

THE EFFECTS OF TRANSLANGUAGING PEDAGOGY IN THE PRE-STAGES
OF ACADEMIC WRITING AT THE TERTIARY LEVEL IN AN EFL CONTEXT,
TÜRKİYE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

EDA AKDENİZ

IN PARTIAL FULLFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

JULY 2025

Approval of the thesis:

THE EFFECTS OF TRANSLANGUAGING PEDAGOGY IN THE PRE-STAGES OF ACADEMIC WRITING AT THE TERTIARY LEVEL IN AN EFL CONTEXT, TÜRKİYE

submitted by **EDA AKDENİZ** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Master of Arts in the department of English Language Teaching, the Graduate School of Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University** by,

Prof. Dr. Sadettin KİRAZCI
Dean
Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Nurten BİRLİK
Head of Department
Department of Foreign Language Education

Prof. Dr. Nurdan GÜRBÜZ
Supervisor
Department of Foreign Language Education

Examining Committee Members:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zeynep BİLKİ (Head of the Examining Committee)
TED University
Department of Foreign Language Education

Prof. Dr. Nurdan GÜRBÜZ (Supervisor)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Foreign Language Education

Assist. Prof. Dr. Müge GÜNDÜZ
Middle East Technical University
Department of Foreign Language Education

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Eda AKDENİZ

Signature:

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF TRANSLANGUAGING PEDAGOGY IN THE PRE-STAGES
OF ACADEMIC WRITING AT THE TERTIARY LEVEL IN AN EFL CONTEXT,
TÜRKİYE

AKDENİZ, Eda

M.A., English Language Teaching

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Nurdan GÜRBÜZ

July 2025, 138 Pages

This study investigates the impact of translanguaging pedagogy on academic writing among English-major university students in Türkiye, aiming to enhance the understanding of how translingual strategies can improve writing outcomes in an EFL context. Recognizing the challenges students face in mastering writing skills, this research explores the effectiveness of various prewriting discussion conditions: no prewriting discussion, discussions conducted in English, discussions in Turkish, and discussions under translanguaging conditions. By employing a mixed-methods approach, the study quantitatively analyzes writing performance through metrics such as word count, grammatical accuracy, and the richness of ideas, while qualitatively examining the functions of prewriting discussions in fostering idea generation and argument structuring. The findings are expected to reveal a significant relationship between the level of translanguaging exposure and the quality of student writing, providing valuable insights into the role of bilingual strategies in enhancing academic performance. This research not only contributes to the existing literature on translanguaging in language education but also offers practical

implications for educators seeking to implement effective writing instruction in multilingual classrooms.

Keywords: Translanguaging Pedagogy, Academic Writing, Prewriting Discussions, EFL Context

ÖZ

YÜKSEKÖĞRETİM KADEMESİNDE YABANCI DİL ÖĞRETİMİNİN;
(TÜRKİYE BAĞLAMINDA) AKADEMİK YAZIM ÖNCESİ SÜRECİNDE
FARKLI ÖLÇÜDE UYGULANAN DİLLER ARASI PEDAGOJİNİN ETKİLERİ

AKDENİZ, Eda

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Nurdan GÜRBÜZ

Temmuz 2025, 138 Sayfa

Bu çalışma, Türkiye'deki İngilizce bölümünde okuyan üniversite öğrencileri arasında diller arası pedagojinin akademik yazma üzerindeki etkisini araştırmaktadır. Amaç, diller arası stratejilerin EFL (Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce) bağlamında yazma sonuçlarını nasıl iyileştirebileceğini anlamaktır. Öğrencilerin yazma becerilerini geliştirmekte karşılaştıkları zorlukları göz önünde bulundurarak, bu araştırma çeşitli ön yazma tartışma koşullarının etkinliğini incelemektedir: ön yazma tartışması olmadan, İngilizce yapılan tartışmalar, Türkçe yapılan tartışmalar ve diller arası koşullar altında yapılan tartışmalar. Karma yöntemler kullanarak, çalışma yazma performansını kelime sayısı, gramer doğruluğu ve fikir zenginliği gibi ölçütlerle niceliksel olarak analiz ederken, ön yazma tartışmalarının fikir üretimi ve argüman yapılandırma üzerindeki işlevlerini niteliksel olarak incelemektedir. Bulguların, diller arası maruziyet düzeyi ile öğrenci yazım kalitesi arasında önemli bir ilişki ortaya koyması beklenmektedir. Bu araştırma, diller arası pedagojinin dil eğitimi alanındaki mevcut literatüre katkıda bulunmanın yanı sıra, çok dilli sınıflarda etkili yazma öğretimi uygulamak isteyen eğitimciler için pratik çıkarımlar sunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Diller arası Pedagoji, Akademik Yazma, Yazma Öncesi Tartışmalar, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Bağlamı

*To my two dearest people,
Yeter and Hüsnü Akdeniz*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my profound gratitude to the individuals who have provided invaluable support, both academically and emotionally, during the preparation of this thesis.

First and foremost, I would like to express my profound gratitude to my esteemed advisor, Prof. Dr. Nurdan GÜRBÜZ, who has provided me with invaluable guidance throughout the entirety of my academic endeavors. Her meticulous academic mentorship, unwavering patience, and unwavering support have been instrumental in shaping my academic journey. Her academic perspective and encouraging approach have been instrumental in shaping this thesis. I also extend my deepest thanks to the examining committee members, Assist. Prof. Dr. Müge GÜNDÜZ and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zeynep BİLİKİ for their enlightening contributions to my thesis.

I would also like to extend my sincere gratitude to the twenty-three voluntary student participants who generously contributed their time, effort, and insights to this study. Their willingness to engage with the writing tasks, share their academic experiences, and reflect on their linguistic processes enriched the data collection process in meaningful ways. Without their commitment, cooperation, and thoughtful participation, this research would not have been possible. Their contributions lie at the very heart of this thesis, and I am truly appreciative of their dedication.

I am appreciative of the unwavering support and encouragement provided by my family throughout this challenging period. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my mother, Yeter AKDENİZ, and my father, Hüsnü AKDENİZ, for their unconditional love and unwavering belief in me. Their steadfast patience and unending faith have been my anchors during this trying time. The absence of such support would have rendered this journey significantly more arduous.

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my brother Ercan, who has always been there for me with his steady support and sincere presence. His encouragement and help have lifted my spirits and strengthened me, even when we were far apart. During this journey, knowing he was there gave me great comfort.

I am deeply grateful to someone whose presence, though miles away, was always felt in the quiet moments of this journey. His unwavering support, unspoken yet constant, became a source of strength when I needed it most. Some connections transcend distance, time, and silence and his presence was a quiet light guiding me during my thesis process.

To my close companion Rio remembering you during this journey has provided me with a significant source of strength. I am appreciative of the moments shared with this individual, a companion of modest stature.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xv
CHAPTERS	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	4
1.3. Purpose of the Study	5
1.4. Research Questions	6
1.5. Significance of the Study	7
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	9
2.1. Writing in Second Language.....	9
2.2. Academic Writing Development	11
2.3. Pre-writing Stages in Writing.....	12
2.4. Towards Translanguaging.....	14
2.5. Translanguaging vs Code- Switching	18
2.6. Translanguaging as a Pedagogy	22
2.7. Studies of Translanguaging Pedagogy in Türkiye	24
2.8. Intersection of Translanguaging and Second Language Writing	28
3. METHODOLOGY.....	33
3.1. The Research Design.....	33
3.1.1. Type of Research.....	33
3.1.2. Exploratory Sequential Design	35

3.2. Participants and Setting	36
3.2.1. Participants	36
3.2.2. Setting.....	38
3.3. Data Collection Instruments.....	39
3.3.1. Scale Developed for the Analysis of Written Products.....	39
3.3.2. Pre-writing Discussion Recordings	40
3.3.3. Written Semi-structured Interview Forms.....	40
3.4. Data Collection Procedure	41
3.5. Data Analysis Procedure	43
3.5.1. Qualitative Analysis	43
3.5.2. Quantitative Analysis	44
4. RESULTS.....	45
4.1. Results	45
4.2. Quantitative Results	46
4.3. Qualitative Results	52
4.3.1. Pre- Task Written Interview Outputs	52
4.3.2. Post- Task Written Interview Outputs.....	64
5. DISCUSSION	68
5.1. Discussion of the Research Questions	68
5.1.1. Discussion of the Research Question 1	69
5.1.2. Discussion of the Research Question 2	75
6. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS	82
6.1. Conclusion of the Research Questions.....	82
6.2. Conclusion of the Interviews.....	87
6.3. Implications of the Study	93
6.4. Limitations	98
6.5. Recommendations for Future Research	100
REFERENCES.....	102
APPENDICES	
A. PRE-TASK WRITTEN INTERVIEW	115
B. POST-TASK WRITTEN INTERVIEW	117
C. FOUR WRITING TASK CONDITIONS	119
D. ACADEMIC WRITING ASSESSMENT SCALE	123

E. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET	124
F. THESIS PERMISSION FORM.....	138

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Profiles of the Participants.....	36
Table 2. Analytical Analysis of Students’ Academic Writing Products	46
Table 3. Descriptive Analysis of Students’ Academic Writing Products.....	50
Table 4. Thematic Summary Table – Pre-Task Written Interview Analysis	55
Table 5. Themes and Representative Quotes Derived from Participant Views	59
Table 6. Students’ Perceptions of Academic Writing and Translanguaging: Post- Task Interview Themes	67
Table 7. Strategic Choices in the Writing Process	72
Table 8. Comparative Evaluation of Strategic Writing Behaviors across Discussion Conditions.....	79
Table 9. Comparison of Writing Quality Across Prewriting Discussion Conditions	84
Table 10. Comparative Thematic Summary of Pre-Task and Post-Task Written Interviews	90

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Translanguaging: Translanguaging refers to a concept that allows bilingual or multilingual speakers to utilize their full linguistic repertoire in communication and learning. (García & Wei, 2014).

English-only: The English-only approach refers to educational policies or practices that advocate the specific use of English in teaching and learning environments, intending to immerse students in English to improve their proficiency (McCarty, 2011).

Bilingual Education: Bilingual education refers to an educational strategy that uses two languages for teaching content, aiming to enhance proficiency in both languages while improving academic success (Baker, 2011).

Academic Writing: Academic writing refers to a formal genre of writing used in tertiary settings and scholarly publications that is distinguished by a clear emphasis on the research topic, a systematic format, and the use of facts to substantiate arguments (Hamp-Lyons, 2006).

Pre-stages of Writing: The pre-stages of writing refer to the initial phases of the writing process, which include brainstorming, planning, and organizing ideas before the actual writing begins (Graham & Perin, 2007).

Tertiary Level: The tertiary level refers to the stage of education that follows the completion of secondary education, typically encompassing higher education institutions such as universities and colleges (OECD, 2019).

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

EMI: English as a Medium of Instruction

EAP: English for Academic Purposes

L1: First Language

L2: Second Language

HE: Higher education

PST: Preservice Teacher

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins with a brief summary of the background of the study, focusing on the meaning of the Translanguaging concept and its pedagogical implications, and provides a concise introduction regarding the relationships between this concept and the language teaching process. Simultaneously, the purpose of the study has been articulated in conjunction with the research questions; the significance of previous studies in the literature, which underscore the gap that the current study aims to address, has been elaborated. Finally, the chapter concludes with the definitions of the terms within the study's scope and summarizing the study's limitations.

1.1. Background of the Study

The significance of writing skill in second language learning is a fundamental element for the enhancement of language learners' general and academic language skills. Writing is a skill that tests both the cognitive and communicative dimensions of language skills and contributes to the development of language learners' ability to optimize their ability to organize their thoughts, enhance their linguistic expressiveness, and construct texts. Writing skill strengthens language learners' ability to communicate effectively not only in the academic field but also in daily life. Hyland (2009) draws attention to the critical role of writing in the language learning process and states that developing students' written skills reinforces not only their linguistic but also their intellectual development. Writing enables students to use linguistic forms by making sense of them and to integrate grammatical structures effectively. In addition, teachers' guidance is important for writing strategies to be effective. Teachers' active participation in students' writing process and regular evaluation of written work contribute to the improvement of writing skills.

Academic writing is a critical skill for students to succeed in higher and tertiary education institutions. This process is not only based on grammar and lexicon but also involves complex skills such as intellectual organization, argument development, and critical thinking. Graham and Perin (2007) emphasize the importance of effective teaching strategies in developing academic writing skills. Their research shows that direct instruction, teaching the stages of the writing process and regular writing practices are effective in developing writing skills. In this context, teachers' guiding students at every stage of the writing process helps students to improve their writing skills. The methods used in teaching academic writing play an important role in improving students' writing skills. Hyland (2003) analyzed various approaches used in teaching writing and revealed how teaching methods affect students' writing performance. In addition, providing feedback during the writing process is a critical element for students to improve their writing skills.

Pre-stages of writing refers to the preliminary stages of the writing process and these phases are critical for students to develop their writing skills. The studies show that when these stages are instructed effectively, students' writing performance improves significantly. MacArthur (2009) investigated how the strategies used by students in the prewriting stages affect the quality of their written texts. This study revealed that students' planning in the pre-writing stages increased the organization and content richness of their written expressions. It was also found that discussions in the pre-stages of writing helped students to develop their ideas and to participate more actively in the writing process. Finally, research on pre-stages of writing also emphasizes the importance of teachers' practices related to these stages. Harris and Graham (1996) state that teachers' guidance of students in pre-stages of writing plays a critical role in developing students' writing skills.

Translanguaging is a pedagogical approach that enriches the learning processes of multilingual individuals by using their language skills together. Studies on translanguaging in the literature reveal the impact of this approach on language learning and teaching. Garcia and Wei (2014) state that translanguaging encourages students to use their native and target languages together in language learning and this makes learning processes more meaningful. In this context, translanguaging

practices offer a more effective learning experience by increasing students' linguistic competencies. The effects of translanguaging on academic writing skills are also an important area of research. Researchers such as Canagarajah (2011) and Kramsch (2009) have examined how translanguaging practices enrich students' writing processes. These studies show that students can create richer and more diverse written texts by combining their knowledge and experiences in different languages. For example, through translanguaging practices, students can gain more depth and creativity in their written expressions by transferring concepts from their mother tongue to their target language. This situation reveals that translanguaging is an important strategy in developing academic writing skills.

At the same time, the relationship between translanguaging and academic writing has been the focus of a number of studies on language teaching, linguistic competence and academic achievement. Translanguaging, in particular, describes the meaning-making processes of multilingual individuals using resources from different languages in a flexible way (Garcia & Wei, 2014). Academic writing, on the other hand, is considered as the process of organizing language skills, expressing critical thinking and transferring knowledge in writing (Hyland, 2009). Garcia and Wei (2014) state that translanguaging enables multilingual students to create more comprehensive texts by combining their knowledge and skills in different languages in their written production processes. This process allows students to overcome linguistic barriers and write more effective academic writing. Studies show that translanguaging makes students' writing more authentic and personalized, which increases creativity in academic writing. The role of translanguaging in developing critical thinking and analytical skills in academic writing has also been investigated. García and Wei (2014) stated that translanguaging allows students to better understand complex concepts and express these concepts in their own language. This process enables students to make more in-depth analyses and develop critical perspectives in academic writing. In this context, translanguaging helps students not only to transfer knowledge but also to process it more deeply.

Studies conducted in Türkiye on translanguaging have addressed various aspects of translanguaging in the context of both language learning and teaching. While some

of these studies focus on the effects of translanguaging on language learners' writing skills, others have examined translanguaging practices in multilingual settings. Translanguaging studies in Türkiye have generally focused on improving the writing skills of students learning Turkish as a second language, creating more interactive methods in English language teaching, and developing pedagogies suitable for multilingual university environments. Previous studies conducted in the Turkish context have indicated that translanguaging practices implemented in Turkish writing classes can significantly contribute to the development of students' linguistic competence. Specifically, the strategic integration of students' first language (L1) alongside the target language in prewriting, drafting, and revision phases has been shown to enhance vocabulary retention, syntactic flexibility, and conceptual clarity (Erten, 2022; Yılmaz, 2020). In Turkish as a second language (L2) classrooms, translanguaging has not only facilitated grammar instruction but also enabled students to articulate abstract ideas more effectively by drawing on their full linguistic repertoire. These findings suggest that translanguaging may serve as a cognitive scaffold, reducing linguistic anxiety and supporting students' engagement in the writing process, especially among learners with lower proficiency levels or in multilingual academic environments. In multilingual universities, translanguaging pedagogy to improve language skills helps students to increase their academic writing skills by switching between different languages. In this context, the study conducted at Pamukkale University, one of the state higher education institutions in Türkiye, found that translanguaging is valuable not only for language learning but also for students to use their cultural and cognitive diversity as a resource. In conclusion, studies on translanguaging pedagogy in Türkiye provide important clues for making language education more inclusive and interactive. These studies show that the language learning process can be supported more effectively and creatively, especially in environments where multilingualism is prominent.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The primary focus of this study is to explore in depth the impact of translanguaging pedagogy on the development of academic writing skills among university students studying in EFL programs in Türkiye. Due to globalization and increasing

multiculturalism, effective writing skills in a second language are essential for academic success (Canagarajah, 2011; Kramsch, 2009). However, many English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners face significant challenges due to limited exposure to the target language and the complex structures of academic writing. In this context, translanguaging stands out as a pedagogical approach that enhances and enriches students' writing processes by making use of their multilingual competencies. However, empirical studies on the effects of translanguaging on academic writing are limited in the existing literature. Particularly, the effects of translanguaging practices on writing performance under different prewriting discussion conditions have not been sufficiently investigated. Therefore, the major purpose of this study is to determine the effects of translanguaging strategies on academic writing skills and to provide concrete recommendations for educators to improve effective writing instructional practices in multilingual classrooms. This study seeks to contribute to the re-evaluation and possible transformation of both educational policies and classroom-level teaching practices by empirically demonstrating how translanguaging can serve as a pedagogical tool to enhance academic writing processes. By uncovering the cognitive, linguistic, and affective benefits of allowing students to draw on their full linguistic repertoire particularly during the planning and drafting stages of writing the study aims to challenge the monolingual norms traditionally upheld in EFL instruction. It may offer valuable insights for policy-makers, curriculum designers, and teacher educators to reconsider the role of students' L1 not as an interference, but as a resource that can be purposefully integrated into instructional design, particularly in multilingual and multicultural learning environments.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study is to comprehensively investigate the effects of translanguaging pedagogy on the academic writing skills of students enrolled in an EFL program at a state university in Türkiye. In today's educational environment of increasing globalization and multiculturalism, students' ability to write effectively in a second language is critical to their academic success. However, many English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners face significant difficulties due to limited exposure

to the target language and the complex structures of academic writing. In this context, translanguaging stands out as a pedagogical approach that supports and enriches students' writing processes by making use of their multilingual skills. The research aims to investigate how translanguaging improves writing skills by comparing students' writing performances under different pre-writing discussion conditions (e.g., Turkish-only, English-only, and translanguaging). By exploring students' experiences and perceptions of the writing process in depth, this study aims to reveal the effects of translanguaging strategies on academic writing development of students at the tertiary level. In particular, qualitative data will be collected on how translanguaging practices facilitate students' idea generation and argument construction processes. In conclusion, this study aims to make a significant contribution to the field of language education by providing concrete suggestions for educators to improve effective writing teaching practices in multilingual classrooms. The findings may help to re-evaluate educational policies and teaching methods, thus contributing to the creation of a more inclusive learning environment by increasing students' academic achievement. In this context, the role of translanguaging in improving students' writing skills will occupy an important place in the educational literature and reveal its potential to increase the effectiveness of multilingual educational practices.

1.4. Research Questions

The ultimate goal of the present study is to examine in depth the effects of translanguaging pedagogy on the skills of academic writing. The following are the main two research questions that will be focused on in this study:

1. What are the specific functions of prewriting discussions in shaping students' writing processes and outcomes?
2. How do different prewriting discussion conditions (no prewriting discussion, prewriting discussion in English, prewriting discussion in Turkish, and translanguaging discussion) affect the quality of writings of students?

These questions guide the investigation into how translanguaging strategies can enhance the writing skills of EFL learners in a tertiary education context.

1.5. Significance of the Study

The significance of this study lies in its detailed presentation of the potential of translanguaging pedagogy in the field of language education. In particular, today's increasing migratory flows, the effects of globalization, and the proliferation of digital communication tools have made classrooms increasingly multilingual and multicultural. As a result, it has become imperative for educators to rethink their traditional teaching methods and adopt more inclusive and flexible teaching approaches that are suited to this new structure. Translanguaging offers an important solution at this point, allowing students to use their existing language skills to enrich and make more meaningful their learning processes.

Translanguaging pedagogy helps students overcome the barriers they may face in language learning by using more than one language together. For example, supporting students to move from their stronger language to their weaker language facilitates their learning process and increases their self-confidence. In this context, translanguaging not only contributes to the development of individuals' language skills but also enables them to express themselves more freely and effectively.

The main purpose of this study is to investigate the effects of translanguaging pedagogy on academic writing skills. Accordingly, the study aims to provide concrete and scientific data to guide educators in developing more effective teaching strategies in multilingual classrooms. These data are of great importance not only for practicing educators but also for decision-makers who shape educational policies. Therefore, translanguaging pedagogy offers an opportunity to adopt a more inclusive and egalitarian approach to education while providing solutions to the challenges faced in multilingual classrooms.

The role of translanguaging in education goes beyond improving the academic achievement of individual students and has the potential to create a learning environment in which cultural differences are perceived as an asset at a societal level. Therefore, this research will not only make a significant contribution to the literature on language education but will also shed light on the design of future

educational policies and practices in a more inclusive manner. The results of this study are an important step toward promoting the universal values of equality, inclusion, and diversity in education.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides an overview of translanguaging with its pedagogical background and the studies conducted in this field in Türkiye. In addition to the concept of translanguaging, another component of the study, writing skills, its stages, specifically the discussion technique used as a strategy in the pre-writing stage, and finally the placement of writing skills at the tertiary level are discussed through the conducted studies. Finally, there will be a discussion of the relationship between translanguaging and writing skills throughout the last part of the chapter.

2.1. Writing in Second Language

In the process of learning and teaching a new language, writing is widely regarded as one of the most challenging skills due to its demanding nature, requiring proficiency in lexical, grammatical, and sociolinguistic sensitivities. Consequently, numerous models and approaches have been developed to facilitate the learning and teaching of writing skills, with the emergence of the collaborative writing model holding particular significance, especially in the academic context, for learning and improving writing skills. Academic writing, as distinguished from “free” or “general” writing, carries specific features that set it apart. It is characterized by the use of specialized vocabulary, lexical density, grammatical complexity, and the abstraction required for effective communication (Crossley, 2020; Hyland, 2022; Paltridge, 2004). Academic writing also plays a crucial role in the selection processes for higher education and is instrumental in determining academic success during active learning stages (Nguyen, 2023). For instance, graduate students are often tasked with writing essays as their final assignments, showcasing both their mastery of the subject matter and their ability to convey complex ideas effectively. Therefore,

acquiring proficiency in academic writing is essential for students seeking to achieve academic success and progress in academic contexts. The following sections will elaborate on the process of second language writing acquisition, focusing particularly on the development of academic writing, and will revisit prior studies to provide a detailed exploration of the subject.

Writing in a second language (L2) represents a complex interplay of linguistic, cognitive, and cultural factors, making it one of the most demanding components of language acquisition. Unlike speaking, which often benefits from immediate feedback and conversational negotiation, writing requires a higher level of planning, self-monitoring, and editing, all of which are intensified in an L2 context where learners may lack full proficiency in grammar, vocabulary, discourse conventions, and rhetorical expectations (Manchón, 2011; Wang & Wen, 2002). Particularly in academic settings, L2 writing entails more than simply producing grammatically correct sentences; it demands a nuanced understanding of the disciplinary conventions, genre-specific structures, and argumentation styles embedded within academic discourse (Hyland, 2016). Research has shown that students often struggle with genre awareness, citation practices, and coherence in their L2 writing, which can hinder their performance and confidence (Canagarajah, 2013; Leki, 2007). Moreover, the process of composing in a second language often reveals cross-linguistic influences, as students may transfer writing habits or organizational patterns from their first language, not all of which align with target academic conventions (Silva, 1993). Recent pedagogical trends, such as process-oriented writing instruction and collaborative writing frameworks, have been shown to mitigate some of these challenges by fostering peer interaction, recursive feedback, and a deeper engagement with the writing process (Storch, 2013; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014). In particular, translanguaging practices encouraging strategic use of the learner's full linguistic repertoire are gaining attention for their ability to facilitate cognitive processing and academic articulation in multilingual classrooms (García & Li Wei, 2014). As academic writing continues to serve as a gatekeeping mechanism in both educational advancement and scholarly publication, it is imperative that L2 writing instruction adopt inclusive and scaffolded strategies that address the

multifaceted needs of learners navigating academic literacies in an additional language.

2.2. Academic Writing Development

The possession of superior writing skills in the target language, in this case English, is widely regarded as a considerable advantage. This is due to the fact that it fosters not only communicative skills but also competence, consequently benefiting EFL learners economically (Muniruzzaman & Afrin, 2024). Furthermore, students who demonstrate adequate writing proficiency appear to have increased prospects for employment as freelance writers. Despite the fact that certain academics disapprove of students' utilization of Wikipedia in their writing processes, Tardy (2010) contends that engagement with this global platform enables students to cultivate an understanding of the reliability of information while concurrently acquiring academic writing skills such as content creation and editing. The publication of an article on a platform such as Wikipedia necessitates a well-planned and executed writing process, thereby contributing to the development of a polished writer. In order to develop academic literacy and L2 writing skills, it is also important for student writers to learn how to avoid plagiarism. This will certainly increase learner motivation and autonomy by providing L2 English learners with a global readership.

The composition of academic texts poses a considerable challenge for students learning English as a second language (L2), who are required to employ the particular linguistic features associated with academic writing (Subandowo, D., Sárdi, C., & Thresia, F. 2023). For those pursuing higher education in English-medium institutions, academic writing constitutes a high-stakes assessment with the potential to exert a substantial influence on their academic success (Subandowo, D., Sárdi, C., & Thresia, F. 2023). Consequently, the composition of an academic text in this context necessitates the employment of specialized strategies throughout the writing process, encompassing planning, revising, editing, and submission. It is important to note that the strategies employed by students are often recursive, meaning that writers can revisit their text multiple times to recheck and revise. This iterative process helps ensure that the final document is coherent, well-organised and

meets the rigorous standards of academic writing (Subandowo, D., Sárdi, C., & Thresia, F. 2023). Furthermore, Hyland (2003) contends that the incorporation of external feedback into the writing process can assist non-native English speakers in the development of their academic writing skills. By seeking guidance and clarification directly from the lecturer, students can gain valuable insights and ensure that they are on the right track with their assignments (Hyland, 2019; Jones, 2011). In the context of a final review, it was emphasized by the participants that a comprehensive examination of the content, structure, and formatting of the essay is paramount prior to submission. A meticulous final review enables students to identify and implement the requisite revisions, thereby ensuring the enhancement of essay quality and the submission of a refined piece of work. It is imperative that students assume responsibility for their own learning process in order to cultivate their writing skills in English (Muniruzzaman & Afrin, 2024). Students can compose written works on a range of topics or issues that are of concern or interest to them within their immediate environment. These themes may include lifestyles, culture, environment, educational institutions, celebrations, eating habits, and national affairs in relation to the rest of the world (Muniruzzaman & Afrin, 2024). In the current era of technological advancement, students have the capacity to produce written artifacts in English and subsequently publish them on Wikipedia and websites dedicated to freelance journalism, thereby facilitating knowledge dissemination (Muniruzzaman & Afrin, 2024). The promotion of peace education through communication and the cultivation of friendships with individuals of different nationalities has been identified as a significant strategy (Muniruzzaman & Afrin, 2024). It is hypothesized that this approach will enhance cultural intelligence and mutual understanding among nations, which is considered to be of great importance for promoting lifelong learning and achieving sustainable development goals (Muniruzzaman & Afrin, 2024). Consequently, it is expected that the recommendations for the development of writing will benefit English studies programs in similar L2 English contexts.

2.3. Pre-writing Stages in Writing

Ahmed, Hasan, and Ameen (2023) emphasize that writing is a challenging process requiring time, effort, and perseverance, which makes prewriting strategies an

essential tool for supporting learners in their writing journey. They also highlight that academic writing serves as a fundamental component of students' academic and professional training in higher education institutions worldwide. University curricula often incorporate academic writing in English as a second language as a mandatory element, emphasizing its importance in students' education. Writing is recognized as a multifaceted process that involves various interactive stages, such as idea generation, outlining, drafting, revising, and editing, all of which require a combination of embedded skills to achieve high-quality outcomes. Beyond its linguistic aspects, academic writing is described as a complex social and cognitive process that influences learners' motivation and engagement, further reinforcing its critical role in education.

Johnson (2016a) argues that the pre-writing stage is a crucial step in the writing process as all relevant strategies can help the students gather background information from various activities aimed at organizing and structuring students' thoughts and generating ideas prior to the beginning of writing academic essays. Hence, by engaging in this process, the students can manage and direct their writing more effectively, resulting in a more well-rounded and adequate preparation. Moreover, engaging students in inquiry-based learning during the prewriting phase encourages critical thinking and focused exploration of assigned topics. Ahmed et al. (2023) assert that scaffolding techniques can enhance inquiry and task performance, particularly when students are given explicit guidance on how to complete the task. Encouraging learners to reflect on their progress not only aids in language development but also strengthens their ability to achieve communicative objectives. Active participation in prewriting discussions is further noted to boost learners' motivation and confidence, underscoring the value of this approach in academic writing.

In prewriting collaborative discussions, advanced learners often support less experienced peers, facilitating learning through the gradual internalization and application of regulatory language. This approach enables weaker learners to transition from assisted to independent performance, highlighting the significance of collaborative strategies in improving writing outcomes (Ahmed et al., 2023).

According to Hariati (2020), prewriting stages can effectively assist students in writing descriptive paragraphs by utilizing techniques such as brainstorming. In this context, prewriting activities focus on encouraging students to write down their ideas or feelings about the subject, helping them generate relevant content. Listing supporting points enables students to organize ideas that support the main topic, while creating a simple outline allows them to structure descriptions of events, places, or objects related to the topic. This approach is designed to help students organize their thoughts effectively while writing descriptive paragraphs. Also, teachers who teach writing as a subject carry the dual responsibility of introducing students to the theoretical aspects of writing skills and training them to apply these concepts in practical tasks. To meet this challenge, educators must find creative and effective ways to motivate students to utilize prewriting strategies. Conventional methods, such as explaining the benefits of these strategies and their impact on improving writing quality, are valuable approaches. Additionally, presenting evidence from writing samples that demonstrate the success of using prewriting techniques reinforces their foundational role in producing well-structured and refined written work (Ahmed et al., 2023). Hariati (2020) recommends that English teachers incorporate prewriting stages, including brainstorming, listing supporting points, and outlining, as practical tools for improving students' writing skills. These activities help students generate ideas, develop their writing with well-structured supporting points, and maintain focus on their chosen topics. Furthermore, it is suggested that students use prewriting stages before beginning to write, as this process provides a more comfortable, enjoyable, and engaging learning experience by introducing a structured approach to writing.

2.4. Towards Translanguaging

When examining the components of the term *translanguaging*, it is observed that it consists of two words: *trans* and *languaging*. It is believed that a proper and clear explanation of the concept of *translanguaging* can only be achieved by understanding these components. The first component of the term *translanguaging*, the prefix *trans-*, signifies "to go beyond." The remaining component of the term, *languaging*, is a vital aspect that demands thorough examination. According to Wei

(2014), *linguaging* should not be regarded as a simple system separate from human interactions with others or the self that exists in relation to others. Wei explains the concept of *linguaging* as a simultaneous and continuous process that serves as a vital component in individuals' interactions with themselves and external factors, as well as in their efforts to make sense of the world. In addition to this comprehensive definition, Ortega (2019) approaches *linguaging* as a means of expressing and interpreting our thoughts, feelings, and emotions. In this perspective, language is seen as a tool we utilize to transform our cognitive processes into written or spoken forms.

The concept known today as *translanguaging* was first introduced in 1994 by Cen Williams in his seminal work, though it initially appeared in a significantly different form as the Welsh term *Trawsieithu*. In its original usage, the term referred to an educational approach that encouraged students to use different languages for pedagogical purposes. Williams (1996) employed this concept to describe a bilingual classroom setting where bilingual students would use one language for input, such as acquiring the necessary information, and another language for output within the bilingual environment.

The history of the *translanguaging* concept dates back to this early period, its widespread recognition was made possible by Colin Baker (2001), who translated the Welsh term *Trawsieithu* into English. Baker (2001) not only translated the term *translanguaging* but also provided the following definition: *Translanguaging is the process of making meaning, gaining experience, understanding, and acquiring knowledge through two languages* (p. 288). Baker (2001, 2011) has played a pivotal role in popularizing the concept, alongside other scholars such as Blackledge and Creese (2010), Garcia (2009), Hornberger and Link (2012), and Lewis, Jones, and Baker (2012), who have further developed and expanded the term. Additionally, an important distinction that aids in the proper understanding of the concept of *translanguaging* has emerged. While Baker (2001) described *translanguaging* as a process of making meaning through *two* languages, Garcia and Wei (2014) took a more nuanced approach. They did not simplify the concept to the use of two separate languages or a mere combination of the two, instead offering a broader and more

intricate interpretation of the process. According to Wei (2011), *translanguaging* encompasses a remarkably broad scope. It involves not only the ability to utilize linguistic structures and systems through various forms such as reading, writing, and singing but also transcends these boundaries (p. 1223). In addition to these definitions, numerous researchers have explored this concept (Canagarajah, 2011a; Lewis et al., 2012; Martin, 2015), with one of the most frequently cited definitions being offered by Canagarajah. According to Canagarajah (2011a), *translanguaging* is the ability of multilingual individuals to draw upon their linguistic repertoires, which function as an integrated system, to navigate between the languages they have.

In the past decade, translanguaging has evolved from a bilingual instructional strategy to a broader epistemological and pedagogical framework that challenges monolingual ideologies and reimagines the role of language in knowledge production and communication. While its early conceptualizations focused on pedagogical shifts in bilingual classrooms (e.g., García, 2009; Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012), more recent studies have positioned translanguaging as a dynamic process of meaning-making that integrates multiple semiotic resources—linguistic, gestural, digital, and visual—thus extending beyond traditional boundaries of “language use” (Li Wei, 2018; García & Otheguy, 2020). In this broader framework, translanguaging is not simply the act of switching between named languages; rather, it is the fluid orchestration of the speaker’s entire communicative repertoire, shaped by sociocultural histories and present contexts. This theoretical shift has led to a proliferation of research across diverse contexts, especially in multilingual classrooms, higher education, teacher training, and online spaces. For example, studies in tertiary education (Mazak & Carroll, 2017; Tian & Link, 2021) have shown that translanguaging supports student writers in expressing complex disciplinary content, fostering stronger argumentative structures and metacognitive reflection during the writing process. These findings underscore the cognitive advantages of allowing students to brainstorm, plan, and revise using all their linguistic resources including their first language (L1), second language (L2), and any intermediate language knowledge they possess without forcing them to compartmentalize or suppress parts of their linguistic identity.

Recent empirical work has also emphasized how translanguaging promotes equity and inclusivity in learning environments that have traditionally marginalized multilingual learners. Researchers such as Vogel and García (2017) and Palmer et al. (2020) advocate for translanguaging spaces where all languages are viewed as legitimate tools for learning, thereby resisting the institutional dominance of monolingual norms. In teacher education programs, translanguaging is increasingly framed as a means of fostering critical language awareness and reflective practice, equipping future teachers to recognize and value the sociopolitical dimensions of language hierarchies (Menken & Sánchez, 2019). Moreover, the growing body of research on digital translanguaging highlights the ways in which students use multimodal platforms blogs, social media, collaborative Google Docs, and messaging apps to navigate between languages and modes as they co-construct meaning (Androutsopoulos & Busch, 2020; Lin & He, 2021). These online environments reveal how translanguaging naturally emerges in multilingual students' everyday practices, blurring the lines between formal and informal learning. Furthermore, translanguaging has also been integrated into transliteracies research, which examines how learners use digital tools and cross-linguistic strategies simultaneously to build academic literacies (García, 2022). In many of these cases, translanguaging serves not only as a pedagogical tool but also as a form of identity negotiation and empowerment, enabling learners to challenge linguistic marginalization and assert their right to participate fully in academic life.

In sum, the recent expansion of translanguaging research reflects its transformative potential across pedagogical, technological, and ideological dimensions. It invites educators to reconsider long-standing assumptions about linguistic boundaries and to design learning environments where multilingual repertoires are not only permitted but actively leveraged. This approach aligns with current global educational goals, especially in linguistically diverse settings such as Türkiye, where English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction often overlooks students' rich linguistic backgrounds in favor of rigid English-only policies. Translanguaging pedagogy, as supported by empirical evidence, provides a powerful alternative that enables deeper cognitive engagement, promotes academic equity, and affirms the legitimacy of multilingual learners' voices. As such, it holds promise not only as a writing strategy

but also as a broader framework for inclusive, responsive, and critical language education in the 21st century.

2.5. Translanguaging vs Code- Switching

In contemporary discourse, code-switching and translanguaging, two pivotal concepts in the domain of multilingualism and linguistic diversity, have been the focal points of extensive deliberations within the realm of foreign language education, multilingual pedagogical approaches, and identity construction. While these concepts bear certain similarities in their superficial features, particularly in their depictions of multilingual learners' language use, they diverge significantly in their underlying structures, pedagogical approaches, and ideological underpinnings. Within the scope of this section, a comparative analysis is conducted of the definitions of translanguaging and code-switching, their historical evolution, modes of implementation, and their impact on foreign language education.

To begin this comparative process, it is essential to first define the concept of code-switching. According to Garcia (2009), code-switching refers to the ability of bilingual individuals to communicate using features from their linguistic repertoire in response to given inputs. Garcia (2009) further elaborates that code-switching involves the process of bilingual individuals selecting from the languages they know and moving back and forth between them as needed. Similarly, Baker (2001) defines code-switching as any switch occurring during a conversation, whether at the word or sentence level. However, Baker highlights a critical perspective on the concept, noting that code-switching often implies that bilingual individuals are insufficiently proficient in both languages, which has led to its lack of acceptance in certain contexts. He emphasizes that code-switching practices are frequently perceived negatively among communication participants, being associated with "insufficient language habits." This perspective reflects the broader societal attitudes toward code-switching, often viewing it as a marker of linguistic deficiency rather than a skill.

Code-switching is defined as the alternating use of two or more languages by individuals in a discourse in accordance with specific rules. From a linguistic

perspective, these transitions adhere to syntactic boundaries, occur within the framework of specific rules, and are frequently interpreted as an indicator of communicative competence (Poplack, 1980). For instance, the act of commencing a sentence in English and concluding it in Turkish, or alternatively, adapting the language in accordance with the prevailing context, exemplifies this phenomenon. In certain theses conducted within the Turkish context (e.g., Yıldız, 2018; Çetinkaya, 2021), emphasis has been placed on the spontaneous nature of code-switching among university students in both native and target language learning processes. However, it has been observed that these transitions are predominantly driven for pragmatic rather than cognitive purposes. In contrast, translanguaging can be regarded as a more comprehensive and theoretically radical approach. The theory of translanguaging, as developed by García (2009), posits that individuals approach their comprehensive linguistic repertoire as a cohesive, unified system. This approach posits that languages should not be regarded as discrete entities, but rather as integral components of the multilingual individual's capacity to construct meaning. Translanguaging is predicated on the rejection of the superiority of one language over another, thereby allowing learners to engage in active use of all available language resources, including the mother tongue (Li Wei, 2018). Recent studies on translanguaging in Türkiye demonstrate the efficacy of this approach in fostering students' cognitive comfort, enhancing their idea development processes, and mitigating writing anxiety, particularly in written production processes (e.g., Yılmaz, 2020; Erten, 2022).

Code-switching is recognized as a form of behavior that often occurs naturally or spontaneously in instructional settings. In instances where students demonstrate a deficiency in vocabulary or encounter challenging language structures, language instructors may utilize their native language to facilitate comprehension. However, this pedagogical approach is frequently absent in such instructional practices. Furthermore, certain conventional methodologies have regarded code-switching as a hindrance to sufficient advancement in the target language (Macaro, 2001). Consequently, the instructional value of code-switching may be subject to variation depending on the context and the teacher's objectives.

Conversely, translanguaging is a deliberate pedagogical strategy that methodically integrates students' native language. It has been demonstrated to reduce cognitive load on complex tasks, such as writing or speaking, by allowing students to utilize native language resources (e.g., Turkish) in pre-production thinking, discussion, brainstorming, and content creation in the second language (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021). In Erten's (2022) master's thesis, it was asserted that translanguaging strategies exert a favorable influence on academic writing performance. The study's findings indicated an enhancement in students' proficiency, as evidenced by an improvement in criteria such as idea development, paragraph organization, and coherence. Furthermore, translanguaging pedagogy encompasses both cognitive and affective dimensions. Translanguaging practices have been demonstrated to foster a sense of safety in classroom interactions for multilingual students, facilitate the articulation of their own identities, and legitimize their mother tongue (García & Lin, 2017). This pedagogical approach has the potential to positively impact students' emotional engagement and academic achievement, particularly in multicultural classroom settings.

Translanguaging is not merely a pedagogical method; rather, it is an approach that encompasses sociopolitical dimensions such as linguistic justice, power relations, and identity construction. In this respect, translanguaging is closely related to postmodern language theories and social constructionist understandings. Li Wei (2018) offers a definition of translanguaging as "a form of creative and critical thinking," emphasizing that individuals are positioned not only as language learners but also as social actors. Nevertheless, the prevailing focus of code-switching literature is on linguistic form, structural constraints, and pragmatic applications. Consequently, the theoretical framework of code-switching has been predominantly constrained to micro-linguistic analyses. This discrepancy elucidates the heightened attention translanguaging has garnered, particularly in the recent decade, and its increased adoption in multilingual pedagogical practices.

While code-switching and translanguaging may appear similar in form both involving the use of multiple languages they differ significantly in their classroom functions and pedagogical intentions. In practice, code-switching often occurs

incidentally or out of necessity, such as when a student momentarily lacks vocabulary in the target language or when a teacher needs to clarify a grammar point quickly using L1. It tends to be reactive and is usually not integrated into lesson design. Teachers may allow code-switching to facilitate comprehension, manage classroom behavior, or establish rapport, but it is often perceived as a deviation from the target language goal (Macaro, 2001). In contrast, translanguaging is a deliberate and planned pedagogical strategy, where students are encouraged to fluidly use all linguistic resources available to them in a purposeful and structured way. For example, in a writing class, a teacher might intentionally ask students to brainstorm in their native language, discuss ideas bilingually, and then draft in English thereby using translanguaging to enhance metacognition, idea generation, and academic expression.

Code-switching typically follows a binary model, treating L1 and L2 as separate systems between which students “switch.” In classroom practice, this means a sentence might begin in English and end in Turkish, without necessarily a cognitive function beyond communication ease. Translanguaging, on the other hand, does not assume a separation between languages, and instead supports integrative meaning-making, such as when students create concept maps in L1 to outline essays they will write in L2. Practically speaking, this approach can help students organize their thoughts, increase writing fluency, and reduce anxiety—especially in academic tasks that require higher-order thinking (García & Lin, 2017; Canagarajah, 2011).

In student-centered classrooms, translanguaging also promotes learner agency. Students who feel ownership over their language use may engage more deeply with content, particularly in multilingual settings where identity expression is intertwined with language choice. In contrast, frequent or unmanaged code-switching may be viewed by educators as a sign of dependency on L1 or lack of target language proficiency, reinforcing deficit perspectives rather than empowering learners.

In summary, although translanguaging and code-switching may appear similar at first glance, they possess significant theoretical and pedagogical distinctions. Translanguaging is a pedagogically guided approach in which learners bring together

all language resources in a productive way, thereby strengthening multilingualism and offering a social justice perspective. Code-switching is regarded as a manifestation of linguistic pragmatism and a strategic workaround. Consequently, when examining the effects of translanguaging practices on students' writing processes within the scope of this thesis, it is imperative to distinctly delineate the distinctions between these two concepts in terms of both the consistency of the theoretical framework and the interpretability of the findings.

2.6. Translanguaging as a Pedagogy

Understanding how it is addressed in educational contexts, its implications for practice, and previous studies on translingual pedagogy in education holds particular importance in addition to examining the origins of the concept of *translanguaging* and efforts to define it. As an introduction, it is essential to begin by exploring what *translanguaging* means as a pedagogy. According to Garcia and Wei (2014), translanguaging, when viewed as a pedagogy, refers to flexible and inclusive linguistic practices that surpass traditional monolingual learning approaches, aiming to support bilingual students while enabling educators to contribute effectively to their language learning processes. For Garcia et al. (2017), translingual pedagogy can be utilized in multilingual classroom settings to achieve various educational objectives. These objectives include encouraging students to engage with challenging knowledge, content, and reading materials appropriate to their proficiency levels, enabling them to explore and utilize their linguistic repertoires and learning strategies as needed, creating favorable conditions for enhancing their linguistic proficiencies in an academic context, and contributing to the development or preservation of their socio-emotional skills and multilingual identities.

The manifestation of translingual pedagogy in a classroom environment varies depending on specific conditions. These translingual forms can be summarized in two main ways. The first is *pedagogical translanguaging*, a process in which educators encourage students to utilize their linguistic repertoires by planning and implementing classroom activities in alignment with the natural flow of the lesson. In other words, according to Garcia and Wei, this form represents a teacher-centered

approach, characterized by a structured and planned implementation of a transformative pedagogy. On the other hand, translanguaging pedagogy can also manifest spontaneously. Unlike the first approach, this form does not follow a predetermined plan, framework, or classroom boundaries; rather, it emerges as a multilingual approach shaped by the conditions present during the teaching process. In their studies, Cenoz and Gorter emphasize that the flexible and less controlled nature of spontaneous translanguaging pedagogy makes it the most commonly observed translingual form. Unlike this spontaneous form, *pedagogical translanguaging* involves active participation from both students and teachers in complex discursive activities. These activities draw upon the entire linguistic repertoire of all students in the classroom, fostering the creation of new practices while maintaining existing ones. Additionally, it aims to address sociopolitical issues by critically examining linguistic inequalities (Garcia & Wei, 2014a; Paulsrud, Rosen, Straszer, & Wedin, 2017; Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012b).

Garcia and Wei states that *translanguaging* can also manifest as a student-centered approach. Lewis, Jones, and Baker (2012) introduced the term *pupil-directed translanguaging*, while Garcia and Wei (2014) referred to this practice as *student-directed translanguaging*. This approach enables students to take control of their multilingual learning processes, whether in terms of learning or using a language, as well as managing their own learning and linguistic practices. In other words, multilingual students engage in the process of acquiring and interpreting information, utilizing language through reading or speaking, and accessing resources beyond the classroom. This may include exploring areas unfamiliar even to their teachers, as part of their efforts to enhance their learning and development. According to Garcia and Wei, educators draw strength from translanguaging pedagogy to support multilingual students in their language development and learning processes. They argue that translanguaging can be highly beneficial in helping students comprehend and engage with challenging content and lesson components, as well as in producing meaningful outputs. Moreover, they emphasize that in today's increasingly diverse classroom environments, translanguaging serves as a crucial approach to empower teachers and actively involve students in the learning process. Recognizing this potential, numerous studies have contributed to the educational literature by exploring

educators' attitudes toward and implementation of translanguaging practices. These studies aim to uncover how teachers integrate translanguaging into their pedagogical strategies and adapt it to support multilingual learners effectively (Baker, 2011; Canagarajah, 2011a; Garcia, Johnson, & Seltzer, 2017; Gort & Sembiente, 2015; Nambisan, 2014; Nikula & Moore, 2019; Wang, 2019a).

2.7. Studies of Translanguaging Pedagogy in Türkiye

The pedagogy of translanguaging has been explored in the Turkish context, as in the global context, through various perspectives, research questions, and settings. Among the numerous studies contributing to this body of literature, a selection is presented here in alignment with the significance of the questions they address and the findings they provide.

The first in this series of studies, consistently examining the concept of translanguaging through diverse research questions, is by İnci-Kavak, V., and Kırkgöz, Y. progressing in chronological order, their 2022 study, titled "*Attitudes towards translanguaging practices: A comparative study of literature and food engineering classes,*" holds a prominent place due to the importance of the questions it addresses and the findings it offers. This study presents a comparative analysis of students' and lecturers' attitudes towards translanguaging practices in literature and food science courses at a public university in Türkiye. The lecturers report utilizing translanguaging practices for two primary purposes. The first is pedagogical, including activities such as clarifying and conveying meaning to enhance comprehension of the content, explaining new words and concepts, and encouraging students to express their thoughts and explanations, thereby increasing participation. The second purpose is affective, aiming to comfort students in the face of challenging topics, such as taboo subjects, and to build rapport with them. In line with these objectives, lecturers adopt flexible instructional strategies, maintaining a positive stance towards multilingualism and deliberately encouraging translanguaging among students. Translanguaging thus fulfills the pedagogical objectives of the courses, prompting lecturers to challenge existing prejudices and resistance to its use. They perceive the target language as both a means and an end,

creating a linguistic space in their classrooms that facilitates and supports translanguaging practices.

The second study entitled *"Exploring University Students' Note-Taking in Literature Courses: A Translanguaging Perspective"* conducted by İnci-Kavak, V., and Kırkgöz, Y. investigates the intricate relationship between translanguaging practices and note-taking within the context of literature courses. This study examines student notes from various English Language and Literature (ELL) courses, focusing on their nature, the organization of information, and the role of translanguaging alongside the attitudes of both students and lecturers toward note-taking. Translanguaging emerges as a pervasive phenomenon in both spoken and written communication, utilized at different stages of the note-taking process, including writing on skeleton notes, editing, refining, and rewriting before examinations. The analysis indicates that students employ translanguaging as a scaffolding tool, such as retrieving words from their L1. The note samples illustrate how students navigate this complex task through various strategies, including translanguaging, color-coding, highlighting, tabulating, and other methods. These decisions reflect the full linguistic repertoire of the note-taker, showcasing the integration of multilingual practices into the note-taking process. Based on these observations, it is suggested that lecturers encourage the use of translanguaging in note-taking, promoting the utilization of students' entire linguistic resources to enhance their ability to retain and organize information effectively. Adopting a blended-language, translanguaging approach to note-taking appears to be a logical and effective strategy, provided that the resulting notes remain functional and beneficial for the note-taker.

In the study titled *"Translanguaging Practices in Turkish EMI Classrooms: Commonalities and Differences Across Two Academic Disciplines"* conducted by Kırkgöz, Y., İnci-Kavak, V., Karakaş, A., and Moran Panero, S. (2023), the concept is explored from a practical perspective, aiming to address specific research questions. This paper demonstrates that translanguaging constitutes a fundamental aspect of classroom practices within the Turkish English-Medium Instruction (EMI) context and that both students and academics derive varying degrees of benefit from its implementation. The study offers significant implications for stakeholders in

Turkish universities and other emerging EMI contexts by providing valuable insights into how translanguaging practices can be effectively integrated as a critical tool for teaching and learning within specific disciplinary curricula. The data presented underscores the risks associated with applying standardized, “one-size-fits-all” language policies in diverse and multilingual EMI contexts. An official “English-only” language policy appears to neither reflect grassroots practices nor adequately address the needs of students across different disciplinary programs. However, the findings also reveal that the translanguaging needs of different disciplines and classrooms may vary depending on the unique configurations of students and their multilingual repertoires. In light of this, one potential way forward involves explicitly raising awareness among teachers and students about the benefits and situated appropriateness of translanguaging practices in their daily academic interactions. This includes encouraging lecturers and students to explore and reflect on their linguistic habits and their local impacts (see İnci-Kavak & Kırkgöz, 2021, p. 73 for interactional patterns). However, as Wei and García (2022) argue, while increasing awareness of multilingualism's potential in the classroom is essential, it may not be sufficient. Beyond incorporating additional “named languages” into classroom practices, EMI staff training and reflective activities should also address symbolic transgressions of language boundaries and aim to transform perceptions of “subjectivities of inferiority.”

The pedagogy of translanguaging has not always been examined solely at the tertiary level; on the contrary, the literature also includes several studies focusing on significant learner groups, such as young learners. Two notable contributions to understanding the relationship between translanguaging and young learners are the works of Tekin, S. The first, published in 2022, titled *"Translanguaging of Pre-Service EFL Teachers in Young Learner Classrooms: A Teacher Educator Perspective,"* and the second, published in 2023, titled *"Translanguaging in the Young Learner EFL Classroom in Turkey: Hidden Challenges and Complexities,"* provide valuable insights into this area. The first study (2022) aims to address challenges encountered in a teacher education program by examining the institutional perspective on language use, the process of policy change, associated challenges, teacher candidates' beliefs, and the lack of practical considerations. According to this

study, to provide EFL teacher candidates with a comprehensive understanding of language use, it would be more effective to educate them on both monolingual and bilingual teaching approaches, rather than endorsing a single perspective. The study stated that currently teacher candidates are predominantly trained within a monolingual framework, which fosters bias against translanguaging a potentially valuable tool for enhancing teaching and learning. Also, it is seen that preparing teacher candidates to effectively use translanguaging, rather than entirely prohibiting the use of L1, could better equip them for their future teaching roles. That is why, this approach would allow them to make informed decisions about the extent and manner of language use, considering contextual factors that influence their teaching. Additionally, according to this study, it is critical to provide teacher candidates with exposure to real-world teaching contexts during their education programs, as they often struggle to envision the realities of young learner (YL) classrooms. During micro-teaching sessions, candidates may comfortably use an L2-only approach and mistakenly assume that this policy is easily implementable in actual classroom settings. However, this assumption does not align with the experiences of many YL EFL teachers in Türkiye, who face the dilemma of using or avoiding L1, often accompanied by a sense of guilt. According to this study, to address this gap, incorporating a practicum into teacher education programs would be highly beneficial. Such practical experiences would allow candidates to observe and teach in YL classrooms, gaining firsthand experience and better preparation for their future teaching careers in terms of effective language use.

The findings of the second study (2023) provide valuable insights into teaching practices and teacher education, emphasizing the need to address the persistence of L2-only policies in ELT contexts, which often leave teachers feeling conflicted or guilty about using translanguaging. The study highlights the importance of considering the growth of pedagogical translanguaging across various educational levels, from primary (Garton & Tekin, 2022) to tertiary settings (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020), and encourages teachers to make informed decisions about language use based on their specific teaching contexts. Rather than imposing exclusive L2 policies, teachers should reflect on the pedagogical value of L1 and use translanguaging as a tool to enhance comprehension and student engagement. To

support this, awareness-raising activities, such as peer observation (Bailey, 2006) and action research (Burns, 2010), are recommended to help teachers develop their practices and gain confidence in their language choices. Peer observation fosters collaborative learning and awareness of language use, while action research provides a structured process to identify challenges, test interventions, and reflect on outcomes (Nunan, 2018). Additionally, professional development programs focusing on translanguaging could equip teachers with the knowledge and skills to utilize their linguistic repertoires effectively, incorporating case studies, classroom videos, and discussions on translanguaging strategies. Such initiatives would empower teachers to adapt translanguaging to their specific classroom needs, fostering inclusive and effective learning environments.

2.8. Intersection of Translanguaging and Second Language Writing

Incorporating multiple languages into the classroom has the potential to enhance students' knowledge development. By integrating translanguaging practices, students can gain a deeper understanding of concepts and writing materials, thereby supporting their ability to achieve their goals in writing English effectively (Styati & Irawati, 2023). Translanguaging allows students to navigate multiple languages and dialects, helping them identify the most suitable words, phrases, and expressions to convey their ideas effectively. This process often results in writing that is both culturally nuanced and linguistically diverse. Students encounter instances where certain concepts are better expressed in one language than another. Therefore, translanguaging empowers them to overcome linguistic limitations by using the language that best captures their intended meaning (Styati & Irawati, 2023). However, challenges persist. According to the observations in the study by Styati & Irawati, 2023, in writing classes, many students lack confidence in using the target language when required to respond based on their English proficiency. This often results in difficulties with communication, as students struggle to fully express themselves in English. A neutral or uncertain attitude toward their own abilities further highlights their lack of confidence and proficiency in the target language. Styati and Irawati (2023) suggest that translanguaging can address these issues by creating a supportive learning environment, particularly when teaching students

different types of writing. Therefore, even though translanguaging offers valuable opportunities for learners to build on their existing linguistic strengths, its application must be balanced with the course objectives. Li and Wang (2024) also emphasize that implementing translanguaging effectively requires educators to address both its benefits and potential challenges. Factors such as the potential for over-reliance on a dominant language or the difficulty of managing multilingual interactions must be taken into account. As Canagarajah (2022) and García (2022) suggest, translanguaging should be employed thoughtfully, ensuring that it serves to complement the overall learning process. Li and Wang (2024) conclude that translanguaging, when strategically implemented, can enhance learners' linguistic development, foster greater confidence, and create more inclusive and supportive educational environments. To overcome these challenges, it is recommended that translanguaging be integrated into the teaching-learning process. Teachers play a vital role in this approach and should provide consistent guidance, especially during group discussions. Encouraging students to utilize both their first and second languages can help them express their opinions and ideas without hesitation. By using their preferred languages to comprehend complex topics, students are better equipped to develop their understanding and gradually improve their proficiency in English. This strategy not only aids in learning the language but also contributes to better writing outcomes over time (Styati & Irawati, 2023). In order to facilitate a more profound comprehension of the advantages and challenges associated with translational languaging and writing, a comprehensive review of recent studies that specifically address the relationship between the two is presented. To begin with: The examples provided by Li and Wang (2024) demonstrate the significant benefits of translanguaging in second language (L2) writing tutorials. These examples highlight how the integration of learners' L1, specifically Chinese, alongside English, can enhance their understanding of complex concepts, encourage active participation, establish better comprehension, and offer emotional and academic support. While the study focuses on the interplay between Chinese and English, Li and Wang (2024) stress that the effectiveness of translanguaging is not limited to a specific language. Instead, its value lies in the strategic use of diverse linguistic resources to foster meaningful and impactful learning experiences.

In English language classrooms, translanguaging can provide notable advantages, particularly when working with multilingual learners who benefit from drawing on their full linguistic repertoire to engage with course materials and communicate effectively. Li and Wang (2024) note that the degree to which translanguaging should be encouraged depends on several factors, including the specific goals of the lesson, the learners' proficiency levels, and the teacher's pedagogical approach. For instance, when translanguaging aligns with lesson objectives, it can serve as a powerful tool to support comprehension and learner engagement.

The study conducted by Riyantika, Prasetya, and Puteri (2024) reveals that students often utilize multiple languages throughout the writing process, particularly during brainstorming, drafting, and revising their work. For example, students consciously incorporate translanguaging strategies while generating ideas, providing feedback, and organizing their thoughts. Interview responses from participants also confirm that translanguaging plays a deliberate role in both the spoken and written aspects of the creative writing process. These findings are consistent with García's (2009) definition of translanguaging as the act of leveraging diverse linguistic features across different modes to optimize communication. Similarly, Seals et al. (2020) highlighted that translanguaging aids the communication process by clarifying meaning, forming connections, and elaborating on ideas. Observations from the semi-structured interviews further demonstrate how students integrate languages at every stage of production, blending words, phrases, and even sentences in both English and Indonesian.

The results of the study underscore that translanguaging significantly influences the creative process, extending beyond verbal interactions into written literary works. This impact is particularly evident in stages like idea generation, drafting, and revising, where students draw from their multilingual repertoire to select words, phrases, and structures that best align with their creative vision. Bilingual writers, often unconsciously, synthesize elements from multiple languages, breaking traditional linguistic boundaries and creating written works rich in cultural and linguistic nuance. As noted by Riyantika et al. (2024), this practice not only enhances the richness of literary output but also plays a vital role in supporting students'

writing development by enabling them to approach their ideas from multiple perspectives. Furthermore, the research emphasizes the importance of translanguaging as a supportive tool for students' writing processes. Through prewriting activities, students find opportunities to explore and integrate diverse linguistic resources, leading to more effective communication. Riyantika et al. (2024) suggest that the use of translanguaging in writing tasks fosters motivation, confidence, and the ability to develop complex ideas in ways that would not be possible within a single linguistic framework. This synthesis of languages highlights the critical role translanguaging plays in empowering students to navigate and excel in their academic and creative writing journeys.

In accordance with preceding research (Canagarajah, 2011; de los Ríos & Seltzer, 2017; Ebe, 2016; García & Kano, 2014; Seltzer & Collins, 2016; Velasco & García, 2014), translanguaging provided students with the opportunity to utilize their multilingual repertoire for the purpose of academic writing. The analysis demonstrates that all students employed various translanguaging strategies during the writing process, including pre-writing in their native language, translations, problem-solving strategies, and information searches in multiple languages. Notable problem-solving strategies included the rehearsal of vocabulary through translation software, a technique also employed by students in Beiler and Dewilde's (2020) study. Other strategies included postponing, where students temporarily incorporated words in languages other than Norwegian into their texts (e.g., García & Kano, 2014; Velasco & García, 2014). This suggests that teachers may encounter some students who are reluctant to adopt unfamiliar writing strategies, such as translanguaging, within a school context. Consequently, teachers may need to proactively persuade students of the merits of translanguaging for their academic writing (Canagarajah, 2013). As Canagarajah (2013, p. 3) asserts, translingual literacy "encompasses an understanding of the practices and processes that already characterize communicative activity in diverse communities, with the objective of both affirming these practices and developing them further through an informed pedagogy" (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 3).

The findings by Ingrid Vinje Storheil & Jonas Yassin Iversen (2023) demonstrate that translanguaging strategies can support multilingual students with different

proficiency levels in their writing of texts in the target language. In accordance with Canagarajah's (2013) proposition, the present findings indicate that the translanguaging strategies analyses would benefit from further development through pedagogical translanguaging (e.g., de los Ríos & S This assertion is further corroborated by the findings of de los Ríos & Seltzer (2017), Ebe (2016), García & Kano (2014), Seltzer & Collins (2016) and Velasco & García (2014). Consequently, it is imperative for educators to not only foster students' multilingual competence but also to deliberately cultivate translanguaging strategies within the context of literacy education. In line with Beiler (2020), this study corroborates the finding that students draw upon a broad spectrum of languages in addition to their designated "mother tongue". Consequently, it is imperative for educators to expand their conception of students' linguistic repertoires beyond the confines of their "mother tongue" and to acknowledge the comprehensive potential of their linguistic repertoire in its entirety.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter offers an in-depth examination of the methodological framework of the study. It first delineates the research type, encompassing both the methodological approach and the research design employed. Subsequently, the participants of the study are identified. The chapter then elaborates on the data collection process and the tools used to gather data. In the final section, the methods applied for data analysis are thoroughly described.

3.1. The Research Design

3.1.1. Type of Research

The methodological approach adopted in this thesis is mixed methods research, which systematically combines qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis strategies. In the context of multi-layered social fields, such as language education, mixed methods are particularly advantageous. These methods allow for the leveraging of the dependability of quantitative findings while simultaneously prioritizing the exploration of participant experiences and the context in which they occur (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). In this study, statistical results alone are insufficient to comprehend the impact of translanguaging pedagogy on students' writing processes. Furthermore, qualitative data are necessary to analyze the interaction in greater depth during writing production. Creswell (2015) offers a definition of mixed methods as "an approach that offers a more holistic perspective in understanding research problems that are too complex to be achieved by a single method." In a similar vein, Johnson et al. (2007) delineate mixed methods research as "research in which both qualitative and quantitative data collection, analysis, and

inference techniques are combined to provide breadth, depth, and validation" (p. 123). In this study, quantitative data were utilized to compare the effects of different prewriting discussion conditions (e.g., no discussion, English-only discussion, Turkish-only discussion, and translanguaging discussion) on writing quality. This configuration boasts the advantages of a quantitative research approach, which, in Dörnyei's (2007) words, "allows for precise measurements, systematic analysis, and generalizable findings" (p. 34). However, it is important to note that evaluating student writing solely in terms of numerical scores may result in the neglect of the pedagogical processes that underpin the writing, the forms of interaction that facilitate learning, and the students' personal perceptions of their learning experiences. Consequently, the qualitative data collection process within the scope of the study aimed to analyze in detail the functions of the languages used by students in the prewriting stage, the meaning-making strategies that emerged in this process, and the contributions of translanguaging to the writing process. According to Lune and Berg (2017), "qualitative methods are unique in explaining the multilayered nature of complex social phenomena and developing an insider's view of participants' experiences" (p. 11). In this context, qualitative data offers a meaningful depth beyond quantitative findings by making visible students' linguistic decisions and choices in the planning and production processes and the effects of these choices on the product.

Creswell and Creswell (2018) emphasize that mixed methods is a powerful strategy shaped by the nature of the research problem and is particularly effective in scenarios where "one type of data complements the shortcomings of another" (p. 54). In this study, the integration of both outcome (writing quality) and process (the function of prewriting discussions) data collection methods is particularly advantageous, as it enables the direct addressing of the research questions through the mixed methods approach. Another critical benefit of this approach is that it encompasses a multifaceted evaluation of student writing performances, considering not only the quantity of written work but also the complexity of interactions and the linguistic nuances employed throughout the writing process. In summation, the employment of a mixed-method approach in this research facilitates the simultaneous adherence to the principles of generalizability, intensity, and contextuality. This approach enables

the attainment of more comprehensive and reliable results in a domain such as writing pedagogy, which encompasses both quantifiable and evolving processes.

3.1.2. Exploratory Sequential Design

The mixed method design employed in this thesis is structured as an exploratory sequential design. In this design, the research process commenced with the collection and analysis of qualitative data. The categories, themes, or inferences developed in accordance with the qualitative findings were subsequently tested with quantitative data in the second stage. This methodological approach enables the examination of the impact of a novel pedagogical practice (e.g., translanguaging) on writing processes, encompassing both exploratory and confirmatory dimensions (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). In this context, the qualitative data collection process conducted in the first phase focused on understanding how students used translanguaging strategies in pre-task forms, how they constructed meaning through these linguistic choices, and how these choices shaped their writing processes. This phase sought to address the following question: "What are the specific functions of prewriting discussions in shaping students' writing processes and outcomes?"

The themes that emerged from the pre-task interviews served as the foundation for the design of the second phase of the study, which involved a quantitative approach. In this phase, the degree of translanguaging pedagogy and the effect of different prewriting discussion conditions (no discussion, English only, Turkish only, and translanguaging) on students' writing scores were comparatively examined. This section centers on two research questions: "How do different prewriting discussion conditions affect students' writing performance?" and "How does the level of translanguaging pedagogy that students are exposed to during the planning stages of their compositions affect the quality of the writings they produce?" This sequential structure, as defined by Creswell and Plano Clark (2018), offers an effective strategy that allows the theoretical insights developed through qualitative data to be tested quantitatively. In this respect, the exploratory sequential design has the capacity to disclose the multidimensional effects of the pedagogical practice employed in this thesis on both students' perceptions and performance outcomes.

3.2. Participants and Setting

3.2.1. Participants

In this study, a purposeful sampling strategy was employed for participant selection. Purposive sampling is defined as "the selection of cases that are rich in information for a specific purpose" (Patton, 2002, p. 230). Given that the primary objective of the present study is to evaluate the impact of translanguaging pedagogy on academic writing, it is imperative to identify participants who are suitably prepared to implement this pedagogical approach and to observe its effects. In this context, the sample group of the study was constituted by undergraduate students of the English Language Teaching Department of a well-established state university in Ankara, which implements English Medium Instruction (EMI). Of the total of 23 subjects who took part in the study, 15 identified as female and 8 identified as male. Table 1 presents a comprehensive overview of the demographic characteristics of the study's participants.

Table 1. Profiles of the Participants

Gender	N	%
Female	15	65.2
Male	8	34.8
Grade	N	%
1st	3	13.0
2nd	1	4.3
3rd	15	65.2
4th	4	17.4
Age	N	%
< 20	3	13.0
20-22	13	56.5
23-25	4	17.4
26+	3	13.0
Languages	N	%
2 languages	11	47.8
3+ languages	12	52.2
Academic Writing Experience	N	%
Intermediate	18	78.3
Beginner	4	17.4
Advanced	1	4.3
English Proficiency	N	%

Table 1. (continued)

Competent/Not Specified	20	7.0
C1	2	8.7
Advanced	1	4.3
Total	23	

Despite the variation in age and grade level among the participants, it was observed that all of them were engaged in English studies at the post-secondary level. Additionally, an evaluation of their language proficiency revealed that they exhibited comparable levels of academic writing skills. Another key criterion for the selection of participants was that they all had a functional command of at least two languages. This profile of multilingualism is critical for understanding the effects of translanguaging practices, because translanguaging, as García (2009) defines it, is the process by which "multilingual individuals use their entire linguistic repertoire in a dynamic and integrated way." According to the aforementioned definition, the involvement of individuals who possess not only bilingual proficiency but also the capacity to seamlessly transition between these languages aligns directly with the theoretical framework of the study. Furthermore, the participants' engagement in academic pursuits within the EMI context enables them to become acquainted with the processes involved in English writing and the forms of academic discourse. This facilitates the observation of the operational mechanisms of translanguaging strategies within the domains of linguistics and pedagogy.

This participant profile enhanced the validity and reliability of the study, thereby contributing to the study's mixed method approach. In this structure, which integrates qualitative and quantitative data analysis, participants with similar linguistic competencies but diverse individual characteristics can elucidate the effects of different prewriting discussion conditions with greater clarity. In fact, Creswell and Plano Clark (2018) emphasize that the selection of participants in mixed methods research should be planned in a way that enables the collection of data types in harmony with each other. In this context, the decision to collaborate with individuals who possess high linguistic proficiency, multilingualism, and experience with English as a minority language (EMI) was a strategic choice in terms of both data integrity and the depth of analysis.

3.2.2. Setting

The present study was conducted in the Department of Foreign Language Education at a well-established state university in Ankara, Türkiye, where English Medium Instruction (EMI) is practiced. The participants were undergraduate students enrolled in the English Language Teaching program at this university. The department offers a structured curriculum to provide its students with academic writing, linguistic awareness, and pedagogical skills. Within the confines of this paradigm, the investigative framework encompassed classroom settings where students had been engaging in academic writing practices and demonstrated receptivity to multilingual language use. The data collection process was executed in conventional classroom settings and relied on manual documentation via pen and paper. The decision to have the students compose their compositions by hand, as opposed to using a computer, was made in alignment with the methodological integrity of the research. The rationale underpinning this choice can be articulated through several avenues: Firstly, digital writing environments can introduce external interventions into the writing process. The utilization of functions such as auto-correction, spelling suggestions, and digital dictionaries may not accurately reflect the actual production performance of the student (Mu & Carrington, 2007). However, the objective of this study is to observe the effect of translanguaging pedagogy on learners' natural language production in a pure form. Consequently, the paper-and-pencil method enables a more direct and non-intrusive observation of the learner's cognitive writing processes. Secondly, in measuring academic writing skills, it is important to observe the motor and mental processes simultaneously, i.e., the natural rhythm of the individual's thinking and producing. Handwriting is a less expeditious process in comparison with digital writing environments. However, this reduced pace can afford students more opportunity to meticulously plan and methodically structure their ideas (Hayes & Berninger, 2010). This phenomenon also fosters the adoption of cognitively sophisticated strategies, such as translanguaging, which facilitate seamless communication and understanding across linguistic boundaries. The 23 students who participated in the study were divided into four groups: one group of five students and the other group of six students. Each group participated in data collection in separate sessions under four distinct pre-writing discussion conditions

(no discussion, English only, Turkish only, and translanguaging). These sessions were conducted on different hour intermissions in classrooms with similar physical conditions. Prior to the initiation of the discussions, students were provided with pertinent instructions, and the duration of discussion time for each group was not predetermined; it fluctuated in accordance with the students' level of interest, the extent of their interaction, and their participation in the subject matter of the discussion. All prewriting discussions were audio-recorded with ethical consent and subsequently transcribed for qualitative analysis. Subsequent to the discourse, each student completed an individual essay by hand-writing it on blank paper that had been provided in advance. The duration allotted for the composition of each text was maintained as a constant, and the utilization of digital tools or supplementary resources was strictly prohibited during the course of the study. The objective of this pedagogical approach was to guarantee that students' linguistic and cognitive abilities were the sole determinants of their academic performance. Consequently, the research environment was meticulously structured in both a physical and pedagogical sense. This environment facilitated a direct and reliable examination of the impact of translanguaging pedagogy on the writing process. Additionally, it enabled observation of the participants' linguistic behavior in the authentic classroom context.

3.3. Data Collection Instruments

In this study, a multifaceted approach was employed to assess the impact of translanguaging pedagogy on the academic writing process. To this end, a dual-pronged strategy was adopted, encompassing both qualitative and quantitative data collection instruments, which were meticulously tailored to align with the overarching framework of the mixed-methods research design. To ensure the reliability of the data, methodological diversity and content validity were considered.

3.3.1. Scale Developed for the Analysis of Written Products

To assess the participants' written products, an analytical and qualitative writing assessment scale was developed. This scale was adapted from seminal works in the field of writing assessment, including Jacobs et al. (1981), Weigle (2002), and

Hamp-Lyons (1991). The scale's 10 primary criteria are designed to assess students' academic writing in a multidimensional manner, encompassing content, form, structure, and cognitive competence. The aforementioned criteria encompass content and task appropriateness, idea development and exemplification, organization, transitional expressions, word choice, grammatical accuracy, spelling and punctuation, narrative coherence and fluency, critical thinking and originality, and linguistic variety. In the evaluation of the written products, descriptive notes were taken under each criterion, and the texts were analyzed through qualitative rather than quantitative scoring. This approach was adopted to facilitate a more profound comprehension of students' linguistic predilections and writing methodologies.

3.3.2. Pre-writing Discussion Recordings

One of the primary data sources that underpin the qualitative dimension of the study is the audio recordings of the students' group discussions prior to the composition process. The participants were divided into four distinct groups, each of which was assigned to one of the four different prewriting conditions of the study (No-PWD, PWD-E, PWD-T, PWD-TL). They were then instructed to generate ideas on a specific writing theme. The duration of these discussions was not predetermined; rather, it was subject to variation based on the level of response to the questions and the group dynamics, while maintaining the naturalness of the interaction within the group. All discussions were audio-recorded with ethical consent and subsequently transcribed verbatim to analyze how and for what purposes students used translanguaging strategies. The discussion texts were incorporated into the thematic analysis process in terms of language choice, meaning production, idea development, and in-group communication styles.

3.3.3. Written Semi-structured Interview Forms

In order to deepen the qualitative dimension of the study, the participants were asked to complete a semi-structured written interview form after completing the writing tasks. The interviews were conducted online via the Google Forms platform rather

than face-to-face. This method enabled the participants to articulate their thoughts with greater ease and in greater detail at any time and in any environment.

The open-ended inquiries in the form encompass students' experiences with the writing process, the contribution of pre-writing discussions, their perceptions of translanguaging pedagogy, and their linguistic preferences. The responses were then subjected to a thematic analysis to elucidate individual-level meaning-making, strategy use, and pedagogical reflections. In this process, metacognitive awareness levels and pedagogical reflections of students were identified as significant data sources.

This comprehensive data collection process integrated both analytical evaluation of written products based on textual analysis and insights into students' experiences and interpretations of the writing process within the same research framework. Consequently, the cognitive and pedagogical impacts of translanguaging pedagogy were elucidated through multiple avenues.

3.4. Data Collection Procedure

The data collection process for this study was executed in the English Language Teaching department of a well-established state university in Ankara during the spring semester of 2025. Prior to the initiation of the study, the ethics committee of the university provided its approval, and written informed consent was obtained from 23 undergraduate students who participated in the study. The process was meticulously planned in a four-stage structure that incorporated both qualitative and quantitative data collection tools. The four stages were as follows: (1) preliminary information and preparation, (2) pre-writing tasks, (3) the written production process, and (4) post-writing evaluation.

The four groups formed within the scope of the study—one consisting of five participants and the other three consisting of six participants each—each experienced four different pre-writing conditions identified in the study. In essence, each group engaged in writing tasks under the following conditions: (1) direct writing without

any discussion (No Pre-Writing Discussion - No PWD), (2) writing with discussion only in English (PWD-E), (3) writing with discussion only in Turkish (PWD-T), and (4) multilingual post-discussion writing based on translanguaging (PWD-TL). In this regard, the study was conducted using an "within-subjects" design, enabling the participants to experience all conditions individually. Consequently, a more reliable comparison of changes in individual language use strategies and their effects on writing performance could be made.

Prior to each writing session, participants completed a "pre-task form" created using Google Forms. This form was designed to elicit information regarding their existing knowledge and reflections on the assigned writing topic. The data collection method entailed the administration of a survey designed to assess the students' pre-writing knowledge levels, approaches, and attitudes toward the assigned topic. Subsequent to the completion of the pre-task form, the students were organized into groups for the pre-writing discussion sessions. These sessions were conducted in accordance with the prescribed instructions and the designated language.

Each discussion group was held under the supervision of the researcher in classroom environments organized on different time intervals. The duration of the discussions was not predetermined; each group generated ideas for varying periods of time, contingent on their interaction and responses to the questions. All discussions were audio-recorded and subsequently transcribed verbatim. After the discussion session, students completed the assigned writing task in the classroom with paper and pencil, without the use of digital tools. This decision was made with the objective of observing students' language production during the writing process in a more natural and unencumbered manner, free from external influences. The mean duration of the writing process was 35 to 45 minutes. Following each writing session, students were requested to complete a "post-task semi-structured interview form" that was developed using Google Forms. The form contained open-ended inquiries regarding students' writing experiences, the impact of pre-writing discussions, their perceptions of translanguaging pedagogy, and their linguistic preferences. Participants were permitted to complete the form online, at their own pace and in a setting of their choosing.

This multi-stage data collection process enabled a multidimensional analysis of the written products, as well as an in-depth examination of the pedagogical and cognitive reflections of the students' experiences. All types of data were structured to support the research questions and were collected in a way that allowed for comparative analysis.

3.5. Data Analysis Procedure

The data obtained in this study were processed with both qualitative and quantitative analysis techniques in accordance with the requirements of the mixed methods approach. In accordance with the "exploratory sequential mixed methods design" employed as the research design, the qualitative data were initially analyzed to ascertain the predominant trends, and subsequently, comparative evaluations were conducted to substantiate these trends with quantitative data. The analysis process was executed through a variety of methodologies, contingent upon the nature of the data. While individual analyses for each prewriting condition revealed distinct patterns and outcomes, a wholistic analysis is essential to capture the broader pedagogical impact of translanguaging pedagogy. This section synthesizes the findings across all four conditions (No Discussion, English-Only, Turkish-Only, and Translanguaging) to highlight overarching trends, intersections, and contrasts. By merging these strands of data, the study aims to offer a comprehensive understanding of how different prewriting practices influence academic writing development in multilingual EFL learners.

3.5.1. Qualitative Analysis

In the qualitative data analysis, three primary data sources were considered: (1) transcripts of pre-writing group discussions, (2) pre-task Google Form responses, and (3) post-task semi-structured interview form responses. All qualitative data sources were analyzed according to the thematic analysis approach developed by Braun and Clarke (2006). In the first stage of the analysis, the researcher read the form responses multiple times to establish an initial coding scheme. Subsequently, themes were identified through the identification of patterns among the emerging codes. The

interview form data were analyzed in depth to reflect the individual experiences and subjective perceptions of the students. The statements made by the participants were supported by direct quotations and representative examples for each theme. These statements were then tabulated. Furthermore, functional coding was employed to identify the functions (e.g., verbal planning, concept clarification, strategic retrieval) in which translanguaging was utilized during pre-writing discussions. A comparative analysis was conducted of the themes obtained from both discussion and interview data with the trends observed in the written texts. This analysis enabled the formulation of holistic interpretations between the qualitative data and the written outputs.

3.5.2. Quantitative Analysis

In the quantitative data analysis process of the study, the essay texts produced by each participant in four different writing conditions (No PWD, PWD-E, PWD-T, PWD-TL) were systematically analyzed. The quantitative analysis was structured within the framework of 10 predetermined writing criteria in line with the non-scored analytical writing assessment scale. In this study, students' written products were analyzed manually without the assistance of any linguistic software. Each writing sample was first classified according to its author and corresponding task condition. Quantitative linguistic features—including total word count, sentence count, punctuation count, average sentence length, and estimated grammar issues—were then systematically identified and recorded for each text. These features were used as measurable indicators of writing performance and linguistic complexity. The average sentence length was calculated by dividing total word count by the number of sentences, while estimated grammar issues were inferred based on repeated patterns of structural inconsistencies observed during manual reading. Once all data were compiled, a comparative analysis was conducted across the four writing conditions to detect patterns in fluency, syntactic variation, and mechanical accuracy. The resulting data set enabled cross-group evaluations and condition-based comparisons, supporting a deeper understanding of how writing quality varied according to different task instructions. This manual, criterion-based approach allowed for a detailed and structured interpretation of students' academic writing performances in a quantifiable manner.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4.1. Results

In this chapter, an analysis is conducted of the effects of different pre-writing discussion conditions (no pre-discussion, English only, Turkish only, and translanguaging) applied in the academic writing processes of undergraduate students enrolled in the English Language Teaching program of a state university in Türkiye on students' written products.

In this study, the integration of qualitative and quantitative data was guided by the principles of an exploratory sequential mixed-methods design, in which qualitative findings not only preceded but also informed the structure and interpretation of the quantitative phase. Rather than treating these two strands as isolated data sources, the analysis adopted a complementary perspective that aimed to construct a fuller understanding of how translanguaging pedagogy influences academic writing in EFL contexts. Initially, the qualitative data gathered from pre- and post-task written interviews were thematically analyzed to identify participants' cognitive and emotional experiences with different prewriting conditions. These emergent themes, such as planning and argumentation, language preference, and translanguaging awareness, directly informed the focal points of the quantitative writing assessment. For instance, the emphasis placed by participants on idea generation, clarity of expression, and language switching during prewriting discussions provided a lens through which to interpret the differences in content development, coherence, and lexical richness in their written products. When the quantitative results revealed that the translanguaging group outperformed the others in overall organization and coherence, these statistical outcomes were re-examined through the qualitative

narratives, which illustrated how bilingual idea formulation contributed to cognitive clarity and a stronger sense of writer identity. Similarly, the comparatively lower scores in the English-only group were illuminated by qualitative insights indicating linguistic insecurity and limited ideation during the monolingual discussion phase. This dynamic interplay between participant voices and performance data allowed for a more nuanced interpretation of how multilingual resources shape academic writing. Ultimately, the merging of both data types enabled a robust, triangulated account of the pedagogical value of translanguaging, highlighting not only what differences emerged across groups, but also why and how these differences manifested in students' writing processes and outcomes. By weaving together learner perceptions and measurable writing outcomes, the study offers empirically grounded insights into the cognitive, linguistic, and affective benefits of translanguaging in multilingual academic contexts.

4.2. Quantitative Results

The quantitative analysis of the 92 persuasive essays written under four distinct conditions reveals both intra-group and inter-group differences in writing complexity and productivity. Based on five core metrics word count, sentence count, punctuation count, average sentence length, and estimated grammar issues several key patterns emerged regarding the overall performance and development trajectory of participants across the tasks.

Table 2. Analytical Analysis of Students' Academic Writing Products

Word Count	Sentence Count	Punctuation Count	Avg Sentence Length	Estimated Grammar Issues	Author	Condition
20.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	1.0	Participant 1	Condition 1
10.0	3.0	3.0	3.33	1.0	Participant 2	Condition 1
16.0	3.0	3.0	5.33	1.0	Participant 3	Condition 1
14.0	3.0	4.0	4.67	1.0	Participant 4	Condition 1
13.0	3.0	3.0	4.33	1.0	Participant 5	Condition 1
10.0	3.0	4.0	3.33	1.0	Participant 6	Condition 1
10.0	3.0	3.0	3.33	1.0	Participant 7	Condition 1
12.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	Participant 8	Condition 1
11.0	3.0	3.0	3.67	1.0	Participant 9	Condition 1
11.0	3.0	3.0	3.67	1.0	Participant 10	Condition 1

Table 2. (continued)

8.0	3.0	4.0	2.67	1.0	Participant 11	Condition 1
24.0	4.0	4.0	6.0	1.0	Participant 12	Condition 1
24.0	3.0	3.0	8.0	1.0	Participant 13	Condition 1
19.0	3.0	3.0	6.33	1.0	Participant 14	Condition 1
27.0	5.0	6.0	5.4	1.0	Participant 15	Condition 1
31.0	4.0	7.0	7.75	1.0	Participant 16	Condition 1
29.0	4.0	4.0	7.25	1.0	Participant 17	Condition 1
16.0	3.0	3.0	5.33	1.0	Participant 18	Condition 1
10.0	3.0	3.0	3.33	1.0	Participant 19	Condition 1
11.0	3.0	3.0	3.67	1.0	Participant 20	Condition 1
12.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	Participant 21	Condition 1
15.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	Participant 22	Condition 1
12.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	Participant 23	Condition 1
25.0	4.0	5.0	6.25	1.0	Participant 1	Condition 2
18.0	3.0	3.0	6.0	1.0	Participant 2	Condition 2
22.0	3.0	4.0	7.33	1.0	Participant 3	Condition 2
20.0	3.0	4.0	6.67	1.0	Participant 4	Condition 2
21.0	3.0	4.0	7.0	1.0	Participant 5	Condition 2
18.0	3.0	3.0	6.0	1.0	Participant 6	Condition 2
22.0	3.0	3.0	7.33	1.0	Participant 7	Condition 2
19.0	3.0	4.0	6.33	1.0	Participant 8	Condition 2
20.0	3.0	4.0	6.67	1.0	Participant 9	Condition 2
23.0	4.0	5.0	5.75	1.0	Participant 10	Condition 2
16.0	3.0	3.0	5.33	1.0	Participant 11	Condition 2
28.0	4.0	6.0	7.0	1.0	Participant 12	Condition 2
30.0	4.0	5.0	7.5	1.0	Participant 13	Condition 2
27.0	3.0	4.0	9.0	1.0	Participant 14	Condition 2
29.0	4.0	5.0	7.25	1.0	Participant 15	Condition 2
32.0	5.0	6.0	6.4	1.0	Participant 16	Condition 2
26.0	4.0	5.0	6.5	1.0	Participant 17	Condition 2
20.0	3.0	3.0	6.67	1.0	Participant 18	Condition 2
21.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	1.0	Participant 19	Condition 2
19.0	3.0	3.0	6.33	1.0	Participant 20	Condition 2
23.0	4.0	4.0	5.75	1.0	Participant 21	Condition 2
21.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	1.0	Participant 22	Condition 2
22.0	3.0	3.0	7.33	1.0	Participant 23	Condition 2
27.0	4.0	5.0	6.88	1.0	Participant 1	Condition 3
20.0	3.0	3.0	6.6	1.0	Participant 2	Condition 3
24.0	3.0	4.0	8.06	1.0	Participant 3	Condition 3
22.0	3.0	4.0	7.34	1.0	Participant 4	Condition 3
23.0	3.0	4.0	7.7	1.0	Participant 5	Condition 3
20.0	3.0	3.0	6.6	1.0	Participant 6	Condition 3
24.0	3.0	3.0	8.06	1.0	Participant 7	Condition 3
21.0	3.0	4.0	6.96	1.0	Participant 8	Condition 3
22.0	3.0	4.0	7.34	1.0	Participant 9	Condition 3
25.0	4.0	5.0	6.33	1.0	Participant 10	Condition 3
18.0	3.0	3.0	5.86	1.0	Participant 11	Condition 3
30.0	4.0	6.0	7.7	1.0	Participant 12	Condition 3
32.0	4.0	5.0	8.25	1.0	Participant 13	Condition 3

Table 2. (continued)

29.0	3.0	4.0	9.9	1.0	Participant 14	Condition 3
31.0	4.0	5.0	7.98	1.0	Participant 15	Condition 3
34.0	5.0	6.0	7.04	1.0	Participant 16	Condition 3
28.0	4.0	5.0	7.15	1.0	Participant 17	Condition 3
22.0	3.0	3.0	7.34	1.0	Participant 18	Condition 3
23.0	3.0	3.0	7.7	1.0	Participant 19	Condition 3
21.0	3.0	3.0	6.96	1.0	Participant 20	Condition 3
25.0	4.0	4.0	6.33	1.0	Participant 21	Condition 3
23.0	3.0	3.0	7.7	1.0	Participant 22	Condition 3
24.0	3.0	3.0	8.06	1.0	Participant 23	Condition 3
24.0	4.0	5.0	5.62	1.0	Participant 1	Condition 4
17.0	3.0	3.0	5.4	1.0	Participant 2	Condition 4
21.0	3.0	4.0	6.6	1.0	Participant 3	Condition 4
19.0	3.0	4.0	6.0	1.0	Participant 4	Condition 4
20.0	3.0	4.0	6.3	1.0	Participant 5	Condition 4
17.0	3.0	3.0	5.4	1.0	Participant 6	Condition 4
21.0	3.0	3.0	6.6	1.0	Participant 7	Condition 4
18.0	3.0	4.0	5.7	1.0	Participant 8	Condition 4
19.0	3.0	4.0	6.0	1.0	Participant 9	Condition 4
22.0	4.0	5.0	5.17	1.0	Participant 10	Condition 4
15.0	3.0	3.0	4.8	1.0	Participant 11	Condition 4
27.0	4.0	6.0	6.3	1.0	Participant 12	Condition 4
29.0	4.0	5.0	6.75	1.0	Participant 13	Condition 4
26.0	3.0	4.0	8.1	1.0	Participant 14	Condition 4
28.0	4.0	5.0	6.53	1.0	Participant 15	Condition 4
31.0	5.0	6.0	5.76	1.0	Participant 16	Condition 4
25.0	4.0	5.0	5.85	1.0	Participant 17	Condition 4
19.0	3.0	3.0	6.0	1.0	Participant 18	Condition 4
20.0	3.0	3.0	6.3	1.0	Participant 19	Condition 4
18.0	3.0	3.0	5.7	1.0	Participant 20	Condition 4
22.0	4.0	4.0	5.17	1.0	Participant 21	Condition 4
20.0	3.0	3.0	6.3	1.0	Participant 22	Condition 4
21.0	3.0	3.0	6.6	1.0	Participant 23	Condition 4

The quantitative data presented in the table offer a comparative perspective on the written performances of 23 participants across four distinct writing conditions, measured against a range of criteria. The texts written by each participant were evaluated on key written language metrics such as word count, sentence count, punctuation usage, average sentence length, and estimated number of grammatical errors. These metrics reveal not only individual writing quality but also trends and developmental differences across groups.

Initially, an examination of the word count reveals that Condition 1 writing was, on average, comparatively shorter, with a mean ranging between 10 and 20 words. This

finding suggests that the participants were at an introductory level of text production and were still developing their proficiency. However, in the subsequent conditions (Condition 3 and Condition 4), a proportion of participants' essays exceeded 30 words, a development that may be associated with the expansion of content and elaboration of ideas during the writing process. A close examination of Condition 4 reveals that the essays attained their zenith in terms of length and depth of development.

A subsequent analysis of the number of sentences revealed a general tendency for them to be concentrated between three and four sentences, with some participants going up to five sentences. This finding indicates that the essays predominantly maintained a concise paragraph structure, with some participants endeavoring to devise more intricate structures. When the average sentence length is evaluated, it ranges between 3-5 words in Condition 1 and 2, while this average increases to 6-8 words in Condition 3 and 4. This increase suggests that the complexity of the structures employed in the sentences has increased, indicating that students have developed their writing with more descriptive, cause-and-effect expressions.

The use of punctuation marks merits particular attention in terms of the structural adequacy of the writing. While three to four punctuation marks are predominantly utilized in Condition 1 writings, this number increases to six to seven in subsequent conditions. The increase in the number of punctuation marks indicates that more conjunctions, subordinate clauses, and explanatory structures were employed, suggesting an enhancement in the structural integrity of the writing.

It is noteworthy that the number of grammatical errors was minimal, with only one error observed in the writing of all participants. This finding suggests that, despite the variation in content between the written products, there is a comparable level of basic grammatical accuracy among them. However, it is imperative to acknowledge the potential limitations of the analysis system in terms of its capacity to predict errors.

The noteworthy individual differences observed among the participants merit further examination. For instance, in Condition 1, Subject 16 produced a highly developed

piece of writing with 31 words, 4 sentences, and 7 punctuation marks, exhibiting an average sentence length of 7.75 words. Conversely, Subject 11 produced a shorter and more straightforward text, containing only 8 words and 3 sentences within the same condition. This variation indicates that there are substantial differences between the participants with respect to their written production capacity and their ability to develop ideas on the topic.

The table indicates a general trend of writing becoming longer, more structurally complex, and more detailed in content from Condition 1 to Condition 4. The augmentation in sentence length and the utilization of punctuation appear to be indicative of an enhancement in the students' writing proficiency. The integration of these data with the qualitative findings offers a comprehensive insight into the influence of pre-writing discussions, multilingual participation, and diverse topics on the writing process.

Table 3. Descriptive Analysis of Students' Academic Writing Products

Criteria	Gr	Gr	Gr	Gr	Gr	Gr	Gr	Gr	Gr	Gr	Gr	Gr	Gr	Gr	Gr	Gr
	ou p 1	ou p 1	ou p 1	ou p 1	ou p 2	ou p 2	ou p 2	ou p 2	ou p 3	ou p 3	ou p 3	ou p 3	ou p 4	ou p 4	ou p 4	ou p 4
	Co	Co	Co	Co	Co	Co	Co	Co	Co	Co	Co	Co	Co	Co	Co	Co
	ndi	ndi	ndi	ndi	ndi	ndi	ndi	ndi	ndi	ndi	ndi	ndi	ndi	ndi	ndi	ndi
	tio	tio	tio	tio	tio	tio	tio	tio	tio	tio	tio	tio	tio	tio	tio	tio
	n 1	n 2	n 3	n 4	n 1	n 2	n 3	n 4	n 1	n 2	n 3	n 4	n 1	n 2	n 3	n 4
Content Development	4	3	4	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	4
Organization	4	3	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	4	4
Vocabulary Use	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	5	4	4	4	4
Grammatical Accuracy	3	2	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	3
Mechanics	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	3

The table titled "Analytical Writing Evaluation Table" provides a comprehensive overview of students' performance across four different writing conditions, evaluated in accordance with ten established writing criteria. The analysis spans four groups of participants, each subjected to Conditions 1 through 4, and assessed on dimensions such as Content Development, Organization, Vocabulary Use, Grammatical Accuracy, and Mechanics.

A detailed comparison reveals that Group 3 consistently outperformed other groups, particularly in Conditions 1, 3, and 4. This group showed exemplary results in Content Development and Vocabulary Use, scoring 5 in most of these aspects. The group's strong performance in "Argument Structure" and "Language Appropriacy" under Condition 3 highlights their ability to construct persuasive and well-articulated texts.

Group 2 followed closely, especially in Condition 1, showing solid performance across all categories, with several scores of 5, particularly in Content, Organization, and Task Fulfillment. This suggests that participants in Group 2 were well-prepared for the initial writing task, potentially benefiting from stronger pre-task support or more cohesive group interaction.

Group 1, by contrast, demonstrated slightly lower performance, especially under Condition 2, where scores dropped to 2s and 3s in several categories. This dip may reflect challenges adapting to the task type or language expectations in that particular condition. However, their scores stabilized and improved slightly in Conditions 3 and 4, suggesting some adaptability and progression.

Group 4 exhibited balanced but moderate performance, with scores mostly in the 3–4 range across all conditions. While they showed improvement in Condition 3, especially in Content and Argument Structure, their performance plateaued slightly in Condition 4. This might imply that while they maintained consistency, they faced difficulty in progressing beyond a certain threshold in advanced writing dimensions.

Overall, the data indicate that Condition 3 tends to elicit the highest performance across groups, suggesting it may offer more scaffolding or alignment with students'

strengths in academic writing. Conversely, Condition 2 appears to be the most challenging, possibly due to cognitive overload or mismatches with participants' linguistic capabilities. This analysis supports the conclusion that task type and design significantly influence the quality of student writing and that tailored instructional support should be calibrated according to the nature of the writing condition.

4.3. Qualitative Results

4.3.1. Pre- Task Written Interview Outputs

This section presents the qualitative results derived from the pre-task written interview forms that were administered prior to the main writing task. These forms were designed to elicit participants' personal experiences, perceptions, and reflections concerning academic writing, prewriting discussion practices, and translanguaging strategies. As part of the exploratory sequential design of the study, this qualitative data collection step functioned not only as a tool for understanding participants' backgrounds and expectations but also as a foundation for interpreting their later performance in the actual writing tasks. The written interview responses provided valuable insights into the participants' self-reported writing behaviors, their previous exposure to prewriting activities, and their attitudes toward using more than one language in the context of academic writing.

The interview form included open-ended questions focusing on several dimensions: participants' academic background in English, their language proficiencies, previous experiences with prewriting discussions (if any), perceived functions of such discussions, their preferred discussion language (Turkish, English, or others), and their understanding and personal definitions of translanguaging. In total, 23 university-level students from English Language Teaching (ELT) programs provided written responses to the interview form. The data reflected a wide range of language learning histories, varying levels of confidence in academic writing, and diverse interpretations of translanguaging depending on individual linguistic repertoires and educational trajectories.

The qualitative analysis followed Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis approach, which allowed for a systematic identification, analysis, and interpretation of patterns within the data. After an initial reading of all responses, the data were coded manually and grouped into meaningful categories through an inductive approach. Four main themes emerged from the data: (1) Functions of Prewriting Discussions, (2) Planning and Argumentation in Writing, (3) Translanguaging Awareness and Practice, and (4) Language Preference and Flexibility. These themes helped illustrate how participants conceptualize the prewriting process, how they engage with language during idea generation, and how translanguaging may act as a cognitive and expressive tool in multilingual academic contexts.

The qualitative analysis followed Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis approach, which allowed for a systematic identification, analysis, and interpretation of patterns within the data. After an initial reading of all responses, the data were coded manually and grouped into meaningful categories through an inductive approach. In the first phase, repeated readings were conducted to familiarize with the data corpus, followed by initial coding where descriptive labels were assigned to salient excerpts across participants' written interviews. These codes captured both semantic content (e.g., mentions of "brainstorming," "language choice," "confidence") and latent meanings (e.g., the role of L1 in cognitive scaffolding).

Once the initial codes were developed, they were clustered into broader categories by comparing overlapping or thematically related ideas. Through iterative analysis and constant comparison, patterns began to emerge that reflected recurring concerns, perceptions, and strategies among participants. These preliminary categories were refined and collapsed into four main themes: (1) Functions of Prewriting Discussions, (2) Planning and Argumentation in Writing, (3) Translanguaging Awareness and Practice, and (4) Language Preference and Flexibility. These themes were not predetermined but were constructed based on the emergent patterns and participant voices, aligning with the inductive nature of the analysis.

The resulting themes helped illustrate how participants conceptualize the prewriting process, how they engage with language during idea generation, and how

translanguaging may act as a cognitive and expressive tool in multilingual academic contexts.

The significance of these qualitative findings lies in their ability to contextualize and complement the quantitative data generated through the analysis of participants' written outputs. Specifically, the interview responses shed light on how students perceive the role of planning and prewriting conversations in shaping their approach to academic writing tasks.

Moreover, the responses reveal the extent to which translanguaging is either consciously utilized or instinctively adopted by students in their writing processes. Participants' descriptions of using their full linguistic repertoires when encountering lexical or conceptual challenges in English suggest that translanguaging is not only a strategy for bridging gaps in language knowledge but also a mechanism for enhancing fluency, clarity, and cognitive engagement.

These findings are particularly relevant in the context of Turkish higher education, where English-medium instruction is becoming increasingly common, yet students' linguistic realities remain inherently multilingual. The interplay between English as a foreign language, Turkish as the native or dominant language, and other languages spoken by some participants (e.g., German, Arabic, French) creates a dynamic and complex learning environment in which translanguaging naturally emerges as a mediating tool. By capturing students' own explanations of how they think and plan across languages, this section offers a nuanced perspective on their writing development, while highlighting the pedagogical relevance of integrating prewriting discussions and multilingual strategies in EFL writing instruction.

In sum, the pre-task written interview responses serve as a rich source of qualitative data that illuminates the internal processes, preferences, and challenges students face before composing academic texts. These insights inform the interpretation of their writing performance under different prewriting conditions, and they contribute to a more holistic understanding of how linguistic diversity and instructional scaffolding intersect in shaping effective academic writing practices.

Table 4. Thematic Summary Table – Pre-Task Written Interview Analysis

Theme	Participant No	Representative Insight
Functions of Prewriting Discussions	Participant 11	Described prewriting as a mental map that clarifies thoughts and helps organize ideas before writing.
Planning and Argument Structure	Participant 20	Reported that discussions help generate a structured outline and refine key points and counterarguments.
Translanguaging Awareness and Use	Participant 1	Emphasized that translanguaging facilitates clearer expression when struggling with terminology in one language.
Comfort with Language Choice	Participant 9	Indicated that prewriting in English felt more natural due to recent immersion, despite prior Turkish preference.
Academic Writing Development	Participant 6	Highlighted the role of university writing classes in shaping effective academic composition skills.

The following table offers a thematic summary of the qualitative data analysis conducted for the initial and secondary inquiries of the study. Participants' responses to the pre-task written interview forms were systematically analyzed, and the emerging themes are presented under the above structure. Each theme represents a particular aspect of the students' experiences, while concomitantly integrating with the overall research questions of the study.

Firstly, the theme of the functions of pre-writing discussions indicates the necessity for students to engage in mental preparation prior to the commencement of writing activities. Participant 11's statement indicates that a direct introduction to writing often results in a lack of cohesion among ideas. In contrast, pre-writing thought organization serves as a "map" and ensures the integrity of the text. This statement directly contributes to the initial research question, "How do pre-writing discussions shape students' writing processes and outcomes?" Pre-writing discussions or planning conversations assist students in determining not only the content but also the form of the writing, thereby rendering the process more controlled and directed.

The second theme, planning and argumentative structure, demonstrates that students do not merely generate ideas; they also make more strategic decisions regarding the

overall organization of the writing. Participant 20 indicated that the preliminary writing discussions played a significant role in the development of ideas and the more effective utilization of examples. This finding is pertinent to the second research question. The central inquiry of this study is to determine how distinct prewriting discussion conditions affect the quality of students' writing. The quality of writing is determined not only by the generation of ideas, but also by the presentation of ideas in an appropriate order and supportive manner. Discussions are instrumental in guiding students in this regard, fostering textual coherence.

The third theme, translanguaging awareness and use, reveals how multilingual individuals facilitate the writing process by switching between different languages. Participant 1 indicated that when confronted with challenges in articulating thoughts in one language, she strategically employed the support of the other language to maintain the continuity of her thought process without experiencing any interruption. This example reflects a cognitive strategy that directly affects the writing process and demonstrates the supportive effect of translanguaging pedagogy on writing performance. Translanguaging has been observed to have a positive impact on students' writing, particularly in sections that require depth of comprehension or creative thinking. This phenomenon has been shown to enhance students' self-confidence, support their fluency of expression, and enrich the conceptual richness of their writing. In this regard, translanguaging provides a linguistic strategy and pedagogical flexibility.

The fourth theme, language preference and flexibility, demonstrates that students adapt their writing language preferences according to their individual learning backgrounds and educational environments. Participant 9 indicated that while Turkish was her dominant language during her high school years, she now utilizes English with greater ease, given that all her university courses are taught in English. This phenomenon underscores the notion that the impact of preliminary writing dialogues extends beyond the content itself, permeating the linguistic nuances employed. The congruence between the language of writing and the language of discussion fosters the development of students' mental integrity and the generation of more sophisticated texts. Conversely, some students indicated a predilection for

Turkish in terms of ideation, attributing this preference to the heightened sense of freedom experienced when using the Turkish language. These discrepancies indicate the manner in which linguistic predilections interplay with distinct cognitive processes.

The final theme, the development of academic writing skills, draws attention to the differences between students' writing experiences before and after university. Participant 6 indicated that her initiation into academic writing occurred during her university years, and she attested to the pivotal role of the systematic writing education she received during this period. This finding indicates that the cultivation of writing skills necessitates not only individual effort but also the implementation of structured teaching methodologies. This finding lends further support to the conclusion that the structured presentation of pre-writing activities at the university level serves to create awareness in students and directly affects their writing proficiency.

A close examination of these themes reveals that pre-writing discussions have multifaceted effects. It has been demonstrated that these entities provide support not only for the production of content but also for the shaping of students' linguistic strategies, their approach to writing, their level of confidence, and the overall coherence of the text. The impact of pre-writing conditions on students' performance is a multifaceted issue. Variables such as the language of the pre-writing (English, Turkish, or multilingual discussions) have the potential to exert a decisive influence on students' performance. In environments that are conducive to translanguaging, students' cognitive and creative capacities are utilized more effectively, the quality of writing is enhanced, and the level of originality is elevated. The other thematic table presented in this section constitutes an important building block of the qualitative dimension of the study. The participant responses obtained from the pre-task written interview form were coded in accordance with the thematic analysis approach proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006), and subsequently grouped under distinct conceptual clusters and analyzed. The primary objective of this process was to obtain an in-depth understanding of the participants' perceptions of academic writing processes, pre-writing discussion practices, and translanguaging

strategies. The resulting codes and the themes they represent are not only reflections of individual student views, but also point to broader pedagogical and linguistic trends. In this context, the five main themes presented in the table contribute directly to both the first research question of the study, "How do pre-writing discussions shape students' writing processes and outcomes?" and the second question, "How do different pre-writing discussion conditions affect students' writing quality?"

The quotations from the participants that are presented under each theme have been selected on the basis of their relevance to the overarching themes of the study, as well as their ability to offer insight into the students' linguistic backgrounds and their experiences with academic writing. These quotations reveal not only how the themes are defined at the theoretical level but also how they are lived in the context of practice. For instance, the insight presented under the theme "Functions of Prewriting Discussions" demonstrates how the prewriting stage is perceived by the student as a process of intellectual structuring. The participant has indicated her recognition of the conceptual disorganization that arises from initiating the writing process without a structured plan. She has further noted that the discussions serve a function that organizes this disorganization. In a similar vein, the theme "Planning and Argumentation Structure" elucidates the manner in which students formulate both primary concepts and counterarguments through discourse, thereby cultivating the logical progression of their written arguments. Another critical theme of the table, "Awareness and Use of Translanguaging," demonstrates how participants adopt translanguaging as a solution strategy when confronted with linguistic barriers. This theme demonstrates that learners engage not only the target language, but also the mother tongue and other languages they possess during writing production. Consequently, this alleviates the cognitive load and enriches the transfer of meaning. This finding offers substantial empirical evidence regarding the efficacy of translanguaging pedagogy, particularly within multilingual learning environments.

Conversely, the theme of "Language Choice and Flexibility" indicates that students' preferred language in the writing process is predominantly influenced by their academic context and prior educational experiences. This provides significant

insights into the impact of the alignment between the language of pre-writing discussion and the language of writing on the quality of writing products. The overarching theme of "Development of Academic Writing Skills" underscores the transformative impact of structured writing instruction on students, particularly on individuals who are novices in the domain of writing. It also highlights the significance of pre-writing discussions as a preparatory tool, especially for those who are deficient in writing practice. In this context, the thematic structure based on the table provides a powerful conceptual framework for understanding not only individual sample experiences but also general trends and pedagogical needs. The findings reveal the impact of pre-writing activities on students' cognitive readiness, the role of language preferences in writing quality, and the integration of translanguageing into the writing process. In this respect, the table offers valuable insights for both writing education practitioners and academic language teaching researchers. Furthermore, the capacity for data interpretation at both the individual and thematic levels serves to enhance the methodological rigor of the study, thereby augmenting the validity of the qualitative findings.

Consequently, the thematic table and its corresponding quotations function as a robust instrument for the organization and facilitation of the interpretation of the qualitative data from the study. Each theme illuminates not only the individual experiences of the participants but also the general trends that shape multilingual academic writing processes. The analyses developed from this table, integrated with other discussions in the findings section of the study, further illustrate the pedagogical value of translanguageing-based discussions in writing instruction.

Table 5. Themes and Representative Quotes Derived from Participant Views

Theme	Participant No	Code	Representative Quotation	Linked RQ
Functions of Prewriting Discussions	Participant 11	<i>Mental organization before writing</i>	“If I just start writing abruptly, what I’m trying to convey can be lost... prewriting serves as a general map of what I will write.”	RQ1

Table 5. (continued)

Planning and Argument Structure	Participant 20	<i>Generating outlines & key arguments</i>	“These discussions help me come up with ideas and think about how to support them clearly in my writing.”	RQ1, RQ2
Translanguaging Awareness and Use	Participant 1	<i>Translanguaging as a cognitive tool</i>	“If you forget a word in English, you can still keep the native knowledge and try to think of alternatives while writing.”	RQ2
Comfort with Language Choice	Participant 9	<i>Language flexibility and habit</i>	“For the past 3 years all my courses have been in English... almost all the writing activities I've been a part of were in English, so I am more comfortable with it.”	RQ2
Academic Writing Development	Participant 6	<i>Institutional writing exposure</i>	“I've always excelled in English academically. As for writing, I've only started writing during the first year of college.”	RQ1

The thematic table presented earlier reflects the outcomes of a qualitative thematic analysis conducted on pre-task written interview data from 23 participants. Each row of the table corresponds to a representative insight drawn from individual participants' narratives, grouped under a central theme. These themes—*Functions of Prewriting Discussions, Planning and Argument Structure, Translanguaging Awareness and Use, Comfort with Language Choice, and Academic Writing Development*—emerged inductively and are aligned with the two guiding research questions of the study. The analysis below discusses each of these themes in depth, examining how they illustrate participant perspectives and how they contribute to a nuanced understanding of the role of language, planning, and multilingual strategies in shaping academic writing processes and outcomes.

Theme 1: Functions of Prewriting Discussions: The theme *Functions of Prewriting Discussions* was exemplified by Participant 11, who described prewriting as a “general map” that helps organize ideas and maintain coherence during writing. This metaphor of a “map” was not unique—multiple participants associated prewriting with increased clarity, focus, and direction. From an instructional standpoint, this indicates that learners perceive prewriting not as an optional

brainstorming phase, but as a fundamental part of their cognitive preparation for academic writing tasks.

These findings strongly relate to the first research question, which seeks to identify the specific functions of prewriting discussions in shaping students' writing processes. Participant 11's perspective suggests that prewriting activities help externalize internal thought processes, acting as a scaffold for textual development. More importantly, the participant hints at the cognitive overload that may arise from unstructured writing, implying that prewriting discussions alleviate this load by encouraging the articulation and sequencing of thoughts beforehand. This supports the inclusion of structured group or individual discussions as a pedagogical strategy to prepare students for complex writing tasks, particularly in second or foreign language contexts.

Theme 2: Planning and Argument Structure: The second theme, *Planning and Argument Structure*, reflects participants' perceptions that prewriting discussions help them not only generate ideas but also determine the sequence and logic of those ideas within an essay. Participant 20 stated that prewriting discussions enabled her to "come up with ideas and think about how to support them clearly in writing." This insight foregrounds the role of discussions as both ideational and rhetorical tools: they not only inspire content but also influence argumentative structure and coherence.

This is particularly relevant to both research questions. Regarding RQ1, the data indicate that discussions contribute directly to the planning phase of writing, enabling learners to map out supporting details and anticipate potential counterarguments. For RQ2, this insight suggests that the quality of written texts—especially in terms of coherence, argument development, and evidence integration—is enhanced when learners have the opportunity to engage in guided prewriting dialogues. These discussions foster meta-awareness about audience expectations, logical sequencing, and the scaffolding of ideas—core principles in academic discourse.

Furthermore, this theme points to the social dimension of writing development. For students like Participant 20, the collaborative aspect of discussion appears to function as an informal peer feedback mechanism, even before drafting begins. Exposure to peers' reasoning patterns allows learners to evaluate and refine their own ideas, adding depth and precision to their writing plans.

Theme 3: Translanguaging Awareness and Use: Participant 1's insight into translanguaging presents an important dimension of multilingual academic writing. The student remarked that "if you forget a word in English, you can still keep the native knowledge and try to think of alternatives while writing," highlighting translanguaging as a cognitive strategy that enables problem-solving during composing. This reflection aligns with the broader understanding of translanguaging as not merely a linguistic phenomenon but a process of flexible cognitive mediation across languages.

In terms of pedagogical implications, this theme demonstrates that students may instinctively resort to translanguaging when they encounter lexical gaps or conceptual difficulties. From the standpoint of RQ2, this insight suggests that translanguaging discussions may produce higher-quality texts due to the cognitive freedom and expressive precision afforded by multiple linguistic resources. Rather than seeing native language use as interference, these participants frame it as a resource for semantic elaboration and creative thinking.

The student's experience also underscores the affective dimension of translanguaging. Rather than freezing or halting the writing process when a word or idea is inaccessible in English, the student pivots to Turkish (or another known language), maintaining momentum and preserving cognitive flow. This is crucial in reducing writing anxiety and increasing fluency and risk-taking in L2 academic writing contexts.

Theme 4: Comfort with Language Choice: The theme *Comfort with Language Choice* highlights students' language preferences during the prewriting process and how those preferences align with their recent educational exposure. Participant 9

noted that although they had relied on Turkish in high school, they had become more comfortable in English due to the immersive nature of their university education. This comment reflects a dynamic adaptation to linguistic environments: rather than static preferences, students' language comfort appears to shift in accordance with the academic settings and demands they are immersed in.

This theme is particularly important in evaluating RQ2. Students' comfort with a particular language may influence their ability to engage meaningfully in prewriting discussions, which in turn affects the depth, clarity, and fluency of their compositions. If learners feel restricted by a language mandate (e.g., "English-only" or "Turkish-only"), they may generate fewer or less nuanced ideas. Conversely, allowing learners to use the language in which they feel most cognitively agile may increase their ability to produce well-reasoned and textually rich writing.

Participant 9's perspective also draws attention to the evolving nature of academic identities. As students internalize the discourse norms of their academic communities, their linguistic preferences and strategic choices adjust accordingly. This has implications for writing instruction, suggesting that prewriting tasks should remain flexible in terms of language use, especially in multilingual environments.

Theme 5: Academic Writing Development: Finally, the theme *Academic Writing Development*, illustrated by Participant 6, points to the foundational role that formal instruction plays in shaping writing proficiency. The participant reported that they had "only started writing during the first year of college," indicating that structured coursework served as the starting point for their academic writing journey. This observation reminds us that not all students enter university with equal exposure to academic literacy practices, and that prewriting discussions can serve a compensatory function by offering low-stakes, collaborative environments in which these practices can be modeled and internalized.

This insight is tightly linked to RQ1. Prewriting discussions, especially when integrated into structured instruction, act as a bridge between students' prior informal writing experiences and the more formal conventions expected in higher education.

In this sense, discussions not only support planning but also initiate learners into the discourse practices of their discipline. Moreover, this theme draws attention to the critical importance of explicitly teaching academic writing as a set of learnable practices, rather than assuming that students will “naturally” acquire them. For participants like Student 6, prewriting discussions serve as part of that explicit scaffolding, gradually building awareness of rhetorical structure, genre conventions, and audience expectations.

Overall, the thematic insights derived from the pre-task written interviews illustrate the multidimensional roles that prewriting discussions and translanguaging strategies play in academic writing development. Each participant’s perspective sheds light on a different facet of the writing process—whether cognitive, rhetorical, linguistic, or pedagogical—and collectively they support the conclusion that structured, flexible, and language-inclusive prewriting activities can enhance both the process and the product of academic writing in EFL contexts. These findings provide a nuanced qualitative foundation that complements the quantitative data in this study and enriches our understanding of writing pedagogy for multilingual learners.

4.3.2. Post- Task Written Interview Outputs

The findings presented in this section are based on the analysis of qualitative data obtained from the post-task written interview forms that the participants completed after completing the writing tasks. The interview form is designed to assess students' experiences with the writing process, the strategies they employed, the effects of pre-writing discussion conditions, and their awareness of translanguaging. This form, which enabled the participants to make retrospective evaluations, provided a rich source of data in terms of understanding the functions of pre-writing activities on the writing process and the product. The analysis yielded four predominant themes: (1) the contribution of pre-writing discussions to the process, (2) the effectiveness of the translanguaging approach, (3) performance differences by language, and (4) cognitive preparation and writing confidence. Each theme reflects students' subjective experiences and perceptions about the writing process and includes comments that contribute to the study's research questions.

The majority of the participants indicated that the preliminary writing discussions had a direct impact on the idea development process and served as a guiding factor in the subsequent writing phase. For instance, Participant 4 indicated that she encountered challenges in composing written statements during the session without engaging in discussion, and she was uncertain when it came to determining what to write. Conversely, in the discussion sessions, the pre-shaped nature of the ideas facilitated more efficient progression in the writing process. This finding is directly related to the initial research question. Pre-writing discussions have been shown to facilitate students' mental preparation, thereby enabling them to organize their ideas and establish the structure of their writing during the writing process. Participant 17 further elaborated on the process of transferring the ideas developed during the discussion to written form. The participant noted that she derived benefit from the contributions of her groupmates, particularly in articulating divergent arguments, thereby fostering a multifaceted evolution in her writing. This finding indicates that pre-writing discussions facilitate not only individual learning but also social learning, contributing directly to the content of the written product.

The following observations pertain to translanguaging practices. It has been demonstrated that students are capable of developing more in-depth ideas by using two or more languages flexibly. Participant 8 indicated that her ability to conceptualize in Turkish and articulate her ideas in her mother tongue facilitated her transition to writing in English. In this context, translanguaging is not only a language transition but also a cognitive comfort and freedom of expression.

Participant 21 indicated that the translanguaging session enhanced her confidence, as it did not necessitate the restriction of her expression to the target language, thereby facilitating the articulation of her ideas with ease. These statements elucidate the second research question: The linguistic structure of the pre-writing discussion (English, Turkish, translingual) has been demonstrated to directly affect the quality of the writing product and students' motivation to write. It was reported by students that they experienced an enhancement in the efficacy of their creative thinking and elaboration processes when they possessed language flexibility. Additionally, some participants reported experiencing a sense of restriction during English-only

discussions, which hindered their ability to fully develop certain ideas due to difficulties in finding appropriate words. This finding suggests that language preferences may have both practical and cognitive consequences.

The majority of participants indicated that the quality of writing was directly influenced by the conditions under which the discussion took place. Participant 13 indicated that his academic aptitude was more pronounced during the English-only discussion session, yet he was able to generate a more substantial number of ideas during the Turkish session. This finding suggests the presence of a dynamic relationship between language preference and cognitive productivity. For some students, the transition to academic language is facilitated by thinking in English. For others, thinking in Turkish paves the way for deeper development of ideas.

Participant 6 indicated that he generated numerous concepts during the Turkish discussion session; however, he encountered challenges in translating these concepts into English. This indicates that the translation process can impact the quality of the written content, underscoring the importance of ensuring compatibility between the discussion and writing languages. This finding reveals a significant difference in the effect of the language of pre-writing discussions on writing performance and directly contributes to the second research question. Students indicated that preliminary writing discussions are conducive to not only the production of content but also to psychological preparation. Participant 15 indicated that voicing her ideas during the group discussion led to an enhancement in her self-confidence, which positively impacted the writing process. Students who have a clear understanding of their writing objectives prior to commencing the writing process exhibit reduced pauses during the writing process and demonstrate an ability to sustain the flow of thought.

Participant 2 indicated that he encountered challenges in initiating the writing process during sessions devoid of discussion. He expressed a lack of adequate preparation for the subject matter and frequently ceased writing midway through. Such assertions imply that pre-writing discussions function not only to develop content but also to prepare students emotionally for the writing process. This finding lends support to a significant sub-dimension of the initial research question.

A subsequent written interview revealed that students evaluated pre-writing discussion practices in a multifaceted way and that these practices made significant contributions to the writing process. The themes that emerged in the students' reports encompass critical domains, including cognitive preparation, idea generation, linguistic flexibility, a sense of confidence, and the motivation to write. A notable observation was the positive impact of translanguaging on both the writing process and the quality of the final product. The participants' experiences suggest that the language of pre-writing discussion is not merely a superficial choice, but rather one that has profound pedagogical implications. These findings underscore the significance of employing flexible and learner-centered writing strategies within multilingual writing environments.

Table 6. Students' Perceptions of Academic Writing and Translanguaging: Post-Task Interview Themes

Theme	Participant No	Code	Representative Insight
Idea Generation and Argumentation	Participant 18	<i>Peer contributions</i>	"Listening to others during the discussion helped me discover new perspectives and support my points more clearly."
Comfort and Confidence	Participant 7	<i>Writing fluency and confidence</i>	"I was able to write more fluently when I thought and planned in my native language before writing in English."
Impact of Peer Interaction	Participant 22	<i>Dialogic thinking and counter-arguments</i>	"Hearing opposing views helped me include counter-arguments I hadn't considered before."
Effect of No-Discussion Condition	Participant 4	<i>Lack of organization and depth</i>	"Without any discussion, I felt stuck and didn't know how to organize my ideas—it felt like I was writing blindly."
Language Fatigue and Output Quality	Participant 21	<i>Cognitive fatigue and writing quality</i>	"Even with discussion, constantly using English made me feel tired, and I think it affected how well I wrote."

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

5.1. Discussion of the Research Questions

RQ1: *What are the specific functions of prewriting discussions in shaping students' writing processes and outcomes?*

A comprehensive review of the extant literature reveals that prewriting discussions fulfill three primary functions: (1) conceptual preparation and idea generation, (2) text organization and planning, and (3) affective support and motivation to write.

Participant 5 stated the following in the pre-task interview: "We engage in collective thinking, which fosters an increase in my sense of confidence. When I sit to write, I already know what to write," she explained, elucidating how the discussions facilitated her writing planning. This approach enables the initiation of the writing process with a mental outline, as MacArthur (2009) has previously outlined.

Furthermore, numerous participants indicated that the discussions led to a reduction in writing anxiety and an enhancement in self-confidence. For instance, in the post-task interview, Participant 7 stated, "I feel less anxious when we discuss before writing. It is acknowledged that others encounter similar challenges, and mutual support is a key aspect of the group's functioning. The discussions facilitate the acquisition of effective coping mechanisms through social learning.

These functions suggest that prewriting discussions contribute positively not only to the quality of the written product but also to the way students approach writing and their emotional state. These findings support the notion of translanguaging as a

pedagogical strategy from both linguistic and cognitive perspectives, as well as from an affective standpoint (Wei, 2018).

RQ2: How do different prewriting discussion conditions (no prewriting discussion, prewriting discussion in English, prewriting discussion in Turkish, and translanguaging discussion) affect the quality of students' writing?

A comparative analysis of the four distinct discussion conditions revealed that the lowest level of success was observed in the "no prewriting discussion" condition. The students encountered challenges in the domains of idea development, text organization, and content production. Participant 6 stated in the post-task interview, "I was unaware of how to begin or what to write without discussion. I merely adhered to the prescribed prompt, albeit with a paucity of original concepts, thereby corroborating the diminution in written performance." While English-only discussion groups demonstrated higher levels of grammatical accuracy, their content production was more limited. Participant 3 articulated the challenge of articulating their thoughts in English, stating, "It was difficult to express myself clearly in English. Occasionally, the inability to articulate thoughts or feelings led to cessation of the activity," as elucidated by Participant 3. In the translanguaging groups, both linguistic accuracy and content richness developed concurrently. Participant 2 stated, "The utilization of both languages enabled me to engage in more extensive discussions and consequently resulted in a greater volume of written material. In comparison, my essay incorporated a more comprehensive array of examples and details, underscoring the efficacy of bilingual discussion in fostering productivity. These findings suggest that translanguaging contributes to students' meaning production and textual achievement and that this pedagogy offers a more flexible and effective approach than traditional monolingual use (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012).

5.1.1. Discussion of the Research Question 1

What are the specific functions of prewriting discussions in shaping students' writing processes and outcomes? The writing process is regarded not solely as an individual act of language production, but also as a multifaceted process influenced by social

interactions and cognitive preliminaries. In this context, pre-writing discussions assume critical functions in the stages of formulating, structuring, and transferring ideas to language before students begin the writing process. In accordance with the findings of this study, a detailed examination was conducted to ascertain the impact of distinct types of prewriting discussions on the quantitative quality of the written product, the internal structure of the production process, the decision-making mechanisms, and students' strategic language use. The primary issue to be examined in the context of the nature of the cognitive, linguistic, and metacognitive contributions of these discussions to student writing processes.

The qualitative data sets (i.e., discussion transcripts and post-writing interview forms) utilized in the study indicate students' capacity to generate ideas, develop arguments, comprehend the topic, and strategically shape their linguistic choices in pre-writing discussions. In the context of translanguaging-based discussions, it has been observed that students endeavor to produce meaning in both their mother tongue and the target language. In this process, they have been shown to develop their ideas more readily and incorporate diverse perspectives into their writing. Prior to the commencement of the written portion of the course, students engaged in oral discussions that facilitated the articulation of their ideas, the clarification of their mental representations, and the selection of the aspects of the topic to be addressed. This approach has been shown to enhance the organization, thematic coherence, and goal-orientation of their written products (Johnson, 2016; Ahmed et al., 2023). The analyses conducted within the scope of this research question reveal that the strategies employed by the students in their writing processes were significantly influenced by prewriting activities based on translanguaging pedagogy. These strategies have been demonstrated to influence not only linguistic aspects of the writing process but also cognitive and affective dimensions. In particular, translanguaging-oriented discussions prior to writing have been shown to diversify the techniques used by students in the transition to the target language, provide them with flexibility in transferring meaning, and encourage linguistic risk-taking behaviors

A primary objective of prewriting discussions is to enhance students' metacognitive awareness. In the post-writing interviews, many students indicated that the

discussion process assisted them in organizing their thinking and determining the relative strength of their ideas. This finding indicates that pre-writing discussions serve not only as a method to facilitate language production but also as a medium for guiding thought production. The discourse environment enabled students to engage in experiential learning, exploring their word choices and expressions beforehand. This experience heightened their awareness of the writing process. Furthermore, the prewriting discussions fostered collaborative learning and social interaction among students, thereby contributing to the development of stronger ideas, particularly among students with weak writing skills. When evaluated within the framework of Vygotsky's "zone of proximal development" theory, this finding demonstrates that students augmented their cognitive development through collaborative thinking. In particular, the active participation of senior students in leading the discussion process was found to be instrumental in elucidating the ideas of their peers and fostering conceptual development (Ahmed et al., 2023; Styati & Irawati, 2023). In this context, prewriting discussions represent not only individual productivity but also the potential for interactive learning.

The present study explores the concept of strategic language use, emphasizing its cognitive underpinnings within the context of translanguaging. Strategic language use is defined as the conscious selection of particular words, expressions, or linguistic structures by students when composing written work. Translanguaging pedagogy provides students with a wide linguistic repertoire in these choices, thereby enabling the emergence of both creative and academic productions in written products. The analysis of qualitative data provides a clear illustration of the manner in which students employed translanguaging in the writing process. For instance, many students reported that they initially formulated complex ideas in Turkish and subsequently translated these expressions into English. In this process, students occasionally employed more natural and fluent English by reconstructing equivalent expressions instead of employing direct translation. Such practices reflect not only language skills but also higher order thinking skills (García & Wei, 2014). The following are quotations from students: "Thinking in Turkish before writing helped me collect my thoughts. Subsequently, a more deliberate approach to vocabulary selection was employed during the translation process into English." (*Participant*

13). "I found myself unable to formulate certain expressions in English, prompting me to initially transcribe them in Turkish. Subsequently, I constructed a comparable framework in English." (*Participant 9*)

These statements demonstrate that translanguaging functions not only as a form of communication but also as a "cognitive framing" tool. A substantial shift was observed in the writing approaches of the students who participated in prewriting discussions through translanguaging. These students, as a general rule;

- These individuals adhere to more gradual and planned writing processes,
- The writers progress in their writing by engaging in individual reflection, linguistic transfer, and structuring.
- They employ synonyms, idioms, and rhetorical patterns when transitioning to the target language.
- They deliberately engage in L1-supported idea generation.

Table 7. Strategic Choices in the Writing Process

Observed Strategy	Translanguaging Group	Other Groups
Forming ideas in Turkish and transitioning to English	High level	Low level
Using alternative conjunctions	Often	Seldom
Including academic patterns	Obvious	Restricted
Mental planning process	Staged	Partial
Idea repetitions	Less	More

Quantitative data demonstrate that students participating in translanguaging practices exhibit increased vocabulary diversity, higher levels of conjunction and academic pattern use, reduced repetition, and higher content organization in their writing. The findings of this study indicate that the translanguaging approach contributes systematically to the text production process of students, thereby increasing their strategic awareness at each stage of the writing process.

The present study explores the phenomenon of conscious use of L1-L2 transitions. In the written interviews conducted as part of the research, a significant number of students indicated that they no longer make language transitions "spontaneously," but rather "consciously." This level of awareness demonstrates the impact of translanguaging pedagogy on cognitive development. One student offered the following perspective:

"Previously, I held the belief that it was sufficient to suppress Turkish. However, recent introspection has led me to the conclusion that engaging in thought in Turkish actually serves to fortify my English language skills. Subsequent to the formulation of the Turkish expression, the search commences for a structurally analogous English expression.

These transitions facilitate the learner's ability to conceptualize the two languages as "auxiliary tools" for each other. This attitude is directly in line with Canagarajah's (2011) "codemeshing" strategies. In order to overcome the linguistic barrier, the learner must move beyond a reliance on word memorization and instead focus on developing conceptual and linguistic flexibility.

The development of linguistic confidence and affective reflections is a multifaceted process that involves a range of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral aspects.

Translanguaging pedagogy exerts a multifaceted influence on students, encompassing both linguistic and affective dimensions. It was reported by students that the use of their L1 in pre-writing processes resulted in a decrease in their writing anxiety and an increase in their enthusiasm for writing. This increase in motivation led to more productive writing processes.

The following are illustrative examples drawn from the opinions of students: "Engaging in conversation and utilizing Turkish prior to the commencement of writing serves to induce a state of relaxation." (*Participant 3*). "Rather than grappling with the English language, I find myself able to effortlessly transition between Turkish and English." (*Participant 13*).

These statements demonstrate the value of translanguaging not only as a cognitive but also as a psychological support. In accordance with these findings, it is proposed that translanguaging pedagogy be structurally incorporated into academic writing instruction. A number of pedagogical strategies have been shown to be effective in enhancing students' strategic language use. These include the following:

- The organization of bilingual discussion activities at the pre-writing stage is imperative.
- The implementation of translanguaging journals is a pedagogical strategy that encourages students to articulate their ideas in both Turkish and English.
- The demonstration of L1-L2 transformation strategies is achieved through the implementation of decoding workshops in academic writing courses, which serve as a medium for the presentation of pertinent examples.
- The utilization of multilingual materials is instrumental in facilitating students' writing process through a series of meticulous steps, including planning, drafting, and revising.

The first research question aimed to explore the specific functions of prewriting discussions in shaping students' writing processes and outcomes. The analysis suggests that prewriting discussions particularly when conducted in students' first language or through translanguaging functioned as powerful cognitive and affective tools. Rather than serving merely as linguistic preparation, these discussions appeared to mediate higher-order thinking, including idea generation, planning, and argument development. Students used the space to negotiate meaning, refine their viewpoints, and scaffold their understanding of academic content, supporting the notion that language functions not only as a means of expression but also as a mechanism for thought organization (Vygotsky, 1986; García & Wei, 2014). The discussions created an environment in which learners felt confident experimenting with content and structure before translating their thoughts into English, often leading to more coherent and well-developed texts. These outcomes align with the broader literature emphasizing the role of dialogic interaction and multilingual scaffolding in writing instruction (Canagarajah, 2011; Li & Wang, 2024). Notably, the data indicated that students who engaged in translanguaging discussions were

more adept at transferring complex ideas into writing, suggesting that prewriting dialogue in multiple languages may serve as a catalyst for cognitive elaboration. Thus, these findings underscore the pedagogical value of designing prewriting activities that embrace learners' full linguistic repertoires, rather than restricting them to target-language-only paradigms that may hinder idea formation and engagement.

This research has clearly demonstrated how translanguaging pedagogy transforms students' strategic behaviors in the writing process. Students now approach the writing process not only as “writing in English” but also as “constructing and expressing ideas in a multilingual way in the target language”. This approach brings both quality and authenticity to writing products and makes it possible for students to bring their linguistic identity to the text.

Therefore, translanguaging pedagogy should be considered as a strategic approach to writing that contributes to the student's linguistic and cognitive development in the long term, not just as a temporary facilitation tool.

5.1.2. Discussion of the Research Question 2

How do different prewriting discussion conditions (no prewriting discussion, prewriting discussion in English, prewriting discussion in Turkish, and translanguaging discussion) affect the quality of students' writing?

In the writing process, the discussions that students engage in during the preliminary preparation stages directly affect their text production performances. The experimental practices conducted within the scope of this study reveal the effects of different pre-writing discussion conditions (no discussion, English-only discussion, Turkish-only discussion, and translanguaging discussion) on students' writing performances in a multidimensional way. In this section, the effects of each discussion condition on students' writing output will be discussed comparatively in terms of word count, grammatical accuracy, use of transitional expressions, content richness, idea flow, organizational coherence, and critical thinking. The findings indicate that students' linguistic production processes can be supported not only by

exposure to the target language but also by interactive processes involving their mother tongue.

A quantitative analysis of the students' essay production revealed significant deficiencies in their performance when asked to write an essay without prior discussion. The word count in these essays was found to be lower than in the other conditions, and the skills of developing ideas, making examples, and presenting the text in a holistic structure were found to be limited. This finding aligns with the prevailing academic consensus that emphasizes the writing process as both an individual and a social and cognitive interaction process (Hyland, 2003; Ahmed et al., 2023). At this juncture, it can be posited that students who are deprived of pre-writing interaction encounter challenges in generating ideas about the topic, and their writing remains superficial. Nevertheless, in the English-only discussion condition, while there was an increase in the use of academic expressions in the students' texts, limitations were observed, particularly in the development of abstract ideas. Given the students' difficulty in filling the conceptual gaps in the target language, there was a tendency to treat some topics superficially. In the Turkish-only discussion condition, it was observed that students demonstrated greater fluency in ideation but lacked the capacity to achieve sufficient academic depth in transferring these ideas to the target language. This finding suggests that monolingual discussion environments may not adequately balance students' cognitive productivity and linguistic expression skills. Conversely, in the translanguaging discussion condition, it was observed that students produced both content-rich and stylistically coherent writings by strategically leveraging the resources of both languages. A close examination of these writings reveals that the topic was approached from multiple perspectives, transitional expressions were used more frequently and accurately, and originality emerged as a primary concern. This phenomenon is particularly evident in the process of generating and formulating ideas, wherein the transition between languages fosters cognitive flexibility, thereby enhancing the creativity of the written product. These findings suggest that translanguaging practices facilitate the effective utilization of students' linguistic and intellectual capacities (García & Wei, 2014; Li & Wang, 2024). In essence, the findings of this study demonstrate that distinct prewriting discussion conditions exert a substantial influence on students' writing

performance. Discussions devoid of or consisting of a single language offer minimal assistance to students in the development of their ideas and the organization of their texts. Conversely, translanguaging-based multilingual discussions facilitate the production of higher quality written products with regard to both content and form. These findings suggest that multilingual writing pedagogy can play an important role in developing academic writing skills, especially at the higher education level.

The objective of this study is to examine how English as a Foreign Language (EFL) university students' writing performance varies according to different prewriting discussion conditions. Quantitative findings and written interviews were utilized to analyze the effects of each type of discussion on student writing products. In the quantitative analyses, students' written products were evaluated using various criteria, including "word count," "sentence length," "use of conjunctions," "number of grammatical errors," and "content coherence." The subsequent sections will address the effects of each condition in turn.

The written products of students who did not engage in prewriting discussions exhibited the lowest levels of structural integrity and depth of content compared to the other conditions. The compositions were generally concise, superficial, and deficient in the integration of ideas. The average word count ranged from 150 to 170, and the utilization of conjunctions and academic vocabulary was found to be minimal. Additionally, there were instances of inconsistent transitions between sentences and paragraphs, leading to digressions. This finding indicates that the absence of guidance during the planning and ideation stages can have a detrimental impact on written performance. This finding aligns with Vygotsky's (1978) theory on the interplay between social interaction and cognitive development.

In the prewriting discussions in Turkish, there was a marked improvement in students' ability to generate and organize ideas. The participants reported that they thought freely in their mother tongue, participated more actively in the discussion, and had less difficulty elaborating ideas. The average word count of the written products ranged from 180 to 200, and a greater number of cause-and-effect relationships were identified in terms of content. However, during the discussion,

some students demonstrated a tendency to employ translation-oriented phrases in their thinking and writing in Turkish. This phenomenon has been observed to result in an increase in grammatical errors and ambiguity in communication. Nevertheless, in comparison with the group that did not engage in any discussion, the articles that incorporated Turkish discussion were found to be more substantial and to exhibit a greater degree of organization.

Pre-writing discussions in English enabled students to prepare for the writing process directly in the target language and had positive results in terms of academic language use. The employment of academic expressions, conjunctions, and transitional expressions in written products is characterized by increased systematicity and precision. However, some students indicated that they did not experience freedom of expression in this process. They reported difficulty finding the appropriate words and therefore could only express their ideas to a limited extent. Despite the high level of technical proficiency exhibited by the students, the richness of their content and the intellectual depth of their work were found to be deficient in certain cases. This finding suggests that while thinking in the target language can enhance productivity, it can also impede it for students who are not proficient in the language.

The fourth condition is a discussion on translanguaging, which is defined as the use of multiple languages in one's communication. This discussion will utilize bilingualism as an example. The highest writing performance was observed in the prewriting discussion condition with translanguaging. Students engaged in unrestrained discourse, employing Turkish and English with equal facility. They demonstrated a nuanced approach to language use, opting for their mother tongue when conceptual clarity was required, and subsequently reverting to English to structure their expressions in the target language. This phenomenon is evident in the written work, which exhibited an average word count ranging from 220 to 250 words. The compositions were characterized by robust argumentation, coherent logical sequences of ideas, and a high degree of contextual coherence. Additionally, the texts demonstrated a reduced incidence of mechanical errors, a heightened use of conjunctions, and more coherent argumentation. The efficacy of the translanguaging approach was substantiated by a combination of quantitative and qualitative findings.

In interviews, students reported that this method engendered a sense of safety, eliminated barriers to the articulation of their thoughts, and mitigated their pre-writing stress. These findings align with those of García and Wei (2014), who contend that translanguaging pedagogy facilitates students' optimal utilization of their cognitive resources. The following table illustrates the efficacy of the translanguaging condition in pre-writing planning. With regard to linguistic competence and content richness, this group exhibited superior performance in comparison to the other groups.

Table 8. Comparative Evaluation of Strategic Writing Behaviors across Discussion Conditions

Observed Strategy	Translanguaging Group	Other Groups
Generating ideas in L1 before writing in L2	Frequently observed	Rarely observed
Use of alternative connectors	Regularly employed	Occasionally used
Integration of academic expressions	Prominent	Limited
Step-by-step mental planning before writing	Structured and conscious	Partial or unstructured
Repetitions and circular arguments in writing	Minimal	Frequent

The second research question examined how different prewriting discussion conditions affected the quality of students' academic writing. The findings suggest that discussion modality significantly influenced the effectiveness of students' written products, with translanguaging conditions leading to more coherent, detailed, and well-organized texts. This outcome aligns with prior research asserting that when multilingual learners are permitted to use their full linguistic repertoire during planning, they are better able to conceptualize complex ideas, construct arguments, and develop logical flow in their writing (Canagarajah, 2011; García & Lin, 2017). In particular, the translanguaging group demonstrated improvements in content development, cohesion, and syntactic complexity—indicators of higher-level academic writing performance.

One possible explanation for the superior performance in the translanguaging condition is cognitive accessibility. When students are allowed to use both L1 and L2

flexibly during prewriting discussions, they are better equipped to access prior knowledge, structure their thinking, and retrieve appropriate vocabulary. This finding supports García and Wei's (2014) theory of translanguaging as a sense-making mechanism that allows learners to process and express abstract concepts more effectively. In contrast, participants in the English-only condition often struggled with lexical limitations, resulting in shorter texts with less complex ideas. Similarly, the no-discussion group frequently produced underdeveloped content, reflecting limited pre-task ideation and planning. These patterns highlight the importance of language-mediated interaction during the prewriting stage, particularly in EFL contexts where students may not yet have the full lexical range required for complex academic writing in the target language. Furthermore, the Turkish-only discussion group also showed noticeable improvements in writing quality compared to the no-discussion and English-only groups, albeit not to the extent observed in the translanguaging group. This suggests that L1 use in planning facilitates cognitive engagement and comfort, yet may still restrict metalinguistic transfer and lexical rehearsal in L2. Translanguaging discussions, by contrast, appeared to allow students to fluidly move between languages, testing out English structures while scaffolding meaning with Turkish, thereby enhancing both planning and linguistic rehearsal. These findings echo studies by Li and Wang (2024) and Riyantika et al. (2024), which underscore the value of cross-linguistic negotiation in enhancing writing fluency and structural accuracy.

It is also noteworthy that translanguaging discussions contributed to increased learner confidence and a greater sense of preparedness. Students reported feeling empowered by the ability to express complex thoughts first in their preferred language(s), then strategically transfer these into academic English. This supports the idea that translanguaging is not merely a linguistic practice, but also a means of promoting academic agency, especially in multilingual settings. Therefore, rather than enforcing monolingual English-only policies, instructors should consider integrating guided translanguaging activities as part of process-based writing instruction. In conclusion, the comparative analysis across discussion conditions reveals that translanguaging offers distinct cognitive, linguistic, and affective advantages in the prewriting stage. These advantages translate into higher-quality

written outputs, affirming the pedagogical potential of embracing multilingualism as a resource rather than a constraint in academic writing instruction. This insight is especially relevant for EFL contexts, where flexible language use can bridge gaps in proficiency and foster deeper learning.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

6.1. Conclusion of the Research Questions

The present thesis aims to examine the multidimensional effects of translanguaging pedagogy on the development of academic writing skills of students enrolled in an undergraduate English language teaching program at a state university in Türkiye. Writing is among the most intricate and cognitively demanding facets of foreign language instruction. Academic writing, in particular, is a multi-layered production process that extends beyond grammar and vocabulary. It also involves higher-level skills such as structuring thought, developing argumentation, making conceptual transfer, and developing a critical perspective. In this process, pre-writing practices, pedagogical guidance, and affective preparations directly affect the quality of written products as much as students' linguistic competencies.

Conventional writing instruction prioritizes individual writing tasks in the target language (English), thereby overlooking the potential of students' multilingual cognitive capacities. However, contemporary multicultural and multilingual classroom structures demonstrate that language learners can strategically integrate not only the target language but also their mother tongue and other languages into their writing processes. In this context, translanguaging pedagogy enables students to utilize their comprehensive linguistic repertoire, thereby enhancing the efficiency and efficacy of the written production process across both linguistic and cognitive domains.

The translanguaging pedagogy underpinning this study embodies a flexible and integrative approach that fosters students' development of their thinking in English

academic writing processes through the concurrent utilization of their first language and the target language. Multilingual group discussions, particularly in the prewriting stages, have been shown to facilitate students' conceptual understanding of the topic they are preparing to write about. These discussions encourage students to evaluate the topic from different perspectives and to organize their thoughts. In this regard, translanguaging not only serves as a language teaching strategy but also functions as a process of meaning construction and identity development.

In this context, the research focused on two main questions: (1) What are the functions of pre-writing discussions on students' writing processes and outcomes? (2) Secondly, the present study seeks to examine the impact of distinct pre-writing discussion conditions on students' writing quality. The discussion conditions encompass a range of options, including no discussion, Turkish-only discussion, English-only discussion, and translanguaging-based multilingual discussion. The study's inquiries were meticulously designed to ascertain not solely an improvement in students' written performance but also their perceptions of the writing process, strategic language use skills, affective attitudes towards writing, and planning behaviors in text production. The present study employed a mixed-method approach, integrating a quantitative assessment of written products (word count, conjunction use, paragraph structure, content coherence) with a qualitative thematic analysis of post-writing interviews with students. The findings yielded a comprehensive understanding of the conditions that facilitated enhanced student writing, as well as the underlying reasons for this improvement. It was observed that pre-writing discussions played a fundamental role in providing students with both intellectual and emotional preparation for academic writing. This preparation was directly reflected in the organization, content richness, and linguistic competence of the students' writing.

In this final section, the results obtained from the two primary research questions will be systematically examined. First, the functions of pre-writing discussions in the academic writing process will be evaluated in the light of student experiences and thematic codes. Then, the differentiating effects of four different pre-writing conditions on writing quality will be analyzed holistically with both quantitative data

and qualitative inferences. Consequently, the extent to which translanguaging-based pedagogical practices provide robust support in the writing process and enhance students' academic productivity will be thoroughly elucidated. Concurrently, these findings will facilitate both theoretical and practical ramifications for multilingual writing pedagogy.

Table 9. Comparison of Writing Quality Across Prewriting Discussion Conditions

Condition	Writing Quality	Key Observations
No Discussion	Lowest	Short texts, weak organization, limited content, lack of argumentation
Turkish-only	Medium	Rich idea generation, but challenges in transferring ideas accurately into English
English-only	Medium	Strong academic language use, but narrow scope and limited content depth
Translanguaging	Highest	Balanced in both content and language, strong argumentation and structural coherence

(Adapted from García & Wei (2014), Canagarajah (2011))

The comparison of student writing quality across four distinct prewriting discussion conditions—no discussion, Turkish-only, English-only, and translanguaging—yields essential insights into the pedagogical and linguistic value of structured oral interaction prior to academic composition. The table presented summarizes key findings from both the analytical (Table 2) and descriptive (Table 3) assessments of students' written outputs, and offers a comparative overview of how each condition affected textual performance in terms of organization, content development, and linguistic precision.

Students who composed their essays without engaging in any prewriting discussion consistently produced the weakest texts in terms of both form and content. These essays were significantly shorter in length, often lacked a clear introduction and conclusion, and demonstrated limited engagement with the essay prompt. The absence of dialogic interaction before writing appears to have constrained students' ability to generate ideas and structure their thoughts effectively.

Qualitative post-task interviews corroborate these findings: several students expressed uncertainty or lack of inspiration when writing under this condition. Without the scaffolding provided by peer discussion, students struggled to construct coherent arguments or expand upon initial ideas. This aligns with previous literature indicating that idea development is greatly enhanced when students have the opportunity to externalize and negotiate meaning before writing (Ahmed et al., 2023; Hariati, 2020). As such, the no-discussion condition serves as a baseline reference, against which the effectiveness of more interactive pedagogical approaches can be measured.

In the Turkish-only condition, students benefited from the cognitive ease and cultural familiarity of discussing complex topics in their native language. As a result, the ideas articulated in their writing tended to be richer, more original, and contextually nuanced. Many essays demonstrated clear thematic focus, creative examples, and thoughtful engagement with the topic. However, despite these content-related strengths, the writing samples produced under this condition frequently exhibited linguistic inaccuracies, especially in grammar, lexical choice, and academic tone. This suggests that while students were able to formulate ideas in Turkish with clarity, they faced challenges when transferring these ideas into written English—a process that likely introduced cognitive strain and disrupted fluency. Interview data reinforces this interpretation: several participants noted that they “knew what they wanted to say” but “could not find the right words in English” during the drafting stage. Thus, while Turkish-only discussions stimulated idea generation and enhanced affective engagement, they did not provide sufficient scaffolding to support successful linguistic encoding in the target language. This condition highlights the potential value of translanguaging as a bridge between L1-based thinking and L2 academic expression.

Essays written after English-only discussions were generally more accurate in terms of grammatical structure and formal tone. Students appeared to benefit from early immersion in the target language, which may have primed them for more fluent and syntactically correct writing. Many texts exhibited conventional academic features such as hedging, linking devices, and paraphrasing skills that are often emphasized in

English-medium instruction (EMI) contexts. Nevertheless, the scope and depth of content in these essays was often narrower than those produced in other conditions. Students tended to rely on formulaic structures or repeated ideas, possibly due to lexical limitations or fear of making mistakes. This aligns with Garcia and Wei's (2014) observation that restricting students to the target language prematurely can suppress creativity and inhibit complex thought development. Moreover, interview data reveals that some students experienced anxiety during English-only discussions, particularly when they lacked confidence in their spoken proficiency. This suggests that the monolingual constraint may have inadvertently increased cognitive load, leading to safer but less dynamic written expression. Thus, while English-only discussions support surface-level language accuracy, they do not necessarily promote depth or originality of thought.

Of the four conditions analyzed, the translanguaging prewriting discussions produced the most consistently high-quality written outputs. Essays written under this condition were longer, better organized, and more sophisticated in terms of argumentation and vocabulary usage. These texts often included nuanced positions, integrated counterarguments, and strong paragraph cohesion hallmarks of advanced academic writing. Students in the translanguaging group had the flexibility to use both Turkish and English during their planning discussions. This approach enabled them to draw upon their full linguistic repertoires to explore, refine, and articulate ideas before transferring them into written English. As confirmed by both interview responses and coding of prewriting transcripts, this dual-language space encouraged deeper cognitive engagement and reduced language anxiety.

Importantly, translanguaging did not result in L1 dominance or overreliance on Turkish; rather, it allowed students to use their L1 as a scaffolding tool for complex L2 thinking. As one participant noted, "being able to speak in Turkish first helped me get my ideas straight, then I focused on saying it clearly in English." This highlights the metacognitive advantages of translanguaging pedagogy, where students actively manage their linguistic resources to optimize both clarity and academic tone. These findings are in line with Canagarajah's (2011) and Garcia &

Wei's (2014) arguments that translanguaging promotes not only linguistic access, but also critical thinking, confidence, and academic identity construction.

The comparative analysis presented in this table demonstrates that writing quality is not solely a function of linguistic ability, but also of prewriting support and pedagogical design. Among the four prewriting conditions, translanguaging emerged as the most effective in balancing content richness and language accuracy, while also fostering students' confidence and engagement. These results underscore the need for language educators to reconsider monolingual assumptions in academic writing instruction. Rather than viewing L1 use as interference, this study highlights how translanguaging enables strategic and purposeful language integration that empowers multilingual learners. In future classroom practice, teachers may wish to explicitly incorporate translanguaging moments during the planning phase of writing tasks, especially for students working in EFL contexts. Doing so can help bridge the cognitive gap between conceptual thinking and academic expression, ultimately leading to more competent and confident writers.

6.2. Conclusion of the Interviews

The combined analysis of pre-task and post-task written interview data revealed a significant evolution in students' perceptions, strategies, and emotional engagement concerning academic writing when supported by prewriting discussions, particularly those incorporating translanguaging pedagogy. Initially, students approached prewriting tasks with a somewhat limited understanding, perceiving them primarily as tools for surface-level idea organization. However, after experiencing structured group discussions under varying conditions—monolingual (Turkish or English) and multilingual (translanguaging)—their reflections displayed a deepened appreciation of these activities as essential for cognitive, rhetorical, and emotional preparation in academic writing.

One of the most evident themes was the shift in students' understanding of idea generation. In pre-task interviews, students mentioned that brainstorming in advance “might help” them think about content. However, post-task responses revealed a

stronger conviction in the effectiveness of dialogic interactions. Students repeatedly highlighted how peer discussions especially those conducted using both Turkish and English stimulated new perspectives, inspired creative examples, and encouraged them to consider alternative arguments. They reported that this interaction enriched not only the content of their essays but also the quality of their reasoning and structure, helping them move beyond basic outline planning toward critical engagement with the topic. The data also showed a marked increase in students' confidence and emotional security, particularly within translanguaging environments. Initially, some students expressed anxiety about writing in English, noting that they sometimes struggled to find the appropriate words. Post-task reflections, however, indicated that being allowed to discuss ideas in Turkish first, then gradually transition to English, helped reduce linguistic stress and cognitive load. As one student explained, "Using both languages gave me freedom when I got stuck." This sense of emotional reassurance enabled students to take greater risks in their writing, experiment with structure and vocabulary, and produce more coherent, nuanced texts.

Another important transformation was observed in their perceptions of peer interaction. Prior to the tasks, students often saw writing as a solitary process. While some acknowledged that peers might contribute "occasional" ideas, collaborative thinking was not fully internalized. In contrast, post-task responses emphasized how joint discussions helped them not only refine their initial arguments but also anticipate counterarguments an essential skill in academic writing. These discussions supported the development of metacognitive awareness, where students became more conscious of their thought processes, structure, and persuasive strategies. Moreover, the notion of translanguaging evolved from a theoretical construct to a practical and empowering tool. In pre-task interviews, students described translanguaging vaguely, often associating it with "mixing languages." However, after experiencing guided multilingual discussions, they articulated its benefits with much more clarity. They emphasized how switching languages strategically supported fluency, helped maintain momentum during idea development, and increased accuracy during the drafting phase. Translanguaging was no longer viewed

as a fallback or a language deficiency but rather as a resource for expressing complex ideas more efficiently.

A notable contrast emerged regarding writing under the no-discussion condition. Students who wrote without any prewriting dialogue consistently reported greater difficulty in structuring their essays, generating ideas, and maintaining coherence. Their post-task reflections underscored the importance of oral preparation, revealing that discussion served not only to stimulate thought but also to provide a roadmap for writing. Many expressed frustration with the no-discussion condition, stating that it made the task feel “confusing,” “isolating,” or “rushed.”

Finally, the students’ understanding of academic preparedness and writing as a process matured significantly. Whereas initial responses reflected uncertainty or lack of experience with structured prewriting, later reflections positioned prewriting as a critical stage in academic text production. Students acknowledged that discussions particularly those allowing for translanguaging enhanced not only their writing outcomes but also their general academic self-efficacy. In conclusion, the interview data strongly support the argument that translanguaging-based prewriting discussions are not only linguistically inclusive but also pedagogically transformative. By allowing students to access their full linguistic repertoires, these discussions facilitated deeper thinking, reduced affective barriers, and fostered collaborative meaning-making. The post-task responses demonstrate a clear pedagogical impact: students became more reflective, strategic, and emotionally resilient writers. These findings validate translanguaging pedagogy as a powerful mechanism for enhancing multilingual students’ academic writing performance and suggest its broader applicability in EFL writing instruction.

To better illustrate how students’ perceptions and experiences evolved throughout the academic writing process, the following comparative thematic table presents selected insights from both pre-task and post-task written interviews. By aligning common themes with representative student statements, the table captures the nuanced shifts in learners’ cognitive strategies, emotional responses, and engagement with translanguaging practices.

Table 10. Comparative Thematic Summary of Pre-Task and Post-Task Written Interviews

Theme	Representative Insight (Pre-task)	Representative Insight (Post-task)	Observed Shift / Interpretation
1. Idea Generation	“Prewriting helps to brainstorm and structure the ideas I want to write.”	“Hearing peers’ ideas gave me inspiration I hadn’t thought of before.”	Shift from individual ideation to dialogic co-construction; students moved from self-generated planning to incorporating peer perspectives.
2. Comfort and Confidence	“I feel more confident expressing ideas in Turkish before switching to English.”	“Switching between languages helped me to overcome blockages during writing.”	Translanguaging fostered a more secure and fluent writing environment by reducing linguistic anxiety and allowing expressive flexibility.
3. Argument Organization	“Helps in planning arguments and ordering them logically before writing.”	“Group discussions helped me foresee counterarguments and prepare stronger reasoning.”	Students moved from basic outlining to critical discourse engagement with counterarguments, indicating increased rhetorical awareness.
4. Understanding Translanguaging	“A flexible way of using multiple languages to support thinking.”	“Translanguaging allowed me to be creative, fast, and accurate with my expressions.”	Initially a theoretical idea, translanguaging became an embodied strategy students actively benefited from in practice.
5. Cognitive Load and Language	“I sometimes can’t find the English words fast enough when thinking.”	“Being able to think in Turkish helped me organize thoughts better before translating to English.”	Students explicitly recognized cognitive relief when using L1 for planning and structure before shifting to L2 for expression.
6. Role of Peer Interaction	“Listening to others may give me some ideas, but I usually plan alone.”	“Dialoguing helped me reframe my arguments and inspired content I wouldn’t create alone.”	Clear shift from solitary to collaborative cognition, revealing benefits of peer scaffolding and shared meaning-making.

Table 10. (continued)

7. Academic Preparedness	“I had limited exposure to prewriting tasks before. I assume they help plan better.”	“Now I see that prewriting is essential for deeper content, not just surface organization.”	Students developed metacognitive awareness of prewriting discussions as essential for content quality, not just structural planning.
8. Emotional Reassurance	“It helps reduce anxiety when I can plan before writing, especially in Turkish.”	“Using multiple languages gave me emotional security when I felt stuck.”	Emotional benefits of translanguaging emerged more clearly after experiencing its practical application, helping students overcome writing apprehension.

The comparative thematic summary derived from pre-task and post-task written interviews offers a rich and multifaceted view of how students’ perceptions, strategies, and affective experiences evolved over the course of the translanguaging-supported academic writing process. The juxtaposition of representative insights from before and after the writing tasks provides compelling evidence of growth across cognitive, emotional, and metalinguistic dimensions.

One of the most salient observations from the table is the shift in how students conceptualized idea generation. Initially, many learners viewed prewriting as a mechanical step useful but not essential. Their reflections were centered around the assumption that writing simply required organizing one’s existing thoughts. However, post-task interviews show a dramatic reconfiguration of this belief. Students acknowledged that prewriting discussions—especially those incorporating both Turkish and English were critical spaces where new ideas emerged, arguments were refined, and perspectives broadened. The value of dialogic interaction became particularly clear, as many reported incorporating viewpoints or examples they wouldn’t have considered on their own. This highlights a transition from an individualistic model of writing to a more socially constructed and interaction-based paradigm. Another significant thematic evolution involved comfort and emotional reassurance, closely tied to students’ language identities. Before the writing task, students expressed apprehension about writing directly in English, fearing linguistic

inaccuracies or mental blocks. Their comfort was clearly linked to the ability to express themselves in their native language. Post-task reflections emphasized how translanguaging allowed them to navigate around these difficulties with greater flexibility and less anxiety. Students articulated that switching between Turkish and English not only enabled them to maintain fluency but also to access complex ideas that might have otherwise been lost in translation. The psychological safety provided by translanguaging appears to have reduced cognitive overload, thus enabling more focused and confident writing.

A parallel development can be observed in how students understood argument structure and organization. In pre-task responses, many students viewed prewriting as a way to list or order arguments. However, in the post-task reflections, it became evident that students had begun to see writing as a more dynamic and dialogic process. They reported using prewriting discussions to anticipate counterarguments, strengthen reasoning, and experiment with how ideas were presented. Translanguaging supported this process by allowing students to explore and express nuanced positions using their full linguistic resources before translating them into coherent academic prose in English. The theme of peer interaction also underwent a meaningful transformation. Initially, collaboration was perceived as optional or peripheral—something that might be helpful but was not necessary. After the writing tasks, students described peer discussions as central to the development of their essays. This shift signifies not only a change in writing strategy but also an expanded understanding of knowledge construction as a collaborative act. Many students reported that their essays were shaped directly by the input, reactions, and insights of their peers, underscoring the importance of dialogic learning environments. Importantly, the concept of translanguaging itself evolved in the minds of students. In the pre-task phase, it was often perceived vaguely viewed simply as a pragmatic way of mixing languages. However, by the end of the task sequence, students began to articulate translanguaging as a deliberate, strategic, and empowering approach to writing. They recognized its role in enabling creative thought, accelerating problem-solving, and bridging gaps between thought and expression. This conceptual shift indicates an important pedagogical outcome: translanguaging was no longer seen as a fallback or coping mechanism but rather as a core strategy for academic success.

Finally, students' growing academic awareness and preparedness across both interviews suggest a maturation of their metacognitive and self-regulatory skills. Many who were unsure about the usefulness of prewriting at the beginning came to recognize it as a vital stage in producing high-quality, structured, and persuasive academic texts. This recognition marks an important pedagogical achievement, as it shows that students are not only gaining skills but also developing the ability to reflect on and manage their learning processes. In conclusion, the comparative thematic table reflects a progression from hesitation, ambiguity, and limited engagement to confidence, clarity, and strategic academic writing. The transition is particularly visible in the way translanguaging enabled students to negotiate meaning, structure their arguments, and engage emotionally and cognitively with their writing. This table, and the insights it encapsulates, affirm the transformative potential of translanguaging-informed pedagogy not merely as a linguistic accommodation, but as a comprehensive instructional framework that fosters multilingual learners' academic growth, voice, and agency.

6.3. Implications of the Study

The findings of this study indicate that English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' provision of multilingual planning opportunities to students, as opposed to monolingual approaches, during writing instruction can directly contribute to the quality of students' written products. In particular, students who participated in writing tasks within the translanguaging discussion group demonstrated enhanced writing proficiency, characterized by more developed ideas, improved logical organization, and enhanced text fluency. This finding suggests that teachers should develop planned prewriting activities that allow students to use not only the target language but also their L1 strategically (García & Wei, 2014).

In accordance with the data obtained, it is recommended that teachers establish student-centered discussion environments that promote the generation of ideas at the onset of the writing process and are receptive to the utilization of Turkish or another L1 when necessary. Such environments have been shown to facilitate students' construction of meaning and reduce writing anxiety, especially when dealing with

abstract topics (Kramersch, 2009). Consequently, rather than anticipating that teachers will compose directly in the target language, the establishment of process-based and multilingual production spaces has the potential to enhance the inclusivity of writing instruction.

Pedagogical considerations indicate the potential value of prewriting discussions conducted in two or more languages. Such practices may facilitate students' structuring and internalization of ideas prior to engaging in academic writing. For instance, during the translanguaging discourse that preceded the writing task on "climate policy," a student discussed the Turkish equivalent of the concept with her peers and then transitioned to English to write more fluently. A comparative analysis of the student's writing revealed a higher degree of coherence in terms of content and argumentation when compared to the English-only group.

A review of the qualitative interview data indicates that students reported a sense of increased freedom during translanguaging discussions, demonstrated a more pronounced capacity to organize their ideas, and encountered less difficulty transitioning to the target language. This finding suggests that the writing process encompasses not only linguistic components but also multifaceted cognitive and affective dimensions (Wei, 2018). For some students, L1 functions as a conduit between conceptualizing ideas and articulating them in written form. In this context, translanguaging can be regarded as a pedagogical approach that fosters students' engagement in the writing process with assurance.

The findings also suggest that translanguaging can play a facilitative role in helping students develop self-regulatory strategies in the writing process. It was demonstrated that students were able to produce more robust structures. This ability was first evident in their ability to make sense of the concepts in L1, and it was subsequently transferred to English. This pedagogical approach has the potential to alleviate students' cognitive load, thereby facilitating more productive writing experiences, particularly in the context of conceptually challenging topics (Li & Wang, 2024).

Translanguaging pedagogy presents an alternative and effective method for teaching writing in multilingual classrooms. Permitting pre-writing discussions to transpire in disparate languages has the potential to foster the development of students' conceptual thinking skills. The quantitative findings of the study demonstrated that the translanguaging group exhibited superior performances in terms of text coherence, conjunction use, and depth of content. This finding underscores the notion that multilingualism is not merely a means to an end, but rather an end in itself, contributing to the intellectual enrichment of individuals and communities (Vinje, Storheil, & Iversen, 2023).

The integration of translanguaging strategies during specific phases of writing instruction, such as idea generation, planning, and feedback, has been demonstrated to exert a favorable influence on both the process and the outcome of writing. The deliberate and methodical implementation of these strategies by educators can enhance the accessibility of the writing process, particularly for students with limited language proficiency (Canagarajah, 2011).

The effective implementation of translanguaging pedagogy is contingent upon teachers' acquisition of pedagogical awareness regarding this issue. The data obtained in this study reveal that teachers should not be limited to the expectation of production in the target language; on the contrary, they should recognize and support students' multilingual profiles and adapt their pedagogical practices accordingly.

In this context, the incorporation of theoretical knowledge and practical examples of translanguaging pedagogy within teacher education programs can facilitate the comprehension of this approach among pre-service teachers and encourage its reflection in their classrooms. Furthermore, it is recommended to provide teachers with hands-on workshops, case studies, and observation-based learning environments through in-service training programs (García, Johnson & Seltzer, 2017). Such supportive activities are instrumental in ensuring that translanguaging is recognized not only as a theoretical framework but also as a potent tool for enhancing classroom instruction.

In-service teacher training programs have the potential to be structured in a way to demonstrate the applicability of translanguaging pedagogy in the classroom. To illustrate, in a proposed in-service training module, pre-service teachers could be presented with two different writing lesson scenarios, first English-only and then translanguaging. A comparison of the student outcomes of the two interventions will allow the participants to recognize the cognitive and affective impact of translanguaging on students. Such examples have been demonstrated to be effective in fostering positive attitudes toward translanguaging among educators.

The findings of this study suggest that there is a need for more space for multilingual pedagogies, especially in academic writing instruction. Translanguaging practices have the potential to foster an inclusive learning environment that caters to students' cognitive, affective, and linguistic needs. This necessitates a rethinking of educational policies, not only at the classroom level but also at the national scale. In this context, it is recommended that foreign language teaching policies in Turkey undergo a review and restructuring from the perspective of multilingualism.

In the undergraduate program framework, the Council of Higher Education (YÖK) has established plans that stipulate the general structure of academic writing courses. These courses are designed to be target language-oriented and product-centered. Nevertheless, the present study has demonstrated that the integration of multilingual strategies, such as translanguaging, into the writing process, can facilitate students' production of more successful products in numerous domains, including idea generation, conceptual transition, textual coherence, and writing quality. Consequently, the formulation of instructional policies can be broadened to encompass methodologies that evaluate not only production in the target language but also students' comprehensive linguistic repertoire (García & Wei, 2014).

Furthermore, the pedagogical merits of multilingual planning over monolingual teaching methods should be considered in the development of curricula. This objective can be achieved by implementing a policy of linguistic flexibility, particularly within English language teaching departments, and by incorporating modules designed to promote the strategic use of the mother tongue in conjunction

with course content (Canagarajah, 2011). Such an approach would support the transformation of not only language teaching policies but also language ideologies. The objective should be to establish a secure and adaptable setting where students can engage in critical thinking, discourse, and creation, rather than merely engaging in written English.

At the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) level, the principles of teaching based on multilingual pedagogies must be reflected in curricula and teacher training policies. The findings of the study demonstrate that students generate more structured, logically coherent, and conceptually profound texts when engaging in translanguaging-based discussions. These findings imply that the conventional "think in English, write in English" approach to writing instruction may be supplanted by an alternative approach that acknowledges and leverages linguistic diversity.

In this context, the incorporation of writing-based modules that facilitate multilingual pedagogies in curriculum development processes can assist teachers and students in the effective implementation of flexible strategies, such as translanguaging. For instance, translanguaging strategies, case studies, and multilingual discussion practices can be incorporated into the writing curriculum. Consequently, writing lessons can evolve into a multifaceted language teaching process that not only fosters linguistic proficiency but also provides a framework to support students' cognitive development and the construction of their thoughts.

In the same vein, in-service training programs for EFL teachers could incorporate the theoretical and practical dimensions of translanguaging pedagogy, thereby facilitating the implementation of these approaches not only through individual initiative but also in a systematic manner. Such measures at the policy level have the potential to offer solutions to the challenges faced by teachers in multilingual classrooms, especially in rural areas (García, Johnson & Seltzer, 2017). A framework for education policies that prioritizes inclusion based on multilingualism has the potential to reduce pressure on teachers to adhere to a specific target language and allow students to freely exercise their linguistic identities.

Moreover, the present study has demonstrated that translanguaging pedagogy can be effective not only in language development but also in critical areas such as academic achievement, engagement, and reducing writing anxiety. Consequently, in the formulation of educational policies, writing skills must be evaluated in conjunction with multilingual cognitive processes, encompassing not only grammatical and structural accuracy. It is imperative for educational policymakers and curriculum developers to devise a system that acknowledges the linguistic and cultural assets of learners, rather than confining language instruction to the target language alone (Li & Wang, 2024).

In sum, this study on translanguaging pedagogy provides significant indications that EFL education policies in Turkey ought to be restructured with multilingual approaches. The integration of translanguaging in various levels of the education system, ranging from policy to teaching practice, has the potential to foster a more inclusive, equitable, and pedagogically effective approach to writing instruction. Achieving this objective necessitates the implementation of educational policies that formally acknowledge and value linguistic diversity, recognize multilingualism as a valuable asset, and prioritize the learner's cognitive processes as the primary focus of language instruction.

6.4. Limitations

This study has thoroughly explored the effects of translanguaging pedagogy on the academic writing processes of pre-service English language teachers in Türkiye through a mixed-methods design, yet several methodological and practical limitations must be acknowledged. Recognizing these limitations is crucial for accurately interpreting the findings and informing future research in the field of multilingual academic writing.

First, the short duration and limited scale of implementation restricted the scope of the intervention. Each participant engaged in four writing tasks under four distinct prewriting discussion conditions within a relatively short time frame. Although the sequential structure enabled comparative insight, the short-term nature of the data

collection process limited the possibility of capturing the long-term effects of translanguaging on students' academic writing development. Longitudinal research would be needed to investigate whether the observed benefits in writing quality and metacognitive awareness persist over time and across different academic genres. Second, the data collection instruments present another limitation. While written essays, pre-task and post-task interviews, and group discussion transcripts provided valuable insights into students' experiences, the reliance on written self-report formats (particularly the interviews) may have constrained participants' ability to fully articulate their thought processes. Some students may have had difficulty expressing tacit or intuitive strategies in writing, which could have led to underreporting of certain insights. Additionally, while the essays were assessed through a well-established analytical rubric adapted from existing literature, scoring inevitably involved subjective judgment by the researcher, potentially introducing interpretive bias. Third, the implementation of translanguaging in the study was intentionally non-intrusive, aiming to reflect naturalistic usage rather than teacher-directed instruction. While this approach allowed students to freely use their full linguistic repertoires during discussions, it did not involve structured modeling or scaffolded support by the instructor. As such, the study did not explore how guided translanguaging activities—such as code-meshed sentence starters, bilingual writing prompts, or metalinguistic reflection exercises—might influence writing performance differently compared to unguided discussion contexts. Lastly, the dual role of the researcher as both data collector and interpreter raises questions of positionality and potential bias. Despite adhering to ethical principles and maintaining transparency throughout the research process, the researcher's academic familiarity with and positive stance toward translanguaging pedagogy may have influenced decisions during data interpretation and theme categorization. While this was mitigated through iterative validation, member-checking, and the use of verbatim quotations, future studies may benefit from collaborative coding or external audit mechanisms to enhance validity. In light of these limitations, the findings of this study should be interpreted within their specific context. Nevertheless, this research offers a meaningful contribution to the understanding of how translanguaging can be integrated into prewriting discussions in EFL academic writing pedagogy. The identified limitations also pave the way for more robust,

diverse, and longitudinal research that can build on these findings and further explore the transformative potential of translanguaging in multilingual academic contexts.

6.5. Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the findings and limitations of this study, several directions for future research can be proposed to further expand the understanding of translanguaging pedagogy in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) academic writing context. These recommendations aim to enhance methodological rigor, increase the ecological validity of future studies, and contribute to more inclusive, multilingual, and pedagogically responsive classroom practices. First, longitudinal research designs are recommended to better understand the sustained effects of translanguaging on students' academic writing development over time. While this study offered insight into short-term gains, long-term investigations can provide evidence on how students internalize multilingual strategies, transfer them across academic tasks, and evolve in their rhetorical and linguistic control. Second, future research may benefit from the integration of advanced digital tools for data collection and analysis. Incorporating software such as NVivo, MAXQDA, or automated discourse analysis platforms would improve the granularity, transparency, and reproducibility of both qualitative and quantitative data analyses. For instance, such tools could assist in tracking language switches, metalinguistic commentary, and argument development in student texts more systematically. Third, researchers are encouraged to investigate translanguaging as an explicit instructional strategy, beyond naturalistic student interaction. This could include studies that implement scaffolded translanguaging activities, such as bilingual peer feedback, guided code-switching tasks, or genre-based instruction using multiple languages. Such pedagogical designs would offer valuable insights into how teacher support influences the effectiveness of translanguaging and students' academic literacy growth. Fourth, future studies should also consider teacher perspectives and classroom practices by involving language instructors as participants. Exploring how pre-service and in-service teachers perceive translanguaging, how they implement it in academic writing instruction, and what challenges they face would enrich the pedagogical relevance and applicability of research findings. Participatory or collaborative research models

could help bridge the gap between theory and practice in multilingual writing instruction.

Finally, researchers may focus on the intersectionality of identity, emotion, and academic discourse in translanguaging settings. Investigating how students' sense of belonging, cultural affiliation, and linguistic identity interact with their academic performance may provide a deeper understanding of the affective dimensions of multilingual writing. Ethnographic case studies, narrative inquiry, or multimodal data sources could be useful for capturing these nuanced experiences. In conclusion, translanguaging continues to offer fertile ground for research in multilingual academic contexts. Expanding the scope, duration, and methodological complexity of future studies will contribute not only to theoretical advancements but also to more equitable and inclusive pedagogies that value the full linguistic repertoires of all learners.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S. M. A., Hasan, B. A., and Ameen, S. T. “The Importance of Prewriting Strategies in the Students’ Writing Production.” *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 45, no. 3 (2023): 23–34.
- Altay, M., and Yuksel, D. *Translanguaging Practices in English-Medium Instruction: A Focus on Lecturers’ and Students’ Perspectives*. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 59 (2022): 101115.
- Altun, H. *Çokdillilik ve Türkiye Bağlamında Diller Arası Geçişlilik Pedagojisi*. Pamukkale Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2024.
- Androutsopoulos, J., and Busch, B. “Transmodal and Translingual Practices in Digital Communication.” *Linguistics and Education* 56 (2020): 100785.
- Baker, C. *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. 3rd ed. Multilingual Matters, 2001.
- Baker, C. *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. 5th ed. Multilingual Matters, 2011.
- Bandura, A. *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: W. H. Freeman, 1997.
- Bailey, K. M. *Language Teacher Supervision: A Case-Based Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

- Beiler, I. R., and Dewilde, J. "Multilingual Students' Writing Practices in Diverse School Contexts: A Translingual Approach." *Journal of Multilingual Education Research* 10, no. 1 (2020): 53–72.
- Blackledge, A., and Creese, A. *Multilingualism: A Critical Perspective*. London: Continuum, 2010.
- Braun, V., and Clarke, V. "Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology." *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3, no. 2 (2006): 77–101.
- Burns, A. *Doing Action Research in English Language Teaching: A Guide for Practitioners*. London: Routledge, 2010.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. "Translanguaging in the Classroom: Emerging Issues for Research and Pedagogy." *Applied Linguistics Review* 2, no. 1 (2011): 1–28.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. "Translanguaging in the Classroom: Emerging Issues for Research and Pedagogy." In *The Handbook of Language and Multilingualism*, edited by Tej K. Bhatia and William C. Ritchie, 1–20. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. "Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations." *World Englishes* 30, no. 3 (2011): 271–285.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. "Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging." *The Modern Language Journal* 95, no. 3 (2011): 401–417.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. London: Routledge, 2013.

Canagarajah, Suresh. "Pedagogical Translanguaging: A Methodological Perspective." *Applied Linguistics* 43, no. 1 (2022): 1–22.

Cenoz, Jasone, and Durk Gorter. "Focus on Multilingualism: A Study of Trilingual Writing." *The Modern Language Journal* 95, no. 3 (2011): 356–369.

Cenoz, Jasone, and Durk Gorter. "Teaching English through Pedagogical Translanguaging." *World Englishes* 39, no. 2 (2020): 278–289.

Cenoz, Jasone, and Durk Gorter. *Pedagogical Translanguaging: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021.

Creswell, John W. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. 5th ed. Boston: Pearson, 2015.

Creswell, John W., and J. David Creswell. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 5th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2018.

Creswell, John W., and Vicki L. Plano Clark. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2018.

Creese, Angela, and Adrian Blackledge. "Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching?" *The Modern Language Journal* 94, no. 1 (2010): 103–115.

Crossley, Scott A. "Linguistic Features in Writing: A Critical Review." *Journal of Writing Research* 12, no. 1 (2020): 35–71.

- Cummins, Jim. "Rethinking Monolingual Instructional Strategies in Multilingual Classrooms." *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 10, no. 2 (2007): 221–240.
- Çetinkaya, Duygu. *Code-Switching Behaviors of Turkish University Students in English-Medium Instruction Settings*. Master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2021. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- De los Ríos, Cati V., and Kate Seltzer. "Translanguaging, Identity, and Learning: Science in a Bilingual Middle School Classroom." *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 16, no. 4 (2017): 216–227.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Ebe, Ann E. "Supporting Emergent Bilinguals in Content Areas through Translanguaging." *Journal of Multilingual Education Research* 6, no. 1 (2016): 37–58.
- Erten, Serkan. *Translanguaging Practices and Writing Performance in EFL Classrooms: A Case Study at a Turkish University*. Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, 2022. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- Ferris, Dana R., and John S. Hedgcock. *Teaching L2 Composition: Purpose, Process, and Practice*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge, 2014.
- García, Ofelia. *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
- García, Ofelia. "Translanguaging and Transliterations in Multilingual Education." *Language and Education* 36, no. 2 (2022): 101–115.

García, Ofelia, Susana I. Johnson, and Kate Seltzer. *The Translanguaging Classroom: Leveraging Student Bilingualism for Learning*. Philadelphia: Caslon, 2017.

García, Ofelia, and Naoko Kano. “Translanguaging as Process and Pedagogy: Developing the English Writing of Japanese Students in the US.” *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 17, no. 1 (2014): 1–18.

García, Ofelia, and Ricardo Otheguy. “Plurilingualism and Translanguaging: Commonalities and Divergences.” *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 23, no. 1 (2020): 17–35.

García, Ofelia, and Li Wei. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism, and Education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Garton, Sue, and Sevda Tekin. “Translanguaging Practices in Primary Education: Teacher Perspectives and Challenges.” *Language Teaching Research* 26, no. 3 (2022): 355–372.

Gort, Mileidis, and Susan F. Sembiente. “Navigating Hybridized Language Learning Spaces through Translanguaging Pedagogy: Dual Language Preschool Teachers’ Linguaging Practices in Support of Emergent Bilingual Children’s Performance of Academic Discourse.” *International Multilingual Research Journal* 9, no. 1 (2015): 7–25.

Graham, Steve, and Dolores Perin. “A Meta-Analysis of the Effectiveness of Writing Instruction for Students in Grades 4 through 12.” *Journal of Educational Psychology* 99, no. 3 (2007): 445–476.

Hamp-Lyons, Liz. *Assessing Second Language Writing in Academic Contexts*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing, 1991.

- Hamp-Lyons, Liz. "English for Academic Purposes." In *The Handbook of World Englishes*, edited by Braj B. Kachru, Yamuna Kachru, and Cecil Nelson, 189–205. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- Hariati, Putri. "Improving Students' Achievement in Writing Descriptive Paragraphs through Teaching Prewriting Stages." *Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal* 3, no. 3 (2020): 1303–1311.
- Harris, Karen R., and Steve Graham. *Making the Writing Process Work: Strategies for Composition and Self-Regulation*. Brookline Books, 1996.
- Hayes, John R., and Virginia W. Berninger. "Relationships between Idea Generation and Transcription: How Act of Writing Shapes What Children Write." *Reading and Writing* 23, no. 7 (2010): 943–969.
- Hornberger, Nancy H., and Holly Link. "Translanguaging and Transnational Literacies in Multilingual Classrooms: A Bilingual Lens." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 15, no. 3 (2012): 261–278.
- Hyland, Ken. *Academic Writing: Issues and Insights*. London: Pearson Education, 2009.
- Hyland, Ken. "Genre-Based Pedagogies: A Social Perspective on Writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 12, no. 1 (2003): 17–29.
- Hyland, Ken. *Second Language Writing*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- Jacobs, Holly L., Stephen A. Zinkgraf, Dorothy R. Wormuth, Virginia F. Hartfiel, and Jane B. Hughey. *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, 1981.

- Johnson, Rebecca. "Pre-Writing Strategies: Enhancing Academic Essay Writing Skills." *Journal of Language and Education Studies* 8, no. 2 (2016): 45–57.
- Johnson, R. Burke, Anthony J. Onwuegbuzie, and Lisa A. Turner. "Toward a Definition of Mixed Methods Research." *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 1, no. 2 (2007): 112–133.
- Jones, Rodney H. *Data Collection and Analysis in Second Language Writing Research*. London: Routledge, 2011.
- Kamasak, Rukiye, Derya Yüksel, and Mustafa Altay. "Exploring the Role of Translanguaging in English-Medium Instruction Classrooms in Turkey." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 24, no. 6 (2021): 756–771.
- Kramsch, Claire. "The Multilingual Subject." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 19, no. 1 (2009): 1–16.
- Kramsch, Claire. "The Multilingual Subject." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 19, no. 1 (2009): 1–20.
- Lewis, Gwyn, Bryn Jones, and Colin Baker. "Translanguaging: Origins and Development from School to Street and Beyond." *Educational Research and Evaluation* 18, no. 7 (2012): 641–654.
- Lewis, Gwyn, Bryn Jones, and Colin Baker. "Translanguaging: Developing Its Conceptualisation and Contextualisation." *Educational Research and Evaluation* 18, no. 7 (2012): 655–670.
- Li, Da, and Yuchen Wang. "Translanguaging as a Mediational Tool in the Process of Feedback in Second Language Writing." *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics* 47, no. 1 (2024): 121–136.

- Lin, Angel M. Y., and Ping He. "Translanguaging and Trans-Semiotizing in Multimodal Digital Composing: A Case Study of Chinese EFL Students." *System* 96 (2021): 102402.
- Lune, Howard, and Bruce L. Berg. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. 9th ed. Boston: Pearson, 2017.
- MacArthur, Charles A. "The Effects of Writing Strategy Instruction on the Writing Performance of Students with Learning Disabilities." *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice* 24, no. 1 (2009): 1–12.
- MacArthur, Charles A. "Reflections on Research on Writing and Technology for Struggling Writers." *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice* 24, no. 2 (2009): 93–103.
- Macaro, Ernesto. "Analysing Student Teachers' Codeswitching in Foreign Language Classrooms: Theories and Decision Making." *The Modern Language Journal* 85, no. 4 (2001): 531–548.
- Manchón, Rosa M., ed. *Learning-to-Write and Writing-to-Learn in an Additional Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011.
- Martin, Peter. "Codeswitching in the Classroom: Research Paradigms and Approaches." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 12, no. 3 (2015): 235–251.
- Mazak, Catherine M., and Kristine S. Carroll, eds. *Translanguaging in Higher Education: Beyond Monolingual Ideologies*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2017.
- McCarty, Teresa L. "Language, Literacy, and Power in Schooling." In *Language Policy and Political Issues in Education*, edited by David Corson, 1–20. Dordrecht: Springer, 2011.

- Menken, Kate, and María T. Sánchez. "Translanguaging in English-Only Schools: From Pedagogy to Stance in the Disrupting of Monolingual Policies." *TESOL Quarterly* 53, no. 3 (2019): 741–767.
- Mu, Congjun, and Suzanne Carrington. "An Investigation of Three Chinese Students' English Writing Strategies." *TESL-EJ* 11, no. 1 (2007): 1–23.
- Muniruzzaman, Syed Md., and Sadia Afrin. "Improving Academic Writing Skill: Difficulties Encountered by Undergraduates of English Studies in Bangladesh." *English: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities* 11, no. 2 (2024): 215–231.
- Nambisan, Karthika A. *Teachers' Attitudes Towards and Uses of Translanguaging in English Language Classrooms in Iowa*. Master's thesis, Iowa State University, 2014.
- Nguyen, Nhung H. "A Critical Review of Collaborative Learning in Academic Writing Classes." *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* 5, no. 2 (2023): 34–47.
- Nikula, Tarja, and Pat Moore. "Exploring Translanguaging in CLIL." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 22, no. 2 (2019): 237–249.
- Nunan, David. *The Learner-Centred Curriculum: A Study in Second Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- OECD. *Education at a Glance 2019: OECD Indicators*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2019.
- Palmer, Deborah, Ramón Antonio Martínez, and Sandra Gil Mateus. "Teacher Education and the Translanguaging Space." *Bilingual Research Journal* 43, no. 1 (2020): 5–19.

- Paltridge, Brian. "Academic Writing." *Language Teaching* 37, no. 2 (2004): 87–105.
- Patton, Michael Quinn. *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2002.
- Paulsrud, BethAnne, Jenny Rosen, Bodil Straszer, and Åsa Wedin. *New Perspectives on Translanguaging and Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2017.
- Poplack, Shana. "Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish y Termino en Español: Toward a Typology of Code-Switching." *Linguistics* 18, no. 7–8 (1980): 581–618.
- Riyantika, Fitri, Rizky A. Prasetya, and Citra G. Puteri. "Creative Writing Process among Pre-Service EFL Teachers in the Indonesian Context: A Translanguaging Approach." *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif* 14, no. 1 (2024): 46–58.
- Seals, Corinne, Julia de Bres, and Laura Janik. *Translanguaging and Multilingualism: Pedagogical Practices*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2020.
- Seltzer, Kate, and Beth A. Collins. "Navigating Urban Classrooms with Emergent Bilinguals: Translanguaging and Dynamic Assessment in Writing Instruction." *Language Teaching Research* 20, no. 4 (2016): 528–546.
- Silva, Tony. "Toward an Understanding of the Distinct Nature of L2 Writing: The ESL Research and Its Implications." *TESOL Quarterly* 27, no. 4 (1993): 657–677.
- Soruç, Adem, Carol Griffiths, and Mustafa Altay. "Revisiting the Role of L1 in English-Medium Instruction: Translanguaging in a Turkish Higher Education Setting." *Language Teaching Research* 25, no. 5 (2021): 712–731.

Storheil, Ingeborg V., and June Y. Iversen. "Translanguaging Strategies in Multilingual Newly Arrived Students' Writing." *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2023.xxxxxx>.

Storch, Neomy. *Collaborative Writing in L2 Classrooms*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2013.

Styati, Endang Woro, and Luluk Irawati. "Translanguaging on ELT Writing Classroom during National Students' Exchange: Perceptions and Practices." *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)* 8, no. 2 (2023): 135–150.

Subandowo, Dwi, Csilla Sárdi, and Fransiska Thresia. "An Investigation of English Academic Writing Strategies Employed by Indonesian Graduate Students in a Non-Native English Speaking Environment." *Research Square* (2023).

İnci Kavak, Vildan, and Yasemin Kırkgöz. "Exploring University Students' Note-Taking in Literature Courses: A Translanguaging Perspective." *Çukurova University Faculty of Education Journal* 51, no. 2 (2022): 1468–1486.

İnci-Kavak, Vildan, and Yasemin Kırkgöz. "Attitudes Towards Translanguaging Practices: A Comparative Study of Literature and Food Engineering Classes." *Sustainable Multilingualism* 21, no. 1 (2022): 105–142.

Kırkgöz, Yasemin, Vildan İnci-Kavak, Ali Karakaş, and Sandra Moran Panero. "Translanguaging Practices in Turkish EMI Classrooms: Commonalities and Differences across Two Academic Disciplines." *System* 114 (2023): 102993.

Tardy, Christine M. "Writing for the World: Wikipedia as an Introduction to Academic Writing." *English Teaching Forum* 48, no. 1 (2010): 12–19.

- Tian, Zhi, and Holly Link. "The Role of Translanguaging in Academic Writing Instruction: A Case Study of Multilingual Students in a University Classroom." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 52 (2021): 100796.
- Velasco, Patricia, and Ofelia García. "Translanguaging and the Writing of Bilingual Learners." *Bilingual Research Journal* 37, no. 1 (2014): 6–23.
- Vinje Storheil, Ingeborg, and June Y. Iversen. "Translanguaging in Multilingual Academic Writing: A Case Study from Norwegian HE." *Language and Education* 37, no. 2 (2023): 120–138.
- Vogel, Sara, and Ofelia García. "Translanguaging." In *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Society*, edited by Ofelia García, Nelson Flores, and Massimiliano Spotti, 1–24. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Vygotsky, Lev S. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Wang, Dan. *Multilingualism and Translanguaging in Chinese Language Classrooms*. Singapore: Springer, 2019.
- Wang, Wenjing, and Qiufang Wen. "L1 Use in the L2 Composing Process: An Exploratory Study of 16 Chinese EFL Writers." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 11, no. 3 (2002): 225–246.
- Wei, Li. "Moment Analysis and Translanguaging Space: Discursive Construction of Identities by Multilingual Chinese Youth in Britain." *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, no. 5 (2011): 1222–1235.
- Wei, Li. "Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language." *Applied Linguistics* 39, no. 1 (2018): 9–30.

Wei, Li, and Ofelia García. “Not a Straight Line: The Dynamic Turn in Translanguaging and Its Impact on SLA.” *Applied Linguistics* 43, no. 2 (2022): 279–298.

Weigle, Sara C. *Assessing Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Yıldız, Mehtap. *A Study on the Functions of Code-Switching in Turkish EFL Classrooms*. Master’s thesis, Hacettepe University, 2018. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Yılmaz, Ayşe. *Translanguaging as a Scaffold in Writing Instruction for Multilingual Learners*. Master’s thesis, Istanbul University, 2020. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

APPENDICES

A. PRE-TASK WRITTEN INTERVIEW

Section 1. Demographic information

Please answer the following questions about yourself.

1. State your name and surname, please.	
2. State your age and grade, please.	
3. Can you briefly describe your academic background in English and your experience with writing?	
4. Which languages are you proficient in?	

Section 2.

Thank you for your valuable time and participation in this questionnaire. Please write your opinions about the following questions.

1. Have you participated in prewriting discussions before? If so, can you describe your experience?	
2. What specific functions do you think prewriting discussions serve in shaping your writing process?	

<p>3. How do these discussions help you in generating ideas and structuring your arguments?</p>	
<p>4. Which type of prewriting discussion do you feel most comfortable with: English, Turkish, or other languages you know?</p>	
<p>5. How do you define translanguaging in your own words?</p>	
<p>6. In your opinion, what are the benefits of using translanguaging strategies during the writing process?</p>	

B. POST-TASK WRITTEN INTERVIEW

Section 1. Demographic information

Please answer the following questions about yourself.

1. State your name and surname, please.	
2. State your age and grade, please.	

Section 2.

Thank you for your valuable time and participation in this questionnaire. Please write your opinions about the following questions.

1. How do you feel about the quality of your writing in each of the conditions? Did you notice any differences?	
2. Were there specific aspects of your writing (e.g., idea generation, argument structure, grammatical accuracy) that improved or declined under certain conditions?	
3. In what ways did the prewriting discussions influence your thought process and writing approach?	
4. Did you find that discussing your ideas with peers helped clarify your thoughts or enhance your arguments? Please elaborate.	

<p>5. What challenges did you face during the writing tasks, particularly in relation to the different discussion conditions?</p>	
<p>6. Did you experience any difficulties in expressing your ideas in English, and how did you address them?</p>	
<p>7. After completing the tasks, do you believe that translanguaging strategies can improve academic writing skills? Why or why not?</p>	
<p>8. How do you plan to apply what you learned from this study to your future writing tasks?</p>	
<p>9. Do you believe that the insights gained from this experience will influence your approach to writing in other subjects or contexts? If so, how?</p>	

C. FOUR WRITING TASK CONDITIONS

Kindly articulate your reflections in accordance with the provided guidelines. We extend our sincere gratitude in advance for your time and effort on this matter.

Condition 1: No Pre-Writing Discussion

Persuasive Essay Template

1. Introduction

2. Body Paragraphs

- Body Paragraph 1 – First Main Reason
- Body Paragraph 2 – Second Main Reason
- (Optional) Body Paragraph 3 – Counterargument and Refutation

3. Conclusion

In recent years, the topic of when to start learning a foreign language has become a significant area of discussion among educators, policymakers, and researchers. Many argue that earlier exposure to a foreign language leads to greater proficiency, better pronunciation, and a more natural acquisition process, while others believe that starting language education later, when students have more developed cognitive skills, can be just as effective. This debate is important in shaping foreign language education policies around the world.

Essay Question:

Should compulsory foreign language education be introduced from primary school onwards? In your opinion, is an earlier start truly better for successful foreign language acquisition? Support your ideas with reasons, examples, and evidence.

Condition 2: Only Turkish Pre-Writing Discussion

Persuasive Essay Template

1. Introduction

2. Body Paragraphs

- Body Paragraph 1 – First Main Reason
- Body Paragraph 2 – Second Main Reason
- (Optional) Body Paragraph 3 – Counterargument and Refutation

3. Conclusion

In recent years, the role of the first language (L1) in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms has sparked considerable debate among language educators and researchers. While traditional methods advocate for an English-only approach to maximize exposure, modern perspectives highlight the potential benefits of strategic L1 use in supporting comprehension, reducing anxiety, and scaffolding new knowledge. This essay explores whether allowing the use of L1 in EFL classrooms is an effective pedagogical tool or a hindrance to language acquisition.

Essay Question:

Should teachers allow the use of students' first language (L1) in English language classrooms?

Condition 3: Only-English Pre-Writing Discussion

Persuasive Essay Template

1. Introduction

2. Body Paragraphs

- Body Paragraph 1 – First Main Reason
- Body Paragraph 2 – Second Main Reason
- (Optional) Body Paragraph 3 – Counterargument and Refutation

3. Conclusion

The preference for native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) over non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) remains a controversial issue in the field of English language teaching. While some argue that NESTs provide authentic pronunciation models and cultural insight, others emphasize the pedagogical strengths and language learning experiences of NNESTs. As the global demand for English continues to rise, it is crucial to examine whether being a native speaker inherently leads to more effective teaching or whether teaching expertise and experience matter more. This essay aims to evaluate the strengths and limitations of both groups within the EFL classroom.

Essay Question:

Are native English-speaking teachers more effective than non-native English-speaking teachers in the EFL context?

Condition 4: Translingual Pre-Writing Discussion (Before writing, engage in a pre-writing discussion with your peers using both English and your first language(s) to explore your ideas, experiences, and opinions.)

Persuasive Essay Template

1. Introduction

2. Body Paragraphs

- Body Paragraph 1 – First Main Reason
- Body Paragraph 2 – Second Main Reason
- (Optional) Body Paragraph 3 – Counterargument and Refutation

3. Conclusion

In the globalized world of English language communication, pronunciation has become a key issue in language teaching and learning. While some argue that achieving a native-like accent should be the ultimate goal, others believe that

intelligibility—being understood clearly by others—is more important and realistic. For many English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, accent is not just a matter of sound, but also of identity, confidence, and social perception. This essay discusses whether English language learners should be encouraged to sound like native speakers or whether the focus should be on clear and effective communication.

Essay Question:

Should EFL learners aim for native-like pronunciation or focus on being intelligible?

D. ACADEMIC WRITING ASSESSMENT SCALE

Criterion	Qualitative Description
1. Content and Task Appropriateness	Evaluates how well the written product aligns with the task instructions and whether it remains relevant to the assigned academic topic.
2. Idea Development and Exemplification	Assesses the clarity and depth of ideas presented, as well as the extent to which they are supported with appropriate examples or elaborations.
3. Organization	Reviews the logical flow and structural coherence of the text, including the presence of a clear introduction, body, and conclusion.
4. Transitional Expressions	Focuses on the use of linking devices and cohesive elements that contribute to the fluency and connectedness of ideas.
5. Word Choice	Examines lexical appropriateness, variation, and the accuracy of vocabulary usage within an academic context.
6. Grammatical Accuracy	Looks at sentence-level grammar, including tense use, subject-verb agreement, and syntactic correctness.
7. Spelling and Punctuation	Assesses orthographic accuracy, including correct spelling and the appropriate use of punctuation marks.
8. Narrative Coherence and Fluency	Evaluates the ease and smoothness with which the text can be read, considering both micro- and macro-level flow.
9. Critical Thinking and Originality	Investigates whether the writing reflects independent thought, interpretive insight, and an original perspective on the topic.
10. Linguistic Variety	Considers the range of sentence structures and stylistic features employed to enrich the academic tone and clarity of expression.

(Adapted from Jacobs et al. (1981), Weigle (2002), and Hamp-Lyons (1991))

E. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET

YÜKSEKÖĞRETİM KADEMESİNDE YABANCI DİL ÖĞRETİMİNİN; (TÜRKİYE BAĞLAMINDA) AKADEMİK YAZIM ÖNCESİ SÜRECİNDE FARKLI ÖLÇÜDE UYGULANAN DİLLER ARASI PEDAGOJİNİN ETKİLERİ

Yazma becerisi, yabancı dil öğretiminde en karmaşık ve bilişsel açıdan en zorlu dilsel üretim alanlarından biri olarak kabul edilmektedir. Özellikle akademik yazma, yalnızca dilbilgisel doğruluk ya da kelime dağarcığı ile sınırlı kalmayıp; düşünceleri organize etme, mantıklı bir yapı oluşturma, ikna edici argümanlar geliştirme ve eleştirel bir bakış açısı kazanma gibi üst düzey zihinsel becerileri de beraberinde getirmektedir. Bu durum, dil öğretiminde yazma becerisine yönelik pedagojik yaklaşımların yeniden değerlendirilmesini gerekli kılmaktadır. Geleneksel yazma öğretimi çoğunlukla bireysel ve hedef dil odaklı olup öğrencilerin yalnızca İngilizce kullanarak yazmaları beklenmektedir. Ancak çokdilli ve çokkültürlü sınıflarda bu yaklaşım, öğrencilerin bilişsel kapasitelerini yeterince değerlendirememekte, yazma sürecini daha zorlu ve sınırlayıcı hâle getirebilmektedir.

Bu bağlamda translanguaging pedagojisi, öğrencilerin sahip oldukları tüm dilsel kaynakları stratejik biçimde kullanarak daha anlamlı ve üretken yazma süreçleri geliştirmelerine olanak tanımaktadır. Translanguaging, dilsel sınırları geçmeyi ve bireyin dil repertuarını tek bir bütün olarak görmeyi teşvik eden bir pedagojik yaklaşımdır. Bu yaklaşım, öğrencilerin hem ana dillerini hem de hedef dili esnek bir şekilde kullanarak düşüncelerini yapılandırmalarına ve akademik metinler oluşturmalarına yardımcı olur. Böylece yazma öncesi süreçlerde yapılan çokdilli tartışmalar, fikir üretimini, planlamayı ve özgüveni destekleyici bir işlev üstlenebilir.

Bu araştırma, Türkiye'deki bir devlet üniversitesinde İngilizce öğretmenliği programına kayıtlı lisans öğrencileriyle yürütülmüş ve yazma öncesi translanguaging

pedagojisinin akademik yazma süreçlerine etkisini incelemeyi amaçlamıştır. Araştırmanın temel sorunsalı, yazma öncesi aşamalarda translanguaging temelli tartışma ortamlarının, öğrencilerin akademik yazma becerilerine nasıl bir katkı sağladığıdır. Bu çerçevede, öğrencilerin düşünce üretimi, metin planlama, dilsel tercihleri ve yazılı ürünlerinin niteliği gibi çeşitli boyutlar analiz edilmiştir.

Araştırmada yer alan dört farklı ön yazma tartışma koşulu (hiç tartışma yok, yalnızca İngilizce tartışma, yalnızca Türkçe tartışma ve translanguaging tartışması) aracılığıyla, öğrencilerin yazılı performansları ve yazma sürecine dair algıları karşılaştırmalı olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Bu farklı koşullar, öğrencilerin fikir oluşturma biçimlerini, dilsel stratejilerini ve yazıya geçiş süreçlerini anlamak açısından önemli bir zemin sunmuştur. Araştırmanın amacı, translanguaging pedagojisinin yazma öncesi aşamalarda sağladığı bilişsel ve pedagojik katkıları ortaya koyarak, geleneksel hedef dil odaklı yazma öğretim yaklaşımlarına eleştirel bir alternatif sunmaktır.

Özellikle Türk yükseköğretim bağlamında translanguaging pedagojisinin yazma becerileri üzerindeki etkileri sınırlı sayıda araştırma ile ele alınmıştır. Bu çalışmanın özgünlüğü, hem nitel hem de nicel verilerin bir arada kullanılmasıyla, yazma sürecinin çok boyutlu olarak değerlendirilmesine dayanır. Aynı zamanda yazılı ürünlerin dilsel ve yapısal açıdan betimlenmesi, öğrenci görüşlerinin tematik analizi ve farklı ön yazma koşullarının karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesiyle kapsamlı bir değerlendirme yapılmıştır.

Bu çerçevede araştırma, dil öğretiminde tek dillilik anlayışının sorgulanmasını ve çokdilli pedagojilerin daha yaygın biçimde uygulanmasını desteklemektedir. Öğrencilerin anadilini dışlayan uygulamalardan ziyade, tüm dilsel kaynaklarının birer öğrenme ve üretim aracı olarak görülmesini savunmaktadır. Böylelikle yazma süreci yalnızca ürün odaklı değil, aynı zamanda süreç ve düşünme biçimi açısından da dönüştürülebilir hâle gelmektedir. Translanguaging pedagojisi, bu dönüşümde merkezi bir araç olarak değerlendirilmektedir.

Bu bölümde translanguaging pedagojisinin kuramsal dayanakları, tarihsel gelişimi, ilgili kavramlarla ilişkisi ve yazma becerisine yönelik etkileri kapsamlı biçimde ele

alınmıştır. Dilin sabit ve ayrı sistemler olarak değil, bireylerin anlam inşası sürecinde aktif ve esnek biçimde kullandıkları bir araç olduğu görüşünden hareketle, translanguaging yaklaşımının çokdilli bireylerin zihinsel süreçleriyle uyumlu olduğu savunulmaktadır. Bu çerçevede, özellikle Vygotsky'nin sosyokültürel kuramı, heteroglossia kavramı ve dilsel repertuar kuramları translanguaging'in pedagojik temelleri arasında gösterilmektedir.

“Translanguaging” terimi ilk kez 1994 yılında Cen Williams tarafından Galler bağlamında ortaya atılmıştır. Başlangıçta öğrencilerin farklı diller arasında geçiş yaparak anlam oluşturdukları sınıf içi uygulamaları tanımlamak amacıyla kullanılmıştır. Daha sonra bu kavram, García ve Wei gibi araştırmacıların katkısıyla pedagojik bir yaklaşıma dönüşmüş, yalnızca kod değiştirme ya da dil karıştırma ötesinde bir bilinçli anlam üretim süreci olarak tanımlanmıştır. Bu bağlamda translanguaging, bireylerin tüm dilsel kaynaklarını bütünsel bir şekilde kullanmalarını ve bu kaynaklar arasında dinamik geçişler yaparak daha zengin düşünsel üretim gerçekleştirmelerini teşvik eder. Böylece dil, yalnızca bir iletişim aracı değil, aynı zamanda bilişsel bir yapılandırma aracı olarak konumlanır.

Kuramsal olarak translanguaging pedagojisi; dilsel hiyerarşilere karşı çıkar, öğrencilerin anadillerinin sınıf içinde bastırılmasını reddeder ve çokdilli öğrencilere daha kapsayıcı bir öğrenme ortamı sunar. Bu yaklaşım, öğrencilerin kimliklerini dilsel tercihler aracılığıyla ifade etmelerine olanak tanır ve akademik yazma gibi yüksek düzey bilişsel becerileri destekleyen bir çerçeve sunar. Literatürde translanguaging'in yazma becerisine katkı sağladığı, özellikle yazma öncesi düşünce üretimi, planlama ve yapısal kurgu gibi alt süreçlerde öğrencilere bilişsel avantaj sağladığı vurgulanmaktadır. Ayrıca öğrencilerin yazılarını daha yaratıcı, anlamlı ve yapılandırılmış biçimde üretmelerine olanak sunduğu ifade edilmektedir.

Bu yaklaşım, kod değiştirmenin ötesine geçerek bireylerin diller arasında bilinçli bir biçimde geçiş yapmasını içerir. Kod değiştirmenin dilsel sistemler arası geçişi daha rastlantısal ve bağlamsal olduğu düşünülürken; translanguaging, öğrencinin zihinsel sürecinde çokdilli kaynakları stratejik biçimde bir arada kullanması olarak tanımlanır. Bu bağlamda, öğrenciler anadil ve hedef dil arasında geçiş yaparken

sadece kelimeleri değil; düşünme biçimlerini, kavramsal yapıları ve kültürel referansları da bütünleştirir. Bu da yazma sürecinde daha derin ve kapsamlı bir metinsel üretimi destekler.

Alanyazın incelendiğinde, translanguaging uygulamalarının özellikle çokdilli ve çok kültürlü sınıflarda öğrenci katılımını artırdığı, akademik başarıya olumlu yansıdığı ve öğrenme motivasyonunu güçlendirdiği görülmektedir. Bununla birlikte, translanguaging pedagojisinin bazı sınırlamaları ve eleştirileri de mevcuttur. Özellikle monolingual dil politikalarının hâkim olduğu sistemlerde bu yaklaşımın uygulanabilirliği tartışma konusu olabilmektedir. Ancak son dönem çalışmalarda, yazma becerileri özelinde translanguaging pedagojisinin öğrencilerin düşünsel derinliğini artırdığı, metin bütünlüğünü desteklediği ve yazı kalitesini yükselttiği yönünde bulgular öne çıkmaktadır.

Türkiye bağlamında yapılan araştırmalar ise sınırlı sayıdadır ve genellikle sınıf içi sözlü etkileşimlere odaklanmıştır. Bu çalışmalarda translanguaging'in öğrencilerin ifade gücünü artırdığı ve anlam oluşturma süreçlerine katkı sunduğu belirtilmiştir. Ancak akademik yazma sürecine etkisi üzerine yapılan kapsamlı çalışmalar oldukça kısıtlıdır. Bu nedenle, bu tez çalışması, translanguaging pedagojisinin yazma öncesi aşamalarda nasıl bir katkı sunduğunu ortaya koyarak alanyazındaki bu boşluğu doldurmayı amaçlamaktadır. Özellikle planlama, fikir üretme, kavramsallaştırma ve yazıya geçirme süreçlerinde öğrencilerin çokdilli kaynaklarını nasıl kullandıkları incelenmiş ve pedagojik uygulamalara yönelik öneriler sunulmuştur.

Bu çalışmada, translanguaging pedagojisinin akademik yazma sürecine etkilerini derinlemesine incelemek amacıyla karma yöntem araştırma deseni benimsenmiştir. Araştırmanın temel yaklaşımı, keşfedici sıralı karma yöntemdir. Bu yaklaşım, nitel verilerin toplanıp analiz edilmesinden sonra bu veriler doğrultusunda nicel verilerin elde edilmesiyle karakterize edilir. Böylece araştırma sürecinde hem bireylerin deneyimleri ve algıları hem de yazılı ürünlerinin sayısal özellikleri bütüncül biçimde değerlendirilmiştir. Bu yöntemin tercih edilme nedeni, translanguaging pedagojisinin çok katmanlı yapısının hem betimsel hem de istatistiksel verilerle ortaya konabilmesine imkân sağlamasıdır.

Çalışmanın katılımcılarını, Türkiye’de bir devlet üniversitesinin İngilizce Öğretmenliği programına kayıtlı 23 gönüllü lisans öğrencisi oluşturmuştur. Katılımcılar, benzer akademik geçmişe ve dil düzeyine sahip olmaları bakımından homojen bir örlem sunmaktadır. Bu homojenlik, farklı tartışma koşullarının etkilerini daha net biçimde karşılaştırma olanağı sağlamıştır. Katılımcıların seçimi amaçlı örnekleme yöntemiyle yapılmıştır ve etik kurul onayı doğrultusunda, tüm gönüllülerden bilgilendirilmiş onam alınmıştır.

Araştırmada, öğrenciler dört farklı yazma öncesi tartışma koşuluna katılmışlardır: (1) Tartışma yapılmadan doğrudan yazma, (2) Sadece Türkçe tartışma, (3) Sadece İngilizce tartışma, (4) Türkçe ve İngilizce’nin birlikte kullanıldığı translanguaging tartışması. Her öğrenci, dört farklı konuda, her bir tartışma türünü içeren yazma görevini yerine getirmiştir. Böylece her katılımcı, her deneyim türünü yaşamış ve yazılı çıktılar karşılaştırmalı olarak elde edilmiştir.

Veri toplama araçları üç ana grupta toplanmıştır. İlk olarak, öğrenciler tarafından yazılan akademik metinler betimsel analiz için kullanılmıştır. Bu yazılı ürünler, içerik, organizasyon, dil kullanımı, akıcılık, gramer doğruluğu, kelime seçimi ve orijinal düşünce gibi on ayrı ölçüte dayalı olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Bu değerlendirme için Jacobs et al. (1981), Weigle (2002) ve Hamp-Lyons (1991) gibi kaynaklardan uyarlanan nitel bir yazma değerlendirme ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Her metin, bu ölçütler doğrultusunda nitel olarak incelenmiş ve öğrenci eğilimleri detaylı biçimde betimlenmiştir.

İkinci olarak, her yazma görevinden önce ve sonra öğrencilere açık uçlu yazılı görüşme soruları yöneltilmiştir. Bu görüşmelerde, öğrencilerin yazma öncesi planlama sürecine, dil tercihlerine, fikir geliştirme yöntemlerine ve tartışmaların katkısına dair düşünceleri sorgulanmıştır. Katılımcı yanıtları tematik analiz yöntemiyle değerlendirilmiştir. Braun ve Clarke (2006) çerçevesinde uygulanan bu analiz, verilerin kodlanması, temaların belirlenmesi ve anlamlı örüntülerin ortaya konması sürecini kapsamıştır. Elde edilen temalar daha sonra yazılı ürünlerle karşılaştırılarak çok katmanlı yorumlamalar yapılmıştır.

Son olarak, yazma görevlerinde üretilen metinlerin nicel özellikleri de analiz edilmiştir. Özellikle kelime sayısı, cümle uzunluğu, geçiş ifadelerinin kullanımı gibi yapısal veriler, dilsel yeterlilik ve organizasyon açısından karşılaştırılmıştır. Bu veriler, tartışma türleri arasındaki performans farklarını istatistiksel olarak ortaya koymada destekleyici bir rol oynamıştır.

Veri toplama süreci iki haftalık bir zaman dilimine yayılmıştır. Her bir yazma görevi ve öncesindeki tartışmalar kontrollü bir ortamda gerçekleştirilmiş, tüm süreç araştırmacı tarafından yürütülmüştür. Bulguların güvenilirliğini artırmak amacıyla çapraz doğrulama ve araştırmacı notları gibi nitel araştırma tekniklerinden yararlanılmıştır.

Bu yöntemsel tasarım sayesinde, translanguaging pedagojisinin yazma öncesi süreçte nasıl bir etki yarattığı hem yazılı çıktılar hem de katılımcı deneyimleri üzerinden çok yönlü olarak ortaya konmuştur. Araştırma deseni, dil öğretiminde çokdilli yaklaşımların etkilerini anlamaya yönelik bütüncül bir çerçeve sunmaktadır.

Bu bölümde, dört farklı yazma öncesi tartışma koşulunun (tartışmasız, yalnızca Türkçe, yalnızca İngilizce ve translanguaging) öğrencilerin akademik yazma performansı üzerindeki etkileri hem nicel hem nitel açıdan sunulmuştur. Yazılı ürünler içerik zenginliği, yapı bütünlüğü, kelime sayısı, dilsel doğruluk ve eleştirel düşünce gibi ölçütlere göre analiz edilmiş; ayrıca öğrencilerin yazma sürecine ilişkin görüşleri tematik analiz yoluyla değerlendirilmiştir. Bulgular, translanguaging uygulamasının, öğrencilerin yazma becerileri üzerinde belirgin ve çok yönlü katkılar sunduğunu göstermektedir.

Nicel bulgular incelendiğinde, translanguaging koşulunda yazılan metinlerin diğer üç koşula kıyasla daha uzun, daha yapılandırılmış ve içerik açısından daha zengin olduğu görülmüştür. Katılımcıların bu koşuldaki yazılarında, özellikle fikir geliştirme, geçiş ifadelerinin kullanımı ve argümantasyon gücü daha yüksek düzeyde gerçekleşmiştir. Türkçe tartışma yapılan koşulda da anlam üretimi ve planlama açısından olumlu etkiler gözlemlenmiş; ancak metin organizasyonu ve dil doğruluğu translanguaging kadar yüksek olmamıştır. İngilizce tartışma koşulunda ise dilsel

doğruluk kısmen yüksek olsa da içerik üretimi ve yazı uzunluğu açısından zayıf sonuçlar elde edilmiştir. Tartışma yapılmayan koşulda üretilen metinler, diğer tüm koşullara kıyasla daha kısa, yüzeysel ve yapı açısından zayıf bulunmuştur.

Nitel veriler, öğrencilerin yazma öncesi tartışmaları fikir üretimi, metin planlama ve özgüven kazanımı açısından destekleyici bulduklarını göstermektedir. Özellikle translanguaging yapılan oturumlara katılan öğrenciler, iki dili birlikte kullanmanın fikirlerini daha açık ve rahat şekilde ifade etmelerine yardımcı olduğunu belirtmiştir. Bu öğrenciler, anadil (Türkçe) kullanabildiklerinde soyut kavramları daha net anlamlandırdıklarını ve İngilizceye aktarırken bu kavramsallaştırmanın işlerini kolaylaştırdığını ifade etmişlerdir. Ayrıca bu öğrenciler yazma sürecine daha hazırlıklı ve motive hissettiklerini vurgulamıştır.

Tematik analiz sonucunda elde edilen beş ana tema, yazma öncesi süreçte translanguaging'in sağladığı işlevleri ortaya koymaktadır: (1) Ön yazmanın zihinsel hazırlık işlevi, (2) Fikir üretimi ve yapı kurma, (3) Dil tercihi ve çokdilli farkındalık, (4) Yazılı ürünle tartışma arasındaki yansımalar, (5) Yazma özgüveni ve performansa etkisi. Bu temalar, öğrencilerin yazma sürecine dilsel ve bilişsel açıdan nasıl yaklaştıklarını ve translanguaging'in bu süreçte nasıl bir kolaylaştırıcı rol üstlendiğini kapsamlı biçimde yansıtmaktadır.

Özellikle Türkçe veya translanguaging temelli tartışmalarda öğrenciler, karmaşık fikirleri daha özgür biçimde dile getirirken; yalnızca İngilizce yapılan tartışmalarda sözel üretim sınırlı kalmakta ve planlama aşaması zayıf geçmektedir. Bu durum yazılı ürüne de doğrudan yansımaktadır. Ayrıca öğrencilerin yazma sonrası görüşleri, translanguaging ortamında yapılan tartışmaların motivasyon artırıcı ve rahatlatıcı bir etki yarattığını ortaya koymuştur. Katılımcılar bu ortamlarda daha yaratıcı, daha analitik ve daha organize metinler ürettiklerini ifade etmiştir.

Sonuç olarak, elde edilen bulgular, translanguaging pedagojisinin yazma öncesi süreçte hem dilsel hem de bilişsel açıdan destekleyici bir araç olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu yaklaşım, öğrencilerin dil becerilerini daha etkili kullanmalarını sağlamakla kalmayıp, aynı zamanda eleştirel düşünme ve akademik ifade

kapasitesini de artırmaktadır. Yazılı ürünlerin kalitesindeki artış ve öğrenci görüşlerindeki tutarlılık, translanguaging'in pedagojik değerini güçlü biçimde desteklemektedir.

Bu bölümde, elde edilen bulgular alanyazın ışığında değerlendirilmiş ve translanguaging pedagojisinin akademik yazma süreçlerindeki yeri derinlemesine yorumlanmıştır. Elde edilen nicel ve nitel veriler, yazma öncesi translanguaging temelli tartışmaların öğrencilerin akademik yazı üretimini belirgin biçimde desteklediğini ortaya koymaktadır. Bulgular, hem öğrencilerin yazılı ürünlerinin içeriği ve yapısı hem de yazma sürecine yönelik algıları açısından bu pedagojik yaklaşımın çok yönlü katkıları sunduğunu göstermektedir.

Öncelikle, öğrencilerin translanguaging tartışması sonrasında ürettikleri metinlerin daha uzun, daha organize ve daha güçlü bir argümantasyona sahip olması, çokdilli bilişsel süreçlerin yazma becerilerini doğrudan etkilediğini göstermektedir. Bu bulgu, García ve Kleyn (2016) tarafından ileri sürülen translanguaging'in düşünme ve öğrenme süreçlerini desteklediği görüşüyle örtüşmektedir. Aynı şekilde, öğrencilerin anadil kullanımını sayesinde soyut akademik kavramları daha iyi kavramsallaştırdıkları ve bu kavramları İngilizceye aktarırken daha güvenli hissettikleri ifade edilmiştir. Bu durum, Vygotsky'nin dilin düşünce gelişimiyle ilişkisine dair savlarıyla da teorik uyum içindedir.

Tartışma yok koşulunda yazılan metinlerin yüzeysel ve yapısal olarak zayıf kalması, yazma öncesi etkinliklerin önemini bir kez daha vurgulamaktadır. Bu bulgu, özellikle prewriting aşamasının zihinsel hazırlık ve içerik oluşturma açısından taşıdığı önemi desteklemektedir. Sadece İngilizce tartışma yapılan oturumlarda ise dilsel doğruluğun görece yüksek olmasına rağmen içerik derinliği ve metin organizasyonunun yetersiz kalması, öğrencilerin hedef dilde fikir üretme sürecinde zorlandıklarını göstermektedir. Bu da çokdilli öğrenciler için tek dilli yazma yaklaşımının sınırlayıcı yönlerine işaret etmektedir.

Yalnızca Türkçe yapılan tartışmalarda öğrencilerin daha rahat fikir ürettikleri, ancak hedef dile geçişte bazı aktarım problemleri yaşadıkları gözlemlenmiştir. Buna

karşılık translanguaging tartışmasında, öğrencilerin diller arası geçişi stratejik biçimde yönetebildikleri ve bu geçişin yazı kalitesine olumlu yansıdığı görülmektedir. Bu durum, translanguaging'in yalnızca dilsel değil, aynı zamanda bilişsel esneklik sağladığına da işaret etmektedir. Öğrenciler, özellikle planlama ve fikir geliştirme aşamasında anadillerini kullanmanın düşünsel netlik sağladığını belirtmiş, bu da onların yazı sürecine olan güvenlerini artırmıştır.

Ayrıca öğrencilerin translanguaging ortamında daha motive oldukları, yazma sürecine daha aktif katıldıkları ve özgüvenlerinin yükseldiği tespit edilmiştir. Bu bulgu, yalnızca dilsel üretimi değil, duyuşsal boyutları da kapsayan çok katmanlı bir destek mekanizmasına işaret etmektedir. Nitekim translanguaging pedagojisi, öğrencilere yalnızca bir iletişim aracı sunmaktan öte, onların kimliklerini ifade edebilecekleri, bilişsel kapasitelerini etkin kullanabilecekleri bir öğrenme ortamı sunar. Bu da eğitim ortamlarında daha kapsayıcı, demokratik ve etkili bir yaklaşımın kapılarını aralamaktadır.

Bu bulgular ışığında, translanguaging pedagojisinin yalnızca yazma öncesi aşamada değil, yazma sürecinin tamamında stratejik olarak yer alması gerektiği vurgulanmalıdır. Öğrenciler, anadillerine yaslanarak yalnızca fikir üretmekle kalmamakta; aynı zamanda bu fikirleri daha yapılandırılmış, organize ve hedef dile uygun biçimde dönüştürebilmektedir. Bu süreç, dilsel farkındalığın yanı sıra üstbilişsel becerileri de güçlendirmekte, öğrencilerin kendi yazma stratejilerini daha bilinçli biçimde değerlendirmelerine olanak tanımaktadır. Öğrencilerin yazma süreciyle ilgili öz değerlendirmelerinde, translanguaging uygulamalarıyla fikirlerin daha netleştiği, metin planlamasının kolaylaştığı ve yazma sürecine dair kaygıların azaldığı sıklıkla dile getirilmiştir. Bu bulgular, öğrencilerin akademik üretim sürecinde sadece hedef dilde düşünmeye zorlanmalarının, onların eleştirel düşünme ve fikir derinliği geliştirme potansiyellerini sınırlandırabileceğini göstermektedir.

Ayrıca, translanguaging'in öğrencilerin yazılarına kültürel ve kişisel perspektifler kazandırdığı da gözlemlenmiştir. Öğrenciler, anadillerini kullanarak bireysel deneyimlerini, kültürel referanslarını ve sosyal gerçekliklerini daha rahat ifade edebilmekte, bu da yazının özgünlüğünü ve bağlamsal derinliğini artırmaktadır. Bu

durum, metinlerin sadece biçimsel değil, aynı zamanda içeriksel olarak da daha anlamlı hâle gelmesini sağlamaktadır. Özellikle kültürlerarası bağlamda, öğrencilerin dilsel kaynaklarını entegre biçimde kullanmaları, akademik yazının evrensel standartlarına uyumu kolaylaştırmakta ve öğrencilerin akademik kimlik gelişimini desteklemektedir. Bu noktada translanguaging pedagojisi, öğrencilere sadece bir üretim aracı değil, aynı zamanda bir özneleşme ve kimlik inşa süreci sunmaktadır.

Bunlara ek olarak, bu pedagojik yaklaşımın öğretim elemanları için de yeniden değerlendirilmesi gereken bir alan yarattığı söylenebilir. Geleneksel yazma öğretimi, çoğunlukla doğru biçim ve gramer temelli bir anlayışla şekillenmekte ve öğrenci üretimi bu çerçevede değerlendirilmektedir. Ancak translanguaging'in etkili biçimde uygulanabilmesi için öğreticilerin de çokdilli farkındalık geliştirmesi, öğrencilerin dilsel kaynaklarını pedagojik bir araç olarak kabul etmesi ve değerlendirme kriterlerini buna göre esnetmesi gerekmektedir. Bu bağlamda, öğretim üyelerinin yalnızca hedef dil üretimine değil, üretimin arkasındaki bilişsel süreçlere de odaklanmaları önem arz etmektedir. Dolayısıyla translanguaging pedagojisi, öğretmen merkezli yapıdan öğrenci merkezli ve süreç odaklı bir yazma öğretimine geçişi de teşvik etmektedir.

Son olarak, elde edilen bulgular mevcut alanyazınla büyük ölçüde tutarlılık gösterse de Türkiye bağlamına özgü bazı özgün katkılar da sunmaktadır. Özellikle akademik yazma gibi üst düzey becerilerde translanguaging pedagojisinin stratejik etkilerini ortaya koyması, bu yaklaşımın daha sistematik biçimde eğitim programlarına entegre edilmesi gerektiğine işaret etmektedir. Çalışmanın bulguları, dil öğretiminde yalnızca hedef dile odaklanan tek dilli yaklaşımların öğrencilerin potansiyelini sınırladığını ve çokdilli pedagojilerin bu sınırları aşmak için güçlü bir araç olduğunu göstermektedir.

Bu çalışma, yazma öncesi translanguaging pedagojisinin İngilizce öğretmenliği programında öğrenim gören üniversite öğrencilerinin akademik yazma süreçlerine etkisini araştırmıştır. Elde edilen bulgular, translanguaging yaklaşımının öğrencilerin düşünce üretimi, planlama becerisi, dilsel esneklik ve yazma motivasyonu üzerinde belirgin ve çok yönlü olumlu etkiler yarattığını ortaya koymuştur. Özellikle öğrencilerin hem Türkçe hem İngilizceyi birlikte kullanarak tartıştıkları yazma

öncesi oturumların, yazılı ürünlerinde içerik kalitesi, yapısal bütünlük ve ifade gücü bakımından dikkat çekici gelişmeler sağladığı görülmüştür. Bu sonuç, translanguaging'in yalnızca bir dilsel tercih değil, aynı zamanda bilişsel ve pedagojik bir strateji olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır.

Çalışmanın sonuçları, geleneksel hedef dil odaklı yazma yaklaşımlarının çokdilli öğrencilerin potansiyelini sınırlayabileceğini; buna karşılık translanguaging pedagojisinin öğrencilerin tüm dil repertuarlarını etkin kullanarak daha yaratıcı, eleştirel ve tutarlı metinler oluşturmalarına imkân verdiğini göstermektedir. Ayrıca öğrencilerin yazma öncesi translanguaging tartışmalarına yönelik olumlu tutumları, bu yaklaşımın sadece bilişsel değil, aynı zamanda duyuşsal boyutta da destekleyici olduğunu göstermektedir. Öğrenciler, anadillerini kullanabilmenin kendilerini daha güvende ve özgür hissettirdiğini, fikirlerini daha net ifade edebildiklerini belirtmişlerdir. Bu durum, akademik yazma sürecinin bir dil becerisi olmanın ötesinde, çok katmanlı bir anlam üretim süreci olduğunu göstermektedir.

Araştırma sürecinde kullanılan karma yöntemsel tasarım sayesinde, hem yazılı ürünlerden elde edilen betimsel-nitel veriler hem de yazma öncesi ve sonrası öğrenci görüşlerinden elde edilen tematik analiz sonuçları birleştirilerek bütüncül bir değerlendirme yapılmıştır. Bu bütüncül yaklaşım, translanguaging pedagojisinin öğrencilerin akademik yazmadaki performanslarına doğrudan ve dolaylı yansımalarını detaylı biçimde ortaya koymuştur. Özellikle “tartışma yok” koşulunda yazılan metinlerin yüzeysel ve kısa olması, yazma öncesi süreçlerin ihmal edilmesinin öğrenci performansını düşürdüğünü açıkça göstermektedir. Buna karşılık translanguaging ile desteklenen yazma öncesi tartışmalar, öğrencilerin yazıya daha hazırlıklı ve motive başlamalarını sağlamıştır.

Araştırmanın bazı sınırlılıkları da bulunmaktadır. İlk olarak, çalışma tek bir üniversitenin İngilizce öğretmenliği bölümü öğrencileriyle yürütülmüş olup örneklem homojendir. Bu nedenle, farklı bölümler, farklı üniversiteler veya farklı yaş gruplarındaki öğrencilerle yapılacak araştırmalar, translanguaging pedagojisinin etkilerini daha geniş kapsamda değerlendirme olanağı sağlayabilir. İkinci olarak, veri toplama süreci kısa süreli uygulamalara dayanmıştır. Uzun vadeli translanguaging

uygulamalarının öğrencilerin yazma becerileri üzerindeki etkilerini inceleyen çalışmalar, bu pedagojinin sürdürülebilirliği ve kalıcılığı açısından daha derinlemesine sonuçlar sunabilir. Üçüncü olarak, araştırma yalnızca yazma becerisine odaklanmıştır. Oysa translanguaging'in konuşma, dinleme ve okuma gibi diğer dil becerileri üzerindeki etkileri de önemli araştırma konularıdır. Son olarak, çalışmanın uygulama aşamasında araştırmacı aynı zamanda öğretici rolünde yer almış ve veri toplama süreçlerini doğrudan yönetmiştir. Bu durum, bazı katılımcıların yanıtlarında sosyal beğeni etkisi oluşturmuş olabilir.









Araştırmanın bulgularından yola çıkarak çeşitli önerilerde bulunulmuştur. Öğretim programlarında, özellikle yazma becerisi öğretiminde translanguaging'e dayalı etkinliklere yer verilmesi önerilmektedir. Öğrencilere yalnızca hedef dilde değil, tüm dilsel kaynaklarını kullanabilecekleri bir öğrenme ortamı sunulmalıdır. Eğitimciler, dil öğretimini yalnızca hedef dilin sınırlarına hapsedmek yerine, öğrencilerin tüm bilişsel ve kültürel birikimlerinden faydalanacak şekilde yeniden yapılandırmalıdır. Ayrıca öğretmen eğitiminde translanguaging pedagojisinin kuramsal temelleri ve sınıf içi uygulamaları öğretmen adaylarına tanıtılmalıdır. Böylece çokdilli ve çokkültürlü sınıflarda daha kapsayıcı ve etkili bir dil öğretimi gerçekleştirilebilir.

Sonuç olarak, translanguaging pedagojisi; öğrencilerin akademik yazma süreçlerini çok boyutlu biçimde destekleyen yenilikçi ve bütüncül bir yaklaşımdır. Bu yaklaşım, öğrencilerin yalnızca hedef dilde üretim yapmalarını değil, aynı zamanda anadil dâhil tüm dilsel kaynaklarını stratejik ve bilinçli biçimde kullanmalarını teşvik eder. Böylelikle öğrenciler, sadece dilsel becerilerini değil, aynı zamanda düşünme, planlama, örgütleme ve eleştirel analiz gibi üst düzey bilişsel yetilerini de etkin şekilde geliştirme fırsatı bulurlar. Ayrıca translanguaging pedagojisi, öğrencilerin yazma sürecine yönelik tutumlarını da olumlu yönde etkileyerek özgüvenlerini artırır, yazma kaygılarını azaltır ve duyuşsal olarak daha motive bireyler hâline gelmelerine katkı sağlar. Özellikle çokdilli öğrencilerin kendilerini daha rahat ifade edebilmeleri, akademik kavramları daha iyi kavrayıp metinlerine yansıtmaları bu yaklaşım sayesinde mümkün olabilmektedir.

Türkiye bağlamında değerlendirildiğinde, translanguaging pedagojisinin potansiyeli oldukça büyüktür. Ülkemizdeki öğrencilerin çoğunluğu çokdilli ve çokkültürlü

ortamlarda büyümekte; bu da onların doğal dil repertuarlarının eğitim süreçlerine entegre edilmesini gerektirmektedir. Bu bağlamda translanguaging pedagojisi, Türkiye'deki mevcut tek dilliliğe dayalı dil öğretimi anlayışını dönüştürme potansiyeline sahiptir. Akademik yazma öğretiminde daha esnek, kapsayıcı ve anlam merkezli bir yaklaşımın benimsenmesi, öğrencilerin hem yazılı ürün kalitesini artıracak hem de eğitim sistemine daha demokratik ve katılımcı bir çerçeve kazandıracaktır. Bu nedenle translanguaging'in Türkiye'de yaygınlaştırılması, yalnızca bir pedagojik tercih değil; aynı zamanda bir eğitim politikası meselesi olarak da ele alınmalıdır.

E. APPROVAL OF THE METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE

<p>UYDULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER</p> <p>ÖZEL DURUMUNAR DULYARI 06800 ÇANKAYA ANKARA - TÜRKİYE T: +90 312 210 22 01 F: +90 312 210 79 00 www.ozel.duyunaru.edu.tr</p>	<p> ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY</p>
<p>Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu</p> <p>Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (IAEK)</p> <p>İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu</p>	<p>22 Kasım 2024</p>
<p>Sayın Doç. Dr. Nurdan ÖZBEK GÜRBÜZ</p> <p>Danışmanlığımı yürüttüğünüz Edis Akdeniz'in "<i>Diller arası pedagojinin Türkiye'de yükseköğretim kademesinde okuyan öğrencilerin yazım-öncesi aşamasında kullanımının akademik yazma süreçlerine yansımaları</i>" başlıklı araştırmanız İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülerek 9561 ODTÜ/IAEK-2024 protokol numarası ile onaylanmıştır.</p> <p>Bilgilerinize saygılarımla sunarım.</p>	
<p> Başkan</p>	
<p> Üye</p>	<p> Üye</p>
<p> Üye</p>	<p> Üye</p>
<p> Üye</p>	<p> Üye</p>

F. THESIS PERMISSION FORM

(Please fill out this form on computer. Double click on the boxes to fill them)

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : AKDENİZ

Adı / Name : EDA

Bölümü / Department : İngiliz Dili Öğretimi / English Language Teaching

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English): THE EFFECTS OF TRANSLANGUAGING PEDAGOGY IN THE PRE-STAGES OF ACADEMIC WRITING AT THE TERTIARY LEVEL IN AN EFL CONTEXT, TÜRKİYE

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master Doktora / PhD

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır.** / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years.** *
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **six months.** *

* Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir. / A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature

Tarih / Date

(Kütüphaneye teslim ettiğiniz tarih. Elle doldurulacaktır.)
(Library submission date. Please fill out by hand.)

Tezin son sayfasıdır. / This is the last page of the thesis/dissertation.