Multidisciplinary Journal of School Education Vol. 09, 2020/1 No. 17
ISSN 2543-7585 e- ISSN 2543-8409
DOI: 10.35765/mjse.2020.0917.08
Submitted: 02.03.2020
Accepted: 09.06.2020

Teresa Maria Włosowicz
http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8767-9332
University of Social Sciences, Łódź
Faculty of Applied Sciences, Krakow
e-mail: melomane.plurilingue@gmail.com

The Use of Elements of Translanguaging in Teaching Third or Additional Languages: Some Advantages and Limitations

Abstract

The purpose of the paper is to analyze some advantages and limitations of the use of translanguaging, or the mobilization of students' whole multilingual repertoires to facilitate understanding and learning (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012, p. 655), in the teaching of third or additional languages (De Angelis's [2007] term) at the university level. The paper is based on two studies by the author, on the use of translanguaging in the teaching of Spanish (Włosowicz, in press-a) and of French (Włosowicz, in press-b). It analyzes the use of translanguaging, including code-switching (see García, 2009), for the purposes of explanation and awareness-raising, taking into consideration the increased language learning experience and awareness of multilingual students (cf. Hufeisen, 2018), and its perception by the students. However, despite its advantages, it also has limitations related to students' lack of experience with translanguaging and unwillingness to use their multilingual repertoires in learning particular languages.

Keywords: translanguaging, multilingual repertoires, language awareness

Multidisciplinary Journal of School Education
Vol. 09, 2020/1 No. 17

Introduction

The studies presented in this article aim to investigate the advantages of using elements of translanguaging in the teaching of third or additional languages at the university level, as well as its limitations. Since the context in which the studies were conducted only allowed for limited use of translanguaging, it seems better to describe the activities as 'elements of translanguaging', rather than full-fledged translanguaging, used in bilingual and multilingual communities for the negotiation of meaning in spoken interactions (Otheguy, García, & Reid, 2019; Li, 2018). The term "third or additional languages", introduced by De Angelis (2007, pp. 10–11), is used here deliberately, since, firstly, L3 learning is qualitatively different from L2 learning (Hufeisen, 2018), so it cannot be treated as synonymous with second language acquisition (De Angelis, 2007, p. 10) and, secondly, even minimal knowledge of a language influences one's multilingual repertoire (De Angelis, 2007, p. 126); that is why L4, L5, etc. acquisition cannot be termed "third language acquisition."

In general, it can be assumed that translanguaging, as a process involving two (Baker, 2011, p. 288, as cited in Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012, p. 655) or more languages (Lewis et al., 2012, p. 655; Li, 2018, pp. 13–14) to facilitate understanding and learning, can be very useful in teaching third or additional languages, capitalizing on the students' existing knowledge and language awareness, which can allow them to exploit similarities and differences between their languages more effectively. However, in a group of international students who possess a variety of language repertoires, translanguaging can be supposed to take a different form than, for example, in a community of bilingual or multilingual speakers who switch and mix languages on a daily basis (Li, 2018; Otheguy, García, & Reid, 2019), as not of all their languages are comprehensible to the whole group. In fact, as Duarte (2018, p. 13) explains, even in multilingual classrooms translanguaging can perform different functions which may or may not require the teacher to know all of the students' languages. Moreover, as adult learners, university students have certain expectations based on their earlier language learning experience (Włosowicz, 2016) which also need to be taken

into consideration. Therefore, in the context of teaching multilingual groups at a university, translanguaging is likely to have certain limitations.

At the same time, it must be stressed that the studies were carried out in the Polish context, where the society does not use multiple languages on a daily basis and where foreign languages are mainly taught in formal, instructional settings, so the use of translanguaging cannot be assumed to be identical with that observed in bilingual classrooms in the USA (Allard, Apt, & Sacks, 2018) or multilingual ones in South Africa (Paradowski, 2020), the Netherlands, or Luxembourg (Duarte, 2018). Students who have been taught not to mix languages may regard this approach to teaching and learning experimental and unusual, and may require encouragement before trying this new way of mobilizing their multilingual repertoires. This is particularly true of Study 1, where the participants were mostly native speakers of Polish, studying Spanish in Polish university settings, where not only does the teaching have to follow certain guidelines, but the verification of teaching and learning outcomes must also adhere to target language norms. On the other hand, the participants in Study 2 had different native languages and different language repertoires, and had been taught foreign languages in different ways in their native countries. Nonetheless, firstly, in Poland they were required to follow a fairly unified course (even though the teacher attempted to personalize the explanations and feedback as much as possible) and, secondly, as the questionnaire revealed, the mobilization of multilingual repertoires was new to them as well. Therefore, the term translanguaging is used here in a broad sense, as the use of multilingual repertoires, not necessarily for the negotiation of meaning in multilingual classrooms—with extensive use of code-switching and code-mixing—but also the use of code-switching regarded as a form of translanguaging (García, 2009) for expressing the intended meaning in a vocabulary task, or referencing the similarities and differences between languages for the purpose of raising language awareness. In fact, it can be assumed that the extent and functions of translanguaging are likely to vary considerably from one context to another, due to differences in the learners' language experience and the classroom context, as well as the social context and the educational system in the country.

Multidisciplinary Journal of School Education
Vol. 09, 2020/1 No. 17

The paper is based mainly on two of the author's studies, one concerning the use of translanguaging in Spanish as a third or additional language (Włosowicz, in press-a) and one investigating multilingual students' acquisition of French and their perception of translanguaging for the purpose of awareness-raising during the classes (Włosowicz, in press-b), as well as on earlier research on the topic. Based on the results, an attempt will be made to suggest some applications for translanguaging in higher education, and to present some limitations of its use in both teaching and evaluation.

Translanguaging as an Approach to Language Teaching and Use

Translanguaging has been defined by Baker (2011, p. 288, as quoted in Lewis et al., 2012, p. 655) as "the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, and gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages", although it can involve more than two languages as well. In education, it is "the planned and systematic use of two languages inside the same lesson" (Baker, 2011, p. 288, as quoted in MacSwan, 2017, p. 170). According to Lewis et al., in the school context, "translanguaging tries to draw on all the linguistic resources of the child to maximize understanding and achievement" (2012, p. 655). Consequently, "both languages are used in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner to organize and mediate mental processes in understanding, speaking, literacy, and, not least, learning" (Lewis et al., 2012, p. 655).

Still, in the case of multilingual students, it is possible to mediate between three or more languages, though—given the differences between the students' language repertoires—the process must be assumed to be largely personalized and (as will be discussed in more detail below) it requires of the teacher a high level of multilingual proficiency and language awareness.

The origins of translanguaging can be traced back to Williams's research (1994, 1996; García & Li, 2014, p. 20) on alternating between English and Welsh in both receptive and productive use, as a pedagogical

practice. It might thus be regarded as a fairly controversial concept, especially in view of the traditional approach to language teaching and learning, which has always involved teaching languages in isolation, either establishing connections between L2 (or L3, etc.) and L1—as in the grammar translation method—but excluding other languages, or even eliminating L1 as well, in an attempt to avoid interference—as in the direct method (Yu, 2001, p. 176, as cited in Cummins, 2008, p. 66). As Gorter and Cenoz remark, "traditionally, languages have been kept separate in school settings" (2017, p. 235). Similarly, the exclusion of the native language from foreign language classes is one of the assumptions which "are rarely discussed or presented to new teachers but are taken for granted as the foundation-stones of language teaching" (Cook, 2001, pp. 403–404, as cited in Gorter & Cenoz, 2017, p. 235).

However, researchers such as Cook (2001, as cited in Cummins, 2008, p. 66) and Cummins question the "'two solitudes' assumption" (Cummins, 2008, p. 65) and call for the inclusion of the principled use of L1 in L2 classes, for example, in the form of translation. According to Cook (2001, as cited in Cummins, 2008, p. 66), the use of L1 should be based on the following criteria: *efficiency*, or the possibility of communicating certain content more effectively in L1; *learning*, as a result of combining both languages; *naturalness*, or capitalizing on the fact that learners feel more comfortable discussing some topics in their native language; and, finally, *external relevance*, or the acquisition of skills that will be useful outside the classroom. Therefore, in the broad sense adopted here, the translation of target language words into the learners' native language (not necessarily Polish, but also Spanish in the case of the Spanish-speaking students in Study 2, to make them aware of certain similarities between French and Spanish), can also be considered a form of translanguaging.

In fact, languages in the bilingual or multilingual mind are not stored in isolation, but there is a certain degree of interconnection between them, depending, on the one hand, on the language subsystem (for example, in the areas of syntax and semantics, the neural connections between languages are largely shared, while phonology uses different networks; Franceschini, Zappatore, & Nitsch, 2003, p. 164), and, on the other hand,

Multidisciplinary Journal of School Education
Vol. 09, 2020/1 No. 17

on the context and way in which the languages were acquired (for example, whether the languages were acquired separately or by establishing connections between L1 and L2 words), as well as on the level of proficiency (Cieślicka, 2000). On the basis of the organization of the multilingual mental lexicon, Müller-Lancé (2003, p. 131) has distinguished three types of multilinguals: a "multilinguoid" possesses strong connections between the mental representations of all his or her languages and a high level of metalinguistic awareness; a "bilinguoid" has connections between two languages, the native language and the dominant foreign language; and a "monolinguoid" is multilingual only "on paper," but he or she behaves like a monolingual. As he explains, multilinguoids learn their languages with cognitive methods, establishing connections between their languages, while bilinguoids acquire the preferred language abroad and monolinguoids "are the result of an unhappy combination of reserved temperament, monitor overuse, and a misguided foreign language education in the classroom"—in particular, "ignoring common features between L1, L2, L3, etc. instead of stressing them" (Müller-Lancé, 2003, p. 131). Certainly, this is a fairly general distinction, as more fine-grained analyses of the multilingual mental lexicon take into consideration, for example, the connections between lexical items and the underlying concepts, shared or not by the languages (e.g. Pavlenko, 2009), but for the purposes of this article it can be assumed that learning strategies (and to some extent teaching methods) play an important role in the organization of multilingual repertoires.

Indeed, the recognition of common features can be beneficial to the learning of further languages. Cummins (2008, p. 69) distinguished five types of transfer whose use depends on the sociolinguistic situation: "transfer of conceptual elements" (understanding the underlying concepts behind words, e.g., "photosynthesis"), "transfer of metacognitive and metalinguistic strategies" (mnemonic devices, vocabulary learning strategies, etc.), "transfer of pragmatic aspects of language use" (e.g., using gestures to aid communication), "transfer of specific linguistic elements" and "transfer of phonological awareness." As learners themselves admit, allowing them to use their L1s in the classroom helps them to understand more and to be more confident about the L2 (Cummins, 2008, p. 71).

Certainly, the use of translanguaging is likely to vary between different contexts of language acquisition and use. On the one hand, there are communities in which mixing languages is the norm; for example, Li (2018, pp. 13–14) presented a dialogue between two Singaporeans which involved the use of seven languages: Hokkien, Teochew, Mandarin, Malay, Cantonese, Singlish, and English and which is typical of that speech community. Similarly, Otheguy et al. (2019, pp. 17–22), based on a body of empirical evidence provided by Latino speakers in the USA, claim that bilinguals possess one unitary system of language competence and not two systems. In their view, "externally named languages" (2019, p. 5), such as English, Spanish, etc., are only "anchored in *sociocultural beliefs*, not in psycholinguistic properties of the underlying system" (Otheguy et al., 2019, p. 4, their emphasis). In their view (2019, pp. 8–9), even though the internal differentiation of bilingual systems is obvious, it "corresponds to the social division between English and Spanish" (Otheguy et al., 2019, p. 8) and the selection of lexical and structural resources depends on the situation, the interlocutor, etc. In fact, this view of translanguaging does not recognize code-switching, because code-switching assumes switching between two languages and—if competence is unitary—there are no two languages to switch between, but rather there is a broader system to choose words and structures from (Otheguy et al., 2019, p. 16). However, in an earlier work, García (2009, p. 140) regarded code-switching as a kind of translanguaging and was arguably correct, as code-switching involves capitalizing on a learner's whole bilingual or multilingual repertoire to facilitate communication and, consequently, achievement. Indeed, in their original definitions of translanguaging, both Baker (2011, as cited in Lewis et al., 2012, p. 655) and Williams (1994, 1996, as cited in García & Li, 2014, p. 20) recognized the existence of two languages in a bilingual classroom and alternation between them, rather than unitary competence without any boundaries between the languages involved.

By contrast, MacSwan represents "a *multilingual perspective on translanguaging*, which acknowledges the existence of discrete languages and multilingualism … along with other 'treasured icons' of the field, including language rights, mother tongues, and codeswitching"

(2017, p. 169, his emphasis). In his integrated multilingual model, "bilinguals have a single system with many shared grammatical resources but with some internal language-specific differentiation as well" (MacSwan, 2017, p. 179). On the basis of code-switching research, he concludes that differences in the structural patterns of various languages are evidenced by bilingual speakers themselves (MacSwan, 2017, p. 182). Similar evidence is provided by Toribio (2001), who has shown that Spanish/English bilinguals are aware of the structural differences and that code-switching requires a certain level of competence in both languages. In fact, even non-fluent bilinguals show some sensitivity to the acceptability of some switches and not others (Toribio, 2001, p. 225).

Moreover, as shown by Williams and Hammarberg (1998), even though multilinguals do mix their languages, they do not do it indiscriminately: the different languages play different roles in communication. In their polyglot speaking model, they distinguish four categories of switches: EDIT (self-repair or facilitating interaction), META (a comment on the communicative situation, or framing an utterance), INSERT (inserting a non-target language word or phrase, e.g., to elicit the target word), and WIPP (Without Identified Pragmatic Purpose, or switches made by mistake, due to the interaction between languages, as evidenced by immediate self-correction; Williams & Hammarberg, 1998, pp. 306–308). Still, the switches tend to take place in languages which play particular roles; for example, the native language has the INSTRUMENTAL role and serves the META function in particular, while WIPP switches tend to involve the DEFAULT SUPPLIER, which is a foreign language (i.e., it has an L2 status) characterized by the learner's high proficiency, typological proximity to the target language, and recency of use (Williams & Hammarberg, 1998, pp. 318–323).

Arguably, what is particularly important for the amount and kind of translanguaging that is used is the context. It is certainly different in a bilingual community in which mixing languages is the norm (Li, 2018; Otheguy et al., 2019), where the speakers may not even recognize certain words as belonging to the non-target language, as in the system shift phenomenon (De Angelis, 2005; see below), and in a community where

the boundaries between the languages are clearly defined, as in the case of Polish learners of English or Spanish. For example, in multilingual classrooms, where there are immigrant children from different countries and the teacher does not even have to know all their native languages, translanguaging performs different functions and requires of the teacher different degrees of competence in the languages involved, from fluency to no competence at all (Duarte, 2018). On the basis of studies carried out in Luxemburg and in Friesland, the Netherlands, Duarte (2018, p. 13) distinguished three functions of official translanguaging (in a school context and not among the immigrants themselves): the symbolic function, which serves to acknowledge the pupils' languages and does not require of the teacher any proficiency in them (e.g., each child says "hello" in his or her native language), the scaffolding function (used for acknowledgement and organizational purposes; proficiency is needed only in the instruction languages), and the epistemological function (as in content and integrated learning [CLIL]; proficiency in both languages is indispensable).

However, just as education should not ignore the language repertoires of multilingual pupils, but should at least acknowledge them, if not involve them all in making meaning and sharing knowledge, it should also take them into consideration in evaluation. According to Gorter and Cenoz (2017), assessment should adopt a more holistic, multilingual approach. They cite a study by Gathercole et al. (2013) in which bilingual children were tested in both their languages separately, taking into account their home languages. As Gorter and Cenoz conclude, "the importance of this study lies in the fact that participants are assessed differently according to their linguistic background and not as deficient speakers of their second languages" (2017, p. 242). In their view, traditional approaches may have been useful in the past, as learner populations were more homogeneous, but now, in the globalized world, even though students from different linguistic backgrounds have to achieve a common goal (e.g., to learn English), assessment should be more holistic and involve, for example, translanguaging (Gorter & Cenoz, 2017, pp. 244–245).

Even so, requirements concerning language courses at university are still largely traditional, and the students' knowledge has to be assessed

Multidisciplinary Journal of School Education
Vol. 09, 2020/1 No. 17

by means of standard tests and documented. Thus, assessing multilingual students on the basis of their native languages and language repertoires does not seem very realistic. Yet, while written tests have to be the same for the whole group, regardless of their native languages, assessment opportunities, or "any actions, interactions, or artifacts (planned or unplanned, deliberate or unconscious, explicit or embedded) which have the potential to provide information on the qualities of a learner's (or group of learners') performance" (Hill & McNamara, 2012, p. 397, their emphasis) might to some extent take into consideration the students' multilingual repertoires and, for example, point out to them the sources of errors caused by negative transfer, recognize the progress of students who can use their language resources efficiently, or those whose L1s are distant from the target language and who need to make more effort than the others.

It might be argued that translanguaging constitutes a solution to many problems related to linguistic diversity in schools. García and Li emphasize its transformative nature, saying that "as new configurations of language practices are generated, old understandings and structures are released, thus transforming not only subjectivities, but also cognitive and social structures" (2014, p. 3). However, even though they believe that "human beings have a natural Translanguaging Instinct" (García & Li, 2014, p. 32), they admit that it is not necessarily spontaneous. Rather, "students need practice and engagement in translanguaging, as much as they need practice of standard features used for academic purposes" (García & Li, 2014, pp. 71–72). In fact, in Jaspers's (2018) view, translanguaging has its limitations and it does not have to be the transforming force García and Li (2014) regard it to be; it may even become an ideology and—as Jaspers remarks, "translanguaging in some of its representations becomes a constraining force that marginalizes, if not silences, particular views" (2018, p. 5). For example, as shown in Charalambous et al. (2016, as cited in Jaspers, 2018, p. 7), promoting translanguaging in a context that is unfavorable to it can decrease pupils' well-being, as in the case of introducing Turkish in a primary school in Greek Cyprus. Similarly, forcing Polish students to switch freely between Polish, English, and

Spanish would probably have felt quite unnatural in the formal instruction context. Indeed, as observed by Testa, following Otwinowska (2016) and Kucharczyk (2018), "Poland is characterized for being a strikingly monolingual country" (2018, p. 70) and most Poles learn foreign languages at school but do not have contact with cultural or linguistic diversity (Kucharczyk, 2018, p. 44, as cited in Testa, 2018, p. 70). In the case of international students, their language experiences could be different and some could actually be used to speaking two languages in their home countries (e.g., switching between Ukrainian and Russian; Włosowicz & Kopeć, 2018), but that might not necessarily result in spontaneous translanguaging in the university context in Poland. In fact, language awareness is not limited to an awareness of similarities and differences between languages or to intuitions about the target language (see James, 1996, below), but it can also be assumed to involve an awareness of what the interlocutor may or may not understand. Consequently, while pointing out similarities between French and Spanish may be useful to native speakers and learners of Spanish, it is unlikely that a spontaneous mixture of Spanish and French would be comprehensible to the whole group, and a spontaneous mixture of Georgian or Azerbaijani and French would be even less so. Thus, even though in immigrant contexts translanguaging allows children to feel safe speaking their home languages (Duarte, 2018), in a university context it might serve such purposes as awareness-raising. Enforced translanguaging, however, could become what Jaspers calls "a constraining force" (2018, 5).

Multilingual Learners' Language Awareness

Undoubtedly, foreign language learning by adults, as in the case of university students, is a conscious process and involves more or less reliance on analytical skills. As mentioned above, certain skills, such as phonological awareness or vocabulary learning strategies, can be transferred from L1 to L2 (Cummins, 2008), or, it can be assumed, from one foreign language to another. James defines language awareness "as

Multidisciplinary Journal of School Education
Vol. 09, 2020/1 No. 17

the possession of metacognitions about language in general, some bit of language, or a particular language over which one already has skilled control and a coherent set of intuitions" (1996, p. 139). By contrast, consciousness-raising involves making the learner aware of what he or she does not know yet and needs to learn. In other words, consciousness-raising is an "activity that develops the ability to locate and identify the *discrepancy* between one's present state of knowledge and a goal state of knowledge" (James, 1996, p. 141). As James remarks, both language awareness and consciousness-raising involve noticing certain elements of the native and/or the foreign language, and foreign language elements that differ from those of the mother tongue are particularly salient, which is why it is easier to identify errors based on negative transfer (1996, p. 143). However, salience may be of two kinds: inherently salient elements are universally noticeable and, as a result, more likely to be acquired, whereas contrast-dependent or cross-linguistic salience makes such items less likely to be acquired (James, 1996, p. 143). Consequently, to make learners aware of the differences between the native and the foreign language, James recommends "classroom-based CA [contrastive analysis]" with a metacognitive dimension (1996, p. 145). In other words, making learners aware of the differences between L1 and L2 (and, it can be assumed, L3, L4, etc.) is likely to facilitate the acquisition of those elements which are different.

It can thus be assumed that what Cenoz calls "pedagogical translanguaging", (2017, p. 193) or the use of translanguaging as a planned, systematic activity, can be beneficial to foreign language learning, if it is aimed at raising students' awareness of the similarities and differences between the language currently being studied and languages previously learned. Indeed, language awareness can facilitate learning, for example, noticing the similarities between English, German, and Swedish facilitates learning Swedish a great deal (Hufeisen & Marx, 2004; Włosowicz, 2018). In the area of vocabulary, the use of cognates for developing learners' cross-linguistic language awareness was studied by Müller-Lancé (2003) and Otwinowska-Kasztelanic (2011), among others. Indeed, similarities between words facilitate reading comprehension (including

intercomprehension—the comprehension of related languages, even ones the learner has not studied; Müller-Lancé, 2003) and vocabulary learning. However, in the present study, the awareness of similarities and differences is not limited to vocabulary, but includes grammar structures and language chunks used in particular situations (e.g., ¿Qué le pongo?) as well.

In general, multilinguals have been shown to possess a higher level of language awareness than monolinguals learning a second language. In her research, Jessner showed that competence in two or more languages could result in increased metalinguistic awareness, which constitutes "a key component in the cognitive aspects involved in language learning" (1999, p. 203). In particular, it "plays a central and facilitating role in the acquisition of additional languages" (Jessner, 1999, p. 207). Indeed, as shown by Klein, bilinguals learning their L3 outperformed monolinguals learning their L2 in learning lexical items, in setting parameters for marked structures—such as preposition stranding (e.g., What are you talking *about*?), and "mapping lexical items onto constructions resulting from the new settings" (1995, p. 451). Klein hypothesizes that this may be due either to multilinguals' higher level of metalinguistic awareness and better analytical skills or to their less conservative approach to grammar and openness to different structures, but she remarks that "some previous studies show a correlation between [multilinguals'] greater metalinguistic abilities and improved syntactic skill" (1995, p. 453).

Indeed, the more language learning experience, the higher the level of language awareness seems to be. As Hufeisen's (2018) Factor Model 2.1 shows, the learning of consecutive languages involves an increasing number of factors. While the factors involved in L1 acquisition are either neurophysiological or learner-external (input, the learning environment, etc.), L2 acquisition also involves affective and cognitive factors (language awareness, learning strategies, etc.) and factors specific to the L1; even the learner-external factors are more numerous, as they include the teacher's role, educational aims, learning traditions, etc. In L3 acquisition, a new group of factors appears, namely, foreign-language-specific factors: "individual foreign language learning experiences and strategies (the ability

to compare, transfer, and make interlingual connections), previous language interlanguages, and interlanguage of the target language(s)" (Hufeisen, 2018, p. 186). On the other hand, L4 acquisition is less qualitatively different: although there are more languages (or rather interlanguages) in the system, and thus more language-specific factors (specific to L2, L3, etc.), no additional type of factors comes into play (Hufeisen, 2018, pp. 184–186).

However, as shown by De Angelis (2005), multilinguals' experience with several languages may not necessarily result in the accurate perception of similarities and differences between the languages. Instead, it may lead to the perception of foreign languages as closer to each other than to the native language, regardless of the actual typological distance. The phenomenon of system shift, or the transfer of lexical items from one language to another, often without recognizing the source of transfer (De Angelis, 2005, pp. 10–11), is predominantly due to two factors: "perception of correctness" and "association of foreignness" (De Angelis, 2005, pp. 11–12). In her words, "*perception of correctness* refers to multilinguals' resistance to incorporating L1 linguistic knowledge into interlanguage production when other information is available for them to use" (De Angelis, 2005, p. 11, her emphasis). This is due to the perception of the native language as too distant from the target language, so the transfer of L1 words is regarded as incorrect by definition. On the other hand, attributing the status of "foreign languages" to L2, L3, etc. "results in a cognitive association between foreign languages that is not established between the native language and a foreign language" (De Angelis, 2005, p. 12). As a result, learners block L1 transfer and prefer to transfer words from one foreign language to another. It might thus be assumed that, in multilingual learners, translanguaging might actually work quite well, and that association of foreignness might prompt them to transfer words and, possibly, structures, from one language to another, in different directions, provided some similarity was perceived. However, as will be shown below, this occurs to some extent, but is not so straightforward.

Last but not least, in the context of multilingual language awareness, teachers' awareness needs to be mentioned as well. According to García

(2008, p. 393), given the increasingly multilingual student populations, multilingual awareness should be a part of all teachers' education. Indeed, teachers themselves recognize foreign languages as a vital component of education, both for the purposes of international communication and for making learners more open-minded, giving them access to different sources of knowledge, etc. Still, as they admit, learners should be motivated, but not forced, to become multilingual (Włosowicz, 2019, p. 227). Moreover, as shown by Otwinowska, even though teachers view multilingualism as an asset and believe cross-linguistic comparisons to be helpful in learning, they often "lack preparation or confidence to apply their own awareness in practice" (Otwinowska, 2014, p. 115). Moreover, in their opinion, "referring to L3–Ln languages, whose level is worse than the language they teach, seemed unprofessional, or even harmful" (Otwinowska, 2014, p. 115). In fact, as Otwinowska observes, they are not prepared to do so during their teacher training, which is why they prefer to keep the languages separate and to avoid revealing their knowledge of languages other than English (2014, p. 115). Therefore, as teachers are taught to stick to the traditional approach and to keep their languages separate, translanguaging seems quite unlikely, at least on the teachers' part.

However, it is possible that multilingual students use their own strategies, based not only on the instruction they have received, but also on their own language awareness and cross-linguistic analysis, and that they use translanguaging as long as their production in a single language is not evaluated. Alternatively, they may be used to traditional methods and be reluctant to use translanguaging, both in their individual work and even in classroom discussions aimed at developing their multilingual awareness.

The Studies

As mentioned in the introduction, the article is based on two of the author's studies, which investigated multilingual students' use of translanguaging in different contexts and language combinations. One study,

on translanguaging as the mobilization of the whole linguistic repertoire in Spanish as a third or additional language, concerned the students' use of translanguaging when prompted to do so, to compensate for the lack of lexical items, and to consult their multilingual competence when simple Polish–Spanish connections were not enough. By contrast, in the other study, the use of some amount of translanguaging, for the purpose of raising students' awareness of similarities and differences between French and other languages, was introduced by the teacher during the French language course. As the studies will be presented in detail elsewhere, the present paper focuses on their most important implications for the use of translanguaging in foreign language teaching in higher education, as well as on its limitations.

The research questions are therefore as follows: Firstly, to what extent and for what purposes do multilingual students use translanguaging and what does it reveal about their multilingual awareness? Secondly, how do they perceive the use of translanguaging by the teacher and awareness-raising activities? Third, what are thus the possible applications of translanguaging in language teaching in a university context and, simultaneously, what are the limitations of its use?

Study 1: Translanguaging in Spanish as a Third or Additional Language

Participants: The study was conducted on 26 participants learning Spanish as a third or additional language (L4, L5, etc.). They all had basic competence (A1/A2) in Spanish, or intermediate at the most (B1). Seven of them were English Philology students from the Mysłowice branch of Ignatianum University in Krakow or the Krakow branch of the University of Social Sciences in Łódź, with Polish (six participants) and Russian (one participant) as their native languages. They took a Spanish-language course with the author, who, whenever possible, drew their attention to similarities between Spanish and English (e.g., the Present Perfect and Pretérito Perfecto), Spanish and Polish (e.g., the use of the present

indicative for both continuous and habitual activities), or even Spanish and Russian (for instance, single verbs rather than phrases, e.g., *desayunar* and *завтракать* [to have breakfast]). Apart from Polish (and, in one case, Russian), English, and some Spanish, they had also studied French or German at some point.

The other group consisted of 19 Romance Philology students from the University of Silesia and Jagiellonian University who were studying Spanish, French, Portuguese, Italian or—in the case of one person—Romanian. Even though their coursework focused on the Romance languages, their language repertoires were quite varied and—apart from having Polish as L1 (one person indicated two L1s, Polish and Italian) and knowing Romance languages in different combinations (e.g., Spanish and Portuguese, Spanish and French, etc.)—they had all studied English (otherwise, they would not have been able to do the tasks and the questionnaire); four had also studied German. Their language repertoires were thus quite varied, but, as Van Gelderen et al. (2003, p. 23) have pointed out, multilingual groups are very likely to be more heterogeneous than the research design assumes.

Method: The study consisted of two parts: three language tasks involving the use of at least two languages (Spanish and English), if not more (for example, Portuguese), and a questionnaire, which are presented in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2, respectively. The first task allowed the students to fill in the gaps in two dialogues with words from Spanish or another language (e.g., English, but also French, Portuguese, Italian, etc.). The aim was to make the students use translanguaging for communication purposes: for lack of a Spanish word, they could express the target meaning, using, for example, an English one. Some of the target words were provided in a box, but, in order to use them, the students had to know them. As the words were quite basic, such as the names of foods, they could be assumed they would have already been studied by Romance Philology students, given the place of Spanish in their curricula, while the English Philology students had in fact studied them.) As the assessment of translanguaging cannot be limited to correctness in only one

Multidisciplinary Journal of School Education
Vol. 09, 2020/1 No. 17

language, the responses were classified according to their communicative value rather than monolingual norms, e.g., a correctly used English word was also accepted as correct; nevertheless, grammatical correctness was not abandoned altogether and the English words were supposed to meet the syntactic constraints as well. Thus, even though the target language norms could be regarded as a point of reference (for example, because the students' progress had to be evaluated and documented), the study did not assume strict adherence to monolingual Spanish norms, but rather focused on the comprehensibility of the responses. While a correctly used Spanish, English, French, etc. word was classified as correct, a response that was still comprehensible in the context and could convey the intended information, even partly, was regarded as "partly correct." By contrast, an incomprehensible or contextually incompatible answer (e.g. *ochocientos gramos de calcetín*—eight hundred grams of sock, instead of some kind of food) was classified as "incorrect," while unfilled gaps (because of failure to retrieve a word, uncertainty, etc.) were labelled "avoidance." Since the students were learning Spanish as a foreign language and the existence of boundaries between the languages was obvious to them, code-switching as the use of two languages to express the intended meanings was also regarded as a form of translanguaging.

The second task involved translating English words and expressions into Spanish in sentence contexts, to force the students to consult both their Spanish and English mental lexicons. In other words, translanguaging in this case involved the use of the whole multilingual repertoire, although not by using words from another language, but through translation, which according to Cummins (2008) can also be treated as a form of translanguaging. Finally, the third task had the opposite focus: it involved the identification and correction of errors in Spanish, but the errors were based on negative transfer from English, Polish, or both; so, rather than using translanguaging to make meaning (cf. Lewis et al., 2012), the students were supposed to rely on their awareness of the differences between those languages. On the other hand, the questionnaire concerned their perception of difficulty in learning Spanish, the influence of their native languages on Spanish, and the tasks they had just completed.

Discussion of the results: In Task 1, translanguaging was generally used in the dialogues to a limited extent. In the English Philology group, twelve switches into English were observed (e.g., *¿Qué le want?* for *¿Qué le pongo?* ["How can I help you?/What would you like?"], as asked by a shop assistant), and only two switches in the Romance Philology group. Both the Romance Philology students' switches were correct: "*Es muy simple*" (for *Es muy sencillo/fácil* ["It is very simple/easy"] and "*Hay ticket machines en todas las estaciones*" ["There are ticket machines at all the stations"]; the Spanish words "*taquilla*" ("ticket office") and "*expendedor automático de billetes*" ["ticket machine"] were probably either unknown to the participants or temporarily unavailable. The English words were also grammatically correct in the sentence contexts, as they belonged to the target syntactic categories and were used in the right forms.

It might be surprising that no switches into other Romance languages (French, Portuguese, etc.) were observed, but it is possible that, in order to minimize the risk of interference and of system shift, the students kept their Romance languages deliberately apart. This may reflect their language awareness and conscious strategy use. Alternatively, it is possible that they followed the instructions, originally written for the English Philology students, despite being explicitly told to switch into other languages too, if necessary. Further still, both interpretations may be possible: keeping the Romance languages separate does not preclude relying on English for communication purposes. Last but not least, the French, Portuguese, etc. words might have been unknown or unavailable to them, but, as the words were quite basic, unavailable (possibly suppressed by control mechanisms; cf. Green, 1986) seems a more plausible explanation than unknown.

On the other hand, the English Philology group had more difficulty completing the dialogues, as evidenced by the amount of avoidance (unfilled gaps): 42.85% in the shop dialogue and 68.57% in the dialogue between the tourist and the receptionist, in contrast to 5.26% and 10% of avoidance, respectively, in the Romance Philology group. The switches into English were mostly (8) classified as correct, for example: "*un kilo de potatoes*" or "*¿Tiene change de cincuenta euros?*" ["Do you have change

Multidisciplinary Journal of School Education
Vol. 09, 2020/1 No. 17

for fifty euros?"]. The five incorrect ones mostly failed to meet the syntactic constraints (e.g., in "*¿Qué le pongo?*", the subject is the shop assistant—the expression can be literally translated as, "What do I give you?"—while in "*¿*Qué le want?*" and "*¿*Qué le need?*", the subject is the customer, so the students relied on the plausible meaning of "What do you want/need?" and not on the syntactic properties of the target verb). Similarly, in "**Es muy close*" ["It is very close"], the adjective "close" was not compatible with the verb "*ser*" ["to be"], which is used for permanent characteristics, not for locations. Locations require the verb "*estar*", so the correct version would have been, "*Está muy cerca*" (or, with code-switching, "*Está muy close*"). As intralingual errors (the use of incorrect Spanish words unrelated to translanguaging and consulting the other languages in the multilingual system) are not the focus of the present study, they will not be discussed here in detail, but it must be admitted that the number of incorrect (i.e., contextually inappropriate and non-communicative) answers in Spanish was also higher in the English Philology group (6.35% in the shop dialogue and 17.14% in the tourist–receptionist dialogue) than in the Romance Philology group (5.26% and 5.08%, respectively). A comparison of both groups' answers (correct in Spanish or English, contextually acceptable in Spanish or English, contextually unacceptable in Spanish or English, and avoidance) by means of a chi-squared test revealed statistically significant differences for the shop dialogue ($p < 0.001$; $df = 6$) and for the dialogue between the tourist and the receptionist ($p < 0.001$, $df = 5$; one column was removed because there were zero values in both rows). The effect sizes, measured by Cramér's V, were quite large: $V = 0.596$ for the shop dialogue and $V = 0.672$ for the other dialogue. This further confirms the significance of the difference between both groups. This finding suggests that not only were the English Philology students less advanced in Spanish, but, possibly, they also lacked the motivation to fill in the gaps with words which could have met the communicative goals, so they tended to leave the gaps empty.

In neither group were any switches into Polish observed—nor into German, as a previously studied language which most likely was no longer used and was undergoing attrition. The L1 Russian participant did

not switch into Russian either. However, this is likely due to the instructions, which encouraged switching into English, but also to the association of foreignness and the perception of correctness (De Angelis, 2005, see above). Given the distances between Polish and Russian between Polish and Spanish, strengthened by the perception of one's native language as being distinct from foreign languages by definition, the students realized that inserting a Polish or Russian word into a Spanish sentence would not be communicative. By contrast, switching into English—it being a global lingua franca— while talking to a native Spanish speaker, even in a real-life situation, was regarded as more likely to solve a communication problem. In fact, as Testa points out, Poles tend to switch to English as soon as they realize that their interlocutor is not Polish (2018, p. 70).

In the remaining two tasks, in which translanguaging took a more subtle form, mobilizing one's whole language repertoire, but not so explicitly and not necessarily for language production, the Romance Philology students also did significantly better, as shown by the chi-squared tests ($p < 0.001$; $d = 3$ for Tasks 2 and 3), which shows that they had higher levels of competence in Spanish and that they could manage their multilingual repertoires more effectively. However, the effect sizes were later checked by means of Cramér's V, and, while the effect for the translation task proved quite large ($V = 0.5983$), it was much smaller for the error correction task ($V = 0.3992$). Finally, in the questionnaire, they were asked about any cross-linguistic interaction (an umbrella term for transfer, interference, etc., introduced by Herdina and Jessner; 2002, p. 29) they had observed during the tasks, including, e.g., interference between L1 and Spanish, interference between English and Spanish, etc., and the responses were compared by a chi-squared test. The difference was not statistically significant ($df = 9$; $p = 0.241$), so the cross-linguistic interaction perceived by the participants did not depend on the language they studied and, as shown by Cramér's V (0.53), the effect size was fairly large.

In general, the results indicate that the students are used to the traditional approach, in which languages are kept separate, so the requirement to use translanguaging may have been an additional challenge, rather than a means to facilitate understanding and making meaning

Multidisciplinary Journal of School Education
Vol. 09, 2020/1 No. 17

(Lewis et al., 2012). Even though some of them resorted to code-switching into English, such responses were relatively rare and were not necessarily correct. This suggests that multilingual competence is not necessarily unitary, as Otheguy et al. (2019) postulate, but rather, boundaries between the languages exist and are psychologically real.

Study 2: Translanguaging in Teaching and Learning French as a Third or Additional Language

Participants: The overall study (i.e., continuous assessment and the questionnaire) was conducted on -a group of international students at WSB University in Dąbrowa Górnicza who were being taught French as a third or additional language by the author. As they were studying International Relations or Management in English, they were all advanced in English, but their language repertoires included other languages as well: Russian (most of the students from the former Soviet republics, such as Ukraine, Georgia, Azerbaijan, etc.), German, Italian, Spanish, Turkish, and—in the case of the student from Laos—Thai. With the exception of two students who had studied French before and were at an intermediate level, they were all beginners in French. Again, the group was quite heterogeneous, but so are the international groups at WSB University, and, following Van Gelderen et al. (2003, p. 23), it must be assumed to be the rule in multilingualism research.

However, to investigate the participants' multilingual awareness and their attitudes towards translanguaging, especially pedagogical translanguaging, a questionnaire was administered to them (see Appendix 3). It was filled out by 20 participants. The respondents' native languages were Spanish (5 participants), Azerbaijani (5), Polish (3), Ukrainian (2), Georgian (1), Turkmen (1), Kazakh (1), Albanian (1), and Lao (1).

Method: The study combined two methods: an assessment of the students' performance in French (tests conducted during the semester and informal observation) and a questionnaire aimed at revealing the

students' perception of similarities and differences between French and the languages already known to them (their native languages, but also English and, possibly, their L2s and/or L3s), the areas of difficulty in learning French as perceived by them, and their attitudes towards the French classes, in particular, to the teacher's use of pedagogical translanguaging to raise the students' awareness of similarities and differences between French and English as a language common to them all, French and Spanish (a related Romance language and the native language of some of them), and even French and Russian (e.g., the analogy between the formal and informal forms of address: *vous* – Вы, *tu* – ты). In fact, during the classes, some other similarities would also come to light between French and languages unknown to the teacher; for example, the similarity between French and Georgian numerals (in French "eighty" is called "*quatre-vingts*", literally "four times twenty," which, as a Georgian student remarked, is also the translation of the Georgian term for "eighty"). The questionnaire in presented in Appendix 3.

Discussion of the results: On the one hand, as the test results and classroom observation indicate, some aspects of French are difficult for all the learners, regardless of their native language. In particular, they all have problems with French pronunciation and, apart from language-specific sounds, such as the French /ʀ/, they tend to confuse /y/, as in the word *étudiant* [student] and /u/, as in "Louvre", especially because of the misleading grapheme-phoneme mapping, as /y/ is spelled "u". They also often pronounce the mute "e" at the end of words, which may change the meaning, for example, if "*j'aime*" /ʒɛm/ [I like/I love] is pronounced as "*j'aimais*" /ʒɛˈmɛ/ [I liked/I loved]. This shows that the transfer of grapheme-phoneme mappings from L1 and, possibly, from other previously learned languages, can inhibit the acquisition of the target language pronunciation. To help the students learn these distinctions, the teacher, apart from providing the correct pronunciation (both in her speech and in recordings), used awareness-raising activities, such as drawing the students' attention to the differences in meaning related to differences in pronunciation, or drawing the vocal tract on the board and marking the places of articulation.

Multidisciplinary Journal of School Education
Vol. 09, 2020/1 No. 17

However, as the native Spanish speakers' pronunciation problems indicate, the overall perception of similarity between languages and overall transfer, based on the perception of similarities between a number of language items (Ringbom, 2001, p. 1), does not necessarily result in facilitation. In fact, some of their errors, such as pronouncing "ch" /ʃ/ as /tʃ/, as it is in Spanish, suggest that perceiving French to be similar to Spanish, without sufficiently focusing on the differences, may make learning more difficult instead of facilitating it.

The students' performance on written tests also reveals some characteristic errors, for example, negative transfer at the level of prepositions. For example, French distinguishes between "*à*" ("in" in the context of a town or city, e.g., "*à Paris*" ["in Paris"]); "*en*" ("in" when talking about countries whose names are feminine nouns, e.g., "*en Russie*" ["in Russia"], or "by" when a means of transport is used in a general sense, e.g., "*en bus*" ["by bus"] or "*en avion*" ["by plane"]); and "*dans*" ("in" meaning within some space—"*dans la chamber*" ["in the room"], "*dans le sac*" ["in the bag"]—or "on" as in on a means of transport: "*dans l'avion*" ["on the plane"]). However, if the name of a country is masculine, "*au*" (a contraction of *à* + *le*) is used, e.g., "*au Danemark*" ["in Denmark"]. This distinction must be learned because transfer from one's native language is likely to be negative and, indeed, this is confirmed by the students' errors made on the test: "**dans Russie*", "**dans Hambourg*", "**dans Danemark*", or "**en Danemark*" (in the latter case, the error may have also been due to intralingual factors, such as overgeneralizing the use of "*en*" in French). In fact, the native Spanish speakers seem to have particular difficulty, as Spanish uses "*en*" in most contexts ("*en Rusia*", "*en Dinamarca*", "*en París*", "*en avión*", "*en la habitación*" ["in the room"], "*en la bolsa*" ["in the bag"], etc.), which indicates that overall transfer without learning the differences is likely to result in negative transfer, i.e., in errors. (More detailed information is presented in Włosowicz; in press-b.)

As for the results of the questionnaire, the respondents do not perceive many similarities between French and their native languages, with the exception of the Spanish speakers. By contrast, students from all language backgrounds perceived differences between French and their L1s.

However, when the responses were analyzed by a chi-squared test, there was no statistically significant difference between the speakers of the different languages for the perception of similarities ($p = 0.991$; $df = 56$) or for that of differences ($p = 0.969$; $df = 56$), so this perception does not depend on the students' native language. Indeed, the effect sizes were also small, $V = 0.388$ for similarities, and $V = 0.255$ for differences.

On the other hand, their attitudes towards the classes and pedagogical translanguaging in particular were more varied. On a 5-point Likert scale, they were asked to mark to what extent they agreed with each statement (1 – completely disagree, 5 – fully agree). In general, they liked the French classes and appreciated the fact that the classes involved different skills—from vocabulary and grammar, through listening comprehension, to cultural information—but their opinions varied considerably (mean = 3.71; SD =1.31). In fact, their attitudes towards raising awareness and pointing out the similarities and differences between French and other languages (i.e., pedagogical translanguaging by the teacher) varied even more (mean = 3.7; SD = 1.45), as did their attitudes towards the discussion of similarities and differences in class (mean = 3.53; SD = 1.35), as the standard deviations indicate.

Therefore, it seems that not everyone appreciates awareness-raising and what Carl James called "classroom-based contrastive analysis" (1996, p. 145). This may be due to some of the factors mentioned in Hufeisen's (2018) Factor Model 2.1, such as language learning experience and language learning traditions. Students who have previously been taught each language in isolation and have not been explicitly made aware of the similarities and differences may find such teaching strategies irrelevant or even confusing, as one of the participants wrote in the questionnaire. Similarly, the variety of activities and materials is not appreciated by everyone, as two participants wrote they would rather use one book. In fact, the teacher combined materials from different books because no single textbook contained all the necessary material, for example, certain topics could be dealt with superficially or not at all, or one exercise devoted to the practice of a grammar structure was not enough for the students to master it. Yet, regarding the questionnaires as feedback,

Multidisciplinary Journal of School Education
Vol. 09, 2020/1 No. 17

the teacher decided to compile an informal textbook, including all the topics and materials for the following semester, and to have it photocopied and bound for the whole group.

However, the opposite approach—that is, speaking only about French and not mentioning any similarities or differences between it and other languages—apparently would have been even less popular, as the mean was 2.35, and the students were slightly more unanimous about it (SD = 1.23). At the same time, they appreciated the teacher's personalized approach and her pointing out the sources of errors to the students (mean = 4.15; SD = 1.14), which is also to some extent related to classroom-based contrastive analysis, if an error can be traced back to negative transfer from L1, L2, etc. It therefore seems that translanguaging in a broad sense, involving the whole language repertoires for the purpose of raising awareness, can be useful in foreign language teaching and is largely perceived as such by students.

Conclusions

In general, both studies confirm, at least to some degree, the usefulness of translanguaging as the mobilization of whole multilingual repertoires at the university level. To answer the research questions, students use translanguaging to a very limited extent and they seem quite reluctant to do so, probably because it is a new experience for them, as opposed to the traditional approach, which calls for teaching each language in isolation. In Study 1, Task 1, where the participants were explicitly told to resort to translanguaging whenever they lacked a Spanish word, they did so in relatively few cases (13 in the English Philology group and 2 in the Romance Philology group). Thus, the purpose of using translanguaging in the form of code-switching was to communicate meanings for which they lacked words in Spanish. In Tasks 2 and 3, translanguaging was not so visible, but—as their answers indicate (Włosowicz, in press-a)—Polish as L1 and English as L2 were co-activated and used in the processing, which sometimes resulted in interference errors. On the other hand, in Study 2,

apart from errors due to negative transfer and/or interference (following Herdina and Jessner [2002, p. 29], these two terms are not regarded as identical, since transfer is more regular and predictable, while interference is dynamic and not reducible to any single language) observed in the students' tests and oral production, no translanguaging seems to have been initiated by the students. This confirms García and Li's observation that translanguaging actually requires practice (2014, pp. 71-72). Certainly, they may have participated in discussions aimed at multilingual awareness-raising, but those discussions were initiated by the teacher as part of pedagogical translanguaging (Cenoz, 2017).

As for multilingual awareness, it might be supposed that it focuses on differences rather than similarities. On the one hand, the students do perceive the boundaries between the languages and do not mix them indiscriminately, which calls into question Otheguy et al.'s (2019) notion of unitary competence and using words from a non-target language in the same way as target-language synonyms. In fact, since they are supposed to take tests based on monolingual norms in order to obtain certificates, etc., it is logical to become aware of differences so as to avoid negative transfer, especially if the languages are related closely enough to be conducive to system shift (De Angelis, 2005, see above), which was particularly visible in the Romance Philology students' production. According to Grosjean (2001), it may be assumed that, especially in such situations, multilinguals adopt a monolingual mode, just as they do while talking to monolinguals. However, there seems to be too little awareness of similarities, and too few connections between the languages, and, arguably, such awareness deserves to be developed, as it facilitates the learning of further languages.

Secondly, even though they benefit from awareness-raising activities and regard them as relatively useful, their opinions vary, and some students perceive pedagogical translanguaging as confusing. University students are adult learners and, unlike children, adults are accustomed to certain teaching methods and expect them to be used, even if such a method is already obsolete, like the grammar translation method (Włosowicz, 2016, p. 277). At the same time, adults feel more speaking anxiety

Multidisciplinary Journal of School Education
Vol. 09, 2020/1 No. 17

(Komorowska, 2002: 91) and are less likely to use their linguistic resources more freely, as children do (e.g., "***Będzie*** ['we are going to have'] orange juice"; Niżegorodcew, 1988, p. 53, in Niżegorodcew, 1998, p. 24, her emphasis). That is why they cannot be forced to use translanguaging; rather, pedagogical translanguaging should be adapted to the learning context, learners' needs (including those perceived by the teacher, for example, on the basis of their errors), and their experience. Of course, if they are not used to any awareness-raising activities, this does not mean awareness-raising should be abandoned; instead, the purpose of such activities should be explained to them.

Thirdly, the applications of translanguaging in a university context seem quite limited. They may serve to raise learners' awareness of similarities and differences between the language being studied and the languages already known to them, to establish connections between the languages and—as a communication strategy—to compensate for some gaps in their lexical knowledge. Similarly, if students are to acquire specific skills, such as translation or foreign language teaching, translanguaging is of limited use: strong cross-linguistic connections may facilitate translation and teachers may use pedagogical translanguaging in their work too, but it must be remembered that a translation based on all of a multilingual's language resources would be incomprehensible to a monolingual reader or even to a multilingual one with a different language repertoire. As for the possibilities of applying translanguaging to evaluation, again, university students are subject to formal tests which are later archived and which must meet certain requirements; thus, the use of translanguaging rather than observing monolingual norms might be questioned. Though translanguaging might theoretically be allowed during some foreign language exams at lower proficiency levels, it is questionable at higher levels, for example, at a Philology department, where the students will later use their skills in professional contexts.

In summary, translanguaging can be an innovative approach that is applicable to the teaching of third or additional languages, especially as a means of raising language awareness, but its use at the university level is limited, which is why it is better to talk about "elements of translanguaging."

On the one hand, adult students may be reluctant to use it themselves, perhaps because it is contrary to their learning experience or to the teaching tradition known to them. On the other hand, the use of translanguaging in evaluation raises a number of questions, for example, which language skills can be tested that way, at which proficiency levels, for which purposes, etc.; these questions would need to be answered if translanguaging were to be introduced on a larger scale. Moreover, context plays an important role. While in multilingual communities—in Singapore (Li, 2018) or South Africa (Paradowski, 2020), for example—it is spontaneous in a largely monolingual society (at least functionally monolingual, because foreign languages may be known but they are not used by many people; Włosowicz, in press-a), such as Polish society (Testa, 2018), it has to be encouraged and practiced if we expect learners to use it.

Multidisciplinary Journal of School Education
Vol. 09, 2020/1 No. 17

References

Allard, E. C., Apt, S., & Sacks, I. (2019). Language policy and practice in almost-bilingual classrooms. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *13*(2), 73–87. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2018.1563425

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cenoz, J. (2017). Translanguaging in school contexts: International perspectives. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, *16*(4), 193–198. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15348458.2017.1327816

Charalambous, P., Charalambous, C., & Zembylas, M. (2016). Troubling translanguaging. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *7*(3), 327–352. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2016-0014

Cieślicka, A. (2000). The effect of language proficiency and L2 vocabulary learning strategies on patterns of bilingual lexical processing. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, *36*, 27–53.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *57*, 402–423. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402

Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education. In J. Cummins & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education. Vol. 5: Bilingual education* (2nd ed., 65–75). Boston: Springer Science + Business Media LLC.

De Angelis, G. (2005). Multilingualism and non-native lexical transfer: An identification problem. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *2*(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501220508668374

De Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or additional language acquisition*. Clevedon–Buffalo–Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Duarte, J. (2018). Translanguaging in the context of mainstream multilingual education. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1–16. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327295100_Translanguaging_in_the_context_of_mainstream_multilingual_education

Franceschini, R., Zappatore, D., & Nitsch, C. (2003). Lexicon in the brain: What neurobiology has to say about languages. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen & U. Jessner (Eds.), *The Multilingual Lexicon* (153–166). Dordrecht–Boston–London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

García, O. (2008). Multilingual language awareness and teacher education. In J. Cenoz, N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education. Vol. 6: Knowledge about Language* (2nd ed., 385–400). Boston: Springer Science + Business Media LLC.

García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism, and translanguaging in the 21st century. In A. Mohanty, M. Panda, R. Phillipson & T. Skutnabb-Kangas (Eds.), *Multilingual education for social justice: Globalising the local* (128–145). New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.

García, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke, UK–New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gathercole, V. C. M., Thomas, E. M., Roberts, E., Hughes, C., & Hughes, E. (2013). Why assessment needs to take exposure into account: Vocabulary and grammatical abilities in bilingual children. In V. C. M. Gathercole (Ed.), *Issues in the Assessment of Bilinguals* (20–55). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Gorter, D., & Cenoz, J. (2017). Language education policy and multilingual assessment. *Language and Education*, *31*(3), 231–248. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2016.1261892

Green, D. W. (1986). Control, activation and resource. *Brain and Language*, *27*, 210–223.

Grosjean, F. (2001). The bilingual's language modes. In J. Nicol (Ed.), *One mind, two languages: Bilingual language processing* (1–25). Oxford: Blackwell.

Herdina, P., & Jessner, U. (2002). *A dynamic model of multilingualism: Perspectives of change in psycholinguistics.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Hill, K., & McNamara, T. (2012). Developing a comprehensive, empirically-based research framework for classroom-based assessment. *Language Testing*, *29*(3), 395–420. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532211428317

Hufeisen, B. (2018). Models of multilingual competence. In A. Bonnet & P. Siemund (Eds.), *Foreign language education in multilingual classrooms* (173–189). Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Hufeisen, B., & Marx, N. (2004). Einleitung. In B. Hufeisen & N. Marx (Eds.), *Beim Schwedischlernen sind Englisch und Deutsch ganz hilfsvoll. Untersuchungen zum multiplen Sprachenlernen* (7–13). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

James, C. (1996). A cross-linguistic approach to language awareness, *Language Awareness*, *5*(3/4), 138–148.

Multidisciplinary Journal of School Education
Vol. 09, 2020/1 No. 17

Jaspers, J. (2018). The transformative limits of translanguaging. *Language and Communication*, *58*(2018), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2017.12.001

Jessner, U. (1999). Metalinguistic awareness in multilinguals: Cognitive aspects of third language learning. *Language Awareness*, *8*(3/4), 201–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658419908667129

Klein, E. C. (1995). Second versus third language acquisition: Is there a difference? *Language Learning*, *45*(3), 419–465.

Komorowska, H. (2002). *Metodyka nauczania języków obcych*. Warsaw: Fraszka edukacyjna.

Kucharczyk, R. (2018). *Nauczanie języków obcych a dydaktyka wielojęzyczności (na przykładzie francuskiego jako drugiego języka obcego)*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Werset.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualization and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *18*(7), 655–670. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718490

Li, W. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, *39*(1), 9–30. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039

MacSwan, J. (2017). A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal*, *54*(1), 167–201. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216683935

Müller-Lancé, J. (2003). A strategy model of multilingual learning. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.) *The Multilingual Lexicon* (117–132). Dordrecht–Boston–London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Niżegorodcew, A. (1988). Akwizycja języka angielskiego jako obcego u polskiego dziecka. In J. Arabski (Ed.), *Metody glottodydaktyki* (47–56). Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Niżegorodcew, A. (1998). Uses of L1 in L2 acquisition/learning. In J. Arabski (Ed.), *Studies in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching* (21–33). Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2019). A translanguaging view of the linguistic system of bilinguals. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *10*(4), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2018-0020

Otwinowska, A. (2014). Does multilingualism influence plurilingual awareness of Polish teachers of English? *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *11*(1), 97–119. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2013.820730

Otwinowska, A. (2016). *Cognate vocabulary in language acquisition and use: Attitudes, awareness, activation*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Otwinowska-Kasztelanic, A. (2011). Awareness of cognate vocabulary and vocabulary learning strategies of Polish multilingual and bilingual advanced learners of English. In J. Arabski & A. Wojtaszek (Eds.), *Individual learner differences in SLA* (110–126). Bristol–Buffalo–Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Paradowski, M. (2020). Transitions, translanguaging, and trans-semiotising in heteroglossic school environments: Lessons (not only) from South African classrooms. In C. van der Walt & V. F. Pfeiffer (Eds.), *Multilingual classroom contexts: Perspectives from the chalk face*. Stellenbosch: African Sun Media.

Pavlenko, A. (2009). Conceptual representation in the bilingual lexicon and second language vocabulary learning. In A. Pavlenko (Ed.), *The bilingual mental lexicon: Interdisciplinary approaches* (125–160). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Ringbom, H. (2001, September 13–15). Levels of Transfer from L1 and L2 in L3-acquisition [Paper presented at the second International Conference on Third Language Acquisition and Trilingualism, Fryske Akademy] (CD-ROM).

Singleton, D. (2003). Perspectives on the multilingual lexicon: A critical synthesis. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *The multilingual lexicon* (167–176). Dordrecht–Boston–London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Testa, M. (2018). The Psycholinguistic Background of L1 Polish Students of L3 Spanish. *Crossroads – A Journal of English Studies*, *22*(3), 69–90. https://doi.org/10.15290/CR.2018.22.3.04

Toribio, A. J. (2001). On the emergence of bilingual code-switching competence. *Bilingualism: Language and cognition*, *4*(3), 203–231. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728901000414

Van Gelderen, A., Schoonen, R., de Glopper, K., Hulstijn, J., Snellings, P., Simis, A., & Stevenson, M. (2003). Roles of linguistic knowledge, metacognitive knowledge, and processing speed in L3, L2, and L1 reading comprehension: A structural equation modeling approach. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *7*(1), 7–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069030070010201

Williams, C. (1994). *Arfaniad o dduliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog* [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education] [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Wales, Bangor, UK.

Williams, C. (1996). Secondary education: Teaching in the bilingual situation. In C. Williams, G. Lewis, & C. Baker (Eds.), *The language policy: Taking stock* (39–78). Llangefni, UK: CAI.

Williams, S., & Hammarberg, B. (1998). Language switches in L3 production: Implications for a polyglot speaking model. *Applied Linguistics*, *19*(3), 295–333. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.3.295

Włosowicz, T. M. (2016). Adult learners' expectations concerning foreign language teachers and the teaching/learning process. In D. Gabryś-Barker & D. Gałajda (Eds.), *Positive psychology perspectives on foreign language learning and teaching* (267–285). Springer International Publishing Switzerland.

Włosowicz, T. M. (2018). Interlinguale Interaktionen in der schriftlichen Produktion vom Schwedischen als L4, in der Übersetzung aus dem Polnischen (L1), dem Deutschen (L2) und dem Englischen (L3) ins Schwedische (L4), und in der Wahl der korrekten Übersetzungen aus dem Deutschen und dem Englischen. [Cross-linguistic interaction in the written production of Swedish as L4, in translation from Polish (L1), German (L2), and English (L3) into Swedish (L4), and in the choice of the correct translations from German and English]. In E. Żebrowska, M. Olpińska-Szkiełko, & M. Latkowska (Eds.), *Blick(e) über die Grenze. Transkulturelle und transdisziplinäre Ansätze in der germanistischen Forschung und Lehre. Wissenschaftliche Beiträge des Verbandes Polnischer Germanisten.* [Glance(s) over the border: Transcultural and transdisciplinary approaches in Germanic language research and teaching – Academic papers of the Polish German Philologists' Association.] Warsaw: Stowarzyszenie Germanistów Polskich. Retrieved from http://www.sgp.edu.pl/media/Beitraege%20zur%20Germanistik-2018.pdf

Włosowicz, T. M. (2019). Multilingual competence as an important component of contemporary teacher education. In O. Mentz & H.-P. Burth (Eds.), *Border studies: Concepts, positions and perspectives in Europe* (208–234). Berlin–Münster–Wien–Zürich–London: LIT Verlag.

Włosowicz, T. M. (in press-a). Translanguaging as the mobilisation of linguistic resources by learners of Spanish as a third or additional language. To appear in *Theory and Practice of Second Language Acquisition*.

Włosowicz, T. M. (in press-b). Teaching and learning French as a third or additional language: Selected aspects of language awareness and assessment. To appear in *Neofilolog*.

Włosowicz, T. M., & Kopeć, A. (2018, May 17–19). The place of the Russian language in the language repertoires and its influence on the identities of students from Ukraine [Paper presented at the 30th International Conference on Foreign/Second Language Acquisition, Szczyrk, Poland].

Yu, W. (2000). Direct method. In M. Byram (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning* (176–178). New York: Routledge.