



Promoting translanguaging (or not) in the ESP classroom: An analysis of monoglossic and heteroglossic practices and discourses

Josep M. Cots^{a,*}, Lúdia Gallego-Balsà^b, Àngels Llanes^a

^a *Universitat de Lleida, Department of English and Linguistics, Pl/ Víctor Saurana, 1, 25003, Lleida, Catalonia, Spain*

^b *Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Department of English and German Studies, Avinguda de Catalunya, 35, 43002, Tarragona, Catalonia, Spain*

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Translanguaging
ESP
Classroom practices and discourses

ABSTRACT

The idea of translanguaging as a potential resource for language and content learning runs counter to “the monolingual principle” (Cummins, 2009), according to which languages should be taught separately in order to (a) avoid interference from other languages and (b) increase the learners exposure to the target language. This study has two main goals: (i) characterise the classroom practices and discourses of two instructors in line with their respective monoglossic or heteroglossic perspective in the context of a university course module on business English; (ii) provide empirical evidence for the impact of translanguaging practices in the form of language learning outcomes. The analysis is mainly based on observations and audiovisual recordings of classroom sessions and the students’ performance before and after a 16-week teaching intervention.

1. Researching ‘heteroglossia’

The term ‘heteroglossia’ was first elaborated by Bakhtin (1981) between 1934 and 1935 (Ivanov, 2000) to criticise the view of language as a unified system and to support the idea that there are different kinds of linguistic forms within a language, corresponding to different varieties, registers, genres or styles, with specific social and ideological meanings. Therefore, from a heteroglossic point of view, language users can be seen as social actors resorting to particular sets of linguistic resources to accomplish their social goals in negotiation with others. For Bailey (2012), the heteroglossic perspective represents a new approach to plurilingualism and plurilingual competence, according to which combining or switching between linguistic forms officially considered as belonging to different languages is simply an extension of the language-internal variation (i.e. sets of linguistic resources available to the social actor to negotiate the social world). Therefore, following Blackledge and Creese (2014), we suggest that the same kind of language ideological tension that we find within a speech community between uniformity (or standardization) and diversity can be found in the tension between a dominant monoglossic perspective of language learning and use, based on the idea of language separation, (Cummins, 2009) and an alternative heteroglossic perspective that the present study explores.

The rationale for the study is based on the premise that a heteroglossic perspective in university foreign language education represents a significant departure from or challenge to the traditional monoglossic perspective. Therefore, the introduction of the new perspective needs to be pedagogically supported by trying to gauge its impact in a systematic way in a particular educational context. In this study we do this by comparing two university instructors teaching the same business English course module and their respective

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: josepm.cots@udl.cat (J.M. Cots), lidia.gallego@urv.cat (L. Gallego-Balsà), angels.llanes@udl.cat (À. Llanes).

students. In the first place, we identify characteristic elements of instructor's classroom discourse that can be connected with either a heteroglossic or a monoglossic approach. In the second place, we focus on the learners' proficiency by measuring their performance in specific tasks.

This study is faced with two main challenges. The first one is the scarcity of previous studies that attempt to explore both qualitatively and quantitatively the pedagogic impact of introducing a heteroglossic perspective. This is the point expressed by [Cenoz and Gorter \(2011, p. 359\)](#) who consider that "[t]he idea of translanguaging is appealing", but they also acknowledge that "it is still too early to determine the effect of these pedagogical practices of combining different languages on bilingual and multilingual proficiency"; ten years after, there still seems to be a dearth of empirical studies focusing on the pedagogic impact of translanguaging. In this paper, we consider 'impact' in terms of (i) the teacher's discursive behaviour in the classroom and (ii) the students' proficiency level. The second challenge confronted by the study is the relative absence of previous research combining a focus on processes and outcomes, which becomes an even more acute issue when we consider that many pedagogic experiences to implement a heteroglossic perspective focus on primary and secondary education, as is the case of the six studies included in [García and Kleyn \(2016\)](#); exceptions to this tendency would be [Mazak and Carroll \(2017\)](#) or [Mbirimi-Hungwe, Hungwe, and Seeletse \(2020\)](#).

2. Translanguaging in the foreign language classroom

The research reported in this paper is based on the notion of translanguaging, which, following [Mazak \(2017, p.5-6\)](#), can be summarised into three main perspectives: (i) a transformational language ideology that considers bi/multilingualism and shuttling between 'languages' as the norm (e.g. [Sánchez & García, 2022](#)); (ii) a theory of bi/multilingualism that holds that individuals do not separate their 'languages' but possess one integrated repertoire of 'language practices' (e.g. [Wei, 2018](#)); and (iii) a pedagogical stance involving communicative and pedagogic practices in which individuals strategically mobilize their entire linguistic repertoire (e.g. [Duarte, 2020](#)). In this paper we focus mostly on the third perspective proposed by Mazak, which views translanguaging as a "pedagogy" for language learning and teaching ([Creese & Blackledge, 2010](#)) or a "pedagogical practice" aimed at enabling students "to create a space where they make use of all their linguistic and semiotic repertoire and which is accepted by teachers as a legitimate pedagogical practice" ([Lasagabaster & García, 2014, p.558](#)).

[García and Kleyn \(2016\)](#) distinguish between two different "stances" that teachers hold towards translanguaging. The first one is a "scaffolding stance", according to which the activation of the learners' bi/multilingual repertoires is only a means to improve their competence in the target language. The second stance is a "transformative stance", and in this case the aim is to transform language education through a change in language hierarchies and, consequently, socio-political power. One of the first examples of the psycholinguistically-oriented "scaffolding stance" can be found in [Cummins' \(1979\)](#) 'interdependence hypothesis', according to which in the process of learning a language an individual acquires a set of skills and metalinguistic knowledge that can partly be transferred to the learning of a second language; Cummins refers to these transferable skills and knowledge as "common underlying proficiency" (CUP). Following [Hall and Cook's \(2012\)](#) review of the role of the learner's "own language" in the teaching of a foreign language, we see a similar 'scaffolding stance' ([García & Kleyn, 2016](#)) argument being made by applied linguistics such as [Widdowson \(1978\)](#), [Stern \(1992\)](#), [Cook \(1995\)](#) and [Cenoz and Gorter \(2013\)](#). For these authors, it is essential to acknowledge explicitly the bilingual nature of the foreign language classroom and to take advantage of the transferability of knowledge and skills from one language to another by combining interlingual and intralingual practices.

The "transformative stance" that García and Kleyn consider is represented by the work of García herself (2009), [Creese and Blackledge \(2010\)](#) and [Makalela \(2017\)](#). For these authors, a translanguaging approach in education promotes participation and inclusion in that it gives the bi/multilingual learners the possibility to use their whole language repertoire, thereby increasing opportunities for participation, self-expression and, ultimately, learning. At a macro-level, translanguaging allows the school to contribute to vindicating the learners' identities through promoting their 'lesser-valued languages' and, consequently, their social power. The connection between language and social identity work in schools is clearly described by [Wei \(2018, p. 15\)](#) in the following words:

"By deliberately breaking the artificial and ideological divides between indigenous versus immigrant, majority versus minority, and target versus mother tongue languages, Translanguaging empowers both the learner and the teacher, transforms the power relations, and focuses the process of teaching and learning on making meaning, enhancing experience, and developing identity."

Apart from [García and Kleyn's \(2016\)](#) two stances towards translanguaging, it is possible to consider a third stance suggested by [Kramersch and Huffmaster \(2015\)](#), which could be labelled as a 'realist stance'. For these authors, the monolingual immersion pedagogy is based on an essentialist view of foreign language teaching connecting one language with one nation and with one culture. This view can no longer be held in a globalised world in which communication is increasingly multimodal and multilingual and it often takes place with multilingual non-native speakers rather than monolingual native nationals. Therefore, [Kramersch and Huffmaster \(2015, p.118\)](#) suggest that rather than focusing on static rules of the system and usage, foreign language teaching should help students to acquire the skills to "operate between languages", as multilinguals do in real life. In this educational process, it is essential for the school to promote "an awareness of the symbolic potential of switching linguistic codes, discourse structure and discourse modes, the symbolic potential of various media and modalities, and the way they position speakers and hearers, readers and writers."

The translanguaging stance adopted by one of the instructors in this study may be considered as combining the first and third types defined above. Following the 'scaffolding stance', the instructor's intervention involves a planned distribution of languages and the explicit use of the learners' previous knowledge of other languages to develop specific communicative skills in the target language. In accordance with the 'realist stance', the instructor focuses on real-life communicative situations in the business domain, usually involving the participation of multilingual non-native speakers of English and considering the semiotic potential of non-linguistic

communicative resources including aspects such as visual presentations generic conventions, register or medium of communication.

In practical terms, the translanguaging perspective adopted by one of the two instructors that took part in the study involved the incorporation of different learning tasks such as those suggested by Cummins (2005), Lin (2013) or Carusso (2018). Specifically, the following tasks were incorporated in the different learning units: (i) multilingual lexical contrasts, (ii) integrating languages and skills (e.g. listening in one language + summarizing the contents in another), (iii) translating texts, (iv) emphasizing the specificity of communicative practices and strategies (vs. linguistic accuracy), (v) allowing code-switching in quotation or technical terms, (vi) contrasting texts in different languages, and (vii) teacher's discourse including repetition in different languages as well as explicit reflection about the benefits of integrating languages.

3. Analytical methodology and data collection

The present study is based on a mixed-methods approach, according to which different components of qualitative and quantitative research are combined, in our case, "to extend breadth and depth (...) (e.g. qualitative to understand *process* and the quantitative to examine *outcomes*)" (Nastasi, Hitchcock, & Brown, 2010, p. 307; emphasis added). The focus on the process adopts a qualitative approach and it takes the form of an analysis of the most characteristic classroom discourse strategies employed by two university ESP teachers associated with their heteroglossic or monoglossic perspective, respectively. The data for this part of the analysis comes mainly from observation and video recordings of classroom sessions, but we also refer briefly to a focus group session with 8 students to show their stance towards a heteroglossic approach.

From the point of view of the outcomes, the analysis aims to measure the extent to which the teaching perspective adopted by the teacher (heteroglossic vs. monoglossic) has a significant effect in terms of oral and written language development. The analysis in this case is based on the students' performance in English in the following activities, which were administered at the beginning and the end of a 16-week term: (i) drafting a business letter and (ii) delivering a 2-min sales pitch on a specific product. At the end of this quantitative analysis, we also include a 'qualitative glimpse' of the discursive strategies employed by some of the students in the 'heteroglossic' group during the focus-group session in order to resist the new approach.

The data collection involved 2 university ESP instructors and a total of 54 Catalan/Castilian bilingual university students distributed into two intact groups of a compulsory first-year English for business course module which was taught at a university in Catalonia (Spain) in the academic year 2016–17 as part of the degree in Business Management and Administration. One of the groups followed a heteroglossic approach and the other followed a monoglossic approach.

The main reason for focusing the study on an English for Specific Purposes (ESP) course module is that in the particular university in which the research was carried out the only compulsory course modules that the university offers to students in order to improve their English under the guidance of a language teaching specialist take the form of ESP courses in different degrees (e.g. Business English, English for Medicine, English for Tourism, etc.). Therefore, an ESP course module such as the one that is the object of this study is very representative of the commitment of the university to invest its language expertise on the training of future graduates.

Both instructors were female, in their 30s and had previous experience in teaching English at university. However, it is important to say that for the instructor of the heteroglossic group, although she was familiar with the new approach at a theoretical level, the teaching intervention represented a totally new experience, for which she not only had to design specific materials but also come up with particular guidelines on how to manage the teaching/learning process. Examples of the decisions that had to be made involved aspects such as (i) the integration of the bilingual students L1s (Catalan and Castilian) in her interaction with them, (ii) the systematicity of the scaffolding role of the students' first language (L1) in the specific design of the activities, (iii) the front-stage or back-stage role of translation or students' L1 performance, (iv) the emphasis on native-speaker accent and degree of accuracy, and (v) the degree of permissiveness in connection with translanguaging in the assessment process.

The materials for the two groups were designed collaboratively by the two instructors together with a group of five university instructors with different degrees of experience in teaching English. In order to avoid possible differences due to the nature of the tasks, the materials used in each group included the same tasks but they were different in the sense that whereas the materials for the 'heteroglossic group' promoted translanguaging and non-native speaker models of English, the materials for the 'monoglossic group' involved the students' exclusive use of English and only native-speaker models. Finally, it must be pointed out that the two instructors were highly coordinated and they talked before and after each class to make sure they devoted a similar amount of time to the tasks.

4. Analysis

The aim of this section is, in the first place, to show the discursive practices through which each of the instructors attempts to implement their respective heteroglossic or monoglossic approach in her classes (sections 4.1 and 4.2). We focus mainly on specific discourse strategies employed by the teachers to construct their heteroglossic or monoglossic stances in the classroom. However, following Du Bois (2007), Jaffe (2009a) and Damari (2010), we look at the process of stance-taking as a dialogical act which can result in the association of particular acts of stance with particular subject positions. For this reason, we report briefly on the stance that some students adopted against the instructor's heteroglossic positioning and which might highlight a tension between them. In the third part of the analysis (section 4.3) we present and discuss the impact of each approach in terms of the students' language development as measured by means of three different instruments. However, in this same section on the students' 'response' we have also thought it appropriate to comment briefly on the unsupportive stance of some students against the instructor's heteroglossic stance.

The analytical framework employed for the analysis of the data is consistent with the mixed-methods approach adopted in this study. Thus, for the analysis of the discursive data derived from the recordings and subsequent transcriptions of class sessions and

interviews we adopt the discourse-analytical notion of ‘stance’ (or ‘stance taking’), a term which was first formulated by Biber and Finegan (1989, p. 92) as “the lexical and grammatical expression of attitudes, feelings, judgment or commitment concerning the propositional content of a message”. Following Du Bois (2007, p.169), we see an act of stance taking as “a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means” and through which he/she carries out three simultaneous acts: (i) evaluation of the object of stance, through which we characterise it as having a particular value; (ii) positioning, through which he/she defines his/her relationship with the object of stance from the point of view of their knowledge or belief (epistemic stance) or personal feelings (affective stance) about it; and (iii) alignment, with which the social actor expresses his/her degree of agreement or affiliation with the stance of another speaker in relation to the same object. Finally, Jaffe (2009b) emphasizes that language choice is a form of stance in bilingual contexts as teachers legitimise the use of languages through their code choices. In the context of our research, we also consider that the teacher(s) code choice(s) are a resource they have at hand to give visibility and legitimise their own teaching approach.

The analysis of the quantitative data, including a pre- and post-intervention drafting of a brief business letter and a 2-min sales pitch, is based on two types of assessment: a holistic assessment based on the ratings by an expert examiner and an atomistic assessment involving a set of objective language measures (Wolfe-Quintero, Inagaki, & Kim, 1998).

4.1. Heteroglossic teaching practices

The teacher’s stance in the heteroglossic group is discursively constructed mainly in the form of three main strategies involving three aspects of her role: (1) managing the learning process, (2) enacting a communicative role model and (3) introducing reflection episodes about the learning process. From the point of view of her management of the learning process, the teacher introduces a front-stage use of the students’ L1 in specific learning activities aimed at enabling students to perform in the target language. This is the case of a learning unit in which the final activity was to make a brief sales pitch about a specific product and one of the preparatory activities involved the students’ production of a sales pitch in their L1, in which they promoted their home university to potential international students. As shown in Extract 1, the teacher’s heteroglossic stance becomes very evident in the fact that she allowed students to make their individual presentations in languages other than Castilian or Catalan, as was the case of a Romanian student and a group of Chinese students, and she committed herself to making an effort to watch the presentation and try to grasp the main ideas even though she did not know the language. Furthermore, in the following class the teacher devoted some time to showing and reflecting upon a few of the presentations. In this sense, the teacher can be seen as opening up spaces for a variety of languages not only beyond English monolingualism but even beyond the official Catalan/Castilian bilingualism of the academic institution.

Extract 1

for the students whose mother tongue is not Catalan or Spanish (.) you can still do it in your mother tongue. ok? yes? e:h and I will do my best to understand it. ok? a:nd the important thing is that you practise the oral presentation in a language in which you feel comfortable. ok? so the language skills is not an obstacle for you. ok?

In Extract 1, the teacher evaluates the students’ level of English as deficient and thus an obstacle for their performance. This evaluation is the basis for her legitimisation of the L1 as a scaffolding strategy and the students who might be actually competent in English might consider the strategy as depriving them of further development of their skills. The students’ stance is further analysed in section 4.4.

Furthermore, in asking students to start the process of elaboration of their sales pitch by producing a first version in the L1, the instructor may implicitly be placing the notion of ‘genre’, rather than ‘language’, at the centre of the learning unit, suggesting that in order to master it students need to take into account different aspects of communication, of which language is just one. These components are made explicit and reified by the teacher in the form a rubric which includes the following scales: presentation order and flow, knowledge of product and audience, use of graphics and models, spelling or grammatical errors, voice quality and pronunciation, eye contact, and appearance. In that sense, it is also worth pointing out that towards the end of Extract 1, she suggests that it is possible for students to practise on this new ‘genre’ in a “comfortable manner” without the “obstacle” of their low proficiency in the target language.

The second strategy used by the instructor to construct her heteroglossic stance in the classroom is her interactional verbal behaviour, which is characterised by her efforts to use Catalan and Castilian side by side with English. One way in which the instructor attempts to present herself as a communicative model for whom the three languages are equally valid means of communication is by translating fairly systematically certain messages that she may consider especially relevant into one or both of the other languages. Extract 2 is an example of how the three languages are made visible by the instructor to convey the message that students need to attend class equipped with specific resources including a set of headphones and mobile device such as a laptop, tablet or smartphone with internet connection. The teacher initiates the utterance in English, continues in Catalan and, before finishing the utterance, she switches into Castilian, possibly after remembering that some of the international students in the classroom do not understand Catalan. We can also see that once she has conveyed the important message, she returns to English, thereby adopting a plurilingual technique known as ‘sandwiching’ (Kerr, 2019) to implicitly remind the students that the ‘main’ language is English.

Extract 2

today a:nd in the future you’re gona need your devices in class. mhm? And also rememeber a head- a set of headphones. you need that.<Lcat> necessiteu. e:l o un ordinado:r o una tablet o un telèfon amb connexió a internet (.) per el tipus de</Lcat><Lcast> el tipo de ejercicio que haremos hoy (1) vale? También acordaros que: tenéis que traer auriculares</Lcast> you

need a set of headphones mhm? ok? I can see that some people already have everything in front of you but it's really important that you remember to bring it (.) together with your dossier

The third strategy which we consider as part of the instructor's construction of her heteroglossic stance involves a series of interactional episodes in which she reflects on the learning process. We have already seen a very brief example of the instructor's 'legitimation work' at the end of Extract 1, in which she explains why she is asking students to prepare an oral presentation in their L1. However, there are several other occasions during the class on which the instructor's legitimation work can be seen clearly. Extract 3 shows how in a lapse of 11 min, the instructor makes two attempts to justify her heteroglossic stance through explicit reflection about the language learning process and we can also see that the 'personal perspective' becomes a key element. In the first part of the extract the teacher resorts to her personal experience as a language learner, whose relevance needs to be understood as part of her role of 'language expert'; in the second example, she tries to involve the students by asking them about both their personal experience and their opinion.

Extract 3

the the reason why I would like you to use Catalan Spanish or your mother tongue (.) is because I really want to see you have understood the information (.) yes? (2) a::nd sometimes at least in my case. the:: when I express something in my mother tongue (.) it is when I realise whether I have understood it or not. ok?

(11 minutes later)

how did you find the exercise of trying to (.) articulate the ideas in your mother tongue? (1) how did you find it? (1) interesting? ok (.) had you ev- had you done it before i:n when you: were learning English? (3) no? ok why do you think it is interesting? (9) ok you show it to yourself if you have understood properly (3) aha. (1) ok you feel more comfortable.ok. so: instead of e::h trying to remember the ideas (.) and trying to produce a good text (.) you can concentrate on remembering the ideas. yes? you don't need to do two things at the same time. just one thing (.) a:nd the other people? what do you think? (2) come on

Again, the teacher's argument is based on projecting English as an obstacle, as it does not allow her to see whether the students really understand the information provided, and as something that limits the students' ability to assess themselves. At the end of the extract, we can also see how she evaluates the students as unable to do two things at the same time. All in all, the teacher's attempts to project translanguaging as a scaffolding technique can be perceived by some students as undermining the development of their abilities in the foreign language.

4.2. Monoglossic teaching practices

The strategies that the instructor in the monoglossic group employs to construct her stance in favour of an English monolingual learning environment are (1) adopting a 'language policing' role by enforcing the use of English exclusively, enforcing rules associated with a native-speaker variety of English, and being an English-monolingual role model, (2) distrusting the use of translation, and (3) adopting a categorical approach to represent language use.

The teacher's language policing stance appears when she enforces an exclusive use of English and the observance of grammatical or pronunciation rules but also when she acts in front of the students as a model of monolingual use, who only uses English. In this sense, it is worth pointing out the contrast between the systematicity with which she uses only English in her interactions with the students and only Catalan when she addresses the researchers observing the lesson while the students are working on their own. Through her language choices, she represents two spaces in the classroom: the front stage, where the teacher interacts with the students in English, the only legitimate language, and the backstage, where the teacher interacts with the researchers and Catalan is the legitimate language. The switch between languages signals when the teacher moves between her teaching communicative practices (only in English) her non-teaching practices (only in Catalan).

Extract 4 is an example of the teacher's rather strict language-policing role. While supervising the work of groups of three students in a reading comprehension activity, the teacher approaches one of the groups and reminds them that they should not only interact in English but they should also take notes in that language:

Extract 4

T: Josep (.) remember that you should be speaking in English. right?

S1: yes (.) we are

T: great.{T addresses a different student} are you taking your notes in English?

The language-policing role of the teacher is also constructed through her frequent focus on formal aspects of language such as grammar and pronunciation, which contrasts with the focus on 'genre' that is promoted by the heteroglossic teacher. This is the case of Extract 5, in which the monoglossic teacher is going over different mistakes made by the students during their participation in class:

Extract 5

T: Pere. you said 'I think no'. and it's 'I don't think so'. 'I think no' doesn't exist in English. it's 'I don't think so'

T: Anna, you said audience <ipa>ɑ:ʊdjens<ipa> and it should be audience <ipa>ɔ:djens<ipa>

It is also worth mentioning that, in contrast with the arguments employed by the instructor in the heteroglossic group (which portrayed students as deficient in English), a focus on errors could be interpreted as a form of evaluating students as deficient in some grammatical aspects but capable of correcting them after receiving some feedback. In this regard, the teacher in the monoglossic group might be constructing a relationship of affiliation with her students whereas the teacher in the heteroglossic group might be disaffiliating with them.

The second strategy through which the teacher's monoglossic stance is projected to the students involves a general distrust towards the use of translation. This can be seen in Extract 6, in which the teacher not only advises students against using translation tools, on the grounds that it does not take context into account, but also rejects translation as a means of discussing or clarifying meaning.

Extract 6

T: I realised that some of you just googled the meaning of the word and you believed the first meaning you found (.) sometimes ehm like there is this google translator and it doesn't work (.) ok? sometimes the word has many meanings ehm so you have to carefully you know take into account the context where the word appears. so just don't believe everything you find

S: {S asks the meaning of an expression in the text} move people to tears?

T: {T redirects the question to the whole class} 'move people to tears'. what does it mean?

S: in Spanish?

T: mm well try to explain it in English. but

S: xxxx

T: ok to make people cry or to mm yeah?

The third aspect of the instructor's construction of her monolingual stance is the role of subjectivity in the interactional episodes through which she attempts to raise the students' awareness of language use and the learning process. For example, she makes reference to her personal language use to advise the students about the benefits of plurilingualism (e.g. "when I express something in my mother tongue") or relativises the importance of errors by appealing to the "tolerance" of the addressee (e.g. "the error is important depending on the communicative situation in which we are in . if the other person is tolerant towards such mistakes maybe he doesn't even notice"; English translation).

This degree of subjectivity of the heteroglossic instructor becomes even more salient when we contrast it with the monoglossic instructor's categorical and prescriptive stance in regulating the students' language behaviour. For example, she corrects the students with utterances like "I think no' doesn't exist in English, it's 'I don't think so'" or "it should be <ipa>ɔ:djens<ipa>" (extract 5).

One final difference between the two instructors is that whereas the instructor in the heteroglossic group tends to present translanguaging as a way to create a more relaxed learning environment you feel more comfortable (extract 3) and work on the emotional side of the student's learning, the instructor in the monoglossic group presents logical arguments to justify an English-only approach "sometimes ehm like there is this google translator and it doesn't work (.) ok? sometimes the word has many meanings" (extract 6).

4.3. The students' response

In this section, we consider the students' response to the new heteroglossic perspective by focusing on the students' development of their proficiency in English based on quantitative data from three assessment tools. However, at the end of the section, we also introduce a qualitative perspective by reflecting briefly on a stance of resistance towards the instructor's heteroglossic stance that appeared quite frequently during a focus-group session that was held with 8 students. This attitude might be a response to the heteroglossic instructor's mode of evaluating the students and justifying the need for a heteroglossic approach based on their limitations.

The analysis of the students' proficiency in English involved two different assessment tools which were administered at the beginning and the end of the term. First, participants were given 30 min to write a business letter to a company settled in the UK asking for information about the product they manufactured. Next, participants were taken individually to a quiet room and they were asked to give a sales pitch. They were shown a picture of a specific product and they were given 2 min to have a look at the picture and to prepare their persuasive speech. Participants were informed that they could not ask any language-related questions, that their speech should have a minimum length of 2 min and that it would be audio-recorded. All the instructions were given in the participants' L1.

All the excerpts (for both the pre- and post-test) of the sales pitch and the business letters were given to an expert examiner with more than 30 years of experience with the Cambridge Assessment English exams. The expert examiner used a rubric including 4 scales (language, communicative achievement, content, and organization) that counted 5 points each, with a maximum total score of 20 points. The examiner was fully familiar with the scales used due to her professional expertise.

Additionally, both the oral and written performance of the students was assessed by means of a set of objective measures (Wolf-e-Quintero et al., 1998). Oral fluency was computed through the measure of words per minute (WPM), whereas written fluency was computed through the average number of words per T-unit¹. Oral and written lexical complexity were computed by means of Guiraud's Index of Lexical Complexity (GUI), which is obtained by dividing the total number of types by the square root of the total number of tokens. Oral and written grammatical complexity were examined through a Clauses per T-unit ratio (CL/TU), which is obtained by dividing the total number of clauses by the total number of T-units. Finally, oral and written accuracy were computed through two

different measures, error-free T-unit per T-unit (EFTU/TU) and Errors per T-unit (ERR/TU). Whereas the first one was obtained by dividing the total number of correct T-units by the total number of T-units, the second one was obtained by dividing the total number of errors by the total number of T-units. A higher value in the post-test would indicate improvement in all the measures except for ERR/TU, for which a lower value would show improvement. It must be pointed out that these measures were obtained with pruned data, which means that false starts, repetitions, unfinished sentences, self-corrections or words in other languages other than English were excluded from the count. Finally, it must be highlighted that although participants were asked to speak for at least 2 min, many of them ran out of ideas and their speech did not meet that requirement. For this reason, all these measures come from the first 60 s of the excerpts.

Several linear mixed-effects models (LMM) with SPSS version 21 were conducted with the measures under study as the dependent variables, with 'time' and 'group' as independent variables, and 'student' as a random factor. It was found that 'Time' was statistically significant for the following measures: sales pitch ($F(1, 47) = 19,206, p = .000$), oral WPM ($F(1, 52) = 31,862, p = .000$), oral GUI ($F(1, 53) = 13,218, p = .001$), written GUI ($F(1, 54) = 4,849, p = .032$) and written CL/TU ($F(1, 57) = 4,311, p = .042$). Hence, it seems that participants, regardless of the group they belonged to, improved significantly these measures from the beginning to the end of the semester. Only two measures turned out to be significant regarding 'Group', namely the two measures by the expert examiner: sales pitch ($F(1, 55) = 10,878, p = .002$) and letter ($F(1, 56) = 4,130, p = .047$). For both measures the heteroglossic group did significantly better than the monoglossic group; regarding the sales pitch: Trans $M = 14.32$, Mono $M = 10.93$; regarding the letter: Trans $M = 11.64$, Mono $M = 9.32$. Finally, the interaction 'Time*Group' turned out to be significant only for written GUI ($F(1, 54) = 6,995, p = .011$). The estimated marginal means indicate that participants in the Translanguaging group in the post-test did significantly better ($M = 7.23$) than their Monolingual counterparts ($M = 6.88$), who scored practically the same in the pre-test ($M = 6.82$). The participants from the heteroglossic group obtained the lowest mean score in the pre-test ($M = 6.59$).

The significant effect of 'Time' (regardless of 'Group') did not come as a surprise and shows that both approaches were effective for L2 teaching. The fact that participants improved some measures (sales pitch, oral WPM, oral GUI, written GUI and written CL/TU) from the pre- to the post-test and not others could be explained by the short duration of the intervention (one semester) and some measures may be more susceptible to improvement than others. It is speculated that if the intervention had lasted longer, participants would have improved more measures from the pre- to the post-test. It must be noted that none of the accuracy measures were improved significantly. This finding was not surprising for the Translanguaging group because previous research in the ELF context shows that the learners tend to prioritize communication over accuracy (Mauranen, 2007; Vettorel, 2014). However, this finding was indeed surprising regarding the monoglossic group since the instructor made a considerable effort to correct the students' mistakes. A possible explanation for this lack of significant improvement in accuracy in the monoglossic group is that accuracy might need more time to develop.

The significant effect of 'Group' showed that the heteroglossic group did better than the monoglossic one. However, this only affected the two measures by the expert examiner. The superiority of the heteroglossic group over the monoglossic one could be due to the multiple advantages from the translanguaging methodology (i.e. positive transfer from the L1 to the L2). The fact that only these two measures from the expert examiner were significant for 'Group' could indicate that participants in the heteroglossic group improved some aspects that were not gauged by the objective measures such as communication achievement.

Finally, the interaction 'Time*Group' was only significant for written GUI, and again it was the heteroglossic group in the post-test who scored the highest. The superiority of the heteroglossic group in written lexical complexity could be explained by the advantages of using the L1 in class. Whereas the monoglossic group did not translate any words (the teacher explained the words and expressions students did not know), students in the heteroglossic group did translate unknown words and expressions, and previous research shows that translation is more effective to learn vocabulary (Zhao & Macaro, 2016). Moreover, it is possible that there was positive transfer from the L1 in the heteroglossic group because technical words were similar between the L1 and the L2 (commission, confirmation, deficit, transport). All in all, both groups showed comparable gains, and only in 3 measures differences in favour of the heteroglossic group. Hence, the results are positive, or at least not negative, for the heteroglossic group.

Despite the evidence obtained of the two groups showing similar gains and, if anything, the heteroglossic group experiencing a greater degree of improvement in written lexical complexity and from the holistic perspective of the expert examiner, it is interesting to point out that some of the students' stance towards the heteroglossic approach, as expressed in the focus group, was essentially unresponsive as a front-stage learning activity but not as a backstage learning strategy that individual students may decide to adopt. The unresponsive stance can be characterised in the form of five main attributes referred to by the students: unprecedented, unchallenging, (in)efficient, irrational, and excessively complex. Three of these attributes are expressed by a student (S1) in Extract 7 (translated from Catalan) during the focus group discussion session:

Extract 7

S1: the thing is that in the book we have things (.) today we were doing an exercise in which there were questions in Catalan (1) or in Castilian (.) **if they tell it to me in Castilian I don't make an effort to understand**{S2, another student, nods expressing agreement} because of course I already understand (.) I mean I read it and I immediately understand it (2) **and let's face it it's an English class (.) I do:n't don't see the point of some things being in Ca- i:n in our language . in Castilian or Catalan (1) and of course and the question in Castilian . the answer in English . it's all I don't know very (.) I find sort of chaotic (1) thinking in Castilian and having to write in English is a lot of work**

In this short intervention from the focus group, S1 refers to three of the five attributes listed above. He begins by presenting the new approach as one that does not lead students to make an effort to learn (it is, therefore, unchallenging). S2 (another student) expresses

his alignment with S1's stance with a nod of the head. Later in the same turn, S1 evaluates the presence of Castilian and Catalan in the English class as irrational (I don't see the point) and chaotic. Finally, and somewhat in contradiction with what he said at the beginning of the turn, S1 considers translanguaging as an excessively complex practice which increases the cognitive work load of the students.

It is also interesting to point out that, as can be seen in extract 8 (translated from Catalan), whenever students express a supportive stance towards a heteroglossic approach, they consider that the introduction of the students' L1 as a scaffolding tool should be a personal option on the part of the students.

Extract 8

S3: if he or she wants. they could prepare it first in Catalan and then in English

S1: yes of course it's personal

S3: yes

S1: but to force us to do it in Catalan:

S4: mhm

We can argue that students seem to align with the use of the kind of heteroglossic practices to which they have been exposed to because they are present in traditional monolingual approaches to foreign language teaching (Hall & Cook, 2012), as a backstage optional learning strategy rather than a legitimate teaching practice. We could also argue that the students' co-construction of this stance and the fact that they reject the same pedagogical strategy when it is a decision made by the instructor could be interpreted as an act of disaffiliation with her evaluation of themselves as being not competent enough in English.

5. Discussion

We have characterised the instructor's heteroglossic approach as involving the following main interactional strategies: (i) incorporating the students' L1 into the learning activities, (ii) adopting translanguaging in her interaction with the students, and (iii) introducing reflection episodes legitimising a plurilingual approach on the basis of her own and the students' personal experience as a plurilingual learners and users. On the other hand, the main strategies that we have found in the monoglossic group's instructor are (i) her emphasis on rule enforcement and monolingual use, (ii) her distrust of the usefulness of translation, and (iii) a categorical discourse in connection with rules of language learning and use.

From the point of view of the students' response, we have shown that the only significant differences in terms of language learning gains are in favour of the students in the heteroglossic group in terms of written lexical complexity and overall language competence as assessed by an expert examiner and expressed in the form of 4 scales: language, communicative achievement, content and organization. However, we have also reflected briefly the nature of the students' unsupportive stance, which might be influenced by a dominant monoglossic tradition. The students' resistance is directed mainly towards a compulsory, official adoption of translanguaging rather than an optional, individual and back-stage use.

The analysis of the students' performance in the pre- and post tests have also shown that, despite the unsupportive stance of some students, the introduction of a heteroglossic perspective in foreign language teaching can have a positive impact in terms of language development. The results are especially relevant when we consider that the heteroglossic group improved significantly in connection with the expert examiner's assessment of the students' communicative oral and written output (a sales pitch and a business letter). In this sense, one could hypothesise that the adoption of a plurilingual approach may help the learners to place the focus of their productions on self-expression and fluency, which results in a positive assessment by the examiner. On the other hand, the emphasis on accuracy, which in our study appears associated with the monoglossic instructor, may act as a constraint for the learners' communicative thrust.

We see that for both instructors, an essential aspect of their classroom discourse is that they aim to present themselves as a 'model' of plurilingual or monolingual use, respectively, and that they make a deliberate effort to enact this role in a consistent way. This effort may sometimes result in somewhat 'unnatural' interactional discourse such as the plurilingual instructor's excessive use of translation in repeating instructions systematically in 2 or 3 languages or the monolingual instructor's rejection of translation as a resource for language learning.

The qualitative analysis has also revealed a significant difference in the instructors' discourse, between the heteroglossic instructor's subjective stance towards language learning and use and the categorical stance of the monoglossic instructor. We believe that a possible explanation should not be limited to personal differences in teaching style or representations of language learning and use. Rather, it should take into account the 'experimental' nature of the heteroglossic instructor's pedagogical approach and the well-established support for the monoglossic instructor's approach. It seems therefore inevitable that the heteroglossic instructor finds it necessary at different points in her class to legitimise her approach, not only by referring to her positive personal experience as language learner and user but also by attempting to deconstruct the same categorical representations of language use that the monoglossic instructor seems to promote in her class.

Finally, it should be also noted that the heteroglossic teacher's stance involves a process of implicit evaluation that represents the students as having limited skills in English and therefore as requiring a pedagogical adaptation. Students who might disagree with the instructor's reasons to justify her methodology might, as a consequence, position themselves against the use of translanguaging as pedagogy.

6. Conclusion

In this paper we have reported on the impact of a sustained pedagogical intervention aimed at implementing a heteroglossic perspective in an ESP university subject. We have focused on two different kinds of impact: (a) the teacher's discursive accommodation to the new perspective, by comparison with the pedagogical behaviour of a teacher adopting a clearly monoglossic perspective, and (b) the students' response, mainly in terms of the development of their proficiency but also in terms of their attitude of resistance towards the pedagogical innovation.

We believe that the study sheds some light on [Cenoz and Gorter's \(2011\)](#) claim about the absence of empirical evidence about the language learning outcomes of introducing translanguaging practices. The analysis of the students' performance at the beginning and the end of the course module shows that a heteroglossic approach can have a positive learning effect from the holistic perspective of an expert examiner. However, we have also attempted to produce a complementary qualitative view of the impact of introducing translanguaging practices by characterising the instructor's classroom discourse.

One of the implications of the study has to do with the special relevance of a plurilingual approach in the context of an ESP academic subject with the goal of developing specific communicative skills in a professional environment with which the learners are not necessarily familiar in their L1. From this point of view, it could be said that the pedagogical intervention analysed in this paper fulfils [Williams' \(2002, p. 29\)](#) idea of translanguaging practices as "a natural way of developing and strengthening both languages". Therefore, the introduction of plurilingual approach in the business English course module may have implicitly transformed it into a multilingual business communication skills including not only English but Catalan and Castilian.

Another implication of the study is connected with the extent and strength of the students' unsupportive stance towards translanguaging practices in foreign language teaching and the possible impact of this stance both on the teaching/learning process as well and on the learning outcomes. This stance of resistance that the heteroglossic instructor possibly sensed during the class may explain the efforts that she made to legitimise her approach in order to save face.

A third implication is the need to take into consideration the legitimisation strategies that teachers need to deploy in class when introducing new courses and new pedagogies. Thus, especially in courses for adults, it may be relevant to think about teacher training beyond a technical matter and to consider how they will justify the innovations in front of the students so as to avoid a disaffiliation with them. It has been previously proved that students' beliefs play a central role in foreign language learning ([Horwitz, 1988](#); [Wenden, 1999](#)), can have a debilitating or facilitative impact ([Barcelos & Kalaja, 2011](#)) and be also related to emotions ([Aragão, 2011](#)). This study can also be a source for the identification of students' beliefs which can inform the design of future lessons, introducing awareness-raising activities and, if necessary, a more gradual approach to innovating activities which may clash with the learners' belief systems.

The study also presents some limitations, which need to be the object of further research. Regarding the quantitative part, in the first place, it goes without saying that a larger number of participants would have yielded stronger results. Another limitation is that the study only focused on certain L2 areas (i.e. vocabulary, grammar complexity and accuracy); for further research it would be interesting to include other areas such as pronunciation and listening comprehension to have a wider picture of the impact of implementing a heteroglossic approach.

From the point of view of the qualitative part of the study, the study has merely suggested that the analysis of the impact of introducing a heteroglossic perspective needs to take into account a change in the students' attitudes towards multilingualism and, more specifically, the notion of plurilingual competence as introduced in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages ([Council of Europe, 2018](#)). In this sense, it would be important to study more deeply the students' stance from both a quantitative and a qualitative perspective.

Finally, it would be interesting to see how offering training to the teacher in charge of the new methodology prior to implementation in terms of stance-taking and legitimisation work as well as the introduction of activities that raise awareness of why and how the students' might benefit from a new pedagogy would have an impact on the students' experience and adopted stance.

6.1. Transcription key

The following symbols are based on the transcription conventions proposed by VOICE (Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English) ([VOICE, 2007](#)).

- ? Words spoken with rising intonation are followed by a question mark "?". This intonation often coincides with a question
- . Words spoken with falling intonation are followed by a full stop "."
- (.) Every brief pause in speech (up to a good half second) is marked with a full stop in parentheses.
- (2) Longer pauses are timed to the nearest second and marked with the number of seconds in parentheses, e.g. (1) = 1 s, (3) = 3 s
- : Lengthened sounds are marked with a colon ":". Exceptionally long sounds (i.e. approximating 2 s or more) are marked with a double colon "::".
- ev- With word fragments, a hyphen marks where a part of the word is missing.
- <Lcat> Utterances in a language other than English are put between tags indicating the language
- { } Contextual information is added between curlybrackets { } only if it is relevant to the understanding of the interaction or to the
- <ipa> Salient variations on the level of phonology, e.g. sound substitution or addition, a phonetic representation is added between <ipa> tags.
- xxxx Unintelligible speech is represented by x's approximating syllable number

Author statement

Josep M. Cots: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision, Project administration.
 Lúdia Gallego-Balsà: Investigation, Formal analysis, Writing - Review & Editing.
 Àngels Llanes: Data Curation, Formal analysis, Writing - Review & Editing.

Declaration of competing interest

None.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Competitiveness [grant number FFI2015-67769-P] and the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation [grant number PID2019-104333 GB-I00].

References

- Aragão, R. (2011). Beliefs and emotions in foreign language learning. *System*, 39(3), 302–313. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.07.003>
- Bailey, B. (2012). Heteroglossia. In M. Martin-Jone, A. Blackledge, & A. Creese (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of multilingualism* (pp. 499–507). London: Routledge.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). In M. Holquist, translated, C. Emerson, & M. Holquist (Eds.), *The dialogic imagination. Four essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barcelos, A. M. F., & Kalaja, P. (2011). Introduction to beliefs about SLA revisited. *System*, 39(3), 281–289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.07.001>
- Biber, D., & Finegan, E. (1989). Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text*, 9(1), 93–124.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2014). Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy. In A. Blackledge, & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 1–20). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Caruso, E. (2018). Translanguaging in higher education: Using several languages for the analysis of academic content in the teaching and learning process. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, 8(1), 65–90. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cercles-2018-0004>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). Focus on multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 356–369. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01206.x>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2013). Towards a plurilingual approach in English language teaching: Softening the boundaries between languages. *Tesol Quarterly*, 47(3), 591–599. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.121>
- Cook, V. (1995). Multi-competence and learning of many languages. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 8(2), 93–98. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908319509525193>
- Council of Europe. (2018). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Companion volume with new descriptors*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing. <https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989>
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>
- Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research*, 49, 222–251. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543049002222>
- Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognising heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(4), 585–592. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2005.00331.x>
- Cummins, J. (2009). Multilingualism in the English-language classroom: Pedagogical considerations. *Tesol Quarterly*, 43(2), 317–321. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00171.x>
- Damari, R. R. (2010). Intertextual stancetaking and the local negotiation of cultural identities by a binational couple. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 14(5), 609–629.
- Du Bois, J. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stance taking in discourse* (pp. 139–182). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Duarte, J. (2020). Translanguaging in the context of mainstream multilingual education. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 17(2), 232–247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1512607>
- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). Translanguaging theory in education. In O. García, & T. Kleyn (Eds.), *Translanguaging with multilingual students. Learning from classroom Moments* (pp. 9–33). New York and London: Routledge.
- Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012). Own-language use in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 45(3), 271–308. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000067>
- Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72, 283–294. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2010.00456.x>
- Ivanov, V. (1999). Heteroglossia. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 9(1–2), 100–102. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jlin.1999.9.1-2.100>
- Jaffe, A. (2009a). Introduction: The sociolinguistics of stance. In A. Jaffe (Ed.), *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 3–28). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jaffe, A. (2009b). Stance in a Corsican school: Institutional and ideological orders and the production of bilingual subjects. In A. Jaffe (Ed.), *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 119–145). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kramsch, C., & Huffmaster, M. (2015). Multilingual practices in foreign language study. In J. Cenoz, & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Multilingual education: Between language learning and translanguaging* (pp. 114–136). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lasagabaster, D., & García, O. (2014). Translanguaging: Towards a dynamic model of bilingualism at school/translanguaging: Hacia un modelo dinámico de bilingüismo en la escuela. *Cultura y Educación/Culture and Education*, 26(3), 557–572. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11356405.2014.973671>
- Lin, A. (2013). Toward paradigmatic change in TESOL methodologies: Building plurilingual pedagogies from the ground up. *Tesol Quarterly*, 47(3), 521–545. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.113>
- Makalela, L. (2017). In C. Mazak, & K. Carroll (Eds.), *Translanguaging practices in a South African institution of higher learning: A case of ubuntu multilingual return* (pp. 11–28).
- Mauranen, A. (2007). Hybrid voices: English as the lingua franca of academics. In K. Flottum (Ed.), *Language and discipline perspectives on academic discourse* (pp. 243–259). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Mazak, C. (2017). In C. Mazak, & K. Carroll (Eds.), *Introduction: Theorizing translanguaging practices in higher education* (pp. 1–10).
- Mazak, C., & Carroll, K. (Eds.). (2017). *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual Ideologies* (pp. 11–28). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Mbirimi-Hungwe, V., Hungwe, T., & Seeletse, S. M. (Eds.). (2020). *Emerging perspective on translanguaging in multilingual university classrooms*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Nastasi, B., Hitchcock, J., & Brown, L. (2010). An inclusive framework for conceptualizing mixed methods design typologies: Moving toward fully integrated synergistic research methods. In A. Tashakkori, & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Sage Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioural Science* (2nd ed., pp. 305–338). Los Angeles, CA (USA): Sage, 2010.
- Sánchez, M. T., & García, O. (2022). Introducción : Transforming educational espacios. Translanguaging sin miedo. In M. T. Sánchez, & O. García (Eds.), *Transformative Translanguaging Espacios. Latinx Students and their Teachers rompiendo fronteras sin miedo* (pp. 1–15).
- Stern, H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Vettorel, P. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in wider networking. Blogging practices*. Berlin: Mouton the Gruyter.
- Voice. (2007). *Transcription conventions* [2.1]. Available at: https://www.univie.ac.at/voice/documents/VOICE_mark-up_conventions_v2-1.pdf.
- Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>
- Wenden, A. L. (1999). An introduction to metacognitive knowledge and beliefs in language learning: Beyond the basics. *System*, 27, 435–441. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(99\)00043-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00043-3)
- Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, C. (2002). *Extending bilingualism in the education system (education and lifelong learning committee report ELL-06-2* (p. 4). [https://senedd.wales/Committee%20Documents/ELL%2006-02\(p.4\)%20Dr%20Cen%20Williams%20paper-20032002-28970/3c91c7af00023d82000059500000000-English.pdf](https://senedd.wales/Committee%20Documents/ELL%2006-02(p.4)%20Dr%20Cen%20Williams%20paper-20032002-28970/3c91c7af00023d82000059500000000-English.pdf). (Accessed 2 August 2018).
- Wolfe-Quintero, K., Inagaki, S., & Kim, H. (1998). *Second language development in writing: Measures of fluency, accuracy and complexity*. University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Zhao, T., & Macaro, E. (2016). What works better for the learning of concrete and abstract words: Teachers' L1 use or L2-only explanations? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 26(1), 75–98. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12080>