Bilingualism and Multilingualism

JEAN-MARC DEWAELE
Birkbeck College at the University of London, UK

Defining bilinguals and multilinguals

Early definitions of bilingualism were extremely restrictive and had a strong monolingual bias. To qualify as a bilingual, one was supposed to have native-like control of two languages. The problem is the difficulty of determining whether somebody has native-like control in a second language (L2). This early definition has methodological and theoretical difficulties. It is too vague and impossible to operationalize, it refers only to proficiency levels, and it ignores nonlinguistic dimensions. Definitions of a bilingual individual have gradually become broader: anyone who has minimal competence in one of the four skills (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) in a language that is not the first language, or anyone who controls two or more languages qualifies. Criteria have thus become more vague, but also more flexible, conceptualizing bilingualism as a continuum rather than a category. One important new aspect in considering the definition of bilingualism is its specific historical, political, and economic contexts (Li, Dewaele, & Housen, 2002).

By the end of the 1980s, researchers argued that bilinguals are more than the sum of two separate and isolable language competencies. As Grosjean (2010) pointed out, it is wrong to appraise the language skills of bilinguals in terms of monolingual standards. One consequence of this monolingual bias in the definition is the proliferation of the beliefs that bilingualism is the exception rather than the norm, that contact between the two languages is accidental, and that the languages of the bilingual can be studied separately. This state of things has affected the views that bilinguals have of themselves: they often report that they know neither language adequately. Grosjean (2010) pointed out that bilinguals are not necessarily equally fluent on all topics in both their languages, and this is because of the complementarity principle: Bilinguals use their languages for different purposes, with different interlocutors, in different domains of life. Levels in proficiency in a language might thus vary depending on the need for that language and the domain in which it is used. Rather than focusing on equal fluency as a marker of bilingualism, it is important to understand why bilinguals need their languages; how they process, organize, and think about them; and how they feel about themselves and their bilingualism.

To avoid the confusing definitions of "bilingual," with their reference to some Platonic ideal of the perfect bilingual, Cook introduced the term "L2 user," whom he sees as the average person who uses an L2 for the needs of his or her everyday life (Cook

The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction, First Edition.
Karen Tracy (General Editor), Cornelia Ilie and Todd Sandel (Associate Editors).

DOI: 10.1002/9781118611463/wbielsi108

& Bassetti, 2010). Cook has proposed an even more holistic and dynamic interpretation of bilingualism, arguing that the combination of various languages in one mind has effects that go beyond the linguistic realm. Users of several languages develop "multicompetence," which affects their cognitive representation of grammatical and lexical categories with languages that have very different categories. As a result, bilinguals may categorize objects or differentiate colors differently from monolinguals in both languages (Cook & Bassetti, 2010).

The trend to move away from focusing on the native-like qualities of bilinguals in favor of the situations and complexities of bilinguals has been welcomed by many but remains contentious. Because of the interdisciplinary nature of bilingualism research, researchers from contiguous fields defend different methods, criteria, and assumptions.

This reaction to the vague use of the term "bilingual" is being taken on by other researchers, as the field moves further away from prescriptive definitions to more descriptive ones, reflective of the language users' realities. Dewaele (2013) also proposed to talk about "LX" to refer to languages acquired after the first language(s), in order to avoid possible confusion about the meaning attached to L2, L3, L4 … Ln (which could represent chronological order of acquisition or levels of proficiency in these languages). An LX user is thus what was previously called a nonnative language user, who could be indistinguishable from a native language user.

Not entirely absent, but left open to discussion and exploration is the notion of how people perceive themselves in linguistic terms. Grosjean (2010) states that bilinguals often do not see themselves as bilingual. Sia and Dewaele (2006) investigated those who self-categorize as bilingual and those who do not. They found that those who claimed to be bilingual were younger and tended not to be studying their L2s anymore. The authors speculate that ongoing formal instruction in the L2 may convince learners that they have not yet reached their peak in L2 proficiency and that it would therefore be premature to claim the status of bilingual. Other factors included living or having lived in an L2 environment and, in the second case, the recency of this experience. In other words, those who were or had been authentic L2 users were more likely to claim to be bilingual. The decision of whether or not one is bilingual was linked to self-perceived abilities in oral rather than in written skills.

A hot debate raged at the International Symposium on Bilingualism in Oslo in June 2011. The executive committee had proposed to add the extension "and Multilingualism" to the name of future conferences. This was met with objections that "bilingualism" covered any number of languages anyway; and the proposal was rejected. Another association, which organizes so-called "trilingualism" conferences, also struggled to agree on an appropriate name: Using the word "trilingualism" could focus the attention on languages that were learned after the L2, but would this also include the L4 or L5? In the end the association opted for "multilingualism," meaning two plus any number of languages. The current use of the term "multilingualism" is broad and inclusive. "Bilingualism" has been used more frequently than "multilingualism" (hits on Google Scholar show 133,000 for the former versus 50,600 hits for the latter), possibly because of the use of alternative terms such as "plurilingualism" for the latter.

More precise and global measures of multilingualism

Dewaele and Stavans (2014) argued that the categorization of people according to the number of languages they claim to know and use may be too imprecise. Indeed, a sextalingual with limited knowledge of three out of his/her six languages would be considered more multilingual than a trilingual with advanced knowledge of three languages. The trilingual might know fewer languages, but knowing them better makes that individual more strongly multilingual. Labels such as "bilingual," "trilingual," or "quadrilingual" may hide the fact that knowledge of some languages can be very limited or may be limited to one skill only—as would be the case for dead languages. The same reasoning was applied to language use. A sextalingual who only uses one out of his/her six languages can be distinguished from a trilingual who uses the three languages constantly. Dewaele and Stavans (2014) thus developed two global measures of multilingualism, using participants' information on frequency of use of their various languages and self-perceived oral and written proficiency in these languages. The global proficiency measure is the sum of scores on oral and written proficiency in the languages known by the participant. It is thus a more fine-grained measure of actual ability in oral and written skills in various languages than the mere number of languages acquired (and/or mostly forgotten) by the individual. The "total frequency score" is the sum of scores for self-reported frequency of use in the different languages. This measure is particularly useful to distinguish an individual who knows many languages but functions mostly in a monolingual/monocultural environment from an individual who knows fewer languages and uses all of them frequently, switching regularly between languages and cultures, and hence possessing a higher degree of multilingualism. The measure has been successfully applied in Dewaele and Li (2013).

Costs and benefits of bi- and multilingualism for individuals and society

For a long time monolingualism has been seen as the norm and bi- or multilingualism was considered to be the exception. This view has shifted, as it appears that bi- and multilingualism are in fact the norm rather than the exception. Researchers now generally acknowledge that bilingualism is not in itself harmful in any way and that it "brings opportunities not only to the individual but also to the society as a whole" (Li, Dewaele, & Housen, 2002, p. 3). This constitutes a radical reappraisal of the earlier view that bilingualism was a psychologically and socially harmful phenomenon. Edwards (2003) comments on the list of so-called disorders linked to bilingualism—moral depravity, stuttering, left-handedness, idleness, excessive materialism—pointing out that most of them are simply stupid and reflect "anti-foreign" prejudices: "Where emotional problems are linked with bilingualism, we have a classic instance of the fallacy that correlation implies causation; as noted above, the more likely explanation is that social and sociological pressures lead to psychological manifestations" (p. 33).

Recent research has focused on the economic benefits of multilingualism for individuals and enterprises. The main research question is how multilingualism and economic

variables influence each other. Grin, Sfreddo, and Vaillancourt (2010) used an econometrical approach to look at language-based earning differentials in the workplace and found that employers value foreign language skills among employees and reward them accordingly. This type of research is not just scientifically intriguing but also politically and socially relevant, as it can guide politicians into adopting language policies that benefit individuals and society.

However, entrenched negative attitudes toward bilingualism remain at various levels in society. Governments officially encourage the learning of foreign languages, but typically not those spoken by their own minorities and not necessarily to very high levels of proficiency. Indeed, for a very long time immigrant parents speaking their languages with their children were advised by health and education officials to switch to speaking the host country's majority language in order to facilitate the children's social integration and academic success. The presence of different home languages often remains to be perceived as a potential obstacle to children's linguistic, social, and cognitive development. Baetens Beardsmore (2003) argued that antagonisms toward bilingualism are typically based on two major types of fears: fears reflecting societal preoccupations and fears centering on the individual (though both are often intertwined). Among societal fears he distinguishes educational fears and politico-ideological fears. The former relates to the ability of children to cope with two languages in education. A marked difference exists between on the one hand "elite bilingualism"—which results from a conscious decision taken by parents from typically stable middle-class backgrounds, who are in a position to support the educative process with backup involvement—and, on the other hand, remedial or transitional bilingual education, where the ultimate goal is to integrate the students as quickly as possible into monolingual education. Politico-ideological fears are linked to a perceived threat to national identity. These fears are particularly common in traditionally monolingual societies, where bilinguals are at times seen as people with two conflicting personalities with unclear political allegiances. The second category of fears consists of parental and cultural fears. Parents can be anxious about linguistic and potentially cognitive problems for the child as well as about weaker cultural allegiance to the parents' home culture. Cultural fears are linked to conflicts of identity, which could lead to marginality and alienation within the community.

The recent upsurge in unemployment, the flood of immigrants, and the debate about the costs and benefits of these immigrants for the host country has led to a resurgence in anti-immigration feelings and in statements by leading politicians to the effect that multiculturalism was a failure. In 2002 David Blunkett, then Labour British home secretary, recommended that Asian British households should use English with their children rather than any other language in order to help overcome the schizophrenia that "bedevils generational relationships" in immigrant families (http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2002/sep/15/race.immigrationpolicy). German Chancellor Angela Merkel declared in 2010 that attempts to build a multicultural society in Germany—where people would live together happily—have completely failed, and immigrants needed to do more to integrate—including learning German. Monolingual perspectives have more chance to prevail in countries where the official language is seen as a "language of wider communication." Such perspectives lead to

linguistic myopia, which is often accompanied by a narrow cultural awareness, itself backed up by state policies that privilege only one official language (Edwards, 2003).

Paradoxically, the negative views that politicians have of the bi- and multilingualism of immigrants (and of their perceived lack of proficiency in the national language of the host country) is offset by the growing popularity of elite bilingualism, often through content and language integrated learning (CLIL), which typically involves the use of English in the teaching of content classes in secondary and university education in countries where English is not an official language. Mandarin Chinese is also a popular language, especially in the US, where it is supported by the Chinese government's Confucius institutes. Another trend is the increasingly early introduction of the foreign language in schools (including nursery schools), in the somewhat naive belief that early exposure to a foreign language is the key to high proficiency in that language. Research indicates that success is linked to a range of other variables, such as intensity and quality of the input and ability to use the language in authentic interactions.

Bilingual and trilingual first language acquisition

The French psychologist Ronjat carried out the first study of bilingual first language acquisition in 1913. He made detailed records of his son Louis' speech from birth to the age of 5. The family lived in Paris. The mother and nanny were native speakers of German; the father was a native speaker of French. They only used their mother tongue with Louis. Ronjat's study showed that Louis' bilingual upbringing had no adverse effects on his cognitive development; that grammar, phonology, and lexis developed in parallel; that the child realized very soon the existence of two languages and acted as an interpreter; that language mixing was always limited and tended to disappear toward his fourth birthday; and that Louis showed a more abstract conception of language. Ronjat's work was a milestone, as it refuted the claim that early bilingualism had adverse effects. These days there is broad agreement among researchers that infants possess the perceptual and memory capacities that allow them to acquire several languages simultaneously from birth. They form differentiated linguistic systems from the first input they get (during babbling). Their pattern and rate of language acquisition is generally comparable to that of monolingual peers, although the vocabulary size might be somewhat smaller in the weaker language. There are of course more instances of cross-linguistic transfer and intentional or nonintentional code-switching in the speech of multilingual children, but these remain quite restricted in space and time. Code-switching is no longer seen as an indicator of the inability to keep languages apart, but more as the manifestation, in certain circumstances, of a unique multicultural personality. Dewaele (2013) found a positive link between high levels of self-reported proficiency in different languages and self-reported frequency of code-switching. Multilingual children have other advantages, such as a better awareness of the arbitrary nature of language, an extra breadth of understanding, and more efficient and more emphatic communication.

The best approach for multilingual language acquisition is probably the "one parent, one language" policy (OPOL). Each parent speaks his or her native language exclusively with the child, which leads to advanced competence in each of the languages. As the

amount of exposure to the languages is rarely the same, the child might feel dominant in the most frequently used language. This is a dynamic situation, as more exposure to one language (for example when spending time with other users of a particular language) can boost that language. The decision as to what language each parent uses with the child is usually based on what the most "natural" language is for them: it should be their dominant language or the language in which they have high proficiency. There are successful examples, however, of parents using an LX in which they were not necessarily native-like, and yet their child acquired that language to a native standard.

Although there is relatively little research on the perspective of the multilingual children themselves, it seems that most of them value the experience and realize how lucky they are to have absorbed their early languages effortlessly once they start studying other languages at school.

Psycholinguistic research on bi- and multilingualism

Psycholinguists using behavioral and neuroimaging methods have carried out a substantial amount of research on the cognitive consequences of bi- and multilingualism. Bilinguals have been found to outperform monolinguals in a range of nonverbal control tasks that tap into cognitive abilities known as the executive function (Bialystok, Craik, & Luk, 2012). Bilinguals not only seem to have better inhibitory control, but also outperform monolinguals in monitoring, switching, and updating. Bilingual cognitive advantages have traditionally been attributed to an individual's knowledge of two linguistic systems and to the practice of having to inhibit one language when it is not needed. Recent research suggests that the presence of a third language seems to provide an extra cognitive advantage. Indeed, trilingual children outperformed a group of both monolingual and bilingual children. Bialystok and colleagues report that the cognitive effects of bilingualism are more muted in adulthood but start playing a larger role in older age. The authors argue that the use of cognitive control networks for bilingual language processing may reconfigure and strengthen them, strengthening "mental flexibility," namely the ability to adapt to ongoing changes and to process information efficiently. Older bilinguals have a larger "cognitive reserve," which can postpone the onset of symptoms in those suffering from dementia. Indeed, bilinguals experience onset symptoms of dementia years later than monolinguals.

Some researchers have wondered whether the advantage might in fact be linked to the presence of two cultures in the mind of the bilingual, which often have very different values.

Social psychological research on bi- and multilingualism

Bi- and multilinguals seem to have an edge in divergent thinking, one of the major components of creativity (Kharkhurin, 2012). This could be linked to the fact that they perceive the world through the amalgam of two different conceptual prisms and view events from a wider and enriched range of experiences. The author reported that

bilinguals with comparable levels of linguistic proficiency and with similar patterns of language dominance typically perform better on nonverbal creativity, whereas monolinguals score higher on verbal creativity. Bilinguals score higher than their monolingual peers on resistance to premature closure, an important indicator of creativity. He underlines the positive effects of bilingualism on creativity and argues in favor of schools where linguistic and cultural diversity is valued and creativity is encouraged. A multilingual and multicultural student population provides a rich source of learning opportunities that can potentially stimulate the acquisition of a range of competencies such as initiative taking, entrepreneurship, creative problem-solving and idea generation, and cultural awareness and expression (Kharkhurin, 2012).

Interestingly, creativity has been found to be enhanced when bilinguals who had lived abroad recalled a functional multicultural learning experience. Tadmor, Galinsky, and Maddux (2012) wondered why not all individuals who had lived abroad for several years performed at the same rate. They found that bicultural individuals outperformed those who identified more with a single culture. The authors suggest that it is the simultaneous juxtaposition and synthesis of two cultural perspectives that triggers a cognitive transformation. In other words, the crucial aspect is not so much the living abroad, but rather how the individual approaches that experience.

Research on the effect of bi- and multilingualism on personality

The abundance of research on the cognitive effects of bi- and multilingualism stands in contrast with the more limited interest in the psychological effects of bi- and multilingualism. Dewaele and Stavans (2014) replicated an earlier study, carried out in London by the first author, where the knowledge of more languages was linked to higher scores on the dimensions of cultural empathy and open-mindedness and significantly lower scores on the dimension of emotional stability. Dewaele and Stavans found that knowing more languages had no effect on scores of the personality dimensions of Israeli participants but that advanced proficiency and frequent use of various languages were linked to significantly higher scores on cultural empathy and open-mindedness. It thus seems that knowing more languages, and presumably being more multicultural, broadens the mind and makes individuals more aware of the arbitrary nature of their cultural values and more willing to accept that other people might have different values.

Dewaele and Li (2013) investigated the relationship between multilingualism and tolerance of ambiguity (TA) among more than 1,500 mono-, bi-, and multilinguals. Monolinguals and bilinguals scored significantly lower on TA than multilinguals. Moreover, participants with higher levels of multilingualism, and especially those who had lived abroad, also scored significantly higher on TA. The authors concluded that individuals' social–linguistic–cultural environment, and especially the experience of having to survive in a foreign cultural and linguistic environment, boosts levels of TA — although the effect size is small (p. 237).

Research has also shown that participants who know more languages typically report lower levels of communicative anxiety in them, including in their L1 (Dewaele, 2013).

This reduced communicative anxiety has been linked to the fact that multilinguals have more experience in communication with a wide range of interlocutors, which allows them to overcome unexpected communicative difficulties.

It thus seems that high levels of multilingualism in an individual's environment constitute the type of enduring social influence that contributes to the shaping of personality.

Language preferences for the communication of emotions among bi- and multilinguals

One area that is becoming increasingly popular in bi- and multilingualism research is how bi- and multilinguals perceive and express emotion and what languages are preferred (Pavlenko, 2012). One fascinating topic is that of the detachment effect in the L2—an effect that has also been discussed in the texts of bilingual authors such as the Canadian Nancy Huston (English L1, French L2): Nancy Houston declared that, compared to her L1 (English), French L2 was less burdened with emotion. When the same Nancy Huston, who has lived in Paris for many years, was interviewed on French radio about language preferences for the expression of strong emotions like sudden anxiety, she answered that English was her preferred language. The journalist then asked her what she would say. Nancy answered:

(1) Dewaele (2013, p. 191)

01 NANCY: Je dis Christ fucking shit merde!
I say Christ fucking shit merde!

(*Merde*, meaning "shit," is a high-frequency French swearword.)

Her own surprise at the unexpected appearance of the French swearword was obvious, and she added:

(2) Dewaele (2013, p. 191)

02 NANCY: Ah je peux ajouter merde!
Ah, I can add merde!

She seemed to realize at that point that her language preferences are shifting and that French had gained emotionality in her mental lexicon. Pavlenko (2012) argues that the L1 is often, but not necessarily always, the most emotional language, as multilinguals' different languages can have different affective meanings depending on the interlocutors and the situation. Affective processing in the L1 is more automatic, and multilinguals display heightened electrodermal reactivity to L1 emotion-laden words and expressions. Because of lower levels of automaticity in affective processing in the L2, there are fewer interference effects and less electrodermal reactivity to negative or taboo emotional stimuli. Pavlenko suggests that, for some late bilinguals and foreign language users, their languages may be differentially embodied, languages learned later in life being processed semantically but not affectively.

Dewaele (2013) looked at the effect of three clusters of independent variables—bilinguals' and multilinguals' linguistic history, present language use, and sociobiographical and psychological variables—on language perception and language choice for the communication of various emotions and on foreign language anxiety. Some general patterns emerged in the database of more than 1,500 participants and 20 multilinguals who were interviewed about their language use. Frequency of use of an LX to express emotions, positive perceptions of the LX, and low levels of foreign language anxiety were linked to a low age of acquisition, naturalistic or mixed learning of the LX (rather than formal instruction only), high frequency of use of the LX, high levels of LX socialization, and larger networks of interlocutors. Self-reported frequency of code-switching was also found to be significantly higher when participants were talking about more emotional topics with familiar interlocutors than when they discussed neutral topics with unknown interlocutors. The emotional weight of swearwords and of the phrase "I love you" was found to be significantly stronger in the L1 of multilinguals. This was usually (but not always) linked to more frequent use. Indeed, for some groups of multilinguals, often Asians and Arabs, the use of particular words or expressions with strong emotional resonance was taboo in their culture. However, it is important not to overgeneralize. Indeed, other kinds of strong emotional language can be used, especially negative terms or fear-inducing language. In the case of swearwords, the use of an LX allowed participants to overcome the social constraints. The analysis of language preferences and perceptions showed that values and practices of the L1 culture remain strongly ingrained in these multilinguals, so that L1 swearwords typically rate more highly in emotionality than their LX equivalents. However, there are clear instances of blending of L1 and LX values and practices. In other words, while multilinguals are perfectly able to keep their languages apart in interactions, there is more permeability between the two languages at a pragmatic, nonverbal, and social level. LX affective socialization results in a unique linguistic behavior both in the L1 and in LX—a nice example of multicompetence (Cook & Bassetti, 2010). Swearing in the LX illustrates the newfound freedom to express oneself without violating L1 norms.

Further research has shown that immigrants' memories of what they experienced in the L1 are generally richer in terms of emotional significance when recalled in the L1. When these L1 memories are recalled in an LX, some of the emotional intensity is lost. This might not always be a bad thing, especially if the multilingual is talking about traumatic events like torture or rape. This finding has important psychotherapeutic implications for the patient and for the therapist. Costa and Dewaele (2014) found that psychotherapists agreed that learning a foreign language made them better attuned to other languages and to multilingual patients. Although no therapist had tried out inviting other languages into the therapy, many were interested and saw the potential of trying this. With increasing numbers of multilinguals accessing therapeutic services and becoming therapists, it seems timely for the curricula of psychotherapy courses to be revised so as to take into account the changing profile and language needs of users and providers.

One of the crucial findings to emerge from the research on bi- and multilingualism is the dynamic, nonlinear, and multilayered character of this phenomenon—for

individuals, groups, and societies. Just as languages and societies are constantly evolving, individuals' language needs change too; language preferences and proficiencies can shift, reflecting personal events such as relationships with LX users or immigration, which themselves can be linked to broader economic, social, or political events. Such shifts can range from a holiday abroad, where one is using an LX constantly and the production of the L1 suddenly seems a bit more difficult on return, to a more permanent settlement in a country where one comes to use that LX — which can lead to attrition of the L1, though not necessarily of the L1 cultural values. These bi- and multilingual individuals become uniquely multicompetent and often more open-minded, and it seems that their presence can benefit their host country.

SEE ALSO: Code-Switching; Communication Accommodation Theory; Cultural Identity; Emotion and Affect; Intercultural Dialogue

References

Baetens Beardsmore, H. (2003). Who is afraid of bilingualism? In J.-M. Dewaele, A. Housen, & W. Li (Eds.), *Bilingualism: Basic principles and beyond* (pp. 10–27). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I. M., & Luk, G. (2012). Bilingualism: Consequences for mind and brain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *16*, 240–250. doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2012.3.001

Cook, V. J., & Bassetti, B. (2010). *Language and bilingual cognition*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Costa, B., & Dewaele, J.-M. (2014). Psychotherapy across languages: Beliefs, attitudes and practices of monolingual and multilingual therapists with their multilingual patients. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, *14*, 235–244. doi: 10.1080/14733145.2013.838338

Dewaele, J.-M. (2013). *Emotions in multiple languages* (2nd ed.). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dewaele, J.-M., & Li, W. (2013). Is multilingualism linked to a higher tolerance of ambiguity? *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *16*, 231–240. doi: 10.1017/S1366728912000570

Dewaele, J.-M., & Stavans, A. (2014). The effect of immigration, acculturation and multicompetence on personality profiles of Israeli multilinguals. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, *18*, 203–221. doi: 10.1177/1367006912439941

Edwards, J. (2003). The importance of being bilingual. In J.-M. Dewaele, A. Housen, & Li Wei (Eds.), *Bilingualism: Basic principles and beyond* (pp. 28–42). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Grin, F., Sfreddo, C., & Vaillancourt, F. (2010). *The economics of the multilingual workplace*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and reality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kharkhurin, A. V. (2012). *Multilingualism and creativity*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Li, W., Dewaele, J.-M., & Housen, A. (2002). Introduction: Opportunities and challenges of bilingualism. In W. Li, J.-M. Dewaele, & A. Housen (Eds.), *Opportunities and challenges of bilingualism* (pp. 1–14). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pavlenko, A. (2012). Affective processing in bilingual speakers: Disembodied cognition? *International Journal of Psychology*, *47*(6), 405–428. doi: 10.1080/00207594.2012.743665

Sia, J., & Dewaele, J.-M. (2006). Are you bilingual? *Birkbeck Studies in Applied Linguistics*, *1*, 1–19.

Tadmor, C. T., Galinsky, A. D., & Maddux, W. W. (2012). Getting the most out of living abroad: Biculturalism and integrative complexity as key drivers of creative and professional success. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *103*, 520–542. doi: 10.1037/a0029360

Further reading

Bathia, T. K., & Ritchie, W. C. (2013). *Handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Wiley Blackwell.

Jean-Marc Dewaele is professor of applied linguistics and multilingualism at Birkbeck, University of London, UK. He does research on individual differences in psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, pragmatic, psychological, and emotional aspects of second language acquisition and multilingualism. He has published over 150 journal papers and book chapters and a monograph titled *Emotions in Multiple Languages* (2010; 2nd edition 2013). He is former president of the European Second Language Association and vice president of the International Association of Multilingualism. He became general editor of the *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* in 2013. He is the father of a trilingual daughter.