



Teaching Languages in Migrant Contexts: Managing Heterogeneity through Inclusive and Multiliteracy-Based Approaches

Elisa Lamura¹

¹Université de Lorraine – ATILF – CNRS, Nancy, France

Abstract

Migrant classrooms are not just another type of second language classroom: they represent a qualitatively different environment. The urgency of language acquisition, the need to select immediately useful topics, limited pedagogical resources, and above all the diversity of learner profiles make them a distinct context for learning the majority language, often perceived as mandatory for social integration. This diversity goes beyond linguistic proficiency: migrant classrooms often bring together learners with widely different ages, educational backgrounds, literacy levels, trajectories, and goals. Some approach language as a tool for survival, others as a path to integration or work, and others with ambivalent attitudes linked to identity. Such diversity demands continuous pedagogical differentiation, understood as the constant adjustment of content, tasks, and modalities to address heterogeneity within a single group. While this poses challenges for teachers accustomed to homogeneous classes, it can also be transformed into a resource through inclusive and multiliteracy-based frameworks. The theoretical perspectives informing this study include dynamic bilingualism, which highlights flexible use of repertoires; investment theory, which links identity to agency; the conceptualization of language as social practice; and multiliteracies pedagogy, which emphasizes multimodal meaning-making. Drawing on both fieldwork in Parisian migrant classrooms and existing research, this paper demonstrates how empirical classroom observations, teaching records, and student questionnaires on the perceived effectiveness of specific techniques provide evidence for strategies to manage heterogeneity constructively. Practical approaches include: valorizing plurilingual repertoires; integrating learners' cultural knowledge into lessons; task-based and collaborative learning; and the use of multimodal resources (oral, written, digital, visual) to address literacy gaps. The originality of this contribution lies in framing migrant classrooms as a distinct pedagogical environment requiring its own framework and in proposing continuous differentiation as a central principle for inclusive migrant language education. By combining theoretical insights with empirical evidence, this paper shows how inclusive approaches can transform heterogeneity into opportunities for linguistic development, intercultural competence, and learner empowerment.

Keywords: *heterogeneity; migrant classrooms; multiliteracy; inclusive pedagogy; plurilingualism*

1. Introduction

Walk into a community French class for recently arrived adults and heterogeneity is not an exception but the organising fact: in the same room you may find learners who can draft a CV beside others who are just beginning to decode the alphabet, all trying to gain fast access to housing, health care and work (Adami, 2015). In such conditions, a single linear lesson plan quickly stalls—some learners are left behind while others are held back—because trajectories, literacies and immediate goals diverge too widely to be served by one path only (Adami, 2020). These tensions are not uniquely French: international work on adult-migration L2 education maps the same blend of urgency, scarce resources and diverse learner profiles (Simpson & Whiteside, 2015).

This paper offers a pragmatic response that keeps a shared objective for the whole class while diversifying entry points and supports, so that participation remains meaningful for everyone without lowering cognitive demand (Tomlinson, 2017). We stage tasks through oral, visual and digital steps before asking for short written outputs, treating multimodality as a scaffold that makes writing possible rather than optional (Bezemer & Kress, 2015). We also bound the use of learners' other languages to



the setup of tasks—brief pre-task cooperation in the same L1 and machine-translated consignes—while keeping French-medium production and assessment at the centre (Wei, 2018).

This study is situated in four intact classes A1–B2 (Council of Europe, 2020) in a Paris community site and examines which supports learners perceive as most useful in practice through teaching logs, lesson artefacts and a brief six-point Likert questionnaire with $N = 48$. My position in the field is deliberately dual: I taught the A1 group while acting as the researcher who designed the supports and coordinated administration with the A2–B2 teachers, and I therefore balance insider knowledge of classroom constraints with the responsibility to report procedures and interpretations transparently. At the policy level, the LIAM research synthesis helps frame how local classroom moves can align with broader expectations for the linguistic integration of adult migrants (Beacco et al., 2017).

We ask three questions: which micro-moves most reliably help manage heterogeneity; how multiliteracy design and a bounded bilingual setup change access to instructions and breadth of participation; and which tensions—fairness in assessment, preparation time, policy constraints—must be navigated in volunteer-heavy provisions (Bygate, 2016). The contribution is an actionable framework that treats heterogeneity as a resource: we spell out design moves a teacher can adopt tomorrow, and we show where they make a perceptible difference for learners starting from very different points (Adams, 2015).

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Dynamic Repertoires and Structured Translanguaging

We adopt a repertoire view of bilingualism in which learners mobilise all their linguistic and semiotic resources to learn and to mean. This flexibility needs classroom boundaries, so we make L1 use visible and time-limited: a brief pre-task brainstorm in learners' other languages secures comprehension of the consignes, after which all production and assessment are in French. We state output expectations and grading criteria explicitly in French to keep the target language central to the task (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021). Conceptually, we follow a linguistic account that clarifies translanguaging and questions the naturalness of "named languages" as discrete systems (Otheguy, García & Reid, 2015). As a classroom theory, translanguaging highlights how learners draw on full semiotic repertoires to make meaning across modes (Wei, 2018). This stance sits comfortably with a multimodal view of classroom communication, where speech, writing, image and gesture work together rather than in isolation (Bezemer & Kress, 2015).

2.2 Investment, Identity and Agency

Investment theory holds that learners participate more fully when classroom tasks speak to their imagined futures and legitimised identities (Norton & De Costa, 2018). To make that connection tangible, we offer limited but meaningful choice among strands linked to work, family or civic needs, so that learners can see a direct path from the task to their own trajectories. We also rotate collaborative roles—interviewer, scribe, time-keeper and summariser—to distribute responsibility and to surface complementary strengths inside the same pair or group. In this configuration, choice signals that diverse goals are welcome, while roles provide a concrete structure within which every learner has a reason and a turn to act. The approach aligns with an additive orientation to multilingual learners, where new learning builds on existing linguistic resources rather than supplanting them (Cummins, 2021). Framed this way, agency is not a personality trait but a classroom affordance: tasks and roles make participation doable, and expectations make French-medium contribution visible and valued.

2.3 Language as Social Practice and Multiliteracies

Treating language as social practice legitimises the use of authentic multimodal artefacts—voice notes, images, short videos, forms and signage—drawn from the communicative environments that learners actually navigate outside the classroom (Bezemer & Kress, 2015). In our sequences, listening, looking and speaking create several entry points into the task before we converge on a short written product that captures understanding in French (Cope & Kalantzis, 2015). This design treats multimodality as a scaffold for writing rather than a substitute, so that images and audio stabilise meaning while the written phase consolidates it in the target language. Learning-by-Design principles



help us stage these moves deliberately—first building a shared representation of the task across modes, then asking for concise text that serves as the assessed evidence of learning.

2.4 Bloom's Taxonomy and Task Sequencing

We use Bloom's taxonomy as a planning heuristic to stage tasks at comparable levels of cognitive demand while varying modalities and supports. In practice, this means that, within a single lesson theme, we propose parallel activities that target the same process level (e.g., *Analyse* or *Evaluate*), so that learners choose how to engage without drifting to lower demand. We rely on a pragmatic, classroom-oriented reading of the taxonomy and its revisions, focusing on the clarity it provides for task purpose and evidence of learning (Adams, 2015).

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Questions

This study addresses three questions in a single, coherent thread. First, which micro-level teaching moves—notably tiered supports, task choice and structured translanguaging—most reliably help teachers manage heterogeneity in migrant classrooms? Second, how multiliteracy tasks and structured translanguaging shape access to consignes, the breadth of participation and learners' perceived usefulness of the supports provided. Third, which tensions emerge (assessment fairness, preparation time, policy constraints) and how they can be mitigated while keeping the appropriation of French at the centre of learning.

3.2 Participants and Context

The study took place at Espace 19 (Paris 19e), where four intact classes—A1, A2, B1, B2—were taught between September 2024 and June 2025. During this period, we administered the test block inside regular lessons. Each class included 12 learners (total N = 48) who were first-arrival migrants with varied schooling and literacy histories and mixed employment status. The A1 questionnaire was administered by the author (class teacher), while in A2, B1 and B2 it was administered by the respective teachers.

Table 1. Sample Description (N = 48)

Class Level	n	Site	Period	Questionnaire Administration
A1	12	Espace 19 (Paris 19e)	Sep 2024 – Jun 2025	Author (course teacher)
A2	12	Espace 19 (Paris 19e)	Sep 2024 – Jun 2025	Class teacher
B1	12	Espace 19 (Paris 19e)	Sep 2024 – Jun 2025	Class teacher
B2	12	Espace 19 (Paris 19e)	Sep 2024 – Jun 2025	Class teacher

Table 1a. Class Demographics by Level

Class Level	Female	Male	Other/Unspecified	Age range
A1	9	3	0	40–60
A2	10	2	0	30–60
B1	7	5	0	40–50
B2	7	4	1	30–60

Note: All participants were first-arrival migrants with varied schooling and literacy backgrounds and mixed employment status (unemployed, homemakers, workers and retirees).



3.3 Instruments and Data Collection

We collected quantitative data only via a six-point Likert questionnaire (six items; anchors 1 = Strongly disagree ... 6 = Strongly agree) on the perceived usefulness of visuals, glossary, the bounded bilingual setup (same-L1 cooperation and machine-translated consignes only), role rotation, and choice among parallel tasks, plus overall usefulness. Teaching logs and lesson artefacts were compiled for documentation of lesson design only; they were not analysed. Observationally, teachers noted fewer clarification questions; no counts were collected.

Box 1. Six-point Likert instrument (English template) Scale anchors: 1 Strongly disagree — 2 Disagree — 3 Slightly disagree — 4 Slightly agree — 5 Agree — 6 Strongly agree.

1. The visual materials (images, drawings) helped me understand what to do.
2. The glossary with icons / key words helped me start the task.
3. The bilingual setup (same-L1 pairing + translated instructions only) helped me start faster.
4. Rotating roles (interviewer/scribe/time-keeper/summariser) helped my participation.
5. Having a choice among parallel tasks (same theme and goal) helped me work better.
6. Overall, the supports used in this lesson were useful for me.

We computed descriptive percentages (Agree/Strongly agree) for each Likert item by level (A1–B2) and overall. No additional process indicators (e.g., time-to-task, clarification-question counts) or qualitative analysis (open responses, interviews, vignettes) were conducted; this will be addressed in Future Work.

3.4 Procedure and Ethics

Development of supports and the instructional approach occurred throughout September 2024–June 2025. The test block (questionnaire + classroom indicators) was administered once per class on separate days within regular lessons: A1 by the author alone; A2, B1, B2 with the respective class teachers present. The questionnaire took approximately 15 minutes at the end of the lesson. Participation was voluntary, anonymous and had no bearing on assessment or access to services. Learners could opt out at any time.

3.5 Lesson Design and Timeline (120 minutes)

The pedagogical experiment was implemented once per class within a two-hour lesson. All scaffolds were present in the same session: machine-translated instructions for setup only, same-L1 peer cooperation during setup, visual materials, a compact icon glossary, and choice among parallel tasks aligned to Bloom's levels (Adams, 2015). Throughout, production and assessment remained in French.

Timeline

- 0–10' Setup (FR + L1 for setup only). State the goal in French; display consignes (FR) with MT glosses (zh/ar/bn/en); allow same-L1 pairing to secure task understanding; assign initial roles.
- 10–25' Remember/Understand. Visual warm-up (icons + keywords) + oral explanation in pairs; brief plenary check.
- 25–45' Apply. Complete a realistic form using a model; optional role rotation; teacher circulates.
- 45–70' Analyse. Order steps of the procedure; justify sequence (2–3 sentences).
- 70–90' Evaluate. Compare two options (online vs. desk) and recommend one for a newcomer (short written argument).
- 90–105' Create. In pairs, design a mini-guide (poster + 30" voice note).
- 105–120' Questionnaire + debrief. Administer six-point Likert (15'); quick oral debrief.

All data were gathered within this single lesson for each class, with the six-point questionnaire administered immediately after the tasks.



3.6 Level-Specific Pedagogical Sequences

To ensure comparability across classes while keeping tasks meaningful for recently arrived adults, all four sequences address key integration domains (Housing, Healthcare, Work, Residence Permits) with rising linguistic demand and discourse complexity from A1 to B2. In every class, consignes (FR) are provided with L1 glosses (zh/ar/bn/en) for setup only; production and assessment remain in French. Differentiation is embedded through tiered input (visuals, models, authentic texts) and role alternation.

A concise overview of the four level-specific sequences is provided in the table below.

Table 2. Overview of Level-Specific Sequences

Level (FR · EN)	Communicative aim	Morphosyntax focus	Key lexicon	Culminating task
A1 — LA MAISON (The House)	Search for housing; describe desired home	Possessive adjectives; prepositions of place	Rooms, furniture, indoor/outdoor	“Mon logement idéal” mini-poster + 20–30” voice note
A2 — SANTÉ: PRISE DE RDV ET SYMPTÔMES (Healthcare: Appointments & Symptoms)	Complete medical sheet; book appointment; describe symptoms	Présent; devoir/pouvoir; basic impératif; recent past; yes/no & wh- questions	Body parts; common illnesses & symptoms; scheduling	Confirmation message (SMS/e-mail)
B1 — TRAVAIL: ENTRETIEN & PROBLÈMES (Work: Interview & Common Issues)	Handle interview; request shift change; report sick leave	Conditionnel (politeness); passé composé vs imparfait; impératif	Interview vocabulary; schedules; HR; medical certificate	60-second self- pitch or shift- change e-mail
B2 — TITRES DE SÉJOUR: DOSSIER & RDV (Residence Permits: File & Appointment)	Interpret multi- source info; prepare file; request clarification	si + imparfait/conditionnel; occasional passive; reported speech	Supporting documents; récépissé; appointment platform	Advisory note + formal e-mail to préfecture

4. Findings

4.1 Sample and Headline Findings

Across the four classes, the combined design—tiered inputs, visible supports, and bounded bilingual setup—made starts smoother, kept everyone working toward the same goal, and helped lower-level learners contribute without diluting the cognitive demand. The high perceived usefulness reported by learners is consistent with recent evidence on how migrants evaluate the practical utility of French in everyday trajectories (Adami, André & Seto Yibokou, 2024). We obtained 48 valid questionnaires at Espace 19 (Paris 19e): A1 (n = 12), A2 (n = 12), B1 (n = 12), B2 (n = 12): findings reflect immediate post-lesson perceptions at a single site. Overall appreciation of the lesson’s supports reached A1 = 95%, A2 = 89%, B1 = 80%, B2 = 84% (Agree/Strongly Agree). Table 3 summarises item-level results for the five supports (visuals; glossary; bounded bilingual setup; role rotation; choice among parallel tasks), while Table 3a shows overall appreciation by level. These tables provide the quantitative backdrop for the classroom patterns described in Sections 4.2–4.3.



Table 3. Perceived Usefulness of Supports (N = 48)

Support	Overall %	A1	A2	B1	B2	Notes
Visuals / images / drawings	≥95	≥95	≥95	≥95	≥95	Most helpful for task access
Glossary (icons + key words)	76	62	79	80	83	Uptake rises with level
Bilingual setup (same-L1 cooperation + MT instructions only)	≥95	≥95	≥95	≥95	≥95	MT into zh/ar/bn/en; setup phase only
Role rotation (scribe/interviewer etc.)	78	68	70	84	90	Lower willingness at A1–A2
Choice among parallel tasks (same Bloom phase/objective)	≥95	≥95	≥95	≥95	≥95	3–4 tasks per phase; same goal/theme

Table 3a. Overall Appreciation by Level (Likert — % Agree/Strongly Agree)

Level	%
A1	95
A2	89
B1	80
B2	84

We now unpack what these figures looked like in practice, focusing on differentiation and multimodal task design. For each pillar we describe the teaching move and the effect observed in class.

4.2 Continuous Differentiation in Practice

In a lesson on booking a health appointment, the whole class worked toward the same objective but entered through three tiered inputs—a pictorial timeline with keywords, a short model dialogue, and an authentic form to complete—with an icon glossary and sentence starters available to all. Differentiation preserved the task’s cognitive demand by varying access routes rather than lowering expectations (Tomlinson, 2017). This logic is consistent with an inclusive-pedagogy stance that treats individual differences as a design parameter for the mainstream classroom, not as exceptions to be remediated (Florian, 2015). Choice among parallel tasks within the same phase was rated ≥95% “useful/very useful” across A1–B2, with the predictable limitation that some learners occasionally chose over-comfortable options; nonetheless, class flow and participation improved and the common objective was maintained. Willingness to rotate roles showed a level gradient—A1 68%, A2 70%, B1 84%, B2 90%—and a brief live demo of roles increased uptake in the lower levels. We interpret the lower baseline at A1–A2 as a language-load effect: swapping roles mid-task requires rephrasing instructions, monitoring a partner’s output, and generating new forms on the fly, which can be more demanding for beginners.

4.3 Multiliteracy Tasks that Bridge Literacy Gaps

In a unit on administrative procedures for a transport pass, the multimodal flow—audio announcement, image sequencing, pair explanation, short written caption, optional voice note—created multiple entry points before a concise written product in French, making multimodality a scaffold toward writing rather than a substitute for it (Bezemer & Kress, 2015). With pair work and rotated roles, we observed systematic completion within time across groups, whereas individual attempts more often remained unfinished: this advantage reflects a redistribution of cognitive and linguistic load: the interviewer/scribe arrangement externalises planning, provides immediate feedback, and allows quick rehearsal and reformulation, preventing the stalls typical of solo work (Ellis et al., 2019). This pattern aligns with a task-based perspective that privileges meaning-focused, goal-oriented classroom activity to sustain engagement and successful outcomes (Bygate, 2016). Visual supports were also rated ≥95% “useful/very useful” at all levels, underscoring their role in securing access to consignes before written synthesis, because they compress procedural steps into salient



cues, stabilise meaning across languages, and lower the initial decoding load, enabling faster entry into the task before written synthesis.

4.4 Structured Translanguaging for Inclusion

In a workplace communication task, we implemented a structured sequence: a brief L1 brainstorming phase, machine-translated instructions (consignes) displayed alongside French, and a French-only output assessed with a transparent grid. The sequence resulted in fewer clarification questions; smoother starts and clearer products. Learners reported feeling safer to begin because they had first secured the meaning of the task; at the same time, French remained the language of the deliverable and of assessment. For a classroom-oriented articulation of pedagogical translanguaging, see also the dedicated framework. (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021).

4.5 Bloom-aligned Task Exemplars (Theme: Administrative Procedures)

Below we illustrate parallel tasks aligned to Bloom's levels. Each example shows the French consigne with L1 glosses in braces for Chinese, Arabic, Bengali and English (automatic translation); L1 is used for setup only; outputs and assessment are in French.

- Remember/Understand. *Task:* Match icons and keywords; explain each in a simple sentence. Consigne (FR): « Associe chaque image à son mot. Puis explique à ton/ta partenaire, en une phrase, ce que c'est. » {zh/ar/bn/en gloss} Output: 6–8 correct pairs; 6–8 FR sentences. Assessment: completeness + clarity.
- Apply. *Task:* Complete a realistic form (Pass transport) using a model. Consigne (FR): « Remplis le formulaire avec tes informations. Utilise l'exemple comme modèle. » {zh/ar/bn/en gloss} Output: form filled; key fields correct. Assessment: accuracy + legibility.
- Analyse. *Task:* Order jumbled steps of the procedure and justify the sequence. Consigne (FR): « Remets les étapes dans l'ordre et explique pourquoi. » {zh/ar/bn/en gloss} Output: correct sequence + 2–3 FR justifications. Assessment: coherence.
- Evaluate. *Task:* Compare two ways to book (online vs guichet) and recommend one for a newcomer. Consigne (FR): « Compare les deux options et recommande la meilleure pour une personne nouvellement arrivée. » {zh/ar/bn/en gloss} Output: short FR argument (3–4 sentences). Assessment: relevance + reasoning.
- Create. *Task:* In pairs, design a mini-guide (poster + 30" voice note) for classmates. Consigne (FR): « Créez un mini-guide (affiche + note vocale 30") pour expliquer la procédure à votre classe. » {zh/ar/bn/en gloss} Output: poster with captions; voice note. Assessment: completeness + clarity; FR only.

5. Discussion

We interpret heterogeneity as complementarity: pairing and role rotation mobilise diverse strengths; multiliteracy tasks and structured translanguaging secure access without diluting French outcomes. Tensions include assessment comparability, time costs of preparing tiers, and institutional preferences for narrow “textbook progress.” Safeguards and policy-aligned framing are proposed (UNHCR, 2024).

6. Implications

For teachers, the findings translate into a compact toolkit: plan tiered entry points and keep them visible; script structured translanguaging so that L1 appears only in the setup of tasks; and rotate pair roles to surface complementary strengths (see Tables 3 and 3a). For institutions, the priority is enabling conditions: small budgets for visuals and printing, short professional development on differentiation and multiliteracies, and realistic expectations for mixed-age, mixed-literacy groups. For assessment, we recommend that teachers accept multimodal evidence (oral/visual) alongside short written products and make rubrics explicit and lightweight. These program-level enablers are consistent with lessons synthesised in LIAM research on adult migrants' linguistic integration (Beacco et al., 2017).



7. Limitations and Future Work

The main limitation is that the study is based on a single site (Espace 19) and four intact classes (A1–B2) with fluctuating attendance. Findings rely on immediate post-lesson self-reports of perceived usefulness; no process measures (e.g., timing or clarification-question counts) were collected under classroom conditions.

In the future, we will complement the present quantitative indicators with qualitative inquiry. In particular, we plan to mobilise trained interpreters of learners' first languages (Chinese, Arabic, Bengali, English) to conduct semi-structured interviews and/or to collect open-ended responses in L1, then translate and cross-check them to ensure interpretive fidelity. This will allow us to track how learners experience access, participation and agency across tasks, and to examine how structured translanguaging and multiliteracy design shape those experiences over time. We also intend to carry out within-class A/B replications of key design features (e.g., with/without bilingual setup) to estimate effect sizes more precisely.

8. Conclusion

The results demonstrate that a coherent combination of continuous differentiation, multiliteracy design and structured translanguaging can transform heterogeneity into a resource for learning. In our Paris setting, visual supports and a carefully bounded bilingual setup were almost universally valued, and pair work with role rotation allowed learners who struggled alone to complete tasks within time. These effects were obtained without lowering cognitive demand and while keeping French at the centre of production and assessment. Personally, I take from this study a renewed confidence that clarity of task purpose and generosity in access routes can coexist in migrant language education.

Building on this pilot, I plan to: (i) develop a ready-to-use activity manual tailored to volunteer-run French classes for migrants (printable handouts, bilingual consignes, rubrics); and (ii) design thematic teaching sequences with explicit differentiation guidance (tiers, roles, assessment) that teachers can adopt wholesale or adapt quickly. Both outputs will be freely shareable within community networks and aligned with CEFR descriptors (Council of Europe, 2020).

REFERENCES

- [1] Adams N. E., "Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive learning objectives", *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 2015, 103(3), pp. 152–153.
- [2] Adami H., "Language training for adult migrants in France: History, policies and institutions", in Simpson J., Whiteside A. (eds.), *Adult Language Education and Migration: Challenging Agendas in Policy and Practice*, London, Routledge, 2015.
- [3] Adami H., *Enseigner le français à des adultes migrants*, Paris, Hachette FLE, 2020.
- [4] Adami H., André V., Seto Yibokou K., "La question de l'utilité de la langue française vue par les migrants. Analyse des résultats d'une enquête épilinguistique", *Revue TDFLE*, n°84, Paris, 2024.
- [5] Beacco J.-C., Krumm H.-J., Little D., Thalgott P. (eds.), *The Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants: Some Lessons from Research*, Berlin–Boston, De Gruyter Mouton (in cooperation with the Council of Europe), 2017.
- [6] Bezemer J., Kress G., *Multimodality, Learning and Communication: A Social Semiotic Frame*, London–New York, Routledge, 2015.
- [7] Bygate M., "Sources, developments and directions of task-based language teaching", *The Language Learning Journal*, 2016, 44(4), pp. 381–400.
- [8] Cenoz J., Gorter D., *Pedagogical Translanguaging*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009029384>
- [9] Cope B., Kalantzis M. (eds.), *A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Learning by Design*, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- [10] Council of Europe, *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment – Companion Volume*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 2020.
- [11] Cummins J., *Rethinking the Education of Multilingual Learners: A Critical Analysis of Theoretical Concepts*, Bristol, Multilingual Matters, 2021.
- [12] Ellis R., Skehan P., Li S., Shintani N., Lambert C., *Task-Based Language Teaching: Theory and Practice*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2019.



- [13] Florian L., “Inclusive pedagogy: A transformative approach to individual differences but can it help reduce educational inequalities?”, *Scottish Educational Review*, 2015, 47(1), pp. 5–14.
- [14] Norton B., De Costa P. I., “Research tasks on identity in language learning and teaching”, *Language Teaching*, 2018, 51(1), pp. 90–112.
- [15] Otheguy R., García O., Reid W., “Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics”, *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2015, 6(3), pp. 281–307.
- [16] Simpson J., Whiteside A. (eds.), *Adult Language Education and Migration: Challenging Agendas in Policy and Practice*, Introduction, London, Routledge, 2015.
- [17] Tomlinson C. A., *The Differentiated Classroom: Responding to the Needs of All Learners* (2nd ed.), Alexandria (VA), ASCD, 2017.
- [18] UNHCR, “Language training programmes”, *Integration Handbook* (online), 2024, available at: <https://www.unhcr.org/handbooks/ih/language/language-training-programmes>
- [19] Wei L., “Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language”, *Applied Linguistics*, 2018, 39(1), pp. 9–30.