

MULTILINGUAL MINDS

Linguistic Repertoires, Translanguaging, and Cross-Linguistic
Interaction in Foreign Language Writing



AYLİN YARDIMCI - ARİF SARIÇOBAN



MULTILINGUAL MINDS
LINGUISTIC REPERTOIRES,
TRANSLANGUAGING, AND CROSS-LINGUISTIC
INTERACTION IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE
WRITING

Aylin YARDIMCI
Arif SARIÇOBAN





MULTILINGUAL MINDS

LINGUISTIC REPERTOIRES,
TRANSLANGUAGING, AND CROSS-LINGUISTIC
INTERACTION IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE
WRITING

T.C. KÜLTÜR ve TURİZM
BAKANLIĞI SERTİFİKA
NU/Certificate Number:
82658

Aylin YARDIMCI

Arif SARIÇOBAN

eISBN: 978-625-5036-17-9

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23626144

Kapak-Dizgi/Cover-
Design:

Umay Yayinevi



Web Sitesi/ Web Page:
<https://umayyayinevi.com>

E-posta/Contact:
umayyayinevi@gmail.com
iletisim@umayyayinevi.com

Adres/Address:
55270, Atakum/Samsun/
Türkiye

Kütüphane Kartı/Catalog in Publication

1. baskı, Umay Yayinevi, iv+105 sf., dizin yok, kaynakça var,
ek görseller yok, Samsun, 2026; 1st Edition, Umay
Publishing House, iv+105 pages, no index, bibliography
included, no images, Samsun, 2026

Anahtar Kelimeler/Key Words

1. Multilingualism, 2. Translanguaging, 3. Foreign
Language Writing, 4. Cross-Linguistic Interaction

THEMA ve BISAC Kodları/THEMA & BISAC Codes

Thema Main and Second: 1. CF – Language, 2. CFF –
Sociolinguistics

BISAC Main and Second: 1. LAN004000 – LANGUAGE ARTS &
DISCIPLINES / Linguistics / General, 2. LAN009000 –
LANGUAGE ARTS & DISCIPLINES / Study & Teaching

Kitabın bütün yayın hakları Umay Yayinevi'ne aittir. Yayinevinden yazılı izin alınmadan, kaynağın açıkça belirtildiği akademik çalışmalar ve tanıtım faaliyetleri haricinde, kısmen veya tamamen alıntı yapılamaz; hiçbir matbu ve dijital ortamda kopya edilemez, çoğaltılamaz ve yayımlanamaz. Kitabın bütünü benzerlik ve yapay zekâ tespit yazılımıyla taranmıştır. Çalışmanın bütün hukukî sorumluluğu yazara aittir. All publication rights to this book belong to Umay Publishing House. Without written permission from the publisher, except for academic studies and promotional activities where the source is clearly indicated, the book may not be quoted in part or in whole; it may not be copied, reproduced, or published in any printed or digital medium. The entire book has been scanned using similarity and ai detection software. The author bears full legal responsibility for this work.

Atıf/Cite: Yardımcı, A., & Sarıçoban, A. (2026). *Multilingual minds linguistic repertoires, translanguaging, and cross-linguistic interaction in foreign language writing*. Umay Yayinevi.

PREFACE

Language is more than a means of communication; it is a dynamic resource through which individuals construct meaning, express identities, and engage with the world. For multilingual writers, foreign language writing involves not only developing proficiency in a target language but also drawing upon existing linguistic knowledge and experiences.

Multilingual Minds: Linguistic Repertoires, Translanguaging, and Cross-Linguistic Interaction in Foreign Language Writing explores how multilingual individuals mobilize their linguistic repertoires, engage in translanguaging practices, and navigate cross-linguistic interactions throughout the writing process. By moving beyond monolingual perspectives, this book highlights the interconnected nature of languages and the valuable role multilingual resources play in written communication.

The book aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of multilingual writing by examining its cognitive, linguistic, and pedagogical dimensions. It also encourages researchers and language educators to reconsider how learners' linguistic backgrounds can be recognized and integrated into foreign language writing instruction.

Ultimately, this book seeks to promote a more inclusive understanding of multilingualism and to emphasize the potential of linguistic diversity as a resource for learning, meaning-making, and writing development. It is hoped that the perspectives presented here will inspire further research and inform educational practices that embrace the complexity and richness of multilingual minds.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	•i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	•iii
CHAPTER 1	•1
Introduction	•1
1.1 Multilingualism in Contemporary Societies	•1
1.2 Türkiye’s Multilingual Landscape	•6
1.3 Purpose and Significance of the Study	•12
CHAPTER 2	•17
Theoretical Perspectives on Multilingualism	•17
2.1 Conceptualizing Multilingualism	•17
2.2 Bilingualism and Multilingual Language Acquisition	•21
2.3 Multicompetence and the Multilingual Mind	•23
2.4 Theoretical Frameworks of Multilingualism	•24
2.5 Linguistic Repertoires and Language Activation	•26
2.6. Cross-Linguistic Influence and Language Transfer	•29
2.7 Code-Switching and Translanguaging	•31
2.8. Language Dominance and Linguistic Identity	•33
CHAPTER 3	•34
Multilingualism and Foreign Language Writing	•34
3.1 Writing as a Cognitive and Linguistic Process	•34
3.2 Multilingual Writing Processes	•37
3.3 Previous Research on Translanguaging in Foreign Language Writing	•40

CHAPTER 4	•43
Research Methodology and Findings	•43
4.1 Research Design and Context	•43
4.2 Participants and Linguistic Backgrounds	•44
4.3 Data Collection Instruments	•46
4.4 Data Collection and Analysis Procedures	•47
4.5 Self-Reported Language Use During Writing	•49
4.6 Language Use in Social Networks	•54
4.7 Language Use in Inner Thought	•59
4.8 Actual Language Activation in Think-Aloud Protocols	•63
4.9 Actual Language Use in Protocols	•66
CHAPTER 5	•75
Discussion, Implications, and Conclusion	•75
5.1 Interpretation of Major Findings	•75
5.2 Pedagogical Implications for Foreign Language Education	•80
5.3 Contributions to Multilingualism and Applied Linguistics	•82
5.4 Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research	•95
References	•98

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1.1 Multilingualism in Contemporary Societies

Multilingualism, encompassing the coexistence and use of different languages at both individual and societal levels, is a phenomenon gaining increasing importance in linguistic research. In its most expansive interpretation, multilingualism refers to the capacity of an individual or community to utilize many languages, encompassing not just bilingualism but also trilingualism and the learning of other languages. Nonetheless, multilingualism encompasses a lot greater complexity than merely the quantity of languages spoken. The linguistic abilities of individuals, their ways of language acquisition, their language choices in different social contexts, and the connections they form between languages are also significant elements of this phenomenon. Globalization, international migration patterns, trade connections, enhanced travel prospects, and extensive intercultural exchanges have led to the prominence of multilingualism in modern society. The presence of individuals from different linguistic and cultural origins has resulted in the utilization of languages outside their communities and in different social contexts. Consequently, multilingualism has emerged as a significant subject of inquiry analyzed from diverse perspectives within disciplines including sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, language acquisition, and applied linguistics (Aronin & Hufeisen, 2009). Specifically, the ways in which individuals acquire several languages, the circumstances in which they utilize these languages, and the impact of previously learned languages on the acquisition of

a new language are fundamental inquiries in the study of multilingualism.

In conventional perspectives on language, monolingualism has long been regarded as a primary criterion for language utilization. Particularly with the emergence of the nation-state, the prioritization of a singular language in formal and social discourse has occasionally diminished the significance of linguistic diversity. Nevertheless, upon analyzing the linguistic frameworks of communities, it becomes apparent that individuals engage with diverse languages in their everyday interactions and utilize them for a range of communicative purposes. The formal endorsement of a singular language within a community does not inherently indicate that the community is monolingual. Alongside the official language, minority languages, immigrant languages, regional dialects, and other different linguistic forms constitute significant components of the sociolinguistic framework. Consequently, assessing multilingualism necessitates examining both official language policy and the actual language usage trends within the community. A primary concern in multilingualism studies is assessing the linguistic proficiency of multilingual individuals. Traditional approaches regard each language utilized by multilingual individuals as a separate entity. However, this approach may not fully clarify the language traits and communicative dynamics of multilingual individuals. Grosjean (1985) asserts that bilingual individuals should not be viewed as mere combinations of two distinct monolingual entities. In a similar vein, the notion of multicompetence, proposed by Cook (1992), emphasizes that the linguistic proficiency of individuals adept in several languages constitutes a distinctive

entirety. From this viewpoint, the linguistic proficiency of multilingual individuals can be assessed not merely by analyzing the individual languages they possess, but also by exploring the interplay among different languages.

The proficiency level and function of languages utilized by multilingual individuals can exhibit differences. Individuals might employ one language inside their familial setting, a different one in their academic pursuits, and other languages among their social relationships. An individual could possess advanced verbal communication abilities in a certain language while exhibiting more restricted written proficiency in that same language. Consequently, multilingualism does not necessitate that an individual possesses equivalent competence in every language he is familiar with. The regularity of language utilization, the contexts in which they are learned, their societal roles, and personal encounters with these languages can all significantly influence the advancement of linguistic proficiency. This indicates that multilingualism is not a fixed trait but rather a dynamic phenomenon that can evolve based on personal and societal factors. Theoretical approaches for explaining the dynamic nature of multilingualism reveal that the languages individuals possess are not entirely independent of each other. The Dynamic Model of Multilingualism, established by Herdina and Jessner (2002), views the language frameworks of multilingual individuals as intricate entities that evolve and interrelate over time. This methodology posits that the evolution of an individual's languages is influenced not alone by the language acquisition process but also by language utilization and personal experiences. Consequently, previously acquired languages may influence the learning of a new lan-

guage in several ways. Particularly in third language acquisition research, the manifestation of linguistic information and learning experiences derived from an individual's first and second languages in the process of acquiring a new language is a significant field of research. At this point, the notion of linguistic repertoire gains significance for multilingual individuals. Linguistic repertoire denotes the complete range of linguistic assets that an individual can employ during communication. Multilingual individuals may utilize these resources variably according on their communicative requirements and contexts. Specifically, when addressing lexical or structural challenges faced in one language, previously acquired knowledge from other languages can be advantageous. This indicates that interlingual interaction should not be only linked to linguistic transfer or error production but can also be viewed as a valuable asset that facilitates communication and language acquisition.

Another significant notion in the field of multilingualism research is the linguistic process known as translanguaging. This notion emphasizes the adaptable use of linguistic resources by multilingual individuals in the processes of meaning-making and communication. Traditional approaches prioritize the segregation of distinct languages, whereas the translanguaging framework views the interplay between linguistic resources as an inherent communicative behavior among multilingual speakers. Canagarajah (2011) illustrates that multilingual individuals can employ several linguistic resources during academic writing, whereas García (2011) stresses the necessity of reassessing the conventional perception of bilingualism as reliant on separate language systems. In this framework, translanguaging provides

a significant theoretical basis for comprehending how multilingual individuals utilize their language resources.

The increasing importance of multilingualism has necessitated a reassessment of the approaches adopted in foreign language teaching. Traditional approaches in foreign language instruction have emphasized the target language while restricting the utilization of students' pre-existing languages. The language acquisition processes of multilingual individuals reveal that previously learned languages can serve many functions in acquiring a new language. Cook (2001) emphasizes that the utilization of students' native languages can serve particular educational purposes in language instruction. In this perspective, the linguistic knowledge and experiences of multilingual students should be regarded not as insignificant but as valuable assets that enhance the learning process. The influence of previously learned languages might be especially apparent in the writing processes of a foreign language. Writing is not merely the application of grammatical rules; it involves various cognitive processes such as the formation and organization of thoughts, the selection of appropriate words, and the review of the text. Multilingual individuals may employ their additional languages at different phases of these procedures while composing a text in the target language. The degree of usage for each language differs based on the individual's linguistic history, language skills, everyday language choices, and the nature of the writing assignment. Consequently, examining the writing processes of multilingual individuals can greatly enhance comprehension of interlingual interaction and the application of linguistic resources.

Comprehending the linguistic practices of multilingual individuals necessitates more than merely identifying the languages they are proficient in. Discrepancies may exist between the languages individuals claim to utilize in their everyday life and those they actually employ throughout specific tasks. Individuals may assert that they predominantly employ one language for cognitive activities, although they might also engage different languages when composing in a non-native tongue. Consequently, in the study of multilingualism, analyzing individuals' self-evaluations of their language usage in conjunction with their actual linguistic behaviors might yield more thorough understanding of the function of linguistic repertoires. In conclusion, multilingualism in contemporary societies is a multidimensional phenomenon encompassing not only the coexistence of different languages but also how individuals use these languages in social, cultural, and cognitive processes. The connections that multilingual individuals form among the languages they utilize profoundly impact language acquisition and the learning of foreign languages. The engagement of linguistic repertoires, interlingual communication, and translanguaging activities are factors that must be acknowledged in comprehending the language production mechanisms of multilingual individuals. In this perspective, Türkiye, characterized by the coexistence of diverse linguistic and cultural communities, provides an important context for exploring the personal and societal aspects of multilingualism.

1.2 Türkiye's Multilingual Landscape

Türkiye is one of the countries where different linguistic and cultural communities have coexisted throughout his-

tory and where linguistic diversity is clearly observed due to its geographical location and social structure. Its function as a conduit between Asia and Europe, its accommodation of several civilizations, and its interaction with numerous migration flows have substantially influenced the nation's linguistic framework. Consequently, due to these historical and social circumstances, numerous languages from various linguistic groups, alongside Turkish, have coexisted in Türkiye. Consequently, assessing Türkiye's linguistic environment exclusively through the official language fails to capture the linguistic variety and language usage practices of different communities within the country. Article 3 of the Constitution of the Republic of Türkiye establishes Turkish as the state's official language. The language utilized in state administration, formal education, legal matters, and numerous aspects of social life is Turkish. Nonetheless, the recognition of Turkish as the official language does not indicate that every individual in Türkiye speaks only Turkish or that it is their first acquired language. Different ethnic and cultural groups in the country employ their unique family and community languages in conjunction with Turkish. This circumstance exemplifies the importance of differentiating between the status of a language as official and its real utilization in society.

Türkiye's linguistic diversity includes various languages such as Kurdish, Arabic, Syriac, Laz, Circassian, Georgian, Armenian, and Greek. The prevalence of usage, spatial distribution, methods of intergenerational transmission, and societal application of various languages vary. Certain areas utilize certain languages more intensively, while others persist within populations dispersed through-

out different cities. Moreover, the social prominence of a language is connected not alone to its speaker population but also to its utilization in familial discourse, educational settings, social interactions, and cultural endeavors. Consequently, when analyzing Türkiye's linguistic diversity, it is essential to ascertain not only the presence of languages but also to assess the societal contexts in which they are utilized and the roles they fulfill. The coexistence of different languages in Türkiye facilitates the development of linguistic settings where individuals encounter multiple languages from an early age. Particularly in areas where a language other than Turkish is utilized within the household, children can simultaneously learn both their familial language and Turkish. Nevertheless, this procedure does not transpire uniformly for every individual. Certain youngsters assimilate both languages within the familial setting, whereas others obtain the family language at home and learn Turkish through educational institutions and the broader social context. The duration of language exposure, the regularity of their application, and the variations in communicative contexts can influence the competency individuals gain in the languages they utilize. Family and the close environment play a significant role in the use and intergenerational transmission of different community languages in Türkiye. Interaction among parents, grandparents, and other relatives significantly assists individuals in preserving their familial languages. Nevertheless, the utilization of community languages extends beyond the familial setting. Familial relationships, local associations, cultural gatherings, and intra-community engagements are other domains where these languages are utilized in everyday life. The scope of these usage regions may differ based on the environmental and so-

cial circumstances of the populations. The widespread use of Turkish in education, work life, and public communication, in particular, can lead individuals to prefer different languages in various settings.

A striking illustration of linguistic diversity in Türkiye is Mardin, a region where several languages and cultures have traditionally coexisted. Mardin has a multilingual atmosphere in which Turkish, Arabic, Kurdish, and Syriac coexist in daily interactions. Residents of the area might utilize one or many of these languages based on their family's linguistic heritage and the communicative contexts they inhabit. Daily engagement among diverse linguistic communities enables individuals to experience not just their languages but also other languages prevalent in their surroundings. In this context, Mardin serves as a significant research setting for the exploration of multilingualism, considering both personal language competencies and their interplay with social connections and cultural ties. In the linguistic structure of Mardin, Arabic, Kurdish, and Syriac serve as languages linked to the cultural narratives and identities of different populations. The employment of different languages in familial and social contexts can affect the development of individuals' linguistic experiences. For instance, a person brought up in a household where either Arabic, Kurdish, or Syriac is utilized may additionally employ Turkish in different facets of their everyday existence. In such instances, the domains and purposes of the languages an individual commands may vary. The familial language may be primarily linked to intimate connections and cultural affiliations, whereas Turkish may emerge as the dominant medium in educational and communicative interactions

with those from diverse linguistic heritages. Nonetheless, these usage trends should not be deemed applicable to every individual; they must be assessed in the context of personal experiences and societal circumstances.

The educational framework also significantly influences the language environment in Türkiye. The requirement for Turkish to be the principal language of teaching in formal education compels students from various linguistic backgrounds to use Turkish for both academic and social interactions. This circumstance can profoundly influence the educational experiences of individuals, especially those whose familial context includes the usage of a language other than Turkish. Alongside the linguistic assets obtained from their families, students enhance their proficiency in Turkish throughout their educational journey and are introduced to new languages through foreign language classes. Consequently, the language acquisition processes of students from different linguistic backgrounds extend beyond merely mastering the target language; they also involve the interplay between previously acquired languages and the newly learned ones. In this context, learning English as a foreign language enhances the linguistic experiences of multilingual individuals in Türkiye. Learners who have mastered languages like Arabic, Kurdish, or Syriac alongside Turkish from an early age already have access to multiple linguistic resources when they begin learning English. The procedures by which they learn English cannot be elucidated merely by examining the connection between Turkish and English. The additional languages people utilize may also influence word choice, meaning formulation, cognitive structuring, and the resolution of linguistic chal-

enges. Consequently, when assessing individuals acquiring foreign languages in Türkiye, it is essential to examine their linguistic backgrounds and the different languages they communicate in.

Investigations carried out in Türkiye reveal diverse insights into the linguistic practices of distinct language communities and their interrelations. Sofu (2009) highlighted the influence of education, job prospects, social mobility, and familial connections on language retention and transformation by analyzing the linguistic practices of Turkish and Arabic-speaking households across three generations. Çabuk (2020) investigated the interplay between Kurmanji Kurdish and Turkish using familial telephone dialogs, demonstrating that certain language features adopted from Turkish can be utilized in Kurdish discourse. These investigations suggest that the linguistic practices of multilingual populations in Türkiye should be assessed in connection to social interactions and everyday discourse. Correspondingly, certain research undertaken in Türkiye indicates that previously acquired linguistic proficiency can facilitate the acquisition of different languages. Sert (2007) investigated instances of interlingual transfer in the German acquisition experiences of individuals who are native Turkish speakers and fluent in English. Efeoğlu et al. (2020) concluded that speakers of Pomak, Greek, and Turkish can leverage their diverse linguistic backgrounds during the English writing process. These investigations highlight the significance of analyzing the foreign language learning experiences of multilingual individuals in Türkiye, taking into account the interplay of different linguistic resources.

The linguistic structure of Türkiye enables multilingualism to be perceived not merely as a societal trait but also as a phenomenon associated with individual cognitive and educational experiences. The connections that individuals with diverse familial languages establish with Turkish and other languages might affect the development and utilization of their linguistic repertoire. Nonetheless, the languages that individuals are proficient in, the frequency of their usage, and the specific languages employed for particular jobs are distinct considerations. To have a more thorough understanding of multilingualism in Türkiye, it is essential to analyze not only individuals' linguistic backgrounds but also their language use in different communicative and educational contexts. In this regard, it can be asserted that Türkiye, particularly areas with notable linguistic diversity like Mardin, provides favorable settings for investigating the linguistic repertoires of multilingual individuals. Examining the English learning processes of individuals who grew up speaking languages like Turkish, Arabic, Kurdish, and Syriac can contribute to understanding how previously acquired languages relate to thinking and writing processes in a foreign language. Consequently, Türkiye's linguistic landscape extends beyond just offering a backdrop for the social distribution of many languages; it constitutes a significant setting for comprehending the language acquisition experiences of multilingual individuals.

1.3 Purpose and Significance of the Study

The way in which multilingual individuals employ their previously acquired languages during the learning of foreign languages is a central concern in the fields of language acquisition and applied linguistics research. In this

perspective, analyzing the correlation between individuals' self-evaluations of their language usage and their performance in certain linguistic tasks is essential for comprehending the functioning of linguistic repertoires. Although personal accounts of language use give insight into individuals' linguistic tendencies and inclinations, it is important to examine the degree to which these assertions correspond with actual language production mechanisms. This study assesses the linguistic resources employed by multilingual individuals while composing in a foreign language, utilizing both their self-reported experiences and the linguistic data produced during the writing process.

The primary objective of this study is to ascertain how multilingual individuals engage their linguistic resources during English writing and to reveal the similarities and differences between their self-reported language use and their actual language use. The research investigates the languages employed at different phases of the writing process, the integration of previously learned languages into cognitive development and text creation, and the impact of participants' linguistic backgrounds on these processes. Additionally, by an analysis of the linguistic characteristics exhibited by monolingual and bilingual individuals, the research aims to elucidate the connection between the variety of linguistic resources and the writing processes in a foreign language.

A notable feature of the research is that it does not assess participants' linguistic usage exclusively through their self-reported data. Survey data is integrated with think-aloud protocols and semi-structured interviews to juxtapose individuals' self-reported language preferences with the languages they employ in writing. Think-aloud protocols hold

significant value, as they facilitate the analysis of articulated thoughts during the composition of written material. Consequently, the enquiry encompasses not only finalized texts but also the linguistic processes involved in text generation. Nonetheless, given that think-aloud protocols do not accurately represent all cognitive processes, the gathered data are assessed within the context of the thought processes articulated by participants.

One of the study's unique contributions is its comparison of writing tasks performed in the same foreign language by individuals with diverse linguistic backgrounds. Analyzing individuals who initially acquired Turkish in conjunction with those concurrently studying Turkish-Arabic, Turkish-Kurdish, and Turkish-Syriac facilitates the recognition of personal and collective variations in linguistic repertoire utilization. This analysis emphasizes both the quantity of languages employed and the roles that various languages play in the writing process. Consequently, the study contributed to addressing the relationship between linguistic background and foreign language production without limiting it to a single language group.

The theoretical significance of this research stems from its examination of the manifestation of interlingual interaction in foreign language writing processes through concrete language use data. The engagement of previously learned languages during writing, the linguistic tools employed when facing lexical challenges, and the simultaneous usage of multiple languages are factors that must be acknowledged in comprehending multilingual language output. Consequently, the research facilitates the assessment of theoretical discussions concerning the use of linguistic

repertoires and translanguaging practices within a specific research framework. Simultaneously, analyzing the correlation between individuals' self-reported language usage and their actual behaviors provides a methodological enhancement to data-gathering strategies employed in multilingualism studies.

This research also holds considerable importance for foreign language instruction in Türkiye. Students with different linguistic origins in a shared foreign language learning setting require the incorporation of their previous linguistic knowledge and experiences into the instructional approach. The findings from this study are anticipated to enhance comprehension of how students address linguistic challenges faced in writing and the resources they utilize. This knowledge can serve as a foundation for discussions aimed at developing pedagogical practices that take into account students' existing linguistic backgrounds, particularly in teaching writing in a foreign language. However, the contribution of the research should be evaluated within the framework of the explanatory possibilities offered by the data obtained from a specific group of participants. The limited sample size of the study does not allow for the generalization of the findings to all multilingual individuals in Türkiye. However, the use of different data collection tools and the comparison of groups with different linguistic backgrounds enable a multifaceted examination of the foreign language writing experiences of the participants studied. In this respect, the research offers a comparative framework for conducting studies with larger samples. In conclusion, this study seeks to enhance the domains of multilingualism and foreign language writing by analyzing the linguistic re-

sources employed by multilingual individuals in their English writing processes, focusing on the correlation between self-reported experiences and data collected during the actual writing process. The importance of the study lies in comparing the writing processes of individuals with different linguistic backgrounds, as well as evaluating the use of linguistic repertoires within the framework of individual experiences and observable linguistic practices.

CHAPTER 2

Theoretical Perspectives on Multilingualism

2.1 Conceptualizing Multilingualism

Multilingualism is a notion that has seen the formulation of diverse approaches concerning its definition and extent, as it pertains to several fields of study. Tucker (1999) links multilingualism to the ability to communicate in multiple languages, whether at an individual or social scale. In this context, the term is employed as a broad description that includes bilingualism, trilingualism, and other languages learned later in life. Nonetheless, defining multilingualism exclusively by the quantity of languages spoken is restrictive when assessing individuals' linguistic experiences and their language utilization. Consequently, factors like language acquisition, linguistic competence, contexts of application, and personal variances must also be taken into account while delineating the idea. The conceptual limits of multilingualism are shaped by different perspectives on the proficiency necessary for an individual to communicate in more than one language. Mastering several languages is not equal to the ability to employ them for certain communicative objectives. Individuals can attain diverse proficiency levels in the languages they communicate and employ them for different purposes. Consequently, presuming uniform competence across all languages as a criterion for defining multilingualism may inadequately reflect the realities of individuals with different linguistic backgrounds. Aronin and Hufeisen (2009) illustrate that the research domain of multilingualism encompasses distinct conceptual and methodological challenges, indicating its breadth surpasses that of

second language acquisition studies. When evaluating multilingualism, it is crucial to differentiate between individual and societal dimensions. Personal multilingualism refers to a person's proficiency and abilities in many languages, whereas societal multilingualism pertains to the presence and utilization of different languages within a specific community. This differentiation is also useful in assessing the sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic aspects of multilingualism. The sociolinguistic perspective (Widdowson, 2009) emphasizes the linguistic experiences of multilingual populations and individuals nurtured in such environments. The psycholinguistic perspective, conversely, investigates the cognitive processes linked to the learning and use of languages by individuals. Consequently, multilingualism is considered a field of study that includes the social roles of languages and the ways individuals utilize their linguistic knowledge. An additional factor that delineates the parameters of multilingualism is the manner in which the connection between bilingualism and the learning of a third or additional languages is considered. Research on second language acquisition often investigates the correlation between the native language and the language learned thereafter, whereas studies on third language acquisition explore the potential influences of previously acquired languages on the learning experience. Hufeisen (2005) highlights the constraints of assessing these two processes under a unified conceptual framework, observing that third language learning may encompass distinct elements compared to second language acquisition. This approach underscores the need for using prior linguistic knowledge and learning experiences in future language acquisition endeavors. In a similar vein, Williams and Hammarberg (1997, 1998) and Ham-

marberg (2001) emphasize the influence of previously learned languages on the development of a third language. These investigations are significant as they demonstrate that analyzing multilingualism exclusively through the connection between the native and target languages is inadequate. The existence of diverse languages utilized by multilingual speakers, which might serve different roles in language creation, requires the integration of various linguistic resources in studies of language acquisition. However, how these languages are activated and under what conditions their roles in language production change is a separate subject of investigation.

The order of acquisition is also a vital factor in understanding multilingualism. An individual learning several languages concurrently during early life, rather than mastering additional languages after their primary language, suggests distinct linguistic foundations. Consequently, the application of terms like "first language," "second language," and "third language" has to be assessed in light of individuals' learning experiences. In instances of simultaneous bilingualism, both languages learned by the individual from early life may be regarded as primary languages. However, the individual's subsequent initiation of foreign language learning makes it difficult to explain the language acquisition process solely through the lens of a single first language. Classifications used in multilingualism research should not be based on the assumption that the languages individuals speak are fully independent of each other. Herdina and Jessner (2002) view the language progression of multilingual individuals as a multifaceted and dynamic system. This approach enhances the comprehension of multi-

lingualism not as a static level of language ability, but as a dynamic process influenced by multiple elements. Consequently, the evolution of the languages that individuals utilize, their usage frequency, and their interrelations are critical factors to examine in comprehending multilingualism.

Multilingualism should be assessed not solely by language acquisition but also by language utilization. Proficiency in many languages does not automatically mean their equal application across all communicative situations. The particular languages utilized in different linguistic activities may rely not solely on the individual's linguistic background but also on the characteristics of the task itself. At this point, a substantial connection exists between the notions of multilingualism and linguistic repertoire. Multilingualism refers to the language variety an individual holds, whereas linguistic repertoire emphasizes the utilization of resources within that diversity. Nevertheless, it is crucial for the conceptual coherence of the study that these two notions are not regarded as completely interchangeable.

In this study, multilingualism is considered within the framework of individuals possessing more than one language, either acquired from an early age or learned later in life. The participant groups, consisting of monolingual and concurrently bilingual individuals, were established based on their language acquisition backgrounds before learning English. Consequently, this categorization should not be considered an evaluation of the participants' linguistic competence across all languages or the regularity with which they employ these languages in their everyday activities. Such a conceptual distinction provides a clearer basis for examining the writing processes in foreign languages of indi-

viduals with different linguistic backgrounds. Thus, understanding multilingualism necessitates evaluating not merely the quantity of languages an individual is familiar with, but also their learning background, linguistic proficiency, and patterns of language utilization. The different dimensions discussed by Tucker (1999), Aronin and Hufeisen (2009), Hufeisen (2005), Hammarberg (2001), Williams and Hammarberg (1997, 1998), and Herdina and Jessner (2002) illustrate that multilingualism cannot be defined by a singular standard. This theoretical structure establishes a basis for a more thorough analysis of the traits of bilingualism and multilingual language learning.

2.2 Bilingualism and Multilingual Language Acquisition

The processes of bilingualism and multilingual language acquisition are interconnected, particularly regarding the influence of individuals' existing linguistic knowledge and experiences on the acquisition of a new language. Bilingualism pertains to the mastery of two languages, whereas multilingual language acquisition highlights the impact of previously learned languages on subsequent learning processes. Consequently, it should not be presumed that the acquisition of a second and third language transpires under identical circumstances. Hufeisen (2005) emphasizes that third language acquisition involves different factors than second language acquisition and should be considered an independent area of research. Multilingual individuals have been shown to employ not only their native tongue but also additional languages they have subsequently learned when acquiring a new language. Hammarberg (2001) and Williams and Hammarberg (1997, 1998) have shown that

previously learned languages can influence third language development, indicating that the second language can facilitate the production of the target language. These investigations reveal that the connections among languages in the processes of language learning cannot be elucidated exclusively through the source and target languages.

Previous language learning experiences are also important in terms of the strategies individuals use when learning a new language. Mitits and Gavriilidou (2016) investigated the transference of language learning strategies among multilingual individuals while learning different languages. In a similar vein, Sercu (2007) showed that multilingual learners can utilize their diverse linguistic resources in translation tasks. These findings indicate that previously acquired languages should be considered not only as a source of linguistic knowledge but also as resources that can be used to accomplish specific tasks. The relationship between multilingual language acquisition and writing processes in a foreign language also becomes significant within this context. Tullock and Fernández-Villanueva (2013) investigated the manner in which multilingual individuals employ their prior language knowledge while formulating their ideas in writing. Such studies indicate that an individual's linguistic background can affect both the learning of a new language and the mechanisms involved in its production.

In conclusion, the fundamental difference between bilingualism and multilingual language acquisition lies in the diversity of linguistic knowledge and experiences individuals possess when they begin learning a new language. The possible impact of previously learned languages on learning methodologies and language output requires an

evaluation of the language learning processes of multilingual individuals in their own specific contexts

2.3 Multicompetence and the Multilingual Mind

Multicompetence is a concept aimed at explaining how knowledge of more than one language is organized in an individual's mind. Cook (1992) defined multicompetence as the simultaneous presence of knowledge from different languages within a single mind and proposed that the linguistic proficiency of second-language speakers may exhibit distinct traits compared to monolinguals. This methodology suggests that the language competence of a multilingual individual should be assessed not as the sum of independent systems but as a whole containing interrelated systems. The multilingualism perspective posits that the cognitive and linguistic characteristics of individuals fluent in multiple languages cannot be entirely elucidated by monolingual standards. Grosjean (1989) asserted that bilingualism represents a distinct language framework, contending that a bilingual person should not be regarded as merely a combination of two independent monolinguals. This viewpoint indicates that assessing an individual's languages solely as distinct competencies may neglect key facets of multilingual language utilization.

A significant characteristic of the multilingual mind is the interaction of information from different languages during cognitive processes. Cook (1992), evaluating findings that the linguistic awareness and cognitive processes of second-language users may differ from those of monolingual individuals, argued that languages are not entirely independent at the mental level. The dynamics of the interaction between languages can differ based on the individual's level of

proficiency and the linguistic task being performed. The notion of different competences challenges the reliance on native speaker proficiency in the target language as the exclusive standard in foreign language education. Cook (1995) asserted that the distinctive linguistic abilities of multilingual individuals should be considered in educational and assessment processes. In accordance with this approach, foreign language learners may be assessed not only based on their deficiencies in the target language but also in relation to their entire linguistic repertoire.

The multi-competence approach is also important for examining foreign language writing processes. Multilingual individuals can utilize their proficiency in different languages when structuring their ideas, selecting vocabulary, and addressing linguistic challenges during text composition. Therefore, focusing solely on the text produced in the target language when evaluating written output can hinder a sufficient understanding of the mental and linguistic resources used in the production process. In conclusion, multi-competence allows for a holistic assessment of the linguistic proficiency of multilingual individuals. This approach provides a theoretical foundation for examining the foreign language writing behavior of multilingual individuals by highlighting the importance of having knowledge of different languages in the same mind for linguistic production and learning processes.

2.4 Theoretical Frameworks of Multilingualism

Theoretical frameworks established to elucidate multilingual language acquisition examine the influence of individuals' previous linguistic experiences on the acquisition and utilization of a new language from several perspectives.

In this framework, the Factor Model, the Polyglot Speaking Model, and the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism are three significant approaches that enhance comprehension of the acquisitional, productive, and developmental aspects of multilingualism.

The Factor Model (Hufeisen, 2005) is based on the idea that the processes of first, second, and third language acquisition do not occur under the same conditions. The approach suggests that when individuals embark on learning a new language, they can draw upon both their existing linguistic knowledge and their prior language acquisition experiences, as well as the learning strategies they have cultivated. Consequently, the acquisition of a third language is not regarded as a mere repetition of second language acquisition. The model highlights the neurophysiological, affective, cognitive, and linguistic factors that influence language acquisition. In particular, metalinguistic awareness and learning strategies cultivated during second language acquisition serve as valuable tools for subsequent language learning processes. Consequently, the Factor Model elucidates how the insights and experiences of multilingual individuals can distinguish the language acquisition process when they embark on learning a new language.

The Polyglot Speaking Model, developed by Williams and Hammarberg (1998), emphasizes the roles of previously learned languages in the development of a third language. The concept indicates that the languages an individual knows do not equally influence target language output and that many languages may serve distinct functions in the production process. In this approach, the distinction between supplier language and instrumental language is particularly

important. The supplier language functions as a source language used to fill lexical gaps in the target language, while the instrumental language can undertake functions such as organizing production and managing the communication process. The model is significant because it shows that not only the first language but also other previously learned languages can be actively involved in third language production.

The Dynamic Multilingualism Model by Herdina and Jessner (2002) views the linguistic development of a multilingual individual as a complex system that changes over time and involves reciprocal interactions. This paradigm posits that language evolution does not occur in a linear or autonomous manner. The connections among languages may vary based on contextual factors and personal attributes. One of the model's key features is that linguistic proficiency is not viewed as a fixed acquisition. Increased or decreased use of a language can lead to changes related to other elements in an individual's linguistic system. Furthermore, factors such as language learning motivation, linguistic environment, and opportunities for use can influence the direction of multilingual development. In this respect, the model describes multilingualism not as a completed acquisition state, but rather as a continuously evolving and restructuring process.

2.5 Linguistic Repertoires and Language Activation

Linguistic repertoire encompasses the complete range of an individual's languages and associated knowledge and abilities utilized for communication purposes. This notion facilitates the analysis of the utilization of several linguistic

resources within particular settings, rather than assessing the language usage of multilingual individuals exclusively based on their skill in separate languages. Blommaert and Backus (2013) emphasize that linguistic repertoires are shaped by the diverse linguistic experiences individuals encounter throughout their lives. In this respect, the repertoire encompasses linguistic resources that can be used in different situations, rather than a fixed list of languages possessed by the individual.

A crucial process in the utilization of linguistic repertoires is referred to as language activation. Language activation pertains to the cognitive availability of knowledge regarding the languages that individuals hold throughout a certain linguistic task. Green (1998) posited that employing the target language might necessitate the oversight of information pertaining to additional languages in elucidating the regulation of language production among bilinguals. This method demonstrates that in multilingual individuals, the language production process may incorporate not just knowledge of the target language but also insights from other languages. A fundamental characteristic of the language activation process is that information from different languages does not operate independently. Kroll and Stewart (1994) provided insights into the cognitive structuring of lexical data pertaining to different languages by investigating the lexical and conceptual associations of bilingual individuals. In this context, recalling or selecting a word in one language may involve processes linked to the individual's knowledge of the other language. However, the quality of the activated linguistic resources can vary depending on the individual's linguistic competence and the characteristics of

the task being performed. Activating linguistic repertoires is crucial, particularly for overcoming lexical difficulties encountered when writing in a foreign language. Multilingual individuals can utilize lexical or conceptual knowledge from previously acquired languages when struggling to identify appropriate expression in the target language. However, the activation of knowledge from different languages at the mental level does not necessarily mean that this knowledge will be transferred to the written text. Therefore, a distinction must be made between language activation and the resulting linguistic production.

In the study of linguistic repertoires, it is important to consider both individuals' self-reports of their language use and their linguistic behaviors in specific tasks. Although individuals can specify the languages they employ in writing, these evaluations may not encompass all linguistic mechanisms. Think-aloud procedures can yield supplementary information regarding the utilization of linguistic resources by facilitating the examination of thoughts articulated verbally during the writing process. Nonetheless, this approach cannot permit the direct examination of all facets of cognitive activation. In conclusion, the concepts of linguistic repertoire and language activation complement each other in explaining how multilingual individuals can utilize their linguistic knowledge in specific tasks. Linguistic repertoire emphasizes the resources accessible to an individual, whereas language activation pertains to the utilization of these resources during linguistic processing. This differentiation offers a theoretical framework for assessing the languages employed by multilingual individuals during their

foreign language writing endeavors and the processes by which they refer to these languages.

2.6. Cross-Linguistic Influence and Language Transfer

Cross-linguistic influence refers to the impact of an individual's previous linguistic knowledge and experiences on the learning or utilization of an additional language. Language transfer, conversely, pertains to the dimension of this connection manifested through certain linguistic characteristics. Odlin (2003) investigated language transfer through the lens of the impacts stemming from the similarities and differences between previously learned languages and the target language. In this framework, cross-linguistic influence is crucial not just for elucidating linguistic inaccuracies but also for comprehending the production mechanisms of individuals learning a new language. Language transfer can facilitate the production of language in the target language, but it can also lead to certain linguistic difficulties. Positive transfer refers to the appropriate use of previously acquired linguistic knowledge in the target language, while negative transfer is associated with inappropriate linguistic uses arising from differences between languages. However, Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008) show that interlingual interaction cannot be reduced solely to grammatical structures; it should also be examined at the lexical, semantic, and conceptual levels.

Interlingual interaction can become more complex due to the presence of multiple source languages in multilingual individuals. De Angelis (2007) emphasizes that linguistic interaction does not only occur between the first and target languages by examining the effects of previously

learned languages on third or additional language acquisition. Accordingly, an individual's knowledge of their second language can also influence subsequent language learning processes. However, which language will have a more significant influence can vary depending on variables such as linguistic similarities, proficiency level, and usage conditions.

The occurrence of interlingual interaction in foreign language writing processes is particularly important in terms of word choice and the construction of linguistic structures. Navés et al. (2005) investigated interlingual interaction among learners of English as a foreign language concerning their proficiency level and linguistic dominance. Such research indicates that the linguistic features observed in written output must be assessed not solely concerning target language competence but also alongside the individual's previous linguistic experience. Distinguishing between interlingual interaction and language transfer is crucial in interpreting multilingual writing processes. Thinking in another language, searching for lexical equivalents, or constructing an expression using elements from different languages during the writing process does not automatically mean that direct language transfer has occurred. Therefore, the linguistic features that emerge in the target language and the mental and linguistic resources used during writing must be examined at separate levels. In conclusion, interlingual interaction is a comprehensive concept that describes the different roles previously acquired languages can play in the language learning and production processes of multilingual individuals. Language transfer, on the other hand, focuses on the observable consequences of this interaction in spe-

cific linguistic features. This distinction allows for a more careful evaluation of the linguistic resources and resulting linguistic behaviors used by multilingual individuals in their English writing processes.

2.7 Code-Switching and Translanguaging

The use of multiple languages by multilingual individuals in communication processes is addressed within the framework of different theoretical approaches. One of these approaches, code-switching, refers to switching between two or more languages during speech or interaction. Translanguaging, on the other hand, focuses on individuals using their linguistic resources in an integrated manner according to their communicative and cognitive needs. While both concepts explain multilingual language use, they are based on different theoretical assumptions regarding how linguistic boundaries are evaluated.

Code switching is a linguistic strategy utilized by multilingual speakers in different communicative contexts. Poplack (2020) has demonstrated that the patterns of language switching in bilingual conversations reveal specific linguistic consistencies. Code switching should not be regarded merely as a behavior arising from insufficient proficiency in one language. The situational environment, the dynamics among the interlocutors, and the intended significance can all affect individuals' inclinations to switch between languages. Code switching in educational settings is also examined as a practice that teachers and students resort to to support the learning process. Sert (2007) investigated the transition of Turkish students from German to English in a classroom setting where they learned German as a second foreign language. Such linguistic transitions can allow

learners to make sense of new linguistic information by utilizing their previous language experiences. However, the function of code switching should be evaluated taking into account the context in which it occurs and the characteristics of the learning activity. García and Wei (2015) emphasize that multilingual individuals dynamically utilize their linguistic resources in their meaning-making processes. The key in this approach is not so much determining which language an individual switches from to another but rather explaining how they combine different linguistic resources and for what purposes they utilize them. Studies compiled by Mazzaferro (2018) also demonstrate that translanguaging practices can emerge in various social and communicative contexts of daily life. When considered in terms of writing in a foreign language, code-switching and translanguaging assist in comprehending the linguistic resources that multilingual individuals use when creating written texts. Learners may organize their thoughts through another language, evaluate the equivalents of words in different languages, or utilize their linguistic background to construct the meaning they wish to express. However, the use of different languages during writing does not always fulfill the same linguistic function. Therefore, it is important to examine the observed language changes separately from the linguistic resources that an individual uses in the meaning-making process. To conclude, while code-switching focuses on the identifiable transitions that multilingual individuals make between languages, translanguaging describes a more integrated and flexible use of linguistic resources. Considering these two approaches together allows for the examination of linguistic behaviors in English writing processes by multilingual learners, not only through the text in the target lan-

guage but also in terms of the different linguistic practices that contribute to text creation.

2.8. Language Dominance and Linguistic Identity

Multilingual individuals do not always possess languages that are equally important in terms of proficiency, frequency of use, and communicative function. The notion of language dominance, employed to elucidate these disparities, pertains to a certain language within an individual's linguistic inventory possessing a more robust or utilitarian role than others. Language supremacy is not exclusively tied to grammatical expertise; it can also be influenced by the age of acquisition, contexts of usage, and its roles in everyday activities (Birdsong, 2014; Gertken et al., 2014). Consequently, the primary language an individual learns is not invariably anticipated to be the prevailing language.

Language dominance should not be considered a characteristic that remains stable throughout an individual's life. Education, family, social environment, and the intensity of interaction with different languages can affect the balance of language use. Grosjean (2010) emphasizes that bilingual individuals can use their languages in different areas of life and for various purposes. Especially in multilingual societies, individuals may use one language more intensively in the family environment while resorting to another language more in their education or professional lives. This situation necessitates examining language dominance not only through individual competence but also by considering the social conditions in which language use takes place.

CHAPTER 3

Multilingualism and Foreign Language Writing

3.1 Writing as a Cognitive and Linguistic Process

Writing is a complex production activity based on the interaction of cognitive and linguistic processes, enabling individuals to express their thoughts through written language. This process encompasses not only the combination of words and grammatical structures but also the organization of thoughts for a specific communicative purpose and their transformation into a meaningful text. Flower and Hayes (1981) describe writing as a cognitive process in which different mental operations interact with each other. Grabe and Kaplan (2014) emphasize that written production should be evaluated in terms of the relationships between linguistic information, communicative purpose, and textual organization.

The cognitive dimension of writing encompasses the mental processes involved in forming, organising, and transforming thoughts into written expression. According to Flower and Hayes' (1981) cognitive process model, planning, text creation, and revision are identified as fundamental components. During planning, the writer determines the purpose of the text and organizes the information to be conveyed. In the text creation process, this information is transformed into linguistic structures, while in the revision phase, the resulting expressions are evaluated in terms of content, clarity, and appropriateness. However, these processes are not strictly separated. The writer can re-evaluate their previous thoughts at any stage of the text, change the expressions they have created, or rearrange the writing plan

they initially determined. This characteristic demonstrates that writing is not a linear but an iterative process. A primary factor contributing to the cognitive complexity of written production is the execution of several procedures with constrained mental resources. McCutchen (1996) asserts that the restricted cognitive capacity in written expression might influence writing efficacy, particularly when numerous processes must be executed concurrently. In this context, the writer's emphasis on content generation may restrict the cognitive resources available for other tasks like selecting words or ensuring grammatical accuracy. As writing experience increases, some processes require less conscious effort, which can facilitate the redirection of attention and working memory resources to higher-level features of the text.

The manner in which a person applies their prior knowledge is a significant cognitive factor in the writing process. Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) distinguish between knowledge telling and knowledge transforming processes in explaining the development of writing. In the knowledge-telling process, the writer directly reflects the information they possess in the text, while in the knowledge-transforming process, they restructure their thoughts in accordance with the purpose of writing and the requirements of the text. Galbraith (1999) draws attention to the role of text production in the knowledge creation process by considering writing as an activity related to the formation and development of thought. These approaches show that writing not only serves to transmit existing information but also contributes to the development, questioning, and reorganization of thoughts.

The linguistic dimension of writing is related to the expression of mentally formed thoughts in a manner that conforms to lexical, grammatical, and textual characteristics. Word choice, the construction of syntactic structures, the establishment of semantic relationships between sentences, and the ensuring of textual integrity are among the fundamental components of written production. Halliday and Hasan (2014) highlight the importance of relationships between linguistic elements in creating textual integrity in explaining textual coherence. Grabe and Kaplan (2014) evaluate written communication not only in terms of grammatical accuracy but also in light of the text's purpose, target audience, and communicative context. From this perspective, successful written production requires not only the creation of correct sentences but also the arrangement of these sentences within a meaningful, coherent, and communicatively appropriate whole.

The quality of written production can vary depending on the writer's linguistic proficiency and writing experience. Particularly when composing in a foreign language, individuals are required to not only arrange their ideas but also choose suitable terminology in the target language, formulate grammatical constructions, and assess the accuracy of their statements. Silva (1993) notes that while writing in a second language shares common characteristics with writing in a first language, it can differ in terms of writing processes and the characteristics of the resulting texts. Cumming (1989) investigated the writing performance in a second language, assessing the influence of writing skill and competency in the target language on the process of text production. These investigations reveal that proficiency in a

foreign language cannot be entirely attributed to one's understanding of the target language; broader writing competencies and cognitive mechanisms must also be taken into account.

In conclusion, writing is a multidimensional production process in which cognitive processes and linguistic choices are in constant interaction. The planning of thoughts, their transformation into linguistic form, and the re-evaluation of the text are shaped by the individual's knowledge, writing experience, and linguistic competence. This theoretical framework forms the basis for examining the writing processes of multilingual individuals in a foreign language. In particular, understanding the cognitive strategies and linguistic resources used by learners with different linguistic experiences during written production necessitates evaluating writing not only based on the resulting text but also in terms of the process of text creation.

3.2 Multilingual Writing Processes

Writing is more than simply creating a text in the target language; it is a multidimensional activity where knowledge and experiences acquired in different languages can be incorporated into the written production process for multilingual individuals. Individuals fluent in multiple languages can not only use their knowledge of the target language but also draw upon their previously acquired languages during the writing process. This demonstrates that written production can be shaped by the interaction of different linguistic resources. Cenoz and Gorter (2011) examine multilingual writing practices within the context of inter-language relationships and learners' integrated linguistic resources. This perspective allows for the examination of multilingual writ-

ing not through independent language systems but by considering different aspects of the individual's linguistic background. The ways by which multilingual learners employ their previously learned languages during writing can differ based on the nature of the writing assignment and the individual's linguistic background. Wang and Wen (2002) demonstrated that the utilization of the first language among Chinese students learning English as a foreign language varies across several phases of the writing process. The research established that the primary language is especially employed in the development and structuring of ideas. These results suggest that assessing language utilization in the writing process exclusively through the language of the final text is insufficient. Learners may utilize resources from another language to organize their thoughts, develop content, or overcome linguistic difficulties when creating a text in the target language. The writing process extends beyond the interaction between the native and target languages for learners possessing different previous language proficiencies. Tullock and Fernández-Villanueva (2013) investigated the influence of previously learned languages on the cognitive processes of multilingual individuals while composing text. The research is important, as it demonstrates that diverse languages can fulfill several roles in written expression. In this context, a learner may utilize one language to structure their ideas, another language to assess lexical counterparts, or to verify the phrases they construct in the target language. Nonetheless, one should not presume that these functions will present uniformly throughout all multilingual individuals. Linguistic resources utilized can be affected by language competency, prior learning experiences, and the demands of the writing assignment.

The use of linguistic resources in multilingual writing processes is also related to the writing strategies developed by learners. Kobayashi and Rinnert (1992) examined the writing approaches of Japanese students in English, contrasting direct composition in the target language with the use of translation. This research illustrates that the linguistic approach employed in writing is a factor that must be taken into account regarding text production. In a similar vein, Manchón et al. (2000) explored the utilization of the first language in second-language writing, analyzing how learners may draw upon different linguistic resources to address challenges faced during the writing process. These investigations indicate that the employment of previous languages cannot be attributed exclusively to insufficient linguistic proficiency but may also pertain to strategic decisions made to manage the writing process.

The methods employed in examining multilingual writing processes are critical to understanding the circumstances and objectives that govern the utilization of linguistic resources. The integrated assessment of think-aloud protocols, interviews, and written documents in the writing process can contribute to exploring the connections between learners' articulated thoughts and their resultant written output. Nevertheless, it should not be presumed that think-aloud protocols transparently provide the entirety of an individual's cognitive mechanisms. Simon and Ericsson (1984) address the theoretical and methodological conditions for using oral reports in the study of cognitive processes. Therefore, the combined use of different data sources in multilingual writing research can allow for a more careful interpretation of observed linguistic behaviors. In conclusion, mul-

tilingual writing processes exhibit a dynamic structure where the languages an individual speaks can contribute to written production at different levels. Learners' use of other languages when creating texts in the target language can be related to various purposes such as content development, evaluating linguistic options, and managing the writing process. Therefore, in the study of multilingual writing, instead of focusing solely on the characteristics of the completed text, the linguistic choices and strategies that emerge during the text's creation should also be considered. Such an approach also provides a theoretical basis for investigating the relationship between learners' evaluations of their language use and the behaviors observed during writing.

3.3 Previous Research on Translanguaging in Foreign Language Writing

Research on writing in foreign languages examines how multilingual learners utilize linguistic resources during written production from various perspectives. Some studies focus on multilingual writing performance, others on the use of different languages in academic texts, and the others on the functions of multilingual teaching practices in learning processes. Cenoz and Gorter (2011) highlighted the importance of evaluating writing experiences developed in different languages in relation to each other by examining the written production of trilingual individuals. This study shows that focusing solely on performance in the target language in multilingual writing research may be limited in explaining learners' linguistic experiences.

Research in the context of academic writing provides significant findings regarding the use of diverse linguistic resources within written discourse. Canagarajah (2011) ex-

amined codemeshing practices, where multilingual students combine elements from different languages in their academic writing. The research reveals that students can construct meaning by utilizing linguistic diversity and develop diverse linguistic strategies in academic written expression. This approach offers an alternative perspective to evaluating academic texts solely within the framework of monolingual writing norms. However, the functions of these practices can vary depending on the type of writing, its communicative purpose, and the expectations of the target audience.

Investigations into the function of translanguaging practices within educational contexts explore pedagogical approaches that enable learners to utilize their pre-existing language resources. Creese and Blackledge (2010) examined the utilization of language in bilingual educational settings, emphasizing the roles that various languages might play in instructional and learning activities. Hornberger and Link (2012) assessed the literacy advancement of multilingual learners through a translanguaging lens, whereas Lewis et al. (2012) examined the evolution and instructional use of these practices in bilingual education. The fact that these studies are not directly limited to the processes of writing compositions in a foreign language necessitates careful consideration when transferring the findings to the context of writing. Nevertheless, these studies provide an important research ground for how learners' linguistic backgrounds can be evaluated in educational activities. Studies conducted in Türkiye contribute to the evaluation of multilingual language use in terms of English teaching and writing skills. Tanış et al. (2020) examined first language use and dialogical teaching in the context of writing skills in their research

conducted with university students learning English as a foreign language. The study presents findings on how learners' previously acquired linguistic knowledge can be evaluated in writing instruction.

Previous research has shown that translanguaging practices have been studied in various fields such as academic writing, multilingual literacy, and foreign language teaching. However, comparing the languages learners report using during writing with their observable linguistic behaviors throughout the process constitutes a separate research focus. In particular, the linguistic preferences exhibited by individuals with diverse native language backgrounds when writing in the same target language offer important data that can contribute to understanding multilingual writing processes. Within this framework, the present research comparatively examines how multilingual English learners in Mardin use their linguistic repertoires, based on their self-reports and data obtained from the writing process.

CHAPTER 4

Research Methodology and Findings

4.1 Research Design and Context

This research was conducted to examine how multilingual English learners use languages from their linguistic repertoires during written production. The main focus of the study is to compare the languages that participants reported using in the English writing process with the linguistic behaviors observed during writing. Accordingly, the research addresses how learners with different linguistic backgrounds activate their previously acquired languages when producing written work in the target language.

This study adapts its design from the research conducted by Gunnarsson et al. (2015) and Tullock and Fernández-Villanueva (2013). Following the approach adopted in those studies, the research focuses on comparing learners' self-assessments of their language use with the linguistic behaviors they exhibit during the writing process. Thus, the aim of the research is to examine how multilingual individuals utilize different languages in their writing processes not only through their self-reports but also through data obtained during writing activities.

The research was conducted in Mardin, where Türkiye's multilingual and multicultural structure is clearly observable, with the participation of students from Mardin Artuklu University. Mardin provides an important context for the research due to its social structure where different linguistic, cultural, and religious communities live together. In this environment, where languages such as Arabic, Kurdish, and Syriac are used in addition to Turkish, it allows for

the examination of the foreign language learning experiences of individuals with different linguistic backgrounds. In this respect, the context in which the research was conducted allows for the evaluation of multilingualism not only in relation to individual language proficiency but also in relation to the social and linguistic environment in which individuals live. This study comparatively examines the writing processes of English learners with diverse linguistic experiences since childhood. This aspect of the research allows for an examination of the use of previously acquired languages in written production across different linguistic backgrounds. Thus, the research offers a framework for understanding how individuals learning in the multilingual context of Mardin utilize their linguistic repertoires when writing in English.

4.2 Participants and Linguistic Backgrounds

The study included a total of 20 students studying at Mardin Artuklu University. The participants ranged in age from 18 to 28; 16 were female and four were male. The participants include individuals with diverse linguistic backgrounds, and all of them were grouped based on the languages they were exposed to during childhood. Accordingly, the study included 5 students who only acquired Turkish as their first language and 15 students who were simultaneously exposed to two languages from childhood.

The grouping of participants was based on their early language acquisition experiences. Following the classification adapted from the study by Gunnarsson et al. (2015), participants were evaluated in two main categories: the Turkish first language group (Turkish L1 Group) and the simultaneous bilingual first language groups (Simultaneous

L1 Groups). The first category consisted of individuals who grew up speaking only Turkish, while the second category included individuals who were exposed to Arabic, Kurdish, or Syriac in addition to Turkish from childhood. The five participants in the Turkish first language group were born into Turkish-speaking families and were exposed only to Turkish within their families and social environments from birth. These participants constitute the monolingual group in the study in terms of their linguistic experiences before starting to learn English. Simultaneous bilingual participants consist of individuals who have acquired another language alongside Turkish from early childhood. This category is further divided into three first-language groups: Turkish-Arabic, Turkish-Kurdish, and Turkish-Syriac. Each group comprises five participants. Participants in the Turkish-Arabic group have been exposed to Turkish and Arabic since childhood, those in the Turkish-Kurdish group to Turkish and Kurdish, and those in the Turkish-Syriac group to Turkish and Syriac. The study notes that Turkish, being the official language of Türkiye, also plays a role in the linguistic experiences of simultaneous bilingual participants.

This grouping reveals that participants engage in the English learning process with varying linguistic backgrounds. While students in the Turkish first language group had early linguistic experiences shaped around a single language, students in the simultaneous bilingual groups have interacted with two languages since childhood. Thus, the study group was structured to allow for a comparison of four participant groups that differed in terms of early language acquisition.

4.3 Data Collection Instruments

The study utilized three different data collection tools to examine participants' statements regarding their linguistic repertoire and their linguistic behaviors during English writing. These tools included an adapted questionnaire, semi-structured interviews, and think-aloud protocols. These tools provided varying types of data regarding participants' linguistic backgrounds, language usage preferences, and the languages they activated during written production.

The first data collection tool of the study was a questionnaire adapted from the studies conducted by Gunnarsson et al. (2015) and Tullock and Fernández-Villanueva (2013). The questionnaire was used to gather information about the participants' linguistic backgrounds and language use habits. In this context, participants were questioned about the languages they use in their social environments, their proficiency levels in the languages they possess, and the languages they prefer for internal thinking activities such as dreaming or counting. Furthermore, the questionnaire obtained participants' self-assessments of how they activate the languages in their linguistic repertoire when writing English compositions. Thus, the questionnaire served as a data source to determine learners' language use in different contexts and their statements regarding the writing process.

The second data collection tool used in the study was semi-structured interviews. These interviews were conducted to verify the information obtained through the questionnaire and to support participants' explanations regarding their language use. The interview questions were prepared in accordance with the questionnaire items, and the same questions were asked to all participants. This tool allowed

participants to assess their own explanations regarding the languages they use when writing in English. The interviews, in particular, contributed to a more detailed evaluation of the survey data concerning participants' linguistic preferences.

The third data collection tool, think-aloud protocols, was used to record the thoughts of participants while creating written texts in English. In this method, participants verbally expressed their thoughts while individually performing writing tasks. This provided data on the languages used during written production and the resources participants consulted when faced with linguistic problems. Think-aloud protocols were used as a tool that supported self-reported data collected through questionnaires and interviews and allowed for the examination of linguistic behaviors expressed during writing.

These three data collection tools provided complementary data sources in line with the main comparative focus of the research. While surveys and interviews revealed participants' statements regarding their language use, think-aloud protocols made it possible to examine thoughts expressed aloud and the language used during writing. Thus, a data base was created that allowed for comparison between participants' self-assessments of their linguistic behavior and the language use observable in their writing activities.

4.4 Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

The data collection process for the research was carried out over approximately four academic months. Data collection was conducted in a specific sequence, and data were obtained comparing participants' statements regarding

language use with their linguistic behaviors exhibited while writing in English.

In the first stage of the data collection process, a questionnaire was administered to all participants. Following this, semi-structured interviews were conducted to verify the information obtained through the questionnaire. After these steps, participants were given writing assignments related to the curriculum of their language course. For each writing assignment, participants were asked to create an English text of approximately 250 words within 30 minutes. The writing assignments were completed individually, and the participants' thoughts expressed aloud while creating the text were recorded. Thus, in addition to the participants' written work, recordings of their thoughts expressed during the writing process were also obtained.

After the data collection process was completed, each data type was analyzed according to its specific characteristics. Data obtained through questionnaires were analyzed using descriptive analysis with SPSS 16 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). Content analysis was used to evaluate data obtained from interviews. Through these analyses, participants' statements regarding language use and the explanations they provided during the interviews were assessed.

In the analysis of data obtained from think-aloud protocols, the three-stage analysis process used by Tullock and Fernández-Villanueva (2013) was followed. In the first stage, the think-aloud statements recorded during writing by the participants were transcribed with the help of a person fluent in the participants' native language. Then, these transcripts were compared with the English texts produced by

the participants. Through this comparison, the differences between the planning processes expressed during think-aloud and the linguistic production that emerged in the written texts were examined. In the second stage, the expressions used by the participants in their written texts were compared with the thoughts they intended to express, and the presence of lexical gaps was assessed. Accordingly, the focus was on identifying the lexical difficulties participants encountered during the writing process. The third stage examined how participants utilized languages from their linguistic repertoire when completing English writing tasks. This included an assessment of participants' proficiency in different languages and indicators related to translanguaging practices. In the final stage of the analysis, data obtained only from participants who acquired Turkish as their first language were compared with data from simultaneous bilingual groups using Turkish-Arabic, Turkish-Kurdish, and Turkish-Syriac languages. This comparison aimed to identify differences in how learners with varying early linguistic experiences activate their previously acquired languages during English writing. The data provided a basis for evaluating participants' self-reported language use alongside observable linguistic behaviors during the writing process.

4.5 Self-Reported Language Use During Writing

Table 1 displays the findings of descriptive statistics concerning the number and proportion of participants (Turkish L1 Group and Simultaneous L1 Group) along with their reports of activating previously acquired languages for each of the five composing models proposed by Wang and Wen (2002, as referenced in Gunnarsson et al., 2015).

Table 1. Self-reported language use by multilingual individuals while composing in English

Languages of Thought	Turkish L1s (N=5)					Simultaneous L1s (N=15)				
	Task-examining	Idea-generating	Idea-organizing	Process-controlling	Text-generating	Task-examining	Idea-generating	Idea-organizing	Process-controlling	Text-generating
Turkish	60%	40%	80%	20%	0%	46,66%	33,33%	6,66%	33,33%	13,33%
English	20%	20%	20%	60%	80%	26,66%	20%	40%	26,66%	40%
Syriac	-	-	-	-	-	0%	13,33%	13,33%	6,66%	6,66%
English & Syriac	-	-	-	-	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Turkish & Syriac	-	-	-	-	-	13,33%	20%	13,33%	13,33%	13,33%
Turkish & English	20%	40%	0%	20%	20%	13,33%	6,66%	13,33%	20%	26,66%
Arabic	-	-	-	-	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Turkish & English & Arabic	-	-	-	-	-	0%	6,66%	0%	0%	0%
Kurdish	-	-	-	-	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Turkish & Kurdish	-	-	-	-	-	6,66%	6,66%	0%	0%	0%
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 1 shows the findings regarding the languages that participants in the Turkish L1 Group and the Simultaneous L1 Group reported as actively using in the English writing process. To determine whether participants used only one language or multiple languages from their linguistic repertoire at different stages of written production, the reported language preferences and language combinations were evaluated separately for each writing stage. In this context, participant statements regarding the task-examining, idea-generating, idea-organizing, process-controlling, and text-generating stages were examined.

Findings regarding the Turkish first language group show that participants' language preferences differed according to the stages of the writing process. In the task examining stage, three participants (60%) stated that they used only Turkish, one (20%) only English, and one (20%) used both Turkish and English. In the idea-generating stage, two participants (40%) reported using Turkish, one participant (20%) used English, and two participants (40%) used both languages. In the idea-generating stage, the use of Turkish was significantly more prominent. In this stage, four participants (80%) stated that they used Turkish, and one participant (20%) used English. In the process controlling stage, language preferences shifted in favor of English. One participant (20%) stated that they used Turkish, three (60%) used English, and one (20%) used both Turkish and English. In the text-generating stage, the use of English also gained prominence. In this stage, four participants (80%) reported using only English, and one participant (20%) used both Turkish and English.

Findings regarding the simultaneous bilingual first language group reveal that a wider variety of language combinations were reported in the writing process when compared to the Turkish first language group. In the task-examining phase, seven participants (46.67%) reported using Turkish, four participants (26.67%) reported using English, two participants (13.33%) reported using Turkish and Syriac, and two participants (13.33%) reported using Turkish and English together. This distribution indicates that Turkish, alone or in combination with other languages, holds a significant place in the task-examining phase. During the idea-generating phase, five participants (33.33%) reported activating Turkish, three (20%) English, two (13.33%) Syriac, one (6.67%) English and Syriac, two (13.33%) Turkish and Syriac, one (6.67%) Turkish and English, and one (6.67%) Turkish and Kurdish together. The diversification of language preferences reported at this phase reflects the statements of simultaneous bilingual participants regarding their use of different linguistic resources during idea-generating. During the idea-organizing phase, one participant (6.67%) reported using Turkish, six participants (40%) reported using English, two participants (13.33%) reported using Syriac, two participants (13.33%) reported using Turkish and Syriac, two participants (13.33%) reported using Turkish and English, one participant (6.67%) reported using Turkish and Kurdish, and one participant (6.67%) reported using Turkish, English, and Arabic together. These findings indicate that English was the most frequently reported language alone during the idea-organizing phase; however, other languages and language combinations were also mentioned in the participants' statements. In the process-controlling phase, five participants

(33.33%) reported activating Turkish, three participants (20%) English, one participant (6.67%) Syriac, one participant (6.67%) English and Syriac, two participants (13.33%) Turkish and Syriac, and three participants (20%) Turkish and English together. While Turkish was the most frequently cited language alone in this phase, the use of English and multiple languages together was also noteworthy. In the text-generating phase, two participants (13.33%) stated they used Turkish, six participants (40%) used English, one participant (6.67%) used Syriac, two participants (13.33%) used both Turkish and Syriac, and four participants (26.67%) used both Turkish and English. This distribution shows that English was the most frequently reported language alone in the text-generating phase. However, the constant reporting of Turkish, both independently and in combination with other languages, reveals that previously acquired languages are also included in the participants' statements when producing written material in the target language.

When the findings presented in Table 1 are evaluated generally, it is seen that Turkish plays an important role in various stages of the writing process in both groups. Especially in the task-examining and idea-generating stages, Turkish is frequently reported, either alone or in combination with other languages. However, it is understood that language preferences vary according to the writing stages, and English stands out particularly in the idea-organizing, process-controlling, and text-generating stages. This trend is more visible in the Turkish first-language group in the process-controlling and text-generating stages, and in the simultaneous bilingual group in the idea-organizing and text-

generating stages. Comparison between groups shows that simultaneous bilingual participants reported a wider variety of language combinations in the writing process. While language preferences in the Turkish first-language group were limited to Turkish and English, the simultaneous bilingual group encompassed diverse combinations including Arabic, Kurdish, and Syriac. However, the reporting of Arabic, Kurdish, and Syriac alongside Turkish in some writing stages indicates that Turkish also plays an important role in the linguistic repertoire of these participants. However, since these findings are based on participants' self-reports, they should not be considered a direct observation of linguistic activation during writing. These results suggest that Turkish, commonly used within the participants' social environment, may play a significant role in their statements regarding writing processes in a foreign language. However, a more comprehensive assessment of the role of social language use on language preferences during writing requires examining data on the languages participants reported using in their social environments and internal thought processes. Accordingly, the following section discusses the findings regarding participants' language use in their social networks and the languages they prefer in their internal thought activities.

4.6 Language Use in Social Networks

Table 2 illustrates the percentages of languages reported to be utilized by the individuals within their social networks.

Table 2. Self-reported languages activated by multi-lingual individuals in their social networks

Languages of Use			Turkish L1s (N=5)					Simultaneous L1s (N=15)						
Turkish Syriac Turkish & Syriac Arabic Turkish & Arabic Kurdish Turkish & Kurdish Total	Mother	Father	Sisters/Brothers		Relatives	Friends	Neighbors	Mother	Father	Sisters/Brothers		Relatives	Friends	Neighbors
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	6,66%	20%	33,33%	13,33%	46,66%	33,33%	
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33,33%	33,33%	20%	33,33%	6,66%	20%	
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	0%	13,33%	0%	26,66%	6,66%	
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,66%	0%	0%	6,66%	0%	6,66%	
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13,33%	20%	20%	13,33%	13,33%	13,33%	
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26,66%	26,66%	0%	26,66%	0%	13,33%	
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13,33%	0%	13,33%	6,66%	6,66%	6,66%	
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 2 presents the findings regarding the languages that participants in the Turkish L1 Group and the Simultaneous L1 Group reported using in their social environments. Examining the languages preferred by participants when communicating with their mothers, fathers, siblings, relatives, friends, and neighbors is important for understanding how their linguistic repertoire is used in different social contexts of daily life. The data obtained in this regard indicate that participants' language preferences may be linked not only to their linguistic background but also to the people they communicate with and the quality of their social relationships.

The findings regarding the Turkish first language group show a significant commonality in the language use of the participants in their social environments. All participants in this group (100%) reported using Turkish in their communication with their mothers, fathers, siblings, relatives, friends, and neighbors. Therefore, Turkish stands out as the common language of communication used by this group both in their intra-family relationships and in their social interactions outside the family. This result is consistent with the participants' early linguistic backgrounds and reveals the central position of Turkish in their daily communication practices.

In the simultaneous bilingual first language group, it appears that language use in the social environment exhibits a more diverse pattern. Participants who acquired Arabic, Kurdish, or Syriac in addition to Turkish from childhood reported using different languages or combinations of languages depending on the people they communicated with. In this group, Turkish stands out as a significant means of

communication, especially in social relationships outside the family. 46.66% of participants stated that they used only Turkish when communicating with friends and 33.33% when communicating with neighbors. However, the presence of participants who reported using Turkish along with other languages indicates that communication outside the family is not limited to a single language. Findings regarding intra-family communication reveal that participants with simultaneous bilingualism continue to use their first language other than Turkish in their daily lives. The participants' reports of using Arabic, Kurdish, and Syriac in their communications with their mothers, fathers, siblings, and relatives indicate that these languages hold a functional place within family and close kinship relationships. The use of these languages, sometimes independently and sometimes in conjunction with Turkish, suggests that participants' language preferences can vary depending on the context in which social interaction takes place. It is noteworthy that participants reported using first languages other than Turkish, particularly in communication with their parents. In the simultaneously bilingual group, 33.33% of participants stated that they spoke only Syriac with their mothers, 26.66% only in Kurdish, and 6.66% only in Arabic. In their communication with their fathers, 33.33% reported using only Syriac, and 26.66% reported using only Kurdish. In addition, patterns of family communication where both Turkish and Arabic are used are also observed. This distribution indicates that participants continue to use their first languages other than Turkish, especially in communication with their parents. Data on communication with siblings and relatives also reveal that language use varies according to social relationships. While some participants preferred

Turkish in these relationships, others reported using Syriac, Arabic, or Kurdish alone or in combination with Turkish. Therefore, family and kinship relations are among the social areas where bilingual participants can utilize different linguistic resources. However, the use of Turkish in these relationships indicates that there is no clear linguistic distinction between intra-family and extra-family communication.

Overall, the findings in Table 2 reveal differences between the two participant groups in terms of the diversity of language use in their social environments. While the Turkish-speaking first-language group reported using Turkish in all social interactions, the bilingual group showed a preference for different languages and language combinations depending on the person they were communicating with. Turkish holds a significant position, particularly in broader social circles, while Arabic, Kurdish, and Syriac also maintain their presence as communication resources used in family and close-knit relationships. These findings demonstrate that the first languages of the bilingual participants other than Turkish are not only part of their linguistic background but also continue to be used in their daily communication. However, the participants' reporting of using multiple languages in different social interactions suggests that the use of their linguistic repertoire can vary depending on the context. Therefore, the results regarding social networks provide an important data source for understanding the participants' linguistic experiences; however, they do not alone reveal the extent to which these languages are activated during English writing. To assess the relationship between language use in the social environment and internal thought processes, it is necessary to also examine the findings re-

garding the languages that participants reported using in different cognitive activities.

4.7 Language Use in Inner Thought

Table 3 presents the results of the languages reported to be activated by multilingual individuals in their inner thought processes.

Table 3. Self-reported languages activated by multilingual individuals in their inner thought processes

Languages of Thought	Turkish L1s (N=5)				Simultaneous L1s (N=15)			
	Calculating	Memorizing a phone number	Training / Exercising	Studying	Calculating	Memorizing a phone number	Training / Exercising	Studying
Turkish	100%	100%	20%	20%	66,66%	86,66%	26,66%	13,33%
English	-	-	60%	60%	0%	6,66%	20%	33,33%
Syriac	-	-	-	-	0%	0%	13,33%	6,66%
Turkish & Syriac	-	-	-	-	20%	6,66%	13,33%	13,33%
Turkish & English & Syriac	-	-	-	-	0%	0%	6,66%	13,33%
Turkish & English	-	-	20%	20%	0%	0%	13,33%	6,66%
Turkish & Arabic	-	-	-	-	6,66%	0%	0%	0%
Turkish & English & Arabic	-	-	-	-	0%	0%	0%	6,66%
Turkish & Kurdish	-	-	-	-	6,66%	0%	0%	0%
Turkish & English & Kurdish	-	-	-	-	0%	0%	6,66%	6,66%
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 3 shows the findings regarding the languages reported by participants in the Turkish L1 Group and the Simultaneous L1 Group for different internal thinking activities. In this context, the languages reported to be activated during activities such as calculating, memorizing a phone number, training/exercising, and studying were examined. The data reveal that participants' language preferences differ not only according to social communication contexts but also according to the nature of the mental activities they perform.

Findings regarding the Turkish L1 group show that Turkish significantly stands out in the activities of calculating and memorizing a phone number. In both activities, all participants (100%) reported using only Turkish. In contrast, language preferences differed in the training/exercising and studying activities. In both activities, 20% of participants stated that they used only Turkish, 60% only English, and 20% used both Turkish and English. This distribution indicates that in the Turkish first language group, Turkish is preferred for activities such as numerical operations and memorizing phone numbers, while English is reported more frequently in the training/exercising and studying activities.

In the simultaneous bilingual language group, Turkish is seen to hold a significant position in the activities of calculating and memorizing a phone number. During calculation, 66.66% of participants reported using only Turkish, 20% used Turkish and Syriac, 6.66% used Turkish and Arabic, and 6.66% used Turkish and Kurdish together. Therefore, Turkish is included in all reported language preferences in this activity. This finding indicates that participants

with different first languages activate Turkish alone or in combination with other languages during numerical operations. In the activity of memorizing a phone number, the use of Turkish alone reached a higher rate. 86.66% of participants reported using only Turkish, 6.66% only English, and 6.66% used both Turkish and Syriac. This distribution reveals that Turkish was predominantly preferred by simultaneous bilingual participants in the phone number memorization activity. Furthermore, the absence of reports for Arabic and Kurdish in this activity indicates that not all languages in the linguistic repertoire are activated to the same extent in every mental activity. Findings regarding the training/exercising activity show that a wider variety of language preferences emerged in the simultaneous bilingual group. 26.66% of participants reported using only Turkish, 20% only English, 13.33% only Syriac, 13.33% Turkish and Syriac, 13.33% Turkish and English, 6.66% Turkish, English, and Syriac, and 6.66% Turkish, English, and Kurdish together. These findings indicate that rather than a single language being distinctly dominant in this activity, different languages and language combinations were reported. However, the presence of Turkish in multiple language combinations suggests that this language plays a major role in this mental activity. In the studying activity, the language preferences of the participants were even more diverse. In this activity, 13.33% of the participants stated that they used only Turkish, 33.33% only English, 6.66% only Syriac, 13.33% Turkish and Syriac, 13.33% Turkish, English, and Syriac, 6.66% Turkish and English, 6.66% Turkish, English, and Arabic, and 6.66% Turkish, English, and Kurdish together. This distribution shows that English alone was the most frequently reported language in the studying activity. However,

the inclusion of Turkish, Syriac, Arabic, and Kurdish in different combinations reveals that the participants stated that they utilized more than one linguistic source in their learning and studying activities.

When comparing the two participant groups, a similar trend is observed in terms of Turkish being prominent in the activities of calculating and memorizing a phone number. However, while only Turkish was reported in these activities in the Turkish L1 group, there were instances where Turkish was used along with other first languages in the simultaneous bilingual group. In contrast, English appears to be more visible in both groups in the training/exercising and studying activities. The fact that English was used alone in 60% of the activities, particularly in the Turkish-first language group, indicates that language preferences can vary depending on the nature of the activity. In the simultaneous bilingual group, training/exercising and studying activities stand out as areas where more diverse language combinations are reported. The inclusion of Syriac, Arabic, and Kurdish in various combinations alongside Turkish and English in these activities indicates that participants utilize multiple elements of their linguistic repertoire in their statements regarding internal thought processes. However, the reporting of Arabic and Kurdish only in specific combinations and at low rates suggests that the languages are not evenly distributed among the activities.

When considered together with the findings regarding social networks presented in Table 2, the results in Table 3 show that Turkish plays an important role in both daily communication and some internal thinking activities. However, it is not possible to say that there is a complete overlap be-

tween the languages used in social environments and the languages reported in internal thinking processes. The prominence of English and different language combinations, especially in training/exercising and studying activities, suggests that participants' language preferences may vary depending on the activity performed. In conclusion, self-reports regarding internal thought processes reveal that participants use languages from their linguistic repertoires in varying proportions in different mental activities. Turkish holds a prominent position, particularly in calculating and memorizing phone numbers, while English and other first languages are reported at varying levels in, while English and other first languages are reported at varying levels in the training/exercising and studying activities. However, these results are based on participants' own assessments. Therefore, determining the extent to which these statements overlap with language use observed during English written production requires examining the findings obtained from think-aloud protocols.

4.8 Actual Language Activation in Think-Aloud Protocols

Table 4 displays the findings of the descriptive statistics on the number of words identified in written texts and protocols categorized by L1 categories. Furthermore, Table 5 illustrates the allocation of language utilization in protocols based on the L1 categories. The methodology proposed by Manchon et al. (2007, as cited in Tullock & Fernández-Villanueva, 2013) was employed to calculate the words and their respective percentages in the think-aloud protocols. Initially, the total word count in the protocols was calculated. Subsequently, every word in the protocol was scruti-

nized, and the number of words from each participant's L1 was determined. Adhering to this methodology, the proportions of all words by language were calculated and then displayed in tables categorized by L1 groups.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics for number of words in compositions and protocols according to L1 groups

Participant Code	L1	C1	P1	C2	P2	C3	P3	C4	P4	C5	P5
BS	Turkish	230	312	165	199	165	147	160	173	138	127
AY	Turkish	171	262	154	226	258	327	152	176	153	205
FCB	Turkish	152	195	368	267	142	119	206	161	129	112
FA	Turkish	127	175	233	326	180	241	193	302	174	237
SG	Turkish	97	111	185	209	204	210	189	194	171	171
EG	Turkish-Arabic	134	141	116	158	143	170	150	169	101	128
SA	Turkish-Arabic	128	156	119	132	119	122	132	142	195	214
ZB	Turkish-Arabic	219	279	191	246	170	223	171	206	188	210
ZU	Turkish-Arabic	120	141	78	98	116	129	190	215	98	135
YS	Turkish-Arabic	132	191	215	237	188	142	176	284	95	117
BM	Turkish-Kurdish	213	306	277	344	229	277	245	299	224	293
CT	Turkish-Kurdish	285	367	234	282	234	282	142	169	127	159
FK	Turkish-Kurdish	137	184	163	187	148	176	129	153	150	189
RS	Turkish-Kurdish	431	909	244	331	363	470	188	213	200	439
SA	Turkish-Kurdish	593	349	241	610	246	575	251	544	264	556
HE	Turkish-Syriac	174	228	218	263	265	335	322	392	234	285
KD	Turkish-Syriac	130	250	141	343	161	366	200	451	173	359
MA	Turkish-Syriac	222	236	307	313	279	342	281	281	203	205
TE	Turkish-Syriac	195	194	200	213	279	292	277	293	230	237
YV	Turkish-Syriac	203	217	251	267	244	271	240	275	228	244

* The first letters of abbreviations in the name column represent the participants codes.
** The abbreviation of C represents the word "composition" and P represents the word "protocol."

Table 4 shows a comparative analysis of the word counts used by individuals from the four language groups participating in the study in their English compositions cre-

ated within five separate writing activities and in the think-aloud protocols accompanying these activities. The findings reveal that the vast majority of participants used more words in the think-aloud protocols compared to their written texts. While this trend was observed across participants with diverse linguistic backgrounds, there were differences at the individual level and in some applications.

The fact that the number of words in the think-aloud protocols exceeds the number of words in the written texts indicates that participants verbally express thoughts that are not directly reflected in the written product when creating English compositions. This suggests that the written production process is not limited only to the expressions in the final text; participants are able to engage in more comprehensive verbal production while creating their texts. However, the use of more words in think-aloud protocols does not, by itself, mean that more languages are activated. Determining the extent to which different languages in the participants' linguistic repertoires are used requires a separate examination of the distribution of words in the protocols according to languages. Therefore, while the findings in Table 4 reveal the quantitative differences between the thinking and written production processes of the participants, they also provide a basis for evaluating the linguistic activation patterns to be addressed in subsequent analyses.

4.9 Actual Language Use in Protocols

Table 5 presents the number of words used in participants’ protocols belonging to their previously learned languages.

Table 5. Distribution of Language Use in Protocols according to L1 Groups

Participant Code	L1	Words in Protocols	English Words in Protocols	Turkish Words in Protocols	Arabic Words in Protocols	Kurdish Words in Protocols	Syriac Words in Protocols
BS	Turkish	958	4	954	-	-	-
AY	Turkish	1196	1048	148	-	-	-
FCB	Turkish	709	5	704	-	-	-
FA	Turkish	1281	1106	175	-	-	-
SG	Turkish	895	806	89	-	-	-
EG	Turkish-Arabic	766	680	81	5	-	-
SA	Turkish-Arabic	766	700	64	2	-	-
ZB	Turkish-Arabic	1164	922	240	2	-	-
ZU	Turkish-Arabic	718	606	100	12	-	-
YS	Turkish-Arabic	971	939	32	-	-	-

BM	Turkish-Kurdish	1519	1330	179	-	10	-
CT	Turkish-Kurdish	1275	886	379	-	10	-
FK	Turkish-Kurdish	889	777	112	-	-	-
RS	Turkish-Kurdish	2362	1425	302	-	635	-
SA	Turkish-Kurdish	2634	1025	650	-	959	-
HE	Turkish-Syriac	1503	1199	147	-	-	157
KD	Turkish-Syriac	1769	1065	672	-	-	32
MA	Turkish-Syriac	1377	1316	37	-	-	24
TE	Turkish-Syriac	1229	1153	76	-	-	-
YV	Turkish-Syriac	1274	1176	80	-	-	18

* The first letters of abbreviations in the name column represent the participants codes.
** The abbreviation of C represents the word “composition” and P represents the word “protocol.”

Table 5 shows the distribution of languages used in the think-aloud protocols created by participants during English writing activities. The findings reveal that multilingual individuals can activate different languages in their linguistic repertoire when creating a written text in the target

language. However, there are significant differences among participants in terms of the frequency and relative intensity of the languages used. These differences are not limited to the linguistic backgrounds of the participants but are also observed in the think-aloud protocols of individuals belonging to the same language group. Therefore, the data indicate that linguistic activation in multilingual writing processes does not occur in the same way for all participants.

When the protocols of participants who have acquired Turkish as their first language are examined, it is observed that Turkish and English are activated in varying degrees. In the think-aloud protocols of participant coded BS, Turkish stands out significantly, and it is understood that he largely expresses his thoughts through his first language when creating his written text. Similarly, participant coded AY also activates the languages he knows in the writing process, but his protocols show a pattern where Turkish usage predominates. In the protocols of participant coded FCB, Turkish also holds an important place, while the use of English words remains quite limited. These findings indicate that these participants heavily utilize their first languages to verbally express their thoughts when producing written work in English. In contrast, it appears that English holds a more prominent position in the think-aloud protocols of participants coded FA and SG. Both participants primarily expressed their thoughts in the target language when creating English compositions but also used Turkish in certain parts of their protocols. This reveals that individuals with the same first language can exhibit different linguistic activation patterns when writing in the target language. Therefore, it is not possible to argue that Turkish was equally dominant for

all participants. While some participants expressed their thoughts largely through Turkish, others used English more intensively and resorted to Turkish when necessary.

In the protocols of participants who simultaneously acquired Turkish and Arabic as their first languages, English generally predominates, Turkish is used as the second most important linguistic resource, and Arabic is used to a very limited extent. In the protocols of participant coded EG, English is identified as the most frequently used language, while Turkish also plays a role in the thought process. The use of Arabic is limited to five words in only the first protocol. Similarly, the use of Arabic in participant coded SA is limited to two words in only the first protocol. The prominence of English and Turkish in this participant's other protocols indicates that Arabic has a limited place in the verbally expressed thoughts during writing. While the protocols of participant ZB show a predominantly English usage, it appears that Turkish is used more effectively compared to some other participants. Arabic is represented only in the last protocol with two words. In the protocols of participant ZU, English and Turkish hold a prominent position, while Arabic is limited to 5, 1, 4, and 2 words, respectively, in the first four protocols. Participant YS, on the other hand, did not use any Arabic words in any of his protocols. In this participant's last four protocols, the number of Turkish words was recorded as 7, 5, 17, and 3, respectively; English was the predominantly used language in the verbal expression of thoughts. When these findings are considered together, it is understood that participants who have acquired Turkish and Arabic as first languages do not activate both first languages equally in their English writing processes. The fact that

Turkish is used more frequently than Arabic, in addition to the intensity of English in the protocols, shows that having more than one first language does not mean that these languages will be activated with the same intensity during writing. However, the limited use of Arabic should not be interpreted as meaning that the participants do not know or use this language in their daily lives. The situation observed here is limited to the level of use of Arabic in the think-aloud protocols accompanying the English writing activities conducted within the scope of the research.

The protocols of participants who simultaneously acquired Turkish and Kurdish as their first languages exhibit a more variable pattern in terms of linguistic activation. In the protocols of participant coded BM, English is predominantly used, followed by Turkish, and Kurdish appears only in the first protocol with ten words. A similar pattern is observed in participant coded CT. This participant used Kurdish only in the first protocol with ten words and did not include Kurdish in the other protocols. English was the most frequently used language in all applications except for the second protocol. In participant coded FK's protocols, no use of Kurdish was observed; English and, to a lesser extent, Turkish were activated in the thought process. These results indicate that these three participants used the target language and Turkish more than Kurdish when verbally expressing their thoughts while writing in English. In contrast, a different pattern emerges in the protocols of participants coded RS and SA. While English is the most frequently used language in the thought processes of the RS-coded participant, Kurdish also holds a significant place and is used more actively than Turkish. In the protocols of the SA-coded par-

ticipant, Kurdish is more prominent than Turkish, and the use of English and Kurdish is at similar levels in some protocols. However, Turkish also played a role in the participant's thought processes. The absence of English word usage in the first protocol of the SA indicates that linguistic activation can vary even among different applications of the same individual. The findings for participants of the Turkish-Kurdish L1 Group clearly demonstrate that individuals with the same linguistic repertoire can use different languages to varying degrees in their thought processes. In some participants, Kurdish was used to a very limited extent, while in others it was used more than Turkish. Therefore, it is not possible to draw a general conclusion that one language, Turkish or Kurdish, is superior to the other for all participants. On the contrary, the findings show that examining individual language use patterns is important for understanding multilingual writing processes.

In the protocols of participants who simultaneously acquired Turkish and Syriac as first languages, English generally predominated, but the usage levels of Turkish and Syriac varied among individuals. In the protocols of participant coded HE, all three languages were activated, with English being the most prominent. However, the similar usage levels of Turkish and Syriac words indicate that this participant utilized both of their first languages during writing. In the protocols of participant coded KD, English and Turkish are predominantly used, while Syriac is used to a more limited extent. The use of Syriac words was limited to 15, 1, 10, and 6 words in the first, third, fourth, and fifth protocols, respectively; no Syriac words were used in the second protocol. This finding indicates that Turkish holds a more

prominent position among the participant's two first languages. The protocols of participant MA also show a predominantly English usage. The participant's use of a total of 37 Turkish and 24 Syriac words across five protocols indicates that both first languages are involved in the thought process, but their usage levels are limited compared to English. In participant TE's protocols, no Syriac word usage was observed; Turkish accompanied the predominantly English thought process to a certain extent. In participant YV's protocols, all three languages are used, but English is significantly more prominent. While the usage levels of Turkish and Syriac words are limited, it appears that Turkish is more actively used than Syriac. These results reveal that participants who have acquired Turkish and Syriac as their first languages predominantly use the target language in their English writing processes, but the level of activation of their first languages differs among them. While some participants used Turkish and Syriac in similar proportions, for others, Turkish was more prominent, and Syriac was not used at all. Therefore, the activation of languages in the linguistic repertoire in thought processes exhibits a different pattern among individuals.

When the findings presented in Table 5 are evaluated in general, it is understood that multilingual participants activate different languages in their English writing processes, but the usage levels of these languages are not equal. While the relative intensity of Turkish and English varies among participants who have acquired Turkish as their only first language, English is seen to hold a significant position in the majority of simultaneous bilingual participants. However, the varying levels of use of Turkish, Arabic, Kurdish, and

Syriac in different participants indicate that linguistic activation during writing is not a uniform process.

Another particularly noteworthy finding is that bilingual participants did not always use their two first languages with the same intensity. The fact that Arabic was used at a very limited level in the protocols, while Kurdish and Syriac were more prominently used by some participants, suggests that first language status alone is not sufficient to explain the frequency of use. However, it is not possible to definitively determine the reasons for these differences solely based on the word distributions in the protocols.

The presence of words from multiple languages in think-aloud protocols provides observable evidence that participants utilize diverse linguistic resources during their English written production. However, the inclusion of words from different languages within the same protocol alone does not explain the functions of the transitions between these languages. Therefore, it is important to evaluate linguistic activation not only through word count but also through the linguistic choices participants make during writing and the contexts of those choices.

In conclusion, Table 5 shows that multilingual individuals use their linguistic repertoires in different ways during their English writing processes and that this use varies individually. The findings reveal that the target language can hold an important position in thought processes, but previously acquired languages continue to be activated during written production. These patterns observed in the participants' think-aloud protocols offer important findings for understanding the role of linguistic repertoire in the writing

process. However, the similarities and differences between the languages that participants reported using and the language uses observed in the protocols need to be evaluated separately.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion, Implications, and Conclusion

5.1 Interpretation of Major Findings

This research aimed to examine the thought processes of multilingual English learners when creating written texts in the target language and the interactions between different languages in their linguistic repertoire during these processes. The fundamental starting point of the research was to understand the extent and manner in which multilingual individuals use their previously acquired languages when producing written work in a new language. Accordingly, participants' linguistic backgrounds, the languages they reported using in their social environments and internal thought processes, and the language use observed in their think-aloud protocols during English writing activities were evaluated together. The findings show that the writing processes of multilingual individuals cannot be explained solely through the target language and that different elements of their linguistic repertoire can be activated to varying degrees in these processes.

The context of the research in Türkiye is crucial in interpreting these findings. While Turkish is defined as the official language of the state in the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey, Turkey has a social structure where different linguistic and cultural communities coexist. Especially in multilingual and multicultural regions like Mardin, individuals' linguistic experiences can vary far beyond what can be defined by a single first language. This situation necessitates considering social and individual differences when evaluating the linguistic backgrounds and foreign learning

processes of individuals. The research findings also reveal that participants learning English in the same educational environment can differ from each other in terms of their linguistic repertoires and the ways they use these repertoires.

One of the key findings of the study is that participants reported activating multiple languages at different stages of the English writing process. The prominent role of Turkish, particularly in the task-examining and idea-generating stages, indicates that participants were able to utilize previously acquired linguistic resources when understanding the writing task and formulating their thoughts. Conversely, the increased prominence of English in the idea-organizing, process-controlling, and text-generating stages reveals that reported language preferences were not consistent across all stages of the writing process. Therefore, instead of assuming continuous dominance of one language in multilingual writing processes, it seems more appropriate to adopt an approach where different linguistic resources are prominent in different writing activities.

Findings regarding participants' language use in their social networks also provide an important context supporting this assessment. While participants who had acquired Turkish solely as their first language reported using Turkish in their social circles, participants who were simultaneously bilingual were found to use different languages and language combinations in their intra-family and extra-family relationships. The continued use of Arabic, Kurdish, and Syriac in family and kinship relations, in particular, indicates that these languages hold a functional place in the participants' daily lives. However, the widespread reporting of Turkish in different social interactions reveals that even if

participants had more than one first language, they utilized a common language of communication within their social environment.

When examining self-reports regarding internal thinking processes, it becomes clear that language preferences vary depending on the activity performed. While Turkish is prominent in the activities of calculating and memorizing a phone number, English and combinations of different languages are reported more frequently in training/exercising and studying activities. This suggests that generalizations about mental activities being conducted solely through a single language may be limited. This finding is consistent with assessments that multilingual individuals use different resources within their linguistic repertoire in varying proportions across different activities. However, it is not possible to draw definitive conclusions about the entirety of participants' thinking processes based solely on self-reports. Therefore, observational data obtained from think-aloud protocols are also of particular importance in this research.

Analysis of think-aloud protocols revealed significant individual differences in the distribution of languages used by participants during English writing. While some participants who had Turkish as their sole first language showed a predominantly Turkish usage, others had a more dominant English usage. In a significant portion of bilingual participants, English was prominent in think-aloud protocols, but Turkish, Arabic, Kurdish, and Syriac were activated to varying degrees. These findings indicate that the number of languages spoken by participants or their first language status alone does not explain which language will be used more frequently during writing.

It is noteworthy that Arabic was used to a very limited extent in the protocols of participants, especially those with a first-language background in Turkish-Arabic, while Turkish and English were used more frequently. Among Turkish-Kurdish participants, the level of Kurdish use varied among individuals; some used Kurdish very sparingly, while others used it more than Turkish. Similarly, among Turkish-Syriac participants, English was generally more prominent, but the levels of use of Turkish and Syriac varied depending on the participant. These results reveal that the use of linguistic repertoires by multilingual individuals does not exhibit a homogeneous structure and that it is necessary to consider individual language experiences.

Another important aspect of the study is that it allows for the simultaneous evaluation of the languages participants reported using and the language use observed in think-aloud protocols. While Turkish stood out in many activities in self-reports, the dominance of English for some participants in think-aloud protocols suggests that reported language preferences and observed usage during a specific writing task may not always exhibit the same pattern. This difference does not mean that participants' statements are invalid. On the contrary, it should be considered that self-reports provide information about individuals' general linguistic experiences, while think-aloud protocols make verbal production visible within the context of a specific task. Therefore, the two data types assist in comprehending different aspects of multilingual writing processes.

These findings also highlight the limitations of approaches that explain bilingualism and multilingualism solely on the basis of monolingualism. Grosjean (1985) em-

phasizes that bilingual individuals should not be considered as the sum of two independent monolingual individuals. Similarly, Cook's (1992) multi-competence approach necessitates that the linguistic knowledge of individuals who speak more than one language be considered as a whole, distinct from the linguistic competence of monolingual individuals. From the perspective of these theoretical approaches, the different linguistic activation patterns observed in the study demonstrate that the linguistic experiences of multilingual participants cannot be reduced solely to their performance in the target language.

The research findings are also significant from the perspective of the translanguaging approach in evaluating the interaction between languages. Canagarajah (2011) argues that multilingual individuals can utilize different linguistic resources during communication and that explaining language use through rigid linguistic boundaries is not always sufficient. In this context, the use of words from different languages in the participants' think-aloud protocols shows that multiple linguistic resources can be activated during writing. However, the presence of words from different languages in the same protocol alone does not explain which functions these resources serve. Therefore, when evaluating these findings within the framework of translanguaging, it is important to consider the contexts in which linguistic transitions occur and their functions in the writing process.

Overall, the main contribution of this research is to present findings based on both self-report and think-aloud protocols regarding how individuals learning multilingual English utilize their linguistic repertoire in their writing processes. The research reveals that linguistic activation can

differ according to participants' first-language backgrounds, the activity undertaken, and individual usage patterns. In particular, the fact that English stands out for many participants in think-aloud protocols, despite Turkish having an important position in social settings and some internal thinking activities, demonstrates that multilingual writing processes cannot be explained solely through the constant dominance of a single language. In this respect, the research findings offer a contextual contribution to the theoretical discussions regarding the need for a holistic approach to the linguistic repertoires of multilingual individuals. They also emphasize the necessity of considering students' diverse linguistic backgrounds, individual characteristics, and linguistic resources used in their learning processes in foreign language teaching in Türkiye. However, these results should be evaluated within the context of the research's participant group and data collection context; it is important to avoid making generalizations without broader participant populations.

5.2 Pedagogical Implications for Foreign Language Education

The results obtained offer various implications for the planning and implementation of foreign language education in Türkiye.

Firstly, the linguistic background of foreign language learners should not be evaluated solely on the basis of their proficiency in the target language. It should be considered that students with multiple first languages participate in the learning process with diverse linguistic experiences and resources. In this respect, instead of approaches based on the assumption of a monolingual student profile in foreign lan-

guage teaching, it is important to develop approaches that recognize the linguistic diversity of learners and consider this diversity as part of the teaching process.

Secondly, the potential roles of previously acquired languages in the process of learning a new language should not be overlooked for multilingual individuals. Research findings show that participants, while writing in English, were able to activate not only the target language but also their previously acquired languages at varying levels. This suggests that, instead of completely excluding students' existing linguistic repertoires in foreign language teaching, they can be considered within appropriate teaching activities. However, the findings of the research do not directly demonstrate that any particular teaching approach is more effective than others. Therefore, pedagogical recommendations should be considered as inferences developed based on the language use patterns observed in the research.

Thirdly, it is important to consider the individual differences among learners in foreign language teaching. Even participants with the same linguistic background exhibit different linguistic activation patterns when writing in English, indicating that teaching processes may not be sufficient if they are tailored solely to the languages students already know. Students' language usage habits, learning experiences, and the linguistic resources they utilize in specific tasks are also factors that can be considered when evaluating the teaching process. In this respect, learner-centered teaching approaches that consider individual diversity are crucial for meeting the needs of multilingual learning environments.

Finally, current theoretical discussions on multilingualism need to be considered in the development of foreign language teaching programs. Instead of viewing multilingualism as an obstacle in the learning process, it is important to investigate how students' linguistic resources can be utilized in educational settings. Approaches to multilingualism and language education discussed by Canagarajah (2006) and Hult (2012) provide a theoretical framework for evaluating linguistic diversity in educational contexts. Lewis et al. (2012) discuss the pedagogical possibilities of translanguaging practices, such as supporting conceptual understanding, improving students' proficiency in different languages, and strengthening the relationship between home and school languages. These approaches highlight the importance of considering the previously acquired languages of multilingual students in their learning processes.

5.3 Contributions to Multilingualism and Applied Linguistics

This research contributes to the fields of multilingualism and applied linguistics at theoretical, empirical, contextual, and methodological levels by examining how multilingual individuals utilize diverse resources within their linguistic repertoire when producing written work in a target language. The scientific significance of this study lies in its avoidance of evaluating multilingualism solely through the number of languages individuals know or their proficiency levels in those languages. Instead, the research addresses how the linguistic repertoire is activated during a specific writing task and how different linguistic resources become visible in verbally expressed thought processes. This approach contributes to the study of multilingualism not as a

stable accumulation of grammar, but as a whole of linguistic resources used in different ways within specific contexts.

One approach that has long been influential in multilingualism research is the tendency to view the languages individuals know as independent systems. From this perspective, the competencies of multilingual individuals can be explained by examining their performance in each language separately. However, Grosjean (1985) pointed out the inadequacy of evaluating bilingual individuals as the sum of two independent monolingual individuals. Similarly, Cook (1992), with the concept of multi-competence, argued that the presence of knowledge of more than one language within the same mental structure constitutes a different form of competence than the linguistic knowledge of monolingual individuals. These approaches offer an alternative theoretical framework to evaluating the linguistic characteristics of multilingual individuals based on monolingual criteria.

The current research contributes to these holistic approaches through empirical data obtained from multilingual writing processes. The participants' ability to activate words from different languages while creating English compositions demonstrates that examining written production in a target language solely based on knowledge of that language may be limited. What is important here is not the presence of multiple languages in the individual's repertoire, but rather the observable use of these languages in a specific production process. In this respect, the research reveals that multilingual competence should be assessed not only through the linguistic knowledge possessed but also through the use of this knowledge during the task. However, since

the study does not directly measure the mental organization of languages, it does not claim to definitively validate holistic multilingualism theories. The contribution of the research is to provide contextual evidence on how these theories can be used to explain multilingual writing processes.

The theoretical contribution of the research can be evaluated in more detail within the framework of the Focus on Multilingualism approach developed by Cenoz and Gorter (2011). Cenoz and Gorter point out the limitations of treating the linguistic competencies of multilingual individuals as independent and separately measured systems and suggest that the entire linguistic repertoire should be evaluated together. Their study on trilingual writing reveals the importance of considering the relationships between different languages and the individual's entire linguistic experience when examining the written production of multilingual individuals. This perspective offers an important orientation in multilingualism studies towards including all linguistic resources possessed by the individual in the research process, instead of evaluating only the performance in the target language. This study contributes to the literature by examining this theoretical approach through English writing activities carried out within Türkiye's multilingual social structure. The inclusion of participants with Turkish as their sole first language, as well as individuals with Turkish-Arabic, Turkish-Kurdish, and Turkish-Syriac first language backgrounds, allowed for the examination of diverse linguistic repertoires within the framework of a writing task in the same target language. Thus, the study demonstrates that in multilingual writing research, linguistic background can be considered not only as a categorical participant charac-

teristic but also as a variable to be taken into account in evaluating the linguistic resources used during writing. In this respect, the research contributes to the discussion of Cenoz and Gorter's (2011) holistic multilingualism approach in different linguistic and social contexts.

From the perspective of the concept of linguistic repertoire, another contribution of the research is that it makes visible the distinction between possessing linguistic resources and using those resources in a specific task. The fact that a multilingual individual has acquired more than one language does not mean that these languages will be used with equal intensity in all communicative or cognitive activities. Research on the use of linguistic repertoire requires examining not only which languages an individual knows but also under what conditions these languages are activated. The present research addresses this distinction through the observation of spoken language use in the English writing process. In this respect, the study goes beyond approaches that consider linguistic repertoire merely as an inventory of language names, placing the usage dimension of the repertoire at the center of the research. This assessment can also be linked to Jessner's (2008) work, which addresses multilingualism within the framework of a dynamic systems approach. Jessner argues that the linguistic systems of multilingual individuals interact with each other and that multilingual development can have non-linear characteristics. This approach makes it possible to consider multilingualism not as a structure composed of fixed linguistic competencies but as a complex system in which various interactions take place. The observation of different usage patterns among individuals with the same linguistic background in

the present research is related to this discussion in that it shows that the linguistic behavior of multilingual individuals cannot be predicted solely based on the languages they know. However, the limitations of this study's contribution to the dynamic systems approach should also be clarified. The study is not longitudinal research that tracks the linguistic development of participants over a long period. Therefore, it is not possible to draw definitive conclusions about the developmental changes of linguistic systems over time based on the data obtained. The study's contribution lies in providing an empirical example of individual differences and contextual sensitivity, issues emphasized by dynamic multilingualism approaches, by revealing the diversity observed among multilingual individuals and within specific writing practices. Thus, the study emphasizes the need to avoid assumptions of uniform linguistic behavior when examining multilingual writing processes.

The research also contributes to discussions in the fields of interlingual interaction and additional language acquisition. De Angelis (2007) demonstrates that the languages individuals have previously acquired are an important subject of research in third or additional language acquisition and that learning a new language cannot be explained solely through the relationship between the first language and the target language. This approach is particularly important in evaluating the production processes in the target language of multilingual individuals. In traditional second language acquisition research, focusing on the influence of the first language on the target language can lead to an insufficient examination of the role of other linguistic resources of multilingual individuals. Additional language ac-

quisition research, on the other hand, offers the opportunity to evaluate the relationship of multiple linguistic resources to learning and production processes in a more comprehensive way. The contribution of the current research to this field is to examine which linguistic resources individuals with multiple first languages activate in their English writing processes. Participant profiles, particularly those involving simultaneous bilingualism, demonstrate that the traditional distinction between first and second languages may not be sufficient to explain all language acquisition histories. The research provides data suggesting that previously acquired languages can be verbally activated during written production in the target language. However, this activation should not be considered direct evidence of the transfer of a particular linguistic structure from one language to another. Determining interlingual transfer requires a separate examination of linguistic forms and their functions within the production process. Therefore, the study's contribution is to emphasise the necessity of a conceptual separation between interlingual activation and interlingual transfer.

Another area where the study contributes to the multilingualism literature is the association of the concept of translanguaging with writing processes. Canagarajah (2011) argues that multilingual individuals can utilize different linguistic resources during communication and that linguistic meaning-making processes cannot always be explained through language systems that are strictly separated. This approach necessitates examining how different linguistic resources are used in specific contexts, rather than evaluating the language use of multilingual individuals solely through the number of transitions from one language to another. In

this respect, translanguaging offers an important theoretical perspective for a holistic assessment of the linguistic repertoire in multilingual writing processes. The current research contributes to this discussion through the linguistic activation observed in think-aloud protocols. The participants' use of words from different languages while writing in English demonstrates that producing written work in the target language does not require the complete exclusion of other linguistic resources. However, the research findings also suggest that the presence of words from different languages in the same protocol alone is insufficient to explain all translanguaging processes. The use of different linguistic resources during the same task, and whether these resources perform functions such as meaning-making, text organization, or solving linguistic problems, should be evaluated at separate analytical levels. Considering this distinction can contribute to a more careful and explanatory use of the translanguaging concept in multilingual writing research.

One of the significant contributions of this research to the field of applied linguistics is the combined evaluation of product-oriented and process-oriented data in the study of multilingual writing processes. In foreign language writing research, final texts are an important data source for evaluating students' linguistic output. However, examining only completed texts may not be sufficient to understand all the decisions and linguistic choices made during writing. While the written product represents the outcome of the production process, process-oriented data collection methods allow for the investigation of certain operations that occur during the creation of the text. Therefore, the combined use of different data sources is methodologically important in understand-

ing writing processes. Sasaki's (2000) study examining writing processes in a foreign language highlights the importance of process-oriented data in researching writing behaviors. Sasaki's approach suggests that going beyond the written text and examining the process of text creation can provide more detailed explanations for research on writing in a foreign language. The present research relates this methodological orientation to the use of linguistic repertoires by multilingual individuals. The combined evaluation of participants' English compositions and the accompanying think-aloud protocols allowed for the examination of the relationship between the written product and verbally expressed thought processes. A key aspect of this methodological contribution is that think-aloud protocols are considered not only as data providing descriptive statements about participants' thoughts but also as examineable linguistic productions related to the languages used. Classifying the words in the protocols according to language allowed for the determination of the distribution of linguistic resources verbally activated during writing. Thus, the study demonstrates that quantitative and qualitative assessments can be used together to examine the use of different languages in multilingual writing processes. While word counts provide information on the distribution of linguistic activation, the content analysis of the protocols allows for the correlation of these distributions with specific writing processes. However, the quality of the data provided by think-aloud protocols needs careful consideration. These protocols do not directly record the entire thought process of the participants; they make the thoughts that participants verbally express during the task accessible to the researcher. Therefore, the absence of a particular language in the protocol should not be interpreted as

definitive proof that that language was not activated at all at the mental level. Similarly, the high frequency of use of a language in the protocol does not mean that that language is equally dominant in all cognitive processes. The methodological contribution of the research is to use think-aloud data not as a complete reflection of mental processes but in the examination of observable verbal production accompanying multilingual writing.

Another methodological contribution of the study is the evaluation of participants' self-reports regarding language use in conjunction with their observed language use during the task. In multilingualism research, surveys and interviews provide important information about individuals' linguistic backgrounds, social relationships, and perceptions of their language use habits. However, individuals' statements about their general usage habits and the linguistic behaviors they exhibit during a specific task are not the same type of data. Therefore, it should not be assumed that these data sources are directly interchangeable. By using different data collection tools together, the research allowed for the evaluation of both reported and observed usage dimensions of the linguistic repertoires of multilingual individuals. This approach highlights the importance of using complementary data sources in applied linguistics. Self-reports offer a broad context for participants' linguistic experiences, while think-aloud protocols provide an opportunity to examine spoken language use during a specific writing task. The combined evaluation of these two data types reveals the limitations of explaining the language use of multilingual individuals through only a single research method. Thus, the research provides a methodological example of interpreting informa-

tion from different data sources in the study of multilingual writing processes without reducing them to one another.

The contextual contribution of this research is its examination of multilingual writing processes within the linguistic and cultural diversity of Türkiye, particularly using the example of Mardin. Evaluating data obtained from different social contexts is crucial for the theoretical development of multilingualism research. Social conditions, educational experiences, and linguistic interaction environments that can influence the use of linguistic repertoires may not occur in the same way in different communities. Therefore, how explanations developed in a specific social context can be evaluated in other multilingual communities is an important research topic for the field's development. Mardin, with its diverse linguistic and cultural coexistence, offers a research context that allows for the examination of the linguistic experiences of multilingual individuals. The presence of languages such as Turkish, Arabic, Kurdish, and Syriac in this environment is significant for investigating the linguistic repertoires of individuals with multiple first languages. This study, by examining the writing processes of individuals learning English within this social context, contributes contextual data from Türkiye to multilingualism research. The study's contribution in this respect is not only to describe the linguistic diversity in Mardin but also to examine the language use exhibited by individuals raised within this diversity during their written production in the target language. This context is also important in terms of discussions on how the concept of first language also plays a crucial role in discussions about the use of the first language concept in multilingualism research. In traditional language

acquisition research, the first language is often treated as a singular category. However, the fact that some individuals acquire more than one language from an early age indicates that the concept of first language may not be sufficient to describe all participant profiles in the same way. The inclusion of individuals with two simultaneous first languages in the study emphasizes the necessity of a more detailed definition of language acquisition history. This situation points to the importance of using the categories of first language, previously acquired language, and target language, especially in additional language acquisition research, taking into account the participants' actual linguistic backgrounds. Another aspect of the research's contextual contribution is that it allows for the separate examination of the use of a language that plays an important role at the societal level in individual writing processes. The widespread use of a language in education, social communication, or public life does not mean that it will be equally activated in all thinking and writing activities of every individual. Therefore, societal language use and individual linguistic activation observed in specific tasks need to be considered as different levels of analysis. This study contributes to the consideration of context and individual language use together in multilingualism research by demonstrating that these two levels, while related, cannot be considered directly identical.

Another noteworthy contribution of the study from the perspective of applied linguistics is the consideration of individual differences alongside group-based comparisons. Classifying multilingual participants according to their linguistic backgrounds makes it possible to compare the language use patterns of individuals with specific repertoires.

However, the fact that individuals with the same linguistic background can exhibit different usage patterns shows that group membership alone is not sufficient to explain individual linguistic behaviors. Therefore, supporting group-level assessments with individual data can contribute to a more detailed understanding of multilingual writing processes. In this respect, the research supports the idea that individual diversity in multilingualism studies should be considered not merely as a result of statistical differences but as a significant dimension of the phenomenon the research seeks to explain. The fact that individuals with the same linguistic repertoire can activate different languages in a given task demonstrates that an invariable relationship cannot be established between linguistic background and linguistic behavior. This situation reveals the limitations of evaluating learners solely through group characteristics in applied linguistics. The contribution of the research is to emphasize the importance of examining group-based tendencies and individual usage patterns together in multilingual writing processes.

The research also highlights the analytical importance of task context in multilingual writing studies. The use of linguistic repertoire should be evaluated not only in terms of the characteristics of the languages the individual speaks but also in conjunction with the nature of the activity performed. Creating written text in the target language is a productive activity involving specific linguistic and cognitive demands. Therefore, it is not appropriate to consider the linguistic activation observed during writing as a direct equivalent of general everyday language use. The present study contributes to the task-based examination of multilingual

language behaviors by relating the use of linguistic repertoire to a specific writing task. This approach also allows for the development of new research questions at the intersection of foreign language writing studies and multilingualism studies. For example, questions such as how different writing tasks relate to linguistic activation patterns, whether individuals' use of linguistic resources changes as their writing competencies develop, or what functions different languages perform in specific writing strategies are among the topics that can be addressed in future research. While the present study does not answer all of these questions, its approach, which focuses on the use of linguistic repertoire during the task, provides a conceptual and methodological foundation for such research.

In conclusion, this research contributes to the fields of multilingualism and applied linguistics at various complementary levels. Theoretically, the study provides empirical data to support discussions on the holistic and contextually sensitive assessment of the linguistic repertoires of multilingual individuals. In terms of interlingual interaction, it contributes to the examination of how individuals with multiple first languages can activate different linguistic resources in the writing process in the target language. Methodologically, it demonstrates the possibilities that the combined use of self-reports, written texts, and think-aloud protocols can provide for understanding different dimensions of multilingual writing processes. Contextually, it increases the visibility of different linguistic experiences in the literature by utilizing data obtained from Mardin, a city within Türkiye's multilingual social structure. When these contributions are considered together, the original value of the research lies in

its avoidance of attempting to explain the writing processes of multilingual individuals through the dominance of a single language, a single participant characteristic, or a single data source. The study reveals that researchers should examine the use of linguistic repertoires in relation to individual characteristics, linguistic background, and the task performed. Thus, it contributes to studies in the fields of multilingualism and applied linguistics that not only define linguistic diversity but also investigate how this diversity becomes visible in specific linguistic production processes.

5.4 Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

This research has some limitations, although it presents important findings on how multilingual individuals utilize their linguistic repertoire in English writing processes. Firstly, the study was conducted with 20 participants who were studying in Mardin. The limited sample size and the fact that the research was conducted within a specific sociolinguistic context limit the generalization of the findings to larger multilingual participant populations. Therefore, it is recommended that comparative studies with a larger number of participants from different regions, educational levels, and linguistic backgrounds can be conducted in the future.

Another limitation of the study is that data on language use were collected through surveys, interviews, and think-aloud protocols. While self-reports reflect participants' perceptions of language use, think-aloud protocols only provide access to thoughts verbally expressed during writing. Therefore, these methods do not directly reveal the entirety of cognitive processes. Future research supplement-

ing think-aloud protocols with screen recordings, keystroke analysis, and post-writing interviews could contribute to a more detailed examination of multilingual writing processes. Furthermore, in this study, linguistic activation was largely assessed through the distribution of words used in protocols across languages. While this approach reveals the frequency of use of different languages, it does not fully explain the functions of these languages in the writing process. Therefore, future studies could examine the purposes for which linguistic transitions occur and how different languages are used in thought formation, text organization, and problem-solving processes in more detail through qualitative analyses. A limitation of the study is that it is based on specific English composition tasks. Different text types, task conditions, and writing proficiency levels may be related to how participants utilize their linguistic repertoire. Future longitudinal studies comparing different writing tasks and tracking participants' linguistic development over time could contribute to a deeper understanding of the variable characteristics of linguistic activation. Finally, current research has not directly examined the effectiveness of specific teaching practices. Therefore, it is important to evaluate the potential effects of teaching approaches that aim to utilize the linguistic repertoires of multilingual individuals on writing processes and written output through experimental or mixed-methods research.

In conclusion, it is suggested that future research should focus not only on identifying which languages multilingual individuals use but also on explaining under what conditions, for what purposes, and at what stages of the writing process they use these languages. This will allow for

a more comprehensive understanding of the cognitive, linguistic, and contextual dimensions of multilingual writing processes.

References

- Aronin, L., & Hufeisen, B. (2009). Crossing the second threshold. *The Exploration of Multilingualism: Development of Research on L3, Multilingualism and Multiple Language Acquisition*, 6, 155.
- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (2013). *The psychology of written composition*. Routledge.
- Birdsong, D. (2014). Dominance and age in bilingualism. *Applied linguistics*, 35(4), 374-392.
- Blommaert, J., & Backus, A. (2013). Superdiverse repertoires and the individual. In *Multilingualism and multimodality: Current challenges for educational studies* (pp. 11-32). Rotterdam: SensePublishers.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). Toward a writing pedagogy of shuttling between languages: Learning from multilingual writers. *College English*, 68(6), 589-604.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 401-417.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). Focus on multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 356-369.
- Cook, V. (1992). Evidence for multi-competence. *Language Learning*, 42, 557-591.
- Cook, V. (1995). Multi-competence and the learning of many languages. *Language, Culture and curriculum*, 8(2), 93-98.

- Cook, V. (2001). *Using the first language in the classroom. Canadian modern language review*, 57(3), 402-423.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching?. *The modern language journal*, 94(1), 103-115.
- Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second-language proficiency. *Language learning*, 39(1), 81-135.
- Çabuk, S. (2020). *Discourse particles in Kurmânjî Kurdish-Turkish contact. International Journal of Multilingualism*, 17(4), 467-484.
- De Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or additional language acquisition* (Vol. 24). Multilingual Matters.
- Efeoglu, G., Yüksel, H. G., & Baran, S. (2020). *Lexical cross-linguistic influence: a study of three multilingual learners of L3 English. International Journal of Multilingualism*, 17(4), 535-551.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition & Communication*, 32(4), 365-387.
- Galbraith, D. (1999). Writing as a knowledge-constituting process. *Knowing what to write: Conceptual processes in text production*, 4, 139-164.
- García, O. (2011). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective. John Wiley & Sons.*

- García, O., & Wei, L. (2015). Translanguaging, bilingualism, and bilingual education. *The handbook of bilingual and multilingual education*, 223-240.
- Gertken, L. M., Amengual, M., & Birdsong, D. (2014). 11. assessing language dominance with the bilingual language profile. *Leclercq, P*, 208-25.
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (2014). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective*. Routledge.
- Green, D. W. (1998). Mental control of the bilingual lexico-semantic system. *Bilingualism: Language and cognition*, 1(2), 67-81.
- Grosjean, F. (1985). The bilingual as a competent but specific speaker-hearer. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6, 467-477.
- Grosjean, F. (1989). Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and language*, 36(1), 3-15.
- Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and reality*. Harvard university press.
- Gunnarsson, T., Housen, A., van de Weijer, J., & Källkvist, M. (2015). Multilingual “Students Self-reported Use of their Language Repertoires when Writing in English. *Apples: journal of applied language studies*.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (2014). *Cohesion in english*. Routledge.

- Hammarberg, B. (2001). Roles of L1 and L2 in L3 production and acquisition. *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives*, 31, 21.
- Herdina, P., & Jessner, U. (2002). *A dynamic model of multilingualism: Perspectives of change in psycholinguistics (Vol. 121). Multilingual Matters.*
- Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International journal of bilingual education and bilingualism*, 15(3), 261-278.
- Hufeisen, B. (2005). Multilingualism: Linguistic models and related issues. *Introductory readings in L*, 3, 31-45.
- Hult, F. M. (2012). English as a transcultural language in Swedish policy and practice. *Tesol Quarterly*, 46(2), 230-257.
- Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2008). *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition*. Routledge.
- Jessner, U. (2008). A DST model of multilingualism and the role of metalinguistic awareness. *The modern language journal*, 92(2), 270-283.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (1992). Effects of first language on second language writing: Translation versus direct composition. *Language learning*, 42(2), 183-209.

- Kroll, J. F., & Stewart, E. (1994). Category interference in translation and picture naming: Evidence for asymmetric connections between bilingual memory representations. *Journal of memory and language*, 33(2), 149-174.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational research and evaluation*, 18(7), 641-654.
- Manchón, R. M., de Larios, J. R., & Murphy, L. (2000). An approximation to the study of backtracking in L2 writing. *Learning and Instruction*, 10(1), 13-35.
- Mazzaferro, G. (2018). Translanguaging as everyday practice. An introduction. In *Translanguaging as everyday practice* (pp. 1-12). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- McCutchen, D. (1996). A capacity theory of writing: Working memory in composition. *Educational psychology review*, 8(3), 299-325.
- Mitits, L., & Gavriilidou, Z. (2016). Exploring language learning strategy transfer Between Greek L2 and English FL in case of early adolescent multilinguals. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 13(3), 292-314.
- Navés, T., Miralpeix, I., & Luz Celaya, M. (2005). Who transfers more... and what? Crosslinguistic influence in relation to school grade and language dominance in EFL. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 2(2), 113-134.

- Odlin, T. (2003). Cross-linguistic influence. *The handbook of second language acquisition*, 436-486.
- Poplack, S. (2020). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: Toward a typology of code-switching. In *The bilingualism reader* (pp. 213-243). Routledge.
- Sasaki, M. (2000). Toward an empirical model of EFL writing processes: An exploratory study. *Journal of second language writing*, 9(3), 259-291.
- Simon, H. A., & Ericsson, K. A. (1984). Protocol analysis: Verbal reports as data. (*No Title*).
- Sercu, L. (2007). Acquiring Multilingualism at School. What Translation Tasks Tell Us about Adolescents' Use of the Multilingual Lexicon. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 4(1), 52-75.
- Sert, O. (2007). *Code-Switching to English in the German as a Second Foreign Language Classroom: The Case of Turkish Learners*. Online Submission.
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL quarterly*, 27(4), 657-677.
- Sofu, H. (2009). *Language shift or maintenance within three generations: Examples from three Turkish-Arabic-speaking families*. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 6(3), 246-257.
- Tanış, A., Şensoy, F. H., & Atay, D. (2020). The effects of L1 use and dialogic instruction on EFL writing. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 1-21.

- Tucker, G. R. (1999). A global perspective on bilingualism and bilingual education. *Washington, DC*.
- Tullock, B. D., & Fernández-Villanueva, M. (2013). The role of previously learned languages in the thought processes of multilingual writers at the Deutsche Schule Barcelona. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 47(4), 420-441.
- Wang, W., & Wen, Q. (2002). L1 use in the L2 composing process: An exploratory study of 16 Chinese EFL writers. *Journal of second language writing*, 11(3), 225-246.
- Widdowson, H. (2009). *Handbook of foreign language communication and learning* (Vol. 6). Walter de Gruyter.
- Williams, S., & Hammarberg, B. (1997). *L1 and L2 influence in L3 production: Evidence from language switches*. Stockholm University, Centre for Research on Bilingualism.
- Williams, S., & Hammarberg, B. (1998). Language switches in L3 production: Implications for a polyglot speaking model. *Applied linguistics*, 19(3), 295-333.

Declarations

Ethical Declaration: This book is based on the author's doctoral dissertation, titled 'The Smell of a Grandmother's Cologne: A Case Study of Multilingual Language Learners' Cross-Linguistic Interactions among Their Languages in Turkey', written under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Arif SARIÇOBAN and defended at Erciyes University in 2020.

Financial Support: This work has been supported by Erciyes University Scientific Research Projects Coordination Unit under grant number SDK-2019-8662.

Conflict of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Copyrights: The author declares that there are no required permissions to be obtained from the copyright holders.

Data Disclosure and Availability Statement: In the preparation of this book, the principles of academic integrity, transparency, and responsible tool usage have been strictly followed. QuillBot was employed exclusively for paraphrasing, text refinement, and grammatical quality control to enhance the academic fluency of the draft. The AI-supported tool served strictly as auxiliary instruments for research efficiency and language optimization; the final conceptual framework, scientific interpretation, originality, and overall ethical accountability of the content rest entirely with the authors.

