

Strategies and Practices for Teaching Grammar and Vocabulary in Multilingual Classrooms

Maria Rosaria Nava

Scienze Della Formazione Primaria, Maria Rosaria Nava, Rome, RM, Italy

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.1026EDU0107>

Received: 13 February 2026; Accepted: 18 February 2026; Published: 02 March 2026

ABSTRACT

One of the most important challenges for today's education systems is to provide students, during their schooling, with linguistic and intercultural skills that enable them to function effectively as citizens, acquire knowledge, and develop open attitudes toward others: this vision of teaching languages and cultures is called plurilingual and intercultural education. Plurilingual and intercultural education is guided by several founding principles, such as the recognition of linguistic and cultural diversity guaranteed by the Council of Europe conventions; the right of everyone to use their linguistic varieties as a means of communication, a vehicle for learning, and a means of expressing their belonging; and the centrality of human dialogue, which essentially depends on languages. The experience of otherness through languages and the cultures they convey is a necessary precondition for intercultural understanding and mutual acceptance. In light of these premises, the aim of this paper is to retrace some of the stages that led to the emergence of plurilingualism, especially in education and school settings, as well as to identify some good teaching practices related to the teaching of grammar and vocabulary within multilingual classrooms. Today's society is considered plural and multicultural, but much can and must still be done to ensure that these dimensions are incorporated and recognized in more contexts, first and foremost in school education. The aim is to use linguistic plurality to generate curiosity, sharing, and encourage learning.

Keywords: multilingual, grammar, vocabulary, language learning, competence.

INTRODUCTION

Our society is increasingly characterized by a multicultural social context, dominated by growing diversity and pluralism, in which different languages and cultures need to coexist. It is quite difficult to provide a definition of multilingualism or bilingualism, as this phenomenon is quite complex and multifaceted. Numerous definitions can be found in literature, from the best-known by Weinreich (1974, p. 5), who defined bilingualism as "the alternative use of two languages," to Bloomsfield (1984, p. 18), who considered "bilinguals only those who had perfect control, at the native language level, over two languages". The way of conceiving multilingualism has varied over time in line with the evolution of linguistic sciences. In this sense, it is worth noting that Dewaele (2016) proposes the use of the generic label Lx to refer to all languages learned after the first, thus avoiding any ambiguity. Baker (2013) recalls that, commonly, 'bilingualism' also refers to situations of trilingualism or multilingualism. Language choice during a communicative event is of considerable importance. In a situation of bilingual communication, the phenomena that occur are varied and the consequences that can be observed at the level of the linguistic production of the individual speaker are multiple. When a speaker has two or more different languages at his or her disposal, he or she may not keep them separate, but may alternate between them, even within the same utterance. Consequently, the strategies used by the bilingual speaker are influenced by social, pragmatic, and interactional factors. Bilingual and multilingual subjects must demonstrate their ability to listen, speak, read, and write, and these four skills are not always clearly separated from each other, but on the contrary, are closely related; in fact, according to Byram (2013), different languages are learned in different contexts and for different purposes, and it is necessary to distinguish between language ability and language use.

The personal and contextual dimension plays a significant role in determining the competence of bilingual or plurilingual speakers. The social context, in short, appears particularly significant in determining language

acquisition and the development of communicative competence, according to the cognitive categories appropriate to social life in the community of reference. The speakers, in other words, have their own knowledge and mental schemas that allow them to adapt their linguistic behavior to the social situation. An important finding that emerges is that bilingual or plurilingual speakers need two languages in everyday life. They resort to one or the other according to the "principle of complementarity" enunciated by the scholar: "they usually acquire and use their languages for different purposes, in different domains of life, with different people" (Grosjean, 2010, p. 34), an aspect already highlighted by Weinreich.

Educational contexts need to consider bilingual and plurilingual education programs, in which two or more languages are used as a teaching tool and vehicle for content outside of the language classes themselves, in order to allow children from minority backgrounds to maintain their native language proficiency while simultaneously acquiring active proficiency in the official language. Therefore, to facilitate learning the language of the host country for multilingual learners, schools and teachers implement various inclusion strategies, such as: providing teaching materials that can facilitate language learning, adapting the curriculum to meet the most immediate linguistic needs of students who are finding themselves in a foreign country for the first time and who do not know a single word of the host country's language. The teacher has the task of facilitating learning, of helping the student in the process of acquiring a non-native language, of organizing classroom activities, employing and exploiting new technologies, applying the various techniques at their disposal. The educational management of the learning process within a multilingual classroom therefore presents several challenges, including its intrinsic variability, which depends on factors both internal and external to the learner, becoming uncontrollable and unpredictable precisely because of their individuality; and, on the other, the challenge of creativity in developing learning paths and products (Vedovelli, 2002). The important role played by schools in the debate on plurilingualism is evident.

With an educational model aimed at the inclusion and acceptance of linguistic variety, the purpose is to ensure that members of minority communities enjoy a linguistic, human, and inalienable right that belongs to every human being. The complete learning of a second or foreign language represents a linguistic right belonging to the individual, and it is fundamental to improving their life prospects.

As a complex psychological and sociocultural phenomenon involving individual and social dimensions, multilingualism is interesting not only at the sociolinguistic level, with regard to the use and stratification of language in society, but also at the psycholinguistic level, that is, with regard to the development and functioning of language, similar to theories of the neurocognitive representation of language in the brain. Finally, the choice of which language to use is, as always, up to the speaker, including the possibility of ignoring a rule to achieve specific communicative goals. Context influences the type of communicative situation and its structure, but at the same time, it is subject to continuous renegotiation by speakers (Bazzanella, 1994).

Characteristics of Multilingual Classes

As previously highlighted, schools play a fundamental role in the debate on multilingualism and, consequently, in the management and promotion of multilingual classes. Indeed, educational contexts are often characterized by linguistically, socially, and culturally diverse learners (Nitti, 2022).

Teaching students to compare two or more linguistic systems can help increase metalinguistic reflection, improving their proficiency in their native language as well. Working on similarities and differences among multiple languages is an excellent mental exercise that accustoms learners to become critical and aware of the existence of multiple languages and multiple cultures that view the world differently (Nitti, 2022). This presupposes, but also requires, a rethinking and redefinition of both school structures and teaching methods, namely the introduction of a new pedagogical paradigm that favoured a certain linguistic and cultural homogeneity among students (Silva, 2015). In this sense, intercultural education programs are essential.

Schools must be able to proactively welcome all those multicultural classes in which the implementation of intercultural teaching is necessary. Educational models must therefore be rethought from a deconstructionist perspective, freeing them from ethnocentric approaches and thus making them responsive to the needs and expectations of a multicultural society (Silva, 2015). A pedagogical vision of interculturality, that is, the analysis

of social meanings as a reality of education, necessarily engages with the evolutionary perspective of the transformation of multicultural society. In this context, schools have a duty to recognize the positive educational value of engaging with diversity, as well as the centrality of the individual in interacting with others and their uniqueness as the foundation for personalized learning. Interculturality is therefore indicated as the perspective to adopt to guide teaching, curricula, teaching methods, subjects, relationships, and classroom life. It emphasizes openness to differences as a distinctive trait of the school's identity, as opposed to integration strategies and compensatory measures. The goal of intercultural education lies in social cohesion and convergence towards common values (Serpieri, Grimaldi, 2013).

In the school environment, intercultural education means promoting effective behaviours in encountering others, within a framework of availability, dialogue, and desire within which the framework for civil and democratic coexistence is built.

The proposed methodological approaches promote and encourage cooperation and dialogue; they do not "teach," but educate. They foster a sense of belonging, emphasize the potential of everyone, and engage everyone, without exception. They promote human values and develop critical thinking. Furthermore, what is most important is not the acquisition of knowledge in and of itself, but the process of acquiring learning. A multicultural society gives rise to the need to initiate teaching activities and strategies aimed at achieving the desired pluralistic integration of cultures in society and in schools. This approach considers interculturality as the new educational paradigm, capable of effectively responding to changing educational needs as well as a unique opportunity to rethink cultures and their identities (Cambi, 2006).

An increasingly targeted teaching methodology is needed (Favaro, 2001), one that aims to welcome, promote, and compare cultures, embrace diverse points of view, combat stereotypes and prejudices. Intercultural interaction is also being strengthened (Terranova, 1997): playful techniques include games for learning about oneself and others, games that encourage cooperation, as well as simulation games and role-playing; nonviolent and anti-racist training techniques; techniques that involve expressive participation, such as dance, music, puppetry, and multilingual storytelling; dramatization techniques are also particularly useful, that is, the representation of real-life problems and critical issues, whether psychological (psychodrama), group (sociodrama), or sociopolitical (theatre of the oppressed); techniques that focus on the use of multimedia tools, such as working with images, photographs, and the use of Computers. These teaching strategies and tools can only be fully applicable and effective if created, managed, and coordinated by teachers willing to embrace intercultural education.

Some important phases characterize the language learning journey within multilingual classes (Favaro, 2016) involving, among the others, the "bridge" phase (Balboni, 2012) and the "common learning" phase (Favaro, 2009, p. 15). In these phases, class teachers need to identify the potential difficulties of the foreign student and intervene to overcome them, implementing effective teaching methods and strategies not only for the foreign students but also for the entire class, in order to create a connection within the plurality of languages and cultures, as well. Therefore, there is a need to design not only personalized language enhancement activities, but also inclusive learning experiences to encourage students to explore and learn.

Multilingual competence

According to Cook (2008), in the mind of a person who learns and uses two or more languages, the skills in the individual languages are structured into multicompetence, which is not simply the sum of the skills, but a new entity, continuously subject to qualitative and quantitative restructuring. It is clear how the experience of learning and using a second, third or fourth language in addition to the mother tongue modifies the linguistic system organized in an individual's mind, not only in quantitative terms, i.e. knowledge and skills that are added to the previous ones, but also in terms of the global quality of the system itself, which is reorganized in its structure (Mariani, 2006). Cummins (2007) proposes the idea of a common underlying competence such that the learned languages are stored within the same "reservoir". This linguistic system is explained using the iceberg metaphor: on the surface, the two languages appear differentiated and separate, while beneath the surface they merge, giving rise to conceptual and lexical associations. The bilingual should therefore be considered a single speaker/listener

who uses one language, another, or both together, depending on the interlocutor, the situation, and the topic (Grosjean, 2010).

The multi-competence approach views bilingual development as a holistic process that impacts not only on the linguistic system which is being acquired but on other languages that are already established in the mind/brain (Cook, Li Wei, 2016). In other words, it is the capacity to successively acquire and use different competences in different languages, at different levels of proficiency and for different functions. The central purpose of plurilingual education is to develop this competence (Mariani, 2010).

The concept of "multicompetence" is fundamental to highlighting and fully understanding the bilingual individual's predisposition to coexist in their mind with more than one language, with different functions and levels of proficiency. This brings notable and obvious advantages: greater awareness of the relationship between signifier and signified, better management of the two linguistic codes depending on the context of reference, evident multilingual skills, and greater mental flexibility for the acquisition of other languages (García, Sylvan, 2011).

The issue of multilingualism could be addressed not so much by the degree of "perfect competence" possessed by speakers, but rather by their communicative ability in everyday life. Individuals, in fact, use their linguistic systems for different purposes, with different interlocutors and in various contexts of their lives. The level of competence possessed in one language or another could therefore vary depending on the need related to the use of that language and the context in which it is used (Li Wei, 2018).

As we have noted, more recent studies and reflections move away from categorizing or labelling bilingual speakers and instead describe their sociological development, cognitive organization, communicative specificities, and ability to interact with the sociocultural context in which they live and operate.

Game-based learning for grammar and vocabulary learning

Play encompasses expressive and communicative skills, the discovery of the surrounding environment and one's own body, cognitive development, learning, respect for rules, the affective and emotional dimension, and the child's ability to socialize. Learning through play occurs through imitation, listening, testing, and making mistakes, but always reasoning and attempting to communicate (Panjaburee et al., 2024).

The frontiers of learning are becoming increasingly broad and inclusive, so much that they involve new social phenomena such as playing environments, digital games, and various forms of gamification, which now profoundly influence various aspects of our daily lives, from interpersonal relationships to learning processes, both in education and in the workplace. The multidisciplinary dimension of game studies underpins new gamebased models, which contribute to generating new and meaningful learning environments based on the gamebased learning approach, where games possess significant potential both as a tool and as a teaching model (Nesti, 2017). Games, then, become an effective educational tool: game-based learning is where the characteristics and principles of games are incorporated into learning activities, thereby promoting student engagement and motivation to learn. Gamification and game-based learning are similar in that both strategies promote engagement and sustained motivation in learning (Aprea, Ifenthaler, 2021). Some of the benefits of game-based learning relate to motivation, the ability of computer games to provide risk-free environments, to strengthen self-esteem, to be versatile, and suitable for learning (Griffiths & Davies, 2002).

Game-based learning draws on theories of motivation, constructivism, situated learning, cognitive development, problem-based learning, and learning by doing (Ligabue, 2020). Most educational proposals that include a gaming dimension focus on their use as an educational aid to support the content. This educational use of games aims to enrich and diversify the educational content itself, making it more attractive and closer to the students' reality, through a medium that motivates and captivates them. The goal is to reflect on gaming education and literacy pathways in order to make it effective and, at the same time, eliminate existing prejudices surrounding the concept of "digital gaming," transforming them into opportunities (Limone, 2007).

In light of the above considerations, it can certainly be argued that play can be more productive and beneficial for learning the complex set of notions that is grammar. Games for teaching grammar can engage students in groups or individually, always seeking to stimulate a constructive and learning challenge (Lombardi, 2019).

In this sense, "by developing those basic skills such as observation, classification, comparison, ordering, inclusion, categorization" (Lo Duca, 2006, p. 23), the teacher-student role can be reversed, allowing the latter to formulate the rules themselves. The student explores the linguistic system they are learning, seeking and finding the hidden rule, while the teacher assumes the role of guide and support, encouraging analysis and reflection, helping students identify the mechanisms by which the language functions (Servetti, 2021). It is important to offer activities that encourage students to build bridges between everyday reality and the grammar rules they are examining, thus bringing them closer to their everyday experiences. Furthermore, these types of computer games can create "error-free" learning environments in which players learn through trial and error with immediate feedback, allowing them to apply newly acquired abstract knowledge to new domains, stimulating curiosity and increasing experimentation and exploration (Yu et al., 2021).

Vocabulary also plays a fundamental role in language learning as it encompasses words as elements that convey meaning, involving other categories and presenting a varied and complex whole. Vocabulary can be taught through courses organized by semantic spheres, communicative situations, or specific language (Nitti, 2020). Furthermore, the social, cultural, and affective dimensions of terms should not be underestimated or neglected. Knowledge of a word involves not only a definition, but also how that word fits into the world. Vocabulary knowledge is not something that can ever be fully known and possessed but is something that develops and deepens throughout our lives. Teaching vocabulary involves much more than simply using a dictionary or using a word in a sentence (Baker, Wright, 2021). Vocabulary is acquired incidentally through indirect exposure to words and intentionally through explicit instruction on specific words and word-learning strategies. To intentionally develop vocabulary, students should be explicitly taught both specific words and robust wordlearning strategies (Beck et al., 2002). Seeing vocabulary in rich contexts provided by authentic texts, rather than in isolated vocabulary exercises, leads to robust vocabulary learning. Teaching a rich and robust vocabulary goes beyond knowing definitions; it actively engages students in using and reflecting on word meanings and creating relationships between words (Nation, 2022). Word learning strategies include dictionary use, morphemic analysis, and contextual analysis. Dictionary use teaches students the meanings of multiple words, as well as the importance of choosing the appropriate definition to fit a particular context. Morphemic analysis is the process of deriving the meaning of a word by analyzing its meaningful parts, or morphemes. Contextual analysis involves deducing the meaning of an unfamiliar word by examining the surrounding text. Contextual analysis generally involves teaching students to use both general and specific types of contextual clues (August et al., 2005).

A more general way to help students develop their vocabulary is to promote word awareness, awareness of, and interest in words themselves. According to Stahl (2005), students likely need to see a word more than once to firmly establish it in their long-term memory. This does not mean merely repeating the word but seeing it in different and multiple contexts. That is, it is important that vocabulary teaching provides students with the opportunity to encounter words repeatedly and in more than one context. Similarly, vocabulary can be taught both through play activities and with the support of text-based instruction (Caon, Rutka, 2003).

Balboni (2014) suggests various approaches to language learning, such as a humanistic-relational approach and a teaching method that considers personality traits, cognitive styles, and intelligence types, favoring a balanced language teaching approach that engages all students without distinction. In this sense, emotional intelligence plays a key role in determining retention and acquisition. Other important factors include collaboration and social mediation, with constructivist activities that foster cooperative learning, peer tutoring, and distributed leadership. In this regard, learning techniques, including playful ones, are introduced that integrate cognitive, linguistic, social, motor, psychomotor, and emotional elements, such as structural and manipulative exercises, naval battles, or memory games.

Among the teaching techniques that promote memorization and vocabulary construction, especially within a multilingual class, there are, for example, image-word pairing, the use of lexical maps, repeated readings over time, i.e. methods for developing the ability to use periphrasis and the use of the CLIL methodology, and role

play, a simulation technique that allows students to interact freely on the basis of information regarding the participants and the situation, working more effectively on oral skills (Alessio, 2013). Storytelling represents an essential element in teaching and learning a second language. In this process, various factors assume specific importance (Balboni, 2012): expectancy grammar, or a student's expectations for what may occur in the communicative act, in terms of the vocabulary used, the type and genre of text produced, and the syntax employed; a student's knowledge of the world that they possess and share with speakers of the same language; and communicative competence in the foreign language, or the level of proficiency achieved by the student.

When learning foreign languages, the L2-only approach is considered essential. However, the inescapable role of L1 as an important reference in the teaching/learning process for L2 development has also been highlighted. In vocabulary learning, providing L1 translation equivalents contributes to longer retention and memorization of L2 terms because it allows students to connect words to consolidated L1 semantic and linguistic structures. If L1 is used systematically, selectively, and sensibly, it will aid foreign language learning. Leveraging what students already know conceptually, strategically, and linguistically allows for cumulative development and intellectual continuity in language development. Researchers have concluded that the use of L1 helps increase students' efficiency and facilitate their learning process (Alroe & Reinders, 2015). In this respect, translanguaging is a theory of language practice, a phenomenon of writing or thinking in a language other than people's native tongue, often using multiple linguistic resources flexibly. In the practice of translanguaging as a pedagogical method there is no rigid separation of languages, since it is a question of maximizing all linguistic, cognitive, semiotic and sociocultural implications in the construction of knowledge (Wei 2017). Therefore, this practice can lead to greater potential for reflection on the language itself, developing a kind of metalinguistic awareness (Jessner, 2006), and a shift in mentality or way of thinking, developing a kind of metacognition (Rutgers, Evans, 2015).

CONCLUSION

The past two decades have witnessed significant shifts in our perception of the role of languages in the social, economic, cultural, and political environment. It is now clear that effective integration and social cohesion can only be achieved by transcending traditional linguistic boundaries and promoting knowledge of different languages and cultures. One response to the challenges posed by new forms of mobility and migration is the development of plurilingual and intercultural education, which involves recognizing and supporting the linguistic and cultural diversity of all students at all levels of education and whose goal is to build a more humane and inclusive society. Although the concept of plurilingualism is now fundamental to today's society, the issues that remain to be addressed are varied, from current research on bilingualism, to the pedagogical implications of plurilingualism and innovative approaches to foreign language teaching, to the importance of neighboring languages, and the question of identity in a world of cultural and linguistic diversity. Developing interlingual competence and addressing the multifaceted aspects of communication across linguistic and cultural barriers is crucial.

A plurilingual approach focuses on developing strategies that support students' ability to recognize and better utilize existing language skills. In an increasingly linguistically diverse educational landscape, this approach allows us to move from what students "lack" to the identification and productive mobilization of a set of linguistic resources and communicative repertoires that students bring to learning. A plurilingual approach to teaching and learning also focuses on the relationship between language and identity. As mentioned above, creative and experienced teachers strive to develop tasks, activities, and assessments that make multilingual practices more visible. In all of this, technology also supports teaching and learning practices. Integrating a plurilingual perspective into education depends on stakeholders—be they students, families, institutions, or the local community—who create ideological spaces that move away from monolingual ideologies toward multilingual ones and who provide concrete tools to implement this vision within the classroom.

REFERENCES

1. Alessio, A.M. (2013). Il Role-playing, un complesso di tecniche di spicco nella didattica dell'Italiano come lingua straniera. *Revista de Lenguas Modernas*, 19(1), 35-47.

2. Aprea, C., Ifenthaler, D. (2021). *Game-based Learning Across the Disciplines*. London: Springer.
3. Balboni, P. E. (2012). *Le sfide di Babele. Insegnare le lingue nelle società complesse*. Torino: UTET.
4. Balboni, P. E. (2012). *Fare educazione linguistica. Insegnare italiano, lingue straniere e lingue classiche*. Torino: UTET.
5. Balboni, P.E. (2014). *Didattica dell'italiano come lingua seconda e straniera*. Torino: Loescher/Bonacci.
6. Baker, C., & Wright, W. E. (2021). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
7. Bazzanella, C. (1994). *Le facce del parlare. Un approccio pragmatico all'italiano parlato*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia.
8. Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
9. Byram, M. (Ed). *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
10. Cambi, F. (2006). *Incontro e dialogo. Prospettive della pedagogia interculturale*. Roma: Carocci editore.
11. Caon F., Rutka S., (2004). *La lingua in gioco. Attività ludiche per l'insegnamento dell'italiano L2*. Perugia: Guerra.
12. Cook, V. (2008). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: Arnold.
13. Cook, V. J., & Li Wei (Eds.). (2016). *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Multi-competence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
14. Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(1), 221-240.
15. Dewaele, J.-M. (2010). *Emotions in multiple languages*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
16. Favaro, G. (2009). L'italiano L2, auto-apprendimento e narratività. *Materiali multimediali di italiano L2 per i bambini e ragazzi*. *Italiano Lingua Due*, 1(1), 35-42.
17. Favaro, G. (2001). *I mediatori linguistici e culturali nella scuola*. Bologna: EMI.
18. Favaro, L. (2016). Verso l'insegnamento precoce. In Melero Rodriguez, C. (ed.), *Le lingue in Italia, le lingue in Europa: dove siamo, dove andiamo*. Venezia: Edizioni Ca' Foscari, 87-97.
19. García, O., & Sylvan, C. E. (2011). Pedagogies and Practices in Multilingual Classrooms. *Singularities in pluralities*. *Modern Language Journal* 95(3), 385 – 400.
20. Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and Reality*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
21. Jessner, U., (2006). *Linguistic Awareness in Multilinguals: English as a Third Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
22. Ligabue., A., (2020). *Didattica ludica. Competenze in gioco*. Trento: Erickson.
23. Limone, P., (2007). *Nuovi media e formazione*. Roma: Armando Editore.
24. Li Wei (2018). "Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language" in *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9-30.
25. Lo Duca, M.G. (a cura di). 2006, *Sillabo di italiano L2 per studenti universitari in scambio*. Roma: Carocci.
26. Mariani, L. (2010). Verso un'educazione linguistica plurilingue e interculturale. *Ilsa*, 1(1), 1-16.
27. Nation, I. S. P. (2022). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
28. Nesti, R., (2017). *Game-based learning. Gioco e progettazione ludica in educazione*. Pisa: Edizioni Ets.
29. Nitti, P. (2020). Lo sviluppo delle abilità linguistiche e la multimodalità a lezione. Un'indagine sulle attività proposte nell'insegnamento dell'italiano come lingua seconda. In Voghera M., Maturi P., Rosi F., (eds.), *Orale e scritto, verbale e non verbale: la multimodalità nell'ora di lezione*, Ospedaletto-Pisa: Pacini Editore, 101-118. Nitti, P. (2022). *Insegnare Italiano nella classe plurilingue*. Brescia: Editrice La Scuola.
30. Panjaburee, P., Hwang, G. J., Intarakamhang, U., Srisawasdi, N., & Chaipidech, P. (2024). Effects of a personalized game on students' outcomes and visual attention during digital citizenship learning. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 1-22.
31. Rutgers, R., Evans, M., (2017). Bilingual education and L3 learning: Metalinguistic advantage or not? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 20(7), 788–806.
32. Serpieri, R., Grimaldi, E. (2013). *Che razza di scuola. Praticare l'educazione interculturale: Praticare l'educazione interculturale*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
33. Silva, C. (2015). *Lo spazio dell'intercultura. Democrazia, diritti umani e laicità*. Milano: Franco Angeli.

34. Stahl, S.A. (2005). Four problems with teaching word meanings (and what to do to make vocabulary an integral part of instruction). In Hiebert E.H., Kamil M. L. (eds.), *Teaching and learning vocabulary: Bringing research to practice*. Mahwah: Erlbaum, 38-57.
35. Terranova, S. C. (1997). *Pedagogia interculturale. Concetti, problemi, proposte*. Milano: Guerini Edizioni.
36. Vedovelli, M. (2002). *Guida all'italiano per stranieri. La prospettiva del Quadro comune europeo per le lingue*. Roma: Carocci Editore.
37. Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of pragmatics*, 43(5), 1222-1235.
38. Weinreich, U. (1974). *Lingue in contatto*. Torino: Boringhieri.
39. Yu, Z., Gao, M., Wang, L. (2021). The effect of educational games on learning outcomes, student motivation, engagement and satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 59(3), 522–546.