

## LANGUAGE IDENTITY FOR A NEW GENERATION

*A. V. Hackett-Jones*

### **Abstract.**

*Introduction.* This article highlights the necessity of reconceptualizing language identity as formed through language learning to address contemporary challenges including transformations in language education and shifts in the generational mindset. The article aims to establish foundational criteria for this reconceptualization and proposes a working definition of a revised and revisited understanding of language identity.

*Materials and Methods.* The research is grounded in a comprehensive review of international and Russian scholarship on language identity. Through comparative analysis and conceptual synthesis, the study evaluates the most viable theoretical approaches to inform its proposed framework.

*Results.* The analysis confirms that while established insights into multilingual and plurilingual identity remain valid, their interpretation can be significantly extended and enriched through the lens of translanguaging theory applied to both personal and social dimensions of learning.

*Conclusions.* The article proposes the draft concept of ‘translanguaging identity’, characterized by several essential features derived from translanguaging theory and practice: (1) multicompetence, referring to the development of a linguistic repertoire integrated into a single competence; (2) creativity and criticality, which serve as crucial tools for addressing contemporary technological challenges including artificial intelligence and the effects of excessive content consumption on cognitive patterns (clip thinking); (3) a transition from monoglossic to heteroglossic ideology, enabling more positive perceptions of bilingualism/multilingualism and creating more constructive learning environments; (4) harmonious integration of learning identity with second language identity. These conceptual advancements offer valuable insights for reorganizing perspectives on language learning.

**Keywords:** language identity, culture identity, bilingualism, multilingualism, plurilingualism, translanguaging

## ЯЗЫКОВАЯ ЛИЧНОСТЬ НОВОГО ПОКОЛЕНИЯ

*A. V. Hackett-Jones*

### **Аннотация**

*Введение.* В статье рассматривается необходимость в пересмотре подхода к понятию «языковая личность», обозначающему совокупность характеристик личности, которые формируются в процессе овладения вторым (или дальнейшим) иностранным языком. Такая необходимость диктуется многочисленными вызовами сегодняшнего дня, включая изменения в системе образования, а также критические изменения в мышлении современного молодого поколения. Целью настоящей статьи является попытка определить базовые критерии для концептуализации этого понятия и сформулировать рабочее определение переосмысленной языковой идентичности.

*Материалы и методы.* В статье представлен обзор исследовательской литературы авторства российских и зарубежных ученых и анализируются наиболее перспективные подходы к рассмотрению языковой личности в рамках компаративного анализа и концептуального синтеза.

*Результаты.* Проведенное исследование позволяет заключить следующее. Несмотря на то что многие ранее сделанные выводы и наблюдения относительно мультилингвальной (полилингвальной) и плюрилингвальной личности по-прежнему не теряют своей актуальности и должны быть учтены при текущем пересмотре подхода к языковой личности, сама интерпретация критериев

для формирования языковой личности, отвечающей требованиям сегодняшнего дня, можно существенно расширить и обогатить при рассмотрении ее с позиций набирающего популярность понятия транслингвизма в его применении к личностным и социальным аспектам образовательного процесса.

*Заключение.* Рабочее определение термина «транслингвальная личность» подразумевает такие ключевые характеристики, продиктованные теорией и практикой транслингвизма, как (1) мультикомпетентность, обозначающая формирование языкового репертуара, интегрированного в единую компетентностную структуру; (2) сформированное креативное и критическое мышление, которое доказывает свою эффективность в противостоянии технологическим вызовам сегодняшнего дня, таким как искусственный интеллект или избыточное контент-потребление, лежащее в основе клипового мышления современной молодежи; (3) идеологический переход от моногlossии к гетерогlossии, формирующий более позитивное восприятие многоязычия в целом и, следовательно, создание более стимулирующей и конструктивной образовательной среды; (4) гармоничное развитие личности обучающегося в тесной связи с его языковой личностью. Результаты, к которым приходит настоящее исследование, могут быть полезны для формулирования обновленного подхода к формированию языковой личности как цели языкового образования.

**Ключевые слова:** языковая личность, лингвокультурная личность, билингвизм, мультилингвизм, плюрилингвизм, транслингвизм

### **Introduction: A new mentality calls for a new foreign language identity**

We have found ourselves in a reality where educators and learners alike are bombarded by new challenges that call for a renewed understanding of the educational process and a thorough analysis of all the implications of those new challenges for the theory and practice of language didactics. As a recent study notes, the Russian educational system is currently experiencing multifaceted shifts — social, political, technological, and interpersonal (Hackett-Jones et al. 2023, 113). To name but a few, students are still recovering from the enduring effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on their formative personal and educational development, suffer from an unprecedented number of mental health concerns and require a sensitive approach to creating a positive and supportive learning environment; the offline native speaker domain has become more unattainable as ever before in the history of modern-day Russia; the interference of AI-technologies into the learning processes has not been exclusively beneficial but also disruptive and largely confusing. These factors, among others, profoundly influence individuals' self-perception, their approach to learning, and their overall mentality. Scholars had previously established that new communication

technologies reshape generational mentality by altering the very language of communication (Ivlieva 2022, 537), a phenomenon now intensified by the pervasive integration of AI across societal domains. This article contends that language identity, or more specifically, second language identity (L2 identity) is undergoing a major transformation, which needs to be accounted for in educational planning and discussed extensively within teaching methodology.

The primary objective of this article is to reconceptualise the notion of language identity by incorporating these contemporary challenges and influencing factors. To accomplish this, the following goals will be pursued sequentially: (1) to review and evaluate existing research, particularly the substantial scholarship on plurilingual and multilingual identity; (2) to examine current research trends in the field; (3) to investigate emerging concepts of translanguaging pedagogy and translingual identity; (4) to explore the potential for further research of second language teacher identity and its impact on student identity formation.

### **Research background:**

#### **Plurilingual and multilingual identity**

Language identity, commonly referred to in Russian literature as 'language personality' ('языковая личность') has been shaped

through decades of formulation, interpretation, and reinvention. It has been defined as a set of qualities, skills, and competences acquired through language learning; as readiness to effectively participate in intercultural communication; as a collective ‘personality’ reflected in an individual’s textual production in the broadest sense, etc. While a comprehensive overview of this concept’s evolution is beyond the scope of this article, we will focus on recent developments most relevant to the issues outlined earlier. Let us also clarify from the outset that we shall use the term ‘language identity’ rather than ‘language personality’ due to its prevalence in the literature under review, and the established analogous concept of ‘learning personality’, which will be addressed subsequently.

Interest in language identity as shaped through language acquisition has been significantly advanced by scholarship distinguishing between plurilingualism and multilingualism, a distinction rigorously explored by both Russian and international authors. Broadly referencing the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), T. N. Kalugina and M. V. Timchenko describe multilingualism as the coexistence of multiple languages at societal and individual levels, whereas plurilingualism refers to a more dynamic and evolving linguistic repertoire of an individual speaker (Kalugina, Timchenko 2024, 66).

First published in 2001, the CEFR was later reviewed and expanded, resulting in the 2017 Companion Volume, which lays special emphasis on plurilingual and pluricultural competence and actively employs such terms as *plurilingual* and *pluricultural repertoire*. As Timchenko summarizes the main takeaways of the document with respect to the differences between multilingualism and plurilingualism, the former is focused on reaching proficiency in two or more languages, while the latter deals with the set of skills allowing a speaker to use all means at their disposal, including switching between languages, paraphrasing, employing paralinguistic tools and generally experimenting with a wide variety of alternative ways of expression (Timchenko 2017, 105).

This distinction leads to an important insight: by putting plurilingualism at the forefront of educational objectives, the aim shifts from producing ‘an ideal speaker’ (a ‘copy’ of a native speaker as close to the ‘original’ as possible) to training an effective communicator capable of flexibly and creatively leveraging their full linguistic and cultural repertoire (Kalugina, Timchenko 2024, 67).

When the Council of Europe first introduced the concept of plurilingualism, it was emphasized that a learner’s competencies across languages differ not only in proficiency but also in the extent and nature of their exposure to each language and culture. Consequently, the primary focus of the plurilingual competence is described by the authors as the necessity to build a skillset enabling learners to strategically manage that imbalance (Coste et al. 2009, 20).

Another term that needs to be set apart from multilingualism and plurilingualism is polylingualism, which some scholars propose as an umbrella term to encompass both multi- and plurilingualism (Shostak 2018, 80). According to V. K. Kochisov and O. U. Gogitsaeva, polylingual identity is characterised by its cultural, historical, social, and ethnic background as well as being a competent user of the native and the foreign languages, which manifests itself through four competences developed simultaneously: linguistic, speech-related, communicative, and ethnocultural (Kochisov, Gogitsaeva 2013, 119). This approach reflects a more traditional understanding of multilingual education and highlights the differences the plurilingual approach suggests.

### **Current research trends: The rise of translanguaging (translingualism)**

In a seminal 2011 paper on academic translanguaging, S. Canagarajah — one of the biggest names in the field from a methodological standpoint — presents an interesting constellation of related terms he considers synonymous with the emerging notion of ‘translanguaging’: from ‘transcultural and translingual literacy’ and ‘polylingual languaging’ to, notably, ‘plu-

bilingualism’ (Canagarajah 2011b, 2), thereby creating a direct link to the Council of Europe’s framework discussed previously.

Both plurilingual and translingual approaches are recognised by L. P. Khalyapina and E. V. Shostak as two leading trends in the present-day Western methodology (Khalyapina, Shostak 2019, 122). According to the authors, Vivian Zamel was among the first researchers to suggest translingualism as a term in the late 1990s. In the Russian literature the term has been extensively treated by Z. G. Proshina (Proshina 2017, 161–162) who stated that we live in a time where liminal terms like translingualism are bound to appear in opposition (or in addition) to polylingualism and multilingualism in an attempt to overcome a controversy caused by two contrasting ambitions of our era: globalism and local identity. Having analysed the frequency and the chronology of the use of multiple relevant terms referring to culturality (poly-, pluri-, multi-, transcultural, as well as inter-, and crosscultural, which fall outside the subject of discussion here), she comes to the conclusion that poly- and pluriculturalism are close in meaning and are focused on an individual’s intrinsic ability to recognize and tolerate multiple cultures (Proshina 2017, 156). Multiculturalism, in her view, refers to the ethnic cultural diversity of established societies. Transculturalism, however, implies the coexistence of two cultural identities within an individual, characterised not by full assimilation but the presence of distinct features of each of the cultures. Western researchers use the term ‘translanguaging’ rather than ‘translingualism’ to emphasise that the translingual approach to language focuses on the process rather than the system.

The shift in focus from language as a system to language as a practice is the essential characteristic of translanguaging. Moreover, it presupposes a full deployment of the speaker’s entire linguistic repertoire, wherein language systems cooperate and interfere with each other, producing numerous instances of interference and transference (Khalyapina, Shostak 2019, 125). This is not a new idea in itself and can be

traced back to N. V. Bagramova’s well-argued point that when taking up a new activity, an individual always seeks support in previously acquired skills through a process known as skills transfer (Bagramova 2006, 56). This involves linguistic skills of various levels as well as academic skills and learning strategies.

International research on translanguaging often emphasises naturally occurring bilingualism in multilingual societies, where learners with migration background are exposed to different languages used as means of instruction within an educational setting and as the primary means of communication (native language). In these contexts, scholars are careful to clarify that translanguaging is much more than just switching between one language to the other (also known as ‘code switching’). As defined by O. García and A. M. Y. Lin, translanguaging is ‘both the complex and fluid language practices of bilinguals, as well as the pedagogical approaches that leverage those practices’ (García, Lin 2016, 117–118). With this in mind, the difference between ‘code switching’ and ‘translanguaging’ consists in the fact that code switching deals with separate language systems, while translanguaging refers to one integrated linguistic system incorporating elements of all linguistic systems available to the learner. The same idea of translingual learners treating their diverse linguistic repertoire as an ‘integrated system’ is expressed in (Canagarajah 2011a, 401).

J. MacSwan takes the idea of an integrated linguistic repertoire of bilingual children one step further and projects the idea of holism onto linguistic ability, describing ‘translanguaging’ as a manifestation of ‘holistic bilingualism’ (MacSwan 2017, 190). This perspective underscores the imperative of enabling learners to use their full range of linguistic talents within the classroom.

Although these findings are largely derived from case studies involving bilingual and multilingual children, it is our firm belief that many of these conclusions offer valuable insights for the practice of the so-called ‘artificial’ or academic bilingualism/multilingualism.



### Discussion: Promoting translanguaging pedagogy to build translingual identity

L. Barratt (Barratt 2021, 171) describes an interesting shift occurring in contemporary language teaching practice. Whereas previous methodologies restricted first language use primarily to early learning stages, transitioning to exclusive target-language instruction at advanced levels, current trends increasingly incorporate ‘home and local languages’ as the language of instruction, which makes a strong case for a further development of what has been termed ‘translanguaging pedagogy’. This teaching approach builds on communicative practices observed in multilingual communities, where speakers demonstrate ‘multicompetence’ in the linguistic repertoire they possess, and the ability to adjust it to the communicative context, depending on whether it requires monolingual or multilingual tools to convey meaning. The cornerstone of translanguaging pedagogy lies in the activation of students’ prior knowledge, which brings us back not only to the earlier discussions about skills transfer, but also to the fundamental scaffolding techniques in language teaching that originated in L. S. Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development, or ZPD (for detailed examination of scaffolding implications for language teaching, see Hackett-Jones 2019).

As quite a nascent concept, translanguaging pedagogy leaves a lot of questions unanswered: How should we approach language interference if we consider every language in the learner’s linguistic repertoire equally valuable? Does using native or previously acquired languages facilitate or impede new language acquisition? Does code switching indicate linguistic deficiency or the opposite? Another concern is that everything is becoming increasingly political in the West, and even these positive processes stimulated by the intention to give more voice and more rights to linguistic minorities might easily become yet another good thing taken too far, like many other good intentions in recent history.

This brings us to the central question this paper seeks to address: can we conceptualise

‘translingual identity’ as a term denoting the language identity of this new generation? Notably, numerous scholars who extensively research translanguaging, both as a social and individual phenomena as well as a pedagogical approach, generally avoid the specific term ‘translingual identity’, preferring to discuss identity in broader cultural and linguistic terms. However, for the purposes of this research, we would like to list some crucial ideas behind the concept of translanguaging that could inform a potential definition:

- 1) Multicompetence. Languages in the learners’ linguistic repertoire do not form independent separate systems but are integrated into a single multicompetence. This is significant for a comprehensive understanding of the objectives formulated for a language learning process, since the focus should shift from mastering separate competences to expanding the existing linguistic repertoire. Canagarajah calls it ‘repertoire building’, emphasizing functional deployment across languages rather than striving for excellence in any one of them (Canagarajah 2011b, 1).
- 2) Creativity. Translanguaging is ‘a creative improvisation’ presupposed by the context (Canagarajah 2011b, 5).
- 3) Criticality. Critical awareness is fundamental to translanguaging along with creativity. As Li Wei eloquently states: ‘These two concepts are intrinsically linked: one cannot push or break boundaries without being critical; and the best expression of one’s criticality is one’s creativity’ (Li 2011, 1223).
- 4) Transition from monoglossic to heteroglossic ideology. This shift involves recognising bilingualism/multilingualism as valuable in its own right, rather than a mere transition to monolingual society (that is, proficiency in one language — if we project this situation of a multilingual society onto academic setting). An added bonus to this is that a positive perception of bilingualism contributes to a more relaxed, natural behaviour among bilinguals (MacSwan 2017).

5) Correlation with learning identity. According to M. M. Wu (Wu 2024, 5), L2 identity strongly correlates with learning experiences, wherein each learning experience contributes to L2 identity construction, while existing L2 identity shapes how students perceive the language learning process. The author here refers to Ph. Benson's definition of L2 identity as 'any aspect of a person's identity that is related to their knowledge and use of a second language' (Benson et al. 2013, 17). The term 'learning identity' generally encompasses learners' metacognitive awareness of their learning process and learning capabilities (Kolb, Kolb 2012, 1889).

### **Further considerations:**

#### **L2 teacher identity**

When discussing a renewed understanding of L2 learner's identity, we cannot fail to overlook the fact that it poses new demands for language teachers. As highlighted in (Wu 2024, 115), the contemporary globalised context demands a teacher identity built upon several essential qualities, including:

- 1) awareness, sensitivity, respect towards various 'Englishes': to avoid discrimination, teachers must possess foundational knowledge of diverse cultures and languages present in their classroom;
- 2) empathy in general, and especially towards those 'who are different from oneself';
- 3) ideological flexibility: educators must move beyond the native vs. non-native speaker dichotomy to avoid the marginalisation of learners.

To cultivate these qualities, Wu recommends that teachers should engage in 'reflection, intercultural activities, local and overseas on-site or virtual service learning projects, and formal training'.

### **Conclusion**

A 'reimagined' language identity is a dynamic and integrated understanding of how learners develop their sense of self through

language learning in response to today's unique challenges. Unlike traditional models that treat languages as separate systems, this conceptualisation frames linguistic competence as a unified repertoire, blending all of a learner's language skills into a single adaptable resource. It emphasizes creativity and critical thinking as essential tools for addressing modern barriers, while, at the same time, aligning with broader societal shifts toward multilingualism. This perspective fosters a more inclusive and motivating learning environment that challenges hierarchies between languages and helps learners navigate practical constraints while developing a healthier, more flexible relationship with language learning itself — one that reflects the realities of a multipolar world with its multiple linguistic and cultural influences.

The term 'translingual identity', if chosen to denote this new incarnation of language identity, captures this reconceptualization as a set of competences built in the process of language learning in close conjunction with the development of learning personality. This approach could bring in new exciting prospects for all the participants involved in the educational process, as it offers three key advantages. First, language multicompetence facilitates the construction of a comprehensive linguistic repertoire, which is an integrated system of a learner's entire language-related knowledge and skills. Second, creativity and criticality of translingual identity seem to be among the most effective and efficient tools to overcome specific modern-day limitations in the Russian context, such as restricted access to English-speaking environments and native speakers traditionally looked upon as models of standardised English, while also building versatile 'survival' skills demanded of language specialists today. Third, its heteroglossic ideology, which aligns with the state policy advocating a multipolar world, actively contributes to a more constructive and motivating learning environment, leaving no space for discrimination and marginalisation.

## REFERENCES

- Bagramova, N. V. (2006) Obuchenie vtoromu inostrannomu yazyku v usloviyakh modernizatsii obrazovaniya [Teaching a second foreign language in the context of educational modernization]. In: N. V. Bagramova (ed.). *Obuchenie vtoromu inostrannomu yazyku v vuze i shkole [Teaching a second foreign language in higher and secondary education]*. Saint Petersburg: Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia Publ., pp. 5–11. (In Russian)
- Barratt, L. (2021) Translanguaging in Teaching/Learning Languages. In: H. Mohebbi, C. Coombe (eds.). *Research Questions in Language Education and Applied Linguistics*. Cham: Springer Publ., pp. 171–175. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-79143-8\\_32](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-79143-8_32) (In English)
- Benson, Ph., Barkhuizen, G., Bodycott, P., Brown, J. (2013) Second language identity. In: Ph. Benson, G. Barkhuizen, P. Bodycott, J. Brown (eds.). *Second language identity in narratives of study abroad*. London: Palgrave Macmillan Publ., pp. 17–33. [https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137029423\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137029423_2) (In English)
- Canagarajah, S. (2011a) Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, no. 95, pp. 401–417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x> (In English)
- Canagarajah, S. (2011b) Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, no. 2, pp. 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110239331.1> (In English)
- Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. companion volume with new descriptors (CEFR). (2018) Council of Europe. [Online]. Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989> (accessed 17.05.2025). (In English)
- Coste, D., Moore, D., Zarate, G. (2009) *Plurilingual and Pluricultural Competence: Studies toward a Common European Framework of Reference for language learning and teaching*. Strasbourg: Language Policy Division Publ. [Online]. Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/168069d29b> (accessed 24.06.2025). (In English)
- García, O., Lin, A. M. Y. (2016) Translanguaging in bilingual education. In: O. García, A. M. Y. Lin, S. May (eds.). *Bilingual and Multilingual Education (Encyclopedia of Language and Education)*. Switzerland: Springer Publ., pp. 117–130. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02258-1\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02258-1_9) (In English)
- Hackett-Jones, A. V. (2019) Pereosmyslenie ponyatiya “lingvometodicheskaya obuchayushchaya podderzhka” dlya polilingval’nogo obucheniya [Reconceptualizing the notion of “linguistic and methodological learning support” for plurilingual education]. *Issledovaniya yazyka i sovremennoe gumanitarnoe znanie — Language Studies and Modern Humanities*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 57–63. <https://doi.org/10.33910/2686-830X-2019-1-1-57-63> (In Russian)
- Hackett-Jones, A. V., Sokolova, Z. N., Ivanenko, E. A. (2023) Osobennosti formirovaniya didakticheskogo polilingvizma v kitajskoj i russkoj uchebnoj auditorii: sopostavitel’nyj aspekt [Features of developing didactic plurilingualism in Chinese and Russian classrooms: A comparative perspective]. *Issledovaniya yazyka i sovremennoe gumanitarnoe znanie — Language Studies and Modern Humanities*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 113–121. <https://doi.org/10.33910/2686-830X-2023-5-2-113-121> (In Russian)
- Ivlieva, E. A. (2022) Osnovnye priemy lingvisticheskoy ekonomii v internet-diskurse (na materiale ispanских sotsial’nykh setej) [Key techniques of linguistic economy in internet discourse: on the material of Spanish social networks]. *Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki — Philology. Theory & Practice*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 537–542. <https://doi.org/10.30853/phil20220064> (In Russian)
- Kalugina, T. N., Timchenko, M. V. (2024) Plyurilingvisticheskij podkhod v inoyazychnom professional’nom obrazovanii: kriticheskij vzglyad na zarubezhnye uchebniki anglijskogo yazyka [A plurilingual approach to foreign language professional education: a critical perspective on ESL textbooks]. *Vyshee obrazovanie segodnya — Higher Education Today*, no. 2, pp. 64–70. (In Russian)
- Khalyapina, L. P., Shostak, E. V. (2019) Plyurilingval’nyj i translingval’nyj podkhody kak novye tendentsii v teorii integrirovannogo obucheniya inostrannym yazykam i professional’nym distsiplinam studentov tekhnicheskikh vuzov [Plurilingual and translingual approaches as emerging trends in the theory of integrated foreign language and discipline-specific instruction for technical university students]. *Vestnik PNIPU. Problemy yazykoznaniya i pedagogiki — PNRPU Linguistics and Pedagogy Bulletin*, no. 2, pp. 119–130. <https://doi.org/10.15593/2224-9389/2019.2.11> (In Russian)
- Kochisov, V. K., Gogitsaeva, O. U. (2013) Etnopedagogicheskie aspekty polilingval’nogo obrazovaniia [Ethnopedagogical aspects of multilingual education]. *Vektor nauki. Ser. Pedagogika i psikhologiya — Science Vector. Series: Pedagogy, Psychology*, no. 3 (14), pp. 119–121. (In Russian)
- Kolb, A. Y., Kolb, D. A. (2012) Learning Identity. In: N. M. Seel (ed.). *Encyclopedia of the Sciences of Learning*. Boston: Springer Publ., pp. 1889–1890. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6\\_229](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6_229) (In English)

Li, W. (2011) Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, no. 43, no. 5, pp. 1222–1235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035> (In English)

MacSwan, J. (2017) A Multilingual Perspective on Translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 167–201. <https://doi.org/10.3012/0002831216683935> (In English)

Proshina, Z. G. (2017) Translingvizm i ego prikladnoe znachenie [Translingualism and its application]. *Vestnik rossiskogo universiteta druzhby narodov. Seriya: Voprosy obra-zovaniia: iazyki i spetsial'nost'* — *RUDN Journal of Language Education and Translingual Practices*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 155–170. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8011-2017-14-2-155-170> (In Russian)

Shostak, E. V. (2018) Kontseptsiya plyurilingvizma v lingvodidaktike i obosnovanie termina “plyurilingval'noe obuchenie” [The concept of plurilingualism in language didactics and the rationale for the term “plurilingual education”]. *Nauchno-tekhicheskie vedomosti SPbGPU. Gumanitarnye i obshchestvennye nauki* — *St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University Journal. Humanities and Social Sciences*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 71–85. <https://doi.org/10.18721/JHSS.9207> (In Russian)

Timchenko, M. V. (2017) Novye trebovaniya evropejskogo soobshchestva k urovniam i formam vladeniya inostrannym yazykom [New European requirements for foreign language proficiency levels and competence frameworks]. In: *Mezhkul'turnaya kommunikatsiya i professional'no orientirovannoe obuchenie inostrannym yazykam: materialy XI Mezhdunarodnoj nauchnoj konferentsii, posvyashchennoj 96-letiyu obrazovaniya Belorusskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* [Intercultural Communication and Professionally-Oriented Foreign Language Teaching: Proceedings of the XI International Conference Dedicated to the 96<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Belarusian State University]. Minsk: Belarusian State University Publ., pp. 104–105. (In Russian)

Wu, M. M. (2024) *Globalisation and Second Language Identity: Opportunities, Challenges, and the Importance of Morality*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan Publ., 163 p. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-68248-3> (In English)

## СВЕДЕНИЯ ОБ АВТОРЕ

**ХЭКЕТТ-ДЖОНС Александра Валерьевна** — *Aleksandra V. Hackett-Jones*

Российский государственный педагогический университет им. А. И. Герцена, Санкт-Петербург, Россия.

Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia, Saint Petersburg, Russia.

SPIN-код: 1661-2074, Scopus AuthorID: 57195559424, ORCID: 0000-0002-1880-4782, e-mail: [avhackettjones@herzen.spb.ru](mailto:avhackettjones@herzen.spb.ru)

Кандидат филологических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры английского языка и лингвострановедения.

**Поступила** в редакцию: 2 июня 2025.

**Прошла** рецензирование: 7 июля 2025.

**Принята** к печати: 30 сентября 2025.