

The Multilingual Turn in Pragmatics: Is the Use of Hedges and Attitude Markers Shared Across Languages in Trilingual Writing?

Abstract

In the Valencian Community in Spain, the coexistence of Spanish and Catalan as co-official languages and English as a foreign language, which is learnt as a third language (L3), shapes a unique multilingual setting. This study examined the extent to which multilingual learners' use of two interpersonal pragmatic markers (PMs), i.e., hedges (e.g., *I believe*) and attitude markers (e.g., *fortunately*), is related across languages and whether the relationship changes over time. Participants were 313 Spanish-Catalan bilingual high school learners of L3 English. They wrote three opinion essays over one academic year in the three languages of instruction: Spanish, Catalan, and English. Quantitative results revealed a trend towards stronger correlations over time in both PMs. At Time 3, correlations were statistically significant for all language pairs in hedges and for two language pairs in attitude markers (Spanish and Catalan, Spanish and English). Qualitative analyses of the learners' essays lend support to these results and show transfer at the phrase and discourse-level.

Keywords: multilingual turn; pragmatic markers; metadiscourse; L3 pragmatics; pragmatic transfer; multilingual pragmatics

1. INTRODUCTION

Globalization has made visible the diversity of learning contexts in language education nowadays. In parallel with the recent trend of using English as the lingua franca (ELF) in educational settings, there has been a desire to maintain and respect linguistic and cultural diversity. For example, Europe presents a rich linguistic context

in which ELF coexists with regional and minority languages in education. In this regard, learners are expected to achieve successful communication in all the languages available in their linguistic repertoire. This involves developing linguistic competence in multiple languages, including competence in pragmatics. Since research has shown that different learning contexts provide different opportunities for pragmatics learning (Martín-Laguna, 2019; Taguchi, 2012), it is critical to focus on the potential of a multilingual classroom.

The goal of pragmatics learning for multilinguals needs to be reconceptualized in the current era. Traditionally, the end goal of pragmatics learning is set to become native-like in competence. A common practice in L2 pragmatics research has been to draw conclusions about L2 pragmatic competence based on a comparison of L2 learners' pragmatics performance with that of L1 speakers (Taguchi & Roever, 2017). However, in a multilingual context, the line between L1 and L2 speakers is not always clear-cut because people grow up speaking multiple languages simultaneously and they develop a hybrid competence. Hence, the goal of pragmatics learning among multilinguals has shifted from being a native speaker to being a 'multicompetent user' who can communicate using all the linguistic resources available to them (Cook, 1991; Cook & Wei, 2016).

When preparing learners for successful communication in the globalized world, one area to consider is how to prepare them for technology-mediated communication (see González-Lloret & Ortega, 2014; and Taguchi & Sykes, 2013). The increased use of new technologies with tools such as e-mail and instant messaging necessitates training learners to be pragmatically competent not only in oral, but also in written communication. Hence, pragmatic markers that occur frequently in writing are an important area of training. Pragmatic markers (PMs) are defined as a type of linguistic

resource that writers can use to present stance, express feelings and commitment towards propositions, and persuade others in logical constructions (Gray & Biber, 2014; Hyland, 2005).

Martín-Laguna and Alcón-Soler's (2018) study on Spanish, Catalan, and English writers analyzed how the learning of interpersonal PMs develops over time, while Martín-Laguna (2020) focused on the transfer of interpersonal PMs across languages. As a follow-up investigation to these two studies, the present study examines the relationship in multilinguals' use of interpersonal PMs (i.e., hedges and attitude markers) and whether the relationship changes over time. In doing so, this study adopts a multilingual turn perspective (Ortega, 2013, 2014, 2019) to the study of pragmatics learning, considering multilingual learners as multicompetent users of the languages in which they receive formal education in the school context.

2. THE MULTILINGUAL TURN IN SLA RESEARCH

As Cenoz and Gorter (2011) pointed out, until the late 1980s, SLA and bilingualism research shared three common practices. First, only one or two languages were usually analyzed as the languages of acquisition. In fact, in SLA research, it is traditionally assumed that the only language to be examined is the language being learnt or the L2 (Ortega, 2019). As a result, the role of any additionally acquired languages is generally not considered. The second common practice is that the so-called 'native speaker norm' has served as the model against which L2 linguistic competence is measured. In this practice, knowing a language from birth grants a superior competence than in any other language that may be developed over life (Ortega, 2019). The third common practice is the lack of concern toward the interaction among languages in the multilingual's repertoire, thereby establishing 'hard boundaries' among languages

(Cenoz & Gorter, 2011, 2013). This separation among languages has also been encouraged in education, where one teacher and one syllabus have been associated with one language in the school curriculum. These common practices show that ‘monolingual first language acquisition’ has been taken as the point of reference without considering the influence of other languages in the learners’ repertoire in the process of additional language learning.

In fact, SLA scholars have long questioned the so-called ‘monolingual bias and nativespeakerism’ (Ortega, 2019, p. 24). One of the early critiques of monolingual bias comes from Cook’s idea of multicompetence (Cook, 1991; Cook & Wei, 2016). According to Cook (1991), multilinguals possess a unique competence called multicompetence which involves a distinct state of mind that is not the sum of monolinguals; their competence is rather seen as a whole in which different areas among languages are closely related to each other in one person. Drawing on Cook’s claim, researchers have recently pursued alternative approaches to monolingual research that have been known as the multilingual turn (Ortega, 2013, 2014, 2019; see also Cenoz & Gorter, 2015a). Researchers under the multilingual turn emphasize adopting a holistic perspective in language learning (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011, 2015b; Herdina & Jessner, 2002).

The multilingual turn has been adopted in diverse areas of second language acquisition reconceptualizing the notion of transfer (see Cook & Wei, 2016). For a long time, transfer in SLA was associated with behaviourism in L2 learning, and characterized as negative *interference* (Weinreich, 1953). *Negative transfer* was considered to account for L2 errors, while *positive transfer* facilitated the acquisition of L2 forms (Selinker, 1969). However, more recently, there has been a change of perspective in the view of the role of transfer as a facilitator and as a hybrid competence

in multilinguals. Back in the 1980s, Kellerman and Sharwood Smith (1986) argued that the term ‘transfer’ was inadequate and proposed the term cross-linguistic influence as a superordinate theory-neutral term to refer to the interplay between earlier and later acquired languages irrespective of the direction. Nevertheless, both terms, i.e. *language transfer* and *cross-linguistic influence*, are normally used interchangeably to refer to the same phenomenon.

Since transfer or cross-linguistic influence can include mutual influence, i.e., not only the influence of the L1 on the L2, but also the influence of the L2 on the L1, it is often termed *bidirectional transfer* (e.g. Pavlenko and Jarvis, 2002). Similarly, Herdina and Jessner (2002) proposed the concept *cross-linguistic interaction* to emphasize the dynamic interaction between language systems in multilinguals. While most research is concerned with L1 and L2 influence, transfer is also present in contexts involving an L3 (De Angelis, 2007). Hence, in this paper, I will use the term *multilingual transfer*.

Cenoz and Gorter (2011) propose adopting the Focus on Multilingualism approach both in research and teaching to soften the boundaries between languages. Focus on Multilingualism is characterized by three dimensions: a focus on the multilingual speaker, a focus on the whole linguistic repertoire, and a focus on the context. This paper focuses on the linguistic repertoire, which emphasizes the need to look at multilinguals’ whole linguistic repertoire in contrast to traditional approaches in which languages are considered separately (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011). In particular, this article considers the languages in which learners are literate following the secondary school curriculum in the Valencian Community in Spain, i.e., Spanish, Catalan and English.

Most studies in writing have analyzed the L1-L2 relationship (e.g., Forbes, 2020; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2008, 2012; Rinnert, Kobayashi & Katayama, 2015), and only a few have taken into account the L3 (e.g., Cenoz & Gorter, 2011; De Angelis & Jessner,

2012; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2013a, 2013b). Regardless of the perspective taken, research has shown that L1, L2, and, if so, L3 writing knowledge is closely interrelated with writing in other languages, particularly the knowledge of common text features, such as discourse markers and strategies for presenting a counterargument (see Kobayashi and Rinnert, 2013c for a discussion). Such overlap tends to grow stronger as writing knowledge expands and develops over time (e.g. Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2008), although learners also gain in control of their use of language-specific features to meet the expectations of a particular audience or context (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2012, 2013b; Rinnert et al., 2015). For example, Kobayashi and Rinnert (2013b) analyzed a multilingual writer's texts longitudinally. Initially, the participant perceived L1 Japanese and L2 English as being entirely different, which was shown in the use of different discourse structures in Japanese and English. However, L2 writing instruction and self-directed writing practice prompted a change of perspective, resulting in merged L1 and L2 writing knowledge, which was later applied to her L3 Chinese. While multilingual transfer of discourse features was observed among her L1, L2 and L3, the participant also maintained some language-specific features, such as less frequent use of Japanese discourse markers, considering audience needs in Japanese.

Numerous factors are considered to affect transfer and transferability (see Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008, pp. 174-210 for a detailed account of factors). For example, the seminal work by Ringbom (2007) showed that typological similarities between Swedish and English, being both Germanic languages, in contrast to Finnish, which is a non-Indo-European language, promoted positive transfer from Swedish to English. Thus, having Swedish as L1 was advantageous for L2 English learners when learning English vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar as compared to having L1 Finnish.

However, Cenoz and Gorter (2011) found that transfer in writing occurs even in

typologically different languages such as Basque (non-Indo-European language of unknown origin), Spanish (Romance language) and English (Germanic language). The participants in their study had Basque and/or Spanish as their L1 and learnt English as L3. They were asked to write three compositions describing a picture in each of their languages. The results indicated that, except for the score on the dimension of “organization,” scores in other writing dimensions (content, structure, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics) significantly correlated across languages.

On the issue of multilingual transfer, Jarvis (2016) argues that learners may have different beliefs about how different languages work. Alonso (2020) also highlights that learners’ individual characteristics may influence transferability. Specifically, Rinnert et al. (2015) have emphasized that writers’ agency is crucial in transfer. When applying prior writing knowledge to a new rhetorical context, writers adapt their familiar writing knowledge to meet the perceived expectations of the new audience.

Evidence of writers’ agentic role in transfer was found in L2 Japanese writers’ frequent use of hedging devices to soften their assertions compared with in their L1 English essays (Rinnert et al., 2015). Rinnert et al. (2015) also found that transfer of familiar text features across languages was influenced by writing instruction and practice in the languages involved. Their case analyses showed that knowledge about L1 English writing conventions, repeated practice, and explicit teaching to reuse L1 English text features when writing in L2 Japanese promoted the use of nearly identical text features in L1 English and L2 Japanese.

Although transfer of writing strategies has received increasing attention in recent research, existing studies have not clarified the role of transfer of pragmatic knowledge in multilingual writing. Analyzing multilingual transfer of pragmatics in writing is crucial because both multilingual writers, both experienced and inexperienced, have an

audience in mind when performing their writing activity (Hyland, 2005; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2012, 2013b; Rinnert et al., 2015). The present study addresses this concern by re-analyzing data from multilingual writers in Martín-Laguna and Alcón-Soler's (2018) and Martín-Laguna's (2020) studies. Specifically, this study investigates how different types of interpersonal pragmatic markers transfer across different languages (i.e., Spanish, Catalan, and English) and how the nature of transfer changes over time.

3. PRAGMATICS AND THE MULTILINGUAL TURN

The trend of the multilingual turn has started to reveal itself in pragmatics learning only recently (Taguchi, 2019; Taguchi & Roever, 2017). In fact, pragmatics studies on multilingual transfer in full are still scarce. A recent review on pragmatic transfer (Félix-Brasdefer, 2020) shows that studies to date have adopted a monolingual perspective in the study, focusing on L1-L2 transfer comparing against native speaker performance, with only one study considering L3 transfer. As discussed in the previous section, knowing how pragmatic is learnt in multilinguals, including the role of transfer, can provide a valuable insight in terms of how to optimize the resources that multilingual learners bring to the classroom. This section provides an overview of previous research on pragmatics from a multilingual turn perspective with a focus on pragmatic transfer.

Earlier studies on multilingual pragmatics predominantly focused on the superiority of bilinguals as compared with monolinguals in L3 production (Alcón-Soler, 2012; Safont-Jordà, 2005). More recently, several studies have adopted a holistic perspective, considering the sociolinguistic context and the languages in which learners are instructed at school for pragmatic development. These studies have shown that learners in multilingual contexts were able to transfer pragmatic ability across languages in written performance (Martín-Laguna, 2016, 2018, 2020; Martín-Laguna & Alcón-

Soler, 2015), but such transfer was not found in their oral performance (Herraiz-Martínez & Sánchez-Hernández, 2019). Moreover, a positive effect of bilingualism on awareness and use of pragmatic strategies has been reported (Portolés, 2015). Studies have also revealed a dynamic relationship among languages in multilinguals; Multiple languages influence one another at the pragmatic level, both in elicited data taken from formal contexts of instruction (Martín-Laguna & Alcón-Soler, 2018) and in authentic data from multilingual families' interactions (Safont-Jordà, 2011, 2012, 2013).

Although a small pool of findings exists, the relationship among languages revealed in the previous research is complex and requires more research. Moreover, it is still unclear how multiple languages affect the development of different aspects of pragmatic competence over time. To fill these gaps, this study examines development in the use of different pragmatic markers in written discourse among multilingual speakers.

4. INTERPERSONAL PRAGMATIC MARKERS IN MULTILINGUAL WRITING

Interpersonal pragmatic markers (interpersonal PMs) have been identified with a variety of names and approaches. The approach to interpersonal PMs adopted in this paper is a metadiscourse one, based on a view of writing as social engagement (Hyland, 2005). According to Ädel and Mauranen (2010), there are two approaches to the study of PMs as metadiscourse elements: a narrow approach or non-integrative, reflexive model (e.g., Ädel, 2010); and a broad approach, also known as the integrative or interactive model (e.g., Hyland, 2010; Vande Kopple, 1985). The narrow approach is concerned with the linguistic elements that reveal the organization of the text making references to the text itself, while the broad approach sees textual interaction as a

defining feature. Thus, in the broad approach, a distinction has been made between textual or text-oriented PMs and interpersonal or reader-oriented PMs (Hyland, 2005). Textual PMs are used to guide the reader through the text (e.g., *moreover, firstly*), while interpersonal PMs are pragmatic resources used to involve and persuade the reader in the argument (e.g., *obviously, in my opinion*).

However, this difference is not clear-cut because PMs can serve more than one function at a time. For instance, while textual markers often reflect one's organizational competence, they are also used to express the writer's interpersonal decisions to "accommodate readers' understandings and guide them towards the writer preferred interpretations" (Hyland, 2004, p. 133). For example, the PM *however* may be used to organize a text into pros and cons, but it is also used to help the reader follow the writer's argument.

When taking a broad approach to PMs (Ädel & Mauranen, 2010), most research has drawn on the taxonomy proposed by Vande Kopple (1985), as well as its subsequent adaptations by Crismore et al. (1993) and Hyland (2000, 2005, 2010). Five major types of interpersonal PMs have been identified in the literature (Hyland, 2010): hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers and self-mentions. Hedges (e.g., *I believe*) soften the writer's full commitment to a proposition. Boosters (e.g., *it is clear that*) stress the writer's certainty in a proposition. Attitude markers (e.g., *unfortunately*) convey the writer's attitude to a proposition, while engagement markers (e.g., *you can see that*) directly refer to or establish relationship with the reader. Finally, self-mentions (e.g., *I/we/my/our*) explicitly refer to the author(s).

PMs have been examined in learners' written and oral performance in a variety of instructional contexts. In the area of PMs in written production, Martín-Laguna and Alcón-Soler (2018) explored learning trajectories in Spanish-Catalan bilinguals learning

L3 English. They found that participants' use of textual PMs increased over time, while their use of interpersonal PMs showed irregular changes. While the developmental pattern of PMs in Spanish was mostly linear, it was more dynamic in English and Catalan. On the other hand, Martín-Laguna (2018, 2020) focused on transfer of PMs, documenting that the use of textual and interpersonal PMs transferred across languages (Spanish, Catalan, and English), although the transfer was more evident in interpersonal PMs than in textual PMs, and in particular, between Spanish and Catalan.

Previous studies showed that, among the sub-types of interpersonal PMs, hedges were the most widely used interpersonal PMs in Spanish, Catalan, and English writing (Dafouz-Milne, 2008; Martín-Laguna, 2020). Research has also evidenced that knowledge of hedges from L1 Spanish to L2 English academic writing is transferable (Alonso, Alonso & Torrado, 2012). Research in cross-cultural rhetoric showed the common use of hedges related to cultural traditions. For example, when comparing editorials in Spanish and British newspapers, Dafouz-Milne (2008) found that hedges were the most widely used interpersonal PMs in both corpora, and parallel rhetorical strategies involving hedges were found among writers in Spanish and English.

In another study, Xiao-Desai and Wong (2017) compared epistemic expressions in blog entries written by Chinese heritage language learners at four different proficiency levels. They found that lower level learners overused a few markers (e.g., hedges) and certain epistemic expressions such as the formulaic bundle *wǒ juéde* (*I think*). Xiao-Desai (forthcoming) further found that Chinese heritage learners have a hybrid competence to express stance through the formula *wǒ juéde* that differs from L1 and L2 writers of Chinese. Another study showed that, when starting an essay, learners often used a hedge, such as *I think* followed by the logical connective indicating a clause (e.g. *because*) (Martín-Laguna & Alcón-Soler, 2018).

While these studies revealed similar trends in written production of PMs across languages, other studies showed that learners produced a significantly higher rate of interpersonal PMs in L3 English as compared with their L1 and L2 (Ament, Barón & Pérez-Vidal, 2018; Herraiz-Martínez & Sánchez-Hernández, 2019). Ament et al. (2018) compared learners' oral production of interpersonal PMs between English-medium and non-English-medium instructional contexts and found that hedges and attitude interpersonal PMs were the most frequently used among all the PMs examined. On the other hand, Herraiz-Martínez and Sánchez-Hernández (2019) reported that the most widely used sub-categories of PMs by Spanish-Catalan bilingual learners of L3 English were hedging devices used to express hesitation in thinking, as well as PMs used to indicate attitude, emphasis, support, and alignment with the hearer. However, hedging strategies used to soften the pragmatic force of an utterance were rarely observed. Their study also revealed different use of PMs across target languages. The use of PMs expressing hesitation was significantly higher in L3 English than Spanish or Catalan.

To sum up, while textual PMs often help organize a text, interpersonal PMs do not typically serve to organize a text and thus may be seen as less necessary by learners when writing an academic essay. However, mastering the use of interpersonal PMs is critical in order to express emotions, assessment and commitment toward the propositional content. When writing a persuasive essay, interpersonal PMs can help guide the reader through the text toward a particular viewpoint (Hyland, 2005). Because previous studies analyzed multilingual users' interpersonal PMs as an entire category (Martín-Laguna, 2018, 2020; Martín-Laguna & Alcón-Soler, 2018), analyzing their use of sub-categories of interpersonal PMs (i.e., hedges and attitude markers) and how the use changes over time can provide a more complete picture of how interpersonal PMs are learnt by multilinguals across different languages. Specifically, conducting

longitudinal research on transfer of hedges across languages over time can shed light on the dynamic and adaptive nature of transfer (Rinnert et al., 2015). The present study pursues this investigation by re-analyzing the data reported in previous studies (Martín-Laguna, 2020; Martín-Laguna & Alcón-Soler, 2018) in order to determine how multilingual writers transfer their use of hedges and attitude markers transfer across languages (i.e., Spanish, Catalan and English).

5. RESEARCH QUESTION

Adopting Genoz and Gorter's (2011) holistic multilingual approach, this study examined the use of different sub-categories of interpersonal PMs (i.e., hedges and attitude markers) in multilingual writing over one academic year (i.e., Time 1, 2, and 3). The study is guided by the following research question: Is there a cross-language relationship in the use of hedges and attitude markers among Spanish-Catalan bilingual learners of L3 English? If so, how does the relationship change over one academic year?

6. METHODS

6.1. Participants and learning context

The participants in this study were 313 secondary school students (140 male and 173 female students; age range: 16-20) recruited from 10 different high schools in the Valencian Community in Spain. According to the background questionnaire, Spanish was the L1 for 63% of the students, Catalan for 30%, Romanian for 6%, and other languages (e.g., Chinese, Arabic) for 1%. Students reported that they had least 10 years of formal instruction in Spanish, Catalan and English, from age 6 to 16. Their English proficiency level was lower intermediate, as measured by the Quick Oxford Placement Test (UCLES, 2001) at the beginning of the study.

In Spain, there are two non-compulsory years of secondary education prior to university. After completing these years, students take the university entrance examinations called *Pruebas de Acceso a la Universidad*. Participants in this study were enrolled in the first year of non-compulsory secondary education. They had Spanish and Catalan as the language of instruction in content courses (e.g., biology, philosophy). They also studied Spanish, Catalan and English in language courses (three hours per week in each language). While English classes focused on communication, grammar, vocabulary and language use, Spanish and Catalan classes focused on reading, writing, literature and grammar.

In the Valencian Community, Spanish and Catalan are co-official languages. These languages are typologically similar because they are both Romance languages derived from Latin. All participants were familiar with these languages and used them on a daily basis both at home and school. However, the sociolinguistic status of these languages is different. Spanish is the majority and dominant language in the community level and has greater social prestige, whereas Catalan is the minority language (Safont-Jordà, 2006). English is a foreign language (L3) taught at all educational levels (primary, secondary and tertiary education) both in private and state-run educational institutions. Target schools in this study were from the city of Castellón and neighboring towns in the Valencian Community, which do not attract much international tourism. As a result, students in those schools have limited exposure to English outside the school settings.

Regarding the use of the co-official languages, there are more opportunities to read and write in Spanish. Catalan is mostly used at home among friends and family members, as well as in local stores (Conselleria d'Educació, Cultura i Esport, 2016). Only 18% of the population in the Valencian-speaking area chooses to write in Catalan

on the Internet (Conselleria d'Educació, Cultura i Esport, 2016). Over the last 40 years, regional authorities have implemented measures to support and promote the use of Catalan in public spaces (e.g., *Llei d'ús i ensenyament del valencià* or Law of use and teaching of Valencian). Thus, Catalan is also used in official documents and administrative procedures as well as in education sectors funded by the regional government. However, access to written Catalan outside of the official channels (e.g., books and newspapers) is not widespread.

6.2. Instruments

Participants completed a writing task three times over one academic year in three languages (Spanish, Catalan, and English). Recent researchers in pragmatics have adopted a task-based perspective by using a task that can simulate real-life language use (e.g., Taguchi & Kim, 2018). One advantage of using a real-life classroom task is the task's ecological validity (Martín-Laguna & Alcón-Soler, 2018). When the task is relevant to learners' classroom language use, pedagogical implications derived from findings are considered valid since the task reflects constraints of real-life classroom performance.

Adopting the task-based perspective, this study used a context-authentic opinion writing task to collect data. The task was common in the three language classes since Spanish, Catalan, and English university entrance exams include a section asking learners to write an opinion text. Participants completed a total of nine opinion essay tasks over one academic year (i.e., three parallel tasks in three languages at the beginning, middle, and end of the academic year). Different essay prompts were used across languages and time points to reduce repetitiveness of the task.

Participants were asked to write their opinion on topics related to their high school lives. Because previous research showed that situational variables included in a

task affect task performance (Taguchi, 2012), the task prompts were controlled in terms of their contextual factors (Brown & Levinson, 1987). All task prompts were similar in terms of power, social distance, and degree of imposition (i.e., a student trying to persuade someone in a higher status to do something rather trivial). Appendix A presents simplified task prompts. Appendix B presents a complete sample task.

6.3 Data collection procedure

Writing samples were collected in three waves over one academic year (Time 1, 2, and 3) in three languages (Spanish, Catalan, and English). Participants were given 20 minutes to complete an essay. Following the requirements of the university entrance exams, participants were asked to produce about 130-150 words for each essay. They were not allowed to use a dictionary nor consult with their teachers or classmates. The corpus of opinion essays consisted of a total of 2, 817 essays, 939 essays in each language (Spanish, Catalan, and English), totaling 418, 933 words. All essays were handwritten. The researcher typed up the essays verbatim.

6.4 Data analysis procedures

The corpus of opinion essays was analyzed for interpersonal PMs. Drawing from Hyland's (2005) taxonomy, two sub-categories of interpersonal PMs were coded in the essays: hedges and attitude markers. Hedges (e.g., *maybe, I think that, in my/our opinion*) express partial commitment to the truth-value of the assertion, while attitude markers (e.g., *fortunately, it is necessary, it is important*) express the writer's affective values towards the proposition. Hedges and attitude markers differ in terms of the writer's approach and personal engagement towards the proposition. Hedges soften the writer's full commitment to a proposition, while attitude markers convey the writer's judgement to a proposition (e.g., conveying surprise or agreement). Following Brown and Levinson's (1987) Politeness Theory, hedges may be considered as negative

politeness strategies, reducing the imposition on the reader (i.e., allowing the reader to consider alternatives). Conversely, attitude markers entail the risk of face-threat to the reader since their use may be related to assertiveness and perceived as imposition on the reader.

The list of hedges and attitude markers coded in the essays was adapted from Hyland (2005) (see Appendix C). The target interpersonal PMs were coded in a semi-automatic manner, combining the use of the Microsoft Access Database with a manual check to discard forms that do not serve as interpersonal PMs in particular contexts. Two researchers coded the data, reaching 95% agreement rate. Discrepancy cases were resolved via discussion. The frequency of hedges and attitude markers was tallied by language (Spanish, Catalan, and English) and by time period (Time 1, 2, and 3). Then, the raw frequencies of hedges and attitude markers were normed by the total number of words in each essay.

Following Cenoz and Gorter's (2011), this study conducted correlation analyses to investigate the relationship in the frequency of hedges and attitude markers among the three languages. Since the data did not confirm a normal distribution, the Spearman's rank-order correlation was used to assess the relationship for each time point (Time 1, 2, and 3). Following the existing conventions, the alpha level was set at .05 (two-tailed). However, because the study conducted nine separate correlation analyses, the alpha level was adjusted to .0055 using the Bonferroni correction in order to avoid a Type One error (i.e., rejecting the null hypothesis when it is true).

7. RESULTS

7.1. Quantitative analysis: Frequency of interpersonal PMs across languages

Table 1 presents the mean normed frequency of hedges and attitude markers produced in each language. Table 2 and 3 present the correlations between language pairs.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of frequency of hedges and attitude markers at Time 1, 2 and 3 in Spanish, Catalan, and English

Sub-category	(n = 313)	Spanish		Catalan		English	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Hedges	Time 1	14.42	10.39	7.16	7.43	11.22	9.02
	Time 2	14.67	11.20	10.99	8.23	14.01	11.02
	Time 3	15.76	11.60	11.74	8.99	16.65	12.00
Attitude markers	Time 1	3.06	4.65	4.61	6.44	5.38	7.52
	Time 2	3.00	5.06	7.33	7.28	1.70	4.66
	Time 3	2.25	4.69	2.74	4.79	2.11	4.87

Note. Mean refers to the mean normed frequency of hedges and attitude markers per essay normalized by one thousand words.

Table 2. Correlations among Spanish, Catalan and English in the normed frequency of hedges at Time 1, 2 and 3

(n = 313)		Spanish-Catalan	Spanish-English	Catalan-English
Time 1	Spearman's ρ	.267*	.082	.132
	<i>p-value</i>	.000	.150	.019

Time 2	Spearman's ρ	.379*	.195*	.189*
	<i>p-value</i>	.000	.001	.001
Time 3	Spearman's ρ	.284*	.330*	.277*
	<i>p-value</i>	.000	.000	.000

* $p < .0055$. Alpha level was adjusted to .0055 using the Bonferroni correction.

Table 3. Correlations among Spanish, Catalan, and English in the normed frequency of attitude markers at Time 1, 2 and 3

	($n = 313$)	Spanish-Catalan	Spanish-English	Catalan-English
Time 1	Spearman's ρ	.094	.109	.062
	<i>p-value</i>	.096	.054	.272
Time 2	Spearman's ρ	.051	.061	.111
	<i>p-value</i>	.366	.284	.050
Time 3	Spearman's ρ	.286*	.174*	.136
	<i>p-value</i>	.000	.002	.016

* $p < .0055$. Alpha level was adjusted to .0055 using the Bonferroni correction.

Results showed that, in all language pairs, there was a trend toward a stronger correlation over time. In the analysis of the hedges, significant correlations were found between Spanish and Catalan at early time point (Time 1). At later time (Time 2 and 3), correlations were found in all language pairs. Although the degree of correlation between Spanish and Catalan was much greater than that of other language pairs at Time 2, by the end of the year, all three language pairs reached a similar degree of correlation. Frequency of hedges was similar between Spanish and Catalan at the beginning of the academic year probably because of linguistic similarities between these

two languages. Spanish and Catalan are Romance languages with Latin origin and have common vocabulary and grammar structures. In addition, growing up speaking Spanish and Catalan simultaneously, the learners were probably more familiar with these languages than their L3, English. Yet, a significant correlation between the co-official languages (Spanish and Catalan) and the foreign language (L3 English) appeared later in the academic year as participants spent more time writing in English in formal school settings.

Unlike the hedges, the frequency of the attitude markers revealed a significant correlation only in two language pairs (i.e., Spanish and Catalan, Spanish and English) only at Time 3, and the degree of correlation was smaller than that of the hedges. At Time 3, the degree of correlation was the largest between Spanish and Catalan. There was no correlation between Catalan and English at any time point. These findings indicate that learners may need more time in order to transfer their ability to use attitude markers across different languages.

In summary, the correlational analyses indicate that learners share abilities to use hedges and attitude markers in Spanish, Catalan, or English. The cross-linguistic relationship tends to consolidate over time, especially in the use of hedges. These findings indicate that pragmatic transfer of attitude markers and hedges in multilinguals occurs not only between typologically similar languages (Spanish and Catalan), but also between languages with different origins (English and Spanish), despite learners' limited contact with English outside the school in the Valencian Community in Spain.

7.2. *Qualitative analysis: Shared interpersonal PM resources between languages*

Qualitative analyses of the learners' essays lend support to the correlation results found in the quantitative analyses. Since the quantitative analyses revealed stronger correlations for hedges involving all language pairs, in this section, I will focus on the analyses of hedges. Specifically, I will present data illustrating the focal relationship between Spanish and Catalan at Time 1 and correlations found in all language pairs at Time 3.

A significant correlation between Spanish and Catalan hedges appeared earlier (Time 1) and was stronger than those between other language pairs (e.g., Catalan and English). The qualitative analysis revealed that learners used the same hedges in Spanish and Catalan mainly in the thesis statement at the beginning of the essays. Excerpt 1 presents an essay written by a participant (Student 736) in Spanish and Catalan. She first wrote a sentence introducing herself as a high school student and then introduced the topic. After that, she stated her opinion using the same hedge in Spanish (*creo que*) and Catalan (*crec que*), equivalent to 'I think' in English.

EXCERPT 1 (Student 736, Time 1)

Spanish

En este escrito quiero presentar, como alumna del instituto <school name>, mi opinión acerca de los estudios y del bachillerato. Creo que, la idea de cambiar septiembre por julio, puede ser beneficiaria para algunos y perjudicial para otros.

Translation: 'As a student from <school name> high school, in this document I want to state my opinion about studies and the High School Diploma. I think

that the idea of swapping [exam dates in] September for July can be beneficial for some and detrimental for others.’

Catalan

Com a alumna d'aquest centre que sóc, penso que vosté, com a director, deuries saber que per a nosaltres serie millor si els destinares a nosaltres. Crec que, el premi, tindria que anar dedicat a alguna cosa que ens abellisca, com per exemple una festa.

Translation: ‘As a student of this high school, I think that you, as principal, should be aware of the fact that it would be better if it [i.e., the money won in the prize] would be allocated to us. I think that the prize should be devoted to something that we really want, such as a party.’

Several learners used two hedges meaning the same in sequence (e.g., ‘In my view I think’). In Excerpt 2, Student 734 started the Spanish essay using the hedge *Desde mi punto de vista* (i.e., ‘in my view’, which is equivalent to ‘in my opinion’) followed by the hedge *Creo que* (i.e., ‘I think’). She used the same pattern in Catalan: *En la meua opinió* (i.e., ‘in my opinion’) and *Crec que* (i.e., ‘I think’). It is possible that this learner felt that using multiple hedges can signal greater level of indirectness.

EXCERPT 2 (Student 734, Time 1)

Spanish

Desde mi punto de vista creo que la selectividad debería mantenerse vigente.

Translation: ‘In my view I think that the university entrance examinations should be kept valid.’

Catalan

En la meua opinió crec que amb els diners es deuria fer alguna cosa que tinguera benefici tant als professors com als alumnes.

Translation: ‘In my opinion I think that something beneficial for both teachers and students should be done with the money [from the prize].’

Excerpt 3, on the other hand, shows that at Time 3, this student opted for using only one hedge in the thesis statement. Here, the same form (i.e., ‘In my opinion’) was used in both Spanish (*En mi opinión*) and Catalan (*En la meua opinió*) essays. This learner also used the same hedge in her English essay (i.e., ‘From my point of view’). These results indicate that the use of hedges was shared between Spanish and Catalan and that the shared use remained over time. Moreover, at Time 3, transfer emerged between the participants’ local languages (Spanish and Catalan) and the foreign language (L3 English).

EXCERPT 3 (Student 734, Time 3)

Spanish

En mi opinión dar una lengua extranjera siempre es algo positivo, y más si es en inglés que probablemente sea la lengua que habla más gente en el mundo y la más importante.

Translation: ‘In my opinion, learning a foreign language is always positive, and even more if it is English, which is probably the most spoken language in the world and the most important one.’

Catalan

En la meua opinió, es podria deixar beure alcohol als menors d'edat però sempre que siga amb moderació, 1 o 2 copes seria el correcte.

Translation: 'In my opinion, minors should be allowed to drink alcohol as long as it is done in a moderate manner, one or two drinks should be right.'

English

From my point of view, spending money on new technologies for our school is not a good idea because they are not affordable.

In addition to the phrase-level transfer of hedges, the qualitative analysis also revealed that transfer occurred at discourse-level at Time 3. The discourse-level transfer was particularly evident in how learners started and ended an essay. As shown in Excerpt 4, Student 649 approached the task as a letter-writing task and used the same discourse structure: (1) opening, (2) announcement of the reason for writing, (3) thesis statement, and (4) personal opinion statement (i.e., *pienso que* in the Spanish essay, *pense que* in the Catalan essay, and *I think* in the English essay). Notably, both in (3) and (4), the same hedge appeared in three languages (underlined in the texts). These results show that, at the end of the academic year, learners not only used shared linguistic resources across three languages, but also transferred the resources (hedges) strategically within specific parts of discourse structure. They were probably aware of the need to soften the force of their opinion by using hedges when they stated the thesis first and then restated the thesis, so they sound more indirect and less imposing. This tendency was observed in all three languages.

EXCERPT 4 (Student 649, Time 3)

Spanish

Señor Director: (1)

Le escribo esta carta para darle mi opinión sobre dar asignaturas de contenido en una lengua extranjera. (2)... Esta medida, pienso que debería ser optativa, que solo la adopten los que quieran, (3) y las asignaturas que deberían ser, pueden ser Castellano, Valenciano, Matemáticas o Informática. ... Finalmente, pienso que no estamos preparados para esa medida, deberíamos tener más horas solo de inglés y más adelante poner esta medida. (4)

Translation: 'Dear school principal,

I am writing this letter to you in order to give you my opinion about giving content subjects in a foreign language. ... This measure, I think that should be optional, it should only be adopted by those who want to, and subjects that should be (taught in English), could be Spanish, Valencian, Maths or Computer Science... Finally, I think that we are not ready for this measure, we should have more (teaching) hours only in English and implement this measure later on.'

Catalan

Senyor Director: (1)

*Li escric aquesta carta per parlarli sobre l'alcohol a la festa de graduació. (2)
En la meua opinió els alumnes no deuriem beure aquest dia, ja que som menors i no podem. (3)*

... Si ficaren alcohol en la festa de graduació i li pasare algo a algun alumne, pense que el responsable sera vosté, per aixó es millor evitar-ho. (4)

Translation: 'Dear school principal,

I am writing this letter in order to talk to you about alcohol drinking in the graduation party. In my opinion students should not drink on this day, given that we are minors and we are not allowed to do so... If alcohol were available in the graduation party and anything happened to a student, I think that you would be the responsible person in charge, for this reason it is better to avoid it.'

English

Dear headmaster, (1)

I write you for give my opinion about new techologies for the classroom. (2) In my opinion is very beneficial for learning the new techologies and my school should spend money on new techologies for the classroom. (3) ... Finally, I think the education is very important to the future, and learing is very funny with new tecnologies. (4)

These excerpts clearly indicate that multilingual learners make a similar choice of hedges when writing an opinion essay in three languages. Initially, learners only used similar hedges in Spanish and Catalan. As the relationship among Spanish, Catalan and English grew stronger over time, learners use hedges similarly across languages at Time 3. This reinforces the idea that a multilingual's ability to use hedges is a single shared competence across languages that is then realized in the languages in the learners' repertoire. Under the right conditions, this competence develops over time and the relationship across languages tends to grow stronger, supporting a holistic multilingual perspective (see Cenoz & Gorter, 2011).

8. DISCUSSION

To date, most research on pragmatics has not considered the role of any acquired language in addition to the L2 (Ortega, 2019; see Félix-Brasdefer, 2020). However,

scholars have claimed that boundaries among languages are ‘soft’ in multilinguals and that multilingual users share a common competence among languages that is then realized through each language channel (Cenoz & Gorter 2011, 2013; Cook, 1991; Cook & Wei, 2016). The present findings lend support to the existing findings by documenting that multilingual learners’ use of hedges and attitude markers is related across languages. Some aspects to discuss are in order.

Overall, the quantitative analysis revealed that multilingual learners were able to establish relationships in their use of hedges and attitude markers in the languages they knew. Thus, in line with previous studies taking a holistic multilingual perspective (Martín-Laguna, 2016, 2018, 2020; Martín-Laguna & Alcón-Soler, 2015, 2018), the present study provides evidence on the unique linguistic resources that multilingual learners may bring to the classroom when learning pragmatics. The analysis of longitudinal data revealed that, as the learners’ repertoire of pragmatic markers expanded over time, the relationship among L1, L2 and L3 knowledge of pragmatic markers shifted from the level of being distinct across languages, to the level of shared resources for meaning-making. These results partially support Kobayashi and Rinnert’s (2012, 2013a) findings that, as students developed their linguistic knowledge through instruction and exposure to the language, their repertoire of multiple languages changed from separate systems to a shared system. The present study showed that this shared multilingual resource may occur later in time.

The present results also provide evidence that these multilingual relationships differ depending on the type of interpersonal pragmatic markers analyzed (hedges and attitude markers). In the case of hedges, the cross-linguistic relationship was stronger and involved all language pairs than that of attitude markers. These differences could be due to different frequency of use of the pragmatic markers. As shown in the descriptive

statistics (Table 1), the mean frequency of attitude markers was much smaller than that of hedges. This may account for the smaller correlations found in attitude markers. It is possible that participants in this study were more accustomed to using hedges than attitude markers. This interpretation is consistent with existing research showing that hedges were the most frequently used sub-type of interpersonal pragmatic markers (Ament et al., 2018; Herraiz-Martínez & Sánchez-Hernández, 2019; Dafouz-Milne, 2008; Martín-Laguna, 2020) and learners often overused them (Martín-Laguna & Alcón-Soler, 2018; Xiao-Desai & Wong, 2017).

Learners' preference for hedges over attitude markers may be a reflection of their politeness considerations toward their imagined audience (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Research has shown that multicompetent writers have their audience in mind (i.e., the head teacher in the present study) when deciding which pragmatic markers to use in writing (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2013b). Learners may have tried to sound more indirect and non-impositional to their teachers by using hedges, and this politeness orientation was shared among languages. This interpretation is supported by Safont's (2011) claim that learners transfer the skill of acknowledging the level of directness in their messages across languages. Whereas learners may consider hedges as necessary devices to project indirectness, attitude markers may be perceived as signs of personal involvement, which are only optional to display in their writing. In addition, it is possible that teachers did not raise learners' awareness on attitude markers since they tended to focus on textual pragmatic markers in the classroom (Martín-Laguna & Alcón-Soler, 2018).

The current findings also revealed that multilingual pragmatic transfer occurs not only between typologically similar languages, namely between Spanish and Catalan (Romance languages), but between languages of different origins such as between

English (Germanic language) and Catalan. These findings are in line with those reported in Cenoz and Gorter (2011), who showed that multilinguals transfer writing abilities between typologically different languages (i.e., Spanish, Basque and English). While the strength of correlations in languages pairs was relatively similar for hedges at Time 3, this was not the case for attitude markers where correlations between typologically similar languages (Spanish and Catalan) were clearly stronger at Time 3. What is more, correlations between Catalan and English were not significant, while correlations between Spanish and English were. These findings may be related to the sociolinguistic status of the languages. In the context of the Valencian Community, there are fewer opportunities to interact in Catalan (minority language) and English (foreign language) as compared to Spanish (majority language). In line with previous research, in order for transfer to occur, abundant exposure and opportunity to use pragmatic markers may be needed (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2012; Martín-Laguna & Alcón-Soler, 2018),

The qualitative analysis revealed that transfer of pragmatic markers occurs both at the phrase and discourse-level. At the phrase level, participants tended to opt for the same hedges in the three languages (see Excerpt 3). At the discourse level, participants used similar text construction approaches in L1, L2 and L3 texts, supporting previous findings (Cenoz and Gorter, 2011; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2012, 2013b; Rinnert et al., 2015). Most notably, the present study revealed that, when learners transferred knowledge of discourse-level structures across languages, they also transferred the hedges embedded in the discourse.

In sum, findings from this study revealed that multilingual learners were able to use shared pragmatic resources across languages, although there were differences in their use (hedges and attitude markers). This study also revealed that transfer of these markers occurred even between typologically different languages, indicating that

sociolinguistic status of languages may play a role in how pragmatic knowledge is shared across languages. Greater opportunity for writing in Spanish may have facilitated the transfer of attitude markers between Spanish and English a Time 3 in contrast to that of attitude markers between Catalan and English. Moreover, this study revealed that hedging devices transferred across languages were often embedded within larger discourse structures, which were also transferred. The present findings go beyond previous findings by considering participants' multilingual competence in using pragmatic markers in different languages. This study further confirms the multilingual turn by showing that learners approached a writing task in three languages not as three separate tasks, but as the single task in which they could apply their multilingual resources. Findings suggest that when multilingual learners are able to use hedges or attitude markers in one language, they are able to transfer this knowledge to other languages they know. Hence, competence in individual language systems could serve as resources for fully developing multilingual pragmatic competence. These findings open up lines for further research and present important pedagogical implications as you see in the following sections.

9. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Several limitations must be acknowledged when interpreting the study findings from a pragmatics and multilingual perspective. From a pragmatics perspective, first, the findings revealed participants' preference for the use of hedges over attitude markers, which was interpreted as a strategy to avoid imposition on the reader. However, further evidence is needed to assess this interpretation since this study did not reveal the reason why learners frequently used hedges and underused attitude markers. Qualitative data coming from interviews to learners and think-aloud protocols may contribute to shed light on learners' choices of pragmatic markers. Second, this study

focused on frequency rather than variety of pragmatic markers. Further studies need to combine both dimensions for analysis. Third, in this study, contextual factors of a writing task were kept constant across prompts (i.e., a student trying to persuade someone in a higher status to do something rather trivial). Future research needs determine how different contextual factors (e.g., different degrees of imposition or familiarity with the reader) may affect participants' choice of pragmatic markers.

From a multilingual perspective, the present study is limited because it only considered languages in which participants were literate. However, it is possible that participants learned additional languages. Another limitation is that the study did not consider individual differences among multilinguals in their use of the languages analyzed (e.g., active vs passive bilinguals or the amount of out-of-school interaction with the languages analyzed). Further research should explore the extent to which the use of target languages in daily lives promotes transfer.

10. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Multilingual learners' unique profile must not be overlooked in considering the implications for pedagogy (Cook, 1991; Cook & Li Wei, 2016; Ortega, 2013, 2014, 2019). Findings from this study could help teachers become more effective in teaching multilingual learners. The most important pedagogical implication is that, when multilingual learners come to the classroom, teachers should recognize that they are pragmatically multicompetent and are able to draw on shared resources. Yet, this study found that learners were able to transfer their knowledge of hedges across Spanish, Catalan and English, but were not able to relate their knowledge of attitude markers between Catalan and English. Hence, teachers can support learners in a way that they can fully develop their abilities to use different pragmatic markers in all languages. The first step in this direction is raising teachers' awareness about the importance of

pragmatic resources. In particular, teachers and students need to direct their attention to the function of pragmatic markers as resources for establishing interpersonal relationships with the reader. Research exploring the effectiveness of pragmatic instruction has shown that providing learners with metapragmatic information positively influences their learning (for reviews, see Basturkmen & Nguyen, 2017; Martínez-Flor & Usó-Juan, 2020; Sánchez-Hernández & Alcón-Soler, 2020; Taguchi, 2011, 2015; and Takahashi, 2010). Thus, teachers should promote learners' awareness and noticing of interpersonal pragmatic markers.

Another pedagogical implication is teaching pragmatics from a multilingual approach by promoting their pragmatic multicompetence across languages (Martín-Laguna, 2020). In doing so, instructional activities promoting a flexible use of all the languages in the learners' repertoire are necessary. Translanguaging strategies have been successfully used to help multilingual learners to self-regulate their linguistic repertoire in writing (Velasco & García, 2014; see also Cenoz & Gorter, 2015a). In order to make the most of pragmatic resources available in multilinguals, language teachers' coordination should be encouraged (Martín-Laguna, 2020). In addition, teachers should be educated understand and adopt a multilingual perspective in the use of translanguaging strategies (Portolés & Martí, 2018).

Acknowledgments

This study was conducted within the framework of research projects funded by *Plan de promoció de la investigació (Universitat Jaume I) UJI-B2019-23* and *Projectes d'Innovació Educativa de la Unitat de Suport Educatiu (Universitat Jaume I) 3821/20*. I would like to thank Dr. Naoko Taguchi for her extensive and insightful feedback on this article. Any errors remain my own.

References

- Ädel, A. (2010). Just to give you kind of a map of where we are going: A taxonomy of metadiscourse in spoken and written academic English. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 9(2), 69–97.
- Ädel, A., & Mauranen, A. (2010). Metadiscourse: Diverse and divided perspectives. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 9(2), 1–12.
- Alonso, R. (2020). *La transferencia lingüística: Perspectivas actuales*. Granada: Comares.
- Alonso, R., Alonso, M., & Torrado, L. (2012). Hedging: An exploratory study of pragmatic transfer in nonnative English readers' rhetorical preferences. *Ibérica*, 23, 47–64.
- Ament, J., Barón, J., & Pérez-Vidal, C. (2018). A focus on the development of the use of interpersonal pragmatic markers and pragmatic awareness among EMI learners. In A. Sánchez-Hernández & A. Herraiz-Martínez (Eds.), *Learning second language pragmatics beyond traditional contexts* (pp. 111–146). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Basturkmen, H., & Nguyen, T. T. M. (2017). Teaching pragmatics. In A. Barron, Y. Gu, & G. Steen (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 563–574). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). Focus on multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 356–369.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2013). Towards a plurilingual approach in English language teaching: Softening the boundaries between languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 591–599.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (Eds.). (2015a). *Multilingual education: Between language learning and translanguaging*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2015b). Towards a holistic approach in the study of multilingual education. In J. Cenoz & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Multilingual education: Between language learning and translanguaging* (pp. 1–15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Conselleria d'Educació, Cultura i Esport (2016). *Encuesta uso y conocimiento del valenciano 2015*. Accessed 23 July 2020 at <http://www.ceice.gva.es/es/web/fondo-estadistico-documental/fondo-datos-numericos>
- Cook, V. (1991). The poverty-of-the-stimulus argument and multi-competence. *Second Language Research*, 7(2), 103–117.
- Cook, V., & Wei, L. (Eds.). (2016). *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic multi-competence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crismore, A., Markkanen, R., & Steffensen, M. (1993). Metadiscourse in persuasive writing: A study of texts written by American and Finnish university students. *Written Communication*, 10(1), 39–71.
- Dafouz-Milne, E. (2008). The pragmatic role of textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in the construction and attainment of persuasion: A cross-linguistic study of newspaper discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(1), 95–113.
- De Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or Additional Language Acquisition*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- De Angelis, G., & Jessner, U. (2012). Writing across languages in a bilingual contexts: A Dynamic Systems Theory approach. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *L2 writing development: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 47–68). Berlin: Mouton.
- Félix-Brasdefer, C. (2020). Pragmatic transfer. In K. P. Schneider & E. Ifantidou (Eds.), *Developmental and clinical pragmatics* (361–392). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Forbes, K. (2020). *Cross-Linguistic Transfer of Writing Strategies: Interactions between Foreign Language and First Language Classrooms*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Gray, B., & Biber, D. (2014). Stance markers. In K. Aijmer & C. Rühlemann (Eds.), *Corpus pragmatics: A handbook* (pp. 219–248). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herdina, P., & Jessner, U. (2002). *A Dynamic Model of Multilingualism: Changing the psycholinguistic perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Herraiz-Martínez, A., & Sánchez-Hernández, A. (2019). Pragmatic markers produced by multilingual speakers: Evidence from a CLIL context. *English Language Teaching*, 12(2), 68–76.
- Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Hyland, K. (2004). Disciplinary interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 133–151.
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse*. Oxford: Continuum.
- Hyland, K. (2010). Metadiscourse: Mapping interactions in academic writing. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 9(2), 125–143.
- Jarvis, S. (2016). The scope of transfer research. In L. Yu & T. Odlin (Eds.), *New perspectives on transfer in second language learning* (pp. 17–47). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Jarvis, S. & Pavlenko, A. (2008). *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition*. New York: Routledge.
- Kellerman, E., & Sharwood Smith, M. (Eds.). (1986). *Crosslinguistic influence in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Pergamon.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2008). Task response and text construction across L1 and L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 7–29.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2012). Understanding L2 writing development from a multicompetence perspective: Dynamic repertoires of knowledge and text construction. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *L2 writing development: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 101-134). Göttingen: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2013a). L1/L2/L3 text construction by multicompetent writers. In C. Conlan (Ed.), *Applied Linguistics Association of Australia Annual Conference 2012: Refereed Proceedings* (CD-Rom) (pp. 28-67). Perth: School of Education, Curtin University .
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2013b). L1/L2/L3 writing development: Longitudinal case study of a Japanese multicompetent writer. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 4-33.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2013c). Second language writing: Is it a separate entity? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 442-443.
- Martín-Laguna, S. (2016). Exploring textual pragmatic markers in a multilingual classroom context. In F. Bianchi & S. Gesuato (Eds.), *Pragmatic issues in specialized communicative contexts* (pp. 195–216). Boston/ Leiden: Brill Rodopi.
- Martín-Laguna, S. (2018). Learning pragmatics in the multilingual classroom: Exploring multicompetence across types of pragmatic markers. In A. Sánchez-

- Hernández & A. Herraiz-Martínez (Eds.), *Learning second language pragmatics beyond traditional contexts* (pp. 205–223). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Martín-Laguna, S. (2019). Exploring case stories in the development of textual discourse-pragmatic markers in formal English language classrooms. In P. Salazar Campillo & V. Codina (Eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. Boston/ Leiden: Brill.
- Martín-Laguna, S. (2020). *Tasks, pragmatics and multilingualism in the classroom: A portrait of adolescent writing in multiple languages*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Martín-Laguna, S., & Alcón-Soler, E. (2015). Do learners rely on metadiscourse markers? An exploratory study in English, Catalan and Spanish. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 173, 85–92.
- Martín-Laguna, S., & Alcón-Soler, E. (2018). Development of discourse-pragmatic markers in a multilingual classroom: A mixed method research approach. *System*, 75, 68-80.
- Martínez-Flor, A., & Usó-Juan, E. (2020). Teaching L2 speech acts. In K. P. Schneider & E. Ifantidou (Eds.), *Developmental and clinical pragmatics* (269–300). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ortega, L. (2013). SLA for the 21st Century: Disciplinary Progress, Transdisciplinary Relevance, and the Bi/multilingual Turn. *Language Learning*, 63(1), 1–24.
- Ortega, L. (2014). Ways forward for a bi/multilingual turn in SLA. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 32–53). New York: Routledge.
- Ortega, L. (2019). SLA and the study of equitable multilingualism. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103, 23–38.
- Pavlenko, A., & Jarvis, S. (2002) Bidirectional transfer. *Applied Linguistics*, 23, 190–214.
- Portolés, L. (2015). *Multilingualism and very young learners: An analysis of pragmatic awareness and language attitudes*. Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Portolés, L., & Martí, O. (2018). Teachers' beliefs about multilingual pedagogies and the role of initial training. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 17(2), 248–264.
- Rinnert, C., Kobayashi, H., & Katayama, A. (2015) Argumentation text construction by Japanese as a foreign language writers: A dynamic view of transfer. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(2), 213–245.
- Ringbom, H. (2007). *Cross-linguistic similarity in foreign language learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Safont-Jordà, M. P. (2005). *Third language learners: Pragmatic production and awareness*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Safont-Jordà, M. P. (2006). Language use and language attitudes in the Valencian Community. In D. Lasagabaster & Á. Huguet (Eds.) *Multilingualism in European bilingual contexts: Language use and attitudes* (pp. 90–113). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Safont-Jordà, M. P. (2011). Early requestive development in consecutive third language learning. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 8(3), 256–276.
- Safont-Jordà, M. P. (2012). A longitudinal analysis of Catalan, Spanish and English request modifiers in early child language learning. In D. Gabrys-Barker (Ed.), *Cross-linguistic influences in multilingual language acquisition* (pp. 99–114). Heidelberg: Springer.

- Safont-Jordà, M. P. (2013). Early stages of trilingual pragmatic development. A longitudinal study of requests in Catalan, Spanish and English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 59, 68–80.
- Sánchez-Hernández, A., & Alcón-Soler, E. (2020). Pragmatic instruction in English as an International Language. In Z. Tajeddin & M. Alemi (Eds.), *English as an International Language: Pragmatic pedagogy* (pp. 95–116). New York: Routledge.
- Selinker, L. (1969). Language transfer. *General Linguistics*, 9, 67–92.
- Taguchi, N. (2011). Teaching pragmatics: Trends and issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 289–310.
- Taguchi, N. (2012). *Context, individual differences, and pragmatic competence*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Taguchi, N. (2015). Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were, are, and should be going. *Language Teaching*, 48, 1–50.
- Taguchi, N. (Ed.). (2019). *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and pragmatics*. New York: Routledge.
- Taguchi, N., & Kim, Y. (Eds.). (2018). *Task-based approaches to teaching and assessing pragmatics*. Philadelphia/ Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Taguchi, N., & Roever, C. (2017). *Second language pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Takahashi, S. (2010). Assessing learnability in second language pragmatics. In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *Pragmatics across languages and cultures* (pp. 391–421). Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- UCLES. (2001). *Quick placement test*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vande Kopple, W. (1985). Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 36, 82–93.
- Velasco, P., & García, O. (2014). Translanguaging and the writing of bilingual learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37(1), 6–23.
- Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems* (1st ed.). New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Xiao-Desai, Y., & Wong, K. F. (2017). Epistemic stance in Chinese heritage language writing – A developmental view. *CASLAR*, 6(1), 73–102.
- Xiao-Desai, Y. (forthcoming) *The Modern Language Journal*

APPENDIX A. SIMPLIFIED PROMPTS USED FOR THE OPINION WRITING

TASK

Spanish prompts

Time 1: *¿Cómo deberían ser las pruebas de acceso a la universidad?*

Translation: ‘How should the university entrance examinations be?’

Time 2: *¿Se debería permitir que los alumnos salieran por la noche?*

Translation: ‘Should students be allowed to go out at night?’

Time 3: *¿Crees que dar asignaturas de contenido en una lengua extranjera es positivo?*

Translation: ‘Do you think that teaching content courses in a foreign language is positive?’

Catalan prompts

Time 1: *Com s’han de gastar els diners del premi que ha guanyat l’institut?*

Translation: ‘How should the high school spend the money won from the prize?’

Time 2: *És important fer un intercanvi?*

Translation: ‘Is it important to do an exchange program?’

Time 3: *S’hauria de deixar beure alcohol als menors d’edat?*

Translation: ‘Should minors be allowed to drink alcohol?’

English prompts

Time 1: What is your opinion about the end-of-school trip?

Time 2: Should students be allowed to take smartphones to school?

Time 3: Do you think your school should spend money on new technologies for the classroom?

APPENDIX B. SAMPLE PROMPT

CONTEXT: The headmaster of your secondary school is considering the possibility of banning smartphones at school and is interested in knowing the students’ opinion.

TASK

Should students be allowed to take smartphones to school?

Write your opinion taking into account that **the headmaster of your school may read it.**

IDEAS TO THINK ABOUT:

(You don't need to use them all. You can add new ones.)

- What if students get distracted during the lesson?
- Can we use smartphones for learning purposes?
- Can smartphones be addictive?
- What if you have to make an emergency call?
- What if somebody steals your smartphone?
- What if somebody records your voice, the teacher's voice or takes a picture without permission?
- etc.



- You have **20 minutes** to plan, write and revise your composition.
- You are not allowed to use any books/dictionaries or ask your teacher/classmates for help.

APPENDIX C. PRAGMATIC MARKERS CODED

	Spanish	Catalan	English
Hedges	(yo) creo que, (nosotros) creemos que, (yo) pienso que, (nosotros) pensamos que, en mi/nuestra opinión, desde mi/nuestro punto de vista, probablemente, quizá(s), puede que, (yo) opino que, (nosotros) opinamos que, a veces, en general, generalmente, normalmente, posiblemente, considero/amos/aríamos que	(jo) crec que, (nosaltres) creiem que, (jo) pense que, (nosaltres) pensem que, en la meua/nostra opinió, des del meu/nostre punt de vista, probablement, potser, pot ser que, (jo) opine que, (nosaltres) opinem que, de vegades, en general, generalment, normalment, possiblement, considere/em/aria/ariem	in my/our opinion, I/we believe (that), I/we think (that), I/we feel (that), in my/our view, it seems to, personally, as I see it, probably, perhaps, maybe, sometimes, in general, generally, normally, as far as I'm/am concerned, I/we consider that
Attitude markers	(Estoy/estamos) de acuerdo, no (estoy/estamos) de acuerdo, des/afortunadamente, por suerte, por desgracia, es importante, es necesario, es interesante, (me/nos) gustaría, quiero, queremos, querría(mos), esper(-o/-amos)	(estic/estem) d'acord, no (estic/estem) d'acord, per sort/desgràcia, des/afortunadament, dissortadament, és important, és necessari, cal/caldria (que), és interessant, (m'/ens) agradaria, vull, volem, voldríem, esper(-e/-em)	I agree, I disagree, I don't agree, I do not agree, fortunately, unfortunately, it is/'s/is not/'s not important/interesting/necessary, I would/'d/would not/wouldn't like to, I/we want, I/we hope, I/we would/'d/wouldn't/would not/'d not like

