ASSESSING L3 TEACHERS' BELIEFS ABOUT MULTILINGUALISM: BUILDING, FINE-TUNING AND VALIDATING A TRILINGUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Esther GUTIERREZ EUGENIO

Language Pedagogy PhD Program, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest
egutierrezeugenio@gmail.com

Abstract: Multilingualism is becoming an everyday reality in today's society, and so is the learning of third languages (L3s). Despite the paramount role of L3 teachers in the processes of Third Language Acquisition (TLA), little is known so far about L3 teachers' beliefs about multilingualism. To fill this gap in the literature, a research project was designed to assess the beliefs of teachers of Spanish, French and German as an L3 about a number of issues that have emerged as central in TLA. This paper carefully describes the steps taken in the early stages of this research project: how the overall study was planned, how the research aims and questions were established, how the questionnaire was initially created, how it was piloted and statistically validated with teachers of Spanish as an L3, how these results led to later fine-tuning of the questionnaire, and how the translation of the questionnaire into Spanish, French and German was undertaken. The study concludes by indicating the way in which this second version of the questionnaire will be piloted and validated with teachers of Spanish, French and German as an L3, and the further steps needed to reliably assess the beliefs about multilingualism held by teachers of such languages.

Keywords: multilingualism, L3, teachers' beliefs, questionnaire validation, questionnaire translation.

1 Introduction

Traditionally, the learning and teaching of foreign languages such as Spanish, French or German have been entirely informed by theories of Second Language Acquisition (SLA). However, in the last few decades two factors have emerged that encourage to question whether this approach is any longer acceptable or adequate. The first of these factors has been the development of multilingualism and Third Language Acquisition (TLA) as academic fields of study, which are acquiring an ever-growing body of researchers interested in different aspects of multilingual use, acquisition and processing (eg. Aronin & Toubkin, 2002; Jessner, 2010; Kemp, 2007; Ó Laoire & Singleton, 2009). The second factor has been the establishment of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) at a global level (e.g., Holliday, 2009; Seidlhofer, 2011), which means that English has become for the most studied foreign language around the world for political, financial and social reasons, and therefore the first foreign language learned by the vast majority of foreign language students (European Commission, 2012; SurveyLang, 2012).

These two factors have led to a necessary reconsideration of the nature of learning and teaching of foreign languages other than English. It is easy to argue that languages such as Spanish, French or German are no longer being taught as second but as third (or fourth, or even

fifth) languages. This implies that the pedagogical approach to teaching these third languages (L3s) should therefore diverge from traditional views based on SLA principles, and become informed by the new findings in the fields of multilingualism and TLA.

This paper aims to fill the existent gap in literature regarding L3 teachers' current perception of issues relating to L3 learning by describing the general process of building, fine-tuning and piloting a questionnaire to assess such beliefs. The paper starts with an account of the theoretical framework within which the study was developed, including clarification of terminology used in the field of multilingualism and TLA, as well as a review of previous literature on teachers' beliefs. The rest of the paper will focus on the Methods section, with a special emphasis on the research aim and questions, the initial building and statistical validation of the questionnaire, its later fine-tuning and translation into Spanish, French and German, and the expected steps that will have to be taken in the process of conducting the final, large-scale research project.

2 Theoretical framework

2.1 Multilingualism: definitions and main findings

The term *multilingualism* itself is arguably one of the most problematic terms to define in the field of linguistics (Franceschini, 2009; García-Mayo, 2012; Hammarberg, 2010; Jessner, 2008; Kemp, 2009; Wilton, 2009). As Kemp (2009) explains, researchers in this field seem to agree that "multilingualism is the ability to use three or more languages to some extent, whether these are in the same or different domains" (p. 16). However, an all-encompassing definition that can be applied to all contexts and individuals seems difficult to attain, partly due to the difficulty of defining what exactly constitutes a language, or the minimum level of proficiency that "the ability to use […] to some extent" implies in the above definition. For the purposes of this study, multilingualism will be understood in line with Kemp's definition, and will be used as an umbrella term to include findings about the multilingual learner, TLA, the L3 didactics and the L3 teacher.

2.1.1 Studies with multilingual learners and the establishment of Third Language Acquisition (TLA)

As suggested by Kemp's (2009) definition, for the purpose of this study a *multilingual learner* will be a student who has some knowledge of at least three foreign languages: their mother tongue (L1); a first foreign language (L2), that will arguably be English in most of the cases (with the exception of balanced bilinguals who may actually be considered to have two L1s); and a second foreign language or third language (L3). Multilingual learners have been one of the main foci of study in multilingualism, and a considerable number of interesting studies have been conducted to investigate the language learning processes that multilingual learners engage in. In comparison with L2 learners, findings from these studies suggest that multilingual learners are more autonomous, benefit from their knowledge of their L1s and L2s to support and enhance L3 learning (although this also leads them to making different errors), have a higher language learning aptitude, and use more language learning strategies more often, which are usually more elaborate and better adapted to the learning task (e.g. Aronin & Toubkin, 2002; Bobanović & Kostić-Bobanović, 2011; Jessner, 2010; Kemp, 2007; Kramsch,

2006; Kujalowicz & Zajdler, 2009; Lindqvist, 2009; Mady, 2013; Molnár, 2010; Ó Laoire & Singleton, 2009; Psaltou-Joycey & Kantaridou, 2009; Rivers, 2001; Thompson & Lee, 2012; Van Gelderen et al., 2003).

Thanks to these findings, researchers came to the conclusion that the processes involved in learning a third language were qualitatively different from those underlying the learning of a second language (Cenoz, 2003; Cenoz, Hufeisen & Jessner, 2001; Flynn, Foley & Vinnitskaya, 2004; Jessner, 2008, 2010; Safont Jorda, 2005). L3 learners not only have a larger number of linguistic systems to compare the L3 to, but also seem to have developed enhanced cognitive and metacognitive abilities that help them significantly speed up the L3 learning process (Herdina & Jessner, 2002; Hufeisen, 1998; Hufeisen & Marx, 2007; Jessner, 2006, 2008, 2010; Mady, 2013). This realisation has led to the recent establishment of a new field known as Third Language Acquisition (TLA) and defined by Cenoz (2003:71) as the "acquisition of a non-native language by learners who have previously acquired or are acquiring two other languages". The term L3 or third language is commonly used to refer to any foreign language learnt after the second language or L2, regardless of whether it is actually a third or a tenth language (Cenoz, 2003; Jessner, 2008).

2.1.2 The L3 didactics and the multilingual teacher

Despite the elevated number of studies that exist to date investigating the multilingual learner, little has been written about the multilingual didactics that could be used for the teaching of L3s. The few works that exist to date suggest that L3 didactics should actively refer to the students' knowledge of all their other languages as this will support and enhance L3 learning by encouraging comparisons between linguistic systems throughout the L3 learning process (Cenoz, Hufeisen & Jessner, 2001; Cummins, 2001, 2007; Hinger, Kofler, Skinner & Stadler, 2005; Jessner, 2008; Spöttl & Hinger, 2001; Wong et al., 2007).

Equally little has been written about the role of the teacher that works with multilingual learners (for the few existent related studies, see Aronin & Ó Laoire, 2003; Ellis, 2006, 2010; Griva & Chostelidou, 2012). The L3 teacher, or the *multilingual teacher*, as Jessner (2008) refers to, would ideally be a multilingual learner him/herself, who teaches (or at least has the linguistic knowledge necessary to teach) several languages to multilingual learners. Besides general training in SLA and language teaching, L3 teachers would also have specialised knowledge about TLA and L3 didactics, and would use their own previous experience of learning and using languages to help their students in the process of becoming multilingual individuals.

2.2 English as a lingua franca and the acquisition of third languages

In the last couple of decades, English has established itself as the main language for international communication, which has led many academics to recognise its status as a lingua franca (Holliday, 2005, 2009; Seidlhofer, 2001, 2005, 2011; Widdowson, 1994, 1997, 2002). This reconsideration of English as a lingua franca has also had a knock-on effect on the status of other languages that have traditionally been learned as foreign languages around the world, such as Spanish, French or German.

Although it is expectable that these languages will be learnt as L2s in countries such as the USA, the UK, Australia or New Zealand, where English is the main official language and the L1 of a great portion of the population, the situation may have become different in other countries where English is learnt as the first foreign language by excellence after the mother tongue. In these contexts, of which Europe is a good example (European Commission, 2012; SurveyLang, 2012), the establishment of English as a lingua franca has led to a situation where languages such as Spanish, French or German are now learned, by definition, as L3s.

However, at the moment there is no existing literature that addresses the current mismatch between the theory underlying the vast majority of materials and methodological manuals – the idea that these languages are learnt and taught as a simple second or foreign language – and the reality – the fact that, in a considerable proportion of the cases, these languages are learnt and taught as L3s. Based on the view of a number of experts on multilingualism, who claim that L3 learning is substantially different from L2 learning (Cenoz, 2003; Cenoz, Hufeisen & Jessner, 2001; Flynn, Foley & Vinnitskaya, 2004; Jessner, 2008), the traditional pedagogical approach to teaching these languages should be reviewed in the light of the new findings in the field of TLA.

2.3 Investigating teachers' beliefs and practices

Teachers' beliefs are part of a broader area of study known as teacher cognition, broadly defined as all the social, personal, instructional and experiential factors that influence teachers' decisions in the classroom (Borg, 2003). To date, there exists a good number of studies that have researched the role of teacher cognition on teaching practice (for reviews of these studies, see Borg, 2003; Calderhead, 1996). Of special relevance for the purpose of this study are the studies devoted to the relationship between teacher cognition and teachers' previous experience of learning languages (Bailey et al., 1996; Einstein-Ebsworth & Schweers, 1997; Ellis, 2006, 2010; Johnson, 1994; Lortie, 1975; Numrich, 1996; Woods, 1996), which show how the teachers' own experience as language learners may have more influence on their teaching practice than any pedagogical principles learnt during teacher training.

Not surprisingly given the newness of the field, hardly anything has been written so far on teacher cognition in multilingual contexts. The main exceptions are Griva and Chostelidou's (2012) study on teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards the development of multilingual competence in the Greek educational context, De Angelis' (2011) study on teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the role of students' prior language knowledge in multilingual contexts with immigrants, and Lasagabaster and Huguet's (2007) volume exploring teacher trainees' language use and attitudes towards several languages in European bilingual regions. Considering this lack of research on the cognition of the L3 teacher, and the growing importance of multilingualism and multilingual education in our current society (Cenoz & Jessner, 2009; Jessner, 2008), it seems relevant to investigate what L3 teachers think about multilingual learners and learning processes, the importance they confer to their specific training to teach third languages to multilingual learners, and how their practices are informed by their own knowledge and experience of multilingual use and learning.

3 Main research project

3.1 Research aims

This main research project, of which this paper only describes the first stages of in detail, initially aims to fulfil three research objectives: (1) to assess L3 teachers' beliefs about a number of issues regarding multilingualism; (2) to compare L3 teachers' beliefs with the latest findings in multilingualism research and literature; and (3) to investigate whether there is any relationship between these beliefs and a number of factors that emerged as crucial from the literature. Considering that the main study will be focused in Europe, and that the three most important L3s in Europe are currently Spanish, French and German, the study will also have a fourth aim: (4) to investigate whether there are any significant differences between the beliefs of teachers of Spanish, French and German.

3.1.1 Research aim 1: to assess L3 teachers' beliefs

The first research aim is to assess L3 teachers' beliefs about the following issues identified as central in multilingualism literature:

(1) the use of other languages in the process of learning an L3, including the mother tongue and any other languages students may have learnt as foreign languages (Aronin & O Laoire, 2003; Hall & Cook, 2013; Herdina & Jessner, 2002; Jessner, 2008, 2010);
(2) the specific learning characteristics of the L3 learner (Aronin & O Laoire, 2003; Bobanović & Kostić- Bobanović, 2011; Jessner, 2008, 2010; Kemp, 2007; Molnár, 2010; Psaltou-Joycey & Kantaridou, 2009; Singleton & Aronin, 2008; Thompson & Lee, 2012);
(3) the importance of the different elements relevant for the training of L3 teachers (Aronin & Ó Laoire, 2003; Jessner, 2008, 2010);
(4) the role of teachers' own experience of learning foreign languages in their teaching (Aronin & O Laoire, 2003; Ellis, 2006, 2010; Hinger, Kofler, Skinner & Stadler, 2005; Jessner, 2008; Lowe, 1987; Waters, Sunderland, Bray & Allwright, 1990).

3.1.2 Research aim 2: to compare L3 teachers' beliefs to existing literature

The second research aim is to evaluate the extent to which L3 teachers' beliefs are in line with findings and claims in multilingualism literature regarding the L3 learner, the L3 didactics and the L3 teacher. This aim is motivated by a number of reasons. First of all, multilingualism is a very young field of research and, as a consequence, findings and results have not been translated yet into pedagogical practices. The academic debates and discussions that are taking place in this field are unknown to a great proportion of L3 teachers, and it is currently difficult to find language teaching programmes where multilingualism is covered at any scope in the curriculum, with the exception of Hinger, Kofler, Skinner and Stadler (2005). However, L3 teachers are, by definition, working with L3 learners who are engaged in the process of becoming multilinguals. As privileged observers in the classrooms, L3 teachers may have consciously or unconsciously developed beliefs that support or differ from the findings obtained in multilingualism studies. It would be therefore interesting to see to what extent L3 teachers' beliefs – based on their observations – match the findings in existing literature. This

would also allow for discussion of to what extent L3 teachers are aware of these findings, to what extent they are aware of L3 learning and teaching processes, and to what extent their observations can support or question research findings.

3.1.3 Research aim 3: to identify significant factors that influence L3 teachers' beliefs

The third research aim is to investigate whether there is any relationship between L3 teachers' beliefs and factors such as the teachers' pedagogical training, their teaching experience, their knowledge of languages and their students' knowledge of languages. These factors were identified as central for the teaching of L3s after a careful review of extensive literature on multilingualism (e.g., Aronin & Hufeisen, 2009; Aronin & Ó Laoire, 2003; Cenoz, Hufeisen & Jessner, 2001; Cummins, 2001, 2007; Ellis, 2006, 2010; Hinger, Kofler, Skinner & Stadler, 2005; Jessner, 2008, 2010; Wong et al., 2007).

3.1.4 Research aim 4: to detect differences between Spanish, French and German teachers' beliefs

As explained above, the main study will focus on assessing the beliefs of teachers who are currently teaching one of the three most important L3s in Europe: Spanish, French and German. The fourth research aim is to investigate whether the teachers' beliefs significantly vary depending on the language they teach, and whether the same factors condition the beliefs of the three groups of teachers to the same extent.

3.2 Research questions

Considering the research aims of this study, there will be three sets of research questions: (a) descriptive, aiming only at describing L3 teachers' beliefs about a number of current issues in multilingualism research, which will provide the basis for the comparison between the teachers' answers and the findings in the literature; (b) correlational, to investigate any significant correlations between the teachers' beliefs and a number of factors; and (c) inter-language, to discover whether there are any significant differences between the answers of the Spanish, French and German teachers. Therefore, the research questions for the main study will be as follows:

(a) What are L3 teachers' beliefs regarding…
   1) the use of other languages in the process of L3 learning?
   2) the specific learning characteristics of the L3 learner?
   3) the importance of the different elements relevant for the training of L3 teachers?
   4) the role of teachers' own experience of learning foreign languages in their teaching?
   5) To what extent do these results match findings from existing literature on multilingualism?

(b) Is there a significant correlation between teachers beliefs about the abovementioned issues and …
   6) whether they are native or non-native speakers of the L3?
   7) the number of foreign languages teachers have learnt?
   8) teachers' level of multilinguality?

9) teachers' level in the students' L1? (in cases where students actually share an L1)
10) students' level of multilinguality?
11) teachers' training in foreign language teaching?
12) teachers' experience of teaching the L3 as a foreign language?
13) teachers' experience of teaching other foreign languages?

(c) 14) Are there any significant differences between the answers of the Spanish, French and German teachers to all of the above questions?

Teachers' multilinguality, teachers' experience and students' multilinguality are complex concepts to capture and operationalise. Details on how they are going to be measured in this study are provided in Appendix A.

3.3 Methods

The choice of the methods reflects a compromise between the four different research aims and the practical scope of the study. Set (a) of research questions could have been easily approached from an exploratory perspective using qualitative data collected through in-depth interviews with a reduced number of L3 teachers. This approach could have offered much more detail-rich data to help understand L3 teachers' beliefs about the issues mentioned above, and to compare them with findings in the literature. However, this approach would not have permitted to also answer sets (b) and (c) of the research questions by using one single research instrument, and it would have been impossible to generalise findings obtained with the kind of small sample used in purely qualitative studies (Dörnyei, 2007).

A mixed-methods approach was also considered, as it would have allowed a qualitative assessment of L3 teachers' beliefs, a comparison of these with existing literature findings (answering research questions 1 to 5), and the subsequent use of this qualitative data to build a quantitative questionnaire aimed at answering sets (b) and (c) of the research questions with a larger sample. However, the emphasis in this study does not lie on exploring L3 teachers' beliefs from scratch without any conceptions *a priori*, as is characteristic of qualitative research approaches (Creswell, 1998), but rather to investigate the extent to which L3 teachers' beliefs conform to the expectations set by the literature. For this reason, and taking the fact that sets (b) and (c) of the research questions necessarily require quantitative data, the qualitative and mixed-methods approaches were left aside in favour of a quantitative approach.

The use of a questionnaire to collect quantitative data will allow, first of all, the gathering of information about L3 teachers' beliefs regarding the issues mentioned above, which will be measured through constructs built on the basis of extensive existing literature, and analysed and reported on through the use of descriptive statistics. These results will be compared to the expectations set by the literature and the findings from existing research in multilingualism and TLA. The data collected through the questionnaire will also allow the use of statistical correlations to determine whether the factors identified in the literature as relevant do have a significant effect on L3 teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and processes of L3 learning and teaching. Finally, the quantitative data will make possible a systematic comparison of the answers between the three language subgroups – Spanish, French and German.

The data will therefore be collected through an online questionnaire to reach a greater number of participants. The estimated time needed to complete the questionnaire is between 15 and 20 minutes, which is just below the maximum recommended 30-minute length (Dörnyei, 2010; Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012). The questionnaire will be created on Google forms and administered by email to language institutes and teacher organisations in the countries targeted at each stage of the research project, who will be kindly asked to forward the link with the questionnaire to any potential participants, hoping therefore for snowball sampling (Dörnyei, 2007). The English version of the introduction email that will be sent to these organisations is included in Appendix C; this email is sent in the target languages to facilitate understanding and distribution. Collecting data through an online questionnaire on Google forms offers also the option to easily export the responses into a Microsoft Excel file, which after some minimal modifications can be fed into SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) for statistical analysis.

4 Research stages

In order to answer the research questions stated above, the research process was split into three stages. The first stage involved the initial creation of the questionnaire, its translation into Spanish, and its piloting and first statistical validation. On the basis of these results, the aim of the second research stage was to fine-tune the questionnaire, translate it into Spanish, French and German, and pilot and validate the questionnaire in the three languages. The third research stage involves another fine-tuning of the questionnaire if the results from the second validation encourage it, a large-scale data collection and the analysis and discussion of the final results. The rest of the paper will offer a detailed presentation and discussion of the first research stage, an account on the development of the second research stage, including the process of fine-tuning and translating the questionnaire into Spanish, French and German, and a brief outline of how the third and final research stage will be conducted. The insights from the thorough description of this meticulous process should be a helpful example for further studies involving the creation, validation and use of multilingual questionnaires.

4.1 Stage I

This stage comprised reviewing all the literature, the initial construction of the questionnaire, its translation into Spanish, the piloting of the Spanish version of the questionnaire and the statistical validation of the constructs. In this stage, the only goal was to pilot the research instrument. Therefore, the only research question at this stage was:

- Do items in the questionnaire prove to be reliable measures of the constructs they were intended to measure?

As some authors (Dörnyei, 2007, 2010; Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012) explain, the goal of piloting a questionnaire is three-fold: (1) to detect missing responses and analyse the reasons for this (for example, unclear questions); (2) to assure that questions elicit a wide variety of answers and that for each item participants use the whole range of possible answers (for example, in a 1-to-5-point Likert scale, ideally there would be participants answering each of the points in the scale, including 1 and 5, for each item); (3) to guarantee the internal consistency of the multi-item scales (i.e. to confirm whether the multi-item scales do actually measure the constructs they were designed to measure). In the case of this study, point (1) does not really

apply because the online provider used to administer the questionnaire allowed the activation of an option by which participants could not go on to the next page of the questionnaire if they had not answered every single question in that section. Points (2) and (3) are certainly relevant and directly related to the research question stated above; therefore, they will be discussed when analysing the scales.

4.1.1 Participants

This stage was planned as a cross-sectional study involving teachers of Spanish working in Hungary, Slovenia, Slovakia, Romania, Cyprus, Italy and Bulgaria, where Spanish is arguably taught as an L3 after English (Instituto Cervantes, 2012; Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, 2012). The teachers were forwarded the online questionnaire together with an introductory email by Spanish Embassies, Cervantes Institutes, Spanish teacher associations and universities. A total of 61 teachers decided to participate in the study and filled in the questionnaire, which is considered an acceptable size for a pilot study (Dörnyei, 2007).

As can be observed in Table 1 below, the gender distribution of the participants was approximately 36.7% men and 63.3% women. These figures are only approximate because the field 'gender' was initially omitted by mistake and added at a later stage when 12 participants had already filled in the questionnaire. However, gender is not a central variable in this study and there did not seem to be sufficiently strong reasons to exclude these participants from the study. In terms of age distribution, most of the participants reported to be aged between 26 and 40 (51.8%), followed very closely by the group of participants aged between 41 and 65 (43.3%). Only 3 participants (4.9%) reported to be aged between 18 and 25. Of all the participants, 23 (38.3%) reported to be native speakers of Spanish, while 37 (61.7%) considered themselves as non-native speakers of Spanish. Regarding the kind of institution where participants work, 42.6% reported working at secondary schools, 32.8% working at universities, 13.1% working at private language schools, 6.6% working at the Cervantes Institute, and 4.9% ticked the option of other and explained that they were working as Spanish teachers at different evening schools and special government programmes such as for retired people or students with special needs. All these details are summarised in Table 1 below.

Age			Gender			Country			Institution		
18-25	3	(4.9%)	Males	18	(36.7%)	Hungary	30	(49.2%)	Secondary school	26	(42.6%)
26-40	31	(51.8%)	Females	31	(63.3%)	Slovenia	14	(23%)	University	20	(32.8%)
41-65	27	(43.3%)				Romania	5	(8.2%)	Private language school	8	(13.1%)
						Cyprus	5	(8.2%)			
						Bulgaria	3	(4.9%)	Instituto Cervantes	4	(6.6%)
						Slovakia	3	(4.9%)	Other	3	(4.9%)
						Italy	1	(1.6%)			
			12 missing (~20%)								

Table 1. Detailed information about the participants.

4.1.2 Instrument

The questionnaire in this stage contained a total of 78 questions and the time estimated to complete it was between 15 and 20 minutes, which is just below the maximum recommended 30-minute length (Dörnyei, 2010; Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012). Of these questions, 13 aimed to obtain some background and socio-demographic information about the participants and the remaining 65 were intended to measure a number of constructs that emerged from examining

previous literature, as it is explained in detail below. The questionnaire was in Spanish, as this was the only language common to all of the participants. The non-native speakers of Spanish work as Spanish teachers and are therefore expected to be able to understand a questionnaire about educational issues without any major problems. The English version of the questionnaire used in this stage is included in Appendix D.

The first section of the questionnaire aimed to obtain some basic information about the participants, their teaching context and their experience both as teachers and as language learners. There were some questions that frequently appear in many questionnaire studies, such as gender, age, country and the kind of institution where teachers work, level and age of the students, size of the groups, academic qualifications or years of experience teaching Spanish as a foreign language. However, to fulfil all the research goals of the main study, a number of additional questions were inserted to explore teachers' contact and experience with other languages. These questions regarded the participants' previous experience of learning foreign languages, including the current level that they reported to have in each of them, the number of years teaching foreign languages other than Spanish, and whether they hold any academic qualifications that involve knowledge of any other foreign languages. Finally, another couple of questions also seemed necessary to guarantee that the participants met the requirements to participate in this study: whether their students share their L1 or not, and whether they have learnt other foreign languages before studying Spanish. This last question in particular was aimed at discovering whether it is possible to confirm the initial hypothesis arguing that languages such as Spanish are nowadays mainly learned and taught as an L3, and to filter out those participants who may not actually be teaching Spanish as an L3 but rather as an L2.

The rest of the questionnaire constituted 65 items that intended to measure the 18 constructs identified in TLA literature. The goal was to create multi-item scales to measure these 18 main constructs, following the advice of some experts in SLA research methods (Dörnyei, 2007, 2010; Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012). These constructs were divided among the main four sections described in research aim 1, which constituted the four main central sections of the questionnaire.

> (1) The use of other languages in L3 learning
> (2) Important elements in the training of L3 teachers
> (3) Specific learning characteristics of the L3 learner
> (4) Role of teachers' own experience of learning foreign languages in their teaching

Section (1) was intended to explore the teachers' beliefs about the use of other foreign languages in the classroom. This section was partly adapted from a larger study by Hall & Cook (2013) to measure the same but in the context of English as a foreign language, and resulted from studies and recommendations put forward in TLA to include the students' other languages as one more tool in L3 learning and teaching (Aronin & O Laoire, 2003; Hall & Cook, 2013; Jessner, 2010). This section included the following five constructs:

- *Explain vocabulary and grammar* (3 items): to what extent teachers admitted to using other languages to explain complex vocabulary and grammar. Example: to explain when meanings in Spanish are unclear.
- *Save time* (3 items): to what extent teachers consider that using other languages in the classroom saves time. Example: because it speeds up the language learning process.

- *Class management and interaction* (4 items): to what extent teachers use other languages for class management purposes and to create a friendly classroom atmosphere. Example: to give instructions.
- *Translation* (3 items): to what extent teachers allow and promote translation tasks and strategies in their classroom. Example: when students try to find the best translation in their L1 (or other language) for a Spanish term.
- *Relating to previous knowledge* (3 items): to what extent teachers consider that learning an L3 is helped by relating and linking with previous knowledge in other languages. Example: because it leads to a positive transfer from the other languages into Spanish.

Section (2) researched the importance that teachers assigned to a number of elements in Spanish teacher training. This was based on recommendations on the part of some authors (Aronin & O Laoire, 2003; Jessner, 2008, 2010) and some rare examples of teacher training programmes (Hinger, Kofler, Skinner & Stadler, 2005) where knowledge of other foreign languages is judged almost essential for L3 teachers, as well as specific instruction on TLA theories and research. This section included the following three constructs:

- *Knowledge of other foreign languages* (3 items): to what extent teachers consider that knowledge of other languages is necessary for L3 teaching. Example: general knowledge about the structure and working of other foreign languages.
- *Training in L2 teaching* (2 items): how important training in SLA is for teachers of L3s. Example: specialised training on second language pedagogy.
- *Training in L3 teaching* (2 items): how important training in TLA is for teachers of L3s. Example: familiarity with the theories of third language acquisition and learning.

Section (3) aimed to explore teachers' perceptions and beliefs about the L3 learner and, by extension, about multilingual learning. The items were pooled from the previous research investigating the unique characteristics of L3 learners (Aronin & O Laoire, 2003; Bobanović & Kostić-Bobanović, 2011; Jessner, 2008, 2010; Kemp, 2007; Molnár, 2010; Psaltou-Joycey & Kantaridou, 2009; Singleton & Aronin, 2008; Thompson & Lee, 2012) although no previous research has been found exploring how teachers perceive these characteristics. This section included the following seven constructs:

- *Acquire new lexical and grammatical structures faster* (3 items): to what extent L3 learners are quicker at understanding and learning new vocabulary and new grammar structures. Example: learn new lexical units faster.
- *Learn by comparing to other foreign languages* (5 items): to what extent teachers are aware of students' using other languages to learn Spanish. Example: They compare Spanish grammar to the grammar of other languages.
- *Make different errors* (2 items): to what extent L3 learners make different mistakes due to negative transference from other languages. Example: they make different mistakes.
- *Use of language learning strategies* (5 items): to what extent L3 learners use more language learning strategies more often. Example: they create more opportunities for practicing Spanish.

- *Students' expectations of the teacher* (3 items): L3 students' expectations of the L3 teacher in terms of knowledge of other languages. Example: they prefer multilingual teachers.
- *Aptitude* (3 items): L3 students' have a special aptitude for learning foreign languages. Example: they have more advanced cognitive abilities for language learning.
- *Autonomy* (3 items): L3 students' learning autonomy. Example: they evaluate more carefully the teacher's contribution to their learning.

Section (4) explored to what extent and in which ways teachers considered their previous experience of learning foreign languages helpful in teaching an L3 such as Spanish. In this case, the items were extracted from a number of qualitative studies researching the advantages of knowing other languages for teachers of English (Ellis, 2006, 2010; Lowe, 1987; Waters, Sunderland, Bray & Allwright, 1990) and following current trends that stress the importance of foreign language knowledge for teachers of L3s (Aronin & O Laoire, 2003; Jessner, 2008; Hinger, Kofler, Skinner & Stadler, 2005). This section included the three following constructs:

- *Understand the language learning process* (6 items): to understand from personal experience the language learning processes and to be more aware of the difference that may exist among students, and how to adapt to them. Example: to understand better how their students may differ in their approaches to learning.
- *Foresee difficulties and mistakes* (4 items): to understand the difficulties that L3 students may have, as well as the aspects that will be significantly easier by transference from other languages known by the students. Example: to understand faster why their students are making certain mistakes.
- *Motivate* (2 items): how teachers' previous experience and knowledge of languages may be used as a motivating factor for their students. Example: to unconsciously become a model of successful language learning for their students.

The items intended to measure these 18 constructs sum up to 73 items. The extra 5 items to reach the total of 78 items in total were initially included in the questionnaire in the second, third and fourth sections, but had to be excluded later on as they did not prove an important contribution to any of the constructs.

4.1.3 Procedure

The validation process in this study aimed to follow as closely as possible the steps indicated by Dörnyei (2007, 2010) and Dörnyei and Csizér (2012) for the piloting of questionnaires. First, the items were pooled from relevant literature and previous studies. These items then went through a process of expert judgment where other members of the academic and research field pointed out the items that needed to be reworded or clarified, and offered insights into the internal structure of the questionnaire. Although the questionnaire was initially created in Spanish, due to the fact that the members of the expert team could not understand Spanish, an English translation was used at this stage and the changes were introduced into this English version. These changes were later included in the Spanish questionnaire and, to avoid issues and misinterpretations due to the translation, an external translator also with training in education was asked to back-translate the Spanish version into English (Dörnyei, 2010; Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012). Some differences were pointed out and discussed until the final version of the Spanish questionnaire was agreed upon. One think-aloud protocol was then conducted with a

teacher of Spanish as an L3 working at a university in Budapest, Hungary, which led to further changes and rewordings of some items.

As indicated above, the questionnaire was distributed by email through institutions and associations that hold lists of Spanish teachers in their respective countries. The email with an introductory message and the link to the online questionnaire was then sent to the teachers, who decided whether they wanted to participate in the study and fill in the questionnaire or not. The online questionnaire was designed using Google Forms and answers were automatically recorded into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, which allowed for an easy coding of the answers for later statistical analysis (Dörnyei, 2007, 2010). The questionnaire was active for a period of three weeks, and teachers were informed in the introductory email about the date when the questionnaire would stop accepting answers.

The data obtained was analyzed with SPSS 17.0. The data were normally distributed, which allowed using parametric statistics for the analysis.

4.1.4 The dimensions of analysis

In order to verify whether the chosen items were reliable measures of the constructs they were intended to measure, or whether, on the contrary, there were other underlying dimensions in the questionnaire that had not been considered, the different items that constituted each of the latent constructs were submitted to principal component analysis (PCA; without rotation). The constructs were confirmed as only one principal component emerged from this analysis for each of the latent dimensions.

4.1.5 The analysis of the scales

The next step was to group the items into scales according to the construct they were intended to measure, and to calculate the Cronbach's alpha internal consistency reliability coefficients for each scale in order to confirm the internal validity of the constructs and of the questionnaire. These results will be reported now section by section.

In section (1) there are 5 constructs measured by a total of 16 items. Table 2 presents the Cronbach's alpha coefficients of each scale. While some scales present a very high Cronbach's alpha coefficient, the Cronbach's alpha's value for the scale *Translation* appeared slightly below the recommended .70. This may be due to the fact that only 3 items contributed to measure this construct, while the recommended minimum number of items per construct is 4 items (Dörnyei, 2007). This last criticism regarding the number of items in each construct can be extended to the rest of the scales because, despite presenting a high Cronbach's alpha value, they are only measured by 3 items each (with the exception of *Class management and interaction*).

Constructs	Cronbach's alpha
Explain vocabulary and grammar (3 items)	.751
Save time (3 items)	.918
Class management and interaction (4 items)	.758
Translation (3 items)	.645
Relating to previous knowledge (3 items)	.866

Table 2. Cronbach's alpha values for the scales in section 1.

Section (2) is made up of 3 constructs and the 7 items that intended to measure them. Table 3 presents the Cronbach's alpha values for each of the three scales. Again, the Cronbach's alpha value for the scale *Knowledge of other foreign languages* appears to be slightly below the recommended value of .70, which may be due to the low number of items. The issue with the low number of items per construct is also remarkable in this case, where 2 constructs are only measured by 2 items each. Although it would have been possible to merge some of the constructs and still obtain statistically reliable results, conceptually the three constructs are very different and therefore they should be kept as separate. In this section an extra item was initially included to ask about the importance of having a very advanced knowledge of Spanish. However, it was excluded from the analysis because conceptually it did not help to measure any of the constructs.

Constructs	Cronbach's alpha
Knowledge of other foreign languages (3 items)	.680
Training in L2 teaching (2 items)	.763
Training in L3 teaching (2 items)	.934

Table 3. Cronbach's alpha values for the scales in section 2.

In section (3) there are 24 items intended to measure 7 different constructs. Table 4 shows the Cronbach's alpha values for each of the 7 scales. As in the previous sections, there is one scale (*Make different errors*) whose Cronbach's alpha value appears to be slightly below the recommended value of .70, which again may be due to the fact that only 2 items were used to measure this scale. In this section, two of the scales are very reliable and have an adequate number of items, which means that they could be used unchanged in forthcoming studies. However, there are still 4 scales with only 3 items each, which is slightly below the recommended number of items per scale.

Constructs	Cronbach's alpha
Understand new lexical and grammatical structures faster (3 items)	.851
Learn by comparing to other foreign languages (5 items)	.780
Make different errors (2 items)	.655
Use of language learning strategies (5 items)	.841
Students' expectations of the teacher (3 items)	.836
Aptitude (3 items)	.822
Autonomy (3 items)	.849

Table 4. Cronbach's alpha values for the scales in section 3.

In this section there were initially 2 extra items that had to be excluded from the analysis. These items were intended to measure whether L3 students seemed more motivated to learn and whether they showed less language learning anxiety. However, at the analysis stage these items did not seem to contribute statistically to any construct but rather to create their own individual component. This is logical because motivation and language learning anxiety could be considered as conceptually separate constructs by themselves, and would need the addition of a few items to reliably measure each of them.

Finally, section (4) is constituted by 13 items intended to measure 3 different constructs. Table 5 presents the Cronbach's alpha values for each of the 3 scales. In this section all the

scales present an acceptable Cronbach's alpha value, which means that they are reliable measures of the constructs, and therefore could be used in further research stages. However, the scale *Motivate* is only composed of 3 items and at least one extra item should be added if the questionnaire is to be considered fully reliable.

Constructs	Cronbach's alpha
Understand the language learning process (6 items)	.829
Foresee difficulties and mistakes (4 items)	.722
Motivate (3 items)	.846

Table 5. Cronbach's alpha values for the scales in section 4.

In this section there were also two items that had to be excluded at the analysis stage because they did not seem to measure any of the established constructs but rather create their own separate construct. This is conceptually logical because these two items were intended to measure whether teachers feel their previous experience in learning languages helps them make their students become more autonomous learners, and whether it helps students overcome their language learning anxiety. However, both anxiety and autonomy are complex issues and would need to be turned into separate constructs with several items each if they were to be measured reliably.

4.1.6 Conclusions and limitations

Answering our research question in this stage of the project, we can state that the items do prove to be reliable measures of the constructs they were intended to measure. However, there are a number of issues that have to be observed before establishing the final version of the questionnaire and using it as the research instrument in the main, large-scale study.

One of these issues is the length of the questionnaire. With a total number of 78 questions, the questionnaire has just below the maximum recommended number of questions (Dörnyei, 2007, 2010). The fact that most of the constructs had an insufficient number of items means that a considerable number of extra items need to be added to the questionnaire in order to reliably measure all the constructs. Furthermore, there were a few items that should ideally be turned into constructs themselves, which would also increase the total number of questions. A higher number of questions means longer time needed to fill in the questionnaire, which may discourage a large number of potential participants from participating in the study. When fine-tuning the questionnaire in the following research stage, compromises will have to be made between the number of constructs included and the reasonable maximum length of the questionnaire.

Another issue is the conceptual validity of some the constructs. Although the statistical results prove that the items do measure the constructs they were intended to measure, it would be advisable to revise the wording and content of all the items. It has been noted that, for some of the items, the conceptual link to the construct they are intended to measure does not appear as sufficiently evident. As has been noted before, more items need to be added to all the 2- and 3-item constructs in order to assure the internal validity of the questionnaire.

The revised version of the questionnaire should also aim to develop a clearer system to ask teachers about their knowledge and experience with other languages. The system should

also allow for a more systematic analysis of the number of foreign languages they know and the level they consider to have in each of them. The system used to ask teachers about their academic qualifications also needs to be fine-tuned so that it allows for a quicker and easier statistical analysis.

4.2 Stage II

Stage II builds on the results and limitations found in Stage I. As it has been explained, despite the high Cronbach's alpha values obtained for all the constructs, issues of conceptual validity suggested that a careful revision of the questionnaire should be done before conducting the final study. To make this stage more productive, it also included the translation of the questionnaire from English into French, German and Spanish (recycling partly the Spanish questionnaire translated in the previous stage), so the questionnaire could be piloted and statistically validated in the three languages. The English version of the questionnaire after all the modifications is included in Appendix E. The research question for this stage is the same as in the previous stage i.e. whether the items in the questionnaire prove to be reliable measures of the constructs they are intended to measure. However, in this case there is the added difficulty of answering this question for the three language versions of the questionnaire. The process was divided into three steps: rebuilding the questionnaire, translations, and piloting and validation.

4.2.1 Rebuilding the questionnaire

In addition to the generally acceptable construct validity reached in the previous stage, in order to fulfil the research aims the questionnaire had to be revised for conceptual validity, scope and relevance of the items and constructs, format of some background questions and format of the scales. The introduction also needed to be redrafted to make it shorter, more concise and to adapt it to the new structure of the questionnaire. In the process of redrafting both the introduction and the rest of the questionnaire special attention was paid to the clarity and translatability of the text into the three target languages.

The number of background questions was maintained (13 questions), although they were divided into two subgroups: 7 questions necessary to later create the dependent variables were located at the beginning of the questionnaire, while the other 6 questions asking about general background details, such as gender or age, were included at the end, just before the final thank you. Collecting the data in this order was designed to avoid the negative effects of tiredness on the participants and to assure the quality of the data that will constitute the basis of the dependent variables. Although the final number of background questions was maintained, a number of questions were modified several times until the wording and the answer to be elicited for each question seemed perfectly clear. This process involved several external reviewers who answered the questions and provided their feedback on which elements had been confusing.

The main part of the questionnaire was divided into four sections as in Stage I, although the number of constructs and items varied importantly: from 18 constructs in Stage I to 15 constructs in Stage II, and from 60 items to 75. The lower number of constructs and the higher number of items is explained because special attention was paid to define each construct in as much detail as possible, raising the minimum number of items per construct from 2 to 5, which will assure a higher level of construct validity. This also implied deleting some constructs that

were not essential for the aims of the study, merging existing ones, and adding new ones that had emerged as relevant from a second, more in-depth review of the literature. After redrafting and fine-tuning all the constructs, only 34 items from the original questionnaire were kept. One of the new constructs was also created by merging two incomplete constructs from the original questionnaire, which showed a high Cronbach's alpha value and only one dimension when principal component analysis was conducted with the data obtained in Stage I. Appendix B includes more details about the changes introduced in each section regarding the number of constructs, the constructs, the number of items per construct and the number of old items per construct.

The format of the scales was also an issue that required careful consideration. Statistically, a five point Likert scale is the most reliable and commonly used option to collect interval data for the analysis and measurement of constructs in questionnaire studies. However, it is not always easy to come up with five descriptors that are both meaningful and at the same semantic distance from each other (Dörnyei, 2007). In Stage I the following descriptors were used:

Extremely important, very important, relatively important, not very important, not important at all
Always, almost always, *only sometimes*, hardly ever, never
Strongly agree, partially agree, *neither agree nor disagree*, partially disagree and strongly disagree

The descriptors in italics present different issues. In the case of *only sometimes*, it does not seem to be at the same semantic distance from *almost always* as from *hardly ever*. In the second case, the middle option of *neither agree nor disagree* may be the cause of ambiguity in the respondents' answers as it is difficult to judge whether they are positioning themselves in a middle point between partially agree and partially disagree, or if they really do not have an opinion, in which case the semantic distance to the adjacent points would not be even. To overcome this issue, in Stage II 5-point semantic differential scales are used with descriptors only in the extremes, therefore allowing the respondents to situate their answers in the appropriate spot between the two extremes (Dörnyei, 2007). In the online questionnaire, it will look something similar to what Figure 1 below illustrates:

Figure 1. Example of what the descriptors look like in the online form.

4.2.2 Translations

Considering the research aims, particularly the fourth one, it was of paramount importance that the translations of the questionnaires were as equivalent as possible. For each language, four different people have been involved in the translation, back-translation and reviewing of the questionnaire. The steps followed are described in Table 6.

	Step	Person	Tasks
1	Translation	Person 1 – professional translator	To translate.
2	Initial review	Person 2 – native speaker of the target language, not necessarily with teaching experience	To identify obvious translation issues, linguistic mistakes, strange collocations.
3	Back-translation	Person 3 – native speaker of English not necessarily with teaching or translating experience	To translate back into English.
4	Second review	Person 1	To consider all the comments and corrections, in discussion with person 2 and 3, and to amend the translation accordingly.
5	Final review of the online questionnaire	Person 4 - native-speaker teacher of the concerned language, in every aspect similar to the target population	To add both linguistic and formatting comments i.e. all the options display correctly, the right terminology is used, etc. This last review works almost like a think-aloud protocol, with the reviewers commenting on issues and general impression while filling in the form.

Table 6. Steps in the translation process for each language.

4.2.3 Piloting and validation

The questionnaire will be piloted simultaneously in the three languages in spring 2014. Although the initial plan was to send the questionnaires in the different languages as soon as they were ready, many language institutes usually offer more than one of the target languages, which implied waiting until the three language versions of the questionnaire were ready in order to facilitate its distribution. To avoid interfering with the potential participants of the main study, which aims to take place in the European context, the piloting of the questionnaire will be conducted in other countries where these languages are expectedly taught as L3s, such as Brazil, Japan, India and Egypt.

After all the data has been collected, the statistical validation of the questionnaire described in Stage I will be conducted again. Considering the large amount of questions that had to be changed and added, and the fact that the questionnaire has undergone the process of translation, the intended sample size in this stage is of 150 participants in total, with around 50 participants for each language. This size will allow the application of parametric statistics to confirm the dimensions of analysis and the validity of the constructs for each language version of the questionnaire. It will also help clarify whether any of the items is not strictly necessary so the final version of the questionnaire can be shortened, especially if some of the items do not contribute significantly to the intended construct. Furthermore, this analysis will also allow the identification of differences between the construct validity of each of the language versions of the questionnaire, which may be an indication of possible translation issues. On the basis of this analysis, the final version of the questionnaire will be established in the three languages so it is ready to be used in Stage III.

4.3 Stage III

In this stage, the validated instrument in the three languages will be used to conduct the large-scale data collection in as many European countries as practically possible. The estimated sample size will be between 300 and 450 participants, with around 100-150 participants for each language. This will allow performing statistical tests for both the whole sample and the three language subgroups, which will in turn allow us to answer the research questions and therefore fulfil the research aims stated above. This will lead to a discussion on the importance of training and experience for the development of teachers' beliefs, teachers' awareness about multilingualism and teachers' pedagogical approach to teaching L3s.

5 Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to introduce the research project, to provide the background information necessary to understand the relevance of the study, to situate it within the larger research fields of multilingualism and teachers' beliefs, to explain the emergence and development of the research aims and questions, and to justify how the research methods were chosen to fulfil the specified research aims. As part of the research methods, the research schedule has been presented as divided into three stages, and special emphasis was paid to describing and justifying the steps taken in the first two research stages, which will constitute the theoretical and methodological basis for the implementation of the third, final research stage. At the end, a brief discussion is offered of how the final, large-scale research project intends to be conducted and what the implications may be for the future understanding of teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and about L3 teaching and learning.

The first stage focused on the initial creation of the questionnaire on the basis of existing literature, the initial piloting of the questionnaire, and its statistical validation with a detailed discussion of both the conceptual and statistical issues encountered. From this stage, the most relevant conclusion was the importance of accurately defining the intended constructs at the very beginning of the project. As advised in many manuals on research methods (e.g., Dörnyei, 2007, 2010; Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012), the reviewed literature should provide the basis for the definition of the constructs, which should in turn guide the elaboration of the items that will describe and measure each construct. Despite the fact that some constructs in this stage showed acceptably high internal consistency reliability coefficients when analysed statistically, a thorough analysis of the underlying concepts revealed flaws in the theoretical understanding and underpinning of the constructs, which derived from an insufficiently clear definition of the constructs. These theoretical considerations were carefully examined and incorporated into the questionnaire during the second research stage, which covered the fine-tuning and redesign of the questionnaire, with a more thorough definition of the constructs and a more careful selection of the items that were intended to measure each construct.

This second research stage also involved the translation process of the questionnaire into Spanish, French and German, with a detailed account of the steps followed in this process, the people involved and the tasks assigned to each of these people. From this process, there are a number of lessons learnt that can be useful for future research projects of a similar nature. The first consideration regards the danger of underestimating the work, time and money that the whole process will take. Translators and reviewers obviously need to be paid, but they also need to receive the text in advance to calculate their fee, and this text needs to be as close as possible to the final version since translators are only relatively willing to incorporate changes that were not in the initial text. Translators are also usually very busy professionals, and they

are not always available to complete the translation of the questionnaire as fast as we would wish, which needs to be reflected in the project schedule by allowing a reasonable margin of time for this part of the study.

The work involved in managing the whole translation project may also be easily underestimated: the researcher needs to manage the three translation projects concurrently, liaise with the translators and reviewers, revise all the documents before passing them on to the next person, chase translators and reviewers when the work is not delivered on time, arrange for the payments to be made, etc. Document management may also prove challenging, as the researcher should ideally keep track of all the changes made and suggested by the different translators and reviewers, update versions accordingly, and make sure that the version uploaded online is the definitive version for each language.

Finally, adopting a trilingual questionnaire as the main research instrument also involves a challenge in itself, particularly if the researcher is not proficient in all the languages of the questionnaire. The challenge stems from having to manage and work with a questionnaire in a language that we do not necessarily know well, which makes it very difficult to deal with translation issues that may inevitably not be perceived as such by the researcher, the impossibility to arbitrate any terminological or phraseological disputes between translators and reviewers, or the impracticality of deciphering the meaning of any responses to the open questions.

As this paper has shown, measuring teacher beliefs through a trilingual questionnaire involves many challenges. Some of them are not different to the challenges involved in other questionnaire studies in the social sciences, such as the need to carefully define the constructs from the beginning of the project or to validate the questionnaire through statistical analysis. However, the incorporation of the three languages involves a further level of difficulty to the study, adding the challenge of ensuring that the conceptual and statistical reliability of the questionnaire is not undermined by language and culture issues associated with the translation of the questionnaire into the three languages. This paper has suggested a step-by-step procedure to ensure the reliability of the instrument in the three languages, and has put forward a number of considerations that could be helpful for the future development of similar multilingual questionnaires.

Proofread for the use of English by: John Savage, Publications Assistant, University of Cambridge

References:

Aronin, L., & Hufeisen, B. (2009). *The exploration of multilingualism: Development of research on L3, multilingualism and multiple language acquisition* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Aronin, L., & Ó Laoire, M. (2003). Multilingual students' awareness of their language teacher's other languages. *Language Awareness, 12*(3-4), 204-219.

Aronin, L., & Toubkin, L. (2002). Language interference and language learning techniques transfer in L2 and L3 immersion programmes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 5*(5), 267-278.

Bailey, K. M., Bergthold, B., Braunstein, B., Jagodzinski Fleischman, N., Holbrook, M. P., Tuman, J., Waissbluth, X., & Zambo, L. J. (1996). The language learners' autobiography: Examining the "apprenticeship of observation". In D. Freeman, & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp.11-29). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bobanović, M., & Kostić- Bobanović, M. (2011). A comparative study of language learning strategies used by monolingual and bilingual EFL learners. *Metodički obzori, 6*(3), 41-53.

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching, 36*, 81-109.

Calderhead, J. (1996). Teachers: Beliefs and knowledge. In D. C. Berliner, & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of Educational Psychology* (pp.709-725). New York: Macmillan.

Cenoz, J. (2003). The additive effect of bilingualism on third language acquisition: A review. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 7*(1), 71-87.

Cenoz, J., & Jessner, U. (2009). The study of multilingualism in educational contexts. In L. Aronin, & B. Hufeisen (Eds.), *The Exploration of Multilingualism: Development of research on L3, multilingualism and multiple language acquisition* (pp. 119-135). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Cenoz, J., Hufeisen, B. & Jessner, U. (2001). Towards trilingual education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 4*(1), 1-10.

Creswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.* London: Sage.

Cummins, J. (2001). Instructional conditions for trilingual development. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 4*(1), 61-75.

Cummnins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*(2), 221-240.

De Angelis, G. (2011). Teachers' beliefs about the role of prior language knowledge in learning and how these influence teaching practices. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 8*(3), 216-234.

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (2012). How to design and analyse surveys in second language acquisition research. In A. Mackey, & S. M. Gass (Eds.), *Research methods in second language acquisition: A practical guide* (pp. 74-94). Chichester: Blackwell.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. London: Routledge.

Eisenstein-Ebsworth, M., & Schweers, C. W. (1997). What researchers say and practitioners do: Perspectives on conscious grammar instruction in the ESL classroom. *Applied Language Learning, 8*, 237-260.

Ellis, E. M. (2006). Language learning experience as a contributor to ESOL teacher cognition. *TESL-EJ, 10*(1). Retrieved November 10, 2014 from http://tesl-ej.org/ej37/a3.html

Ellis, E. M. (2010). The invisible multilingual teacher: The contribution of language background to Australian ESL teachers' professional knowledge and beliefs. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *1*(2), 90-108.

European Commission (2012). *Special Eurobarometer 386. Europeans and their languages. Report.* Retrieved August 20, 2014 from
http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_386_en.pdf

Flynn, S., Foley, C., & Vinnitskaya, I. (2004). The cumulative-enhancement model for language acquisition: Comparing adults' and children's patterns of development in first, second and third language acquisition of relative clauses. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 1*(1), 3-16.

Franceschini, R. (2009). The genesis and development of research in multilingualism. In L. Aronin, & B. Hufeisen (Eds.), *The exploration of multilingualism: Development of research on L3, multilingualism and multiple language acquisition* (pp. 27–60). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

García-Mayo, M. P. (2012). Cognitive approaches to L3 acquisition. *IJES, 12*(1), 129-146.

Griva, E., & Chostelidou, D. (2012). Multilingual competence development in the Greek educational system: FL teachers' beliefs and attitudes. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 9*(3), 257-271.

Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2013). Own language use in ELT: Exploring global practices and attitudes. *ELT Research Papers 13-01.* London: British Council 2013.

Hammarberg, B. (2010). The languages of the multilingual: Some conceptual and terminological issues. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 48*, 91-104.

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

Hinger, B., Kofler, W., Skinner, A., & Stadler, W. (2005). The Innsbruck model of Fremdsprachendidaktik: Towards an integrated multilingual approach in pre-service teacher education*. The Teacher Trainer, 15*(1), 17-20.

Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holliday, A. (2009). English as a Lingua Franca, non-native speakers and cosmopolitan realities. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 21-33). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Hufeisen, B. (1998). L3 – Stand der Forschung – Was bleibt zu tun? [State of Art: What remains to be done?] In B. Hufeisen, & B. Lindemann (Eds.), *Tertiärsprachen: Theorien, modellen, methoden [Tertiary languages: Theories, models, methods]* (pp. 169-183). Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Hufeisen, B., & Marx, N. (2007). How can DaFnE and EuroComGerm contribute to the concept of receptive multilingualism? Theoretical and practical considerations. In J. Thije, & L. Zeevaert (Eds.), *Receptive, multilingualism: Linguistic analyses, language policies and didactic concepts* (pp. 307-321). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Instituto Cervantes. (2012). *El español: Una lengua viva. Informe 2012. [Spanish: A live language. Report 2012].* Retrieved November 28, 2014 from http://eldiae.es/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/2012_el_espanol_en_el_mundo.pdf

Jessner, U. (2006). *Linguistic awareness in multilinguals: English as a third language.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Jessner, U. (2008).Teaching third languages: Findings, trends and challenges. *Language Teaching*, *41*(1), 15-56.

Jessner, U. (2010). Metalinguistic awareness in multilinguals: Cognitive aspects of third language learning. *Language Awareness*, *8*(3-4), 201-209.

Johnson, K. E. (1994). The emerging beliefs and instructional practices or preservice English as a second language teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 10*(4), 439-452.

Kemp, C. (2007). Strategic processing in grammar learning: do multilinguals use more strategies? *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *4*(4), 241-261.

Kemp, C. (2009). Defining multilingualism. In L. Aronin, & B. Hufeisen (Eds.), *The exploration of multilingualism: Development of research on L3, multilingualism and multiple language acquisition* (pp. 11-26). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kramsch, C. (2006). The multilingual subject. *International Journal or Applied Linguistics, 16*(1), 97-110.

Kujalowicz, A., & Zajdler, E. (2009). Language activation and lexical processing by Polish learners of English and Chinese – the role of learning experience in TLA. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 6*(1), 85-104.

Lasagabaster, D., & Huguet, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Multilingualism in European bilingual contexts. Language use and attitudes.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Lindqvist, C. (2009). The use of the L1 and the L2 in French L3: Examining cross-linguistic lexemes in multilingual learners' oral production. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 6*(3), 281-297.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lowe, T. (1987). An experiment in role reversal: Teachers as language learners. *ELT Journal, 41*(2), 89-96.

Mady, C. (2013). Learning French as a second official language in Canada: comparing monolingual and bilingual students at Grade 6. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2013.767778.

Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte (2012): *El mundo estudia español. [The world studies Spanish.].* Retrieved November 10, 2014 from http://www.mecd.gob.es/dctm/redele/Material-RedEle/el-mundo-estudia-espanol/estudiaespanol2012definitivo.pdf?documentId=0901e72b816512df

Molnár, T. (2010). Cognate recognition and L3 vocabulary acquisition. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica*, *2*(2), 337-349.

Numrich, C. (1996). On becoming a language teacher: Insights from diary studies. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(1), 131-153.

Ó Laoire, M., & Singleton, D. (2009). The role of prior knowledge in L3 learning and use: Further evidence of psycotypological dimensions. In L. Aronin, & B. Hufeisen (Eds.), *The exploration of multilingualism: Development of research on L3, multilingualism and multiple language acquisition* (pp. 79-102). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Psaltou-Joycey, A, & Kantaridou, Z. (2009). Plurilingualism, language learnign strategy use and learning style preferences. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 6*(4), 460-474.

Rivers, W. P. (2001). Autonomy at all costs: An ethnography of metacognitive self-assessment and self-management among experienced language learners. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*(2), 279-290.

Safont Jorda, M. P. (2005). *Third language learners. Pragmatic production and awareness.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics 11*, 133–58.

Seidlhofer, B. (2005). Key concepts in ELT: English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal, 59*(4), 339-341.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University.

Singleton, D., & Aronin, L. (2007). Multiple language learning in the light of the theory of affordances. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *1*(1), 83-96.

Spöttl, C., & Hinger, B. (2001). A multilingual approach to vocabulary acquisition. Retrieved November 10, 2014 from http://www.inomedia.at/papers/spoettl_hinger/data/index.html

SPSS. (2008). *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (17.0 for Windows) [Computer software].

SurveyLang (2012). *First European survey on language competences*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Thompson, A. S., & Lee, J. (2012). Anxiety and EFL: Does multilingualism matter? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2012.713322.

Van Gelderen, A., Schoonen, R., De Glopper, K., Hulstijn, J., Snellings, P., Simis, A., & Stevenson, M. (2003). Roles of linguistics knowledge, metacognitive knowledge and processing speed in L3, L2 and L1 reading comprehension: A structural equation modelling approach. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 7*(7), 7-25.

Waters, A., Sunderland, J., Bray, T., & Allwright, J. (1990). Getting the best out of 'the language-learning experience'. *ELT Journal, 44*(4), 305-315.

Widdowson H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(2), 377-89.

Widdowson, H. G. (1997). EIL, ESL, EFL: Global issues and local interests. *World Englishes 16*(1), 146-53.

Widdowson, H. G. (2003). *Defining issues in English language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University.

Wilton, A. (2009). Multilingualism and foreign language learning. In K. Knapp, & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Handbook of foreign language communication and learning* (pp. 45-77). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wong, P. L., Murai, H., Bérta-Ávila, M., William-White, L., Baker, S., Arellano, A., & Echandia, A. (2007). The M/M Center: Meeting the demand for multicultural, multilingual teacher preparation. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 34*(4), 9-25.

Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher cognition in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX A

Teachers' multilinguality

Teachers' multilinguality will be measured as a composite of the number of languages they know, including their mother tongue(s), and the level they have in each of these languages in a range from 1 to 7, with 7 = native level, and values 1 to 6 corresponding with the six levels of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages with 1 = A1 and 6 = C2. The index of multilinguality will be calculated by simply adding the levels they have in the different languages. The results will be figures, which will be rank ordered to create three profiles of teacher multilinguality: lower, medium and high multilinguality. Teachers with high multilinguality will have either a very high level in a few languages, or a lower level in an higher number of languages. Counting languages and, more specifically, discussing what is considered as a language, is a recurrent source of conflict in multilingualism research and, as argued by (Kemp, 2009), the researcher's obligation is to always clarify as much as possible what parameters are taken into consideration to determine the number of languages. In the case of this study, and also as advised by this author as a common practice in multilingualism research, the participants are asked to self-report both on the number of languages and on the level in each language.

Students' multilinguality

Students' multilinguality will be assessed by asking teachers whether their students (i) only know their L1, (ii) already know an L2 or (iii) already know at least two foreign languages when they start learning the supposedly L3. This will allow the confirmation of whether the languages assessed are in practice learned as L3s, which would support the main purpose of this whole study, and whether there is any relationship between students' multilinguality and the teachers' beliefs to the abovementioned issues.

Teachers' experience

Teachers' experience will be measured in a range from 1 to 6, as observed in the questionnaire (Appendix E, Page 1 – General questions, sixth question). The value '1 = No experience at all' aims to cover teachers with no experience of teaching the L3 but also and most importantly with no experience of teaching other languages, as it may be case for many teachers who have never taught more than the L3.

Students' multilinguality

Students' multilinguality will be measured in terms of whether students only know their L1, already know or have studied an L2, or know or have studied at least other two foreign languages before starting to learn the target L3 language. This question is asked straight-forwardly to the teachers in similar terms (Appendix E, Page 1 – General questions, first question).

APPENDIX B

Summary of changes in the constructs and number of items from Stage I to Stage II

Number of sections, constructs and items.

Stage I	Stage II
4 main sections	4 main sections
18 constructs	15 constructs
60 items	74 items

Details of the four sections indicating the number of constructs, the number of items per construct (in brackets) and the number of old items from Stage I that are used in Stage II.

Stage I	Stage II
Section 1 - Use of other languages in L3 learning	

1) Explain (3) 2) Save time (3) 3) Class management (4) 4) Translation (3) 5) Transference/relating (3)	1) Explaining grammar and vocabulary (5) – 1 old 2) Promoting interlinguistic transference (5) – 3 old 3) Helping students become multilingual individuals (5)

Section 2 – Important elements in the training of L3 teachers

1) Knowledge of foreign languages (3) 2) Training in L2 teaching (2) 3) Training in L3 teaching (2)	1) Knowledge of foreign languages (5) – 1 old 2) Training in L2 teaching (5) – 2 old 3) Training in L3 teaching (5) – 2 old 4) Experience of learning foreign languages (5) – 1 old 5) Experience using foreign languages (5)

Section 3 – Specific learning characteristics of the L3 learner

1) Language learning strategies (5) 2) Expectations of the teacher (3) 3) Aptitude (3) 4) Autonomy (3) 5) Learn faster (3) 6) Interlinguistic and compare (5) 7) Mistakes (2)	1) Aptitude (5) – 3 old 2) Autonomy (5) – 3 old 3) Influence and use of other FLs (7) – 7 old ➢ combination of the scales "Interlang compare" + "Mistakes" Cronbach α = .874, 1 dimension

Section 4 – Role of teachers' own experience of learning foreign languages in their teaching

1) Understand language learning process (6) 2) Foresee difficulties and mistakes (4) 3) Motivate (3)	1) Experience of learning foreign languages (5) – 5 old 2) Knowledge of foreign languages (7) – 4 old 3) Motivate (5) – 3 old

APPENDIX C

Email sent to potential participants

Dear colleagues,

My name is Esther Gutiérrez Eugenio and I am a Spanish teacher in the Department of Translation and Interpreting at the University of Eötvös Loránd, Budapest (Hungary).

I am writing to you because I would like to ask you for a huge favour. At the moment I am working on a research project about teaching languages to multilingual students, and I would be extremely grateful if you could fill in the following questionnaire:

(link to questionnaire)

It shouldn't take you more than **15-20 minutes**. Apart from the first and last sections, where you have to include some basic information about yourselves and about your personal

experience, the rest of the questionnaire can be **easily and quickly filled in by selecting an option from 1 to 5**. It really takes less time to fill in than it may seem at the beginning!

Officially, the questionnaire will be active until **(deadline)**. However, if for any reason you need a few more days, please let me know and I will reactivate the questionnaire so you can submit your responses even after the deadline.

I would also like to ask you to please forward this questionnaire to all the LANGUAGE teachers you may know. The more people that fill in the questionnaire, the more solid the results will be.

Thank you very much in advance to all of you for your help.

Best regards,

Esther Gutiérrez Eugenio
(author's email address)

APPENDIX D

Stage I – Questionnaire in English

1. Gender:
2. Age range: 18-25   26-40   41-65
3. Country where you work:
4. Type of school/institution where you teach Spanish most often: (tick ONE)
   Primary school
   Secondary school
   University
   Private language school (*Academia*)
   Cervantes Institute
   Other (please specify)
5. Age of learners you teach most often: (tick ONE)
   6-11   12-17   18-23   24-49   50+
6. Spanish level of the learners you teach most often: (tick ONE)
   Beginner   (A1-A2)   Intermediate (B1-B2)   Advanced (C1-C2)
7. Number of learners in your classes, on average: (tick ONE)
   1-10   11-20   21-30   30+
8. If you had to describe your students, you would say that…
   They share a common L1.
   They don't share a common L1.
9. Which of the following statements best describes your students' prior experience of learning foreign languages?
   My students only know their L1.
   My students have studied/learnt an L2.
   My students have studied/learnt at least another two foreign languages.
10. Please fill in the following chart specifying as accurately as possible the languages that YOU know, including your L1.

"Your L1" refers to your mother tongue, if it's not Spanish. If you are a native speaker of Spanish, please leave this space blank. "Your students' L1" refers to the mother tongue of your students, if they share it. If you don't have any knowledge of your students' L1, please leave this space blank. "Other languages" refers to other foreign languages that you may have studied or learned, and that are neither Spanish nor your mother tongue, nor the L1 of your students. If you don't know any foreign language, please just leave these spaces blank.

	Native	C1-C2	B1-B2	A1-A2
Spanish				
Your L1 (if not Spanish)				
Your students' L1 (if they share it)				
Other language 1				
Other language 2				
Other language 3				
Other language 4				
Other language 5				

11. Years of experience as a Spanish teacher:
12. Years of experience as a teacher of languages other than Spanish:
If you have only taught Spanish, please indicate "0".
13. Academic qualifications
Please select the options that best fit your profile. You can also select the options "other" and specify in the blank space at the end of this question.
Degree in Spanish language or Linguistics
Degree in Modern Languages or Translation and Interpreting
Degree in other (please specify):
MA in Spanish language or Linguistics
MA in Modern Languages or Translation and Interpreting
MA in Teaching Spanish as a Foreign Language
MA in other (please specify):
PhD in Spanish language or Linguistics
PhD in Modern Languages or Translation and Interpreting
PhD in Teaching Spanish as a Foreign Language
PhD in other (please specify):
I don't have any academic qualifications
Other (please specify):

14. **MULTILINGUALISM IN THE SPANISH CLASSROOM**
   This section is going to focus on YOUR opinion about the use of other languages during the Spanish lessons. Please remember that there are no correct or incorrect answers, what counts is YOUR opinion.
   Using other foreign languages in the classroom IS JUSTIFIED:
   Strongly agree, partially agree, neither agree nor disagree, partially disagree and strongly disagree
a) To explain complex vocabulary
b) To give instructions
c) To explain grammar
d) To develop good classroom atmosphere
e) To explain when meanings in Spanish are unclear

f) To assess students' knowledge of Spanish
g) To maintain discipline
h) To do activities of pedagogic translation
i) When students prepare for tasks (for example, in their L1) before switching to Spanish
j) When students try to find the best translation in their L1 (or in other common language) for a Spanish term
k) Because it saves time
l) Because it speeds up the language learning process
m) Because it speeds up the comprehension process
n) Because it helps learners relate new Spanish-language knowledge to their knowledge in other languages
o) Because it leads to positive transfer from the other languages into Spanish
p) Because language learning is by definition a multilingual activity

15. **TEACHERS OF MULTILINGUAL STUDENTS**

This section focuses on the training that YOU consider recommendable for teachers who work with groups of students who have previous knowledge of other languages. Remember that there are no right or wrong answers, what counts is YOUR opinion.

How important do you consider the following aspects in the training of teachers of multilingual students?

Extremely important, very important, relatively important, not very important, not important at all

a) Native proficiency of the target language
b) General knowledge about the structure and working of other foreign languages
c) Personal experience of learning foreign languages
d) Intermediate-advanced level of other foreign languages
e) Specialised training on second language pedagogy
f) Familiarity with the theories of second language acquisition and learning
g) Specialised training on third language pedagogy
h) Familiarity with the theories of third language acquisition and learning

16. **MULTILINGUAL STUDENTS AND THE TEACHER OF SPANISH**

This section seeks to know YOUR opinion about the students who have previous knowledge of other foreign languages. Please remember that there are no right or wrong answers, what matters is YOUR opinion.

In comparison with other learners of Spanish, multilingual learners…

Always, almost always, only sometimes, hardly ever, never

a) learn new lexical items faster
b) guess the meaning of lexical items in Spanish more easily
c) compare Spanish lexical items to those of other languages
d) make up new lexical items in Spanish (correct or incorrect) based on their knowledge of other languages
e) understand grammatical structures faster
f) compare Spanish grammar to the grammar of other languages
g) use grammatical structures borrowed from other languages
h) ask for clarification in another language
i) make different mistakes
j) confuse linguistic elements between languages

In your opinion, multilingual learners…

Strongly agree, partially agree, neither agree nor disagree, partially disagree and strongly disagree

k) have a special aptitude to learn languages
l) have an advanced practical knowledge of language learning processes
m) have more advanced cognitive skills for language learning
n) use more language learning strategies
o) use language learning strategies more often
p) have developed their own personal language learning strategies
q) create more opportunities for practicing Spanish
r) are more autonomous learners
s) depend less on the teacher
t) show more interest to know about the other languages spoken by the teacher
u) prefer multilingual teachers
v) have higher expectations of the foreign language teacher
w) evaluate more carefully the teacher's contribution to their learning
x) study Spanish in a more structured manner
y) are more motivated to learn Spanish
z) show less language learning anxiety

17. **TEACHERS WITH PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF LEARNING OTHER LANGUAGES**

This last section aims to discover YOUR opinion about the teachers' prior experience in learning languages, and about the influence of this experience in their teaching practices. Again, please remember that there are no right or wrong answers, and that the only thing we are interested in is YOUR opinion.

The teachers' previous experience of learning and studying foreign languages will allow them to be able to…

Strongly agree, partially agree, neither agree nor disagree, partially disagree and strongly disagree

a) Empathise with their students when they are struggling
b) Understand better the learning process that their students are going through
c) Anticipate their students' difficulties more easily
d) Understand faster why their students are making certain mistakes
e) Plan their explanations better
f) Base their explanations on the differences and similarities between linguistic systems
g) Share with their students the language learning strategies that worked for them
h) Guide their students more confidently through the language learning process
i) Unconsciously become a model of successful language learning for their students
j) Understand better how their students may differ in their approaches to learning
k) Adapt more easily to the students' different learning styles
l) Motivate their students
m) Transmit more positive experiences about the language learning process
n) Help their students overcome their language learning anxiety
o) Help their students become more autonomous learners

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
This is the end of the questionnaire.
Please don't forget to click on the "Submit" button at the end of this page so your answers are recorded in the system.

As explained at the beginning of the questionnaire, you participation is totally anonymous. However, if you would be interested in knowing the results of this study, or would be willing to participate in a round of interviews at a later stage, please leave your email address in the following space and specify on what the purpose we are allowed to contact you in the future.

APPENDIX E

Stage II – Questionnaire in English
(items followed by * are old items from Stage I)

Multilingual students and the teacher of LANGUAGE

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY.

The average length of the questionnaire is 15-20 minutes. It is divided into six sections/pages, which you will discover progressively when clicking on the button "Continue" at the bottom of each page. While questions in sections 1 and 6 may require a bit more of elaboration, all the questions in sections 2 to 5 are easily answered by selecting your response in a 1-to-5 scale.

Introduction
1. General questions (7 questions)
2. Multilingualism in the LANGUAGE classroom (15 questions)
3. Teachers of multilingual students (25 questions)
4. Multilingual students (17 questions)
5. Teachers with previous experience of learning other languages (17 questions)
6. General background details (6 questions)
   Final thank you

Participation in this study is completely voluntary and anonymous. However, at the end of the questionnaire you will have the chance to leave your email address if you wish to receive the results of this study, or if you would be willing to participate in a potential round of interviews about this same topic in the future.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH AGAIN FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.

PAGE 1 – GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. **Which of the following statements best describes your students' prior experience of learning foreign languages?**
   When they start learning LANGUAGE,
   Most of my students only know their mother tongue.
   Most of my students already know or have studied one other foreign language.
   Most of my students already know or have studied at least two other foreign languages.
2. **Which of the following statements best describes your students in terms of their mother tongue?**
   A/All or most of my students share a common mother tongue.
   B/ My students do not share a common mother tongue.

If you selected statement A ("All or most of my students share a common mother tongue")
in the previous question, please specify now YOUR current level in your students' mother
tongue. (Circle ONE)
None
A1 - Beginner
A2 – Elementary
B1 - Lower intermediate
B2 - Upper intermediate
C1 - Advanced
C2 - Proficiency
Native

3. Is LANGUAGE your mother tongue?
Yes.
No.

4. Did you grow up as a bilingual/trilingual/multilingual child?
No.
Yes, I grew up as a bilingual child with two mother tongues.
Yes, I grew up as a trilingual child with three mother tongues.
Yes, I grew up as a multilingual child with more than three mother tongues.

5. How many foreign languages have you learnt or studied? (Circle ONE)
Please include here EVERY FOREIGN LANGUAGE that you have learnt or studied at some
point in your life. This includes LANGUAGE too if it is not your mother tongue. Please do
NOT include your mother tongues(s).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 more than 10

Please specify your proficiency level in each of these foreign languages.

	A1 – Beginner	A2 – Basic	B1 – Lower intermediate	B2 – Upper intermediate	C1 – Advanced	C2 – Proficient
Foreign language 1						
Foreign language 2						
Foreign language 3						
Foreign language 4						
Foreign language 5						
Foreign language 6						
Foreign language 7						
Foreign language 8						
Foreign language 9						
Foreign language 10						

6. Experience as a language teacher:

	No experience at all	Less than a year	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-20 years	More than 20 years
Teaching LANGUAGE as a foreign language						
Teaching other foreign languages						

7. Academic qualifications
Please, choose the options that best describe your profile.

	LANGUAGE/Hispanic Studies/Linguistics	Other foreign languages/ Translation/Interpreting	Teaching LANGUAGE as a foreign language	Pedagogy/Education	Other
Certificate/diploma/course					
Bachelor degree/BA/BSc					
Master/MA/MSc					
PhD					

PAGE 2 – Multilingualism in the LANGUAGE classroom
This section focuses on YOUR opinion about the use of other languages in the LANGUAGE classroom. Please, remember that there are no right or wrong answers, YOUR opinion is what matters the most.
Using other foreign languages in the classroom IS JUSTIFIED:
Strongly disagree _____ x _____ x _____ x _____ x _____ Strongly agree

To explain when meanings in LANGUAGE are unclear*
To speed up the language learning process*
To help students get used to switching from one language to another
To explain nuances in the meaning of words
To encourage positive transfer from the other languages into LANGUAGE*
To help students develop as multilingual individuals
To explain the use of certain grammatical structures
To reactivate students' passive knowledge of LANGUAGE through the other languages
To help students become successful communicators across all their languages
To help students find the best translation for terms and expressions
To help learners relate new LANGUAGE-language knowledge to their knowledge in other languages*
To prepare students for real life situations where code-switching may be necessary
To explain aspects of the language that otherwise would not be understood
To help students realise the similarities and differences between LANGUAGE and the other languages
To help students develop their ability to interact in settings where more than one language is used

PAGE 3 – Teachers of multilingual students
This section focuses on the training that YOU consider advisable for teachers who work with groups of students who have previous knowledge of other foreign languages. Remember that there are no right or wrong answers, what matters here is YOUR opinion.
How important do you consider that the following aspects are in the training of teachers of multilingual students?
Not important at all _____ x _____ x _____ x _____ x _____ Extremely important

Knowledge about the general characteristics of other foreign languages*
Specialised training in teaching second languages*
Personal experience of learning foreign languages*
Familiarity with current research in second language teaching and learning
To have experienced the difficulty of learning a foreign language
Personal experience communicating in one or several foreign languages
Specialised training in teaching third languages*
Knowledge of the students' mother tongue
Familiarity with the different methods of second language teaching
To have successfully learnt a foreign language
Familiarity with current models of multilingualism
Personal experience interacting in multilingual settings
Familiarity with the theories of third language acquisition and learning*
Knowledge of the other foreign languages their students know
Continuous in-service training on second language didactics
To have learnt LANGUAGE as a foreign language
Personal experience in code-switching
Basic knowledge of several foreign languages
Familiarity with the practical aspects of third language teaching and learning
Personal experience mediating between speakers of different languages
Familiarity with the theories of second language acquisition and learning*
Advanced knowledge of at least one foreign language
To have gone through the ups and downs of learning a foreign language
Personal experience negotiating meanings between speakers of different languages
Familiarity with current research in third language teaching and learning

PAGE 4 – Multilingual students
The aim of this section is to discover YOUR opinion about the students who arrive at the LANGUAGE classroom with previous knowledge of other foreign languages. Remember that there are no right or wrong answers, what matters here is YOUR opinion.
In comparison with other learners of LANGUAGE, multilingual learners…
Strongly disagree _____ x _____ x _____ x _____ x _____ Strongly agree

Have a special aptitude to learn languages*
Are more autonomous learners*
Compare LANGUAGE lexical items to those of other languages*
Make different mistakes*
Have an advanced practical knowledge of language learning processes*
Evaluate more carefully the teacher's contribution to their learning*
Use grammatical structures borrowed from other languages*
Have a special ability to deduce the rules governing the linguistic system
Confuse linguistic elements between languages*

Manage their own learning more efficiently
Have more advanced cognitive skills for language learning*
Ask for clarification in another language*
Depend less on the teacher*
Compare LANGUAGE grammar to the grammar of other languages*
Have a greater sensitivity to recognise the grammatical functions of words
Are more willing to take responsibility for their own learning process
Make up new lexical items in LANGUAGE (correct or incorrect) based on their knowledge of other languages*

PAGE 5 – Teachers' own experience of learning foreign languages

This last section aims at discovering YOUR opinion about the teachers' previous experience of learning foreign languages, and about its influence in their teaching practices. Again, please remember that there are no right or wrong answers, and that the only thing that matters here is YOUR opinion.
The teachers' previous experience of learning and studying foreign languages will allow them to be able to…
Strongly disagree _____ x _____ x _____ x _____ x _____ Strongly agree

Empathise with their students when they are struggling *
Anticipate difficulties more easily *
Motivate their students*
Recognise more easily the students' different learning styles*
Promote comparisons between the different languages
Transmit more positive experiences about the language learning process*
Understand better the learning process that their students are going through*
Plan better their explanations *
Link new linguistic structures to other languages that students know
Share personal experiences of successful interaction in multilingual situations
Guide their students more confidently through the language learning process*
Understand faster why students are making certain mistakes*
Explain how they managed to overcome challenges while learning foreign languages
Anticipate what aspects of the language will be particularly easy for students
Unconsciously become a model of successful language learning for their students*
Base their explanations on the differences and similarities between linguistic systems*
Understand better how their students may differ in their approaches to learning*

PAGE 6 – GENERAL BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

   1.   **Gender:** Male   Female

   2.   **Age:** _____

   3.   **Country where you work:** _____

4.   Type of school/institution where you teach LANGUAGE most often: (circle ONE)
Primary school
Secondary school
University
Private language school (*Academia*)
Cervantes Institute
Other (please specify)

5.   Age of learners you teach most often: (circle ONE)
6-11 12-17   18-23 24-49   50+

6.   Level of LANGUAGE of the learners you teach most often: (circle ONE)
Beginner (A1-A2)   Intermediate (B1-B2) Advanced (C1-C2)

PAGE 7 – THANK YOU VERY MUCH!

This is the end of the questionnaire. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND YOUR PARTICIPATION.

Please, DO NOT FORGET TO CLICK ON THE BUTTON "SUBMIT" AT THE END OF THIS PAGE so all your answers can be recorded in the system.

As indicated at the beginning of the questionnaire, if you would like to receive a summary of the results of this study, or if you would be interested to participate in an interview about this topic in the future, please leave your email address in the space provided below.
_____

Please, specify on what purpose we are authorised to contact you on this email address.
___ I would like to know the results of this study.
___ I would be interested to participate in an interview about this topic.

Your answers have been recorded successfully.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION! :-)