

Emilee Moore

Introduction

Inclusive epistemologies and practices of out-of-school English learning

Abstract Official indicators suggest that English as a Foreign Language is one of the school subjects that is most telling of social inequalities in Catalonia, this being the geographical and educational context where the research presented in this volume was carried out. Similar findings are reported in other areas of Europe. This monograph reports on the main findings of the research project ‘Inclusive epistemologies and practices of out-of-school English learning (IEP!)’, funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation and led by the author of this chapter, which ran from January 2019 until June 2021. The project responded to low attainment levels for English as a Foreign Language among socioeconomically disadvantaged youth in a municipality in the metropolitan area surrounding Barcelona. As part of this project, the contributors to this volume: 1) collaboratively researched teenagers’ existing practices of using and learning English out of school time; 2) implemented new, inclusive, nonformal English language educational initiatives; 3) evaluated the impact of the nonformal English language educational initiatives implemented; and 4) supported the sustainability and transferability of the initiatives. The project embedded collaborative and creative ways of working and building knowledge into its methodology, and in this sense, it aimed to contest traditional researcher-researched and logocentric hierarchies of knowledge, and to foster not only inclusive educational practices, but also inclusive epistemologies.

Keywords: English as a Foreign Language, out-of-school, youth, collaboration, creativity, inclusion

1. Introduction

All students in their fourth – and thus final – year of compulsory secondary schooling (*educació secundària obligatòria* or ESO) in Catalonia, the geographical and educational context where the research presented in this volume was carried out, sit core competences tests. These young people, who are approximately 15 years of age at the time of testing, are assessed in Science and Technology, Mathematics, Catalan, Spanish and English (English being a required subject throughout compulsory schooling, from the age of six, Catalan being the vehicular language of schooling, and Spanish being taught as a second language and/

or used as a medium of instruction in other curricular subjects). The results of this assessment of core competences reveal significant differences between young people in more and less affluent areas. According to recent data (Consell Superior d'Avaluació del Sistema Educatiu, 2019), 27 % of students at schools labelled 'high complexity' (a category used by Catalan educational authorities which is determined by indicators including low socioeconomic status and a high number of recent migrants) do not achieve the minimum required competences in English, compared with only 3.7 % of students from 'low complexity' schools. Furthermore, English is the subject area with most difference in achievement levels between students from high and low complexity schools. These results are particularly noteworthy because while the outcomes of students from high complexity schools for English are consistently low, the English results of students from low complexity schools are higher than their results for all other subjects and this is a tendency that has been sustained over the years (Consell Superior d'Avaluació del Sistema Educatiu, 2019). The data thus suggest that if there is one school subject that is especially telling of social and educational inequalities in our context, it is English. Erling et al. (2020) report similar findings for Austria, suggesting that this is not an isolated phenomenon, but rather one affecting other educational systems across Europe.

The contributors to this volume set out from a first premise that taking action to improve the competences in English of socioeconomically disadvantaged youth is a meaningful contribution towards more equitable educational outcomes and more inclusive future opportunities for them. The contributors also share the conviction that young people learn not only in schools, but also in the myriad of interactions across space and time that they encounter beyond formal education (see Moore, Vallejo, et al., this volume). Amalgamating these positions, the volume reports on the main findings of the research project 'Inclusive epistemologies and practices of out-of-school English learning (IEP!)', funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation, which ran from January 2019 until June 2021. The aims of the project were:

- 1) To collaboratively research teenagers' existing practices of using and learning English out of school time;
- 2) To implement new, inclusive, nonformal English language educational initiatives;
- 3) To evaluate the impact of the nonformal English language educational initiatives implemented;
- 4) To support the sustainability and transferability of the initiatives.

The project responded to the transversal objective of the Spanish Science, Technology and Innovation Strategy to generate knowledge that contributes to greater social welfare. It also responded to the Horizon 2020 challenge of building an inclusive Europe. By placing intersectoral cooperation – between university, schools and other educational agents – as an epistemological pillar (see Section 3 of this chapter), the project also addressed the Horizon 2020 aim of promoting effective cooperation between science and society in order to embed social awareness and responsibility into the pursuit of scientific excellence. It further responded to the Horizon 2020 vision of boosting employment, and more specifically to the European Commission's Europe 2020 recommendations that member states take actions that improve young people's competences in foreign languages as a means of boosting their domestic and international employability.

This introductory chapter continues in Section 2 by presenting the research context in more depth, drawing on some of the ethnographic data – i.e. fieldnotes and a focus group – gathered from different IEP! project sites in doing so. Following that, in Section 3, the overarching methodological approach followed in the research is introduced, although individual contributors to the volume present their specific approaches in the different empirical chapters. Finally, in Section 4, the overall organisation of the volume is presented.

2. The research context

Our research was conducted in a town in the metropolitan area surrounding Barcelona, in Catalonia. The town is home to approximately 13,500 people and has an area spanning less than one square kilometre. A main feature of the town is thus its high density, with families living in rows of similarly designed apartment blocks, some as low as five stories in height, but most of which are approximately 10 to 15 floors high. All these residential tower blocks were originally constructed as public housing in the 1970s – towards the end of the Franco dictatorship – to provide accommodation for workers who mainly migrated from other parts of Spain to take up employment in the state-owned electricity or railway companies. The town plan was based on the map of the Iberian Peninsula and the Balearic Islands, and the street names are different Spanish places and landmarks. The town is bordered by two major highways from which it is separated by sound barriers installed in recent years. The following extract from fieldnotes written by Víctor Corona, one of the researchers in the IEP! project, reflect his first impressions of the municipality:

Extract 1

El instituto está situado muy cerca del centro de la ciudad. Está rodeado por bloques de apartamentos muy altos. Se pueden contar muchas ventanas, todas ellas muy pequeñas. [...] Salta a la vista su carácter industrial, así como su condición de ciudad dormitorio. No hay muchas zonas verdes ni parques. Tampoco es que sea demasiado grande.

The high school is located near the centre of the city. It is surrounded by very high blocks of apartments. You can count lots of windows, all of them are very small. [...] Its industrial character stands out, as does its condition as a dormitory town. There are not many green spaces nor parks. It's also not very large.

(Víctor Corona, 22 October, 2019)

In terms of public educational facilities, there are four primary schools, two secondary schools, a vocational training school, an adult education centre, two childcare centres, a library, a civic centre, a music school, and a youth centre. There is also one private English language academy offering after-school classes for children and teens and life-long learning courses for adults, which was attended by some of the young people we worked with as part of the IEP! project (see Corona et al., this volume). The town is located within kilometres of a major university, which acts as a hub of internationalisation, and is also surrounded by innovative business and I+D facilities, also with international projection. However, while the young people in the municipality are surrounded by a buzz of educational and professional activities that take place in English, most do not have direct associations with them (e.g. through their parents' work). While some of the young people we worked with did imagine themselves attending the university in the future, others saw themselves attending vocational training or joining armed or police forces. Disposable household income in the town is below the average for Catalonia and unemployment – especially youth unemployment – is higher than the Catalan average. Educational attainment levels are below average; for example, more than half of the students at the two high schools do not meet minimum curricular standards for English on completing their compulsory schooling.

Besides working-class families who migrated to the town in the 1970s, there is also a significant population of Catalan and Spanish gypsies, as well as more recent migrants from other parts of the globe. Spanish is the main language heard in the town and spoken by the young people who participated in IEP! research, with Catalan, the main language of formal education, being a language

that most of the youth we worked with only used at school. This is reflected in the following extract from a focus group conducted with some of the young people who took part in our research at the local youth centre, which will be introduced later in this section:

Extract 2

EMI: Emilee (researcher), SAR (Sara, pseudonym, youth participant), DAN (Daniel, pseudonym, youth participant), ANA (Ana Li, pseudonym, youth participant), JEF (Jefferson, pseudonym, youth participant). Others are present but do not speak in the extract.

- 01 **EMI** **entonces a ver si nos podéis explicar las lenguas que se**
so let's see if you can explain to us the languages that are
- 02 **hablan en (name of town)?**
spoken in (name of town)?
- 03 **SAR** **el castellano.**
spanish.
- 04 **DAN** **el castellano.**
spanish.
- 05 **ANA** **[el castellano.]**
[spanish.]
- 06 **JEF** **[el castellano] más.**
[spanish] mo:re.

In line 1 of the extract, Emilee asks the youth to tell her and another IEP! researcher present (Claudia Vallejo), about the languages spoken in their town. Without hesitation, Sara answers “el castellano” (“Spanish”), which is repeated in chorus by her peers Daniel and Ana Li in the following lines. Only Jefferson, who had very recently migrated to Spain and settled in the town from Ecuador, nuances his response – “el castellano más” (“Spanish more”) – presumably because he had also encountered another language (Catalan) on arrival, both in and out of school, which he was in the early stages of learning. He would thus experience its social and educational presence and use in a different way from his peers. Finally, the very fact that the interaction between the researchers and the young people in Extract 2 takes place in Spanish is also representative of the youths’ preference for this language as their main language of socialisation. Indeed, different research in our context has shown how Catalan is often used by young people in addressing adults who they identify with educational institutions (e.g. Masats et al., 2017), which was not the case in our setting.

As for English, the following extract from an improvised focus group discussion held with a group of students at one of the two secondary schools we collaborated with as part of IEP! – introduced in the following paragraphs – is quite representative of the diversity of reasons the young people had for investing or otherwise in learning this language (see also Corona et al., this volume). The extract begins in lines 1 to 2 with the researcher asking the students why they want English or to learn English. Their English teacher, Almudena Herrera, was also part of the discussion.

Extract 3

EMI: Emilee (researcher), ALM: Almudena (English teacher), S01, S02, etc. (unidentified students)

- 01 EMI para que queréis el inglés. (.) para que queréis aprender
 02 inglés?
why do you want english. (.) why do you want to learn english?
- 03 S03 porque si yo [()
because if i [()
- 04 S01 [para viajar.
[to travel.
- 05 S10 [para los turistas. (.) para los turistas.
[for tourists. (.) for tourists.
- 06 S06 [para poder leer mangas que no estén subtítulos.
[to be able to read mangas that are not subtitled.
- 07 S09 me quiero ir a estudiar a la universidad.
i want to go to study at university.
- 08 S02 para entender a los ingleses.
to understand english people.
- 09 S06 yo para que quiero el inglés? (.) para leer mangas que no están
 10 subtítulos en inglés por- o sea en español porque me da mucha
 11 rabia tener que buscarlo en el traductor.
*why do i want english? (.) to read mangas that are not
 subtitled in english for- i mean in spanish because it irritates
 me to have to search in the translator.*
- 12 ALM vale.
ok.
- 13 ((excerpt not transcribed))
- 14 S02 yo para que mi madre esté contenta.
me so that my mother is happy.

- 15 S07 **vamos si me piro de casa allí:** ()
come on if i leave home there: ()
- 16 S08 **supongo que para conseguir algún trabajo.**
i suppose that to get some job.

In response to the researcher's question, the students provide multiple reasons for learning English. These include wanting to be able to read manga comics that are not translated into Spanish, to travel and to understand tourists, go to university and get a job. Indeed, the young people we worked with as part of IEP! were far from homogenous in terms of their personal and academic interests or their future aspirations, and this diversity is reflected in the responses they provide in Extract 3. Similar to findings from previous research in Catalonia with adolescents (Garrido & Moore, 2016) and pre-service teachers (Birello et al., 2020), some of the young people appropriate the common-sense discourse, which circulates in European and national policies and recommendations, in schools and in society, that learning foreign languages, and especially English, is useful for future employment and international exchanges (see also Flors Mas, 2013; Pérez-Milans & Patiño-Santos, 2014; Patiño-Santos & Codó, 2021). It is important to note, as was explained in the first section of this introduction, that this common-sense discourse about the future utility of English for youth was also part of the justification for the IEP! project. However, some young people also orient to the utility of English in the present for engaging in activities for pleasure, a point that is developed further in several of the chapters that make up this volume (see Corona et al., this volume; Moore, Deal, et al., this volume; Pratinestós & Masats, this volume). These chapters show how the emotional experience of using and learning English in young people's presents may be harnessed for supporting their foreign language learning in school.

As has been alluded to in presenting the different data extracts in this chapter, IEP! research took place at different sites in the town at the focus of our work. On the one hand, some of the research took place in, or in direct collaboration with, the two secondary schools. This is the case of the research presented, firstly, by Corona et al. (this volume), who study the video productions of youth who reflect on the importance of English in their lives as part of a project set by their English teacher. It is also the case of the research by Pratinestós and Masats (this volume), who investigate the spontaneous use of social media as a tool for learning English following a translocal project conducted with English learners from two secondary schools located in Catalonia and in Greece. Finally,

the chapter by Moore, Deal et al. (this volume) explores how supposedly inauthentic language input is transformed into a real, embodied, aesthetic and emotional learning experience by youth participants in a nonformal drama activity organised by an English teacher at one of the secondary schools.

On the other hand, the volume includes research carried out at the youth centre, where IEP! researchers set up and ran a site for the Global StoryBridges (GSB)¹ project. This is the case of the chapters by Zhang and Llompart (this volume), who explore young people's multimodal and plurilingual construction of linguistic mediation activities, and by Moore and Hawkins (this volume), who study the affordances of an arts-based method for learning at the Catalan site. Working across sites allowed us to observe and accompany the young people in different contexts of language use and language learning; indeed, some of the youth participants in the data presented in different chapters are the same.

In the following section, the methodological approach guiding the IEP! project is introduced.

3. Methodological approach

The researchers who participated in the IEP! research project were fortunate in the sense that we did not start from nothing. IEP! began in 2019, but it emerged from an intersectoral alliance established previously in 2016. The alliance was led by our university's outreach office – Fundació Autònoma Solidària – and it involved English teachers and head teachers from the town's two secondary schools, members of the local council, the Catalan Education Department and university researchers/teacher educators. Since 2016, action had been taken to implement and research innovations in English language teaching in formal education supported by a different research project which complements the work done as part of IEP!: 'Teachers as agents of transformation through their engagement in cross disciplinary innovative projects in the English classrooms (DATE)²', led by Dolors Masats, who is also a contributor to this volume. The IEP! project built on the network, familiarity

-
- 1 Global StoryBridges (GSB) is coordinated globally by Margaret R. Hawkins, a contributor to this volume. GSB works in different global sites as an extracurricular program in which youth collectively produce video stories representing different aspects of their lives. These videos, which use English as a lingua franca, are shared and commented on the project's web-based platform. See: <http://www.globalstorybridges.com/>
 - 2 Funded by a RecerCaixa grant, reference: 2016-ACUP-001.

with and access to the youth and other relevant social actors and spaces established through this intersectoral alliance and the DATE project. However, IEP! focused on the youths' existing practices and opportunities for out-of-school learning of English and on the collaborative implementation of new out-of-school English learning activities with and for them, as well as on the measurement of the impact of these innovations on young people's learning. It should be noted that by 'out-of-school' we refer to school hours, not necessarily to school spaces. Furthermore, it is important to clarify that the lines between school and out-of-school learning are not always easy to draw. Coherent with current thinking – for example the 'Educació360: Educació a temps complet' ('Education360: Full time education', see Fundació Jaume Bofill, n.d.) initiative in our context – we consider these contexts to be intrinsically connected in what should be considered a continuum of complementary learning spaces and times, although often "learning activities that take place in and out of school are [...] not mutually recognized" (Subero et al., 2017, p. 247).

In the remainder of this section, the main methodological influences of the IEP! project are highlighted. On the one hand, in order to respond to the objectives of documenting and comparing existing practices and opportunities for out-of-school learning of English, the project was conceptualised as a comparative case study (CCS), with the 'case' being built through a process of collaborative, multi-sited ethnography. On the other, in order to generate and sustain new opportunities for young people to learn English out of school, and to support lasting connections between school and out-of-school learning, the project used a transformative activist approach, incorporating university student volunteerism, collaborative action-research with teachers, reflective practice and youth-led participatory action-research. In addition, the project aimed to measure the impact of the actions taken on the youth participants' learning of English, for which sociointeractionist approaches to learning predominate in the different contributions to the volume, in combination with other sociocultural perspectives. Threading through all these approaches, as a transversal methodological contribution, the project draws on creative inquiry, or arts-based methods. The title of the project refers to inclusive epistemologies, and it is precisely by embedding collaborative and creative ways of knowing that the project aims to contest traditional researcher-researched and logocentric hierarchies of knowledge.

3.1 Comparative case study and collaborative, multi-sited and multi-scalar ethnography

One of the main methodological contributions that inspired the IEP! project was that of comparative case study (CCS), as described by Bartlett and Vavrus (2017). Unlike other types of case study research, CCS is a heuristic approach based on emergent case design. The aim is to understand how different aspects relevant to the phenomena under study surface in possibly unpredictable ways across different spaces and times and involving different social actors. The perspective of the social actors who participate in the study thereby become central to the eventual definition of the case. Indeed CCS, and the IEP! project specifically, draw heavily on collaborative forms of ethnography (Lassiter, 2005). Such collaborative ethnography includes not only traditional ethnographic methods such as participant-observation and the collection of multiple types of data in the form of fieldnotes, recordings of interviews, focus groups and naturally-occurring encounters, etc., but also the co-collection, co-interpretation and co-writing of ethnographic texts. Coherent with this approach, this volume includes two chapters which are co-authored by university-based researchers and the secondary school English teachers with whom we worked (see Corona et al., this volume; Moore, Deal et al, this volume). CCS also involves constant comparison between what is emerging in one place and at one time with what is happening at other sites, as well as considering other relevant contemporary and historical processes. In this sense, Bartlett and Vavrus establish parallels between the comparative case study approach and multi-sited and multi-scalar ethnography (e.g. Blackledge & Creese, 2010). In Section 2 of this chapter, the different research sites, and thus the different spaces and times of language use and learning considered by the contributors, were introduced. Catalan, Spanish and international research on out-of-school (language) learning in other socioeconomically disadvantaged settings also illuminated the case study as it developed. Policies and reports on school and out-of-school (language) education and uses of leisure time were also considered. A review of this research and policy is presented in the chapter by Moore, Vallejo et al. (this volume).

3.2 Transformative activist research, collaborative action-research and reflective practice

In the IEP! project, a transformative activist stance (TAS, see Vianna & Stetsenko, 2014) was taken, in the sense that the research not only aimed to understand existing realities and the ways that people adapt to them, but also to collaboratively enact change. From a TAS:

development and learning are collaborative achievements of an activist nature that are not confined to adapting to what is 'given' in the world. Instead, these processes rely upon people forming and carrying out future-oriented agendas within collaborative projects of social transformation. These agendas centrally involve taking an activist stance grounded in a vision, or 'endpoint,' of how community members believe present practices can be changed and what kind of future ought to be created. (Vianna & Stetsenko, 2014, pp. 575–576)

This stance was materialised in IEP! in two ways: on the one hand, the research sought to help build new, inclusive and sustainable opportunities for the youth participants' out-of-school learning of English, drawing on already established intersectoral partnerships. Our work in setting up the Global StoryBridges site at the local youth centre, or in working with the English teachers at the schools, was guided by our imaginations of what students' opportunities for learning English could be like. On the other hand, the research incorporated university student volunteerism, with the Global StoryBridges site being co-facilitated by university student volunteers. This was coherent with our understanding that in order to build a more inclusive society, the more 'allies' the better.

The IEP! project was further guided by principles of collaborative action-research with teachers (Nussbaum, 2017). As Nussbaum explains:

Research in schools [...] entails a long journey of mutual recognition and trust between the researchers and the teaching staff, and a negotiation of give-and-take. In our experience, the most effective reward for both parties is engaging in a mutually satisfying project in which both the researchers and the teachers occupy complementary spaces – rather than asymmetrical ones – to collaboratively build educational knowledge. For external research teams working in a school, this option represents an excellent opportunity to acquire educational experience, to compare theory and practice, and as a source of inspiration for future investigations. For teachers, it offers a chance to share their professional concerns with colleagues who can help them to reflect upon them, as well as the reward of being a collaborative participant in building didactic knowledge and disseminating it jointly. (p. 47)

The research presented in the chapters by Corona et al. (this volume), Moore, Deal et al. (this volume) and Pratinestós and Masats (this volume) are examples of this collaborative action-research. In all these studies, teams of university-based researchers and secondary school teachers worked together to set up and reflect on activities to support young people's learning of English. Closely related to such collaborative action-research, researchers in IEP! were also inspired by the principles of reflective practice (e.g. Schön, 1983; Eraut, 1995), specifically in the case of the research presented in Moore and Hawkins (this volume) and Zhang and Llompart (this volume). In these cases, the authors took on the

dual role of researchers and educators and reflect on the lessons learned from experience.

3.3. Youth-led participatory action-research

IEP! was also inspired by youth-led participatory action-research (YPAR, Ozer et al., 2010), an inclusive epistemological approach designed to support youth participants' self-determination and redistribute power between youth and adults, which has proved effective in other out-of-school research contexts (Anyon et al., 2018). The YPAR process involves different stages, supported by adults, including: 1) young people engaging in initial explorations of the issue and gaining training and hands-on experience in research methods allowing in-depth study of it; 2) young people participating in data collection about the issue, in collaboration with different stakeholders; 3) young people thinking strategically about how to create social change by building alliances with different stakeholders; 4) youth participating in the implementation and evaluation of changes (Anyon, et al., 2018). The YPAR approach was at the base of the research presented in Corona et al. (this volume), which represents the first step – initial explorations of the issue of the young people's learning of English – of what was intended as a YPAR process. The aim was also to promote YPAR in the Global StoryBridges activity run at the youth centre reported on in the chapters by Moore and Hawkins (this volume) and Zhang and Llompart (this volume); indeed, one of the guiding philosophies of Global StoryBridges is that it be youth-led. However, our intentions to promote YPAR at these two sites – a secondary school and the GSB site – were frustrated as the COVID-19 pandemic and a hard national lockdown from March 2020 meant a rapid switch to remote schooling and the suspension of our fieldwork. As we discuss in Moore and Morodo (this volume), this is a pending challenge for future research.

3.4. Creative inquiry and arts-based epistemologies

Creative inquiry sets out from the premise that in order to deal with contemporary issues, more than new knowledge is needed. Rather, new *ways of knowing* are at stake. In its simplest sense, creative inquiry involves the use of arts-based practices – painting, drawing, photography, collage, drama, music, creative writing, etc. – as methods of research. This is the perspective that is reflected in Leavy's definition of creative inquiry as “any social research or human inquiry that adapts the tenets of the creative arts as a part of the methodology” (cited in Jones & Leavy, 2014, p. 1). Arts-based methods have proved effective in language

education research as a means for young people to explore their realities and imaginations in ways that extend beyond written and spoken expression, which is typical of much research data collection. There is also increasing interest in how arts-based and ethnographic methods relate and complement each other, particularly in educational research (see Ferro & Poveda, 2019). Arts-based methods have been used previously in researching different aspects of language education by IEP! team members, who have used collage, drawing, drama, film-production or music in pushing epistemological boundaries (e.g. Ambrós & Masats, 2011; Bradley et al., 2018; Bradley & Moore, 2018; Garrido & Moore, 2016; Llompарт, 2016; Masats & Unamuno, 2011).

Bradley and Harvey (2019) offer a broader understanding of this emergent field, establishing three categories of research engaging with creative inquiry in applied linguistics. On the one hand, they discuss research that is conducted *through* the arts; that is, by using arts-based and arts-informed methods, which corresponds with Leavy's definition of creative inquiry. This is the approach taken in two of the contributions to this volume. Corona et al. (this volume) used a video-production activity to gather information about teenagers' use and learning of English. Moore and Hawkins (this volume) consider the impact of a handicraft activity on a learning ecology. Research *with* the arts focuses on what the arts can inform us about language. Here, the arts may be considered as objects of analysis from which questions and concepts about language can emerge. This would be the case of the research by Moore, Deal et al. (this volume), who study students' interaction as part of a drama activity and consider what their drama practice can tell us about their understandings of language use and language learning. Finally, Bradley and Harvey discuss research *into* the arts using applied linguistics methods, the focus of which are creative and artistic practices themselves, contexts and collaborations.

3.5. Sociocultural approaches to learning

In terms of researching learning, the chapters that make up this volume are inspired by different theoretical and methodological approaches, all of which are of a sociocultural nature (see Hawkins, 2010). Sociocultural approaches to learning include contributions from sociocultural psychology, linguistic anthropology, ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, among other traditions. Learning is conceptualised as a process that has its genesis, its means and its ends in communicative practices that are embedded in the sociocultural environment.

The chapter by Corona et al. (this volume) takes a language socialisation approach (Duranti et al., 2011), which originated in linguistic anthropology, to

account for the ways that language use and learning relate to processes of gaining community membership. Language socialisation approaches to learning help illuminate, for example, processes of identity building, of inclusion and exclusion, or the social representations that emerge in language-mediated learning trajectories. In the case of the research presented by Corona et al (this volume), the ‘communities’ that learners belong to are non-tangible ones of YouTubers and Instagrammers, and so these authors also draw on the notion of imagined communities. This notion was introduced into sociocultural theories of language learning by Norton and her colleagues (Norton, 2001; Kanno & Norton, 2003), and refers to “groups of people, not immediately tangible and accessible, with whom we connect through the power of the imagination” (Kanno & Norton, 2003, p. 241).

Moore and Hawkins (this volume) take an ecological approach (Hawkins, 2004; van Lier, 2004) to learning, to consider how young people’s identities, histories, linguistic repertoires and uses, embodied resources, participant roles, as well as digital artefacts, literacies, etc., all combine in an ecosystem that might afford different opportunities for learning. As Hawkins (2004) writes, ecosystems involve:

a fragile balance, and in order for it to ‘work’ – to have the inhabitant life forms survive and prosper – we need to understand not only the individual components, but also the ways in which the patterns and the ebb and flow of contacts and engagements result from and contribute to the whole. (p. 21)

In seeking to understand these ebbs and flows, Moore and Hawkins (this volume) further draw on the anthropological approach to cognition and learning “as a public, social process embedded within an historically shaped material world” (Goodwin, 2000, p. 1491), an approach which is also developed in the contribution by Moore, Deal et al. (this volume).

The chapters by Moore, Deal et al (this volume), Moore and Hawkins (this volume), Pratinestós and Masats (this volume), and Zhang and Llompart (this volume), also integrate conversation analytical perspectives on cognition and learning in their framing. Since its beginnings, ethnomethodology – the tradition in which conversation analysis has its roots – has explored the procedures through which knowledge is displayed, acquired, confirmed and modified by people in everyday social actions. According to Kasper (2008), ethnomethodologists contribute two insights for understanding the relationship between social interaction and cognitive processes, including learning, “by emphasising that the knowledge that people draw on in the concerted management of their situated activities is always embedded in and arises from practical exigencies” (p. 61). The first of

the insights contributed by ethnomethodology is the redefinition of objects that have traditionally been treated as individual mechanisms in the psychological programme – such as memory, perception and learning – as activities that are intrinsically social, occasioned and deployed by people for practical purposes. The second “treats all cognitive properties of persons as embedded within, and thereby available from, their situated communicative and other forms of activities” (Coulter, 1991, p. 189). Although ethnomethodology and conversation analysis are reticent to using external models – including learning theories – for understanding situated interaction, authors including Mondada and Pekarek Doehler (2004) provide support for the complementarity of sociocultural theories and conversation analytical methods for understanding situated second language learning processes, in what they call a strong sociointeractionist perspective (Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004). The interactions studied in the chapter by Moore, Deal et al. (this volume) – who focus on young people’s rehearsals of a play – are face-to-face ones. On the other hand, the chapters by Zhang and Llompart (this one) as well as Pratginestós and Masats (this volume) involve digitally-mediated interaction. Zhang and Llompart focus on linguistic mediation activities involving human and non-human (i.e. a computer translator) interactional participants, while Pratginestós and Masats analyse young people’s interactions in Instagram chats.

Finally, the research by Moore, Deal et al. (this volume) focuses explicitly on aesthetic and emotional dimensions of language learning, an approach that is also implicit in the contribution by Corona et al. (this volume). The emotional dimensions of language learning have been well studied in sociocultural theory (e.g. Kramsch, 2009). Moore, Deal et al. (this volume) develop this work further by drawing on Piazzoli’s (2019) approach to teaching and learning as artistic processes that “involve not only cognition, but also affect, imagery, sensation, different forms of memory, emotion and embodiment” (Piazzoli, 2019, p. 8).

4. Organisation of the volume

The volume is structured as follows. In Chapter 2, by Moore, Vallejo, et al., an overview of local and international research and policy on nonformal and informal language learning is presented. The following two chapters, by Corona, et al. (Chapter 3) and Pratginestós and Masats (Chapter 4), focus on students’ informal language use and learning. The following three chapters, by Moore and Hawkins (Chapter 5), Zhang and Llompart (Chapter 6) and Moore, Deal et al. (Chapter 7) explore language use and learning in nonformal educational

settings. Finally, Chapter 8, by Moore and Morodo, offers some final reflections on the IEP! project.

Acknowledgements

This research and publication were funded by FEDER/Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades – Agencia Estatal de Investigación. Grant ID PRPPGC2018-099071-A-I00.

References

- Ambrós, A., & Masats, D. (2011). Experimentem la narració de contes i llenguatges amb John Baldessari en pantalla. *Dipòsit Digital de la Universitat de Barcelona*. <http://hdl.handle.net/2445/21162>
- Anyon, Y., Kennedy, H., Durbahn, R., & Jenson, J. M. (2018). Youth-led participatory action research: Promoting youth voice and adult support in afterschool programs. *Afterschool Matters*, 27, 10–18.
- Bartlett, L., & Vavrus, F. (2017). *Rethinking case study research: A comparative approach*. Routledge.
- Birello, M., Llompart, J., & Moore, E. (2021). Being a plurilingual speaker versus becoming a linguistically sensitive teacher: contradictions in the discourses of initial teacher education students. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2021.1900195>
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. Bloomsbury. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474212281>
- Bradley, J., & Harvey, L. (2019). Creative inquiry in applied linguistics: researching language and communication through visual and performing arts. In C. Wright, L. Harvey & J. Simpson (Eds.), *Voices and practices in applied linguistics: Diversifying a discipline* (pp. 91–107). White Rose University Press. <https://doi.org/10.22599/baal1.f>
- Bradley, J., Moore, E., Atkinson, L., & Simpson, J. (2018). Translanguaging creativity: Theorising collaborative arts-based learning. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 18(1), 54–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2017.1401120>
- Bradley, J. & Moore, E. (2018). Resemiotization and creative production: extending the translanguaging lens. In A. Sherris & E. Adami (Eds.), *Making signs, translanguaging ethnographies: Exploring urban, rural, and educational spaces*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788921923-009>
- Consell Superior d'Avaluació del Sistema Educatiu (2019). L'avaluació de quart d'ESO 2019. *Quaderns d'Avaluació*, 43. Departament d'Ensenyament,

- Generalitat de Catalunya. <http://csda.gencat.cat/web/.content/home/arees-actuacio/publicacions/quaderns-avaluacio/quaderns-avaluacio-21/quaderns43.pdf>
- Coulter, J. (1991). Cognition: Cognition in ethnomethodological mode. In C. Button (Ed.), *Ethnomethodology and the human sciences* (pp. 176–196). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511611827.009>
- Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (Eds.). (2011). *The handbook of language socialization*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Eraut, M. (1995). Schon shock: A case for reframing reflection in action. *Teachers and Teaching, 1*, 9–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1354060950010102>
- Erling, E. J., Radinger, S., & Foltz, A. (2020). Understanding low outcomes in English language education in Austrian middle schools: the role of teachers' beliefs and practices, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1829630>
- Ferro, L., & Poveda, D. (Eds.). (2019). *Arts & ethnography in a contemporary world: From learning to social participation*. The Tuffnell Press.
- Flors Mas, A. (2013). “L'idioma que ens connecta a tots”: Els discursos sobre l'aprenentatge de l'anglès dels adolescents de Mataró. *Treballs de Sociolingüística Catalana, 23*, 205–233.
- Fundació Jaume Bofill (n.d.). *Educació360: Educació a temps complet*. <https://www.educa360.cat/>
- Garrido, M. R., & Moore, E. (2016). ‘We can speak we do it our way’: Linguistic ideologies in Catalan adolescents' language biography raps. *Linguistics and Education, 36*, 35–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2016.07.006>
- Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics, 32*(10), 1489–1522. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00096-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00096-X)
- Hawkins, M. R. (2004). Researching English language and literacy development in schools. *Educational Researcher, 33*(3), 14–25. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x033003014>
- Hawkins, M. R. (2010). Sociocultural approaches to language teaching and learning. In A. Creese & C. Leung (Eds.), *English as an additional language: Approaches to teaching language minority students* (pp. 97–107). Sage.
- Immordino-Yang, M. H. (2016). *Emotions, learning, and the brain: Exploring the educational implications of affective neuroscience*. Norton. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446251454.n7>
- Jones, K., & Leavy, P. (2014). A conversation between Kip Jones and Patricia Leavy: Arts-based research, performative social science and working on the

- margins. *The Qualitative Report*, 19(19), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2014.1232>
- Kanno, Y., & Norton, B. (2003). Imagined communities and educational possibilities: Introduction. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 2(4), 241–249. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327701jlie0204_1
- Kasper, G. (2008). Discourse and socially shared cognition. In J. Cenoz & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education*, 2(6) (pp. 59–78). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_139
- Kramsch, C. (2009). *The multilingual subject*. Oxford University Press.
- Lassiter, L. E. (2005). *The Chicago guide to collaborative ethnography*. University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226467016.001.0001>
- Llompert, J. (2016). *Pràctiques plurilingües d'escolars d'un institut superdivers: De la recerca a l'acció educativa* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. <http://www.tdx.cat/handle/10803/399835>
- Masats, D., Canals, L., Dooly, M., Juanhuix, M., Llompert, J., Moore, E., Nussbaum, L., & Vallejo, C. (2017, January 26–27). *Quan els aprenents es converteixen en sociolingüistes: algunes mostres de les veus de l'alumnat* [Conference paper presented] VIII Seminari Internacional 'L'aula com a àmbit d'investigació sobre l'ensenyament i l'aprenentatge de la llengua', Vic. <https://mon.uvic.cat/aula-investigacio-llengua/files/2015/12/Masatsetal.pdf>
- Masats, D., & Unamuno, V. (2011). Case study 9: Getting students to document linguistic diversity. In J. Cummins & M. Early (Eds.), *Identity texts: The collaborative creation of power in multilingual schools* (pp. 113–116). Trentham Books Limited.
- Mondada, L., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice: Task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 501–518. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.t01-15-.x>
- Norton, B. (2001). Non-participation, imagined communities, and the language classroom. In M. Breen (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research* (pp. 159–171). Pearson Education.
- Nussbaum, L. (2017). Doing research with teachers. In E. Moore & M. Dooly (Eds.), *Qualitative approaches to research on plurilingual education / Enfocaments qualitatiu per a la recerca en educació plurilingüe / Enfoques cualitativos para la investigación en educación plurilingüe* (pp. 46–67). Research-publishing.net. <https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2017.emmd2016.621>
- Ozer, E. J., Ritterman, M. L., & Wanis, M. G. (2010). Participatory action research (YPAR) in middle school: Opportunities, constraints, and key processes.

- American Journal of Community Psychology*, 46(1–2), 152–166. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-010-9335-8>
- Pérez-Milans, M. & Patiño-Santos, A. (2014). Language education and institutional change in a Madrid multilingual school. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 11(4), 449–470. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2014.944532>
- Patiño-Santos, A., & Codó, E. (2021). Diversitat, globalització i desigualtat: una mirada etnogràfica a dues respostes de política lingüística educativa a Catalunya. *Revista de Llengua i Dret*, 75. <http://revistes.eapc.gencat.cat/index.php/rld/article/view/10.2436-rld.i75.2021.3586>
- Piazzoli, E. (2018). *Embodying language in action: The artistry of process drama in second language education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. Basic Books.
- Subero, D., Vujasinovic, E., & Esteban-Guitart, M. (2017). Mobilising funds of identity in and out of school. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 2, 247–263. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781316544884.003>
- van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning: A sociocultural perspective*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Vianna, E., & Stetsenko, A. (2014). Research with a transformative activist agenda: Creating the future through education for social change. In J. Vadeboncoeur (Ed.), *Learning in and across contexts: Reimagining education* (pp. 575–602). Teachers College, Columbia University.