welsh or vice-versa. Resorting to ideas from translanguaging pedagogies, the researchers’ goal is to promote understanding of the content of a school subject and at the same time help the development of the weaker language (Baker 2011). Taking into account the situation of Welsh as a minority language, Jones & Lewis (2014) think that it is necessary to systematically control the use of translanguaging so that it does not trigger the use of English as the majority language.

D. Cross-linguistic mediation in testing and assessment

- 11) The last research area to be recorded in this directory is an endeavour which started in 2004, as part of a much larger project in Greece: that of developing a national foreign language proficiency examination system into a multilingual examination suite, which is the only one to date that has been using cross-linguistic tasks to test the oral and written mediation skills of Greek learners of English, French, German, Italian, Spanish and Turkish in the target language, on the 6 level scale of the Council of Europe, from B1 to C2 level. A1 and A2 level test tasks include mediation also though some would probably call this ‘translanguaging’. As a matter of fact, Greek – the language all candidates have in common – is used as a scaffold when testing reading comprehension or giving instructions for a writing test task, so as to facilitate candidates’ performance.

Within the framework of this localised exam system, known in Greece and beyond as the KPG exams (https://rcel2.enl.uoa.gr/kpg/en_index.htm), the tests for all languages are developed – on the basis of the common for all languages specifications and guidelines – by expert teams at the two universities involved in this undertaking (the University of Athens and the University of Thessaloniki). These two institutions are also responsible for test-validation, training of examiners, development of reliable tools for script rating and applications for research purposes. They are also responsible for all the research bases being developed and projects around the exams – though different units of the universities are responsible for the research around exams in different languages. The Greek Ministry of Education, which is responsible for exam administration, for securing reliability of exam marking and scoring and for issuing the results, is also responsible for the certification issuing bilingual certificates to successful candidates.

The endeavour to carry out research in cross-linguistic mediation, as defined by Dendrinis (2006, 2013b) long before the publication of the CEFR Companion volume, generated several projects

and studies, one of which was successfully completed in 2009. The product was an MA dissertation by Stathopoulou⁹, investigating the hybridised formations that candidates (Greek learners of English) had produced in their written scripts, which had been generated by mediation test tasks in the writing test papers of the KPG exam in English. The cross-linguistic writing test tasks in the KPG exams require writers to relay information from a Greek text into a script in English, for a specified purpose, based on a defined context. The outcomes of this and other projects investigating mediation performance of Greek learners of English relied on data made available to its researchers by the Research Centre of Language Teaching, Testing and Assessment (RCeL) of the University of Athens, which is the unit that is responsible for research into the KPG exams in English (www.rcel.enl.uoa.gr). Specifically, the data originated from (a) the KPG Task Repository and (b) the KPG English Corpus.

There were several other outcomes from the whole team’s endeavour to investigate cross-linguistic mediation and some of these outcomes are discussed in published papers (e.g., Dendrinou 2013b; Stathopoulou 2013a),¹⁰ while others are still ongoing (especially those that involve not only Greek and English but also Greek and German or French). To date, however, the most comprehensive cross-linguistic research project was a PhD thesis by Stathopoulou (2013b), which empirically investigated, through textual analysis of Greek learners’ scripts in English, their task-dependent mediation strategies at different levels of competence. A revised version of the thesis was published in two years later (Stathopoulou 2015). The team continues to carry out research in this specific field of study and publish results or implications (e.g., Stathopoulou 2018), as well as issues resulting from the development of a global multilingual examination suits, as this is discussed in Karavas & Mitsikopoulou (2018).

3. Conclusions and proposal for collaboration

Except for the projects listed under the four categories above, there are several others conducted not only in Europe, but also in North and South America, as well as in Asia. If they were listed, I believe they would enrich categories (1) and (3) above: i.e., the categories whose main aim is to ultimately succeed in convincing educators and policy makers that more inclusive language education policies are needed, as are multilingual school curricula, and multilingual teaching, testing and assessment practices.

When I read the relevant research reports and academic publications about all the projects which have recently been appearing with higher frequency, because of the multilingual turn in education for reasons already discussed earlier, it struck me that the outcomes of all these projects and the discourses used to substantiate them contributed to me realizing that multilingual testing and assessment (with its variety of referents) is a ‘fragmented’, somewhat incohesive disciplinary area. That is, while there are common threads across the colourful canvas embroidered, there are significant discrepancies, for example: (a) in how terms such ‘multilingualism’, ‘plurilingualism’ and ‘heteroglossia’ are understood and used, (b) in how concepts such as ‘translanguaging’, ‘code-switching’ and ‘mediation’ are used or circumvented, (c) in how research participants are viewed, what their subject positions are, and whether they are perceived

⁹ The MA thesis I supervised, entitled *Written mediation in the KPG exams: Source text regulation resulting in hybrid formations* can be accessed from: http://rcel.enl.uoa.gr/kpg/texts/MA_thesis_Stathopoulou_mediation.pdf

¹⁰ The Dendrinou article may be accessed from: https://rcel2.enl.uoa.gr/directions/issue1_1f.htm, while the Stathopoulou article may be accessed from: https://rcel2.enl.uoa.gr/directions/issue1_1e.htm

as meaning-making agents, and (d) in the ideological and political underpinnings of their points of departure and their ultimate purpose.

However, despite the often sharply different terminology and discursive formations used to describe project design and practices in which researchers are engaged, there are also many common elements across research projects and instruments constructed. Given that, as Shohamy and Menken (2015: 265) put it, ‘researchers and language testers are just beginning to explore dynamic assessments that allow emergent bilingual adults and children to demonstrate their knowledge and skills using their entire linguistic repertoire’, it is my contention that, rather than taking for granted that multilingual assessment has a single referent (as is often the case in relevant academic papers), the area would stand much to gain – as an academic area of research and as a politically defined action – if research units worked in collaboration with one another to explore and investigate issues such as the following: (a) What are the challenges for teaching and assessment aiming to making sure that bi- and multilinguals are using their repertoires effectively through valid learning and testing tasks, so as to further develop their plurilingual competence? (b) Which multilingual curricular and extra-curricular activities and test or assessment tasks are conducive to developing foreign language learners’ plurilingual competence? (c) Which translanguaging and mediation strategies can be developed in school (language and subject classes) and community actions?

Many more questions can be raised by me, and/or other researchers in this rather uncharted area and it is only proper that the questions be collaboratively posed.

For the time being, I am proposing -- in my leading capacity at the ECSPM – that the CURUM members, especially, begin by collaborating on one or more of the projects below which will need to be described in detail in order to submit them for funding, following specifications of the organisation to which the project is submitted to:

- a) To develop training materials for teachers of language and other curricular areas to use translanguaging pedagogical techniques and specifically to develop and cross-linguistic and intralinguistic mediation tests and assessment tasks aiming at developing the effective use of the learners’ repertoire and all of their semiotic resources.
- b) To diagnostically analyse ‘multilingual testing and assessment’ research and practices with a view to identify? convergences and divergences so as to be able to present ‘best practices’ in a unified, coherent discourse.
- c) To examine ‘multilingual testing and assessment’ research under the light of large-scale multilingualism projects, and especially multilingualism in education for the design of policies which feed into one another.

References

- Baker, C. 2011. *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (5th edn.) Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, B. & A. Hope. 2017. Expanding the construct of 'passive bilingualism' in a listening test for university professors: Incorporating translanguaging. Presentation at AAAL, Portland.
- Blackledge, A., & A. Creese. 2010. *Multilingualism: A Critical Perspective*. London: Continuum.
- Bourdieu, P. *Language and Symbolic Power*. J. Thompson (ed.), Translated by G. Raymond and M. Adamson. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Bravo Granström, M. 2019. *Teachers' Beliefs and Strategies when Teaching Reading in Multilingual Settings: Case Studies in German, Swedish and Chilean Grade 4 Classrooms*. Berlin: Logos Verlag.
- CEFR Companion Volume. 2018. Council of Europe (available to download: <https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989>).
- Cheng, L. 2005. *Changing language teaching through language testing: A washback study*. Cambridge University Press.
- Conteh, J., and G. Meier (eds). 2014. *The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Dendrinou, B. 1992. *The EFL Textbook and Ideology*. Athens: N.C. Grivas Publications.
- Dendrinou, B. 2003. European discourses of homogenisation in language education planning. In Macedo, D. B. Dendrinou & P. Gounari (eds.) *The Hegemony of English*. Boulder, Co: Paradigm Publishers.
- Dendrinou, B. 2004. Multilingual literacy in the EU: Toward alternative discourse in foreign language education programmes. In B. Dendrinou & B. Mitsikopoulou (eds.) *Politics of Linguistic Pluralism and the Teaching of Languages in Europe*. Athens: Metaxmio Publishers and University of Athens.
- Dendrinou, B. 2006. Mediation in communication, language teaching and testing. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, No. 22. Thessaloniki: Hellenic Association of Applied Linguistics, pp. 9-35.
- Dendrinou, B. 2012. The role of language testing in supporting multilingualism. *RCeL e-periodical* (https://rcel2.enl.uoa.gr/periodical/articles/Article8_Bessie_Dendrinou-The_role_of_language_testing_in_supporting_multilingualism.pdf)
- Dendrinou, B. 2013a. Social meanings in global-glocal language proficiency exams. In C. Tzagari, S. Papadima-Sophocleous & S. Ioannou-Georgiou (eds.) *Language Testing and Assessment around the Globe: Achievements and Experiences*. Language Testing and Evaluation Series. Frankfurt, New York and Vienna: Peter Lang.
- Dendrinou, B. 2013b. Testing and teaching mediation. *Directions in English Language Teaching, Testing and Assessment*. Athens: RCeL publications (https://rcel2.enl.uoa.gr/directions/issue1_1f.htm)
- Dendrinou, B. 2015. The politics of instructional materials of English for young learners. In X. Curdt-Christiansen & C. Weninger (eds), *Language, Ideology and Education: The politics of textbooks in language education*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Dendrinou, B. 2016. Is Multilingualism taking a back seat in the EU? Time for action. In P. Nuolijärvi & G. Stickel (eds.) *Language use in public administration. Theory and practice in the European states*. Contributions to the EFNIL Conference 2015 in Helsinki. Budapest: Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences.
- Dendrinou, B. 2018. Multilingualism language policy in the EU today: A paradigm shift in language education. *TLC Journal*, published by the ICC & RUDN University, volume 2, Issue 3. (https://icc-languages.eu/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/TLC_ISSUE-07_September2018.pdf).

- Dendrinis, B. & V. Gotsouliia. 2015. Setting standards for multilingual frameworks in foreign language education. In B. Spolsky, O. Inbar & M. Tannenbaum (eds.) *Recognizing the Individual in Language Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Garcia, O. 2009. *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garcia, O. & N. Flores. 2012. Multilingual pedagogies. In M. Martin-Jones, A., Blackledge & A. Creese (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism*. London & New York: Routledge.
- González-Vilbazo, K., L. Bartlett, S. Downey, S. Ebert, J. Heil, B. Hoot, B. Koronkiewicz & S. Ramos. 2013. Methodological Considerations in Code-Switching Research. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics*, Volume 6, Issue 1, University of Illinois at Chicago
- Gorter, D. & J. Cenoz. 2017. Language education policy and multilingual assessment. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 1–18.
- Haukås, Å. 2016. Teachers’ beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 1–18.
- Hélot, C. 2014. Rethinking bilingual pedagogy in Alsace: Translingual writers and translanguaging. In A. Blackledge A. & A. Creese (eds.) *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy*. Educational Linguistics, vol 20. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Heugh, K., C. Prinsloo, M. Makgamatha, G. Diedericks & L. Winnaar. 2017. Multilingualism(s) and system-wide assessment: a southern perspective. *Language and Education*, Volume 31, 2017 - Issue 3: Education and multilingualism: navigating policy and assessment.
- Jones, B. & G. Lewis. 2014. Language Arrangements within Bilingual Education. In E. M. Thomas & I. Mennen (eds.) *Advances in the Study of Bilingualism*, 141–170. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- López-Gopar, M. E. & W. Sughrua. 2014. Social Class in English Language Education in Oaxaca, Mexico. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 13 (2): 104–110.
- Karavas, E. and B. Mitsikopoulou (eds.). 2018. *Developments in Glocal Language Testing: The Case of the Greek National Foreign Language Exam System*. Oxford, Bern, Berlin, Bruxelles, New York, Wien: Peter Lang.
- Lewis, G., B. Jones & C. Baker. 2012. Translanguaging: Origins and Development from School to Street and Beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18 (7): 641–654.
- Makalela, L. 2015. Moving out of linguistic boxes: the effects of translanguaging strategies for multilingual classrooms. *Language and Education*, Vol. 29, No. 3, 200-217.
- May, S. (ed.) 2013. *The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and Bilingual Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Ortega, L. 2013. SLA for the 21st Century: Disciplinary Progress, Transdisciplinary Relevance, and the Bi/Multilingual Turn. *Language Learning*, 63 (S1): 1–24.
- Ortega, L. 2014. Ways Forward for a Bi/Multilingual Turn in SLA.” In S. May (ed.), *The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Palmer, D. K., R. A. Martínez, S. G. Mateus & K. Henderson. 2014. “Reframing the Debate on Language Separation: Toward a Vision for Translanguaging Pedagogies in the Dual Language Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98 (3): 757–772.
- Pennycook, A. 1994. *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. Harlow, Essex, UK: Longman Group Limited
- Phillipson, R. 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sachtleben, A. 2015. Pedagogy for the multilingual classroom: interpreting education. *The International Journal for Translation & Interpreting Research*, Vol 7, No 2: 51-59.

- Schissel, J. L., C. Leung, M. López-Gopar & J. Davis. 2018. "Multilingual Learners in Language Assessment: Assessment Design for Linguistically Diverse Communities." *Language and Education* 32: 167–182.
- Shohamy, E. 2001. *The Power of Tests: A critical perspective on the uses of language tests*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Educational.
- Shohamy, E. 2006. *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Shohamy, E. (2009). Language tests for immigrants: Why language? Why tests? Why citizenship? In G. Hogan-Brun, C. Mar-Molinero, & P. Stevenson (eds.), *Discourses on language and Discourses on language and integration*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Shohamy, E. 2011. Assessing Multilingual Competencies: Adopting Construct Valid Assessment Policies. *The Modern Language Journal* 95 (3): 418–429.
- Shohamy, E. & K. Menken. 2015. Language assessment: Past to present misuses and future possibilities. In W. Wright, S. Boun, & O. García (eds.) *Handbook of bilingual and multilingual education*. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Stathopoulou, M. 2013a. Investigating Mediation as Translanguaging Practice in a Testing Context: Towards the Development of Levelled Mediation Descriptors. In the Proceedings of the International Conference Language Testing in Europe: Time for a New Framework? University of Antwerp, Belgium.
- Stathopoulou, M. 2013b. *Task dependent interlinguistic mediation performance as translanguaging practice: The use to KPG data for an empirically based study*. PhD thesis. Faculty of English Language and Literature, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens (<https://www.didaktorika.gr/eadd/handle/10442/29102>)
- Stathopoulou, M. 2015. *Cross-Language Mediation in Foreign Language Teaching and Testing*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Stathopoulou, M. 2018. Assessing learners' translingual literacy: From research to practice. In Katsillis, I. (ed.) *Confronting Contemporary Educational Challenges through Research*. International Conference on Educational Research Proceedings. University of Patras publication.
- Tsangari, Dina. 2011. The washback effect of language proficiency testing on education and learning processes (in Greek). *RCeL e-periodical*, RCeL Publications, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens (https://rcel2.enl.uoa.gr/periodical/articles/Article3_Tsagari_periodical.pdf).
- Turner, M. 2017. Integrating Content and Language in Institutionally Monolingual Settings: Teacher Positioning and Differentiation. *Bilingual Research Journal* 40 (1): 70–80.
- Vaish, V. & A. Subhan. 2015. Translanguaging in a Reading Class. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 12 (3): 338–357.
- van Splunder, F. & C. Verguts. 2017. English language testing in a non-English speaking context: The Interuniversity Test of Academic English. Presentation at the ALTE conference (http://www.ealta.eu.org/conference/2017/presentations/Friday/EALTA_2017_0602_SDG_16_H35_F_van_Splunder.pdf).