The Association of Multilingualism with English Language Proficiency: The Role of Metalinguistic Awareness

Wodajo Kassaye Tadesse[*], Getachew Seyoum Woldemariam, and Temesgen Mereba Dobech

Jimma University, College of Social Sciences and Humanities, Department of English Language and Literature

Abstract: This study investigated the association of multilingualism with English language proficiency in terms of the role of metalinguistic awareness in the context of multilingual second year undergraduate students of Hawassa University, Ethiopia. The study employed a correlational mixed design with 39 multilingual and 30 monolingual students using comprehensive sampling. The quantitative data were collected from both groups using proficiency test while the qualitative data were collected only from 15 multilingual students using semi-structured interview. To analyze the data obtained from the proficiency test, the mean, variance and standard deviation were used. In addition, the mean results of the multilingual and monolingual participants were compared using independent sample t-test. The two-tailed Pearson Correlation was also employed to find out the association of multilingualism with the multilinguals' English language proficiency. The results of the study revealed that the multilingual participants were more proficient than the monolinguals in English language because of their metalinguistic awareness. Finally, the study suggested that the Department of English Language, instructors and students of Hawassa University should work hand-in-hand to implement a multilingual pedagogical approach in the classroom so that the students would get maximum benefit from their prior languages during English language learning.

Keywords: L3 proficiency; Local languages; Metalinguistic awareness; Monolinguals; Multilinguals

1. Introduction

The role of metalinguistic awareness (MLA) in additional language learning got attention in the past two decades. The unprecedented rise of "multilingualism as a new linguistic dispensation" (Aronin and Singleton, 2008: 1) and the rise of multilingualism as a field of study (Cenoz, 2013) contribute to this concern. Thus, nowadays multilingualism has become one feature of the human being in the English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom because the majority of the students get opportunities to learn in their mother tongues and other non-native languages since their primary educations. This emerging field of study challenged the conventional Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) that advocates English Only approach.

The basic assumption behind the English Only approach is that the use of local languages was an obstacle in the target language learning because of interference; therefore, target language only is its means to an end (Richards and Rodgers, 2014). However, since this approach is "neither conclusive nor pedagogically sound" (Roberts, 1993: 5), a paradigm shift to multilingual pedagogy in foreign language teaching is practiced (Hungwe, 2021; Woll, 2020). Contrary to the former approaches and methods, the multilingual pedagogy viewed multilingualism as a resource to learn additional languages (Alieto, 2018). Its main claim is that multilinguals are more efficient than monolinguals because knowledge learned in local languages is transferred to target language learning due to metalinguistic awareness of the multilingual additional language learners (Falk, Lindqvist and Bardel, 2015; Jessner, 2008; Munoz, 2000; Rothman, 2011; Wilson and González-Davies, 2017).

The people of Ethiopia are linguistically diverse with 87 local languages spoken as mother tongues (Central Statistics Agency, 2008). The situation is also reflected in higher educations of the country (Mendisu and Johannessen, 2016) because many local languages are given as school subjects and some are used as medium of instructions at primary schools (Seidel and Moritz, 2009); thus, the students join universities being multilinguals. In addition, the Higher Education Proclamation of Ethiopia also promotes multilingualism and multiculturalism in higher education (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, 2009). Based on the researchers' experience, the linguistic diversity is observed in Hawassa University as well. It is common to hear students in the campus using different local languages for communication among each other. This shows that the students join the university from different ethnic groups who use different languages as mother tongues and second languages. This is practical evidence for the metaphor "higher education in the country represent mini Ethiopia."

Though higher education students are multilinguals, multilingualism is not considered as a resource in EFL learning in Ethiopia. The students are most of the time considered as if they were monolinguals and encouraged to think through the target language - English. Due to this, the English classroom is covered in English Only or the teachers' use of the lingua franca Amharic in the classroom to give instructions and clarify difficult concepts. Thus, the monolingual mind-set embedded in conventional communicative approach and direct approach to EFL teaching challenges the implementation of the multilingual pedagogies. This hinders the students from using their prior languages as a resource when they learn English. Perhaps, because of this, there is a difference among the EFL learners in their English language proficiency in higher educations in the country. Some students are better than others to use the language for communication while others face difficulties to use it.

Researchers tried to study some aspects of multilingual learners that are assumed to contribute to their additional language proficiency. However, the role of MLA has scarcely been investigated and more recently attracted the attention of researchers to explore its contribution to additional language learning (Beiler and Dewilde, 2020; Falk *et al*., 2015; Jessner, 2017; Kasimova, 2021). Likewise, even if a significant number of students in higher education of Ethiopia are multilinguals, the role of their MLA in EFL learning has not been explored as far as the knowledge of the researchers is concerned. Thus, based on the Dynamic System Theory (DST) (Jessenr, 2008a), this study investigates the role of MLA to English language proficiency. Specifically, the study investigates the contributions of the theoretically stated metalinguistic awareness skills: language analysis, language

control and translation skill to English language proficiency. According to Creswell (2014), the predetermined themes provide ready-made research questions that could be answered based on the literature. To this end, the present study has aimed to answer the following research questions.

1. Is there any significant difference between multilingual and monolingual students in terms of their English language proficiency?

2. Does metalinguistic awareness contribute to multilinguals' English language proficiency? If yes, what are the metalinguistic awareness skills that contribute to English language proficiency?

The notion of multilingualism

There is no agreement on the definition of bilingualism and multilingualism among scholars. Myres-Scotton (2002: 1) defines bilingual as "a person who speaks two or more languages." Equally, the term multilingualism, like the term bilingualism denotes individual competence of more than one language (Herzog-Punzenberger, 2017). According to European Commission (2007: 6), multilingualism is defined as "the ability of societies, institutions, groups and individuals engage, on a regular basis with more than one language in their day -to -day lives". The fuzzy boundary between the concept of bilingualism and multilingualism still creates confusion of terminological uncertainty in research of multilingualism (De Angelis, 2007). However, instead of bilingualism researchers commonly use the term multilingualism as a cover term to refer to both bilingualism and multilingualism in the literature and this may resolve terminological debates that decrease disciplinary fragmentations of the field (Berthele, 2021).

   In the present study, multilingualism is defined as the daily use of two or more local languages for communication (De Bot, 2019). Specifically, it refers to students of Hawassa University who learn English as a foreign language and use two and more Ethiopian languages for communication in the four language skills. English is considered as a foreign language in this context because it is confined to the classroom and not widely used for communication in the local community (Richards and Schmidt, 2010). Thus, both terms bilingual and multilingual fall under the same definitions, because they share the same border. Since English is the language under investigation in both monolingual and multilingual cases, it is not taken as an index for multilingualism in the study.

Measuring multilingual proficiency

Since there is no standardized proficiency test that fits for all multilingual EFL learners in different countries, researchers design their own tests based on their areas of interest. Some used the tests to measure the grammar proficiency (Munoz, 2000; Safont and Pilar, 2005). Others are interested in testing reading skills (Rauch, Neumann and Jude 2011). Still others used the tests to measure writing skills (Benzehaf, 2021; Hungwe, 2021). However, measuring only a single skill underestimates the overall use of the language in real life situation because language proficiency emanates from the combinations of multiple language skills. Therefore, instead of measuring isolated specific skill, the researchers of the present study integrated the four language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing to measure the proficiency level of the students. This comprehensive way of assessment is important to determine the overall English language proficiency of the target group. To sum up, there is no a uniform procedure to measure the proficiency of multilinguals. Therefore, to alleviate the shortcomings of the previous studies (i.e., a single-skill-oriented approach) both the self-reflection proficiency level assessment prior to actual data collection and skill based proficiency test approaches were utilized in the present study to determine the proficiency of the multilingual and monolingual students.

Language proficiency of multilinguals and metalinguistic awareness

Language proficiency is an umbrella term used to refer to one's ability to use the language for different communicative purposes (Bachman and Palmer, 1996). In the present study, we define proficiency in relation to the skills that multilinguals have to "understand the language without

difficulty, express a range of ideas clearly in speech and writing, and interact with other speakers comfortably" (Renandya, Hamied and Nurkamto, 2018: 618). Since language learning is skill oriented, this definition shows the primary goal of language learning is related to acquiring a good command of the language in listening, speaking, reading and writing skills.

In the field of multilingualism researchers give a number of definitions for MLA. It is the awareness of language rules as a result of formal instruction in a school context (Falk *et al*., 2015). Diaz and Klingler (1991: 173) define MLA as "a set of abilities involving an objective awareness and control of linguistic variables, such as understanding the arbitrariness of word-referent relations and the capacity to detect and correct syntactic violations". In the present study, the concept of MLA not only incorporates the analysis and control of local languages and English language but also considers/ incorporates translation from the English language to local languages and vis-à-vis as English language learning resource.

Due to language learning experiences of the multilinguals, multiple language systems constantly interplay in their minds during additional language learning and this qualitatively differentiates them from monolinguals (Herdina and Jessner, 2002). To situate the proficiency of multilinguals in a holistic approach rather than focusing only on knowledge based grammar manipulation, Herdina and Jessner proposed a Dynamic Model of Multilingualism (DMM). According to this model, multilingual proficiency is a cumulative process of crosslinguistic interaction (CLIN) between prior language learning systems (LS1, LS2, LS3,…LSn) which develop the skills multilingualism factor (M-factors). Jessner (2006: 33) puts this concept using the formula "LS1 + LS2 + LS3 + LSn + CLIN + M = MP" where, LS: language system, CLIN: cross-linguistic interaction, M: M(ultilingualism)-factor and MP: multilingual proficiency. This shows that multilingual additional language learners at least contact with two language systems (LS1 and LS2) in their repertoire and they employ CLIN as a strategy to transfer the prior language systems to target language for better comprehension.

To show the integration of different language systems in the mind of multilinguals, it is a common practice to use first/second/third language (L1/L2/L3) within the research of multilingualism. According to Hammarberg (2010), L1 refers to any learner's native language acquired during infancy; an L2 is the language(s) subsequently learned as secondary to L1 while L3 is the language currently under investigation where the person already has knowledge of L1 (s) and L2 (s). The terms first, second and third language do not necessarily refer the literal meaning of language number one, two, and three in order of acquisition because an individual may acquire one or more L1s up to 3 years old and after that can have one or more L2s in natural context or formal education (Lightbown and Spada, 2021). However, the terms may show the order of acquisition if a person acquires only three languages in sequential order. This means one L1, one formerly acquired L2 and the present target language, L3.

Motivated by DMM, Jessner (2008a) developed a DST. Holding the view of multilingual proficiency as a cumulative process, she defined the M- factor that Herdina and Jessner (2002) used as a cover term. The M-factor "is made up of a set of skills and abilities that the multilingual user develops owing to her/his prior linguistic and metacognitive knowledge" (Jessner, 2008a: 275). As MLA is a part of complex and abstract cognitive information processing ability of multilingual speakers, the present study is situated in Jessner's (2008a) DST. The DST was employed as a theoretical framework because in the mind of multilinguals there are dynamic cognitive interactions of at least their prior languages of their mother tongue (L1) and a second language (L2) for the production of additional language English (L3). At the center of dynamic cognitive interactions, three M-factors of MLA: language analysis, language control and translation skills are explored in the study in terms of their contributions to L3 proficiency of multilinguals.

Language analysis and control

Multilinguals have special internal language processing skills of language analysis and control (Jessner, 2008a). For the first time, Bialystok (2001a) developed a MLA model of Language Analysis

and Control containing two major parts that improve language proficiency in second language learning. These two major parts are the learners' mental representation of language and the attention function. The mental representation occurred through analysis of linguistic knowledge and this is realized by having explicit knowledge of language structures or forms. On the other hand, the attention ability is guided by control of linguistic processing. It refers to the conscious ability to select and process information to solve metalinguistic problems (Cromdal, 1999). This is done by selecting information which requires processing and having attention to that for performance. According to Diaz and Klingler (1991), the attention ability can be defining the meaning of words in context, referencing words in reading, and identifying and correcting wrong sentences constructed by others.

Multilinguals easily identify structural similarities and differences among the languages in their repertoire as a result of having language analysis skills (Falk *et al*., 2015). As English is confined to the classroom in EFL contexts, students may not have access to learning the grammar in a natural setting. Because of this, explicit grammar learning helps them to get knowledge to reflect upon it. When there is topological similarity between the structures of source and target languages, the learners directly apply the form of the prior languages to target language with less cognitive demanding effort (Rothman, 2011). However, language learners are not only confronted with topologically related language like many European languages (Rothman, 2011), but also with topologically different languages like in the context of Ethiopian language and English language (Ferguson, 1970). In this situation the L3 learners engage not only in structural similarities, but also in structural differences for the transfer to take place.

Translation skills
Translation is another metalinguistic skill of multilingual speakers (Beiler and Dewilde, 2020). Considering it as a language learning strategy, Oxford (1990: 46) defined it as a component of two alternative elements that is "converting the target language expression into the native language or converting the native language into the target language; using one language as the basis for understanding or producing another". As a language teaching method, it was begun during Grammar Translation Method in teaching Latin and Greek languages (Gonzalez-Davies, 2020). But, because of the negative implication of switching between the languages in the course of instruction, it was replaced by CLT (Artar, 2017). Since then translation has been ignored from academic discourses for a century because language teachers and researchers assume its use as the Renaissance of the Grammar Translation Method (Kerr, 2014). However, it is currently considered as an additional language learning strategy by EFL learners. This point of view also gets support from EFL researchers in different multilingual countries. According to Hungwe (2021), multilinguals use translation to generate ideas during writing in L3 (Hungwe, 2021). Similarly, Artar (2017) pointed out that the students use translation when they feel anxiety and face difficulties to follow the lessons. Furthermore, the multilinguals refer back to their local languages and make effective cross-lingual comparisons in their mind for meaning making during L3 learning with their instructors' limited role in giving directions (Beiler and Dewilde, 2020). This shows that there is no room for the English Only approach in the 21st century, when ethnic and linguistic diversity are related to the learners' identity in language learning.

Translation is one of the MLA factors of multilingual additional language learners (Jessner, 2008a). It was developed as a model of MLA by Malakoff and Hakuta (1991) for the first time. The model comprises manipulation of source language and target language at two different stages. First, the translator must know the meaning in the source language and then this knowledge must be conveyed according to the conventions of the target language sentence structure. They also clearly put the difference between translation and interpretation as, "translation refers to the written modality and interpretation generally refers to the oral modality" (142).

The concept of translation in the present study is both written and oral modalities of communicating a message from different local languages competing to be a source for the target language and vice

versa. Since the participants are at the threshold level, they can communicate in listening, speaking, reading, and writing in local languages and English. Thus, unlike Malakofa and Hakuta a horizontal a word for word or phrase to phrase translation from the local languages to target language is not expected. Instead, a conceptual translation strategy or vertical translation suggested by Paradis (1994) is required in terms of its communicative functions for L3 proficiency. This strategy follows an analysis of the source languages' message and synthesizing it into the target language concept in which the translators engage in two cognitive demanding tasks simultaneously (De Groot and Christoffels, 2006).

2. Research Methods

2.1. Design of the Study

A correlational design which makes use of a mixed approach was used. Unlike post positivist and the constructivist paradigms, this approach rejects choosing a single method. Rather, it argues that a combination of the methods strengthens the quality of the data (Cresswell, 2009). An explanatory sequential mixed method was employed from the other mixed designs. According to Creswell (2014), the researchers follow certain steps to apply this method. First, the quantitative research is conducted. After that, the qualitative research is employed to explain the quantitative results. Similarly, in this study the quantitative data were collected using the proficiency test. Then, the semi-structured interview was conducted to get deeper insight into issues related to the association of multilingualism with students' English language proficiency. The reason behind using this approach is not only to achieve an elaborate and comprehensive understanding of the issue and look at it from different points of view, but also to verify certain findings against the others to validate the conclusions by converging the results gained through different methods (Dörnyei, 2007).

2.2. Participants and Sampling Techniques

The participants of the study were 39 multilingual and 30 monolingual second year EFL students of Hawassa University. The participants were grouped into multilingual and monolingual groups based on the Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (LEAP-Q) they had completed. The questionnaire was used to assess background information of the participants on their language learning profiles. It was adapted from Peric and Mijic (2017) with slight modification of the contents to assess the background information of the students on their local language learning experiences. The LEAP-Q contains the number of language spoken, performance rating of prior language proficiency, contexts of language acquisition (formal, informal), language exposure and current language use. Therefore, it is assumed as a reliable measure of language proficiency in the present study to get background information on linguistic ability of the participants (Jia, Aaronson and Wu, 2002; Neuser, 2017)

   A comprehensive sampling technique was employed to select the participants. In this regard, all the multilingual and monolingual second year EFL students of the 2020 academic year were included in the study. Both groups took the same English language proficiency test for the purpose of comparison. Based on the demographic questionnaire they had filled, altogether ten mother tongues were identified on the side of multilinguals. Specifically, the number of participants who speak each mother tongue were *Afan Oromo* (9), *Agewgna* (1), Amharic (5), *Dawurogna* (1), *Gamogna* (4), *Hadiygna (5)*, *Kafigna* (5), *Sidamigna* (4), *Somaligna* (1) and *Wolaytigna* (4). While Amharic mother tongue speakers used different local languages as their second language, the other nine mother tongue speakers used Amharic as their second language. As shown in the background assessment of the participants, they are proficient in their L1s and L2s in the four language skills and grammar because they learned the languages formally in school contexts, and also use them actively for communication in the speech community.

   Participants who were proficient and can communicate only in one language are monolinguals. Although some of them replied that they can listen what has been said in other language(s) in the self-

assessment report, they were categorized under the monolingual group because the ability of listening skills may not indicate the overall proficiency of the language(s).

Stratified simple random sampling and comprehensive sampling techniques were employed to select 15 multilingual participants for the interview. First, the students were grouped into ten based on their mother tongues. Then, simple random sampling was employed to select two students from *Afan Oromo*, Amharic, *Gamogna*, *Hadiygna*, *Kafigna*, *Sidamigna* and *Wolaytigna* speakers. However, the existing one participant was taken using comprehensive sampling from each *Agewgna*, *Dawurogna* and *Somaligna* mother tongue speakers. The researchers assumed that the number of the participants is enough to collect the necessary data to answer the research questions. .

2.3. Instruments of Data Collection
2.3.1. Proficiency test
To measure the general proficiency of the participants in the four language skills, adapted English proficiency test was employed. Prior to its design, researchers should have background knowledge of the participants using "narrowly-focused assessment" to determine their L3 skills (Thomas, 1994: 310). Therefore, a questionnaire was distributed to assess the proficiency level of the participants using adapted Common European Frame of Reference self-assessment grid, CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001, 2018) before the actual data collection. Although CEFR was used as a frame of reference to determine the foreign language proficiency of multilingual students (not necessarily English) in Europe, different countries in USA, Asia and the Asia-Pacific adapted it to measure the foreign language proficiency of the students (Bakar, 2020; Foley, 2019). It is an internationally accepted proficiency framework because it is comprehensive and less rigged to be applied without reference to any specific language (Gorter and Cenoz, 2017). The result of the background assessment indicated that 69% of the participants were independent users of level B1. According to the CEFR, foreign language learners at this level are expected to communicate about their daily activities through listening, reading, writing and speaking skills. Though the researchers used the background assessment as a benchmark to design the proficiency test for the present study, the level of the students may vary from year to year.

Based on the daily activities of the participants*,* a proficiency test containing 60 questions was adapted from some authors and university materials (Basic Writing Skills, 1012 of Jimma University; Dendrinos and Mitsikopoulou, 2012; Lemma and Alebel, 2004; University of Cambridge ESOL Examinations, 2012). Based on Cambridge English Preliminary CEFR Level B1 (2012), listening, reading, writing and speaking skills were scored out of 25 percent. Except the practical story writing, others were objective type. Since the story writing was subjective type, it was marked using the adapted Marking Scheme of Cambridge English Preliminary to minimize the subjectivity of the scorers.

2.3.2. Interview
Semi-structured interview was conducted with the multilingual participants to collect in-depth responses on their local languages and English language learning experiences in line with the themes designed based on DST M-factors: language analysis, language control and translation skills. The theory comes first in qualitative study to shape the type of questions asked to answer the research questions (Creswell, 2014). The interview was conducted only with multilingual participants because those predetermined themes are theoretically stated as the major characteristics of multilingual additional language learners. Thus, the aim of the interview was to find out the practicability of those themes in Ethiopian higher education context in line with their contribution to L3 proficiency. The interview took 25=30 minutes and was carried out in *Afan Oromo* and Amharic languages.

Although the interviewees have their own mother tongues, the researchers assumed that conducting the interview in each mother tongue was impossible as it requires interviewers that can communicate in each mother tongue. Despite the difficulties of getting the interviewers that can communicate in the

identified mother tongues, employing them as interviewers is also not economical. Because of this, it was carried out in *Afan Oromo* and Amharic languages to avoid language related barriers and make the students reflect their idea on the topic of the study. *Afan Oromo* was employed since the researchers can communicate in it. In addition, as the background assessment of local language learning experience reveals, all the respondents can communicate in Amharic with other ethnic groups in the country and they are proficient in the four language skills. Instead of mentioning the respondents' names during data analysis, codes that indicate the interviewees according to the order of the interview carried out i.e. S1, S2, S3… S15 were used to refer to them.

2.4. Data Analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis were utilized. First, the mean results of the proficiency test of the multilingual and monolingual participants were calculated. Then, using independent sample t-test the group means of the proficiency test of the two groups were compared and correlation analysis was carried out to find the association of multilingualism with the English language proficiency. Finally, the data obtained through semi-structured interview were analyzed qualitatively by categorizing the respondents' views into three major themes of M-factors. Before the analysis, the recorded interview was transcribed and the data were proven consistent. The translation was context-based since it is unlikely to get a word-for-word similarity between the local languages and the English language. Therefore, the translation was made by finding equivalent meanings that were appropriate in the English language. Based on the grounded theory, the interview data were an inductive theory building. Thus, the findings generated from the data were grounded in the participants' words about their local languages and English language learning experiences. These themes were compared with the results of the proficiency test and interpreted in line with existing literature of multilingualism and additional language learning to enable readers make sense of the findings.

2.5. Validity and Reliability of the Instruments

Validity is about whether the measurement used in the study actually measures what it is supposed to measure (Creswell, 2014). Since it is paradigm bounded, different researchers are concerned with different validity issues. As to this study, internal validity was given emphasis. It refers to the causal relationship between variables and the formulation of general conclusion thus the findings must describe correctly the topic being researched (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007). According to them, validity can be realized by the content validity of the instruments of the study.

   The content validity of the tools in the present study is controlled in different ways. To maintain the content validity of the proficiency test, the test was adapted from standardized EFL proficiency tests of Cambridge English Preliminary ESOL Examinations (2012) and Dendrinos and Mitsikopoulou (2012). To get background information on the participants' EFL proficiency level and determine the content and difficulty level of the test, pre-assessment in the four language skills was carried out using CEFR (2001a, 2018) in different study site, but similar with the actual study site in the participants' years of higher education enrollment and group of universities in the country based on generations (i.e., First Generation Universities). Similarly, the content validity of the interview guide was maintained by situating it within the DST and reviewing the work of influential scholars in the field. To determine its content validity, the interview guide was evaluated by two associate professors of EFL instructors at Jimma University and their comments on the relevance and the wording of the items were included in the final version. The content validity of the instruments was further controlled by adding some of the major variables in the study. The English language proficiency test included listening, reading, speaking and writing skills and it is assumed that designing the test-based on the four language skills is appropriate to determine the overall English language proficiency of the participants.

The meaning of reliability is different in quantitative and qualitative research. In quantitative research reliability is the consistency of instruments over time and group of respondents, while in qualitative research it refers to relationship between the collected data and what actually occurred in the natural setting that is being researched (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992). Since the present study is based on explanatory sequential mixed methods approach, the reliability of the instruments can be viewed both quantitatively and qualitatively. With regards to the quantitative point of view, Crombach's alpha statistic reliability analysis was conducted to check the reliability of the proficiency test. According to the analysis, the Alpha coefficients were 0.89 and 0.83 for multilingual and monolingual participants, respectively. These show that the instrument is reliable to collect the necessary data. Brown, Bull, and Pendlebury (1997) stated that the major threat to reliability in subjective written test is the lack of consistency of the test scores. Thus, to mitigate the threats related to scoring the written test two measures were taken. Adapted scoring rubrics were used to mark it as rubrics are assumed to improve the consistency of scoring subjective tests (Jonsson and Svingby, 2007). In addition, member checking is important to avoid researchers' bias and increase credibility (Creswell, 2014). Based on this point of view, two PhD candidates in TEFL at Jimma University were trained to score the test and the result of the Combach's Alpha inter-rater reliability coefficient is .73 which, according to Brown, Glasswell, and Harland (2004), is acceptable to maintain the internal consistency. In addition, to maintain credibility and trustworthiness of the interviews they were recorded and documented.

3. Results
3.1. Quantitative Results
The quantitative data of the study were obtained from the multilingual and monolingual participants' proficiency test. To compare the results of the two groups, the descriptive statistic measures of central tendency mean, and measures of dispersion variance and standard deviation were used. Furthermore, the inferential statistics independent sample t-test was used to compare the mean result of the proficiency test of the multilingual and monolingual participants while two-tailed Pearson Correlation was employed to find out the association of multilingualism with L3 proficiency.

Table 1. Mean results of multilingual and monolingual participants

Group statistics					
Proficiency test score	Group of participants	N	Mean	SD. deviation	SE. error mean
	Multilingual	39	60.8974	13.74733	2.20168
	Monolingual	30	49.8333	5.05203	.92240

Table 1 shows the mean results of the multilingual and monolingual groups with the mean scores of (M=60.8974, SD=13.74733) and (49.8333, SD=5.05203), respectively. This shows that there is a mean difference in the proficiency test scores among the groups.

To compare the proficiency test results of multilingual and monolingual participants, the independent sample t- test was employed. The results of the analysis showed that there was a significant difference in the proficiency test between the two groups.

Table 2. Results of t-test analysis of group means

Independent samples test

		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean df	Std. error	95% CI Lower	Upper
PTAv	Equal V assumed	32.913	.000	4.19	67	.000	11.064	2.640	16.33	5.79
	Equal V not assumed			4.64	50.47	.000	11.064	2.386	15.85	6.27

Where PTAv- Proficiency test average; V -Variance

As shown in Table 2, the two group's variances is (F=32.913) with a significance value of (.000 and p <. 05). Similarly, the t value (T =4.19) is significant at (.000 and p<. 05). This indicates that there is statically significant difference between the multilingual and the monolingual participants in their English language proficiency**.** To explore the association of multilingualism with the English language proficiency further, a correlation analysis was computed. The results can be seen in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Correlation between multilingualism and L3 proficiency

Correlations

		Group of participant	Proficiency test
Group of participant	Pearson correlation	1	.756[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	69	69
Proficiency test	Pearson correlation	.756[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	69	69

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

As shown in Table 3, the two-tailed Pearson correlation is significant at=.000, which is below the cut score of P <. 05. The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient (.756) shows that the strength of the association is high. This shows that multilingualism has a high correlation with L3 proficiency.

3.2. Qualitative Results

To pinpoint which facets of the MLA skills predict the L3 proficiency of the multilinguals, semi-structure interview was conducted and students' experiences of local languages and English language were investigated in line with the predetermined themes. The analysis shows that MLA contributes to additional language learning. It provides rich insight into the three candidates of MLA: language analysis, language control and translation skills that were found to be the factors for the multilinguals' L3 proficiency.

3.2.1. Language analysis skill

When the students were asked about their experiences of grammatical knowledge of their prior language and English language, it was found out that all 15 multilinguals replied that they had

language analysis skill that is used as L3 learning resource. They can identify parts of speech that are found in their local languages and the target language. The local language learning experiences in a school context contributes a lot to acquiring this skill although they have their own terminologies, the multilinguals realize the universality of the parts of speech in their local languages and the target language. Having the knowledge of structural similarities and differences among different languages, the multilinguals used them as a building block of the target language sentence construction during communication. For example, S14 replied that there were rule similarities and differences between his mother tongue *Sidamigna* and the English language. Here, it is important to present the example he has given.

Example (1) He bought a new car. (English)
> *Isi haaro yanatte kameela hidhinno. (Sidamigna)*

He has discussed the examples as follows:

> በሲዳምኛ *(Isi)* የሚለው ተውላጠ ስም *(su'mu)* በኢንግሊዘኛ ቆንቆ *(he)*የሚለውን ተውላጠ ስም *(pronoun)* ያገልፃል፡፡ይህም በስም ቦታ እየገባ የስምን ተግባር ያከናውናል፤ በዓረፍት ነገር መጀመሪያ ላይ በመግባትም እንዲ ባለቤት *Riqiwancho (subject)* ያገለግላል፡፡ እንዲሁም ቅጽል, *xawisaancho (adjective)* የሀነው *(haaro yanatte)* ስም *(suma)* በኢንግሊዘኛ ቆንቆ *(noun)* የሀነውን *car (kameela)* ይገልፃል፡፡ በተጨማሪም *hidhinno* የሚለው ግስ *(gurda)* በኢንግሊዘኛ ቆንቆ *(verb)* የሀነውን *bought* ይገልፃል *(S14)*::

Based on the given example, it can be suggested that in the English language 'He'- is a pronoun used as a subject, 'has bought'- is a present perfect tense verb, 'a'- is an article, 'modern'- is an adjective and 'car'- is a noun used as an object. Whereas, in his mother tongue Sidamigna '*Isi*' (he) is a pronoun (*su'mu*) used as subject (*riqiwancho*) 'haaro yanatte'- is an adjective (*xawisaancho*) used to describe the noun (*suma*) car (*kameela*) and '*hidhinno*'- is the verb has bought (*gurda*).

Based on the given examples, it can be suggested that both languages have parts of speeches that have their own terminologies. Both began with capital letters and ended with full stops. In both cases the adjective (*Xawisaancho*) came before the noun (*suma*) to describe it. However, the parts of speeches in both languages have their own grammatical rules. Similarly, S1 stated that there were parts of speeches in his L3- English, L2-Amharic and L1-*Afan Oromo*. He substantiated his point of view using the following examples:

Example (2) He submitted his report earlier than his classmates. (English)
> እሱ ከክፍል ተማሪዎቹ ቀድሞ ሪፖርቱን አቀረበ፡፡(Amharic)
> *Inni barattoota daree isaa dura gabaasa isaa dhiheesse. (Afan Oromo)*

He has further shown structural similarities and differences among the languages where the parts of speech appeared in each sentence. To begin with the similarities, the pronoun 'He', (እሱ) and (*Inni*) came at the beginning of each sentence in each language. However, the past verb (submitted) was followed by the subject in case of English, but in the case of Amharic and *Afan Oromo* (አቀረበ) and (*dhiheesse*) appeared at the end of the sentences, respectively. According to his report, there was also great difference in the place of the object in English, Amharic and Afan Oromo languages. It followed the subject in the English language, but the (ሪፖርቱን) and (*gabaasa isaa*) appeared before the verb in both Amharic and Afan Oromo, respectively. In addition, there was a great difference in the place of the time adverb (earlier than his classmates) in English sentence and its Amharic and *Afan Oromo* versions. According to the rule of the English language, it appeared at the end of the active sentence if the emphasis does not fall on it. However, in the case of Amharic and Afan Oromo languages (ከክፍል ተማሪዎቹ ቀድሞ) and (*barattoota daree isaa dura*) came between the subjects and objects.

Similarly, S3 stated that the knowledge of her L1 Agewugna and L2 Amharic helped her to know the structure of the target language. She supported her point of view using the following examples.

Example (3) Ethiopia is a multilingual country. (English)

ኢትዮጵያ ብዙ ቋንቋ ተናጋሪ ሀገር ነች:: (Amharic)

ኢትዮጵያ ሚንች ኩንኪ ዲብስታትክ አጋር ኽ:: (Agewugna)

She (*S3)* has discussed the given examples in the extract below.

በኢንግሊዘኛ ፣ አማርኛ እና አገውኛ ቋንቋዎች በተሰጠው ዓረፍተ ነገር ውስጥ ስም (Noun) የሆነው ኢትዮጵያ (Ethiopia) በዓረፍተ ነገሮቹ መጀመሪያ ላይ በመግባት እንደ ባለቤት (subject) ያገለግላል::በኢንግሊዘኛ ቋንቋ ረዳት ግስ (auxiliary verb) የሆነው (is) ከዓረፍተ ነገሩ ባለቤት ቀጥሎ የገባ ሲሆን ነገር ግን በአማርኛ እና አገውኛ ቋንቋዎች ረዳት ግሶች (ነች) እና (ኽ) በዓረፍተ ነገሮቹ መጨረሻ ላይ ይገኛሉ:: በተጨማሪ ም a multilingual፣ ብዙ ቋንቋ የሚነገርባት እና ሚንች ኩንኪ ዲብስታትክ የሚሉት ቅጽሎች country፣ ሀገር እና አጋር የሚሉትን ስሞች ቀድመው በመግባት ስሞቹን የሚገልጹ ሚና ይጫወታሉ::

As she has discussed the given examples, the subject Ethiopia (ኢትዮጵያ) appeared at the beginning of the sentence in each language. However, the helping verb (is) followed the subject in the case of English while (ነች) and (ኽ) came at the end of the sentences in Amharic and Agewugna languages, respectively. In addition, the adjective- 'multilingual' (ብዙ ቋንቋ ተናጋሪ) and (ሚንች ኩንኪ ዲብስታትክ) in each sentence was used to describe the noun country (ሀገር) and (አጋር) in each language. Therefore, by comparing and contrasting the structures of local languages and target language, S3 learned the grammar of the target language effectively.

As pointed out by S11, he could understand the difference between the structures of the English language and his local languages. The rule of the English active sentence construction followed Subject-Verb-Object arrangement. However, in the case of his L1 Kafigna and L2 Amharic, the subject came first and it was followed by an object, while the verb came at the end (i.e, S-O-V). He illustrated this point of view using the example given in English and its Amharic and Kafigna versions I that order:

Example (4) They drank coffee. (English)

እነሱ ቡና ጠጡ:: (Amharic)

Arenao buno uchitete. (Kafigna)

In his further description of this example, 'They' (እነሱ) (*Arenao*) - is a subject, 'drank' (ጠጡ) (*uchitete*) - is a past verb and 'coffee' (ቡና) (*buno*) - is an object in English, Amharic and *Kafigna* languages, respectively. Thus, the knowledge of sentence structures in both local languages helped him not to commit mistakes in L3 sentence construction.

It can be concluded that the Ethiopian languages are head finals, while the English language is head initial in the case of normal word order (Ferguson, 1970). According to Ferguson, the normal word order refers to the familiar sentence structure without emphasis. To clarify this point of view using the example given in Kafigan above, the S-O-V structure is a common sentence construction in Ethiopian languages which is similar to S-V-O structure of the English sentence. However, it is possible to change the emphasis using O-V-S structure: *Buno uchitete Arenao*. In this sentence, the emphasis is given to the object *buno* (coffee). This shows that the order of the verb is different in a normal declarative sentence and a sentence with emphasis. Therefore, the analysis of prior languages and target language helped the learners to know structural similarities and differences among the languages to use them in target language learning.

3.2.2. Language controlling skill
As the interview data reveal, the multilingual additional language learners have language controlling skills. They used defining the meaning of words in context and referencing as an L3 controlling strategy. Out of 15 interviewees, 13 replied that that they always used context clues to define the meaning of unfamiliar words in reading or listening texts. They believe that one word could have several meanings in different contexts, and they look at the words or phrases that appear before and

after the new words s to guess its contextual meaning. However, 2 respondents usually use contextual clues and dictionary equally to define the meaning of unfamiliar words. As S9 explained, she usually defines the meaning of a word in context using clues before and after that word in L3 learning. Her reading experiences in her L1 (Amharic) and L2 (*Wolaytigna)* have helped her to use this strategy. According to S6, during reading and listening she had limited time and looking for the new vocabularies in a dictionary was not her choice because that interrupted her reading speed and affected her comprehension. Because of this, she guessed the meaning of unfamiliar words she encountered in reading that helped her to focus on the main idea of the text.

In the same way, the respondents in this study acquired the referencing skills to comprehend and keep the flow of idea in the L3 texts. They are aware that pronouns are used to refer to nouns such as people, things, times and places. Thus, the students use them to avoid repetition during communications. For example, S1 and S14 replied that there are pronouns in their local languages and the target language. They use these pronouns to avoid repetition in writing and speaking. In addition, based on their local language knowledge of pronouns, they easily comprehend reading texts since pronouns represent certain nouns earlier mentioned in the text. As to S13, he always found pronouns that referred to places, people and times in reading and he looked for the suitable nouns stated before them to understand their meanings. That was important for him to recognize reference words represented the same idea with the nouns mentioned earlier in the text.

3.2.3. Translation skill

Translation skill was the other factor for MLA of the multilingual participants that contributed to their L3 proficiency. All the respondents replied that translation was an unavoidable strategy in EFL learning and they code-switched between their local languages and L3 as L3 learning resource. Although it has been ignored by many teachers in the EFL classroom, learners still use it as an additional language learning strategy (Artar, 2017). Therefore, the multilinguals used it during listening, speaking, reading and writing lessons for different purposes in the present study.

They employed it to generate ideas during target language production. This helped them to ease memory constraints that challenge the EFL learners. As S4 replied, whenever a written assignment was given to him, first he outlined its content in his mind using his L1 *Gamogna* and L2 Amharic before he began writing in his L3. This was also true for S3 as she replied she usually activated her L1 *Agawugna* and L2 Amharic in her repertoire when L3 spoken and written lessons were given. For S7, generating ideas through translation was important to reduce anxiety during L3 learning. Particularly, she felt free and relaxed during writing and speaking lessons, since this technique monitored her social atmosphere of the class. She underlined that translation is a basic secrete for her success in L3 learning.

The multilinguals used translation for better comprehension during L3 reading and listening sessions/lessons. In support of this view, S9 replied that she often translated what had been written and said in her mind into her local languages L1 Amaharic and L2 *Wolaytigna* when she read and listened texts that were written in English. During this process, she activated her repertoire and audited her prior language knowledge in line with the topic under consideration. She used this as the target language learning strategy because she had already stored the real world knowledge of different topics in her schema using prior local languages. For S15, translation was used as L3 comprehension strategy that has helped her to stick to the context and hold the centrality of the lessons; especially in speaking and writing. This has helped her to keep the flow of ideas that was difficult for many EFL learners.

4. Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to find out the association of multilingualism with English language proficiency in terms of the role of metalinguistic awareness of the multilingual speakers. The results of the study revealed that the multilingual participants outperformed the monolingual counterparts in the proficiency test. Perhaps they used the theoretically stated factors of the MLA as L3 learning resources.

The multilinguals used language analysis skill as an L3 learning resource. Since they were experienced language learners, they exploited all available prior language grammars at their disposal. For example, they had the skill to understand the use of grammatical forms and structures among their prior languages and target language appropriately. Realizing the sentence structure differences among the languages, they approached the target language sentence construction according to its language specific rules. Formal instruction of their L1s and L2s contributed to this skill because in the classroom context, both form and meaning are given emphasis (Angelovska, 2018).

It is clear that there is no structural similarity between the Ethiopian languages and the English language in which the students directly apply the form of local language grammar to L3. However, due to the explicit instruction of prior language structures, the students managed the overlaps of structures among the source languages and target language. They maintain the structures of different languages in their repertoire separately to avoid rule interference. To do this, they have conceptual systems in their mind that stores the structures of different languages separately (Davidson *et al.,* 2019). This helped them to develop better awareness of the grammatical forms and reflect upon the structures of the source languages and target language to enhance their L3 proficiency. Consciously, comparing and contrasting how the grammars of different languages work in their repertoire, they approached the L3 grammars according to its language specific rules (Rauch *et al*., 2011). This finding lends support to Dimitrenko (2017) who found that the multilinguals used the knowledge of language analysis skill to compare the relationships between the source languages and target language to use the common features during the target language learning controlling negative transfers.

The multilingual L3 learners have language controlling mechanisms of defining the meaning of unfamiliar words in context and referencing skills as a result of prior language learning experiences. They believed that a word can have several meanings in its context and using context clues helped them to get the meaning of certain word according to its specific use in the given context. Reading experiences in their local languages (L1 and L2s) contribute a lot to the development of L3 reading comprehension. Benzehaf (2021) argued that the multilinguals transferred their prior language learning experiences to target language as the target language learning strategy when they are at the threshold level in the source languages. Thus, the reading process appears the same for all languages except language specific characteristics of orthography and grammatical structure of the languages. This shows that reading is supposed to be learned and subsequently transferred from the prior language learning experience to target language as it is a part of metacognitive skill (Oxford, 1990). At this stage, the students used their cumulative knowledge of syntactic and semantic information and their background knowledge as a control processing when they interacted with the L3 written text. Likewise, the participants acquired the referencing skills as language controlling mechanism to comprehend and keep the flow of idea in the L3 texts. They believed that pronouns used to refer to nouns and employed to avoid repetition in addition to keeping the flow of ideas. Such attention function regulates the meaning making cognitive process of the students, and it is a central component of their academic success in L3 learning (Bialystok, 2001a). Having the knowledge of defining the meaning of words in context and referencing skills, the students engaged in higher order processing of comprehension and interpretation of the meanings communicated in the reading text. This finding is also consistent with Benzehaf (2021) and Rauch *et al*. (2011) that found out the L1s and L2s reading experiences contribute to L3 reading proficiency.

The multilinguals think through their linguistic repertoires during L3 learning. They translate different concepts they think as important from the languages they know to L3 and vis-à-vis as target

language learning resource. During L3 learning, the mental system that stores the other language is not completely at rest and the students activated all their prior languages in their repertoire for better L3 learning. Thus, the interconnected language systems that embedded within the multilinguals' memory are activated and rapid mental switching between multiple linguistic systems takes place during L3 learning. This enhanced their L3 proficiency as they bring authentic language resources into the classroom through translation. They used it for idea generation, anxiety reduction and centrality claiming during writing in L3 (Hungwe, 2021). They also used it to associate meaning and control comprehension during reading and listening. In all cases, they activated their repertoire and audited their prior knowledge in terms of the target language lessons for better comprehension. This shows that when the students are allowed to use translation from the local languages visa-vise to target language, their critical thinking skills will be developed. They also deeply understand the topic under discussion in the target language which lead to the overall proficiency of the students.

Although translation has been marginalized in Communicative Language Teaching because of its negative connotation of the Grammar Translation Method, the multilinguals used it during L3 learning as a multilingual pedagogy (Woll, 2020). Since translation takes place in the mind of the learners as metacognitive language learning strategy, it cannot be directly observed and the learners used it as an integral part of their classroom practice by their own right (Munoz-Basols, 2019). Beiler and Dewilde (2020) argued that translation is rehabilitated in multilingual turn and situating the learners in their wider linguistic repertoires enhances additional language learning. This implies that multilinguals are more conscious additional language learners than monolinguals that can use their prior languages wisely (Hungwe, 2021). Thus, the present study insisted that L3 learning should be out of the comfort zone that advocates the English Only approach in language teaching; the students should utilize translation as a resource in L3 learning rather than devaluing its potential advantages.

5. Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to discover the association of multilingualism with English language proficiency in terms of the role of MLA. The results of the study have shown that there is a significance difference between the results of the proficiency test among multilingual and monolingual participants. Likewise, the data collected using interview revealed that the MLA factors: language analysis, language control and translation skills seem to be the predictors of the L3 proficiency of multilinguals. The multilinguals have the skills to analyze the structures of their prior languages and L3. Thus, through comparing the structural similarities and differences among the languages they enhance their L3 proficiency. Since they were fully biliterate, they transferred the reading strategies of defining the meaning of unfamiliar words using context clues and referencing skills of prior languages to L3 learning. The participants also denoted that translation plays a positive role in their L3 learning. They refer back to their local languages and make effective cross-lingual comparisons in their mind and employ it as L3 learning resource. These findings may fill the gaps among opposing paradigms of English Only approaches and Multilingual Pedagogy which advocates the use of prior language knowledge as a resource in additional language learning.

6. Recommendation

In order to get maximum benefit from multilingualism in L3 learning, the Department of English Language and Literature, instructors and students of Hawassa University should work hand-in-hand. To begin with the Department of English Language and Literature, should train the instructors to implement a multilingual pedagogical approach in the L3 classroom because their beliefs strongly influence their pedagogical decisions. Likewise, the instructors should promote the potential benefits of applying the new approach in the classroom. They should hold the view of multilingualism as an asset in L3 learning and motivate students to employ their prior language knowledge during L3 learning without prejudice. Students, whether monolinguals or multilinguals, should be open to learn more local languages. The more languages they learn, the better MLA skills they will develop and

more opportunities of source language will emerge during L3 learning. As a result, the linguistic diversity of the students in the University becomes a source of L3 proficiency. The present study compared the monolingual and multilingual L3 learners of Hawassa University in terms of the role of MLA of the multilingual speakers. Future research could also benefit from investigating L3 instructors' perspectives of the multilingual pedagogy and their classroom practice.

7. References

Alieto, E. 2018. Language shift from English to mother tongue: Exploring language attitude and willingness to teach among pre-service teachers. *TESOL International Journal*, 13 (3): 134-146.

Angelovska, T. 2018. Cross-linguistic awareness of adult L3 learners of English: A focus on metalinguistic reflections and proficiency. *Language Awareness*, 27 (1-2): 136-152.

Aronin, L. and Singleton, D. 2008. Multilingualism as a new linguistic dispensation. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5 (1): 1-16.

Artar, P. 2017. The role of translation in foreign-language teaching. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Tarragona: Rovira and Virgili University.

Bachman, L. and Palmer, A. 1996. *Language testing in practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bakar, E. 2020. Can-do descriptors–realigning English language curriculum at higher education institution to CEFR. *International Journal of Modern Languages and Applied Linguistics,* 4 (2): 84-97.

Beiler, I. and Dewilde, J. 2020. Translation as translingual writing practice in English as an additional language. *The Modern Language Journal*, 104 (3): 533-549.

Benzehaf, B. 2021. Language learning strategies reported by successful English language learners. *Journal of Applied Language and Culture Studies,* 4 (3): 143-160.

Berthele, R. 2021. The extraordinary ordinary: Re-engineering multilingualism as a natural category. *Language Learning,* 71 (S1): 80–120.

Bialystok, E. 2001a. *Bilingualism in development: Language, literacy and cognition*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Bogdan, R. and Biklen, S. 1992. *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Brown, G., Bull, J. and Pendlebury, M. 1997. *Assessing student learning in higher education*. London: Routledge.

Brown, G., Glasswell, K. and Harland, D. 2004. Accuracy in the scoring of writing: Studies of reliability and validity using a New Zealand writing assessment system. *Assessing Writing*, 9 (2): 105- 121.

Cenoz, J. 2013. The influence of bilingualism on third language acquisition: Focus on multilingualism. *Language Teaching*, 46 (1): 71-86.

Central Statistical Agency. 2008. Summary and statistical report of the 2007 population and housing census. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. Addis Ababa. (https://www.csa.gov.et/pdf/Cen2007_firstdraft.pdf). (Accessed on January 7, 2021).

Cohen, C., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. 2007. *Research methods in education* (6th Ed.). New York: Routledge- Taylor and Francis Group.

Council of Europe. 2001a. *Common European framework of reference for languages learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. 2018. Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching and assessment. Companion volume with new descriptors. (https://www.coe.int/lang-cefr). (Accessed November 10, 2020).

Creswell, J. 2009. *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (3rd Ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.

_____. 2014. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. (4th Ed.). Sage.

Cromdal, J. 1999. Childhood bilingualism and metalinguistic skills: Analysis and control in young Swedish–English bilinguals. *Applied Psycholinguistics,* 20 (1): 1–20.

Davidson, D., Vanegas, S., Hilvert, E., Rainey, V. and Misiunaite, I. 2019. Examination of monolingual (English) and bilingual (English/Spanish; English/Urdu) children's syntactic awareness. *Journal of Child Language*, 46 (4): 682–706.

De Angelis, G. 2007. *Third or additional language learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

De Bot, K. 2019. Defining and assessing multilingualism. In: Schwieter, J. W. (Ed.), *The handbook of the neuroscience of multilingualism* (pp. 3-18). Wiley Blackwell.

De Groot, A. and Christoffels, I. 2006. Language control in bilinguals: Monolingual tasks and simultaneous interpreting. Bilingualism: *Language and Cognition*, 9 (2): 189–201.

Dendrinos, B. and Mitsikopoulou, B. 2012. *Exam preparation in school the B level (B1 & B2)*. Students' book. Athens: RCe.

Department of English Language and Literature. n.d. Basic writing skills (EnLa 1012). Abridged handout. Jimma University.

Diaz, R. and Klingler, C. 1991. Towards an explanatory model of the interaction between bilingualismand cognitive development. In: Bialystok, E. (Ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children.* UK, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. PP. 167–191.

Dimitrenko, V. 2017. Language learning strategies of multilingual adults learning additional languages. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 14 (1): 6-22.

Dörnyei, Z. 2007. *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods.* London: Oxford University Press.

ESOL Examinations. 2012. Cambridge English preliminary. Cambridge: Council of Europe.

European Commission. 2007. High level group on multilingualism. (http://www. ec.europea /polices/ lang/doc). (Accessed on Febraury 13, 2021).

Falk, Y., Lindqvist, C. and Bardel, C. 2015. The role of L1 explicit metalinguistic knowledge in L3 oral production at the initial state. *Bilingualism*: *Language and Cognition*, 18 (2): 227–235.

Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. 2009. Higher education proclamation No. 650/2009, *Negarit Gazeta*. 64, 4976-5044. Addis Ababa.

Ferguson, C. 1970. The Ethiopian language area. *Journal of Ethiopian Studies*, 8 (2): 67-80.

Foley, J. 2019. Issues on assessment using CEFR in the region. *Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 12 (2): 28-48.

Gonzalez-Davies, M. 2020. *The Routledge handbook of translation and education.* London and New York: Taylor and Francis group.

Gorter, D. and Cenoz, J. 2017. Language education policy and multilingual assessment. *Language and Education*, 31 (3): 231-248.

Hammarberg, B. 2010. The languages of the multilingual: Some conceptual and terminological issues. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 48 (2-3): 91–104.

Herdina, P. and Jessner, U. 2002. *A dynamic model of multilingualism. Perspectives of changing the psycholinguistic perspective.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Herzog-Punzenberger, B. 2017. *Multilingual education in the light of diversity: Lessons learned. NESET II report*, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Hungwe, M. 2021. An insight into South African multilingual students' perceptions about using translanguaging during group discussion. *Applied Linguistics*, 42 (2): 252-268.

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

_____. 2008a. A DST model of multilingualism and the role of metalinguistic awareness. *The Modern Language Journal,* 92 (2): 270-283.

_____. 2017. Language awareness in multilinguals: Theoretical trends. In: Cenoz, J., Gorter, D. and May, S. (Eds.), *Language awareness and multilingualism*. Switzerland: Springer. PP. 19–29.

Jia, G., Aaronson, D. and Wu, Y. 2002. Long-term language attainment of bilingual immigrants: Predictive variables and language group differences. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 23 (4): 599–621.

Jonsson, A. and Svingby, G. 2007. The use of scoring rubrics: Reliability, validity and educational consequences. *Educational Research Review*, 2 (2): 130-144.

Kasimova, M. 2021. Comparative study of bilingual and monolingual children in acquiring grammar strategies. *The American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 3 (01): 128-147.

Kerr, P. 2014. *Translation and own-language activities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lemma, Tesfaye and Alebel, Dessie. 2004. *The best way to review and prepare for all English examinations. A complete revision for all English examinations*. Addis Ababa: Mega Printing Enterprise.

Lightbown, P. and Spada, N. 2021. *How languages are learned (5th Ed.)*. Oxford University Press

Malakoff, M. and Hakut, K. 1991. Translation skill and metalinguistic awareness in bilinguals. In: Bialystok, E. (Eds.), *Language processing in bilingual children*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. PP. 113=140.

Mendisu, B. and Johannessen, J. 2016. *Multilingual Ethiopia: Linguistic challenges and capacity building efforts*. Oslo: University of Oslo.

Munoz -Basols, J. 2019. Going beyond the comfort zone: Multilingualism, translation and mediation to foster plurilingual competence. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 32 (3): 299-321.

Munoz, C. 2000. Bilingualism and trilingualism in school students in Catalonia. In: Cenoz, J and Jessner, U. (Eds.), *English in Europe: The acquisition of a third language*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto, Sydney: Multilingual Matters Ltd. PP. 157-178.

Myres-Scotton, C. 2002. *Contact linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Neuser, H. 2017. Source language of lexical transfer in multilingual learners. Academic dissertation for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Stockholm University, Stockholm.

Oxford, R. 1990. *Language learning strategies*: *What every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Paradis, M. 1994. Toward a neurolinguistic theory of simultaneous translation: The framework. *International Journal of Psycholinguistics*, 10 (3): 319–335.

Peric, B. and Mijic, N. 2017. Cross-linguistic influences in third language acquisition (Spanish) and the relationship between language proficiency and types of lexical errors. *Croatian Journal of Education,* 19 (2): 91-107.

Rauch, P., Naumann, J. and Jude, N. 2011. Metalinguistic awareness mediates effects of full biliteracy on third-language reading proficiency in Turkish–German bilinguals. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 16 (4): 402–418.

Renandya, W., Hamied, F. and Nurkamto, J. 2018. English language proficiency in Indonesia: Issues and prospects. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15 (3): 618.

Richards, J. and Rodgers, T. 2014. *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. and Schmidt, R. 2010. *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (4th Ed.). Pearson Education.

Roberts, E. 1993. Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly,* 27 (1): 1-18.

Rothman, J. 2011. L3 syntactic transfer selectivity and typological determinacy: The typological primacy model. *Second Language Research*, 27 (1): 107-127.

Safont, J. and Pilar, M. 2005. *Third language learners: Pragmatic production and awareness*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Seidel, K. and Moreitz, J. 2009. Changes in Ethiopia's language and education policy: Pioneering reforms?. In: Ege, S., Aspen, H., Teferra, B. and Bekele, S. (Eds.), Proceedings of the 16th International Conference of Ethiopian Studies, Trondheim.

Thomas, M. 1994. Assessment of L2 proficiency in second language acquisition research. *Language Learning*, 44 (2): 307–336.

Wilson, J. and González-Davies, M. 2017. Tackling the plurilingual student/monolingual classroom phenomenon through translation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51 (1): 207–219.

Woll, N. 2020. Towards crosslinguistic pedagogy: Demystifying pre-service teachers' beliefs regarding the target-language-only rule. (https://www. doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102275). (Accessed on January 7, 2021).