2019

PRACTICING TRANSLINGUALISM: FACULTY CONCEPTIONS AND PRACTICES

Adrienne Jones Daly
University of Rhode Island, adriennejdaly@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss

Recommended Citation

Daly, Adrienne Jones, "PRACTICING TRANSLINGUALISM: FACULTY CONCEPTIONS AND PRACTICES" (2019). *Open Access Dissertations*. Paper 855.
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss/855

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

PRACTICING TRANSLINGUALISM: FACULTY CONCEPTIONS AND
PRACTICES

BY

ADRIENNE JONES DALY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

ENGLISH, SPECIALIZATION IN RHETORIC AND COMPOSITION

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
2019

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DISSERTATION

OF

ADRIENNE JONES DALY

APPROVED:

Dissertation Committee

Major Professor: Lehua Ledbetter

Nedra Reynolds

Kathleen Torrens

Ingrid Lofgren

Dean of the Graduate School: Nasser H. Zawia

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

2019

ABSTRACT

Translingualism (Horner, Lu, Royster, & Trimbur, 2011; Sugiharto, 2015) has received increasing interest in recent years as a way of recognizing and valuing students' linguistic diversity and of pushing back against language ideology that can disenfranchise minority groups. Composition scholarship has taken on the task of understanding how to implement the translingual paradigm in the writing classroom and has examined the importance of an openness to language difference in reading practices (Gallagher & Noonan, 2017; Horner, 2017) and assessment practices (Kraemer Sohan, 2014; Dryer & Mitchell, 2017) and at translanguaging, or code-meshing, in student writing (Canagarajah, 2011; Lu; Bommarito & Cooney, 2016) and in academic and literary works (Ahmad & Nero, 2012; Horner, 2017). Receiving less discussion are the language practices of college composition instructors. Yet if we understand our language practices to be the embodiment of our language ideology (Tardy, 2011), then the translingual approach would benefit from understanding how writing instructors use language in the classroom. Using semi-structured interviews, this study took a grounded theory approach to examine how instructors understand translingualism and how they perceived and used their own language histories, including multilingual resources, for teaching writing. Even though the instructors of this interview knew languages other than English, they used English predominantly in the classroom. However, they employed their fuller language histories—their experiences with language and language difference as well as their knowledge of multiple languages—in multiple ways to help students develop a translingual orientation, to make visible the diversity and complexity of language practices, and to value students' own language histories and practices.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First thanks to my husband Josh. We're a team, dude! To my girls. You provided the yin to the yang of grad studies. To Mama Maureen, Eileen, and Emily. I couldn't have done this without you. To my roots, deep in the red Virginia soil: Mom, Dad, and Ves.

To all the friends who helped out and cheered me on. Thank you. To my advisor, Lehua, who imparted wisdom, sympathy, and encouragement. To my supportively questioning committee: Nedra, Kathleen, and Ingrid. To Etienne, Mary, Molly, Joelle,

Elena, DB, Keiko, and Cat. Not only did you make this project possible, your enthusiasm and interest in it bolstered my own confidence in its value. Plus, y'all are all so dang smart and cool. I hope I did right by you! And all praise to my Creator God, my

strength, hope, and promise. May this work do Yours.

DEDICATION

Ljubo Lulić, in memoriam. You would be so proud.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
DEDICATION	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
CHAPTER ONE: 鼻水.....	1
Providing a Constellation of Translingual Practices.....	20
CHAPTER TWO Making Composition Linguistically Diverse with A Translingual Approach	22
Monolingualism and Standard Language Ideology	23
Defining the Translingual Approach	30
Translingual Practices	39
How Students Learn about Translingual Writing	48
Missing: Teachers' Language Practices in the Classroom	50
A Closer Look at Translanguaging	60
A Linguistic View of Translanguaging.....	61
Bilingual Education.....	63
Second Language Learning	67
Conclusion	69
CHAPTER THREE Methodology	72
Methodological Frameworks	72
Study Methods	76
Recruitment	76
Bias Towards Translingualism.....	78
Data Collection.....	79
Preparation of Data for Analysis	88

Data Analysis	91
Member Checking.....	112
CHAPTER FOUR Language Histories in The Translingual Classroom	114
Language Practices in the Classroom	115
Using English	116
Using Languages Other than English.....	119
Using Other Modes and Communicative Practices	127
The Importance of a Shared Language	129
Speaking versus Writing	130
Translanguaging as Part of the Process of Translingual Writing	131
Using Their Language Histories	144
Rhetorical Attunement and Paying Attention to Translation Moments	144
Focusing on Communication and Its Negotiation.....	159
Vulnerability and Creating Safe Spaces.....	164
Language and Culture	178
Localizing the Translingual Classroom	182
Conclusion	195
CHAPTER FIVE Reframing Translingual Writing	198
Looking at Process—Translanguaging Under the Hood	201
Navigating the Tensions of Translingual Writing	213
Revisiting the Idea of Language Difference	226
Using Language Histories to Create a Translanguaging Space	230
Importance of Being Multilingual and Going Further	241
Conclusion	246
APPENDIX A – Interview Scripts	251
BIBLIOGRAPHY	254

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1 – Example of Simultaneous Coding.....	101
Figure 3.2 – Network for Code {LgPr: crossing}	114
Figure 3.3 – Network for Code {TLG Using Multiple Languages}	109
Figure 3.4 – Coding-Participant Pairing.....	112
Figure 5.1 – The Process of Communicating Rhetorically	201

CHAPTER ONE: 鼻水

Throughout much of the time that I worked on this dissertation project, a particular memory popped up repeatedly. It was from when I was an English teacher in Japan, right after college. I had arrived in the country with little knowledge of the culture and even less familiarity with the language. Learning a language in total immersion was a thrilling and challenging experience. I connected with a group of the younger teachers at my school; despite various levels of fluency in Japanese and English on our parts, we bonded through our shared ages and the sense of adventure and camaraderie that comes from being in one's mid-twenties.

One day, I was explaining to one of my friends the American Sign Language (ASL) sign for “water”: three fingers held up in the sign for W, and then tapped against the chin. “*Mizu*,” I said. “Water.” My colleague's knowledge of English was roughly the same as my level of Japanese, and neither of us knew much ASL. But we were having fun with the sign, joking about what other similar gestures could stand for, when he laughingly pretended to stick his finger up his nose.

“*Kore wa?*” he said. “What's this sign?”

“*Hanamizu*,” I replied instantly. “Nose water”—the expression for a runny nose. (In kanji, *hanamizu* is written 鼻水, the characters for nose and water.) We both burst out laughing, and I felt an especial pride; I had made my first joke in Japanese *and* made a native Japanese speaker laugh.

As I talked with composition instructors whom I interviewed for this study about their own language experiences and practices, as well as those of their students, my *hanamizu* story kept surfacing in my mind. That moment of language play and interplay

encapsulates much of what my participants have revealed about language use. First is the amazing creativity that comes from working among more than one language—the creation of meaning that goes beyond the words in one language or the other. Second is the role that curiosity, word play, and humor have in multilingual communication. Third is the way that proficiency—or lack thereof—in a language is only a barrier to our ideas of code-mixing if we allow it to be. Finally, it is the fact that the act of translanguaging, the moving between two or more languages, goes beyond the lexicality of code-mixing and involves multimodality of many sorts.

This study examined what it means to practice translingualism, a theoretical understanding of the dynamism of language that emphasizes the ways that we engage and even play with the multiplicity of words and meaning. My first reaction when I stumbled upon the theory of translingualism was much like that of some of my participants in this study. There was a profound sense of recognition that translingualism captured the reality of being multilingual and of working within and between a second or third language. One of my participants, Cat,¹ felt that same connection when she first heard about translingualism:

AJD: So it was something that you were exposed to through a class and doing the readings, and you said that it, because of your own background

Cat: Yeah, yeah.

AJD: was something that spoke to you?

¹ All names provided in this study are pseudonyms.

Cat: Yeah, it kind of like (.) You know, it opened my eyes. I said, “Finally.”
You know, I didn’t say “finally” but I thought, “yes.”

AJD: Right.

Cat: This is something that really explains what this is all about. ((laughs))
And I’m happy it exists. (Int. 1)

What does translingualism explain? The theory of translingualism starts from two key acknowledgements. The first is that languages are not as discrete and stable as we imagine them to be. Even what we consider to be English, or even Academic English, comes in many guises and forms, shaped by the various social and cultural contexts in which it is used. The second is that throughout history people have been multilingual and have spoken and written with language practices that are much more heterogeneous than homogeneous.

Translingualism would remain a linguistic theory except for the realization that “multilingual is mainstream” (Hall, 2014), even within the composition classroom. Since the 1960s and 1970s, there has been a growing awareness that college students in the United States are not a homogeneous group and have incredibly diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds that are often ignored or erased within the college composition classroom in the efforts to teach a *Standardized English.² Efforts such as

² I adopt Watson and Shapiro’s (2018) use of *Standardized English as a reference to the idea of a privileged, normalized variety of English. Watson and Shapiro use the “-ized” morpheme to emphasize the “ongoing and emergent historical and social processes that shape what version of English is privileged at a given place and time” (Note 1) and the myth that there is one standard, natural version of English. The use of

the SRTOL and Mina Shaughnessy's *Errors and Expectations* have been made to reposition the other languages that students have (often referred to as home languages, native languages, or vernaculars) as valid languages³ in their own rights with their own potential for knowledge-sharing and meaning-making, just as *Standardized English. Since then, there has been discussions and efforts to make room in the college composition classroom for students' other languages.

Just how to make room is not quite clear. One of the ways that composition instructors have tried to make room is by inviting students to use their other languages for talking in the classroom and for writing drafts and notes, then translating or rewriting in a *Standardized English for a final version (Elbow, 2002). However, scholars have shown that while on the surface this seems to be a positive approach—students use their languages and they learn the prestige language, win-win!—it actually continues the devaluation of the other languages (Ahmad & Nero, 2012; Jaspers, 2015).

What is actually happening is a power system that values one sort of language over another. Power dynamics are inherent in language throughout time and space, but in the United States, as in many places, these dynamics are intertwined with racism and

asterisk is also from them “in chorus with sociolinguist Rosina Lippi-Green who explains her use of *SAE as follows: ‘syntacticians use an asterisk to mark utterances which are judged grammatically inauthentic. I am adapting that practice here, and will use *SAE to refer to that mythical beast, the idea of homogenous, standard American English’” (62) (Watson & Shapiro, 2018, Note 1).

³ I frequently use the term “language” in this dissertation to refer to not just named languages such as English, Spanish, or Swahili but also to language varieties and social languages, often designated as vernaculars or dialects. Although the dynamics faced by different varieties and languages can be vastly different (Gilyard, 2016; Watson &

xenophobia. Writing in 1974, Geneva Smitherman, cuts straight to the point:

After all, if the dialect is not a problem, but sociolinguistic attitudes are, then why not work to change those attitudes? While we may be talkin about Blacks enterin the mainstream, we can change the course of the stream. Not CAN but IS—since Black language (as well as other Black cultural patterns) is rapidly being adopted by whites. Not CAN but GOT TO—since cultural plurality don’t mean remake Black folk in white face. Anyway, if racism persist, all the language education in the world won’t help you. (p. 14)

Smitherman calls out the reality that it doesn’t matter how White a person of color may talk or write; it doesn’t matter how much they learn a particular variety of English; if racism exists, their language skills won’t keep it from affecting them. The alternative, as she sees it, is to rethink diversity as a plurality of voices.

This is where translingualism comes in. Translingualism centers that plurality as the norm and reframes the way we teach composition and changes the way we understand good writing to focus on communication instead of form. A translingual perspective demands composition scholars and instructors to reconsider how Whiteness is wrapped up with what we consider to be “good language” and how composition’s insistence on a certain variety of English (instead of other named languages or other varieties) (Ahmad & Nero, 2012) continues to disadvantage some students rather than

Shaipro, 2018) there is enough in common to make some general observations here. When important and needed, I distinguish between these different categories.

others. As a theory, translingualism asks us to consider that maybe instead of saying people need to write and speak a certain way, we (meaning particularly those from White, English-speaking, middle- and upper-class backgrounds) learn to read and listen in a different way, that we change the very way we expect to engage with language⁴.

Translingualism wants to bring a plurality of voices into writing and to make that plurality legitimate rather than innovative or inappropriate. Translingualism asks why one accent, one way of talking is perceived better than another—why the Southerner must change her accent to be “better understood” and the Brooklynite must change his accent to not be perceived as stupid. The emphasis on plurality, however, doesn’t mean Babel and the dissolution of communication. It doesn’t mean “anything goes”:

Speaking to the legitimacy of minority dialects in the English classroom do not mean abdication of responsible language teaching. It do not mean lettin kids get away with irresponsible, disorganized uses of language and communication.

Righteous teachers taking care of business in the English classroom must see to it that kids learn to compose coherent, documented, specific, logical—in short, rhetorically powerful oral and/or written communications. There’s good rappers and there’s bad rappers, and anything do not go in the Black community, just as

⁴ A translingual perspective asks why the spelling check of my word processor doesn’t recognize Black English and doesn’t even have that option, even though it is known to be another variety of English. For the record, the available languages include British English, Canadian English (but not Canadian French), and American English. Spanish from Spain is also an option, as is French (France) and French (Switzerland). Language varieties from Latin American, the Caribbean, Africa, and Asia are not included.

anything does not go in the white community. Uhm talkin bout redefinin what do go. And it mean more than zero in on usage, on such trivia as movin students from they house to their house. (Smitherman, 1974, p. 15)

Geneva Smitherman's text develops her argument for legitimization of students' home languages doing the very thing it calls to do: bringing in Black English with what we might call an Academic English. It forces us to re-examine what counts as a scholarly text.⁵ If a reader is taken aback by this text, why? Does it fail in communicating because it does not adhere to what tends to be considered a standardized Academic English?

In their landmark opinion piece, which many consider to be the translingual "manifesto," Horner, Lu, Royster, and Trimbur (2011) frame a different kind of response to these moments of *language difference*, when the language that we read (or hear) is not expected, whether due to an accent, unfamiliar words, or different ways of phrasing or using words.

By contrast, translingualism teaches language users to assume and expect that each new instance of language use brings the need and opportunity to develop new ways of using language, and to draw on a range of language resources. The ability to negotiate differences and to improvise ways to produce meaning across language differences with whatever language resources are available is

⁵ I have tried to write with a translingual approach in this document as well. Some of the ways that I have done this is by occasionally using discourses or registers one may not expect to find in academic writing; leaving "errors" in quoted text to stand as they were originally written; leaving quotations from other languages in their original

becoming increasingly necessary, not only to careers and commerce, but to the chances for peace and justice. (p. 312-313)

In addition to reframing how we respond to language difference, translanguaging has emphasized code-mixing (or code-meshing, as many translanguaging scholars prefer; see Young (2009) and Canagarajah (2013b)) as a way to challenge perceptions of a standard language and also to make the space for students to bring in their other languages and language varieties. As translanguaging theorists point out (Horner et al., 2011; Canagarajah, 2006b), the switching, mixing, meshing of languages is a common phenomenon, particularly in multilingual or multidialectal communities. These scholars have called for creating opportunities for students to code-mesh in their writing, creating texts much like Smitherman's above.

Others, however, have argued that code-meshing is inherent in all writing, even if not done as obviously as Smitherman (1974) did in the examples above. Yet others have expressed concern that encouraging code-meshing would actually be detrimental to the very students the translanguaging approach wishes to support. These tensions can be felt throughout the study and will shape the discussion in Chapter Five.

Despite these tensions, there is a lot of support for a translanguaging approach within composition studies. Many writing instructors, including Cat and me, recognize that it highlights an aspect of language use that is not reflected in the ways we teach writing and that it can help to challenge language ideology that perpetuates racism and classism. However, just how to go about teaching writing with a translanguaging approach has not

language. Unexpected language use in this dissertation is very likely to be intentional.

been as clear. In Chapter Two, I examine some of the ways that composition scholarship has taken on the task of working out what it means to practice translingualism and to teach it in the classroom, but what struck me is that it is not clear how an instructor's own language practices factor into a translingual approach in the classroom. Multilingualism of the instructors seemed to be certainly valued (Horner, NeCamp, & Donahue, 2011) and considered present (Tardy, 2011; Cushman, 2016), but not discussed. Translingualism values code-meshing, but in my own experience, I knew that I wasn't sure how to bring my own multilingual experience into the classroom.⁶ Toss out some French or Japanese greetings? Slip in "y'all" or "might could"? Use French sources in my annotated bibliography example? Code-mesh in an assignment sheet? I wanted to know what other instructors were doing, and just how multilingual we are. It seemed to me that whether instructors were multilingual and how they brought their language practices into the classroom were important questions to ask.

These questions gained weight after learning that the fields of bilingual education and, to a lesser extent, second-language studies have also been discussing the use of translanguaging as a teaching practice. Pedagogical translanguaging is when a teacher engages with students in two (or more) languages to facilitate their learning and to build their literacy practices in those two languages (Lewis et al., 2012; García & Kleyn, 2016; Cenoz & Gorter, 2017). As I explain in Chapter Two, translanguaging as a pedagogy has been connected to valorizing minority languages and helping students learn literacy practices in both languages. The potential value of a translanguaging

⁶ I echo Brogden's (2009) ethical positioning of herself within her research: "this particular research is invested; it is not neutral" (p. 90).

pedagogy for composition studies thus further emphasized the importance looking more closely at instructors' language practices in the classroom and, importantly, whether their language backgrounds played a role in how they taught a translingual approach.

When planning the research study, it became clear that in order to get a sense even of the potential language practices used in the translingual, I needed to interview composition instructors. Over the course of several months, I conducted interviews with eight composition instructors from across the United States who either independently adapted a translingual approach or who taught in a writing program that had adopted a translingual perspective. Our conversations focused on how they understood translingualism as a practice and how they practiced it in the classroom. I learned their language stories and how they used those language histories in the classroom. From those stories, I gleaned a number of practices that can be considered translingual as well as various conceptualizations of translingualism and translanguaging that help to frame the ways that participants practice translingualism. To identify these practices and conceptualizations, I used a grounded approach to coding the data that started by identifying various concepts that were linked to the ideas of translingualism (e.g., an orientation or a framework) and translanguaging (e.g., moving across languages or a pedagogy) and from there building up a rich set of practices. Chapter Three provides further details on the research methodology and the tools that were used.

My approach to this research has been influenced certainly by translingual theory, particularly in the ways that I frame language and teaching practices, but also by cultural rhetorics (Powell et al., 2014; Bratta & Powell, 2016; Ramos, 2016) and Indigenous research paradigms (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999; Wilson, 2008) which stress the

importance of honoring the voices and the efforts of those who participate in the research. As Riley-Mukavetz (2016) observes, “to carry stories is a way to practice relational accountability” (para. 3). This study would have been impossible without participants’ willingness to take time from the demands of their lives, and their interest in the project was both re-affirming of the value of my question but also humbling in its spirit of generosity. Their words echo throughout this dissertation, not just in the quotations and stories that I present but also in the very ways that I framed and analyzed the data. Because their voices are so important to this dissertation, I would like to introduce them through their own language stories. While not capable of fully capturing the complexities of their language histories nor their language practices, the stories provide a picture of who they are and what language knowledge they brought to this study.

Joelle

Joelle grew up in a household with grandparents who were Polish immigrants. Her mother and grandparents spoke the language, and although she never really learned to speak it, she does understand it to an extent. She learned French in school and has a “graduate-level” reading ability in French, but does not speak at that level. She has also studied other languages for various reasons, including in preparation for travel. She lived for a short time in China and jumped in enthusiastically to the culture and life there. She knows a “smattering” of other languages, enough to carry on basic conversations, and she will try to talk when traveling, but none of it is “thoroughly mastered.”

In the classroom, Joelle doesn't see herself as drawing on her language background and her upbringing in a bilingual context. However, at other times, she makes connections between her family background and her knowledge of communicating across language boundaries, including the importance of body language and gestures, drawing, and using language tools and the Internet. She says that she can't use her "second language knowledge" with students beyond basic greetings, but she does feel that, more than anything else, her language knowledge makes her aware of the challenges of studying and communicating in a second language.⁷ She draws heavily on her experience learning and using French when in France, mentioning often her reliance on the phrase "par exemple" [for example] as a way of getting across her meaning when her vocabulary was insufficient for a direct description.

Joelle began implementing a translingual approach as part of a group of professors who began reading and discussing different approaches for working with the increasing numbers of international students at their institution. She has been involved in reframing the learning outcomes of the writing program in a more translingual orientation.

Mary

Mary spent the early years of her life in South America, where her family spoke a

⁷ "Second language" refers to any language that a person learned in school or from living in an environment that forced them to learn a new language. Some people grow up speaking two or more languages as home or community languages and then learn other languages later in other contexts. These later languages are what I am calling second languages, even if they are not actually the second in sequence.

variety of Spanish called Castellano, which is more similar to the varieties spoken in Spain than those spoken in Central America and the Latin Caribbean. Her family immigrated to the United States when she was ten. She learned English while in school, but she also learned about other varieties of Spanish from her classmates from Spanish-speaking families. Most of these classmates spoke Spanishes from the Caribbean Latin countries, predominantly Puerto Rico, and Mary learned to adjust to different language varieties.

While attending grad school, Mary became involved with translating for medical organizations and medical groups working with Spanish-speaking populations. When she moved to her current institution, at the U.S.-Mexico border, she encountered a rich bilingual history, but also one with a history of linguistic violence. Mary's students come both from Mexico—crossing the border between the two countries each day—and also from a Mexican-American history in which previous generations experienced severe language policies against their Spanish. Mary had to adapt again to a new variety of Spanish—Mexican Spanish—but also to the “border language” that fluidly moves between Spanish and English. At the same time, she has learned to be aware that for Mexican-Americans, Spanish comes with inherited trauma, making its use problematic at times. When she first started teaching, she assumed that everyone in the class knew Spanish, but after learning the history of the language in the area, she adjusted her teaching, which I will describe later.

For Mary, translanguaging helps to frame her own language practices and those of her students in a positive, more realistic way. She learned about translanguaging from conversations that she had around her research and with her graduate studies.

Etienne

Etienne grew up considering himself a monolingual English speaker. As an adult, he has gone back into his past to recover his family's language history. His artifact for our interview was his paternal grandfather's naturalization certificate—on which the Greek family name was anglicized. Etienne noted also that his mother grew up bilingual in English and Canadian French variant used in working-class communities.

The area of New England where his mother and her family lived and where Etienne grew up had a large French-Canadian population. Etienne recalls hearing his mother using French when he was younger, but she then stopped using it when his older sister began learning French at school. He concludes that his mother was self-conscious of her working-class French, but he does not know for sure. Certainly, French was a common language of the community up into the early decades of the 20th century before language policies and other political maneuvers took place that banished French from the schools, churches, and media of the community. Etienne has since learned French as a literary language—he does not speak it and describes himself as having a passive fluency—and has used it to research his community's language history. He also has a background in creative writing and finds a great deal of overlap between creative writing pedagogy and translingual pedagogy in terms of the sensitivity to language and the willingness of readers to negotiate meaning with the author.

Now on the West Coast, Etienne teaches at a larger science and tech-oriented state university. He wryly notes the monolingual English nature of the campus and its students in contrast to the Indigenous and Hispanic history of the area. He

acknowledges the contentious and colonial history of the area and tries to present himself in class as “not just another gringo.” He teaches a first-year writing course section designed for multilingual students, but the university itself is English-only. He learned about translingualism when attending the 2010 Watson Conference at University of Louisville where many of the ideas that turned into key scholarship on translingualism (such as Horner, Lu, et al., 2011) were first presented. He was excited by the potential translingualism had to fundamentally change composition studies.

Elena

Elena grew up in the Northwest of the U.S. in what she calls a “super-white” family that was monolingual, although, she adds, her grandfather was French Canadian and both her parents learned French in school. She lived in California for six years and attributes portions of her vocabulary to that time spent there. She also spent time in Russia and Serbia learned a bit of the languages while there. She first learned about translingualism while working on her Master’s in TESOL. She is married to a German man and has learned some German through him, using it mainly to communicate to his family and occasionally together. His command of English is very high, and they often joke and play together with various languages and accents, frequently mixing and meshing languages in word play and personal jokes.

Elena describes herself as multilingual, if of limited proficiency: “Like I would consider myself a multilingual person. I have fairly limited competence (.) I have extremely limited competence ((laughs)) in my other languages, you know.” Within that sense of being multilingual, she defines herself as a language learner, and draws heavily

on that identity as a teacher. She teaches primarily non-native English speakers, and she positions herself as a language learner alongside them and as someone who happened to have learned English as a first language.

Cat

Cat grew up in Spain, and early on was aware of differences in the language she learned at school (Castilian Spanish) and the regional Spanish variant that her grandparents spoke. She began learning English at age eight in school and continued to study it up through university studies, majoring in English and Spanish. She has also learned other European languages over the years, to various levels of proficiency. Cat mentioned living in the U.K. for a short time, and at the time of the interview, she had just finished her graduate studies in the U.S. and was preparing to begin a faculty position at a U.S. college. She learned about translingualism through her grad studies and scholarship, and it resonated with her own experiences and observations of language practices.

Out of all the participants, Cat was the only one who did not speak English with an American accent. She described how she initially was hyper-aware of her language differences and constantly checking her grammar and English usage. After time, however, she saw that vigilance as “super-counter-productive,” using a great deal of energy that could be spent paying attention to how others were using language and on what she wanted to accomplish with language, rather than on “the form of what I was going to write.” In her teaching, she began to relax more with how she used language. So, while she uses English—as her student demographics are predominantly White,

suburban English speakers—she does not fret about her language use as much. However, her language and her background mark her as a minority to her students—something she was not expecting. She describes it being challenging to teach as an intersectional minority.

Molly

Molly grew up speaking English and majored in French literature before going abroad to teach English, literature, “civilization,” and phonetics in France for twenty-five years. She described how when she arrived in France, her spoken French sounded odd because she had primarily learned French from the literature: “my language was really correct but was not at all appropriate.” She also learned Russian while a student in the U.S., although she has never been to Russia. She picked up “marketplace” Italian from spending summers in Italy as an adult. Molly received a degree in TOEFL in England, where she picked up on differences in English use between the U.K. and the U.S. Molly described code-switching between French and English with her students in France. She also likes to use Russian in conferences with her Russian students (although there do not seem to be large numbers of Russian students at the school), but she does not do it very much because she does not feel as proficient in it. On her own, she has been taking online courses in another language.

She describes her own English as very formal, even in informal contexts. As she says, she is “rather literary in my everyday life,” noting with amusement that other people “probably don’t use ‘ostensibly’ in everyday language.” She often mentioned being playful in language: in one case, a playful meshing of English words with a

Russian syntax when goofing off with classmates from her Russian class; in another case, a more “formal playfulness” that comes from a very extensive background in literature and from years living in a non-English speaking place.

Molly learned about translanguaging through the same reading group as Joelle, and it connected with her efforts to orient the writing program around culture and language and to see different languages as resources. “Translanguaging is another way of being asset-based in your pedagogy.”

DB

DB grew up in the United States speaking what he calls “North American West Coast White English.” He has a memory of being reprimanded by his mom to “talk white” because he used the word “axed” instead of “asked.” When DB was 19, he spent a brief time in Brazil and learned Portuguese on the street. He had learned Spanish and French in school, but Brazil was the first time he was immersed in a language. From the three months he was there, he can speak and read Portuguese “pretty well,” but he is not familiar with academic and formal literacies.

DB has traveled a lot and quickly picks up languages and phrases as he goes, with one exception. He spent a year teaching English in an Asian country and had terrible experiences with xenophobia and with being treated with contempt. For the first time, he said, “I was fully othered.” Being treated as a “second-class citizen” left him no desire to learn the local language. DB also worked for a year in the United Kingdom and observed the many dialects present in Britain—and the ways that power and identity mapped onto people’s languages. Language was much more tied to power and

social structure in Britain than in the U.S. He also experienced some negative views of his American dialect. His experiences in Asia and in the U.K. were influential in his understanding of language and power.

DB currently teaches in a predominantly monolingual setting, but he taught while doing his Master's at a school that had many multilingual students. Those differences in demographics have in part influenced how he understands translanguaging. Most of his engagement with translanguaging theory has come out of his graduate studies.

Keiko

My eighth participant, a self-described “military brat,” Keiko grew up in the U.S. Naval community overseas from ages ten to eighteen. She has family in the U.S., and so has spent time there. Overseas, she attended school with a diverse group of kids, and so had a much more global childhood experience than she might have had in the U.S. It means also that she feels slightly like an outsider coming to the U.S., very aware of the racial divisions and how culture affects language and rhetoric. She draws on that “outsider looking in” feeling to connect with her international students and to pay attention to cultural differences in how language is being used, often adapting her speech or language to be more comprehensible to international students.

As African-American, she has spent time in Black communities and has volunteered with organizations in southern Africa and with African-American churches. She has picked up AAVE, although she considers her usual variety to be “standard” English. She also learned Spanish in high school and college and sees herself as having

a conversational understanding of the language. She doesn't, however, mention using it in any capacity, although she says it aided her ability to pronounce foreign words and names in a more accurate, less "American" accent.

Keiko is a graduate student and works as a writing instructor and a writing tutor in a program that takes a translingual perspective. The influence of translingualism on her pedagogy and tutoring is quite evident, but Keiko was not actually familiar with the term "translingualism" and often framed her pedagogical approach through the lens of culture rather than language.

Providing a Constellation of Translingual Practices

Powell et al. (2014) use the term "constellation" to express the plurality of different perspectives and the relationships between them. In Chapters Four and Five, I present a constellation around translingualism and translanguaging. If each participant, with their language histories and translingual practices, is a star in this constellation, then my interpretation and presentation of their stories and the practices they reveal serve as the finger tracing a shape in the sky and the story that connects these stars. Others may read these stories and see a different shape.

This study used a methodology framed by a situated grounded theoretical approach (Clarke, 2005; Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003) and cultural rhetorics (Powell et al., 2014; Bratta & Powell, 2016) that grounds the response to the research questions in the practices and conceptualizations described by the participants and that understands the individual participants' practices and conceptualizations are situated in their historical and current situations. In other words, participants' understandings and

practices of translingualism and translanguaging, while sharing much in common and helping us to understand what practicing translingualism entails in concrete ways, are also shaped by their unique personal histories with language and with translingual scholarship and by the particular contexts in which they find themselves.

My own understanding of translingualism and translingual practice has undergone significant changes over the course of this study. The instructors I interviewed shared many insights and ideas that inspired—breathed life—into my own teaching practices and helped me sort through how I understood translingualism and language practices within that paradigm. However, this study cannot present a one-size-fits-all version of translingual pedagogy or translingual language practices. What I have done instead is drawn a range of possible ways to navigate the tensions inherent in a translingual approach. In Chapter Four, I note the importance of adapting translingual practices to the local classroom and teaching context. It is up to the individual teacher to consider these possibilities and then determine how they want to practice translingualism in the classroom.

CHAPTER TWO

Making Composition Linguistically Diverse with A Translingual Approach

What would our classrooms and scholarship be like if teachers and students spoke, read, wrote, and listened to more than one language?

(Cushman, 2016, p. 236)

In particular, we do not start instruction by assuming that our boats are gives from nature, all duly constructed and already afloat, or that we are all in the same one. We start from a different point of view, from a different set of assumptions, assumptions that make clearer that there are many vessels in addition to our own on the sea around us and they are all sailing interestingly along, and that we—as the historically mandated champions of righteousness and good in our own boat, academic writing—are not really being invaded at all. In fact, the enterprise is not about war or invasions; it’s about sailing.

(Royster, 2002, p. 25-26)

In recent years, the translingual approach (or translingualism) in particular has taken a center role in defining the discussion in composition studies around language difference and linguistic diversity. Rather than language-as-error, translingualism is one of several approaches seeing language-as-resource (Catalano & Hamann, 2016). In their manifesto for the translingual approach, Horner, Lu, Royster, and Trimbur (2011) explained that translingualism “sees difference in language not as a barrier to overcome or as a

problem to manage, but as a resource for producing meaning in writing, speaking, reading, and listening” (p. 303). This chapter explains in more detail what defines a translingual approach, particularly in its challenge to a monolingual ideology, and examines what practices are considered to be part of a translingual approach.

One of the biggest sites of confusion for composition instructors interested in translingualism is understanding how to teach writing with a translingual approach, including what translingual writing should look like or do. As this chapter will demonstrate, that question continues to be debated, leaving many instructors still scratching their heads.

Also taken up is the concept of translanguaging, a way of understanding how an individual works across their entire set of language practices for communicating and making meaning. Translanguaging has been discussed and studied as a language practice and as a pedagogical approach in bilingual education, second language studies, and linguistics. This chapter examines this term and its various definitions as a possible way for rhetoric and composition to frame the practices of translingual writing. A translanguaging pedagogy also raises questions about how instructors could use languages other than English in the classroom. Surprisingly, although translingualism values multilingualism and has noted the importance of instructors being familiar with other languages, there is not as much information on what instructors can do with these other languages in their classrooms.

Monolingualism and Standard Language Ideology

In order to better understand translingualism, it is helpful to frame it in contrast to a monolingual ideology. The push for linguistic diversity in composition is a push against a monolingual ideology. Watson and Shapiro (2018)⁸ identified four, interconnected facets of this ideology.

- *Monolingualism as Standard Language Ideology*: Standard language ideology (SLI), briefly, upholds the idea that there is one singular variety of a language that is superior and “inherently correct” (Davila, 2016, p. 128) and that its use allows for easy and neutral communication among all groups.
- *Monolingualism as Tacit English-Only Policies*: “English-Only” refers to the tacit understanding and policies at national but also institutional and programmatic levels “concerning the dominance of the English language, and defines particular codes of English as those toward which all users should strive” (Watson & Shapiro, 2018, p. 8). In the U.S., tacit English-Only ideology is expressed in the common exhortation used against people not speaking English, “This is America. We speak English here.”
- *Monolingualism as the Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity*: Matsuda (2006) describes the “myth of linguistic homogeneity” as the “tacit and widespread acceptance of the dominant image of composition students as native speakers of

⁸ I strongly encourage readers to read Watson and Shapiro’s article for its thorough analysis of monolingual ideology and the harms that it causes for monolinguals and

a privileged variety of English” (p. 638). As a result, “we are, by and large, prepared to teach just one variety of English through methods and practices designed only with linguistically homogeneous English-speaking students in mind” (Watson & Shapiro, 2018, p. 9).

- *Monolingualism as the Myth of Linguistic Uniformity, Stability, and Separateness*: This particular myth “imagines languages as whole and static codes with inherent structures that have been and will always be internal to a given language and its use” (Watson & Shapiro, 2018, p. 10) and that the multiple languages of a multilingual are discrete and separate from each other and interfere with each other in a detrimental way.

Readers will notice the repeated use of the word “tacit” in these descriptions. Monolingual ideology is difficult to challenge because it is often unexpressed, taken for granted, and seen as natural or neutral. Monolingual ideology hides the fact that any variety of language, including the “standard,” is always in flux (Ahmad & Nero, 2012; Davila, 2016) and that by putting forward one “correct” standard form, often seen as demonstrating a higher level of intellect and literacy, monolingual ideology portrays other varieties as inferior in their ability to communicate rich and complex ideas (Young, 2009; Horner et al., 2011; Ahmad & Nero, 2012). Moreover, monolingual ideology is not solely directed at speakers of other languages but can also denigrate native speakers of English who don’t perform English in the

multilinguals alike.

privileged ways. Davila (2016) makes clear one of the roles of education in maintaining this language ideology:

Schools teach and expect standard languages because they are superior and correct, and the fact that standard languages are taught and expected in schools allows for a perception of widespread availability of these privileged language varieties. While the perception of universal availability is most commonly associated with spoken language, it also applies to written language. For example, the assumption exists that whether or not students have exposure to SEAE [Standard Edited Academic English] from their home environments, schools will provide access to this language variety as part of their equalizing function. As such, it's common sense to use SEAE in most settings, including writing classrooms. (p. 129-130)

It is important to point out that a monolingual ideology does not just exist in the United States but around the world, in many named languages and in many cultures. France, for example, has a long history of working to standardize the French language through L'Académie française, the agency that defines what counts as French spelling, syntax, and usage. In the push for a "clear" and unified language, many of the regional vernaculars and varieties of the language have been discouraged and or even lost, and a native francophone from Quebec can be considered to be a non-native speaker of French.

This myth of a standard language pushes composition toward a unidirectional

monolingualism (Matsuda, 2006) that, in the U.S., privileges a particular variety of English, often labeled “Standard Academic English,” “Edited Academic English,” or “Language of Wider Communication,” which I will call here *Standardized English⁹. As critics have pointed out, however, this “standard” language is actually a prestige variety, “an abstracted, idealized, homogeneous spoken language which is imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions and which names as its model the written language, but which is drawn primarily from the spoken language of the upper middle class” (Rosina Lippi-Green, 1997, p. 64, cited in Turner & Ives, 2013, p. 289). In other words, upper-class White folks more or less consciously saw their variety as the right way of talking and the standard of language and since then have expected everyone else to match up with their idea of good language. What is often seen as “good” writing or the “language of wider communication” is actually tied to a prestige variety of English that has gained its prestige and its position as the language of wider communication because it is used by a social class and racial group with power. Importantly, this prestige variety is not inherently superior in communicating ideas.

Sugiharto (2015) offers multiple reasons to challenge monolingual ideology in the composition classroom. He argues that “the advocacy of a monolingual ideology through written language” (p. 128) may disguise discrimination against particular ethnicities, nationalities, and classes. The implication that other languages or language varieties are not “conventional,” “acceptable,” “easy to understand,” or “universal” all point to an ideology that *Standardized English is all these attributes, when really it is

⁹ See Note 2 in the previous chapter for an explanation of the use of *Standardized English over other terms.

one language variety among many that has received the privilege of being chosen the standard. Moreover, the insistence that one variety of language is superior to others erodes the value placed in other languages, forces groups to assimilate, and ultimately results in a loss of linguistic plurality and the vibrant cultural and epistemological diversity encoded in those languages.

García and Sylvan (2011) frame this argument in terms of equity. “Imposing one school standardized language without any flexibility of norms and practices will always mean that those students whose home language practices show the greatest distance from the school norm will always be disadvantaged” (p. 398). “At best,” write Watson and Shapiro (2018), a narrow, constricted idea of language overlooks the “the power non-privileged genres and modes may afford speakers of other languages and varieties” (p. 20) and that it devalues the languages and their speakers. “At worst,” it has led to emotional, even physical, violence against speakers of non-standard languages and varieties. In trying to hold down language difference, monolingualism is language oppression, one of many factors in a system that perpetuates discrimination and inequality in a society.

Monolingualism also disadvantages teachers and students considered to be in the dominant mainstream. “Siloing” multilinguals (typically international and immigrant students) and speakers of non-dominant languages in remedial, English as a Second Language (ESL), or multilingual courses

problematically relieves mainstream composition teachers of their responsibility to gain knowledge and strategies needed to support any and all students enrolled

in their courses, no matter students' language backgrounds and exposure to or prior experiences with *SE [*Standardized English]. Further, students with more dominant language varieties are sheltered from the realities of linguistic diversity, thereby missing out on opportunities to develop more complex cross-language and cross-variety communicative strategies. (Watson & Shapiro, 2018, p. 4)

Isolating monolingual students and their teachers from their linguistically diverse counterparts prevents them from learning and practicing the strategies and awareness of working across linguistic and cultural difference. The ability to interact in positive and effective ways with others from different language or cultural backgrounds is not only important for communicating in an increasingly linguistically diverse U.S. and transnational economy and educational environment but also for countering and breaking down the prejudices and systems that continue to marginalize or discriminate against people of color.

In the face of the “linguistic injustice” (Watson and Shapiro, 2018) of monolingualism, multilingualism, argues Sugiharto (2015), “is deemed more appropriate than monolingualism in liberating or democratizing the process of knowledge construction in a global contact zone in the late modernity” (p. 127). He cautions, however, that the multilingualism that he encourages is not the neoliberal approach that celebrates diversity yet segregates languages into separate containers, each used in their own sphere, but a multilingualism that is more akin to Cushman’s (2016) “pluriversality” in which writing, reading, and meaning-making are done in and with a multitude of languages. “Multi” in this sense is akin to the “multi” in

“multimodal,” which indicates its layering and mixing of modes—or to our point, languages—to create a whole out of many different parts. To put this another way, there is more than one way to get an idea across. It is this layering of multiplicity that translingualism calls for.

Defining the Translingual Approach

A precise meaning of translingualism is “still unsettled” (Horner & Tetreault, 2017, p. 4), with various scholars employing the term in various ways. In general, however, a translingual approach supports the following ideas:

- Language diversity is a resource, not a liability.
- Languages are not fixed and stable but are dynamic and fluid in their use.
- Multilingualism is the norm for most people around the world.
- Language use is shaped and negotiated in concrete social and material contexts.

Gallagher and Noonan (2017) describe translingualism as “an orientation to language difference and the reading, writing, and teaching practices that emerge from that orientation” (p. 175-176). Language difference in the translingual approach is *not* error; an unexpected word, use of a word, phrase, or syntactical structure is seen not as a mistake that reflects a paucity of language knowledge. Instead, a translingual orientation takes that difference as a point of language interaction that demands negotiation between reader and writer. In other words, what might be seen as bad writing may actually be an intentional use of language in non-standard ways. A

translingual disposition demands, therefore, an openness to the possibility of language difference as intentional and meaningful. In the face of difference, a reader must be willing to accommodate different ways of communicating and look for meaning beyond that particular part of text. Furthermore, even if that language difference is unintentional, the reader or listener does not automatically dismiss it as a failure in communication or a deficit on the part of the writer or speaker, but seeks out other clues from the conversation or text that can help with the meaning.

Translingualism often uses the word *negotiation* to describe how communication is performed. Negotiation is the co-construction of meaning (Canagarajah, 2013a) by two interlocutors. Negotiation requires a give-and-take in which communicants are aware of each other and work out understandings through various strategies. The give-and-take of communication and collaborative meaning-making can be easily understood in a face-to-face setting in which interlocutors can work with a broad array of semiotic tools and strategies. However, negotiation can be done in textual forms as well.

Textual meaning does not reside solely in language or text, but in all the resources of the text and context. There is thus a strong sense of performativity, as the content is not given but co-constructed. The text is not itself constitutive of meaning but provides the resources for the construction of meaning. More importantly, the status of readers and writers gets redefined, as everyone is both a reader and a writer, sharing mutual responsibility in the construction of meaning. Invention and creativity are not left to a single writer but distributed,

as multiple readers and writers invent the text. (Canagarajah, 2013a, p. 44)

Understanding communication as negotiation pushes some of the responsibility for understanding on the reader, not just the writer. Communication is not a one-way street in which the writer must assume all responsibility for making meaning clear. The reader must be willing to take up the work of making meaning from the text and the array of cues, codes, and practices that the writer is using.

This negotiation of meaning is true even in contexts in which there is a very great need for meaning to be “clear” and “transparent,” such as with scientific writing. In scientific writing, there are co-constructed norms such as the shared meaning imbued to particular terms and the expectations of what will be presented in a research article. The writer will do what he or she can to express ideas, but the reader has a responsibility as well to use all of the linguistic and semiotic information—terms, graphs, definitions, methods descriptions, citations, and more—to construct meaning from the text.

Translingualism also emphasizes that multilingualism is the global norm (not monolingualism) and, moreover, that multiple named languages, language varieties, or language practices are often used in the same setting. Li Wei (2018) points out that in the globalized 21st century, multilingualism is something that is increasingly welcomed—but only in particular forms: “Whilst there has been significant progress in many parts of the world where multilingualism, in the sense of having different languages co-existing alongside each other, is beginning to be acceptable, what remains hugely problematic is the mixing of languages” (p. 14).

This idea of mixing languages is central to the translingual paradigm. Unlike accommodationist approaches, translingualism takes “a holistic perspective rather than compartmentalizing different codes” (Tardy, 2017, p. 181) and understands that writers (and speakers) pull from their full linguistic repertoire¹⁰ to create meaning. People do not just turn one language off and another one on; all of their language practices are always all present and in play. In fact, the use of the prefix *trans-* is a visible reminder that translingualism sees individual languages not as separate, stable entities but as dynamic, fluid states. In short, this mixing, the “shuttling between” languages (Canagarajah, 2013a) is a natural phenomenon in language use. Rather than asking speakers and writers of non-dominant forms of English or of other named languages to carry the burden of acquiring and communicating in *Standardized English (Watson & Shapiro, 2018), translingualism pushes those who grew up speaking privileged varieties of English to learn other named languages and language varieties in order to share the burden of communication more equally.

These facets of translingualism also help to broaden the paradigm beyond our common understanding of language difference as linked only to multilingualism. Horner (2017) writes that language difference must be understood “not as an option writers may choose to pursue or not, nor as a feature marking some writing but not others, but as *an inevitable feature of all writing*, whatever forms that writing may take” (p. 88, emphasis mine). All communication, not just those of people writing in their

¹⁰ A person’s linguistic repertoire is what MacSwan (2017) calls “the broad stock of speech styles, registers, varieties, and languages people know” (p. 187) and a “catalog” of the ways that people can “talk in different social contexts” (p. 188). I will define this term more fully at a later point.

non-native language, involves language difference because complete and total understanding of all the meaning of a text is impossible. Lisa Delpit (1995) writes,

One of the most difficult tasks we face as human beings is trying to communicate across our individual differences, trying to make sure that what we say to someone is interpreted the way we intend. This becomes even more difficult when we attempt to communicate across social differences, gender, race, or class lines, or any situation of unequal power. (p. 135)

Translingualism reminds all readers to approach a text with an awareness of difference and a willingness to negotiate meaning.

Translingualism also counters the idea of language proficiency and the idea that two people interacting must fully share a language in common in order to understand each other. Cooper (2014) writes, “The assumption that language exists apart from its use leads us to believe, as [Kenneth] Burke suggests [in “Definition of Man”], that all could be made clear if only we had a common language, that the only real difference that divides us is what language forms we use” (p. 15). Yet, as anyone traveling or living in a foreign country can attest, this is not the case. Communication can still happen with little shared language in common, when no one has mastered a shared language. Instead, communication is supported by contextual and semiotic clues and the willingness to negotiate meaning across the divides of difference, even when there is not much in common.

The idea of negotiation does not mean, however, that “anything goes,” that

writers and speakers can use whatever language practices they want and their audience just has to figure it out for themselves; such a situation would be a breakdown in communication. There must be enough common ground for communication to take place, and more communication is possible the more that a language is shared. However, what translingualism challenges is the idea that the ground for communication must look a particular way and that there is one right way to communicate. In many ways, translingualism wants to balance the power differential. An English monolingual can learn more languages to unlock even more paths of knowledge and to not put all the burden of communication on people from other language backgrounds. Even when English is the shared language, other languages, varieties, and language practices do not need to be kept away out of sight in order for communication to be successful. Accents, unexpected phrasings influenced by a first language, dropped definite articles, an expression or phrase in another language, verbal banter—these are things that don't really impede shared communication as a whole but which still affirm the linguistic richness and identity of the writer or speaker. Instead of erasing these elements, translingualism welcomes them to play a role in communication.

That sense of correctness is often what leads to the appearance of a prestige variety as “neutral” when it is certainly not the case: the prestige variety is the one of the group in power. This is why valuing and including other languages in academic writing challenges a monolingual ideology. It places those languages on an equal footing with the prestige variety. With its perspective of language boundaries as fluid and of the equal value of all languages, translingualism seems to be a decided step away

from the idea that students must master academic discourse in order to communicate successfully.

In fact, the very idea that languages are “pure” and stable structures with clear parameters and rules is an inaccurate understanding of language and language use according to a translingual paradigm. Composition studies has acknowledged the sociocultural and kairotic influences of text-making; translingualism brings this social constructive awareness to bear on language, seeing the “forms and functions of language as emergent and socially constructed and reconstructed in line with social mobility” (Sugiharto, 2015, p. 129). Instead of seeing “language” as an object, out there in the world, translingualism sees language as an activity. The term *linguaging* has been used to communicate this understanding of language as a dynamic activity: “Linguaging is different from language conceived simply as a system of rules or structures; linguaging is a product of social action and refers to discursive practices of people” (García and Sylvan, 2013, p. 389). Therefore, learning to write or communicate within a translingual paradigm means developing “a critical awareness about what language does, rather than what it is, in the context of very specific circumstances” (Guerra, 2016, p. 228).

Questions have been raised about just how different a translingual paradigm is in the college composition classroom, whether it’s something new or just the same concepts of rhetoric again. Lalicker (2017) agrees that “translingual writing courses are rhetoric at its core” because “they focus on communicating effectively to audiences across the boundaries of difference; they focus attention on how discourse operates so our students leave our courses knowing how to apply principles of written rhetoric in a

wide variety of situations for transferability” (p. 52-53). However, he notes, translingual writing courses also use “the exchange of language to broaden knowledge and understanding of the world” (p. 53). In other words, translingualism is rhetoric that is attuned to multiple linguistic practices and conscious of the role of language in the act of meaning-making. Translingualism pulls language practices and language ideologies squarely into view within the writing class.

The foundational concepts of translingualism, particularly the dynamism and instability of languages and the ways that languages mix and overlap in use, are also not new but are familiar concepts in the fields of linguistics and second language learning. Second language learning (including English as a Second Language education) has long acknowledged multilingualism and its value. Translingualism is, in many ways, adapting this knowledge to a new terrain of rhetoric and composition. Translingualism asks what this knowledge means for our understanding of writing and how compositionists can use this knowledge to support the linguistic diversity of their students.

In this way it is important to distinguish translingualism from second language studies in particular. Atkinson et al. (2013) have cautioned against a tendency to conflate translingual pedagogy of composition studies with second language writing pedagogy. Translingualism’s emphasis on the theoretical fluidity of language boundaries and language use is not directly applicable to the goals of second language writing studies, which is focused more on teaching non-native English students to write in a second language (English). Although there is much overlap and agreement between translingual theory and second language studies, it is important not to merge the two

completely.

In seeking for students to use their “languages” and in valuing language difference, translingualism directly exposes, examines, and challenges the monolingual assumptions of rhetoric and composition that maintain *Standardized English as the language of the academy (Watson & Shapiro, 2018). By emphasizing language and the multiplicity of meaning and language in writing, translingualism challenges the ideology that “endows mainstream English with a sense of inevitability and historical destiny, erases other languages, and associates language differences, both within English and across languages, with subaltern groups of unnaturalized strangers” (Trimbur, 2016, p. 220). Cushman (2016) underscores this anti-hegemonic goal: “Decentering the primacy of English as the lingua franca of composition studies in educational economies means an explicit valuation of all languages in the writing and readings assigned to students, spoken in the classroom, and produced in scholarly work” (p. 235). In order to upend our “tacit monolingualism” (Horner & Trimbur, 2002; Matsuda, 2006), explicitly value “all languages in the writing and readings assigned to students, spoken in the classroom, and produced in scholarly work” (Cushman, 2016, p. 235) and not privilege any one type of semiotic or literacy practice (Coronel-Molina & Samuelson, 2017).

This imperative to explicitly take on monolingual ideology and invite language difference into writing is what makes translingualism unique among other rhetorical and critical language pedagogies, according to Gilyard (2016). Central to this approach are discussions of language politics and examination of how certain languages and language varieties are privileged or stigmatized (Watson & Shapiro, 2018). For an

increasingly diverse and polyvocal world, the translingual paradigm has some clear advantages to offer.

Translingual Practices

To recap, translingualism is a theoretical understanding of language and language diversity that emphasizes the instability and fluidity of language use and practices. Using this theoretical understanding to view one's own language practices and the language practices of others is called a translingual orientation. Importantly, a translingual orientation is open to language difference and the mixing of languages because one understands that is a natural aspect of any language use. However, the ways that a translingual orientation play out in practice are not understood quite as well, particularly in terms of pedagogical practice. Gallagher and Noonan (2017) write, "We cannot claim to be translingual; we can only learn to practice translingualism" (p. 176, emphasis original)." What does translingual practice actually look like? What does it mean for teaching and writing to say that we value all language practices? How is writing taught and graded in a translingual classroom? What kind of writing is taught? Because monolingual ideology is reinforced in educational settings, particularly in composition courses, we must look at how to use a translingual approach within the classroom.

In the scholarship on translingualism in composition studies, reading practices are one of the main ways that a translingual orientation is enacted. Translingual reading practices are characterized by a close attention to language practices in the reading and

a willingness to engage with language difference instead of treating difference as error. Negotiation, then, becomes part of the reading practice in a translingual approach. Trimbur (2016) traces the history of translingual reading practices to the close reading practices of literary studies that Mina Shaughnessy and others adapted to reading the texts of basic writers and exploring the styles of their students' writing without judging them against a set standard. Over the years, he argues, these close reading practices have moved composition studies away from interpreting language difference as wrong, ignorant, and dumb, to seeing such difference as evidence of efforts made toward acquiring a standard English and an invention of the university (Bartholomae, 1985), toward understanding language difference as "negotiating a place to speak within the academy through a kind of transculturation that draws on the writer's available linguistic and rhetorical resources" (p. 225). Translingual reading practices then "involves redirecting 'the focus of "close reading" practices [toward] questions of *what is gained by writers' use or deviation from standard conventions in their texts* (literary or otherwise)'" (Trimbur, 2016, p. 226, citing Horner & Lu, 2010, p. 125; emphasis mine).

Reading is thus an interpretative task (Molina, 2011) and demands a willingness to understand the rhetorical aspects of language use and to be open to unexpected or non-conformative use of language. This openness is not the same as overlooking and accepting any sort of language difference; rather, it is a willingness to look at what that "error" is actually doing and whether it is truly impeding communication or is giving a different way of expressing a concept. Belcher (2014) points to the importance of reading practice:

Given our increased and increasing virtual and real-life contact with the rest of the world, there is ample reason for a new reader responsibility, [...] as in reading that is flexible in its expectations, willing, when needed, to accept responsibility for constructing meaning from what may seem less-than-immediately-transparent text and be responsive to writers' not-always-readily-apparent aims. (p. 65).

Understanding translingual reading practice is important for instructors for the purposes of teaching students how to read with a translingual orientation toward difference (Trimbur, 2016; Gallagher and Noonan; 2017) and for the purposes of assessment¹¹ (Dryer, 2016; Lee; 2016; Dryer & Mitchell, 2017; Inoue, 2017; Lavelle, 2017). Lee (2016) points out, adopting a translingual approach toward students' writing means nothing if that student writing is assessed using *Standardized English as the norm. Translingual reading and assessment practices begin with curbing the impulse to call language difference in a student's writing "wrong." Rather, the reader tries instead to see what is at play in the choice of words or syntax, to see whether communication can be negotiated despite (or even because of) that difference. When reading students' writing, an instructor can then go on to evaluate whether the student writer needs some

¹¹ The term *assessment* is used in composition to refer to two main tasks. Assessment refers to the grading and evaluation of students' writing for course assignments. It also refers to the process of evaluating students' language and writing skills in order to place them into writing courses. Both types of assessment traditionally result in some sort of judgement of students' writing abilities, often made through the lens of language proficiency.

further assistance and discussion to find a better phrasing. The biggest shift for instructors is paying attention to the overall effectiveness of the document rather than judgments on the quality of the language (Dryer & Mitchell, 2017).

Reading and assessment are the receptive practices of the translingual disposition because they are how students and teachers as readers respond to translingual writing. The main communicative practice of translingual approach within composition studies focuses, not surprisingly, on writing. Whereas in more traditional approaches, writers' language difference was a liability (Horner et al., 2011), within a translingual view of writing, these differences serve as assets for "disseminating and creating knowledge" (Malcolm, 2017, p. 103). Translingual writers show a "deftness" (Horner et al., 2011, p. 308) in drawing from across their linguistic repertoire and in negotiating "their semiotic resources in relation to the dominant conventions of language and rhetoric" (Canagarajah, 2016, p. 266). Translingual writing demonstrates attention to the situatedness of language and literacy practices (Canagarajah, 2016) within particular contexts and with regards to the sociocultural, ideological, and linguistic positions of audiences.

For instructors interested in encouraging translingual writing in their courses, these descriptions are interesting, but they do raise the question of what such writing looks like (Matsuda, 2014) or what teachers should be encouraging their students to do. Early on in the discussion around translingual writing, Canagarajah (2006b; 2011; 2013b) and Young (2009) define translingual writing using texts that demonstrate overt mixing of different languages and language varieties. Canagarajah and Young use the term *code-meshing* to describe this hybrid language practice. Young (2009) describes

code-meshing as the “blending, merging, meshing” of dialects and languages and “blending dos idiomas or copping enough standard English to really make yo' AAE be Da Bomb” (p. 50). Code-meshing demonstrates how a person’s languages form an integrated system of linguistic resources from which the person draws to construct texts in ever-new forms (Canagarajah, 2006b; Milson-Whyte, 2014).

Young (2009) and others (Canagarajah, 2006b; Milson-Whyte, 2014) distinguish code-meshing from code-switching, the term used in linguistics to describe the alternation of languages in speech. Even though they are in essence the same thing,¹² (Matsuda, 2014; see MacSwan, 2017, for his description of code-switching; see Coronel-Molina & Samuelson, 2017, for a counter-argument), translingual scholars see code-meshing as a more holistic use of one’s linguistic repertoire. By blending two codes (languages or language varieties) into one utterance, as seen in Young’s definition above, a speaker is working across all of their linguistic repertoire rather than using one language at a time. Translingual scholars also see code-meshing as a critical language practice: a conscious blending of languages to subvert or challenge standard language ideology. Milson-Whyte (2014) notes that letting students code-mesh in their writing helps to “subvert the hegemonic role of English” by making room for other language varieties to do the intellectual work and affirming the value of students’

¹² Sociolinguists actually define multiple types of multilingual language practices that involve moving between languages or language varieties. *Diglossia* is the segregation of languages into specific contexts of usage, such as one language for home or personal interactions and the other for school, professional, or political environments. *Code-switching* can be inter-sentential (moving between different languages from sentence to sentence) or intra-sentential (using more than one language in the span of a sentence). *Heterography* refers to the use of more than one script in a document (Bodin, 2018). *Code-meshing* tends to be used to refer to intra-sentential code-switching and

languages and knowledge.

James (2017) picks up on this counter-hegemonic ambition but uses the term *translanguaging* instead. Originally used to describe the alternation between two languages as a pedagogical practice in a bilingual K-12 educational environment (Lewis et al., 2012; MacSwan, 2017), translanguaging has since been used to indicate more broadly the ability to draw from more than one language in a situation (or a text) to communicate and make meaning (Canagarajah, 2011; Lewis et al., 2012; Heugh, 2015). Velasco and García (2014) describe it as “the flexible and meaningful actions through which bilinguals select features in their linguistic repertoire in order to communicate appropriately” (p. 7). More specifically, translanguaging is the conscious and intentional use of two or more languages or language varieties for the purpose of communication, comprehension, or self-expression.

James (2017) further expands the definition of translanguaging to include not only the “act of moving between and among languages in a given text and/or encounter,” like code-meshing, but also the “act of challenging monolingualistic assumptions of higher education and contextualizing Standard Edited American English as one discourse among many” (“Translingual Scholarship”). In her definition we begin to see the combination of the act of language alternation with the disposition toward language difference. But we also see here an understanding of translanguaging as overt language movement.

Like James, I have chosen to use *translanguaging* to describe the communicative practice of translingualism. This choice stems from several reasons.

heteroglossics.

First is that the word itself manifests the language ideology it represents. The prefix *trans-* highlights key ideas of inter-relationship and movement among languages (Lewis et al., 2012; Donahue, 2016). The base is *linguaging*, a term that many scholars prefer as it emphasizes intentional and dynamic action (Pietikäinen et al., 2008) in specific contexts rather than a perception of language as a static system (García and Sylvan, 2011). More importantly, *translinguaging* is a term used in other fields—namely, applied linguistics, second-language writing, and bilingual education—that have a long history of researching multilingual writing and language practices, including translinguaging. (As Matsuda (2014) wryly notes, much of the arguments that translingual scholars have been making around language use are not new to either language users or linguists.) Using *translinguaging* connects the conversation of translingualism in composition studies to the existing conversations around translinguaging in these fields (Matsuda, 2014) and opens up broader ideas of what translinguaging is.

Canagarajah's (2006b) arguments for a translingual approach to writing stem from the translinguaging he and other multilinguals do every day. He and Young (2009) indicate that this intentional language mixing should be permitted in the academic writing that students do. Allowing translinguaging honors the linguistic diversity of students and reflects the ways language is used all around the world to communicate. It also challenges the dominance of monolingual ideologies that maintain that there is one correct way to write academic texts. Translinguaging, according to Canagarajah and Young, is therefore what makes writing translingual.

However, other scholars argue against equating translingual writing with

“visible” movements between or among languages or language varieties¹³. Matsuda (2014) critiques this emphasis on overt language mixing as “linguistic tourism” that focuses on the product rather than the negotiation and choices made by writers, including the possible choice of using the dominant, conventional language practices. By equating translingual writing with visible translanguaging, he argues, composition studies falls into a trap of exoticizing language difference, which does not address the complex material realities that minority language users must navigate.

Other scholars (Lu & Horner, 2013; Horner, 2017; Mangelsdorf, 2017) also reject the idea that translingual writing equals visible translanguaging, arguing that even “normal” looking writing is translingual because all instances of language use are “fluid, relational, and contingent” (Mangelsdorf, 2017, p. 200) and are agentive and an “intra-action” of identities (Guerra & Shivers McNair, 2017). Language difference, therefore, is the norm for all writers and speakers, even so-called monolinguals (Lu & Horner, 2013). This view tempers the idea of translingual writing as a form of overt language mixing and opens the door to understanding how even those writers not traditionally seen as linguistically diverse can also practice translingualism in their writing. As Guerra and Shivers McNair (2017) write, “translingualism has evolved from an approach to language difference designed for specific intervention in the lives of disenfranchised students to one intended to address the needs of all student writers” (p. 19). Guerra (2016) lays out the dilemma of the writing instructor in clear terms:

¹³ Canagarajah (2013b) offers multiple examples of this visible movement. One of the texts he references and analyzes is Smitherman’s 1999 article, “CCCC’s Role in the Struggle for Language Rights,” in which she subtly meshes Black English into the scholarly article. Young (2009) code-meshes more drastically in his article, “Nah We

When we as teachers take a translingual approach to difference, are we expecting students to produce a particular kind of writing that mimics what we call code-meshing, or do we want students to develop a rhetorical sensibility that reflects a critical awareness of language as a contingent and emergent, rather than a standardized and static, practice? (p. 228)

Guerra advocates for the latter approach: developing “a critical awareness about what language does, rather than what it is” (p. 228). Through a series of assignments and discussions, he encourages students to a fuller awareness of the semiotic and rhetorical resources that they currently have and can transfer to academic writing contexts as well as developing those resources they will need to have in the future in order to negotiate a wide range of communicative situations.

However, saying that all writing is (or could be) translingual complicates the understanding of translanguaging and translingual writing. How do we define in more concrete terms what translingual writing is? How is rhetorical sensibility manifested or evaluated? What role does translanguaging play in our understanding of translingual writing if such writing does not evidence visible language alternation or mixing? Reframing all writing as translingual writing doesn’t really help to clarify what translingual language practices are, much less how composition instructors would teach or encourage students to write using these practices.

How Students Learn about Translingual Writing

I move now from a linguistic perspective of translanguaging to understanding how students learn about translingual writing. In the literature on translingual pedagogy in composition, the models for translingual writing are predominantly literary. Students read various texts that discuss language difference (teaching them about translingualism or what it means to experience language difference) (Guerra, 2016; Canagarajah, 2016; James, 2018) or that may use translanguaging practices. Sugiharto (2015), for example, recommends using “a model of code-meshed texts written by professional writers” as a “pedagogical heuristic” (p. 149). Texts like Smitherman’s “Soul ‘n’ Style” (1974) and García’s “Subiendo y Bajando” (2017) are both scholarly texts that model a mixing of languages, and Gloria Anzaldúa’s works are also commonly mentioned as examples of translanguaging.

Student translanguaging is also cultivated through exploratory writing assignments, such as language ethnographies and literacy narratives or autobiographies (Canagarajah, 2016; Cavazos et al., 2018). These assignments help students to move toward translanguaging in their writing by engaging them in metalinguistic awareness: drawing attention to how they use language and fostering a rhetorical sensibility (Guerra, 2016) toward their language practices in specific contexts.

The *Translanguaging at TCU* website (James, 2018) was created to serve as an instructor resource for discussions about translanguaging and materials geared toward using a translingual approach. As a result, the site provides a succinct overview of the translingual pedagogical approach. On the main “Teach” page, the links are entitled

“Teaching Resources,” which includes a list of assignments and readings, “Translingual Syllabi,” “Translanguaging Assessment,” and “Meeting TCU’s Written Communication Outcomes.” These various sections reflect the emphasis that translingual scholarship places on curriculum materials (“Translingual Syllabi”), the types of readings (“Teaching Resources”), assessment (“Translanguaging Assessment”), and understanding translingualism as supporting, rather than undermining, expectations for students’ written abilities (“Meeting TCU’s Written Communication Outcomes”). Of particular note, the “Teaching Resources” page includes a list of readings, various writing assignments and activities, and textbooks for teaching in a translingual approach.

Drawing from a wealth of translingual and transdisciplinary literature, Cavazos et al. (2018) designed a four-part elective professional development workshop for graduate student teaching assistants of writing and Spanish-language courses at a bilingual Spanish-English university. The workshop’s goal was to help the teaching assistants to develop a translingual orientation and to understand how translingualism would “‘look’ or work” (p. 14) in the classroom. As the TCU website does, Cavazos et al. emphasize student writing assignments and instructor assessment practices as essential ways that instructors (in this case, teaching assistants) encourage linguistic diversity within their own classrooms.

These examples illustrate that to foster translingual writing—and the communicative practice of translanguaging in particular—translingual pedagogy relies on written, mostly literary or scholarly, models of translanguaging and on students’ own exploratory writing. But what about another, ever-present model of language practices

in the classroom: the teacher?

Missing: Teachers' Language Practices in the Classroom

By and large, discussion of translanguaging in the writing classroom focuses on students' language practices. Less evident in translingual scholarship is how *instructors* themselves used language in the classroom. As I will show in the following examples, the discussion thus far has been consistently directed toward students' language use.

Dryer and Mitchell (2017) describe students' translanguaging practices as a desirable outcome in a translingual writing classroom: "students working translingually will manifest their choices most strikingly at the level of word and phrase and might benefit from instructors better prepared to help them deploy linguistic resources to foreground those choices as deliberate and from assessors better prepared to name, and thus better see, multilingual students' skilled deployment of unconventional linguistic resources" (p. 151). This goal is echoed by Cavazos et al. (2018): "our goal for this project was not only to create space for language mixing in academia but also to facilitate conversations with TAs on how to encourage students to engage their existing language skills as they participate in academic discourse across linguistic, disciplinary, and national borders" (p. 14).

In her discussion of language policies and educational approaches in the multilingual contexts of Lebanon and Singapore, Bou Ayash (2016) captures the primacy that student translanguaging practice plays in translingual scholarship: "[Writing program administrators] must also create space in writing curricula for the

full multiplicity of languages and discourses in their *students' repertoire*, as well as increase opportunities for more deliberative inquiries about how *students* are strategically using and navigating these resources and toward what specific ends” (p. 239, emphasis mine). In this quote, as in the others above, we see that the focus is on developing and observing students’ linguistic and rhetorical abilities. Here, the “deliberative inquiries” are into student repertoires only, not teachers, and the space for the “full multiplicity of languages and discourses” explicitly benefit the students and do not mention whether the space includes teachers’ language practices.

Some authors did mention instructors’ linguistic histories as a presence in the educational context. Horner and Tetreault (2017) state that a translingual perspective in composition acknowledges “the increasingly undeniable fact of students’ and faculty’s linguistic heterogeneity, the inherent instability of languages as the always-shifting outcome of practices, and the dispersed and shifting location of faculty, students, and programs” (p. 5). However, they do not further explain the role that faculty’s language knowledge might actually play in the classroom.

In her research into language practices in first-year writing courses, Tardy (2011) notes that several of the instructors that she interviewed demonstrated multilingual resources and reports that the most common practices teachers used were to present and discuss multilingual readings and inviting students to integrate their own languages into their writing. She does not discuss further how teachers used their linguistic repertoires, although her student survey results show that 11% of the students surveyed reported to have spoken with their instructor in a language other than English and 7% reported having spoken with the instructor in a variety of English. Her study

indicates that instructors bring linguistic diversity into the classroom; however, her exploration of how teachers used their linguistic repertoires is limited to these brief observations.

Canagarajah (2016) mentions how his multilingual background serves as a resource for talking about language difference with students and for understanding. He presents his literacy autobiography as an example for the assignment he gives to students. His background as a multilingual and World English speaker is clearly a part of the course and how he talks about language. At other times, however, he does not include himself as part of the classroom ecology he describes: “The mix of students and materials from diverse cultures and languages makes the classroom a contact zone. Such a space is extremely valuable for reflections and negotiations on translanguality” (p. 268). Although his focus is on developing students’ rhetorical awareness, and therefore his own language practices are not the focus of the course, it would be valuable to know more specifically how language teachers could draw on their own language backgrounds when teaching a translingual approach.

Likewise, Cushman (2016) envisions classrooms in which, “[Black English] speakers and English language learners could ideally see their home languages valued, taught, and practiced in reading and writing assignments and classroom discussions in ways that sustain this as one of many Englishes” (p. 236). We see the potential here for teacher language practices as an important way of valuing, teaching, and sustaining named languages and language varieties that do not traditionally play a role in the composition classroom.

Lorimer Leonard’s (2014) study on multilingual writers and writing instructors

offers the most information on how multilinguals' language histories could play a role in the writing classroom. A key attribute of multilingual literacy practices, she says, is "how writing across languages and locations in the world fosters what might be thought of as *rhetorical attunement*: an ear for, or a tuning toward, difference or multiplicity" (p. 228). This rhetorical attunement comes into play not only in her participants' literacy practices, such as writing, but also in how they teach writing. They model a norm of language difference and example of the multiplicity of languages and language practices. They encourage students to improvise and be curious and creative with language, to make do and use tools and experts to help themselves write and learn. They draw students' attention to patterns of language use and to the messiness of language in general. In short, the teachers build off of their experiences and knowledge using language to help students to be more flexible and strategic in their own writing practices. Although Lorimer Leonard does not make the focus of these practices her main study, we see the possible ways that teacher language histories can be used for teaching writing in the college composition classroom.

The focus on student language practices rather than teacher language practices is not isolated to the United States. Safford and Kelly (2010) make a similar observation in British primary school education:

The significant developments in theoretical understanding of children's language learning, the resulting arguments over what constitutes best practice and provision and policies which encourage appreciation of pupil diversity have had virtually no parallel impact on considerations of the language learning of

mainstream (as opposed to language/English language teaching/English as a foreign language) teachers, as to how practitioners' linguistic and cultural knowledge is applied in the mainstream classroom and how teacher education programmes might enable student teachers to enact current theoretical understandings. (403-404)

Importantly, there is the potential for more discussion of the role that teacher language practices could play in the classroom, but this potential needs to be realized as explicit discussions that look for connections between teacher language practices and students' translingual writing practices. For example, Cavazos et al. (2018) note in their article that their workshop participants come from a range of linguistic backgrounds; moreover, the institution itself is on the Texas-Mexico border and is shaping itself to be a bilingual university. Cavazos et al. emphasize that students should encounter language variety in the classroom, particularly exposure to non-prestige varieties. Teaching assistants begin the first workshop of the series with considering their own language practices and the contexts in which they use them, including their education and academic work (p. 14). Participants then reflect on the language diversity of their classrooms, the languages their students use, and the role that language diversity plays in the classroom (p. 14). This workshop is a key moment to draw attention to how teaching assistants' own languages or language practices could play a role in the classroom, whether as part of a discussion around language diversity in the classroom or as a way to model language variation and non-standard forms in the classroom. Yet that explicit connection between teacher language practices and language diversity in the

classroom is not made in this article.

Cavazos et al. (2018) concludes with this observation:

Our respective language backgrounds, language perceptions, and linguistically inclusive pedagogies can impact our students' linguistic agency, academic success, and sense of belonging in higher education; therefore, it is critical to explore how multilingual students perceive the presence of language difference in the classroom and create opportunities where they can use all their language resources as they navigate through changing academic and community contexts. (p. 22-23)

From this review of the literature, I would argue that the second part of their call has been the focus of much of translingual pedagogical practices. It is vital for students to be able to draw from all of their resources when writing and learning. However, the first part of the call, to explore the presence of language difference in the classroom is where we can do more work and where teacher language practices could play a role. Up till now, teacher language practices and their linguistic backgrounds have not received much attention in the scholarship on translingualism in composition studies. For an approach that challenges the use of "standard" varieties of English and the assumption that these languages are natural and neutral, translingualism's silence on the languages used by teachers is remarkable. At best this silence presents an opportunity to learn more; at worst, it seems to be an example of the tacit English-only approaches that composition is currently critiquing.

The need for a closer look at teacher language practices in composition aligns with some of the earliest arguments made for translingualism which emphasized the value of knowing and working in another language. The Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) recently put out a Statement on Teaching Second Language Writing and Writers (2014), which stressed not only the importance of understanding second language development but the importance of teachers being second language learners themselves in order to understand the experience of working in another language. This call for teachers' language learning has been repeated in other scholarship (Matsuda, 2013; Severino, 2017). Severino (2017) notes how second language learning increases teachers' own language awareness and pedagogical awareness. Sugiharto (2015) also emphasizes the importance of the *practice* of translinguaging and that this practice must be combined with "sufficient understanding about it, coupled with one's proficiency in multiple languages and metalinguistic awareness" (p. 136), a call echoed by Canagarajah (2016). Knowing more than one language is essential for developing a translingual mindset toward language use and language difference.

As the discussion around translingualism has progressed, however, the emphasis has changed to demonstrate that translingual work is not just for multilingual writers and to clarify how a translingual approach can work for monolingual students as well. Translingualism scholars have been careful to articulate that *monolingual* students also translanguage and benefit from the rhetorical sensitivity to language cultivated by a translingual approach, including a greater awareness of their own language use (Lu and Horner, 2013; Donahue, 2016; Trimbur, 2016; Malcolm, 2017). Including monolingual

writers into a translingual approach is important, but it has meant less emphasis on the value of multilingualism and the rhetorical and cultural knowledge that comes from knowing more than one language that were part of the original argument presented by Horner et al. (2011). Sugiharto (2015) counters this tendency:

What teachers and scholars often misunderstand (probably due to their insufficient knowledge about translingualism) in doing translanguaging is that practice involves the constant process of negotiating language differences. Clearly, to be able to do this, they certainly ought to be proficient in multiple languages. (p. 136)

Gilyard (2016) also warns against the dangers of “flattening” the differences between monolinguals and multilinguals. Treating all differences alike by not distinguishing between monolinguals and multilinguals (and between monolinguals of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, particularly linked to race) can potentially result in rendering again invisible the real issues that multilinguals and linguistic minority students face.

Furthermore, the original idea of translingualism was not solely about openness to language difference; it was also about how to counter monolingualism through an increased emphasis on the importance of multilingualism. Cushman (2016), envisioning the decolonizing and liberating aspects of the translingual approach, also emphasizes how teachers must be involved in the languaging of the classroom:

“Translingualism could also help the process of decolonizing thought and everyday languaging practices in composition scholarship and classrooms by helping scholars, teachers, and students dwell in the borders of colonial difference by using multiple scripts, media, languages, and English(es) as routine and integral parts of the teaching, learning, and knowledge making activities of universities” (p 240).

This emphasis includes not only students’ competency in more than one language and their knowledge of intercultural rhetoric (Sugiharto, 2015) but also teachers’ competency in more than one language (Kilfoil, 2015) and linguistics (Tardy, 2017; Dryer & Mitchell, 2017). In fact, to truly combat the devaluing of students’ languages in the classroom, we need to bring them into the classroom in meaningful, prominent ways.

Molina (2011) poses the following questions: “What makes speakers choose the language for the exchange in multilingual settings? How do we provide students with explicit modelling of strategies to succeed in multilingual settings? What are those strategies, how are they used, and what for?” (p. 1250). Too often, the monolingual speaker, not the multilingual, is the norm held up for student writers (Wei, 2018). These questions are not only valuable in thinking about how we would teach in a translingual approach; they also point to a need for writing instructors, including monolingual instructors, to be familiar with and even model multilingual communicative strategies.

In fact, translingualism’s most radical assertion is that multilingualism is the norm in the U.S. society and should be the norm in the writing classroom. Sugiharto

(2015) writes,

translingualism seems to have been narrowly conceived and greatly valorized as uplifting one's rhetorical writing traditions to contest the dominant writing convention or English monolingualism. What teachers and scholars often misunderstand (probably due to their insufficient knowledge about translingualism) in doing translanguaging is that practice involves the constant process of negotiating language differences. *Clearly, to be able to do this, they certainly ought to be proficient in multiple languages.* (p. 135-136, emphasis mine)

Likewise, Horner, Lu, Royster, and Trimbur (2011), in their keystone piece outlining the translingual approach, emphasized the value of knowing more than one language and encouraged more extensive foreign language education for traditionally monolingual English students and for graduate students in composition studies. Horner, NeCamp, and Donahue (2011) argue for rhetoric and composition scholarship that is done across language borders. Therefore, in its earliest forms, translingualism encouraged knowing and working in more than one language or language variety.

Of course, this raises the question of how many composition instructors are multilingual. Christiane Donahue (2009) points out that "U.S. composition theorists and teachers are often monolingual, unlike much of the rest of the world. Our classrooms may well be multilingual, but our writing faculty and scholars are quite often not" (p. 227). Geller (2011) found that at her institution, many of the faculty who taught writing

or writing-intensive courses were multilingual, giving them a different perspective on writing, particularly that done by their multilingual students.

We return to the fact that the translingual approach, as it has been defined in U.S. composition scholarship, has been oriented toward developing students' and teachers' dispositions toward language use and to open the way for *students* to use translanguaging practices in their own writing—and to do so it appears to rely predominantly on exploratory activities and literary models and not the language practices of instructors. Despite the clear value that translingual scholars have placed on instructors' own multilingual knowledge, it is not yet clear how that knowledge comes into play when teaching with a translingual approach. There is an opportunity here to learn more about how instructors bring their language knowledge and practices into the classroom.

A Closer Look at Translanguaging

Other disciplines have devoted more attention to the language practices of instructors, and in doing so they have demonstrated a keen sense of the benefits of teacher translanguaging. As mentioned earlier, the concept of translanguaging originated in the field of bilingual education and has been taken up in second-language writing studies and applied linguistics. Understanding how these fields define *translanguaging* and its pedagogical uses gives a broader view of language practices and potential ways that writing instructors could use their own language practices in the classroom.

A Linguistic View of Translanguaging

The field of applied linguistics has looked more deeply at the phenomenon of translanguaging in order to define and describe it. Because the field of linguistics is interested in the phenomena of language use, a foray into the scholarship of applied linguistics on translanguaging will offer a more concrete sense of the practice.

MacSwan (2017) helps to ground the idea of translingualism in more linguistic terms. He presents a “multilingual perspective” on language fluidity by distinguishing linguistic repertoires from grammars. As understood in linguistics, grammars are phonological, lexical, and syntactical “subsystems” that represent the way people communicate in a particular context. Crucially, a person’s linguistic repertoire can contain multiple grammars. For example, a Muslim African-American student with parents and family who immigrated from Somalia may have a linguistic repertoire that contains the grammars of an array of social languages (Gee, 1996), which are those languages she speaks as a member of various social groups, including different styles and varieties of English. This careful distinction between repertoires and grammars and the concept of social languages help to clarify how one person can work across multiple named languages, language varieties, and social discourses in social interactions as well as writing.

Wei (2018) uses the term *idiolect* to describe much the same thing and frames “Translanguaging” as a theory of language, a way of understanding language “as a multilingual, multisemiotic, multisensory, and multimodal resource that human beings use for thinking and for communicating thought” (p. 26). He defines translanguaging as “using one’s idiolect, that is one’s linguistic repertoire, without regard for socially and

politically defined language names and labels” (p. 19). To use myself as an example, while we can ascribe the names of French, English, and Japanese (perhaps more) to certain parts of my personal idiolect, for me they make up a unitary whole, an ever-growing repertoire of forms and language practices that I can use when speaking or writing.

Regardless of whether we use *linguistic repertoire* or *idiolect*, these models of translanguaging also help to explain how *monolinguals* could also be understood to translanguage. Wei (2018) writes, “a bilingual person’s idiolect would consist of lexical and grammatical features from different socially and politically defined languages, just as a so-called monolingual’s idiolect would consist of lexical and grammatical features from regionally, social class-wise, and stylistically differentiated varieties of the same named language” (p. 19). This idea of a linguistic repertoire as a unitary whole, rather than a collection of language boxes to choose from, has been generally supported by other linguists¹⁴ (Velasco & García, 2014; Coronel-Molina & Samuelson, 2015; Jaspers, 2018). These works help to ground the discussion of translanguaging in more concrete terms.

Although the use of different rhetorical or discursive styles by different language or cultural groups needs much more attention than it will receive here (see Mao (2002), Canagarajah (2006b), Powell (2002), Jackson (2014), and McDougall & Nordstrom (2011) for perspectives on the meshing of rhetorical practices), I am limiting my focus of translanguaging here to include only the grammatical and syntactical forms of

¹⁴ Jaspers (2018) does warn of the “discursive drift” of the term “translanguaging” and its application to different phenomena. I draw attention here to the range of definitions

language use. Even though I believe that translanguaging can happen on the level of rhetorical patterns and practices, these aspects of writing are not as easily noticed—and therefore their non-standard or culturally linked uses often pass under the standard language radar, as described in Perryman-Clark (2012). Non-standard grammar, syntactic, and linguistic forms, however, stick out and end up being penalized (Smitherman, 2000), and therefore the work of translanguaging needs to challenge the ideology at this level.

Bilingual Education

Scholarship on translanguaging in bilingual education at the K-12 level has shown that the use of more than one language in the classroom is valuable. Hornberger and Link (2012) define translanguaging as not only “a language practice of multilinguals” but is also “a pedagogical strategy to foster language and literacy development¹⁵” (242) and to value local languages in addition to formal or official languages. In fact, the term translanguaging originated in bilingual education scholarship to indicate a particular pedagogical practice of a teacher interacting with students (K-12 education) in more than one language to aid learning and then extended outward to apply more generally (Lewis et al., 2012; Cenoz & Gorter, 2017; Jaspers, 2018).

There are actually two types of translanguaging that teachers use. One type is

as well as define it for the understanding of this project.

¹⁵ In bilingual education classrooms, students not only learn core content material in the two (or more) languages, they develop their literacy and proficiency in both languages as well. It is not unusual for students in a bilingual classroom to know yet other languages; Rosiers et al. (2017) mention the ways that students and teachers translanguage among multiple languages, not all of them shared, in the classroom.

spontaneous translanguaging (Lewis et al., 2012; Cenoz and Gorter, 2017), which is the impromptu “fluid discursive practices” that can happen in the classroom just as they do outside of the classroom. The other type is pedagogical translanguaging (Lewis et al., 2012; Cenoz and Gorter, 2017; Cahyani et al. 2018), which is a more intentional and strategic use of translanguaging by the teacher within the classroom for the purposes of scaffolding or assisting learning. The use of more than one language “in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner to organise and mediate mental processes in understanding, speaking, literacy, and, not least, learning” (Lewis, Jones, and Baker, 2012, p. 655) has been broadly encouraged by scholars in the field, including Blackledge and Creese (2010), Velasco and García (2014), Cahyani et al. (2018), and Caruso (2018).

Velasco and García (2014) expand the concept of translanguaging even further to include not only discourse and pedagogical strategies but as an essential learning strategy for multilingual students: “Translanguaging is not solely a bilingual discourse or a pedagogical strategy for scaffolding instruction. It is also the way that emergent bilinguals can, and do, self-regulate and advance their learning” (p. 21). They demonstrated how restating concepts in other languages and making rhetorical decisions about the language used in writing led students to deepen their own learning.

More recently, translanguaging has been connected to pedagogical goals beyond assisting students’ learning. García (2017) notes several socio-emotional purposes to translanguaging, including affirmation of bilingual identities, empowering students, developing critical sociolinguistic consciousness, motivating learning, and improving social interaction and communication. Rosiers et al. (2017) argue that teacher

translanguaging supports relationships between teachers and students as well as assists in learning. Cahyani et al. (2018) identified four main purposes for teacher translanguaging: knowledge construction, classroom management, interpersonal relations, and instructors' personal affect.

In addition to serving as a bilingual discourse, a pedagogical strategy, and learning strategy, translanguaging has also been linked to the goal of social justice in the form of biliteracy. Velasco and García (2014) frame it this way: as a “bilingual theory of learning,” translanguaging “becomes the framework for conceptualizing the education of bilinguals,” particularly those of minority language groups, “as a democratic endeavor for social justice” (p. 7). They stridently add, “Teaching practices that jeopardize this [linguistically diverse] reality essentially undermine the right to learn of language-minority children” (p. 7), a stance that ties to the languages-as-right argument found in the SRTOL. Wei (2018) envisions an equalizing outcome:

By deliberately breaking the artificial and ideological divides between indigenous versus immigrant, majority versus minority, and target versus mother tongue languages, Translanguaging empowers both the learner and the teacher, transforms the power relations, and focuses the process of teaching and learning on making meaning, enhancing experience, and developing identity. (p. 15)

A few scholars within bilingual education have presented translanguaging as a practice not limited to multilinguals but used by even those traditionally considered monolingual (Otheguy, García, and Reid, 2015, cited in Cenoz, 2017). García (2017)

notes that a translanguaging approach moves beyond the ideas of one dominant language or even a categorical multilingual approach (multiple languages but in separate contexts) to promoting “creative languaging that open up limitless possibilities of knowledge generation” (p. 298). However, this pan-linguistic view of translanguaging has not been taken up more widely by other scholars in bilingual education.

In this emphasis on valuing fluid language practices and the connections to social justice, discussions of translanguaging in bilingual education parallel the argument for translanguaging in composition. This is essentially a translanguaging ideology but in a different context. In bilingual education, however, teacher translanguaging is an important part of achieving these educational and socioemotional goals. Teacher translanguaging practices, therefore, can be a very valuable tool for encouraging the very dispositions and language practices that a translanguaging approach values.

It is important to point out, however, the differences in the context in which these arguments are made. The focus of bilingual education scholarship is in the K-12 context where language is learned along with other areas of content. Translanguaging is therefore the medium of the classroom and facilitates content learning as well language learning. Often—but not always—the classroom context is meant to be multilingual, with two or more languages functioning as the classroom languages. In comparison, composition courses tend to be at the college level and focus on the skill of writing; language-learning, much less bilingualism, is not always a stated learning objective. Despite this contextual difference, we see the importance of teacher translanguaging as validating and supporting students’ language use and developing rapport within the

classroom, and we also see ways that students can use language to develop their own learning and writing abilities.

Second Language Learning

If bilingual education teaches language through its use as the medium for learning content, second language (also labeled as L2) education focuses on language as the content. As Moore (2002) notes, second language teachers have in the past tended to avoid use of any language other than the target language in the classroom and are “highly suspicious of intra-sentential mixing of the two languages” (p. 280). Their concerns stem from a belief that intrusion of students’ native languages will impede their ability to learn another language. However, this suspicion is dwindling in the face of the shift from a more fluid understanding of language and multilingualism, a shift that is happening in second language studies in parallel with bilingual education, applied linguistics, and composition (Piccardo, 2013).

Piccardo (2013) describes this as a movement from purity to plurality. She distinguishes between the purist multilingualism paradigm and the pluralism of *plurilingualism*:

Multilingualism keeps languages distinct both at the societal level and at the individual level. It also tends to stress the separate, advanced mastery of each language a person speaks. Plurilingualism, on the contrary, is focused on the fact that languages interrelate and interconnect particularly, but not exclusively, at the level of the individual. It stresses the dynamic process of language

acquisition and use, in contrast with coexistence and balanced mastery of languages. (p. 601)

Piccardo's distinction between multilingualism and plurilingualism parallels Guerra's (2016) distinction between multilingualism and translingualism, particularly in seeing that multilingualism enforces separation of languages rather than seeing them as inter-related and always in play with each other as a translingual or plurilingual view takes.

As a result of this paradigmatic shift, second language studies is more open to the idea of translanguaging, which Moore describes as the "intra-sentential mixing of two languages" (Moore, 2002, p. 280). She points to a number of ways that students' first languages support their learning of a new language. Translanguaging, she argues, is not "a mere discursive proof of lack of competence" (p. 280), but a way of using students' existing language knowledge to enrich their learning. This view is shared by others (Lewis et al., 2012; Piccardo, 2013; Velasco & García, 2014; Haukås, 2016).

However, while second language studies has become more receptive to the idea of translanguaging in the classroom, second language studies scholars have expressed concern and caution over the conflation of second language (and ESL) pedagogy with translingual pedagogy in composition (Atkinson et al., 2015; Williams and Condon, 2016). Williams and Condon point out that second language studies share with translingualism the same perspective on languages that value the "linguistic talents" of students and that recognize the flexible uses of language while focusing on the teaching of language and grammar in order for students to learn to "decipher and negotiate the shifting boundaries between acceptable and unacceptable linguistic variation" (p. 2).

Conclusion

From our look at translingual practices, two major points stand out. First is that translingual scholarship in composition studies has defined translingual writing in multiple ways. Horner (2017) and Mangelsdorf (2017) include all communicative (by this I mean spoken, written, and multimodal) acts as translingual; according to them, we are always already translanguaging, moving among our various registers, languages, and modes and creating new meanings and new ways of using language. Others, as Matsuda (2014) has pointed out, have taken a narrower view of translingual writing, defining it in terms of more overt language mixing (Canagarajah, 2006a; Young, 2009).

I draw attention to this range of definitions because the act of translanguaging has been presented as the primary productive practice of translingualism. As a phenomenon of language mixing that has been performed by humans for millennia, translanguaging serves as the foundation for the theorization of the translingual approach. To have the current conversations in translingual writing present contradictory understandings of translanguaging complicates our understanding of what *translingual writing* is and what it means to “practice translingualism.” In other words, what kind of writing should we be teaching?

A second observation is that translingual scholarship in composition studies presents a very limited discussion of how translanguaging could be taught in the translingual writing classroom. Instructor reading and assessment practices have been eagerly taken up and discussed, and these discussions have produced good theoretical

refinements and a host of pedagogical practices. Teaching translingual writing has proven a thornier discussion, likely due to confusion over what translingual writing and translanguaging are. For me, this raises the question of how students learn, or are otherwise encouraged, to translanguage in their writing or the writing classroom. What models do they have? How are they exposed to translingual writing? How do they understand that translanguaging can happen in academic contexts as well as outside of the classroom?

A review of translanguaging scholarship in other disciplines shows that *translanguaging* as a term and a practice can be understood in different ways and that this multiplicity of meanings has several implications for how writing instructors practice translingualism. First, that teacher translanguaging, whether spontaneous or as an intentional pedagogy, has been shown to provide both educational and socioemotional benefits as well as supporting literacy and language learning. The objectives of teacher translanguaging align in many ways with the goals of the translingual paradigm, and therefore, composition studies may want to investigate teacher translanguaging as an element of a translingual pedagogy. Moreover, the college composition classroom has the potential to become a “Translanguaging Space”

where teachers and students can go between and beyond socially constructed language and educational systems, structures and practices to engage diverse multiple meaning-making systems and subjectivities, to generate new configurations of language and education practices, and to challenge and transform old understandings and structures. In so doing, orders of discourse

shift and the voices of Others come to the forefront, relating Translanguaging to criticality, critical pedagogy, social justice, and the linguistic human rights agenda. (Wei, 2018, p. 24)

As of yet, however, translingual scholarship has not given as much attention to teacher translanguaging in composition studies. In general, composition instructors are assumed to be monolingual English speakers. The linguistic repertoires of composition instructors and the potential for teacher translanguaging in the composition classroom are fertile sites for exploration.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

This study examined writing instructors' conceptions of practice and teaching of a translingual approach. More specifically, this study focused on how faculty understand and define translingual practices and how they perceive of their own language practices in a translingual approach. The research questions that guided this study are as follows:

- How do faculty understand the practice of translingualism?
- Do they include their own language practices in this conception?
- What language practices do they use?
- How do faculty define translanguaging?

In this chapter, I present my methodology for investigating these research questions. I begin with outlining the theoretical frameworks and guiding terms that shaped this study and then move on to describing the methods.

Methodological Frameworks

The paradigms of translingualism and cultural rhetorics influenced how this study was conducted. A practical reason for using translingualism as a framework is that increasingly instructors and writing programs are adopting a translingual approach for teaching writing. Therefore, translingualism as a concept functions as a way to identify

programs and instructors who are already engaging language diversity and multilingual writing. Moreover, because translingualism is a more recent development, the nuances of this paradigm and its application provide an opportunity for further investigation.

In terms of data analysis, I recognize that a translingual ideology affected my research in two specific ways. First is that I understand that language use is based on the rhetorical and social dimensions of a context, which means not only did my participants and I use and negotiate language in particular ways during the interview, but my participants will vary in their classroom languaging because the classrooms' rhetorical and social dimensions are all different. Therefore, I cannot isolate the language practices they described from their contexts. My methodology must take into consideration the social and rhetorical dimensions of my participants' contexts when examining their language practices. This situated understanding of language and rhetorical practices is also informed by a cultural rhetorics framework, which I will discuss shortly.

Because I take the broader view of translingual practice and translanguaging as something that we all do—albeit with more particular circumstances for multilinguals—with multiple semiotic resources, my view of what counts as translanguaging and translingual practice encompasses more practices than others may include. My definitions of these concepts affect what practices I included for analysis of participants' language practices. It was critical for me to keep this fact in mind because participants did not always define these terms in the same ways. In particular, the second research question compares their definitions of translanguaging and translingual practice with their language practices; conflating their definitions with mine would be

wrong.

Cultural rhetorics is another theoretical perspective that influenced this research study. “In practice, cultural rhetorics scholars investigate and understand meaning-making as it is situated in specific cultural communities,” in which cultural communities are “any place/space where groups organize under a set of shared beliefs and practices” (Powell et al., 2014, 1.1). In this case, a shared belief and practice in translingualism defined the cultural community which I studied—a cultural community in which I also belong. Cultural rhetorics emphasizes that cultures do not simply exist *a priori* but are created and shaped by the people and the practices of the community. In terms of this project, then, translingualism doesn’t just exist on its own; it is a practice and a way of relating to people that is shaped by the people who practice it and which leads the culture place more emphasis and merit on some ways of doing and thinking and not others.

Cultural rhetoricians use the term “constellating” as a metaphor “for those relationships that honor all possible realities” (Powell et al., 2014, 1.2). There is not just one type of practice, one way to make meaning, but a constellation of them. This study does not so much build theory as building constellations of practices and perspectives around translingualism.

Cultural rhetorics also emphasizes relationality, not just in terms of a framework of viewing the various elements of a culture but in terms of how the very relationship between the researcher and research participants. In line with decolonial and Indigenous research paradigms (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999; Wilson, 2008), cultural rhetorics emphasizes that the researcher has a responsibility to understand research as a “relational practice,

requiring interaction with and investment in the communities whose practices are being investigated” (Powell et al., 2014, 2.2). This relationality emphasizes a respect for and an accountability to the participants and the culture. In this vein, I used member-checking not just a technique for validating the data but for holding myself accountable to my research participants, their stories, practices, and perspectives. Likewise, my interview data is not mine but theirs. As a consequence, I shared participants’ data with them.

The interviews were, as much as possible, allowed to progress as though they were conversations.¹⁶ In many ways they were; participants and I share many of the same beliefs, experiences, and interests around language practices and teaching, and I occasionally referenced my own experiences or perspectives to frame questions within the interviews. Likewise, some interview participants asked *me* questions. I was not a blank wall but another person with whom participants were interacting and responding to.

At times, however, I found myself struggling to navigate that ethic of relationality vis a vis the expectations around objectivity and confidentiality as I understood them to be defined by IRB and institutional dictates of ethical research and

¹⁶ I often refer to the interviews as stories and conversations. That is because they are stories - particularly stories of participants’ language histories and their teaching. Stories are a natural way of sharing information and reveal complex practices and applications of these concepts into real contexts. For example, I would ask a participant to clarify an idea, and they would tell a story, revealing much more than just a simple definition. I also kept the ideas of stories in mind while designing the interview. Asking for stories - whether inquiring into the language history of a participant or using the artifact in the first interview (Halbritter & Lindquist, 2012) - generated a richer data set. Just as surveys would not allow for the theory-building that I needed to do, asking participants to provide a list of their language practices would not capture the full extent

as I had previously learned in past experiences with more pragmatic (Cresswell, 2010) and empirical approaches to research. These expectations often demand that the interviewer is practically effaced through practices such as open-ended questions, no personal viewpoints, and no discussion of other participants. The methodology of this study, particularly the interview methods, therefore manifests elements of both positivistic and cultural rhetorical research approaches as my understanding of research as relational and situated developed.

Study Methods

The research methods that I used for this study are a series of two qualitative semi-structured interviews, followed by a grounded theory approach to data analysis, and validated through member-checking. In the sections that follow, I provide details and support for the methods I used in this dissertation study, including participant recruitment and data analysis. The sections are organized based on the stages of this project:

Recruitment

In the first stage, I recruited writing instructors who either had self-identified as teaching using the translingual approach, as determined by their scholarship or in their professional teaching descriptions, or who taught in writing programs that have adopted a translingual approach (indicated through the use of “translingual” in their program

of language practices and, more importantly, their connection to contexts.

descriptions or by their presence in scholarship as an example of translingual writing program). I decided to focus on this group because it is reasonable to expect that teachers who independently take on a translingual approach will be practicing translingualism and be more conscious of their own language practices (although this study tests those assumptions). Likewise, writing programs that have adopted a translingual approach are reasonably expected to have actively worked to cultivate a translingual language disposition in teachers, and therefore instructors in these programs are also likely to be practicing translingualism.

While a translingual approach has not been widely adopted, there were still enough writing programs and instructors who have self-identified as using a translingual approach to make feasible a strong enough sample. When compiling a list of potential participants, I was mindful of the types of institutions (4-year, 2-year, large, small, public, private) and the populations and regions they serve and to try to recruit from as diverse a selection as possible. The emphasis on a translingual approach did, however, limit the pool of institutional contexts and the pool of potential participants. Additionally, not all those I reached out to responded, so the diversity was limited in that regard. For future projects of similar nature, snowball sampling would be a useful recruitment measure to follow up with; some of my participants even suggested colleagues whom I should talk to. Nevertheless, as presented in Chapters One and Four, participants represent some diversity in terms of institutional contexts and status, regions, and language and cultural backgrounds.

I sent my recruitment e-mail directly to individual writing instructors whom I identified as teaching using a translingual approach and to instructors within writing

programs that use the translingual approach. Instructors who responded and expressed interest in participating received the consent form to review. They agreed to participate by e-mailing me that they accepted the consent form. From there, I set up a convenient time with them for our first interview. My original goal was to have five participants to complete both interviews for the study. I ended up with eight, who all participated in both interviews. As an incentive for participation, but also in recognition and gratitude for their time, I sent them Amazon gift cards after the first and the second interviews.

Bias Towards Translingualism

One of the limitations of the recruitment method was that the instructors who did agree to participate were more likely to be engaged with translingualism. Participants who agreed to be in the study often did so because they believed in the translingual approach or found the project interesting, and they enjoyed the opportunity to talk about the paradigm. This enthusiasm for translingualism often meant that the participants were well-versed in the scholarship of the approach, and therefore aware of the translingual ideology itself as well as the standard language ideology that it counters. This may have lessened the potential for their language ideology to differ from their language practices, which was one element I was interested in observing.

In the cases where a writing program was known to adopt translingualism either as a pedagogical approach or, more evident, as a learning outcome, I sent the recruitment e-mail to more people in the department. Rather than just targeting a few people that either demonstrated clear evidence of using the approach or who demonstrated interest in scholarship areas that aligned with translingualism, I e-mailed

more graduate students and faculty in the hopes of getting a wider range of instructor profiles. However, the ones who responded tended to have some interest in the approach. Only one participant, Keiko, did not recognize “translingualism” as a term and approach; however, by virtue of teaching in a program that did take a translingual approach, particularly in terms of its learning outcomes, she demonstrated many of the same values and approaches to working with students that the other participants did.

Data Collection

Data (in the form of stories) were collected through interviews. My choice of interviews is what Cresswell (2010) would describe as pragmatic, stemming from the research problem as one of the most likely ways to explore teachers’ languaging effectively. The phenomena that I explored are set in particular contexts and situations, shaped by many different factors, but that from these a generalizable pattern of practices can be drawn out. This research is also qualitative, or context-preserving (Broad, 2012), in that it understands that these phenomena cannot be studied in dissociation with its context. To understand the translingual practices and languaging of instructors, we have to understand the larger programmatic, ideological, and demographic contexts in which they are teaching (Tardy, 2011) as well as the cultural and rhetorical elements of their contexts (Powell et al., 2014; Bratta & Powell, 2016). Interviews were a way to get that rich contextual information and to understand how participants saw their own practices as situated in these contexts.

Interviews helped to gain a more concrete sense of the ways that instructors exemplify and define translanguaging in the classroom. I chose to use interviews,

instead of classroom observations or analysis of course documents, to highlight the conscious, rhetorical choice behind practices, including translanguaging. My reasoning was that it is important to understand how instructors themselves understand how they are using language rather than the researcher telling them when or how they are translanguaging.¹⁷

The choice of interviews was due also to two practical reasons. First was that the nature of a dissertation study necessitated a limited scope of project. Because my university does not take a translingual approach, nor is it (as far as I know) common in some of the nearby institutions, video and phone interviews made it easier for me to do the study with people who were already using a translingual approach.

Second, composition's understanding of translanguaging has not been well-defined. At the point of starting this study, I had a definition of translanguaging, informed by my background in linguistics and my own experiences in multilingualism, as a visible and audible mixing of two noticeably distinct languages or language varieties. With such a definition in mind, I initially wanted to do a survey to see what kind of translanguaging was done by composition teachers. However, as I continued to investigate the concepts of code-meshing and translanguaging, the definitions of *translanguaging* became less clear cut. Moreover, it wasn't clear whether multilingual

¹⁷ It was important for me to not apply my own definitions of translanguaging but to understand how the instructors conceptualized it. Moreover, because there are so many definitions of translanguaging in the literature, I could not be sure that instructors shared the same definition. In order to understand their conceptualizations, I needed to talk to participants rather than observe them. Observations or surveys would not provide as rich an understanding of their own definitions. In exploring both their own definitions but their practices and ideologies more broadly, I could develop a more nuanced idea of translanguaging.

instructors in the composition classroom were even using their other languages. So, I needed to shift from looking at what kind of translanguaging was being used to examining if translanguaging was actually occurring and whether multilingual instructors actively considered their own language practices in their classroom speaking and writing. A more exploratory method was necessary, and interviews provided a way of investigating translingualism and translanguaging in a more nuanced way.

Interviews were semi-structured (Lorimer Leonard, 2014). I had a list of interview questions, but in general I let the interviews with participants follow participants' lines of thought. Lorimer Leonard (2014) writes, "semistructured interview formats allow for adaptability to the 'emerging worldview of the respondent' (Merriam 90) as experts in their experience" (p. 228). For this study as well, it was important to center the participants as "experts in their experience" and for them to reveal what they thought was important and meaningful, rather than for me to stick to a script. The questions therefore provided a touchpoint for moving conversations forward in lulls and avenues of further conversation.

Most of the second interviews were scheduled after all of the first-round interviews were completed. This scheduling was due more to happenstance than any specific planning on my part: at the end of the first interviews, I asked participants if they would like to schedule their next interview. Most preferred to wait until I had a better sense of timing—a perspective based on their assumption that it would be better to finish all of the first interviews before moving on to the next. I think my participants' assumption of timing proved rather wise; by the end of the first round of interviews I had come to realize that I needed to pursue the idea of translanguaging more directly

and ask participants to define the term, which I was able to incorporate into the second interviews.

At the end of the first interview, participants were asked if they wanted to choose their own pseudonym and if they would like to receive the audio file of the recorded interview.¹⁸ This was in keeping with collaborative (Armstrong et al., 2005) and cultural rhetorics and Indigenous research methods (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999; Wilson, 2008; Powell et al., 2014; Ramos, 2016). Several participants asked for a transcript of the interview so that they could remember what they had said; they found the interview conversation really helpful for parsing out their own ideas around translingualism, and the transcripts served as a record of those thoughts that they could review. Participants were also invited to reflect on the interview—or to review the recording of their interview—before the next interview to identify any points or ideas that they wished to clarify or elaborate on further. Giving access to their interview recordings and letting participants choose their pseudonyms was a way of honoring their participation but also giving them control over their voices and stories.

None of my participants were interested in receiving the audio recording; those participants who did want to review the interview asked instead for a copy of the

¹⁸ Most interviews were conducted through Skype as a video chat. Two participants requested interviewing over the phone, and one of the second interviews also ended up being held over the phone after technical difficulties with Skype made that medium impossible to use. The interviews lasted no more than 60 minutes and were audio-recorded. For the phone calls, I used a call recording app to record the interviews; for Skype, I used a computer-based application designed for recording Skype calls. No video was recorded, even when I used video-call functions on Skype. I also took handwritten notes although my notes for the video calls on Skype were less copious because I wanted to maintain eye contact with my interviewee and not be seen to be writing or have my head down the whole time.

transcription. This request made sense in that it is faster to read through a transcript than to listen to an hour or more of interviews. (And in the case of the participants who found the interview helpful for articulating valuable ideas, they could more easily find their ideas on the page.) However, as I explain in the section on preparing data for analysis, transcribing every interview was not really feasible. In future cases of interviews, I would offer instead the option of the recording or a “listen-through” document. In the second interview, I again offered to share the recording. Most participants declined again although almost all of them asked to see the write-up of the research because they were personally interested in the topic. Those participants whose interviews I transcribed did receive a copy of their interview transcripts.

After each interview, I reviewed and annotated the notes and then wrote up a summary of the interview on my contact sheets. I provide more details into this process as well as the transcription and documentation process in the section on preparing the data.

Interview 1

This first interview was focused on learning about participants’ language views and beliefs. The questions for this interview asked about their background in the translingual approach and their views on language and translingualism, which form a foundation of how they practice translingualism and use language in their classrooms. In the latter part of the interview, I asked a few demographics-related questions to gain a sense of their teaching and language contexts. Appendix A presents the questions that I used to guide the interviews.

When setting up the first interview, I asked participants to choose an item that represents their concept of practicing translingualism. We then used that item as a starting point for discussion, following the artifact-based method described by Halbritter and Lindquist (2012). I used the artifact-based question as way of starting the discussion and having them tell me a story. As I described earlier, stories are rich sources of data in that they reveal complex interactions between practices, ideologies, and contexts. In other words, they help to situate practices rather than isolating them from the contexts that shape them.

The stories that the participants told about these items led into discussions about their teaching more generally, and helped to answer Questions B and C regarding how they taught translingualism in the classroom. Although I was interested in translingualism in a broader context than the classroom, it was important to also frame translingual practices within a classroom context because I wanted to see what practices these instructors considered to be translingual and how they modeled them to students. In a similar vein, I used Question F to explore participants' ideologies as well as objectives for teaching with a translingual approach.

Comparisons can be very helpful for revealing the outlines of practices and beliefs. Question H asked participants to compare their practice of translingualism with others whom they knew also practiced translingualism. Originally, I had used "how you teach using a translingual approach," but I changed it to "how you practice translingualism" to allow for the practice of translingualism to be interpreted as not just limited to teaching practices. This comparison helped to refine their ideas, gave some glimpses of other ways people practice translingualism, and also highlighted the ways

that practices are developed in relation and in collaboration with other scholars and colleagues.

Question D also tried to elicit a story from participants. It asked about their background with translingualism, particularly how they learned about translingualism and why they began to use it in the classroom. This question helps to uncover the ways that instructors begin to incorporate a particular approach or paradigm into their teaching and also unearths the motivations—the ideologies and experiences—for using the approach. This question helps to add nuance to our understanding of the translingual approach and the interplay of ideology, theory, personal connections, and material experiences that underlie one's practices.

Tardy (2011) points to how institutional structures and ideologies are entwined (and at times in conflict) with instructors' pedagogical practices and their own language beliefs. It was important, therefore, to understand the institutional contexts in which my participants were teaching and working. In addition to the demographic questions that I asked at the end of the interview, Question G asked about participants' writing programs to understand the programmatic elements affecting an instructor's understanding and use of a translingual approach.

In my original vision for this study, I anticipated interviewing instructors who taught within a writing program using a translingual approach but who may not be entirely enthusiastic on the idea. Therefore, I had a question about how they felt about translingualism (Question F). However, I did not end up needing this question. Most participants had taken up the translingual approach on their own accord, and only one participant was unfamiliar with the term, which made this question impossible to ask.

Interview 2

The second round of semi-structured individual interviews built off of the previous interviews. Using questions and themes identified through the first round of data analysis, I began the second interview by asking questions to develop or clarify information shared in the previous interview. I also invited participants to clarify or elaborate on anything that they had previously shared. A few did so, but most were interested in jumping into the questions.

The goal of the second interview¹⁹ was to have participants to describe and explain their language practices in the classroom and thereby dig more deeply into the language practices of the instructors, connecting them to the beliefs and practices around translingualism that they have already described. The script and questions that I used are presented in Appendix A. To generate discussion around ideas of practice and translingualism, I used a quote from Gallagher and Noonan (2017, p. 176): “We cannot claim to be translingual; we can only learn to *practice* translingualism.” This quote proved very useful for starting a discussion around what it means to be or to practice translingualism and who could be translingual (if anyone). Participants’ responses also were fruitful in helping me see how they viewed themselves in terms of translingualism and being translingual.

¹⁹ Like the first interview, I tried to keep the second interviews to no more than 60 minutes and conducted them either over Skype or by phone. These interviews were also audio-recorded and I took handwritten researcher notes. Participants were offered to receive the audio files for their individual interviews. The recordings and research notes from the second round of interviews were organized, transcribed, and then analyzed per the procedures described in later sections of this chapter.

I also asked questions about their language backgrounds and the languages that they used in their classrooms. However, because I was letting conversations be directed around the participants' stories—and because of my own, perhaps misguided, concerns about asking too direct of questions and thereby making the conversation feel formal—I did not ask as many specific questions about their language practices as I had originally intended, particularly regarding their written language practices in the classroom.

As I progressed through the study, I realized that I needed to ask participants how they defined “translanguaging” as this term offered a valuable perspective into what participants had read or studied and how they understood language use in the classroom. I added Question B to elicit their definitions. However, I did not get to ask all of the participants how they defined this term, leaving that data less complete than I would have liked.

Interview 2, even more than Interview 1, tended to not draw on the list of questions as much. This was due to a range of factors, predominantly my desire to make the interview seem more like a conversation and let the participants drive much of the conversation. In later interviews, however, I realized that I needed to ask more specific questions around their language practices and in doing so, participants often began to reflect more consciously on what they were doing and why, which they found helpful. This experience taught me an important lesson: while giving participants control over the direction of the conversation was important, asking more direct questions can stimulate important discussions.

Finally, I included a question about the teaching of grammar because translanguaging challenges the standard notion of the importance of grammar. However,

in the course of the interviews, this question did not seem as important, and I therefore did not ask it, although a few participants mentioned their approach to grammar of their own accord.

Preparation of Data for Analysis

The preparation of data also served as initial data analysis as part of an iterative approach to data analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994). As I describe in the following section, processing and preparing the interview data provided some initial insights into the data and helped to inform later interview questions and data analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Immediately following an interview, I reviewed my handwritten field notes to add any further notes, to summarize some primary observations, and to highlight and note any particular words or comments of interest or that were repeated. As interviewing continued, rough comparisons between the interviews could be made. This rough analysis allowed for some commonalities and differences to emerge, which, when paired with a review of the research questions, then helped me to fine-tune the interview questions and process for subsequent interviews. I also wrote up “contact summaries” for each participant that captured pertinent information about the participants and their contexts (Miles & Huberman, 1994); on the back I recorded key ideas and observations. Later on, I typed up the field notes and contact summaries, once again revisiting the data and continuing to find patterns and points of interest.

Further data organization and analysis happened with a step I called the “listen-through.” The listen-throughs were an idea born out of necessity. First, I needed to get a

better sense of the data and how the interviews would answer my research questions than I was getting from the field notes and contact summaries. However, transcription of all the interviews was not feasible with the time-line I needed to maintain. The listen-throughs therefore offered a way to get more richness in order to get the broader comparisons I thought were important for answering my research questions without demanding too much time.

To create the listen-throughs, I listened to the interviews and wrote up a running summary of the content, interspersed with direct quotes from the participants and time stamped to make it easy to locate particular conversations on the recordings. Although I summarized all the discussion points, the summaries were richer when the conversation was about aspects directly connected to the research questions or to elements that I had picked up on from previous interactions with the field notes and contact summaries.

The listen-throughs provided a quicker way to engage with the material than transcribing but also provided a record of the ideas and language of the participants. The listen-throughs also served as an excellent reference point for finding information and stories. Often, I could find information I needed by referring to the listen-through, and if I needed more detail, the time stamp allowed me to easily find that particular part of the conversation in the recording. Because the listen-throughs were much shorter than transcripts (4-6 pages versus 22+ pages), it was easier to review them and find information for data analysis. I also used the listen-throughs to distinguish which participants I would want to focus on for parts of my in-depth analysis.

For this study, I sought to balance depth of data analysis with breadth. For the research questions around the definitions of translingualism and translanguaging, I

wanted to compare across all of the participants. That breadth was important. However, I also knew that participants' interviews offered very dense observations into translanguaging practice that, if done across all the interviews, would be beyond the scope of this project and its timeline. I therefore needed to identify several participants whose interviews I could use for a more in-depth analysis of practices embedded in contexts. I chose four participants who I thought presented descriptions of translanguaging practice that captured both the diversity and commonality of perspectives, practices, and contexts represented in the entire data set. Their interviews were then transcribed.

I eventually ended up with ten transcriptions: the eight interviews of the four participants chosen as case studies, and two further transcriptions that were made for various reasons. Originally, I had wanted to transcribe interviews myself, and I did transcribe seven interviews, including the two I just described as well as five that I used for in-depth analysis. I found transcription to be invaluable for becoming very familiar with the data and for learning about the process. However, because transcription is also demanding of time and effort, I made the decision to use a transcription service to transcribe the remaining three interviews that I wanted to use. This choice allowed me to devote more attention to data analysis and writing my dissertation.

However, after receiving these outsourced transcriptions, I read over each one while listening to the interviews. One reason for doing this was to double-check the accuracy of the transcriptions against the interview recordings. I did find a few spots where things were heard inaccurately, and so I was able to make those corrections before data analysis. Another important reason was to reacquaint myself with the interviews and imbue the text with the presence of my participants. Referencing

Derrida, St. Pierre and Jackson (2014) write, “words spoken in face-to-face interviews do not count as data until they are written, textualized in interview transcripts—until they have lost their presence. In fact, words can never retain presence” (p. 716).

However, reading the transcripts while listening to the interviews—like the transcription process itself—helped to retain, however imperfectly, the sense of presence of my participants. The recordings retain numerous cues for meaning (inflection, pauses, laughter, intonation) that add presence as well as nuance. Although I did not use a transcription protocol to capture all these paralinguistic cues, transcribing and reviewing the transcripts while listening to the interviews helped me not only to be more familiar with the stories and perspectives but also reminded me of these layers of meaning to the words and of the people behind the words. This meant that during data analysis, they were not just words but pieces of larger quilts of meaning and history. When I read a particular quotation or phrase pulled for coding, I could retain the larger context in which it was said and could hear my participant saying it.

At the time of the interviews, I had not yet come up with the idea of the listen-throughs, but in hindsight, the listen-throughs may have been a good compromise of including interview participants in their stories while maintaining a more reasonable amount of work. In the future, I would approach the data preparation process a bit differently: I would still take notes and make a contact sheet with summary notes. The next step would then be to do the listen-throughs, for the reasons stated above, and then transcribe the interviews on which I wanted to do the in-depth analysis.

Data Analysis

One of the challenges of this project was also its strength: the interview data are incredibly rich in stories and insights into the understanding of translingualism, language practices, and pedagogical practices. With the various processes I describe here, I sought to engage and present my data in ways that allow for the broad comparison across the experiences and perspectives of my participants and for the deeper rich analysis that comes from case studies, all while attempting to keep the scope of the project realistic for finishing the project.

Because of the exploratory nature of the study, along with its investigation of three different phenomena (conceptualizations, contexts, and practices), I used a grounded theory approach (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003; Clarke, 2005), which builds up hypotheses and theories using “the research participants as the source of knowledge” (Auerbach and Silverstein, 2003, p. 7). This study sought to understand participants’ own conceptualizations of ideas that have a range of definitions, and so it was important to work from the ground up to understand their perspectives without assuming that I knew what they were.

My grounded approach was also shaped by the situated analysis approach that Clarke (2005) takes. According to her, the “embodiment and situatedness of knowledge producers” (p. 20)—in this case, my participants—means that I must take into account participants’ individual contexts and subjective experiences. Recognizing the situatedness of participants and taking into account their contexts as well as their language histories and beliefs were also ways that I practice a cultural rhetorics approach that recognizes that the meaning and practice of translingualism are cultural practices and situated in a particular community of shared beliefs (Powell et al., 2014).

Unlike Clarke's situated analysis approach, however, a cultural rhetorics approach acknowledges that the researcher is also involved in a relationship with the community (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999; Powell et al., 2014), which was certainly the case here.

Although Auerbach and Silverstein frame grounded theory as an inductive approach, in which the data generate theory, this study takes more of an abductive approach (Brinkmann, 2014). Brinkmann (2014) describes abductive research in the following way: "Inquiry is thus the process of trying to understand the situation by sense-making. The result of sense-making (which may be a concept or a theory) is then tested to see whether the situation is resolved" (p. 722). This quote captured the sense of what I wanted to achieve through the research with one caveat: my goal was not to resolve a situation but rather to provide a broader picture of collective perspectives and practices—a constellation (Powell et al., 2014).

The rich set of data that I collected presented a challenge: how to represent the breadth of perspectives and understandings of translingualism and translanguaging while also pursuing the deeper analysis that allows for a greater appreciation and more theoretical understanding of how these perceptions played out in practice. In the end I found ways to compare data and stories from all participants while doing a closer analysis on four participants in particular whose stories captured many of the practices and perspectives of all of the participants.

Initial Engagement with the Data

The section above, "Preparation of Data," outlines the rough analysis and comparisons that I did while preparing the data for further analysis. Organizing, reviewing, and

summarizing my notes, writing the listen-throughs, and transcribing interviews were all important elements for engaging with the data. As I explained there, these activities helped me to become familiar with the data and to begin identifying repeated themes, stories, and points of comparison well before I began coding. By the end, participants' stories became my story.

Coding for Conceptualizations and Practices

I used coding as the main data analysis technique for this project. The data analysis section outlines the specifics of my process. I chose coding because it provided the most effective way to get into the fine-grained analysis of concepts and practices that I wanted to do. Process coding—the use of gerunds such as “moving back and forth” to code data—was a particularly important technique because this type of data analysis best captures practices, a key element of this study.

It was also important for me to maintain the integrity of the stories and the relation of the concepts, practices, and contexts, in line with a cultural rhetorics emphasis on story and relationality. Therefore, I had to find ways to analyze and present the data to reflect those relations. In this the previous section, I described how I repeatedly engaged with data before I began the process of coding. Those encounters were invaluable for gaining a sense of what themes and practices were emerging. However, the richness and sheer amount of data meant that I needed a more methodical way of engaging with the data to reveal more nuanced insights and theories. In other words, I used coding as a way of making data analysis manageable but framed the process through a cultural rhetorics lens.

This study works up from concepts to practices. The following research questions focus on the conceptualization of two particular terms:

- How do faculty understand the practice of translingualism?
- How do faculty define translanguaging?

These two research questions dealt with how the participants understood translingualism and translanguaging. I wanted both to understand how they individually regarded these terms and to compare and investigate these terms in more depth. How are they being understood? What do we mean by these terms? It was important to have these conceptualizations in order to frame the both the practices ascribed to those two concepts but also to answer the next two research questions:

- What language practices do they use?
- Do they include their own language practices in this conception?

In my data analysis, therefore, I progressed from identifying the various conceptualizations of translanguaging and translingualism to identifying the practices connected to them and the practices of the participants. From there I could compare the practices to their conceptualizations and frame them within their contexts.

I used the qualitative data analysis software ATLAS.ti. This program was developed for qualitative data and it provided several important affordances. First is that I could code the same section of textual data with multiple codes. Second is that it made

it very easy to use a grounded approach as I could create the codes with my own labels as I went along and then later merge or split the codes as I saw fit. The software also provided different ways to visualize data and the connections between codes and passages of text. Because the tool shapes how analysis is performed, my description of my analytic methods relies on an understanding of the software and its analytic tools and I therefore frame the discussion of my analytic methods in terms of the various capacities and tools of ATLAS.ti.

First Round Coding for Ideas and Themes

I adapted Auerbach and Silverstein's (2003) grounded approach in which they move from collecting ideas to sorting them into themes. In their method, they start with a research question and then move through the transcriptions, collecting chunks of text (what they call *relevant text*) that respond to the question. After marking or collecting the relevant text, they start with the first chunk and identify a main idea (*repeating idea*, or what Saldaña (2016) calls a "common script"), then create a document for that idea, copying the chunk of text into that document. They then run through the other relevant texts and find other chunks that share that repeating idea and copy that text into their document. From there they continue to identify repeating ideas and then begin sorting ideas into coherent categories and then developing their theory.

I adapted this approach to work with ATLAS.ti software and with my study focus. For example, for the concept of translingualism, I started by first running through my transcripts (for those I had decided to transcribe) and my listen-throughs, marking the passages that discussed definitions and understandings of translingualism. Unless I

knew a particular passage was part of a continuing discussion over an element of translanguaging, I only marked (coded) those passages where the words “translingual” or “translanguaging” were used, applying the code {idea: translanguaging}. These passages served as my relevant text.

After I marked the relevant text in my data, I then went through and began coding for repeating ideas, or what I called themes. Using Auerbach’s and Silverstein’s approach, I started with the first passage of relevant text that I had marked and then coded it for a theme. I then ran through the list of all the relevant text passages and coded any other passages with that theme. After coding for that theme, I then returned to the top of the list and identified the next theme, coding the rest of the list with that.

As I progressed, I realized that there were different ways that *translingual* and *translanguaging* were being conceptualized or applied. For example, some used *translingual approach* to refer both to an orientation, a framework, a pedagogy, and a way of writing. I decided to start from the first relevant text and identify which conceptualization was being used. I used a different coding scheme, using the classifier {concept: }, such as {concept: TL = orientation}. Unlike with the themes, I didn’t focus on coding for one concept at a time. Instead, I just used the list of relevant text (marked with {idea: translanguaging(ism)}) and identified a concept for each text passage.

After coming up with a list of 18 concept codes, I realized that a few contradicted each other—highlighting the tensions and confusions in how the term translanguaging is understood. More importantly, I realized at this point that I had some overlap in terms. There was more that I needed to do to categorize these further. To move forward on this, I turned to process coding these passages.

Process Coding

The concepts of translanguaging and translingualism both center on the idea of practice. What are people doing? Process coding (Saldaña, 2016) is a method for examining the text for actions and assigning codes in the form of a gerund (e.g., using English, moving back and forth, telling a story, workshopping sentences). As Lorimer Leonard (2014) writes, “Coding with gerunds [...] foregrounded the active do-ing of multilingual” communication (p. 229). It highlights language as an activity, not as a static object. To process code, I took the relevant text that I had selected and coded the passages for practices. I would try to use participants’ words when possible, such as the code {TL practice: being “at home in all your languages”}, but I often would observe a type of action that could be described more generally, such as {TL practice: comparing languages}.

To process code the ideas of translanguaging and translingualism, I went through the relevant text (those passages marked with the {idea} codes for those terms) for one idea at a time. For each passage of relevant text linked to a particular idea, I coded the practices that I saw there. These indicated the practices directly associated with these ideas. After coding for the various practices, I could then move on to categorization and theorization. I used process coding at other points as well, which I describe below.

Memoing and Commenting

Writing analytic memos is a method of documenting the thoughts behind the various

aspects of the research process, including decisions made in coding, reflections on emerging theory or patterns, or tensions within the data (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003; Saldaña, 2016; Lorimer Leonard, 2014). Point and Fourboul (2006) offer this description: “Les mémos constituent un mode de conservation et de progression des pensées du chercheur” [Memos serve as a way of capturing and progressing the thoughts of the researcher] (p. 68). Although I did not use consistently write memos in the form of full documents, as described by the authors cited above, I did use the act of memoing in various forms to both capture and progress my thoughts.

I wrote full memos periodically to my adviser. These memos helped me to reflect on what I was doing, why I was doing it, and what I was finding. Like any kind of reflection, articulating these things helped me not only to generate text I could use for this dissertation, it helped me to identify challenges and tensions, problem solve, and justify my process. The memos *may* have even been helpful for my adviser for understanding what I was doing!

More often, my memoing took more spontaneous and dispersed forms, such as writing down my ideas as notes in my research log and as comments within ATLAS.ti. My research log—a simple composition notebook—is where I jotted ideas by hand. In my notebook, I would sketch diagrams to connect and sort information, capture theoretical and methodological ideas, work through and solidify concepts and ideas.

I also captured my analytic observations in the coding software itself. ATLAS.ti offers two functions that served me in capturing ideas and making valuable connections in my data analysis. One feature is a memo feature. It can certainly be used in the fuller sense of the memo technique, but I used it a bit more sparingly. It helped me to capture

some of my observations on the fly—observations that were a bit too lengthy or too sporadic to write down by hand, but too nebulous or incomplete to write into my dissertation manuscript.

I also used the comment feature in the software. ATLAS.ti allows you to write comments on quotations (the passages of text that have been marked for coding) and on the codes themselves, among other things. I used the comments to write out ideas and observations about the codes or the quotations. For example, when I merged some of the codes (see “Categorization and Theorization” below), I could use the comment feature to capture some of the nuances that were lost through merging or to distinguish the code from another. Comments therefore helped me both to keep track of the nuances in the data and codes but also to begin theorizing my data.

Simultaneous Coding

Saldaña (2016) distinguishes between coding as “lumper” and coding as a “splitter.” Lumping, as he defines it, is marking a full passage with one code that speaks to the essence of the passage. In contrast, splitting is coding smaller, more discrete parts of a passage, essentially going line-by-line. In other words, the same passage would be marked with just one code if lumping or be divided into smaller codes if splitting. As Saldaña explains, lumping “gets to the essence of categorizing a phenomenon” while splitting “encourages careful scrutiny” of the actions and perspectives in the data (2016, p. 24).

For this study, I melded these two approaches together by coding a lump of text with multiple bits of code, or simultaneous coding (Saldaña, 2016). Figure 3.1, below,

illustrates what this approach looks like.

Figure 3.1—Example of Simultaneous Coding

Joelle: There's lots of class exercises I do that lead up to what ... Julia Kiernan and Sonia Wang and I have published on article on the translation assignment. But leading up to that we might do – I might give them some American poems that are culturally laden and linguistically laden. So some might be written in African-American vernacular. So part of it is they translate those. I might have them translate it into their home language, and then have other students from the same language base translate it back to English. It's like the telephone game. If you know the telephone game. How language, when repeated, it's never the same. When you translate it, it's never the same as the original. Something is always lost. Sometimes something is gained, but you can't replicate the culture.

Joelle: So one of the premises of the course is language equals culture, culture equals language, so talking about the different ways things are embodied. I mean, because so many of the students in the particular class I teach, Preparation for College Writing, are international and most of them are Chinese, one of the early things that comes up right away is we do things with puns and with jokes and how they don't translate. My Arabic students will share an Arabic joke. We actually use language as the subject of exploration. So you learn right away about the four-word sayings in China that say things like -- I have an example with me -- "paint snake with feet." Which actually means something very specific. It's like an Aesop tale with a four sentence in English thing at the end that makes absolutely no sense to an outside, from the outside who isn't familiar with that phrase or that story, but in China that will be invoked in conversation. "Oh, paint snake with feet." For them it's very culturally rich in meaning. It has like a moral to it.

9:13 There's lots of class exerci...

- ◇ concept: TL = assignment
- ◇ idea: translingul(ism)
- ★ LgPr: translating
- ◇ TeachPr: give culturally rich tex...
- ◇ TeachPr: giving texts written in...
- ◇ TeachPr: having students transl...
- ◇ TeachPr: making translation pa...
- ◇ theme: language is always in tr...
- ◇ Translating

9:45...

- ◇ LgPr: playing with lg
- ★ LgPr: translating

Here, the highlighted text is a quotation—the term that ATLAS.ti uses for a coded passage of text—that has been labeled with several rounds of coding:

- the initial idea, {idea: translingual(ism)};
- the concept, {concept: TL = practice}, and a theme {theme: language is always in translation};
- several different types of practice, e.g., {LgPr: translating};
- a head code, {Translating}

I found that coding one chunk of text with multiple codes to be most effective for my study. The concepts of translanguaging and translingualism, as well as language

and teaching practices, were often interwoven. For example, the first paragraph in Figure 3.1 was Joelle's response to my request to clarify what she meant by "negotiation of language," a phrase she used to define translingual practice. In this paragraph, she describes both pedagogical and language practices to illustrate a particular aspect of her conceptualization of translingualism. If I were to code via splitting, I would divorce a particular practice from a richer environment of related practices and ideas. On the other hand, if I were to code via lumping as defined by Saldaña, I would potentially lose the relationships and distinctions of the practices she describes. With simultaneous coding, I kept that dense, rich text together but allowed for finer-grain distinctions in the practices and their purposes.

Additionally, in the second paragraph in Figure 3.1, another line of text has been coded with two LgPr codes. The quotation itself is less than two lines of text but contains two language practices. I coded this bit of text in the round of process coding for language practices described above. Because I was focused primarily on language practices, not the discussion of the pedagogical practices surrounding these practices, I did not code a larger passage, just the lines describing language practices.

Saldaña (2016) describes a process called "Coding the codes" (p. 229) in which "a number of sequential split codes" are combined into "a more manageable lump for analysis." My approach to coding starts from the opposite end: working with the larger concepts down to the more specific process codes.

Categorization and Theorization

After I coded for various practices (Process Coding), I had over a hundred different

codes. I needed to condense my coding scheme. To condense my codes, I came up with categories for the codes to go into. Then in each category, I grouped codes further, merged similar codes, split codes, and began identifying relationships and hierarchies. I will describe these activities further. I use terminology from ATLAS.ti to describe my process because it is the medium I used and its features necessarily shaped how I interacted with my data. As I will describe, I occasionally used other tools to categorize or visualize data, but much of the data analysis work was done with this software.

I initially categorized the data from the process coding of the data marked {idea: translingual(ism)}. These were all practices that my participants directly associated with translingualism and the “translingual approach,” and I coded these all with the prefix {TL practice}. I realized—in the middle of coding, actually—that the practices described fell into three broad categories: language practices, teaching practices, and orientation practices, which described the practices of people taking a translingual stance toward language use and linguistic difference. I then went back through my practice codes and renamed them based on these categories. Each code was labeled with a new prefix, shown below, that indicated which category it belonged to. As an example, a process code that was initially {TL practice: moving back and forth} was relabeled {LgPr: moving back and forth}. I had just a few codes that did not fall into these categories.

“LgPr”	language practices
“TeachPr”	teaching practices
“OrientPr”	orientation practices

Because this study focused on language practices in particular, I extended the process coding to capture language practices connected with translanguaging. I went through all the passages marked with {idea: translanguaging} and coded for language practices, using either the {LgPr} codes already defined or, if needed, developing new {LgPr} codes.

After coding all the language practices associated with translanguaging and translanguaging, I worked on categorizing the codes connected to language practices. These categories were not as clearly distinct from one another and did not present themselves as immediately. I used an analog approach to start: printing out the entire list of language practice codes and then by hand making a note of a theme or major concept. I quickly developed the following categories:

TLG	Connected to translanguaging
RHET	Connected with rhetorical elements of languaging
NEG	Connected to negotiating language and meaning
CREAT	Connected to creating and transforming language

This initial classification was helpful in framing different types of language practices. However, I knew there were more language practices described in the data than were captured in this initial round of process coding. I therefore went back into the data and coded for other language practices that connected with ideas of multilingual or translingual practice.

It is important to note here that while one of my goals in this analysis was to identify how participants defined translanguaging, in my own perspective, I view translanguaging in a broad sense of using all of one's linguistic practices for communication. Therefore, when I returned to code for {LgPr}, I extended coding to language practices that were not marked as {idea: translingual(ism)} or {idea: translanguaging}. These practices fell under several general categories: language practices of the individual participants, language practices ascribed to multilinguals, and language practices that could be coded with the same {LgPr} codes that were linked to translingualism and translanguaging and thereby implicated within a translingual approach more broadly. Additionally, I coded other semiotic practices, such as drawing a picture or using gestures, because these are important communicative practices that help with translingual communication and that were also identified by participants as part of negotiating communication. I did not code language practices that participants linked to monolingual and standard language ideology because these are placed in opposition to a translingual approach to language practice.

After this additional coding, I returned to the categorization and theorization of language practices. For codes that seemed to go in more than one category, I returned to ATLAS.ti to look at the passages marked with those codes to see what was being described. This exploration usually resulted in one of four actions: identifying the appropriate category for the code; merging the code with another code; splitting the code into other codes; recoding the passages with more applicable codes.

“Merging” is the term used by the ATLAS.ti software to describe the combining of two or more codes into one. For example,

{LgPr: adapting your ideas}

{LgPr: tailoring}

{LgPr: shifting}

{LgPr: adjusting communication to a particular situation}

merged into

{LgPr: adjusting communication to a particular situation}

As I mentioned earlier, the comment function was helpful for noting the different activities that were merged into the final code.

Occasionally, a code was being used in more than one sense, and I wanted to make a distinction between those different ideas. For example, the code {LgPr: using lg creatively} was split into the codes {LgPr: reshaping lg} and {LgPr: playing with lg}.

Using the Network Tool in ATLAS.ti

Although categorization, merging, and splitting could be done by looking at the list of codes, the network tool proved an invaluable way of both visualizing data and categorizing, condensing, and theorizing the data. The network tool allowed me to look at codes in relation to each other and in relation to the data and other elements of the software (other networks, memos, etc.). In the network function, I pulled up a code (or more generally, a category of codes) and began to literally position them relative to

each other and to draw connections between them. This work embodies the constellating work of cultural rhetorics: seeing practices, conceptualizations, and contexts in relation to each other.

Figure 3.2 – Network for Code {LgPr: crossing}

The figure above (Figure 3.2) presents a part of the network for the code, {LgPr: crossing}. I can call up the quotations (passages of text) that are marked with this code (the white boxes in this picture) and also the codes directly linked to {LgPr: crossing} (shaded in purple). The lines between the boxes indicate relationships. Codes are linked to their quotations with simple lines, and more complex relationships can be drawn between codes. The more quotations that are linked to a particular code—especially if the quotations come from more than one participant—the more that code indicates a practice commonly associated by participants with translingualism or transanguaging. In Figure 3.2, the practice “crossing” has been linked to many quotations. The density of connections, then, indicated the validity of the particular practice as part of the

translingual approach.

With the network tool, I was able to see when one passage was marked with several codes and then examine how those codes are used in other situations. This allowed me to identify if there was redundancy in my codes—which could necessitate merging the codes—or if there was a relationship between the codes. I verified relationships and redundancy by examining the other quotations linked to those codes. Likewise, if a particular quotation under examination had more codes that might be relevant, I could bring those into the network and continue to identify relationships between those codes and others. For example, the following quotation was coded with codes {LgPr: code-switching} and {LgPr: moving back and forth}:

So, you know, it allows for students to write and express in class with code switching practices, going back and forth between their home language and other languages. To utilize the stuff that I think is the -- I talked to Jonathan Hall about this once at a conference -- it's the invisible thing in the classroom.

In this quotation, code-switching is equated with or relates to going back and forth across. This relationship helped me make connect {LgPr: code-switching} and {LgPr: moving back and forth}. I could then verify this connection by examining other quotations marked with these two codes to see if they also connected code-switching with moving back and forth. The relationship between codes was also validated and reinforced when more than one participant described a connection between them.

Figure 3.3, below, shows part of a network that I created for exploring the code

able to build out the network and further define relationships and distinctions between the codes. The network tool was an effective tool for identifying these relationships.

The software also allowed me to create relationships between codes and between quotations (marked passages) while coding the documents. This capacity was helpful for when I was coding and picked up on relationships between ideas that might not be as readily obvious when working within the network tool.

By doing this fine-grained work with codes and quotations, I built up categories of practices, articulated how they informed each other, and distinguished practices from the processes and products of translingualism, translanguaging, and translingual teaching. I applied similar techniques to help categorize and theorize OrientPr codes and various LgPr codes such as RHET and. TLG. As I continued to do this deeper work of condensing the codes, the relationships between the codes and between the different categories became more and more clear. I then worked on making networks to show how various aspects of these practices (Orientation, Rhetorical, and Language) informed each other and connected with teaching practices.

Importantly, the work of looking at the codes in relation to the quotations and the other codes applied to those quotations helped me to validate the strength of the codes being used and also to see how various practices relate to each other.

Pairing Concepts with Participants

One important aspect of this study was to see how individual participants understood the terms “translingualism” and “translanguaging” and to then compare their practices with their conceptualization of these terms. The network tool made this actually rather

easy. Because I had coded for concepts (for example, {concept: TL = orientation}), I could pull up the list of concepts in a network and then add in the documents (interview transcripts and look-throughs). As soon as I added the documents, lines appeared to connect the documents with the codes that were applied to them. I then had the work of reviewing the codes (by exploring the quotations marked with that code) and determining both whether that concept was one held by the participant (versus one that the participant mentioned but did not ascribe to) and how exactly that participant understood that concept. I created codes for the individual participants and linked the associated codes to those participant codes.

Figure 3.4 below is an example of how this kind of network played out for the term “translanguaging.” In Figure 3.4, we can see how Cat sees translanguaging as connected to ways of thinking and exploring language use, which is a different conception from Mary, who sees it as a language practice. Moreover, Cat specifically opposes her understanding of translanguaging to the use of the term by Ofelia García and its application within a K-12 bilingual education system. I found the visualization of these distinctions and the virtual yet physical act of moving codes around the screen to help immensely with disentangling the nuanced differences in conceptualizations of the terms “translingualism” and “translanguaging.” It was a virtual parallel to the “tabletop” method of arranging codes and categories that Saldaña (2016, p. 230-231) describes, and the maps described by Clarke (2005).

Figure 3.4—Example of Coding-Participant Pairing

Silverstein (2003) explain, the value of member-checking is that the discussion around the research “corrects, broadens, and deepens the researchers’ understanding of the participants’ subjective experience” (p. 9). When I shared the final write-up, I invited participants (but did not require them) to provide feedback on the accuracy of representations and data interpretations. As much as possible, I tried to accommodate participants’ feedback (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Some minor adjustments were made, but overall, participants felt comfortable with their presence in these pages and agreed with the arguments and findings that appear in the next two chapters. Some offered suggestions or pointed to inconsistencies in how I was presenting the terminology and findings. Their feedback helped me to more accurately frame translingual approaches and theories—the cultural community in which this study took place.

Sharing the research is considered an important element of critical, decolonial/Indigenous, and cultural rhetorics research paradigms that emphasize relationality and reciprocity. Sharing the findings with my research participants was a way of “reporting back” and “sharing the knowledge” (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). In fact, writes Tuhiwai Smith, “Sharing [with the community] is a responsibility of research” (p. 161). A number of the participants expressed the desire to see the write-up of the study, usually because of their own interest in the topic and their sense of the value of the research. I also received offers to provide feedback as a way of assisting me in finishing this dissertation, and others wanted to make sure their work did not overlap with mine. I am grateful for their enthusiasm and thoughtfulness.

CHAPTER FOUR

Language Histories in The Translingual Classroom

One of the biggest perceptions of translingual writing is that it is visibly code-meshed, where one language is mixed into a text written in another language. As discussed in the literature review, visible code-meshing has been both promoted and critiqued by scholars in composition studies and in other fields. Moreover, some translingual scholars have argued that all writing is code-meshed, whether visibly or not. My original interest in this study was seeing if instructors using a translingual approach were code-meshing in the classroom. Although I anticipated that instructors would use languages other than English in the classroom, even if occasionally, that was not the case. English was the dominant language of the classroom for a number of reasons, and overt translanguaging was very limited. However, instructors translanguaged in other ways. Even more interestingly, their teaching practices drew from their language histories to build the translingual classroom.

The instructors of this study had a much more nuanced view of translingual language practices than simply code-meshing. Translingual language practices included the idea of translanguaging as moving across one's language repertoire, which included code-meshing but also translating and other forms of code-switching. Moreover, translingual language practices also included important rhetorical processes linked to audience and other contextual considerations. Participants' stories (the data of this study) point to the importance of reframing translanguaging in broader terms.

Language Practices in the Classroom

In Chapter One, I highlighted the diverse language histories that participants brought to this study. Although not all of the participants used more than one language regularly or considered themselves fluent in more than one language, they all had had multilingual experiences, such as learning and using another language or working across language boundaries. Even if they did not use more than one language or language variety on a regular basis, this multilingual experience was there, and it did play out in important ways in the classroom, even if not necessarily as code-switching or code-meshing as initially anticipated.

One of the questions of this research study was how those language histories are enacted as language practices in the translingual classroom. Did instructors see themselves as translanguaging or otherwise using their language practices in the classroom? What I learned is that they tended not to, which perhaps should not have been surprising. Juan Guerra (2016) makes the point that we should not expect students to recreate the translanguaging practices they use in their personal lives in the classroom because the two spaces present different rhetorical contexts. Likewise, my participants' language practices in the classroom were necessarily different from those they used outside of the classroom, both those practices in their personal lives and those with their students in conferences or personal conversations and communication.

This section presents the language practices that instructors described themselves as using in the classrooms. These language practices fell into general categories of how they used English and English varieties, how they used named

languages other than English, and how they used other modes of communication. At the end, I examine how the concept of a shared language plays a determining role in instructors' language practices.

Using English

By and large the language of participants' classrooms was English. There were several reasons for this, all tied to the particular contexts in which instructors were working, but they center on the fact that English was the most common *shared language*.

For instructors like Cat and DB, their students were predominantly monolingual English-speaking students; extensive use of another language would not make sense. For linguistically diverse classrooms made up of students, international and domestic, who grew up speaking named languages other than English, English served as a *lingua franca*, a language in common. English was also a language that was expected by students, even in bilingual contexts such as that Mary taught in.

We can also look at participants' use of English on a finer scale. Even when English was the language in common, instructors paid attention to what kind of English they used. Sometimes choices of English were made based on instructors' own typical English language practices. Mary described her English as "colloquial" because that's the language she tends to use. Molly, on the other hand, uses a more formal, "literary" register of English in the classroom, just as she does outside of the classroom. She joked, "Most people don't use 'ostensibly' in everyday life."

Joelle did not want to use an English that was too formal or heavy in academic discourse: "When I speak with them, my role is to communicate with them, not to be

formal to the extent that lose them” (Int. 2). She describes her classroom language as “comfortable English with a spritz thrown in of other languages that are more formal registers” (Int. 2) so that students can learn about academic discourse and understand what certain words in that discourse mean. Joelle also frequently incorporates other modes and semiotic practices to aid in communication and negotiation of meaning: “I will speak in terminology and then I’ll explain it or dance it or share it or show it in some way.” Reflecting the student-centered teaching practices that I described above, she asserted the importance of communicating successfully over demonstrating competency in academic discourse: “My goal is not to establish my own ethos as this knowledge person with this huge vocabulary, I’m interested in teaching them these communicative tools. It’s not to befuddle them” (Int. 2). And despite her quips about her formal language practices, Molly as well tends to be very careful about not using words or idiomatic expressions that might confuse or lose her international students.

Elena also made conscious choice to use an English that students would find accessible. She describes her classroom English as “teacher-y” and “textbook” and, like Joelle, adopts other practices to help her students understand:

[My English is] Very close to what they would have studied in high school. For purposes of accessibility. So that my speech is as accessible to the majority of the students in the class as possible. And I don’t – I mean as you can tell – I don’t speak particularly slowly – no, I know, but and that’s partially my California. Uh, but I do articulate um in an English-teachery way. And I do um, I do pause, and I do repeat myself. Um, and so I’ve had people observe my class

and tell me that I don't speak slowly, you know, I don't have like a particularly calm ((laughs)) or slow or robotic or anything way of speaking. Um. But I do uh circumlocute, I do provide sort of glosses for the words that I use because I'm using them. Um. And I do try to use that sort of more lingua franca, teacher-y kind of language in the classroom. And that's with the ESL students. And at [Institution], all classes are ESL classes ((laughs)) basically. (Int. 2)

Even though Mary shares Spanish as a language with many of her students, she primarily uses English because it is a language that her students expect from her as the teacher. In her case, the institution itself (much like Elena's) heavily pushes a monolingual ideology that expects the use of *Standardized English. This expectation of English is deeply ingrained into the structure of the university:

Well, I mean I think like the way that the institution is built – like my students from Mexico have to take the TOEFL to go to school. So, the notion of English proficiency, English as the central language, is already embedded in their education. You know? Way before college. (Mary, Int. 2)

Mary's students perceive "school language" to be English, and while Mary can challenge this in some ways, she cannot completely overturn that expectation. One of the ways that Mary does challenge the notion of "school language" is by using what she calls a "pretty colloquial English" that is not "academic" "formal" or "standardized." She uses an informal register "because it's just the way that I talk" but also to push

against students' preconceptions of what an Academic English could be; in doing so, she tries to relate to them and to show them that "it's okay to have conversations like that." Occasionally, she will switch to another register: when discussing an assignment, such as literature review, which is "more formal and standardized," she talks about the language and why. "But our day-to-day conversations" are more relaxed. Mary also provides translations in English when she uses bilingual Spanish-English materials in the classroom.

Although I was also interested in whether participants brought in other varieties of English, none of them indicated that they knew any distinct varieties; variation in English was predominantly between different registers and social languages, rather than varieties. Participants did bring in other varieties of English that were not part of their language histories (notably, African-American Vernacular English) in materials and readings that they shared and discussed with students for the purpose of exploring the diversity of language practices.

Importantly, English was the language of all written documents in the classroom. None of the participants said that they provide course documents in other languages or language varieties or that have overt translanguaging. Written personal communication with students through e-mail was somewhat different, and Mary did caption some Spanish videos with English, as will be described below.

Using Languages Other than English

Because English was the shared language in the classrooms of most of the participants

(excepting Mary), the use of other languages and language varieties tended to be limited to particular purposes and practices, the most common of which was for providing examples of diverse languages for the purposes of comparison and the discussion of language learning. Mary was the only participant in this study who used a named language other than English on a regular basis in the classroom; because Chicano Spanish was a language that she shared with many of her students and that was part of the larger cultural context of the area, she was able to use it to a moderate degree within the classroom.

An important distinction must be made here between the rhetorical contexts of inside the classroom and outside the classroom. Inside the classroom, the instructor is engaging with all the students at once. In this context, English predominates as the shared language with other languages being used for particular pedagogical purposes (although not reaching the level of translanguaging that Lewis et al. (2012) describe). Outside of the classroom, however, we find instructors using other languages more spontaneously with students in more personal interactions. The practices that I describe below are organized based on this rhetorical consideration. Additionally, the ways that languages other than English are used inside the classroom are categorized into particular purposes.

Inside the Classroom

Bringing in a word or phrase from another language as part of telling a story:

Participants often told stories about languages, particularly stories about themselves and

their own language experiences and mishaps, and in the telling they included the words or phrases that were used as part of that context. This incorporation of another language is different from the code-meshing that blends words or phrases from one language into the language of the conversation.²⁰ Instead, participants use these non-English words or phrases because they are authentic to the context of their story or lesson; the words or phrase are often glossed or explained and do not provide meaning beyond their role in the story. Joelle mentions how she tells her students how useful the French phrase “*par exemple*” [for example] was for her in trying to communicate while in France. In using “*par exemple*,” she could get her meaning across even when she did not have all the vocabulary. In our interview, and quite possibly in her classroom, the phrase became almost shorthand for the concept of negotiating language and communication, but it wasn’t used in its original sense.

Using examples from another language for comparisons: Sometimes participants drew on their language knowledge to make comparisons or to provide examples for students of how other languages and grammars functioned. DB and Elena mention providing examples from other languages to show how different languages construct sentences in different ways.

Bringing in materials in other languages for discussion or analysis: As mentioned earlier, bringing in materials in other languages for discussion and comparison were one

²⁰ An example of tag-switching is the following: “Well, *chez nous*, we don’t do things quite the same way.” (English-French)

way that instructors made the presence of languages other than English visible. Mary mentions bringing in memes, news articles, and pop culture materials in Spanish. DB mentions having materials in other languages that were often subtitled in English and then asking students who spoke the original languages of the materials to comment on the translations and how they compared or differed from the original language. Etienne also gave examples of this sort of discussion in his class. This practice distinguishes itself from the use of non-English materials that students have created or brought in (common to the classroom activities and assignments that participants describe) by the fact that these materials are provided by the instructors themselves.

However, a distinction should be made between materials that are in languages that the instructors themselves use and access on a regular basis and materials that are just simply in other non-English languages and which are used for various pedagogical purposes. Mary's materials tend to reflect the former usage: she brings in materials in Spanish that she herself comes across in her literacy practices outside of class. If she reads an article that has relevance to her students or comes across a meme that she knows her students will like, she brings them into class. There is a personal element to these materials; they are examples of Mary's own language practices and she brings them in, in part, to connect and relate to her students. In contrast, Mary mentions discussing Twitter in Chinese with her students. Chinese is neither a language Mary speaks nor is it one she shares with her students, and the examples that she provides are not ones that she herself has found through her own personal literacy practices. These non-English materials, then, do not exemplify her language practices the same way that the memes and articles do. Although this is not a distinction I pursued in the interviews,

I believe the origins of non-English materials (or materials in other Englishes) has some importance in how composition instructors can model their language practices. Bringing in materials that an instructor has found through their own reading or research is a subtle yet visible example of the instructor's translanguaging.

Using either or both languages: Mary was the only participant who taught in a bilingual context in which she shared more than one language in common with many of her students. As a result, she demonstrated two particular language practices linked to the bilingual context that the other participants did not.

One practice was *using either language*, which describes the practice of drawing on both of the shared languages of the context. Mary provided the following example,

So, even in our discussions, sometimes I'll say a word in Spanish, and again it's not necessarily because I'm like "Okay, I'm going to switch to Spanish now," but I'm just like talking, and I know that most of them will understand a term when I say it. And so, I say it. And if they don't, then we'll have a conversation about it, but I think most of the time it creates this sort of relationality and relationship with students because they know that I understand if they do the same thing back. (Int. 2)

The nature of being a border town meant that most of her students were accustomed to hearing Spanish to a certain extent in their everyday life, even if they were not speakers of Spanish themselves. Therefore, Mary felt reasonably confident to occasionally code-

mesh in class, using a word or phrase from Spanish if that's what came most readily.

The other practice that Mary described as using in her bilingual context was *providing translations of materials*. Aware that she had Spanish and English speakers, Mary would often provide bilingual translations and subtitles of videos or other materials that she might use in class. Here is an example of this translation work:

I'll do Skype introductions with the people that we're collaborating with, um, and say that they can also talk in Spanish. This last year I didn't get to have a simultaneous Skype call, but um my community partners recorded a video. And I showed it, like, introducing their organization. And I showed it to my class, and a lot of the – a lot of that discussion was in Spanish, that the community partners were introducing in Spanish, and so I captioned it in English. And then when they were speaking in English, I captioned it in Spanish. (Int. 2)

Mary is sensitive to the language histories of her students and therefore makes materials accessible by offering translations in both languages.

Of additional interest in this example is Mary's allusion to using Spanish when on Skype calls with community partners. Her use of a language other than English in front of her students is another overt way that she models translingual practices to her students.

On the Margins of the Classroom

Because "outside" the classroom can include a variety of different contexts, including

outside in the community and participants' personal lives, I use the term the "margins" of the classroom to refer to contexts in which instructors are interacting with students on a more personal level that are not during the class or in the classroom space. Three different marginal contexts presented themselves in the interviews: interactions at the beginning or end of class, one-on-one conferences with students, and personal communications with students.

Participants were more likely to use languages other than English in the margins of class. Elena talked about using Russian greetings with students after class or in e-mails. Molly also mentioned that although she doesn't have Russian students, she would enjoy trying to use her Russian in conferences or in e-mail.

Although Mary did not consider herself to translanguage in the classroom because, in her mind, she did not use enough Spanish in class for it to count, in one-on-one conferences with students, she definitely uses Spanish with her Spanish-speaking students. When I asked if she also used Spanish in her assignment sheets, she provided an interesting glimpse into how she leverages her language practices with her students.

Mary Yeah. I haven't translated my assignment sheets. Which maybe I should.

But um I also know that like other teachers in school are not translating their assignment sheets, and so, it's better for me to have a conversation with them in Spanish about that assignment sheet that's written in English. Um.

AJD Is that something you already do?

Mary Yeah, yeah, so. (.) And I do those conversations about the assignment

sheets through individual conferences with students.

AJD Okay. So. Not like as a large group, but as individual

Mary Yeah, individual. (.) ‘Cause I think that the stakes are just a little bit higher for when it’s a written assignment. And so, we have a little conversation about (.) Yeah, making sure that the students understand the material, like what’s being asked of them in assignments. (Int. 2)

There are parallels here between the way Mary uses the assignment sheet and a triangulation activity that Molly does with her students.²¹ Triangulation occurs when interlocutors negotiate language and meaning in the presence of an object that is the focus of their attention and conversation. In Mary’s example, she draws on Spanish as a shared language to ensure her student understands the assignment, the instructions of which are written in English. My question about having the assignment sheets translated in Spanish makes her consider the value of doing so, but she recognizes an important role that translanguaging plays in the conferences in making sure her student can navigate the assignment and the English successfully. This form of translanguaging—using the one language to practice the other—is a common technique in bilingual education (García & Kleyn, 2016).

²¹ See the section “Rhetorical Attunement and Paying Attention to Translation Moments” in the next chapter.

Using Other Modes and Communicative Practices

Although other participants alluded to using other modes and communicative practices in the classroom, Joelle provided the most description of the various practices that she both uses and encourages students to use in the classroom. The following excerpt from our second interview is rich with all kinds of communicative practices:

Joelle: Then I also know from having traveled a lot and spent a lot of time abroad and in other countries, that body language and other forms of communication are so essential. Especially when you're communicating with people across differences. Across difference of language, of cultures, whatever it happens to be. So, in my own classes, a lot of what I do, I draw pictures on the board – they all laugh at me because I'm a terrible artist, but I'll draw a stick person and then use that as a – The stick person going through doors to talk about threshold concepts or constantly drawing. Drawing on drawing and using my hands to indicate ideas like interlocking ideas. I'll use my hands to show what that might look like. I use my body and I use images and I draw on the Internet to look at pictures and I encourage my students to use all those tools, because those are tools of communicative – you know make communication possible, all those things. I mean, I couldn't tell you the number of times I've been in Europe and I've communicated ideas without speaking a word of the language. Have indicated ((makes trains sounds)) "Ch-ch-ch-ch-ch Choo-choo!" you know, to indicate I need it for a train station. It's amazing when you can – The conversations you can have with people in other language from other cultures of languages without necessarily adhering to English.

AJD: Right. Are those conscious choices that you're making to use the drawings to use the Internet, to use the gestures? You're saying that right now to me, but are those things that in class you're thinking, "I need to do this more?"

Joelle: Oh. It's both. It's finally because I grew up trying to communicate with grandparents who didn't speak English well. So, I learned to draw and give examples and talk around things and how to communicate with them. Some of it might be involuntary from that and also my traveling, but I think a lot of it is conscious in the sense that I can see when I've used the word, the blank faces that happened in the classroom. I'm thinking, "You know, recursive is this idea that makes absolutely no sense, probably even to my English students too who want to speak and

no English." I'll draw a picture on the board of a circle that folds back on itself and talk about curves and curving back on yourself and going back to something and how learning is this constant looping back. So, I mean, I consciously do that. I think I described for you the culture circles. I asked them to talk about their languages and cultures, but I asked them to show us too. Show us your language and what it needs. Give us an example. Look on the Internet and show us a picture of those ideas that you're conveying about your culture. Or draw a picture. You know? (Int. 2)

Joelle uses multiple semiotic resources (sounds, images, gestures) in order to communicate and negotiate language with her students, and she also uses different modes and tools (Internet images, dictionaries) as well to model how to negotiate meaning with an audience.

Participants often linked negotiation with translingual practice. As described in the literature review, *negotiation* is a term frequently used in translingual theory to describe the grappling with language and meaning that people must do to communicate with others. Participants in this study used the practices *negotiating language* and *negotiating meaning* to describe the rhetorical work and translanguaging that they and their students did. Some practices that they connected to negotiation were *talking around it* (explaining or demonstrating a concept further when concerned that the audience doesn't understand), *making information understandable*, *communicating across boundaries*, and *coming to an understanding*.

The use of other modes and semiotic resources is an important part of translingual practice because they are common means of talking around things, communicating boundaries, and making information understandable. Joelle and others model these sorts of communicative practices in face-to-face interactions. They did not describe discussing with their how non-textual semiotic elements could be used with

written texts to negotiate meaning—although Keiko discussed her interest in how visual document design was influenced by cultural factors. Gonzales (2015), Canagarajah (2016), Shipka (2016), and Vaudrin-Charette and Fleuret (2016) point to the ways that multimodality and translingualism can inform each other in terms of textual practices, an avenue worth exploring further for a translingual pedagogy.

The Importance of a Shared Language

In the excerpt above, Joelle mentions how much can be communicated “without necessarily adhering to English”—or even any language, it seems. A theme that came up repeatedly was the importance of a shared language. Although communication can be possible without sharing much of a language in common, the idea of shared languages played a big role in what languages participants used with their students and in their classrooms.

Elena’s use of language in the classroom drew particular attention to this. Even when she had students who spoke one of the other languages she knew, she did not use that language with them in the classroom because she was concerned that doing so would exclude other students and give the appearance that she was playing favorites. Using English as a shared language was paramount for including all of her students and creating an inclusive class environment as well as making her language accessible to English language learners.

Mary demonstrated a similar sensitivity to her students. Even though Spanish was a language she shared with many of the students, Mary knew that not all of her

students used the language fluently. Because of their location at the border, Mary felt that she could use some Spanish and be reasonably confident all of her students would understand, but Spanish was not used to the same extent as English. Other factors, such as the institutional context and local language history, were at play in her use of English, but the fact remains that English was a language in common for the classroom.

A shared language—or the lack thereof—was also given as a reason for not using language other than English with students. Joelle, Molly, and Cat all mentioned not having many students who shared some of the same languages they did and how that meant they didn't speak or write in their other languages. However, they did indicate that the classroom margins were places where they could see themselves communicating in languages other than English. Cat mentions exchanging greetings in Spanish with a student. Molly wishes she could have students who knew Russian so she could use it in conferences or e-mails. In the more personal interactions at the classroom margins, instructors used or could see themselves using languages other than English more often because they shared those languages with those individual students. The idea of a shared language shaped how participants used language with their students. It was a driving force in the dominance of English, but it also was present in the choice of languages that teachers used in more personal interactions.

Speaking versus Writing

In the interviews, I asked participants if they moved between languages in the writing that they did for the classroom. Perhaps not surprisingly, most of them said they did not.

Written code-switching or code-meshing, if done at all, tended to be in e-mails with students, which corresponds with what Losey (2009) observed about written code-meshing tending to be in less formal contexts and with audiences that the writer would code-switch more naturally in speech. The documents that instructors produced for the class, such as syllabi or assignment sheets tended to be written in a more formal, Academic English.

Whether the use of a more formal Academic English was by intent or was unintentional was not discussed in the interviews, but like for Mary, there is the potential for instructors to use the various course documents as starting points for discussions around language and expectations of academic language. In our conversation, Mary briefly considered the idea of writing hers in Spanish, but reflected that she often discussed the assignment sheets in Spanish with Spanish-speaking students in their one-to-one conferences. Keeping them in English actually served as a tool to help her Spanish speakers learn the academic discourse they would need in other classes, and their questions about it helped her to see where they needed more guidance. To a lesser degree, the same seems to be true for other instructors; the assignment sheets were written in the type of language students were likely to see elsewhere. Writing course texts in this sort of English could offer a possible space for translanguaging in the classroom, using one language variety to discuss and learn about another.

Translanguaging as Part of the Process of Translingual Writing

The translingual language practices that participants described can be divided into

several categories of practices: communicating rhetorically, translanguaging, negotiating, creating, and learning. These categories arose from participants' descriptions.

COMMUNICATING RHETORICALLY

Identifying audience considerations

Adjusting communication to particular situations: *translating; attending and adhering to norms; making information understandable*

Choosing among options to communicate: *drawing from all language resources*

Deploying language strategically: *using multiple languages; using one language; translating; using language with dense cultural clues; writing with translation in mind; displacing one's own language for audience*

TRANSLANGUAGING

Translanguaging as a Process: *accessing one's language repertoire; using multiple languages for writing process*

Translanguaging as a Product

Using One Language: *using a lingua franca; using one language; using one's second language; using an "unaccented" language*

Using Multiple Languages: *code-switching, code-meshing, presenting materials in more than one language; translating; using more than one language variety*

Using Other Modes: *embodying something; using tools; showing things through*

story, sounds, images, examples

NEGOTIATING [Related to Communicating Rhetorically]

Negotiating meaning

Negotiating language

CREATING

Reshaping language

Playing with language

LEARNING

Practicing a language [Related to Translanguaging and Negotiating]

Making mistakes

Learning the norms for a particular situation

It is important to note that these categories are an attempt to distinguish between different types of practices, but the reality is that the boundary lines that I have drawn here are not so clear-cut. A translingual perspective highlights the fact that all language practices are rhetorical and are a form of translation to a certain degree. All of us draw from our language histories to communicate, not just multilinguals in the fullest sense of the word. However, drawing some lines helps the nebulous take more form, and that is what I attempt to do here.

In its emphasis on language use emerging from a particular context, shaped by

the interlocutors and their purposes and available resources, translingualism is closely aligned with social constructionist ideas of rhetoric and writing as well as a cultural rhetorics understanding of rhetoric and language use as being cultural. When asked to define translingual practice, Mary pondered for a few seconds and responded,

Mary I think translingual practice is just the practice of (.) um (.) way of looking rhetorically? ((laughs))

AJD Okay. ((laughs))

Mary Uh. I think – that sounds really simple. But communicating rhetorically, the understanding of who you’re talking to, and then using your other like resources and practices that you have to make your point and to stand by that, for some that would be different, so that’s why I would say that it would be practice translingualism? Because I don’t think – I mean maybe (.) maybe if you’re learning a language like I want to learn French and so I’m learning to practice translingualism, incorporating my French. Maybe that would go (under) learning translingual practice? But I don’t know exactly. We’re already practicing translingualism by communicating rhetorically to different audiences and by um (.) shifting our messages depending on who we’re talking to. And so I think (.) translingualism helps – as a framework helps us to get attention to that (.) rhetorical work that we’re already doing. (Int. 2)

Mary mentioned several important rhetorical ideas here. First was the awareness of

one's audience and *identifying audience considerations*, then *using one's resources purposefully* and *using language to make a point*. She also referred to the work of *adjusting communication to a particular situation* to get the message across to that particular audience.

Another element was the idea of *deploying language strategically*. Using language strategically is a rhetorical practice because it is not the action of using language so much as the choice of which language to use and then using it in strategic ways. For example, Etienne described the inclusion of a word from a working-class French-Canadian dialect into a relatively *Standardized French newspaper. He noted that the word was not being used as an example of non-standard language but as simply the best word for the context and was used to convey important rhetorical cultural information to the readers *using dense cultural cues*.

Sometimes, deploying language strategically requires *displacing one's own language for the audience*. When talking about her language practices in the border town she now lives in, Mary mentioned that she uses Mexican-American terms instead of words from her native Castellano Spanish because that is what her audience uses. She can set her original language aside in order to facilitate communication more effectively. Depending on the audience and the writer's own goals, a writer may choose to make those cultural meanings understandable by using various methods to link the word to meanings such as translations or explaining the cultural nuances, or they may choose to leave the word as is, to let the meaning of the word be inscrutable or eloquent, as the case may be.

This *choosing among options to communicate* is affected in part by the rhetorical

need for *attending and adhering to norms*. Mary used the latter phrase in describing how translingualism frames the tensions that she and her students feel about the ways they naturally move between their various languages and language practices and the ways that they are expected to use language: “because they [her students] function in the same way that we all function which is all about attention to adhere to whatever the norm is, and communication wherever we are” (Int. 2). Sometimes the choice of language is influenced by the writer’s need or decision to adhere to norms, which may lead to the writer displacing their own language practices—including code-meshing—in order to meet the expectations of the rhetorical context.

Elena emphasized, however, that this choice should be made not out of shame or fear but because a writer wants to adhere to those norms. She explained that although she teaches her students to code-mesh, she is not so concerned about whether they do so in their writing in the future. What she does care about is why they do so, what influences that choice:

I don’t actually care if they ever code-mesh in their writing again, as long as the reason that they don’t ever code-mesh is not because they are ashamed. It’s choosing not to. Right? So, they know how, and they’re not ashamed. But they may never choose to do it again (Int. 1)

It is this *choice* of how to use language, then, that is an important aspect that translingualism brings to the understanding of rhetoric and the idea of communicating rhetorically.

One of the more interesting findings of this study was the distinction that participants made between the process and the product of translingual writing. The first indication of this distinction came through several comments that participants made.

Like, you can have a translingual process and still come out with a Standard English product. Right? Because that's often required. (Elena, Int. 1)

When I think through what it means to take a translingual approach, or to look at translingual texts, the text itself does not necessarily have to change. But like a writer's understanding of what's valuable and good about writing is what changes. So maybe I'd still submit the exact same paper and still want you to like it, and I'd still want it to do certain things that are considered conventional, if in my mind, I am fully aware that this is just like just for that purpose. (DB, Int. 1)

I know that my students write and speak and think not just in English. (.) And that there's some labor that they're doing (.) by translating you know from those (.) languages into English writing (.) that's unaccounted for. So it's writing work that they're doing that isn't part of the assessment of their writing. (Etienne, Int. 1)

Like regardless of what's coming out, regardless of what I'm actually writing, in my head I'm using all of my language practices. So, I'm still being translingual

because I'm like translating, and I'm like moving through these different options for how to communicate, even if what I'm writing is only in English. (Mary, Int. 2)

Although Elena was the participant who most clearly distinguished between process and product, other participants also pointed to a difference between the work that goes on “behind the scenes” of writing and the actual written text itself. This distinction is important because, as Etienne and Mary pointed out, the movement between languages that a person may do while writing may not always manifest on the page—but it is there.

I shift here to using the term *translanguaging* to describe this category of language practices, rather than *translingual writing*. The first reason is that the practices in this category were linked not just to writing but to speaking and communicating in a translingual way more broadly.²² Participants did not always specify writing or speaking in reference to certain practices, or their description of a particular practice indicated that they applied it to speaking and to writing. Therefore, *translanguaging* works as an umbrella term for the range of communicative practices.

Moreover, the terms *translingual writing* and *translingual language practices* encompass more practices than I describe in this section. These terms include the rhetorical practices I describe above and the other language practices I describe later.

²² One critique of translingualism validly points out that translingual approach often lumps together oral and textual practices—particularly when applying observations about spoken language practices to textual practice—even though they function in different ways (Atkinson & Tardy, 2018).

Using *translanguaging* as a category, rather than *translingual writing*, helps to focus on the practices of using language resources in a specific sense.

I also use the term *translanguaging* because it is a term that participants used. I should be clear here. There were three particular conceptualizations of *translanguaging* that participants described in the data. The first was translanguaging as a sense of languaging and the negotiation of language more generally, as Cat uses it. Another definition of translanguaging connected the term with bilingual education contexts in which the teacher and students share more than one language in common and use those languages equally in the classroom. Mary and Joelle both used this definition in the interviews and contrast this definition with the ways they use language in the classroom. Finally, translanguaging was defined as “using all your languages” and applied to code-switching in speech and in texts, to using different languages for different parts of the writing and learning process, and to translingual writing, both the process and the product.

Mary and Elena were the only participants who used “translanguaging” in this latter sense to describe translingual language practices. However, the practices they label as *translanguaging* are the same practices that the other participants describe as “translingual” or “moving back and forth” or “using all of one’s languages or resources” in both in the process of the communication and in the product. Therefore, although *translanguaging* as a term was not widely used to discuss the practices I will describe here, there was a consensus among the participants that these language practices were translingual and were part of the process and the product of translingual communication.

Once aware of the distinction between process and product, it gradually became obvious in the data that when participants used the metaphors “moving between languages” or “crossing borders,” that they in fact were pointing sometimes to the product, sometimes to the process, and sometimes referring to both. As I began to untangle these metaphors, I uncovered two particular ways that translanguaging can be understood as a process.

The first way to understand translanguaging as a process is as the act of *accessing one’s language repertoire*. As Mary noted, in the story above, when she is writing, she is engaged with all of her language practices and moves between the different options of her linguistic repertoire, drawing on her language history and its knowledge of communicating in many situations, in order to choose how to communicate, “even if it’s only in English.” Joelle noted how this movement is the “invisible stuff” of the classroom: “It’s this big elephant in the room. [The students are] constantly negotiating language. They’re constantly moving back and forth between several languages at the same time” (Int. 1). Understanding translanguaging as a process means acknowledging the mental movement that a person is doing with the languages they have.

There are two important aspects to this mental movement. First is that one language is not “turned off.” Instead, all of a person’s languages are present and accessible in any communicative moment.²³ This point is important for understanding

²³ This understanding of a person’s languages as always in play is a big factor distinguishing a translingual approach from a multilingual approach (Velasco & García, 2014; Guerra, 2016).

translingual approaches to teaching writing because it means that a linguistically diverse person is not turning off one language in order to use another language; the first language is still there, but a choice is made whether to use it or not.

Another aspect is that a person may not even always distinguish between the languages in their head. Mary brought this point up:

[Translingualism] helps me understand that all of my (.) all of my languages are used in contact with each other. And so (.) because of that when I'm talking I might draw on multiple different main languages, so like my main language is Spanish or English I might draw on a different one and say something because my brain is not making a distinction between one or the other. My brain is just trying to like communicate something to somebody. (Int. 2)

Mary's description of her own language practices highlights what MacSwan (2017) and Wei (2018) and others call a person's idiolect, the individual compilation of languages and language practices that form the rich set of possibilities for communicating.

This process of *accessing one's language repertoire* is certainly more obvious when the person is a multilingual. But the same process is true for someone considered monolingual. As described previously, monolinguals as well have a range of social languages from which they can draw from (Gee, 1996; Piccardo, 2013; MacSwan, 2017). The movement between these languages might not be as obvious.

The next sense of translanguaging as process is *using multiple languages for the writing process*. Multiple languages and language practices can be used along the way

to producing a text. Elena provided a helpful description:

But a person can, you know, do research in another language, do some drafting in another language, talk to people about your writing in another language, and ultimately, like, sort of consciously choose to write something that is completely you know quote-unquote unaccented. (Int. 1)

Elena and Etienne both mentioned assigning projects for which students interviewed a person in another language and then decided how to present that interview in the write-up for the project. Even if the final write-up of the project ended up being in Academic English, students still used their range of languages along the way. In other words, the writing process work, including researching, drafting, and thinking about and discussing the writing, can be done in various languages or language varieties.

Translingual communication makes visible the process of *choosing* a language to use. Sometimes this choice is almost unconscious, as Mary described when she says that her brain “is not making a distinction” between one language and the other but “just trying to communicate something to somebody” (Int. 2). However, and particularly for writing, this choice can be conscious, a thoughtful *deploying language strategically*. Whether conscious or not, the process of translanguaging can result in a range of different products, as described by participants. Notably, translanguaging products can appear in just one language, and they can also appear in multiple language or in multiple modes and semiotic practices. Participants highlighted that the use of one language did not mean that a text was not translingual. What sets a translingual text

apart from a traditional understanding of a written text is the attitude and the process that informed the creation of the text. Instead of trying to block out part of their language repertoire, a translingual writer acknowledges that all their languages are at play and can be used throughout the writing process, even if not visible in the finished text.

With this expanded view of translanguaging, we can see that instructors actually used several different kinds of translanguaging practices, although they themselves may not have described these practices as such based on their own conceptualizations of translanguaging. Here are several different translanguaging practices that I observed participants using:

- Using other languages in conferences, before or after class, or in written communications;
- Bringing in materials in their other languages for analysis or comparison;
- Comparing patterns and structures of Academic English to other Englishes or languages;
- Multimodal and multi-semiotic practices to negotiate meaning and language with students; and
- Language play for both learning language and for making visible the slipperiness of language.

Although these practices do not fall under a narrow definition of translanguaging as overt code-meshing, they do in fact show the ability to work between languages and to

negotiate meaning using a broader array of linguistic resources than is usually expected within the writing classroom. Certainly, these practices give us ideas of how to use languages other than English in the classroom in the case when English is the shared language of the classroom.

Using Their Language Histories

One of the findings of this study that I did not anticipate was how participants used their language histories in more subtle ways to practice a translingual orientation to their students' language practices and to create a translingual classroom. This section describes several important ways that they drew on their language histories.

Rhetorical Attunement and Paying Attention to Translation Moments

Rebecca Lorimer Leonard (2014) describes "rhetorical attunement" as "an ear for, or a tuning toward, difference or multiplicity" (p. 228). Her study focuses on the ways that multilingual writers cultivate a rhetorical sensitivity to differences in cultural and linguistic writing practices. What struck me was that even though her article more broadly focused on how rhetorical attunement is deployed in literacy practices (with a brief look at inside the classroom), the instructors of this study demonstrated the same practices that Lorimer Leonard described, particularly in their own orientation to language and to the language difference of their students. They showed, therefore, how rhetorical attunement can also be deployed as a *pedagogical practice*. In fact, this

rhetorical attunement might be the biggest way that instructors can bring their language histories into the classroom.

Lorimer Leonard describes a number of practices used by her participants as multilingual writers and teachers: acknowledgment of multiplicity and messiness of language, improvisation and language play, collaborative meaning-making, using tools and experts, attention to how language is used and the patterns languages follow, and attention to the “political and historical trajectories” (p. 238) and backdrops of practices. Many of these practices were also evident in participants’ descriptions of their own language practices. What I want to stress here is that these practices are possible because of the participants’ rhetorical attunement.

Etienne talked about wanting to hone this attention to language, particularly in figuring out how to respond to translation moments in the class and to students’ own “mobilizing” of their language histories to respond to language difference and readings. He observed that as an instructor, he can’t anticipate when those opportunities arise:

So a lot of it just has to be very responsive to the moments that present themselves. And that requires me to take an attitude of like openness, listening, and um recognition of the kinds of proficiencies and (.) expertise that they do have when they demonstrate that. (Int. 1)

When asked how he develops that awareness and ability to respond, Etienne mentioned learning “theoretically what the skills are” from scholarship on languaging and translanguaging, but he also credited his own family history of bilingualism:

So, I grew up at a very young age with a kind of like (.) the circumstances for a kind of emergent bilingualism? That got kind of cut off by schooling and you know American sort of cultural pressures. Um. So my own ability to kind of go back (.) you know (.) in my own experiences and my own memories – for me in my research [...] And kind of trying to recover as much of that understanding and mentality as I can. Um. (.) I think that's you know (.) partly how I am developing the ability to do it with my students, to understand um (.) what the moments are when those multilingual competencies might manifest themselves. And in what ways. (Int. 1)

Etienne draws from his language history to be more attuned to how his students are using language and responding to those moments in class when he can draw their attention to their “multilingual competencies.” For him, this attention to students is more important than any language practice that he himself could model in class.

AJD: Do you ever bring in examples of yourself, of you [translating in the writing process]? Or do you ever demonstrate that in class?

Eti: I have. Not in any like. Like, I don't have a lesson plan or something where I know that I'm going to. But as part of class discussion, if it's appropriate, I'll bring it up. But I find that the experiences that I have personally with these kinds of issues, would require so much contextualization for them to appreciate, that I feel like it's kind of too

much to bring that. And it would take over the class too much. But I can use what I know, my insights, my personal experience to inform what I see them going through, and help frame it in terms of like what they're experiencing, in the terms that they're experiencing it, but informed by what I know.

AJD: Right. (.) Does having that background in French help you to frame it for them? To identify it, to frame it, to work with them on that?

Eti: Yeah it does. At the very least it helps me to know how to identify things that are important or worth paying attention to that for them are just not even (.) not even noteworthy. (Int. 2)

Apart from English, Etienne does not share much of another language with his students; he does not speak Spanish or Mandarin, the two other languages his students often speak in addition to English. Therefore, his own language experiences would require too much explanation in order to make a point. He finds that his language history is more useful in the form of rhetorical attunement because it allows him to see his students engaging in language work and to make it visible to his students.

Commenting on the broad language diversity of her students, Joelle said that she can't use her "second language knowledge" with them beyond basic greetings, but she does feel that her language knowledge makes her aware of the challenges of studying and communicating in a second language, more than anything else. Moreover, her language experiences have honed a semiotic competency. As depicted earlier, Joelle uses a variety of communicative practices and different modes, including gestures,

images, and sounds to help her students understand the meaning of the terminology she uses in class. Joelle directly linked her negotiation practices with her upbringing in a bilingual family and her travels overseas.

It's finally because I grew up trying to communicate with grandparents who didn't speak English well. So, I learned to draw and give examples and talk around things and how to communicate with them. Some of it might be involuntary from that and also my traveling, but I think a lot of it is conscious in the sense that I can see when I've used the word, the blank faces that happened in the classroom. (Int. 2)

She attributed her semiotic competency in part to growing up trying to communicate with grandparents who didn't speak English well. Travel and living abroad has helped her know that body language and other modes of communication are essential. In fact, she observes, it is possible to communicate ideas without speaking a word of the language. "It's amazing the conversations you can have," she says, "without adhering to English." Some of these practices are done unconsciously, she said—years of navigating multilingual contexts have made these moves second nature—but often they are consciously done. She is aware of having explained a concept and, upon seeing blank faces, realizing she has to explain the concept further, with pictures. But this attention to audience and the quick and at time unconscious adoption of other communication strategies comes from her experience in multilingual contexts.

Cat (Int. 2) found that being multilingual allows her to be more comfortable in

encountering language difference. “In a way I think that I am more prepared to deal with unfamiliar stuff. I’m not scared of having to navigate those situations.” Unlike people who try to avoid unfamiliar situations, she does not shy away from differences and connects that to a translingual orientation: “So, not being scared, being open to unexpected practices, to unfamiliar ways of doing things.”

For Mary and Elena, one of the ways that their rhetorical attunement plays out is as an awareness of the precariousness that their multilingual students face in their respective institutional contexts and the “political and historical trajectories” (Lorimer Leonard, 2014, p. 238) of those contexts. They create the spaces for their students to navigate different rhetorical situations and learn the strategies to communicate successfully. Rhetorical attunement allows teachers to point out to students that different contexts require different rhetorical and language practices, that one size does not fit all, but that sometimes you have to write a certain way.

I am pretty certain that there have been teachers who were like hey like the five-paragraph essay is just a thing (.) that’s a tool that meets a need. It is not the *sacred* way to write an article, it’s not the sacred way to understand a text. But it turns out like this is very much a Western (.) white construction of an essay. But you know what? Over in China they have this whole other structure that we can look at and over in these communities they have whole other ways of looking at it. So like this is just like ours and like you’ve gotta write a good one if you want to get into this university but like do *not* think that it is it, that it is *superior*, that it is – that other things are *inferior*. This is just one way to do it. Um. And that to

me is very translingual. (DB, Int. 1)

DB's awareness of multiple rhetorical practices and the situatedness of those rhetorical practices is the rhetorical attunement Leonard points to. He draws on that awareness to help students to see that situatedness; in seeing the multiplicity, students can begin to develop their own "ear" for difference and their own rhetorical attunement.

As Lorimer Leonard emphasizes, rhetorical attunement is not a natural quality of being multilingual: one becomes rhetorically attuned "over a lifetime of communicating across difference" (p. 228) and "across a spectrum of language and geographic boundaries" (p. 230). The instructors of this study have each in their own way developed rhetorical attunement through culminating experiences in multilingual situations. They deploy this attunement in the classroom as a rhetorical sensitivity to linguistic and cultural difference in their classroom, both in their students' writing and in the course of class discussions. They have tuned their own rhetorical and linguistic knowledge to pick up on moments where language and meaning are being negotiated and model language negotiation strategies for students and encouraged students to draw from their own rich language and cultural resources.

Having a rhetorical attunement means being able to pay attention to translation moments in class. The idea of *translation moments* is useful as a part of a translingual classroom environment. In using this term, I am expanding on what Gonzales and Zantjer (2015) describe as instances when a direct word-to-word translation does not capture the meaning or cultural nuances of an expression or word, and translators use additional strategies to communicate meaning to the audience. Gonzales and Zantjer

draw attention to the ways that translation is a localized practice in which translators negotiate meaning with a specific audience. They also demonstrate that translation relies on multiple strategies that draw on the rhetorical sensitivity of the translators, a sensitivity that was developed from a wealth of experiences and their cultural and linguistic knowledge. Joelle provided a description of a translation moment in her classroom:

I can see when I've used the word, the blank faces that happened in the classroom. I'm thinking, "You know, recursive is this idea that makes absolutely no sense, probably even to my English students too who want to speak and know English." I'll draw a picture on the board of a circle that folds back on itself and talk about curves and curving back on yourself and going back to something and how learning is this constant looping back. (Int. 2)

Faced with the realization that her students did not understand a word, Joelle used other strategies to communicate the meaning of that word to them. The translation moment in her classroom allows her to teach both a new term but also the larger cultural meaning that academic culture imbues the word. Joelle displayed a keen sensitivity to her audience's reaction and adapted accordingly in order to make communication successful. In the translingual classroom, translation moments like this are opportunities to model language negotiation.

Translation moments can also be used to draw attention to students' linguistic knowledge that comes from their language histories. Etienne told a story of such a

moment in his class:

Eti: It's about a, um – I was teaching an excerpt from Min-Zhan Lu's Shanghai Quartets. Um. So, a book she published I think in the (.) 90s? The excerpt is – it's been anthologized, it's uh called uh something like “Do the Chinese Drink Coffee?”

AJD: Mmhmm. Okay?

Eti: [...] And the um – there was this one moment in the (.) um in the writing where she describes her family's tea-making ceremony. Like the process that they go through to make it. Um. And she uh uses the word “dim sum” (.) to describe (.) the dumplings that go with tea. [...] Yeah, so my students were in groups answering some discussion questions in class and um my student from Shanghai pointed out that the word “dim sum” is not the word that is used to refer to those dumplings in Shanghai. If you live in Shanghai, you speak Mandarin, or a dialect known as Shanghaiese. And um, the word for those dumplings is different in Mandarin and in Shanghaiese. It's not dim sum. Dim sum is the Cantonese word, which is (.) Hong Kong. (.) And [uh neighboring]

AJD: [Interesting]

Eti: sort of province on the mainland where Cantonese is mostly spoken.

AJD: Okay.

Eti: So, so my student's ability to sort of identify that? was (.) ((laughs)) was really exciting! Right? Like I saw – what I saw them do was like

mobilizing multilingual resources to conduct textual analysis on this reading. Where they could identify um some of the audience considerations? (.) that Min-Zhan Lu was making in (.) You know, she's describing you know a local Shanghai family's ceremony but not using the language that that family would use to describe their own (.) practices, right? Instead their displacing their own language and using (.) a different (.) or maybe cosmopolitan term to be familiar with English-speaking audiences et cetera.

AJD: Okay.

Eti: So, right? So I found that to be like, one really (.) exciting. I remember I saw the possibilities of kind of trying to build that into the work that we do in the classroom more. But I can't anticipate that, right? Like because I don't know what my students' language abilities are going to be, I don't know where they're from. I don't know ((laughs)) what uh you know, what their family languages are. What languages they learned in school. I don't know that until we get into the classroom. So a lot of it just has to be very responsive to the moments that present themselves. And that requires me to take an attitude of like openness, listening, and recognition of the kinds of proficiencies and (.) expertise that they do have when they demonstrate that. (Int. 1; edited for brevity and flow)

Etienne noticed how his students were able to pick up on a moment when an author was negotiating language with an anticipated audience, ultimately displacing one language

in order to use another with the expectation of successful communication. What was especially exciting to Etienne was the fact that his students could use their language backgrounds to pick up on those moments and to analyze the language work that goes on during the construction of a text. He called this *mobilizing their multilingual resources* and he is trying to find ways of creating more opportunities for students to do this work.

In the translingual classroom, a translation moment is where the messiness and slippage of language pops up, when the act of translation becomes visible within a text or discussion. Instructors pay attention to translation moments and use those to draw student's attention to the language work happening under the surface of a text.

Sometimes these moments are happenstance. In Etienne's case, the use of Min-Zhan Lu's story provided an unplanned opportunity to look at how language was negotiated and for students to use their linguistic knowledge. As Etienne observed, an instructor has to be paying attention in order to catch these moments and to use them for teaching. Instructors always needs to have their "antennae" waving to pay attention to these moments; they must demonstrate rhetorical attunement in the similar ways to translators: recognizing moments where difference is present in the classroom or in students writing and making them visible and then drawing attention to the translation strategies (Gonzales & Zantjer, 2015) that are in play.

Sometimes the translation moments can be purposely cultivated by assignments and discussions. Joelle described the translation assignments²⁴ that she does with her

²⁴ For a more extensive look at this sort of translation assignment, see Kiernan et al. (2016), "Negotiating Languages and Cultures: Enacting Translingualism through a

students. In her description, we see how she sets up the opportunity for students to experience their own translation moments and then, through reflection, making visible that translation and then connecting it to the languaging that they all do every day.

They pick a cultural story, poem, song, whatever they want from their culture, and this is a multilingual class, but I always have domestic students too. So sometimes I paired them up with other students who are also solo. They look for a story that is in each of their home languages, whatever that home languages will be, and then they – the goal of it is that you translate that story into your home language, from your home language into English. And then in your small group you share your translations with each other, and the translations are always different. The question is why are those translations different. Most importantly, why did you make the choices you made? The assignment isn't on the quality of the translation. That's not the point. The point is the reflecting they do about the actual act of translating. What parts were hard for you and why? What words surprised you and why? What words were most challenging to come up with a good word in English to describe that?

In the class where I've had two domestic students, they chose to translate a very strongly coded rap song into language that they thought that the other students in class who were from around the world could understand. So their translations had tremendous differences, so their papers were about choices they had to make in order to make that translation, what they were thinking of. One of them it was

a moral dilemma because how do you translate the F word into a language for others from other cultures without violating their sense of cultural norm or without upsetting them and how that word might have different kinds of resonance. And the N word, how complicated that is in English and who gets to say it and who doesn't. So they're writing things about language and their sense of language and deeper understanding of language. So, I'm also teaching the course from the assumption that African American English – as Anazaldúa reminds us there are many forms of Chicana English. So it's all around the rich varieties of Englishes. So then the paper itself is they all end up writing a four to five page paper about that translation activity, and also thinking about different ways they translate in their daily lives and how that interacts with the exercise they just did. (Joelle, Int. 1)

These translation assignments work not just for multilingual students but for monolingual students as well. In fact, creating translation moments in class might be even more important when working with monolingual students. Multilingual students often are familiar with the fact that an idea or word in one language does not often neatly translate into another language and that there are gaps in meaning that they can attempt to bridge in multiple ways, using negotiation and translation strategies. For monolinguals, however, these gaps are not always so evident, so it is important for instructors to create the opportunities to make translation visible, even within one language. My study participants offer several glimpses into the ways that composition instructors can get monolingual students to think about translation and the ways that

writing involves a negotiation of meaning with the audience.

We're learning, we're practicing English, but you're going to speak it so differently depending on the context. And even when we master things like "synthesize," in terms of generally what we think about when we talk about that word in academic English, what that supply chain management professor asks you to do when he asks you to synthesize ((laughs)) is really different from what that literature professor in the humanities course is asking you to do. So, there's constantly evolving different situations. The language is fluid. It's not set.

(Joelle, Int. 1)

Like in our regular first year writing curriculum, our first assignment is a learning memoir. The second assignment is to write about an artifact that has meaning for you and represents your culture. Well, both of those are things that other people in the classroom may not know about. [...] How can you share to other people who may not have any background in that subject? What it felt like to be in that place, to learn in that way. You know, there's two ways to do it, you can include a lot of the language of that field. Football players, sometimes my football students want to put in all the football lingo and that's good in so many ways, because yes, it gives us ethos and we sense what's going on. But someone who doesn't know about football may not understand if you won or lost the game the way we wrote that with all that language. Make sure you're translating. It has to do with the idea of writing all these being as a form of translation to your

audience. Or negotiating meaning with your audience. (Joelle, Int. 2; edited for brevity)

Some of the times I've done recomposing and translation exercises? So, sometimes we'll use the word "translation." It can freak them out a little bit as well, because they think that it's going to be from one language to another, but not exact. Translation will build (in English). [...] Yeah, sometimes I ask them to, to recreate, um, a recipe (.) from their families. So, we look at how each of those recipes has uh (.) you know, their unique linguistic repertoires. You know like maybe they have some expressions that they relate to their families that are unique to them. Things like that. (Cat, Int. 1; edited for brevity)

These vignettes/assignments all provide students the chance to see how language is a choice relative to a particular rhetorical situation. Students face the realization that the words they use have a particular meaning within a particular context and may not be immediately clear or accessible for an audience in another context. This realization results in a translation moment in which students recognized the need to translate the meanings of their words in a way that helps their audience grasp the full meaning of what they want to say.

Instructors in the translingual classroom can create the opportunities for students to encounter and then reflect on these translation moments. However, they also need to be aware that these opportunities can pop up in unplanned ways and to be ready to channel those moments into further discussion and exploration of language, translation,

and writing.

Focusing on Communication and Its Negotiation

Understanding that language difference is not an insurmountable obstacle to communication is very important in the translingual classroom. Instructors whose language histories involve experience being a non-native speaker of a language can build from that knowledge to emphasize the importance of this understanding. In the classroom, this work is enacted as focusing on students' abilities to communicate successfully and downplays the importance of perfect grammar in writing and speaking. Canagarajah (2013a) argues that "success requires a different attitude to communication: interlocutors are supportive and consensus-oriented as they strive to achieve their shared objectives through their divergent codes" (p. 43).

The focus on the *functionality* of communication rather than the form is a key part of translingualism. Canagarajah (2013b) calls this "rhetorical success" and highlights the importance of negotiation as part of this translingual perspective on writing and communication: "More importantly, since meaning is co-constructed, form doesn't hold unqualified power in translingual communication Grammar is incidental to meaning-making. It is an affordance for performing social and rhetorical acts, and doesn't become an end in itself" (p. 147). Of course, co-construction of communication seems more evident in face-to-face communication and also in the writing process of successive drafts and peer review that Canagarajah (2013a and 2013b) describes. However, negotiation of communication is possible in writing as well. Gonzales (2015)

observes the ways that multimodal composition, using written text in conjunction with other modes such as images or videos, offers new possibilities for translingual communication. Even in more text-bound contexts, instead of relying on grammar and creating the perfect form in order to aid communication, translingual writing uses a multitude of resources from the context—even subtle elements such as the relative position of text and images on the page—to cue the reader into how to interpret a text and negotiate meaning. Sometimes these cues and other clues to help with meaning-making are intentionally done; other times it is simply the writer “just trying to communicate” (Mary, Int. 2).

In her second interview, Molly offered a valuable insight into this approach. After years of working with international and multilingual students, she’s aware of particular obstacles related to language. Molly gave the example of the definite article (i.e., “the”). Knowing that the definite article poses a perennial challenge for students whose languages do not have such elements, especially those from non-European language backgrounds, she doesn’t spend time teaching the definite article or correcting its use or absence in work. “It’s not something you learn unless you learn it young,” and since the lack or non-standard use of the definite article does not tend to pose a problem for comprehension, she’s not going to continually demand students to correct it. She drew a comparison to her own language history: “Just like I wouldn’t want somebody to jump on me – although they would – if I mis-spoke the gender in French.” She doesn’t want to spend all her time and energy on these smaller things because they’re not as important. She wants to focus on communication and making choices that helps communication, and she doesn’t see these smaller grammatical matters as important.

Molly tells her students that she wrote her dissertation in French and still had to have a native-speaker make corrections for her. “It’s not a fault, it’s normal,” she says, to need help when working in one’s second language. However, at the end of it all, “You want to be a good communicator, you don’t want to be perfect.” As a teacher, Molly does support individual students who want to work on grammar points on their own volition, “once they see that I mean what I say and that I will not grade them down on the articles.” Clearly, Molly grades papers in a way that reflects her emphasis on communication, not grammatical perfection.

In addition to affecting how an instructor responds to students’ language practices, a focus on communication means that the instructor can also feel comfortable using their own language practices to negotiate communication with students in a more translingual way. One way is to not worry about their own language practices as “ideal” but to be more relaxed and less concerned about the language they are using and the possibility of language difference—something Cat described doing with her own language practices in the classroom. Instructors can also use and draw attention to the ways that they use different modes and semiotic practices to communicate. Joelle’s use of images and gestures and her encouragement of those practices by students is an example of this making visible.

One of the tensions of a translingual approach is the idea of competence and the importance of a shared language. On the one hand, “intelligibility and communicative success are not predicated on sharedness (deriving from grammar or community identity)” (Canagarajah, 2013b, p. 68). Canagarajah does right to draw attention to the ways that communication is possible in situations with little shared language because

much can be communicated through other semiotic resources, whether in person or on the page.²⁵ But the challenge is that this sort of communication situation is only successful when both sides are willing to negotiate and look past the difference to the meaning that is being established together. When the other side is not willing to negotiate, the importance of a shared language and the writer or speaker's competence in that shared language becomes more important.

Translingualism as a theory and communicative approach challenges the centrality of competence to communication. The long-term goal is to counter monolingual ideology by encouraging students to have a translingual orientation to language difference, gradually lessening the judgment against language difference.²⁶ Likewise, by challenging the idea of successful communication as requiring mastery of a language, we can support students in seeing themselves as competent communicators already rather than as deficient language users.

Focusing on communication over proficiency is not to deny the importance of competence in a language or language variety and the real need and desire that minority language students have for learning the prestige varieties of languages, including prestige varieties of English. Challenging a monolingual ideology and working towards

²⁵ In writing this chapter, I uncovered (*retrouver*) a photo from my days traveling abroad of a friend's grandmother in Catalonia. Accompanying the photo was a story recounting how she and I enjoyed talking with each other and how much we could communicate without sharing a language.

²⁶ Although outside the scope of this argument, it is important to point out that a translingual orientation is invaluable for developing a reading practice that is open to language difference. Recounting the evolution his teaching took with regards to translingualism, Matt Noonan (Gallagher & Noonan, 2017) observes, "Now I see translingualism as a *reading* practice" (p. 175). Learning to read with a translingual orientation is just as important as learning to write.

proficiency in a language are not mutually exclusive goals.

We come back to Molly to see another potential approach to responding to students' writing in a way that can emphasize the need to negotiate meaning and that can help students (monolingual and multilingual alike) learn the grammar and the norms of Academic English. When having her students do peer review, Molly asks them to not try to correct grammar but to look for moments in a text that caused them to stumble: "Did a language issue block you, slow you down, make you question meaning of what was being written? If so, let's look at that" (Int. 1). She also has students look for "humorous mistakes" where the language may cause potentially embarrassing interpretations. By focusing on the stumbling points, where communication gets blocked, Molly helps her students to see why the language causes an issue and results in unsuccessful communication and then to navigate a more successful way forward. This approach can be paired with Elena's practice of helping her students to see the multiple ways that an idea can be phrased or a sentence rewritten. Through the process, we continue to see the ways that the translingual classroom offers students opportunities to practice learning about audience and expectations and negotiating communication successfully.

Focusing on communication also means that instructors can model translanguaging in the classroom, not just as overt models of "this is what code-meshing looks like" but modeling the negotiation of language and the ways that one's languages play a role in writing process and the rhetorical decisions that are made. The ways that Joelle, Elena, Cat, and others use different strategies and resources to negotiate meaning with their students, rather than expecting them to understand the first time, sets an

example of paying attention to one's audience and adapting language practices to that context in order to achieve communicative success. Just as with written models, modeling translingual language practices may be less important than giving students the opportunity to practice, to work through the challenges of translating and choosing the language, to code-mesh or not, but importantly, to understand why, to understand that it is a choice of their own to make.

Vulnerability and Creating Safe Spaces

A translingual approach to teaching writing has been connected with issues around social justice, based in the idea of valuing languages and ways of communicating that are often discriminated against. For some of the instructors in this study, especially those who work with multilingual and multicultural students, valuing linguistic and cultural backgrounds was an important part of adapting a translingual disposition in the classroom. Many of their students come into the classroom feeling vulnerable or even ashamed for their home languages, and the translingual classroom becomes a safe space for students to use their languages. The idea of a safe space comes from Elena's description of her own classroom:

You know, within that, what I've heard consistently from my students is—they would say things like, “your class is the only class where anybody cares that I speak a second language or come from another culture. In all the rest of my classes they just want me to produce standard English.” Students aren't phrasing

it like that, right, like that's how I'm phrasing it. But, um, I would have students say to me, "your class is this sort of welcoming safe space because you understand that I'm a non-native speaker and that you help us specifically in that way." So, I wanted the whole class to sort of celebrate that, like honor that. This is like the one chance that my students might ever get where that's not the case, and my class, as, as, as far as I know, is very, very different from the other um even the [other sections of the course]. (Elena, Int. 1)

Students, especially those whose first languages or language varieties tend to face stigma, value a place where their language histories are welcomed. Even if the goal is to learn a particular academic discourse, they need a space in which their language difference is not seen as either a liability or an unwanted intrusion but which is accepted. Instructors can help to create this safe space in many ways, including the use of grading practices that do not heavily penalize non-standard language use, but an important way—perhaps the most important way—for creating a safe space is for instructors to also show vulnerability as a language learner and user.

Mary's use of language and stories in her classroom provide valuable insight into this idea of vulnerability. In our second interview, Mary observed that if she speaks in Spanish, she doesn't think it "will go over very well" because they (her and her students) are in a school setting and the students "perceive school language to be a certain way." When I comment about how English seems to be the default language, Mary offers this explanation:

Well, and I think like the way that the institution is built – students from Mexico have to take the TOEFL to go to school. Like so the notion of English proficiency, English as the central language, is already embedded in their education. You know? Way before college. And so, I don't think that's something that you can undo – as much as you might want to influence it, I don't think it's something you can undo in like one class. (Mary, Int. 2)

However, there is more at play in her classroom than the institutional pressure to use English. Mary has become sensitive to the powerful history and trauma of violence against the Spanish language that some of her students and their families have experienced.

There's a lot of Mexican-American students, Chicano students, who live in [U.S. town] and have been here for generations um and don't know any Spanish at all. And will tell you "I'm not Span – I don't speak Spanish at all." And there's a lot of history behind that because when their parents first came over from [Mexican town across the border] or from Mexico, like they were punished for speaking Spanish in school. They were like beat for speaking Spanish in school. And so when they had kids, like that generation, they were very focused on like learning English and assimilating, and like learning Spanish was not part of um (.) was just not seen as something positive. Because of their experiences. I think there's like this new – it's not like a new generation – there's like this emerging group of (.) Chicano students who grew up not speaking Spanish at all because of the

many – the violent history that Spanish has had on their side of the family, but who are now trying to relearn and re-embrace their Spanish. (Mary, Int. 2)

This is a generational trauma as well as an everyday experience. Outside of the home or their home communities, Spanish is not a safe language for many of them, and to identify as a Spanish speaker means exposure. As a result, Mary balances between using Spanish as part of the border language that she and her students share to carefully while acknowledging the fraught history of Spanish in the area as well as the institutional expectations pressing on students.

There is something really important here about how language minority students have to feel safe and not pressured in order to use their languages. Mary does not force her students to use Spanish or even identify as Spanish speakers unless they want to. Here is another excerpt from our second interview:

Mary: So, I think it's more like an awareness of um the potential of writing beyond English that is cultivated throughout the semester.

AJD: Okay.

Mary: In small gestures that open up the space I think to just have more of an awareness and an understanding that like in this space we can leverage like our full histories with language and like bring them into the class. I think that's. Yeah. I think that's what's worked best for me. Because I think when they're – like if I am more direct about well, we're going to do this assignment in Spanish, then there is so much tension because so

many of the students don't feel like they're fluent in Spanish or like there's just so much there. Um. And I don't think it's my place to bring those feelings up for students. And I think also like putting them in groups and um having them work on specific projects that can be tailored for Spanish speakers and then bring that up and saying this might be something that can be tailored for Spanish speakers, so forming groups of students that might feel more comfortable in Spanish within that also kind of shifts the like um (.) where the expertise is situated. Because so often, the students who are, who feel more comfortable in Spanish are positioned as like maybe the ones who contribute the least to a team? Because it's all in English. But if you say up front, it's – actually having the Spanish skill is an asset because we're going to translate this information so be sure there's someone who feels (you're) – that they can write something in Spanish, it's like a small way of shifting where the expertise is and how it's understood in the class.

AJD: Interesting. So kind of – So, are you making these groups? Are you kind of forming these groups to – Like you're assigning the groups? Or is this where the students are forming the groups and you're suggesting (.)

Mary: Yeah, the students will form their own groups because again, I don't want to make assumptions about like “oh, this student walks over from [the town across the border], so they must be really good at Spanish,” you know. So, I say in each group to make sure you have someone who is really good at visual design, and someone who is really good at

proofreading Spanish, in case you want to translate this, and someone who is really good at making clear and succinct arguments. You know, and so, having them kind of build groups around that allows them to like have discussions about “hey, do you feel comfortable proofreading in Spanish, or no?” And so, I don’t have be the one mitigating all that, ‘cause I think they would say it differently to me than they would to each other, anyway. So, I think then there would be a “oh hell no, I don’t want to speak Spanish,” you know? Whereas to me they might be a little bit more hesitant, especially knowing that I speak Spanish, so it’s like (.) Yeah, it’s a lot of like navigating and letting them make decisions.

Mary is incredibly careful not to force her students to speak or write in Spanish but rather opens up the space for its use in several important ways. First, she does not force the students to use Spanish because she knows there would be a great deal of push-back; it would essentially set up a fight-or-flight response. She therefore positions Spanish as an asset to the project among other important skills. Mary has other ways of showing the “possibility” of using Spanish as a valuable resource for writing. She often connects her classes with Spanish-speaking community partners. Here again we see the presence of Spanish in the classroom:

I’ll do Skype introductions with the people that we’re collaborating with, um, and say that they can also talk in Spanish. Last year I didn’t get to have a simultaneous Skype call, but um my community partners recorded a video. And

I showed it, like, introducing their organization. And I showed it to my class, and a lot of the – a lot of that discussion was in Spanish, that the community partners were introducing in Spanish, and so I captioned it in English. And then when they were speaking in English, I captioned it in Spanish. (Mary, Int. 2)

Mary has this remarkable awareness of the language of her students and the need for the duality so that all feel included. Most importantly, Mary uses her own stories as a language learner and her own language practices to make the class a safe space.

Mary: Um. I think what it means for me going into the classroom is to not make assumptions? Because when I first – So, earlier in my first year, I made the assumption that all of my students would speak Spanish, you know? Like, they're Mexican, they're Mexican-American, so of course they like speak Spanish, because that was more the case in like Florida. [...] And so, I think the thing that is most important to me is to not make assumptions? about what types of languages my students will have when I go into the classroom, and just to have like an open conversation and just tell them a little about me and my language histories. I always start like the first day of class telling students about me and who I am and where I come from. Um. Sometimes I read like a few excerpts from like stories that I have in my book project, just like about my own experiences learning English. Just as a way to connect with them before I ask them anything about themselves. I feel like it's important for me to

(.) share and have that vulnerability from my perspective before I ask for that from my students. And then through that I get to learn their language histories about more. Maybe not on the first day, but throughout the semester. Um, and then, I use that to make the claim or just to kind of say that all language histories are valued and language practices are important in my class and that they can be used for a lot of projects. They can be used however students feel is important or necessary, um. And so kind of allow them to have the agency to do that instead of being like “Today, we’re going to write in Spanish.” Or “Today, we’re going to write in English.” It’s more like just having the fluidity from the beginning?

AJD: Yeah.

Mary: Available to the students, and just let that be like part of our classroom practice. So, even in our discussions, sometimes I’ll say a word in Spanish, and again it’s not necessarily because I’m like “Okay, I’m going to switch to Spanish now” but I’m just like talking, and I know that most of them will understand a term when I say it. And so I say it. And if they don’t, then we’ll have a conversation about it, but I think most of the time it creates this sort of relationality and relationship with students because they know that I understand if they do the same thing back. Like if for some reason they can’t think of an English word right away, they can still say a Spanish word and it’ll be fine, it’s not like the end of the world

What Mary described is a gradual process of getting to know her students. She does not come in speaking Spanish nor does she assume that all of her students speak Spanish. Rather, Mary starts with her stories and then allows her students to share their stories and reveal their own language practices. Telling stories is one of the most important ways that instructors in this study created a safe space for students. Elena was another one who told stories about herself as a language learner:

Because the whole point of me exposing – not exposing myself. Sort of opening up of myself as a language learner is to build community, right? To deepen that sort of sense of shared language learner status. (Int. 2)

Elena pairs her use of stories with her decision to use an inclusive “teachery” English. Her goal is inclusion and a sense of community and relationship with the students. This community is very important for her students, who often feel at a disadvantage with their status as language learners and multilinguals. Another way that she creates a safe space for her students is acknowledging that the work they do is hard.

Elena: You know, and so I find myself, like, constantly saying to students “do you know that I can’t do what you’re doing,” right, like going to college in a second language? Like, I could barely even watch cartoons in Russian.

AJD: ((laughs))

Elena: I could not write a whole paper. It's unbelievable, like, I can't do what you're doing. Most people can't. Most Americans can't do it. And so, you need to stop -apologizing for, to me for making a verb error. You're doing something really challenging.

AJD: Yeah.

Elena: And, for me, uh the translangual approach is just a way of solidifying – well, theorizing but also solidifying that sort of psychological idea, that what you're doing is really hard and we should honor it. Because nobody else will. (Int. 1)

Elena confirms the challenges they face and gives them permission to make mistakes and to accept mistakes as part of the natural process of learning and using a second (or third or fourth) language. In doing so, she not only sets them at ease but also counters a monolingual ideology that people have to have perfect grammar in order communicate successfully. She framed this goal as challenging the shame that her ESL students feel around language, a goal that is perhaps the most important one of the class for her, even more than learning how to translanguage in their writing: “I don't actually care if they ever code-mesh in their writing again,” she said, “as long as the reason that they don't ever code-mesh is not because they are ashamed.”

Challenging students' shame, for Elena, also meant challenging the ethos of the writing teacher as a perfect language model. In the story above, she poked fun at herself and her language abilities in Russian. She challenged the image of the teacher as an authoritative language expert on purpose:

Elena: I'm very open with my students, I talk to them a lot about my own language-learning experiences, and I tell them stories about times that I screwed up in my other languages. Um. Which I do (.) very deliberately. Like, I am also like, just sort of break down that idea of like I'm the monolingual, uh, I'm the native English speaker, like I'm the language authority. I'm, like, no, I happened to be born speaking English, but when I learn other languages, I screw up just like everybody else does. You know? So, that's where like, we're all language learners here. It's just that I'm learning languages that aren't the universal lingua – the global lingua franca. (Int. 1)

Elena demonstrated that instructors can use their stories about learning languages to work toward multiple pedagogical goals: building rapport with students, challenging monolingual ideology around proficiency, and creating space for language difference.

Other study participants also use stories of their language mishaps and culture shock in order to reassure students that mistakes and challenges are part of the learning process and of languaging more generally. Molly directly linked her telling of stories with encouraging her students to be less embarrassed in their language use. Her stories demonstrate the ways that “your third language is always getting stepped on by your second language” and the fact that even when we try hard, there's always a chance to say something we didn't mean – and that the people around us usually know that wasn't what we were trying to say. Stories can help to show that not all communication is

successful, even when people share the same native language, something that Joelle commented on:

We talk – For example, here's another specific. I will share with them at some point the story of my being in England. I have second cousins there who are also of Polish descent. And my first experience visiting my cousins there was that I spent some time – There's some people there who are my age, these second cousins, around my age. I was there at my students' age, so 18 or 19 the first time I went to visit these cousins. One of them said to me, this young woman, she said, ((attempts British accent)) “Well, what are the blokes like in America?” I can't do the British accents, but what are the blokes like in America. I thought she was saying, “What are the blacks like in America.” I was like, “Oh, they're just like everywhere else. What do you mean what are the blacks like in America?” I got kind of affronted. Then it turned out what she was saying is B-L-O-K-E-S, blokes, which is the way of saying, “What are the guys like in America?” Which is not uncommon question for a young woman to ask another woman from another culture. “What are the guys like over there? Are they good? Are they nice to you? Are they mean? Are they you know jerks or whatever?” But that's such a great story, because my students always – They get it that there's multiple Englishes too. (Joelle, Int. 2)

Cat was another teacher who was willing to challenge the idea of the teacher as expert language user. She drew on her presence as a non-native speaker of English to

model a willingness to admit when she did not know everything and to use those moments to learn more about language.

You have to kind of, like, create a space and create an atmosphere that where it's okay, and students can understand why that's happening. So, for example, I'm fine being the person who tells their students um, you know, uh, this is what I know, um, can you tell me more about the expression that you just used? Um, you know, I don't know that expression. I'm totally fine with doing that. Maybe it was more difficult at the beginning when I was a first-year PhD instructor, you know, because you come with these assumptions like, oh, I have to do all these things, right? But then you grow, and you start learning that you don't have to know everything. So, I'm okay showing that to students, and actually, I think that my translingual pedagogies has to do with modeling that behavior to students, to tell them okay, here's what I don't know, and here's how I learn what I don't know. Here's how I do research about what I don't know. (Cat, Int. 1)

This willingness, she admits, did not come easily at first, but as she has become more comfortable with a translingual approach, she is more at ease with this vulnerability and can see how it makes the space for students to become curious and more adventurous as well.

Vulnerability around language is an incredibly important element to consider in the translingual classroom. Identifying as a non-native English speaker or a speaker of

minority English varieties (particularly those identified with traditionally stigmatized racial or socioeconomic groups) can be a risky move for some students, opening them up to negative responses.

They also can feel that their identities are tokenized or pigeon-holed. DB described how students in his more monolingual classes who come from non-English-speaking language backgrounds tend to not draw attention to their multilingualness but rather try to blend in as an English speaker. Were DB to draw attention to their language knowledge in the public setting of the classroom, these students may feel exposed; we see the same sense of vulnerability in Mary's students. In certain contexts, students perceive their language difference as a risk, not a valuable asset—the opposite of what a translingual approach wants to achieve.

To lessen this sense of risk and to create a space where students can use their languages as assets, instructors can do several important things. First is to be vulnerable about their own language learning and language experiences. When teachers normalize mistakes and other forms of language difference, students feel more comfortable exposing their own language difference. Another vital way is by letting students take the lead in how (and if) they want to share their language stories or use their language practices. Working with students who felt their Spanish to be a liability, Mary never assumed that her students knew Spanish or wanted to use Spanish in her class. She made the use of Spanish an option in her class, often presenting it as another skill that could be added to the project. The precariousness²⁷ of the institutional and local context

²⁷ We can contrast this context to that of Elena, Joelle, and Etienne, who all use projects in their courses that have their multilingual students (often English language

made it very important that she gave her students the freedom to choose how they wish to be identified or how they use their languages. This element of choice is another important aspect of the translingual classroom.

Instructors did not perform their language practices as much as they performed their language beliefs. What became clear in this study is that while it is important to draw attention to the ways that writing instructors can practice translanguaging and translingual language practices in the classroom, it is equally helpful to understand how instructors can draw on their language histories and language beliefs in various ways to teach with a translingual approach. Instructor code-meshing can play a vital role in connecting with students and representing other languages in the classroom, but instructors can draw on their language histories in other ways to make visible the ways that languages and dialects other than *Standardized English make meaning and to make space for students to learn how to draw from their own language histories.

Language and Culture

It is impossible to teach language without considering culture. It is very easy to focus on linguistic difference, particularly the audible or visible differences, while forgetting how much cultural differences may be involved. Several participants referred to the connection between language and culture. Joelle often used the topic of culture shock as a springboard into cultural nuances of language. Culture circles in her class function for the exploration and discussion of language and translation and develop students'

learners) using languages other than English.

curiosity and openness to language and cultural difference. Joelle noted,

The other thing I want to say real quick, to me, language is culture and culture is language. It's really hard to separate those two for me. I see this in the class over and over again and I emphasize it in the class too, because there's just so many ways that the way they talk about something, it's culture, but it's also language.

(Int. 2)

Mary pointed out how cultural values and practices affect writing in ways that are not immediately tied to syntactical or lexical choices:

Like even just writing e-mails, e-mails in Spanish, among like Spanish speakers, tend to be like really long and verbose because you don't just like e-mail someone and ask a quick question, you're like "hello, how are you? how is your grandma? how are your kids? I hope everything's well," you know and then get to the question. So even things like that I think we're like (.) navigating our language histories when we're talking to specific people. (Int. 2)

The need for a longer greeting in an e-mail rather than just "asking a quick question" is not really one of language; it is a cultural expectation that is mapped into the practice of language itself, inextricable from Mary's language history.

Although most of the study participants had worked extensively with translingual theory, Keiko was not familiar with translingualism as either a theory or an

approach to teaching, yet her pedagogy reflected the same practices and sensitivity to difference that the other participants demonstrated because she teaches writing in a writing program that has been heavily influenced by translingual theory and pedagogy. However, she framed her approach through the lens of culture and cultural differences. Essentially, Keiko was practicing a translingual orientation that encouraged and welcomed cultural differences including linguistic difference.

Her interest in cultural differences developed through her own experiences in living and working in different cultural environments. Intercultural awareness was something she cultivated from an early age.²⁸ Her experiences of cultural dissonance, like language difference, led her to develop a sensitivity to students' own efforts, particularly those of international students, to make sense of a new culture and language. She works with a large international student population but also domestic students who come to a smaller urban center from large urban areas or more rural areas. Everyone, she observed, brings culture into the classroom, and she helps them to see what they bring and how their cultural backgrounds shape how they think about writing and literacy practices. Activities in her class help students to develop cultural and rhetorical awareness by reflecting on their own writing and culture but also by talking and working with one another: "we are all different but we can learn from each other" (Int. 1).

Like other instructors in this study, Keiko consciously adapts her language to be more accommodating to students whose first language is not English, including altering

²⁸ See her story in Chapter One.

her pronunciation or slowing down a bit, and she intentionally finds diverse examples and images to use in class. One story she shared was about listening to a student present a project in front of class and using a word that Keiko realized had particular cultural meaning for the student presenting but which other students would not catch. Keiko then came back to the word and helped her students to understand the other possible interpretations of that word. Her own experiences and interest in cultural differences means that she frames her teaching in terms of cultural awareness.

Keiko also uses this awareness to respond positively to difference. As a writing tutor, Keiko does not try to tell students “how to write” but instead “affirms their language practices” and encourages them to “use their native dialects” (Int. 2). She discussed the differences in writing that she noticed of her African students who were brought up in a more British English “way to write” that is more “poetic” than the American approach. She mentioned working with him to change how he wrote for the American system while still affirming the validity of the way he was taught.

Keiko is in a writing program that sees language and culture as two sides of the same coin. Language and culture are inseparably intertwined, and the writing program in which Keiko teaches emphasizes both. When she observed, “we have to first know your audience” (Int. 1), she may have been framing this knowledge in terms of culture, but the end goal is much the same: finding the best way to communicate to a particular group in a way that resonates with them. As translingualism discusses how to engage with and make space for language difference, it is important to remember the presence of culture as the constant companion to language and the ways that cultural

expectations, norms, and practices influence how language is also practiced.²⁹ Like language, the idea of culture has been shown to be more fluid and individualized, rather than monolithic (Atkinson, 2003; Kubota, 2004), and discussions over cultural practices and cultural differences can be an effective way to build the same skills of seeing, valuing, and responding to difference that are central to a translingual orientation, as well as encouraging an approach to writing that takes into account the audience and rhetorical context.

Localizing the Translingual Classroom

Although I wish I had a fully elaborated methodology—the “pedagogical answer” I always desire at the ends of essays—such a pedagogy can only be local.

(LeCourt, 2006, p. 46)

The languaging that students and instructors do in the classroom and on the classroom margins are contingent on a complex array of various factors, including the institutional context, the writing program, as well as the students and teachers themselves and their respective language histories.

The practices and perspectives that have been discussed throughout these pages

²⁹ I am struck with a memory of one of the middle-aged teachers I worked with in Japan repeatedly asking me one day if I were cold. I couldn't figure out why she kept asking me, and I continued to reply that I was all right. Finally, she decided I wasn't getting the message and took the direct route and pointed out that my midriff was showing. In Japanese culture, “saving face” is very important, and the poor woman was trying discreetly to get me, the clueless foreigner, to pull my shirt down.

as part of translingual practice and a translingual classroom are a constellation of possibilities, not a set of requirements. Each classroom context, including the students, their language histories, and the ideologies and structures of the writing program and institution, will be different, as will the language histories of the instructors who come into these classrooms. What these pages have done is investigated how instructors can draw from their language histories to support students' learning and to valorize students' language practices. In this section, I make some observations of the various elements that make up the classroom context and frame three general types of classrooms.

From the participants, several common goals of a translingual classroom were identified:

- Giving students language and framework to talk about their experiences
- Countering monolingualism and shame
- Helping students be better writers
- Preparing students to encounter and work with languages around the world
- Helping students understand a deeper and more complex picture around language
- Giving students a sense of agency in their language use
- Helping students strengthen their ties to their language and cultural histories

The translingual classroom keeps these goals in mind while designing the course, and how they are achieved will vary depending on the context. Along with these goals, the

three metaphors, making space, making visible, and being open, capture the goals of translingual pedagogy but also the practices and types of activities that can help to achieve these goals. In this regard, the metaphors can serve as an important framework for a translingual classroom and guide an instructor in designing a course and deciding what to focus on in the classroom.

One of the biggest factors affecting the context of a classroom is the language backgrounds of the students themselves, particularly whether the students are multilingual or monolingual. This distinction is important, as this discussion will show, but it is important to stress that the goals listed above are applicable equally to multilingual and monolingual students. This commonality was something that DB observed several different times:

Yeah, I mean like the way that I approach getting students to reflect on good writing is pretty unchanged from course to course. It's just wrapping it in a different kind of set of clothes. (DB, Int. 1)

I think that all of my students have been native English speakers. Um, a couple of them have been bilingual. But in these instances um I'm doing more or less the same things as when I had in a multilingual class. I'm asking them to question of what good writing means. (DB, Int. 1)

It is important to stress that the goals of translingualism are the same for what are conceivably different groups of students. Writing programs often separate students

based on language backgrounds, and multilingual students (i.e., those for whom English is clearly not a first language) and monolingual students (i.e., those who pass for native speakers of English) are often separated (Matsuda, 2006). A translingual ideology challenges the idea that students of different language backgrounds need to be separated. Etienne's context and experience provides support for this argument:

we separate our first-year writing courses by um you know we have first-year writing, which is just called writing and rhetoric and we have another course – equal-credit-bearing courses satisfying the same general ed (.) requirement for multilingual students, it's called writing and rhetoric, or multilingual writing and rhetoric. And so the program itself sorts the students. So students who, you know, don't think of themselves as multilingual register for the (.) one and students who do register for the other. Um but I've had uh (.) students ((laughs)) accidentally enroll ((laughs)) in my multilingual course who get there on the first day and they're like, oh, wait, whoops, you know, like I didn't mean to (.) I meant to take the other one. I didn't realize that, you know, what I was doing. But then it can be hard to switch because the sections all fill up and they have to get on waitlists. So they end up either having to drop the course or they're stuck. You know. With it. And they have a great time! It's not that they don't find themselves (.) you know, at any loss. *It's just a different set of opportunities to explore language in a different way than what they came to assume (.) was what they did in an English class or a writing class.* (Int. 1, edited for brevity, emphasis mine)

The opportunities for exploring language become very interesting when monolingual and multilingual students work together. The writing program in which Joelle and Molly teach has a slightly different approach. Their program underwent some changes several years ago when the institution began recruiting more international students. The number of non-native English speakers began to increase dramatically and were placed into preparatory courses before shifting into standard first-year writing courses. Joelle, Molly, and other instructors wanted to find ways to integrate these students into their program in a way that did not devalue their language and cultural histories. Because Joelle's story eloquently demonstrated the various factors and ideas influencing the ways the program and course are designed, I include a long excerpt for illustration:

Jo: I'm going to say this came about mostly because of the group of us that got together to reconfigure the [preparatory] class. And it's in that class mostly that the translingual approach happens. I think in the class past it there's another emphasis, the regular first year writing composition class. We have some 50 instructors. We have, as you know, huge numbers of students. So the emphasis in that class tends to be on student reflection on their learning. So you can still do a translingual approach with that. It's a little less strong, and the populations of the students are um. Even though the students who come in and do the [preparatory] class end up in the regular course, there aren't many of them. Now, I taught a version of the [regular course] last semester where I did use a translingual approach

and it was very rich, but not all my colleagues do. We use that approach most of all in the [preparatory] class. If that makes sense.

AJD: Yeah, and that's predominantly because you do have such a mix of ... is that because of the student population or is that because of the history of you guys (.) working?

Joelle: I'd say both. It's a history of us working together and it's also the student, the population helped drive that initiative to begin with. So, because we were all working together we started sharing things, and then we all sort of. And then we built some of the language of respecting students' cultures and languages and trying to include those assets into the course outcomes.

AJD: And those are the course are the course outcomes for that preparation class?

Joelle: Yes. Now in the second class, or in the other class, the regular [course], the regular writing as inquiry class, if you look at our website and read our robust course outcome goals, cultures is all through it, and the languages by which students express their cultures and honoring student cultures. It's along the same lines. It's just not as explicit.

AJD: It's not as explicit.

Joelle: There's a lot of overlap. Then there's an emphasis on different forms of writing. It's pretty clear. There's a required remix assignment. You know, just a cultural artifact assignment where students take artifacts that are meaningful to them and share them. So, there's some of the same moves.

It's a lot like what happens in the [preparatory] class, but it's just not as explicitly expressed in the outcomes.

AJD: Why do you think that is?

Joelle: Well, because that has all been in place longer. You know, I worked on those outcomes too and I think there's a lot of good there. I don't think we have to say we have to do this in a certain way to have it happen.

At play in Joelle's description are the institutional context, including its size as well as the way the curriculum is set up with a preparatory and regular first-year writing course. The writing program itself has an approach that values student reflection as well as students' languages and cultures. Joelle used the word "assets" to describe how students' backgrounds are viewed, a term that stems from a colleague's interest in asset-based pedagogy. Joelle and her colleagues have taken up the idea of asset-based pedagogy and integrated it with a translingual pedagogy. The goals of the two pedagogical approaches have similarities in wanting to value and make space for minority students' backgrounds, and thus they function together well.

This combination of translingual orientation with other pedagogical approaches was something that came out of conversations with other participants. Earlier I mentioned that Etienne found that his background in creative writing workshops helped him to practice a translingual orientation of listening, negotiating, and responding in his writing classrooms. Cat integrates a translingual approach with the activity theory-based approach that her institution uses.

And I think that doing a translingual approach, um, pairing it with the approaches that we use in the writing program at [Institution], which are genre studies and cultural historic activity theory. So, pairing translingualism with those two approaches definitely helps them become better writers. Because they realize, you know, how writing is an activity that they do, uh, that's networked and that has to do with sociocultural and ecological factors, right? And translingualism just adds another layer of complexity to that. (Cat, Int. 1)

Prior and current teaching and curricular experiences and approaches therefore also play a role in how instructors will take a translingual approach in a classroom. Likewise, instructors are influenced by the scholars they have read and learned from as well as the people that they work with and discuss language and teaching with³⁰. All of these influences will be brought into the classroom with them, making up their own teaching backgrounds.

The institutional context has been mentioned repeatedly as another influence on how the translingual classroom is created. There are a number of aspects involved in the institutional context, including the size of the school, the cultural and socioeconomic make up of the students, the region that the school is situated as well as the regions from which the students come from, and so forth. The language ideology of the school is a

³⁰ One of the more amusing situations that I found myself in was listening to two of my participants take very different views of Canagarajah's work. Elena found Canagarajah's ideas on translingualism so inspiring that she went on to study with Canagarajah when getting her doctoral degree. DB on the other hand disagreed with how Canagarajah (2013b) framed translingual writing, arguing that the examples that Canagarajah gave were representative of multilingual writing instead.

not insignificant factor as well. Although it could be argued that colleges and universities in general in the United States tend to hold a monolingual ideology toward language (Horner & Trimbur, 2002; Matsuda, 2006), some schools can be more stringent in this ideology than others. Perhaps not surprisingly, the institutions in this study that had some of the strongest English-only views were the ones that had some of the most linguistically diverse student bodies. As seen throughout this study, the pressures to use *Standardized English that Elena's and Mary's institutions place on students have clearly influenced their teaching and the ways that they engage students with their language practices.

Writing about the restrictive language policies that Arizona K-12 teachers face for working with English language learners, Mackinney and Rios-Aguilar (2012) observe

What teachers choose to do in their classrooms depends on their own skills, experience, education, and beliefs about their students' academic potential and how their students learn. But it also depends on how structural arrangements and ideologies constrain or enhance what is possible in the classroom. (p. 355)

Much like the participants in this study, the teachers that they studied had individual ways of negotiating these policies and what Mackinney and Rios-Aguilar call "complex teaching contexts." They sometimes made choices to accommodate the policies or chose certain "pedagogical strategies to pursue in the classroom" over others (p. 363).

The translingual classroom will never be designed from scratch. There will

always be a variety of influences and contextual considerations that instructors must take into account when considering how to take a translingual approach in the composition classroom. Cat observed the importance of localizing one's course design:

It depends on who you are and what you want, but if I'm taking a writing class, what else do I need for me to know about language in a writing class in a mid-western context, right? In a public institution in a mid-western context, as opposed to an English Language Institute, as opposed to learning how to write in English in Spain. Or knowing how to write (.) or learning how to navigate writing in any other context, in Asia, or whatever. Or communicating – sending an e-mail to my parents as opposed to sending an e-mail to my students, right?

(Cat, Int. 1)

Cat's question, "what else do I need to know about language?," takes on a rhetorical aspect as it considers the local context.

I want to return, however, to the factor of students' language backgrounds and how they shape the translingual classroom. Cat and DB both drew attention to the ways that a translingual approach adapts to different contexts.

Cat: We can use the same approach, but we frame it and we introduce it in different ways, so we scaffold activities in different ways to accomplish different things. Right? So, you have the same idea of language (.) language as practice, language as performance, language as something

that we do. We use language creatively. And this works for social justice, but even if that's the main idea, the way that it has to be done in these contexts is very different. And what students need is different too. So, my, um, multilingual students, um, they have been learning English as a foreign language in contexts outside of the U.S. So, they were (.) they had been socialized into believing that they had to learn this academic language, right?

AJD: Yeah.

Cat: Because they wanted to pursue a valid () career in the U.S., so, they wanted to learn that. So (.) in that case it was about teaching them, or helping them to see, how it's not just about academic language. Even if you want to learn the discourses of, you know, being a business student (.) or being a music major, right, if you want to learn the main discourses of that, that doesn't mean that there is one form of academic language.

AJD Right, right.

Cat: Um. And then, for [first-year writing] students who were very homogeneous, they come from the U.S., they are from around [major city], the depths of knowledge that they need about language and writing are different, so. In their case it was more about, so, think about genre and think about the five-paragraph essay. Think about writing in a broader sense, right? And how language depends (.) from the situation, like, every genre is going to require you to use different types of language, different registers. (Int. 1)

Cat observed that the language background of her students plays a role in how she teaches a translingual approach. Although she uses the term “linguistically diverse” to refer to all of her students (a term that I have taken up in this study as well), she does distinguish between multilingual and monolingual students in terms of the what they needed to know to write successfully in the contexts in which they were studying based on their backgrounds. In other words, the needs and goals of the students can vary depending on their language backgrounds and the institutional context.

Additionally, students’ language backgrounds can influence the activities and topics of discussion around language and writing. There were three dominant types of classroom contexts that I observed in this study. The first is a monolingual context. This is a classroom where most of the students are conceivably monolingual in some variety of English. They tend to be domestic United States students, and although they may know other languages or language varieties, English is a major language for them. Cat and DB had writing courses that tend to be this context. A second context is bilingual, where there is linguistic diversity among the students but that diversity is generally between English and one other dominant language. Mary’s context falls into this context. Another context is plurilingual, much like the ones that Joelle, Molly, Elena, and Etienne teach in, where students come from a range of different contexts and backgrounds, including many international students or students for whom English is not a first language.

When I asked DB if he speaks and writes differently with his students at his current institution, which is more monolingual English, than he did with his more

multilingual students at a previous institution, DB interpreted the question as a pedagogical one and described how the language backgrounds of his students affect how he addresses the topic of language stability. With his monolingual students, he focuses on thinking critically about writing and destabilizing “the entrenched monolingual hierarchy,” which he likened to “the one unicorn that is out there,” and countering the idea that “writing has to be” a particular way. He saw himself as asking questions not so much about language as much as about genres and discourses, much like Cat’s use of a humorous recipe book to stimulate discussions around the flexibility of genres. For DB, these discussions of genre and discourses in his monolingual classes tend to come “at the detriment of language,” but in a more multilingual context, he uses language as an opening to talk about writing and the destabilization of writing. For multilingual students, their experiences around language and language difference were “the way in” to destabilizing monolingual ideologies around writing.

The plurilingual classrooms offer a dynamic similar to that of a contact zone (Pratt, 1991), which Pratt describes as “social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other” (p. 34). Canagarajah (2016) finds these classrooms to be valuable for practicing translanguaging: “The mix of students and materials from diverse cultures and languages,” he writes, “makes the classroom a contact zone. Such a space is extremely valuable for reflections and negotiations on translanguaging” (p. 268). The interactions that Joelle, Molly, Etienne, and Elena set up in their classrooms allows for this “bumping up” of languages and cultures. Students and teachers alike must engage in paying attention to how languages and cultures are practiced and negotiating meaning with each other.

These classroom contexts are broad generalizations, but they do help us to get a sense of the potential language needs and dynamics that underlie the practices and conceptualizations to follow.

Conclusion

As the discussion of language practices above suggests, except for Mary, participants rarely used code-meshing or even other forms of overt translanguaging. All of these instructors had access to named languages or language varieties other than English, so why did these instructors not model more overt translanguaging for students? There are several important reasons that participants gave for this.

First, instructors prized accessibility and successful communication over modeling translanguaging, and accessible communication meant using English, even in a bilingual context such as Mary's. I have discussed the nature of shared languages and how they restricted overt translanguaging to the classroom margins and personal communication. I bring back Guerra's (2016) point that language practices from one context do not neatly transfer to another; even if my participants practiced overt translanguaging regularly in their personal lives, they were not necessarily able to bring that to the classroom because the rhetorical situations are different. The instructors in this study tended to avoid overt translanguaging because of concerns of confusing or excluding students. Nevertheless, while overt translanguaging was not a common language practice, instructors were able to model a broad array of communicative practices and language knowledge in the process of negotiating meaning with their

students.

Another reason was that participants viewed the focus of a translingual classroom to be on developing students' orientation toward language difference and their ability to negotiate communication in creative and strategic ways that drew from their language knowledge. The general view was that students, particularly multilingual students, do not need to be taught how to translanguage or to use language in a translingual way. Those who are multilingual, as several participants pointed out, already translanguage in their everyday lives. Rather, instructors saw that it was more important for students to look more closely at their own language practices, to value those practices, and to value those of others. Therefore, my participants most often modeled an interest in others' languages and cultures, rhetorical attunement to translation and language difference, and a willingness to negotiate meaning and language with their students and methods for doing so. Etienne and Joelle both explained that they did not bring their other languages into the classroom because what their students were doing with language was more important than what they could do with languages.

Another important conclusion is that participants tended to not see themselves as translanguaging in the classroom because of their own conceptualizations of translanguaging. Even though the definition of translanguaging that I have defined in this chapter arose from their descriptions of translingual practice—and for some, like Elena and Mary, their personal language practices—participants tended to not apply it to the language practices that they used in the classroom. A big factor in this perception was that they equate translanguaging with the pedagogical translanguaging described in

bilingual education and therefore felt like it wasn't applicable to their classroom context (Joelle), that they weren't using enough of their other language for it to be considered translanguaging (Mary), or did not know enough of another language that students used to make it possible (Joelle and Molly). Others did not pursue overt translanguaging and code-meshing for the reasons described above.

Even though their full range of language practices were not overtly used in the classroom, instructors did translanguage in various ways. Even more importantly, they drew from their larger language histories—not just their repertoires—to practice translingualism and to create a translingual classroom. In other words, a multilingual background is valuable not just for the potential for overt translanguaging but for a wider range of translingual teaching and orientation practices in the classroom.

CHAPTER FIVE

Reframing Translingual Writing

As I wrapped up this dissertation, a heated discussion was taking place on the WPA-L (a mailing list on composition and writing program administration) about code-meshing and whether it should be taught in the composition classroom. As with a similar one in the same space the year before, this conversation was spurred by the code-meshing in several texts and speeches of the current and past chairs of the Conference for College Composition and Communication, a large, national conference for the field of rhetoric and composition. The discussion on the list this time around had the added element of reactions to the speech made by Asao Inoue at the most recent (2019) conference in which he linked *Standardized English to racism and called on White scholars to recognize their dominance and to make space for scholars of color.

On the WPA-L list, a number of list members wrote in support of the idea of students bringing their own languages into the classroom and validated the code-meshing that the chairs, Vershawn Young and Asao Inoue, were doing and the challenges to *Standardized English that Inoue posed. Others disagreed and brought up Delpit's (1995) concerns about teaching students to write using the vernacular, questioning the idea of not teaching *Standardized English and pointing to students' own demands for learning *Standardized English and their resistance to writing in the vernacular. Both sides present valid questions and concerns. It is a legitimate concern that asking students to only write a certain way upholds racist structures in the United

States. Equally, it is understandable to question whether not teaching a *Standardized English (also called Edited Academic English or Language of Wider Communication) would be to deny our students—particularly our students of color—access to the language of power.

As Tardy (2011) notes, the idea of a standard language is a powerful one: “The power of Standard English and the symbolic capital that it carries looms large for writing instructors and represents a major source of tension for many teachers who believe that Standard English will provide their students access but who simultaneously value diversity of expression” (p. 648). This tension between linguistic diversity and what Jaspers (2018) calls a “collective standard variety” is at the heart of the debate on the WPA-L. This chapter is a response to those questions and arguments—it arose out of my wanting to say something to the listserv conversation—and presents a way of moving forward.

The problem with this recurring conversation is that it focuses on a binary between communicability in the form of a standardized language on the one side and identity as expressed through code-meshing and the vernacular (which has often been interpreted, inaccurately, that anything goes, *tout est permis*) on the other. In some ways, this binary has been created by translingual scholarship itself and its presentation of code-meshing as a more “natural” way of using language (Canagarajah, 2013a; Jaspers, 2018), or as Jordan (2015), replacing one type of linguistic hero (“fluent” language users) with another (code-meshers). Essentially, translingual scholars argue, the translingual writer does not hold back parts of their linguistic repertoire. In many ways, code-meshing is understood as a form of individual expression or even as

transgressive, pushing the status quo and challenging the reader or listener a bit (Atkinson & Tardy, 2018).

However, this view of code-meshing didn't work when it came to instructors' language practices and their individual contexts. The participants in this study did not want to use their languages other than English in transgressive or expressive ways because doing so would distance them from their students or cause confusion for students who were learning English. Overt code-meshing for them would be rhetorically unsuccessful for the type of classroom they had and the type of community they were trying to build. They recognized that English was the shared language of the classroom.

By continuing to frame translingual language practices more generally—and translingual writing more specifically—as overt code-meshing, translingualism actually may be doing a disservice to our linguistically diverse students and also preventing a translingual approach from being accepted more widely. Rather, we need to reframe translingual writing in terms of a process of translanguaging with a focus on the rhetorical situation and making visible the element of **choice** and deploying language strategically. Reframing translanguaging and, by extension, translingual writing as processes as well as products can help navigate some of the tensions inherent in translanguaging or teaching with translanguaging and can help composition studies integrate languages other than *Standardized English into the writing classroom. Likewise, taking a process view of translanguaging makes it possible for writing instructors to see more opportunities to use their own language practices and experiences in the classroom. The translingual classroom becomes a translanguaging space that is open to dynamic and creative language practices.

Looking at Process—Translanguaging Under the Hood

By viewing translanguaging as a process, we can see that movement between languages does not have to be realized on the page. The activities of *accessing one's language repertoire* and *using multiple languages for the writing process* both function as opportunities for a writer to engage their full linguistic capacities. We can apply this understanding of translanguaging as process to the concept of translingual writing, as Elena does, more broadly. Translingual writing, therefore, does not have to mean a visibly translanguaged text that involves more than one language. Translingual writing involves a process of leveraging all of one's language resources in different ways to achieve successful communication.

Figure 5.1—The Process of Communicating Rhetorically

That process of leveraging the full repertoire also requires a rhetorical process. The model in Figure 5.1 is drawn from participants' conversations around looking rhetorically, communicating rhetorically, and negotiating language and meaning—all concepts that they connected with translingualism and translingual communication. While acknowledging that this process does not happen linearly, we can see how the stage in which choosing from available means aligns with the conceptualization of translanguaging as drawing from across one's language repertoire. From there choices can be made about how to use language and which language or languages to use. Mary describes how she understands herself to be translingual:

Like regardless of what's coming out, regardless of what I'm actually writing, in my head I'm using all of my language practices. So, I'm still being translingual because I'm like translating, and I'm like moving through these different options for how to communicate, even if what I'm writing is only in English. (Int. 2)

When Etienne, Joelle, and others talk about making translation and “the invisible stuff” visible, they mean bringing up to our and students' awareness this grappling with language that goes on under the hood of the writing process. By emphasizing translanguaging and translingual writing as a process instead of a product, instructors are in fact making visible this language work. We turn back to Mary for more of a perspective on the translanguaging under the hood.

Like you get all the different ways I could think and whatever is being communicated or whatever I'm acknowledging might be in English. So, I think those language histories are always in conversation. And without it even being conscious. I think that part of the mistake we make as writing teachers is that we tend to only acknowledge and only analyze and only look at what is produced. But there's so much that is not, like visually or verbally, said or seen that is still happening in our interactions in the classroom. So, I don't know how those specific things look like necessarily, but I could give you some examples of how like you could be thinking of how to say something, and the word in Spanish will come to you first, but you don't voice the word in Spanish; you wait until the word comes to you in English and you voice that. Oh, so there are several instances of that. Oh, and there are some cultural things. Like even just writing e-mails, e-mails in Spanish, among like Spanish speakers, tend to be like really long and verbose because you don't just like e-mail someone and ask a quick question, you're like "hello, how are you? how is your grandma? how are your kids? I hope everything's well," you know and then get to the question. So even things like that I think we're like (.) navigating our language histories when we're talking to specific people. If that makes sense. And I know that my students do that, too. (Mary, Int. 2)

When translanguaging and translingual writing are understood in terms of a process, then the role of the instructor is to make this process visible to students, whatever their language background. Modeling that moving back and forth in more than one language

can be one way to make it visible, but there are other ways as well. The instructors that I interviewed helped to make this process visible by having students reflect on their writing, asking them to think about things such as what they were thinking, the choices that they were making, the ways that their languages may have interacted.

This understanding of process is also important for students traditionally considered monolingual as well. Understanding that translingual writing draws from all linguistic resources and rhetorical resources also helps us to better understand how presumably monolingual speakers and writers can benefit from a translingual approach. So-called monolingual writers also have a range of social languages, varieties, or registers to work with (Piccardo, 2013; MacSwan, 2017) and that complement their rhetorical knowledge. Their writing process also involves accessing their full language repertoires. As DB illustrates, the product element of translingual writing is less important than using a translingual process or taking a translingual orientation to heart.

DB Um and so (.) if a (.) //if like two native English-speaking writers are going to write an essay, right? Um, I think that it's entirely possible that they turn in the same work and one of them is translingual and one of them is not.

AJD How so?

DB This is quite tricky. Because the – it's about like the approach and the orientation that's in the writer. So //if one of them writes //their text thinking like oh! I'm working really hard to write what is good writing and it is to me what uh the standard is that I have learned. And they're

like searching for this like Shangri-La of good writing like in their hearts they're like abiding by monolingualist ideology and they're just trying to impress whomever they have to impress.

AJD Okay.

DB To be let into the club. It's entirely possible that there's another who submits the same work but they're writing it going like okay (.) this is not necessarily (.) the best piece of writing. Uh, I am, I am writing in a particular way that will have a particular outcome but in my heart I do not believe that this is working towards and achieving this perfect grasp of English.

AJD Okay?

DB Kind of like murky. And so, weird though it might seem like this is one of the reasons why it's so hard to think about the approach because like a text can be translingual depending on the writer's heart almost. (Int. 1)

Although the process for monolingual and multilingual writers might be slightly different, at the bottom is a desire to communicate effectively within a particular situation. A translingual process focuses on successful communication and on maximizing one's full linguistic repertoire to achieve this.

Mary's students in the bilingual border community in which she now teaches are already well aware of the fact that two languages were at play in their community. When working with local community partners, they often wrote up materials in both Spanish and English without Mary indicating that they needed to that. However, even

multilingual students can learn about translation in writing.

And then the way that I teach [translation] is through the projects that I already described, partnering with an organization and writing for a real audience that is bilingual and having students to think about the decision they want to make around creating documents for a bilingual audience. I also have um my students partner with ah this group of teachers called the Transatlantic and Pacific Network – TAPP, uh tee-ay-pee-pee. It's through North Dakota State University and they pair writing classes in the U.S. with writing classes in international contexts. Most of them are in Europe, we had a couple in Asia. Um and so my students will do that. My students will write something, and then the students outside the U.S. will translate it. And so the students in the U.S. have to (.) write with translation in mind, which I think is a really valuable skill. So like simplifying sentences, making their points as direct as possible. Things that you want students to do anyway regardless of whether their work is going to be translated or not. [...] Having those real-life projects and exigencies helped students understand when and where to leverage their language practices for specific reasons. And I think that's a way that's more appropriate, more so than like asking them to bring in their languages for whatever reason. In a classroom setting. (Int. 1)

The idea of leveraging one's language practices for specific reasons is part of the rhetorical practice of *deploying language strategically*. This is the element of choice:

choosing from among the many options to communicate an idea.

Another way to make visible the ways that language is involved in the writing process is by having students use their languages in various ways over the process of writing. Researching, planning, drafting, discussing, commenting—these are all actions that demand the use of language. These actions do not have to be consistently in one language or another; students can code-switch or code-mesh while performing all these actions as well. García and Kleyn (2016) argue for this understanding of a translanguaging classroom, in which students’ “full language repertoires” are given a rightful place in the *process* of learning. Even when the *product* of learning is one or another language, the process must leverage the students’ full repertoires” (p. 28). They go on to add that simply letting students do tasks in other languages is not enough; it is important to further and find ways to create a translanguaging space that “ties together all the students’ language practices” into a more unified repertoire.

In their study of elementary students’ bilingual writing, Velasco and García (2014, p. 20) show several ways that students used translanguaging at multiple stages of the writing process, including planning, drafting, and in the final text. Velasco and García show that translanguaging throughout the writing process allowed students to use all of their linguistic resources to craft texts rather than forcing them to think within the “box” of only one language. Translingual studies in composition, in Matsuda’s (2014) critique, focuses only on the final stage, the final text. However, if we shift to understanding translanguaging more broadly and translingual writing more specifically as a process, we may be able to find the balance between expecting multilingual students to produce code-meshed texts and expecting students to always set aside the

same set of language practices in order to produce a particular language variety.

This move towards a more unified approach can be seen in Etienne's and Elena's descriptions of projects in which their students had to interview a person outside of the class in another language. The students were then faced with the decision of how to present the information from that interview to others who likely did not share that language. Etienne described the project and the resulting decisions:

One of the projects that we do in the first-year writing classes is writing profiles. So the students have to conduct an interview with somebody. And often their interview is in another language. So they're talking with, interviewing their mom, or a friend, or cousin or something. So we talk about, "Okay what do you do now? You conducted the interview in this language. You have to transcribe that interview. So are you going to transcribe it in the language in which it was conducted? Or are you going to translate it into English? And if so, what gets lost there when you do that? How do you manage that translation process? And then if you're going to transcribe it into English, you're going to transcribe it in the language it was conducted, how are you then going to incorporate that interview into the essay that you eventually have to write? So are you – how are you going to cue your readers to understand or appreciate certain things that maybe were said in that interview, that maybe your audience isn't going to understand?" And I want them to think of their audience as being multilingual, but they're writing in English, so they have to assume that certain – that they're multilingual, but they're not multilingual in exactly the same way that maybe the

student is. So they don't have that perfect knowledge of the two languages that the student has. They're writing maybe, a Spanish-English bilingual student writing for an international student from India, or from Shanghai. So if you're going to bring Spanish into your English language essay, how are you going to convey the value of what was said there to that audience? (Int. 2)

Translanguaging is enmeshed through the entire process, from the interview to the final written version. Students are working between different languages, even if only between social languages of English, and deciding how to represent those languages in the transcriptions, how to translate, how to integrate them into a profile. The action of moving between languages integrates with the careful attention to audience and decisions about how to use the language to represent the original context and to “convey the value of what was said there” to a particular audience.

The concept of translanguaging, like translingual writing, combines many different types of practices under one term. Code-meshing and translation are practices encompassed within a process view of translanguaging. Another practice to consider is that of code-switching, which is distinguished from code-meshing³¹ in this study by being defined as switching from one language to another for different purposes or topics, can be used in the various activities that help to plan, research, and draft. Elena gave a sense of this process:

³¹Actually, code-meshing as Young (2009) and Canagarajah (2006b) define it could be considered a form of code-switching, the term generally used in sociolinguistics (see Note 11 in Chapter Two; Wardhaugh, 1998; Losey, 2009; see Coronel-Molina & Samuelson, 2017 for a different take).

But a person can, you know, do research in another language, do some drafting in another language, talk to people about your writing in another language, and ultimately, like, sort of consciously choose to write something that is completely you know quote-unquote unaccented. (Int. 1)

As I described before, we can see how different languages are used throughout the writing process for different tasks and for helping to shape the final product, even if that final product seems to be nothing more than a *Standardized English.

The translanguaging activities that Velasco and García (2014) describe are similar or even equivalent to those that I describe here; certainly, their activities can be useful in the composition classroom as well. However, Velasco and García focus on the ways that students use their multiple languages in the texts themselves as they are being planned, drafted, and written and the ways that those translanguaging practices help students navigate these stages with a bit more confidence in both their languages. The activities and practices that Etienne, Elena, and others discussed focus instead on the decisions that have to be made. What distinguish the translanguaging of the translingual classroom from translanguaging as it is understood in other contexts are the attention to the rhetorical situation and the choices that are made throughout the writing process and into the final text. Framing translingual writing as a rhetorical process as well a writing process that involves translanguaging practices helps us to understand how to integrate translanguaging into a college composition class and make sense of translingual writing that goes beyond visible code-meshing.

This approach also should be distinguished from the process that Elbow (2002) describes. Elbow has his students using their vernacular languages to write drafts and then essentially translate them into an Academic English for the final version. Elbow is careful to invite students to write in other languages or language varieties (vernacular) in earlier drafts, if they so choose. He recognizes that students may not want to. However, he does not give a choice in the final draft. The final version, the “final final draft,” still must be copy-edited to what he calls a Standard Written English³². If we were to reframe this approach to be more translingual, to acknowledge translanguaging as a process and a product, then we acknowledge that students must have a choice throughout the entire process and up through the final product. (Moreover, translingualism points out that even a Standard Written English can have various other codes enmeshed within it.) Students may choose to write the final product in a form of *Standardized English because they feel it is most rhetorically effective, but they may also choose to integrate other languages or varieties of English for rhetorical purposes—or because those languages are always present for them anyway. Translingual writing seeks not to erase the presence of those languages but to acknowledge them and to use them as effectively as possible.

However, this is not to say that “code-meshing is always appropriate.” As Elena observed, neither Gloria Anzaldúa nor Geneva Smitherman, both well-recognized academics known for translanguaging, code-mesh all the time in their writing. Rather, a

³² Milson-Whyte (2014) believes that Elbow’s approach “paves the way” for code-meshing because he places value on the role that the other languages play in a person’s processing of information and in their natural ways of communication. His approach just does not go quite far enough in exploring how those other ways of communicating

translingual classroom seeks to open the space for students to learn how to overtly translanguage “if they have the strategies, and they also have the motivation” (Elena, Int. 1). A translingual classroom is also where they can learn to pay attention to the rhetorical elements that might affect that decision to openly translanguage, to gain the rhetorical sensibility to make those decisions as well as the strategies for doing it successfully. What Tardy (2016) observes about genres is true as well for translanguage: challenging the conventions just for the sake of doing so is not the goal of promoting creativity or innovation with language or with writing.

Much of the translingual literature in composition thus far has described translingual writing as visible code-meshing, with bits from two or more languages clearly present throughout a text. The texts often provided by instructors to demonstrate translingual writing are also ones that show code-meshing. While these are liberating (or confusing for some students), they can often seem irrelevant to students who consider themselves monolingual—and they can also seem undesirable for students who have experienced stigma and discrimination for using their other languages. Although Lu and Horner (2013) and Mangelsdorf (2017) have argued that all forms of writing are translingual, it is not clear how to explain this to students. The average practitioner finds themself³³ stuck between these two poles of understanding translingual writing.

This confusion stems from a continued attention to what the *product* of translingual writing would look like. However, re-orienting our perspective to include the whole process of writing, including the final product, then we find a richer

are integrated into the final product.

³³ The non-gendered singular reflexive pronoun “themself” has been around since the

appreciation and a broader view of how to use all of our language resources when writing. In composition, we have long understood writing as process, not just a final product. Considering translanguaging and, by extension, translingual writing as a fuller process is what Matsuda (2014) encourages:

But in translingual writing the process of negotiating assumptions about language is more important than the product. Restricting the scope of translingual writing to the end result can obscure more subtle manifestations of the negotiation as well as situations where writers make the rhetorical choice not to deviate from the dominant practices. (p. 481)

In Matsuda's perspective, the process of negotiation and rhetorical considerations are important but are often ignored with the focus on the code-meshed text. Translingual writing includes translanguaging and it also includes these rhetorical aspects of the writing process that leads to a choice of how languages will be deployed for the rhetorical purpose and the final product of translingual writing.

Navigating the Tensions of Translingual Writing

Let us briefly return to the central tension and point of contention within the translingual approach that I describe above. Although writing about translanguaging more broadly, Jaspers (2018) succinctly frames the tension that is felt in composition

14th century and has been accepted by the Chicago Manual of Style.

around translingual pedagogy:

This is a familiar problem for teachers who favour linguistic diversity: how do you valorize pupils' linguistic diversity without losing sight of socially valued, monolingual, registers? Or, inversely, how do you make pupils learn a collectively valued register without implying that their individual linguistic skills are less important? (p. 6)

Jaspers argues that the debate isn't really about monolingual vs. translanguaging (translingual) but rather "navigating a single ideology [of liberal Enlightenment] that values the opposing themes" of "transparent communication" that comes through using a "collective standard variety" and of the respect for "individual differences, freedom of expression, and equality" (p. 6). These opposing themes are evident in how Elena frames "writerly choices" for her students, particularly the choice whether to bring in languages other than English into their assignments:

But what I did do in class was, I didn't require them [to code-mesh]. I said, here are a bunch of options, and if you want to bring in these other languages, and you want to use them with me when you know I don't speak those languages, here's the tools for doing that and here's – we talked, ah, we actually talked, I framed it as sort of like what do you gain and what do you lose. And the students grasped that immediately, right? *What do you gain? You gain identity (.) you gain sort of representation (.)* and you gain – the students liked to call it unique,

sort of, like you're sort of eye-catching and stand out. Which is one of the things people talked about with code-meshing. *But what you lose is clarity. The communicability.* And the students had no trouble, like, with that. I think they, they were the ones who sort of brought that idea out. So, we talked a lot about, like, these things as writerly choices. If you choose to bring in this word, what are the strategies you could do to make it effective for your audience? (Int. 1, emphasis mine)

Emphasizing the process of writing can help to navigate these tensions and work towards the goal that Jaspers outlines above of learning a particular language variety (Academic English) while honoring their other languages and language practices. However, discussions of translingual writing and translanguaging must also include an important emphasis on *choice*, particularly the ability for students to choose how they want to write and in which languages they want to write in. Not all students want to write in overtly translanguaged texts. It is this aspect of choice, as seen in Elena's pedagogy above, that can distinguish a translingual pedagogy around writing from other approaches that have been critiqued in the literature.

However, Jaspers says that the dilemma is not actually two opposing ideologies but a single ideology:

teachers (in Western schools) are not faced with a choice between two unrelated ideologies (monolingualism versus translanguaging) but have to navigate a single ideology that values the opposing themes of transparent communication

and emancipation through a collective standard variety on the one hand, and respect for individual difference, freedom of expression and equality (of languages, among other things) on the other. (2018, p. 6)

This ideology, he argues, comes from the “widespread, common-sense ideology of liberal Enlightenment” that “is inherently dilemmatic in that it valorizes opposing themes – authority and equality, teaching and learning, the collective and the individual – leading to everyday problems *that require practical compromises through discursive work*” (p. 6, emphasis mine). Part of the translingual approach to teaching composition is doing that discursive work and discussing the compromises that come from one choice or another with regards to language.

These compromises are rhetorical and tied to the idea of what language to use in a particular situation. Reframing translingual writing and translanguaging as a process helps to emphasize that deploying one’s languages strategically is a rhetorical choice. Writers have a choice of what language(s) they will use when writing.³⁴ In “Communicating Rhetorically” in the previous chapter, I pointed to how the practice of *identifying audience considerations* and the expectations of the rhetorical situation serve as the footing for a writer’s *choosing among languages to communicate* and *deploying language strategically*. LeCourt (2006) writes, “A rhetorical situation comes with multiple exigencies, multiple positions for writer and reader, that, while not infinite, suggest choices rather than mere accommodation to its demands” (p. 46). Part of what

³⁴ However, sometimes there is no choice. I will return this idea at a later point.

the translingual classroom does is to make visible for students that there is indeed a choice—not an inevitable way of writing—and to give them the agency to deploy their linguistic resources in strategic ways.

Elena offers us several ways for doing this work with student writers. The first aspect is that there is more than one way to say or write something. In the following example, Elena describes how she frames corrections when working with students on drafts:

I talk a lot – I say things like there’s more than one way to fix this. Like I’m pointing out a problem but there are a dozen ways that you could fix this and all of them would be correct. And I think that just even that idea we change things (in different ways and there’s not agreement), that’s already a step ahead for a lot of them. (Int. 2)

Elena draws attention to the fact that ideas can be expressed in different ways and sentences can be revised in different ways; there is no one right way. For her linguistically diverse students, discussions like these serve as both language learning moments (different ways that something can be said in English) but also as a way to provide a choice in how they will use this language. Along with offering these choices, there should be a discussion of what those choices afford and what they constrain. Elena also gives us an example of this sort of discussion:

Elena But what I did do in class was, I didn’t require them [to code-mesh]. I

said, here are a bunch of options, and if you want to bring in these other languages, and you want to use them with me when you know I don't speak those languages, here's the tools for doing that and here's – we talked, ah, we actually talked, I framed it as sort of like what do you gain and what do you lose.

AJD Ah, yeah. Mmhmm.

Elena And the students gripped that, grasped that immediately, right? What do you gain? You gain identity (.) you gain sort of representation (.) and you gain – the students liked to call it unique, sort of, like you're sort of eye-catching and stand out.

AJD Yeah.

Elena Which is one of the things people talked about with code-meshing. But what you lose is clarity. The communicability. And the students had no trouble, like, with that. I think they, they were the ones who sort of brought that idea out. So, we talked a lot about, like, these things as writerly choices. If you choose to bring in this word, what are the strategies you could do to make it effective for your audience? (Int. 1)

Elena allows her students to make decisions around how they want to use language in their writing by making visible the fact that they had a choice and then helping them to see what that choice entails. Similarly, LeCourt (2006) encourages students to examine their “writerly choices” through reflective writing; students reflect on the rhetorical choices they made while writing “and ones they considered but discarded at every step

of the process” (p. 47). This reflective process is very similar to the reflections Joelle has her students do around translation—a way of making visible the choices that are necessary in writing. But these reflections, followed by discussions as a class or in conference with a teacher, are also a way for students to work through what it means to write and how writing can be both alienating but also accommodating of one’s identity.

The goal of all such discussions is similar: to find ways to accommodate some of a given situation’s constraints without ignoring the subjectivity of the writer that existed prior to writing for that situation. We attempt, that is, to construct an ethos that can be heard by an audience without necessarily contradicting the writer’s own sense of a more authentic identity. When this is impossible, I encourage students to see the “I” created when writing within certain contexts as a rhetorical act, literally a momentary performance, not a new way of thinking that they *have* to accept. (LeCourt, 2006, p. 48; emphasis original)

LeCourt is discussing class identity in particular, but the construction of ethos that she describes is true for all aspects of identity and is expressed predominantly through language. Thus, we can frame translanguaging as a way of adapting communication to the rhetorical and linguistic expectations and constraints (including the constraint of the power dynamics of the situation) while not negating their fuller range of language practices.

Another point of value in LeCourt’s approach is that students do not have to accept certain ways of writing or using language as a permanent expression of their

identity. There is agency here, to use a particular way of writing because it is what will get things done—but it does not have to define the writer. We see echoes of this in DB's description of translingual writing:

It's entirely possible that there's another who submits the same work but they're writing it going like okay (.) this is not necessarily (.) the best piece of writing. Uh, I am, I am writing in a particular way that will have a particular outcome but in my heart I do not believe that this is working towards and achieving this perfect grasp of English. (Int. 1)

The translingual writer here knows that there is more than one way to write and that they are writing for a “particular outcome” rather than achieving mastery over a particular form of language. Writing (and speaking) is a kairotic and deeply situated practice, rooted in the rhetorical situation at that moment. The translingual classroom can highlight the situatedness of writing and can emphasize that students' adherence to particular expectations and norms are strategic—a negotiation of the rhetorical moment, rather than a negation of particular facets of their identity.

LeCourt describes how people display interests and opinions that cannot be neatly pigeonholed into a particular identity. She argues,

We do our students a disservice, I think, when we construct pedagogies assuming their subjectivities are any less complicated than our own or my father's. We similarly do them a disservice when we assume that they do not

already perceive the marking of difference or have the critical abilities to understand the alteration in identity that marking seeks to orchestrate. (LeCourt, 2006, p. 43).

Although she writes about class differences, the same can be said about language differences. Our identities as expressed through language cannot be neatly contained within one set of language practices or another. Identity and language are enacted and embodied in relation to other people (Powell et al., 2014); how we identify ourselves—and are identified by others—and how we use language is going to depend on the person or persons with whom we are communicating and interacting. Fisch-Ferguson (in Powell et al., 2014) observes, “language [is] an integral component to understanding culture, and when language is attacked by those who demand a formal tone and ‘proper’ construction, culture is attacked and made invalid because of non-comprehension of connections and relationships” (2.3).

Our pedagogy also needs to allow for this complicated presentation of language and to recognize the cultural embodiment of those languages as well as the relationships that are enacted through languages and connected to languages. The instructors of this study demonstrated ways of making this complication possible by not assuming they knew students’ identities and preferred language practices and by not forcing their students to write a particular way. In the section “Vulnerability and Creating Safe Spaces,” I described how the history of Spanish in the region of Mary’s institution along with the pressures to use English as the institution itself meant that students often had a fraught relationship with Spanish. Rather than assuming her students would want

to use Spanish, Mary carefully created the space for students to choose to use Spanish in the class or in their writing if they wanted to. She did not assume to know what her students wanted to do or what language they would use. Like Elena, she invited languages other than English, but did not require. And while subtle, this element of choice is a crucial element to translingual pedagogy because it values the complexity of students' identities and their language practices, rather than tokenizing them.

In their conversation over whether students should use their home languages in the writing classroom, Bean and his colleagues (2003) identified a number of variables to consider. They also emphasized invitation and choice. "*Who chooses whether to write in a language different from standardized English—the student or the teacher (or the institution)?*" We suspect most readers would agree that students should not be forced or even pressured into this option. Thus, we stress our word *invite*" (p. 36, their emphasis). They offer a number of reasons why a student may not want to bring languages other than a more academic English into the classroom, including reasons that Mary observed. However, stress Bean et al., the importance is invitation and giving students the choice. Reflecting on the usual situation of a composition course, they observe, "But if choice is important, then we note this: in most classrooms, students now have no choice. That is, in most classrooms where the dominant variety of English is the norm, students feel it is wrong to write in a different dialect or language" (p. 36). Thus, instructors have to work to make the space of the classroom welcoming to these other languages, by valuing students' language histories and the challenges of working between languages and by giving students the opportunities to use other languages if they wish to.

Taking this open, invitational approach to students' identities and languaging helps to counter the well-meaning but misguided teaching practices that shocked Lisa Delpit (1995).

I am reminded of one educator of adult African-American veterans who insisted that her students needed to develop their “own voices” by developing “fluency” in their home language. Her students vociferously objected, demanding that they be taught grammar, punctuation, and “Standard English.” The teacher insisted that such a mode of student was “oppressive.” The students continued venting their objections in loud and certain tones. When asked why she thought her students had not developed “voice” when they were using their voices to loudly express their displeasure, she responded that it was “because of who they are,” that is, apparently because they were working-class, black, and disagreed with her. (p. 161-162)

These teachers assumed they knew what language was authentic to their students—what Ahmad and Nero (2012) call the authenticity trap—and then required them to use that language when writing. It is this assumption that students want to use their “authentic languages” and therefore must use them that critics of “code-meshing pedagogy” critique (Kopelson, 2017; Atkinson & Tardy, 2018), and with good reason. Replacing the ideal of a standard language with the ideal that all writing should be code-meshed still removes the element of choice from students' writing process and replaces one ideology with another.

It is also important to firmly ground translanguaging as a rhetorical action tied to a specific rhetorical context. The ways that linguistically diverse people translanguage have rhetorical purposes (Wardhaugh, 1998; Losey, 2009; Velasco & García, 2014) and cannot be divorced from the context. Jaspers (2018) notes that when translanguaging “is severed from all ties to a specific (bilingual) group” and then presented as “a universal, innate capacity,” translingual ideology thus “performs the same moves of purification and hybridization that position translanguaging as the ‘natural’ practice of languaging that is ‘ideology-free’ and done by everyone” (p. 8).

Prioritizing overtly translanguage writing also ignores the realities and challenges that writers face with language difference. Translingualism, while rooted in real language practices, is yet an ideal. As Gilyard (2016) and Delpit point out, students with non-prestige languages already understand that the world takes a binary view. Mary also voices this reality:

I would always find that reading all this stuff about language being fluid and there not being a distinction between monolingual-multilingual, I would always recall my own experiences learning to speak English and thinking Wow! Sure, I was speaking different versions of English and different versions of Spanish but in my mind – like everyone was telling me to speak English, and in my mind I knew that I had to speak English in order to be successful in the U.S. And so to tell me that there isn’t a distinction between (.) a person who speaks (.) Spanish-English and a person who only speaks Spanish just didn’t make sense in my own lived experience? [And] the more that I work with students who have

backgrounds similar to mine, I recognize the same things in that, like, we can have a translingual orientation to language for sure and value all language practices but there's still degrees of difference (.) um there's still language stigma, there's still (.) there are still binaries. Academia still functions in binaries. (Int. 1)

Students must navigate those binaries every day. To not acknowledge that language plays a role in discrimination and power dynamics is akin to saying that we are in a “post-race” and race-blind society: people of color know firsthand that racism and the concepts of race affect their lives in very real ways. Speakers and writers of minority languages also know the material effects of not adhering to a *Standardized English, such as being overlooked for jobs.

In the quote above, Mary is responding in particular to the extension of translanguaging and translingualism to all language practices, such as when Horner (2017) pushes translingualism to its broadest definition, positioning “difference in language not as an option writers may choose to pursue or not, nor as a feature marking some writing but not others, but as an inevitable feature of all writing, whatever forms that writing may take” (p. 88). Mangelsdorf (2017) also takes this view in her observation that “a key feature of translingualism is that all language users are translingual, not just those who know more than one language, because all utterances are fluid, relational, and contingent” (p. 200). Mary challenges this view, echoing Gilyard's (2016) warning to not flatten differences but to recognize that “we don't all differ from said standard in the same way” (p. 285) and that some differences are

penalized more than others.

The challenge faced here is that translanguaging as a communicative practice is about choosing the best options for successful communication, including communicating identification with a particular group. Often this means choosing shared language features to minimize negative reactions from the audience. Translingualism, however, is interested in pushing the envelope with language. Canagarajah (2013b) and Young (2009) propose doing this with language practices that appear to amplify language difference, placing interlocutors in positions of negotiating language difference. Although translingualism seems to promote the amplification of difference and the open resistance to language expectations, this positioning at times seems at odds with the goals of translanguaging and with the goals of usual language practice. Therefore, overt translanguaging, in itself, cannot be a goal of translingual writing although it can be a potential outcome.

Revisiting the Idea of Language Difference

The idea of choice has to be considered in relation to the idea of language difference. In Chapter One, I defined *language difference* as language that is unexpected, whether due to an accent, unfamiliar words, or different ways of phrasing or using words. What I would like to stress here is that difference is relative; what strikes a person as non-standard, non-conformative, or “different” in a text may not be seen the same way as another person. These perceptions of difference are based on expectations for language in a particular context as well as the degree that a language is shared between

interlocutors. For example, the use of border language (code-meshing of Spanish and English) in the local community where Mary lives is a normal language practice; as Mary observes, people do not notice whether someone says *hello* or *hola* when they enter a store. However, using border language in an academic presentation would draw attention, especially if audience members did not know either Spanish or English.

Lu and Horner (2013) argue that “difference is an inevitable product of all language acts” (p. 585), including those that appear to be conventional, and encourage us to acknowledge that difference is present in all texts. This idea of difference, much more subtle than my definition above, is that words can never be used the same way in all contexts and can never fully communicate the full meaning of what the writer is trying to convey. Difference is always present because how the writer uses the word will not be exactly how the reader receives the word. Their argument is important because reframing writing as inherently imbued with difference pushes readers that difference will always be present. The reader must listen and look beyond the word to the fuller text itself—not just its words but the meanings behind the words and the presentation of the text itself on the page—in order to better construct the writer’s meaning. By realizing that we as readers have to work harder to be sure we understand, we understand a translingual orientation as an openness to difference and a willingness to do that work of listening and looking beyond the word on the page.

Not all kinds of difference are the same, however. Lu and Horner acknowledge that reality and point out that certain kinds of differences are valued while others are denigrated:

Within those same terms, writers identified as and located in the “mainstream” whose writing deviates in recognizable ways from the norm are perceived as creative innovators, while deviations in writing by those identified as belonging to subordinate social groups are taken as manifestations of the writers’ lack of knowledge or fluency with “the standard.” (p. 583).

Two things stand out in this passage. First, difference here is indeed language that is unexpected, a “deviation” from some kind of norm that stands out in some way. Even if difference can be conceived as invisible, it is visible difference that readers react to. Second, not all kinds of difference are the same. To rephrase Lu and Horner’s words, currently, composition (traditionally or generally) and just about everybody else view some kinds of difference to be okay, even creative or innovative, but other kinds of difference—particularly those kinds of differences attached to people of color or in lower income groups—to be just bad English. As Gilyard (2016) warns, the danger of saying that difference is inevitable is that it can “flatten language difference” without acknowledging and calling out the underlying systems of racism and power that value some kinds of difference over others.

Gilyard’s critique points to the challenge of saying that translanguaging or language difference is a choice. Sometimes writers do not have a choice about “what kinds of language difference to make, how or why.” Sometimes language difference is present because the writer cannot do otherwise; their first language is “stepping all over their second and third language,” as Molly describes it. Therefore, although I think choice is an important part of the discussion, composition instructors cannot just leave

their teaching of translingual writing at that.

The translingual classroom therefore has two important jobs. The first job is to help students, particularly those who come in with language practices that differ in a larger degree from the language varieties valued by academic and professional institutions—institutions of power—to navigate the tensions, to make the rhetorical choices, and to deploy their languages strategically. The second is cultivating a translingual orientation in students for them to read and respond to language difference with a spirit of openness and willingness to do some work to understand. In order to make space for students' unintentional language difference, writing instructors also need to train a new generation of audiences that will not respond negatively to language difference but rather focus on negotiating meaning through the full text.

Importantly, these two jobs need to be accompanied by frank discussions of language beliefs and language politics. Canagarajah (2016) described the translingual classroom as a contact zone (Pratt, 1991), but his depiction misses an important part of the original idea of Pratt's contact zone, that such zones are situated “often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths” (p. 34). Contact often means conflict (Boyer, 1997), and it is essential to examine these relations of power to more fully understand the rhetorical choices behind language. And in order for language difference to become an accepted part of writing, teachers and students have to critically examine the power dynamics that make language difference a vulnerability for many writers and speakers.

The ways that language difference is tied up with racism and other types of discrimination need to be made visible. A monolingual ideology is inherently tied with

notions of race in the United States (Young, 2009; Baker-Bell, 2013; Dryer, 2016; Watson & Shapiro, 2018); embracing translingual writing must be accompanied by challenging the ways that language is racialized and the ways that people of color are discriminated against regardless of how they write or speak. Recognizing the sociocultural and political and racialized elements of language practices helps students to become more rhetorically strategic as well as reconsider how they understand language practices and language difference (Bommarito & Cooney, 2016). As Watson and Shapiro (2018) observe, “We can, at once, prepare students to identify and harness the standard strategically in context while also deconstructing its perceived inherent legitimacy and inviting linguistic and rhetorical differences” (p. 13). It is not enough, according to them, to value linguistic diversity in the classroom; it must be accompanied by discussions of power and language ideology.

Using Language Histories to Create a Translanguaging Space

Each of us bring our own language histories—a range of resources and experiences—into the classroom. How we deploy these histories is unique to our particular context and even that particular class. When I mentioned to Cat that I did the study because I was interested in what language practices we’re using as writing instructors, she emphasized the individual nature of the context: “What I do depends on who they are, what they do, what they need to learn, and what is going to help them learn” (Cat, Int. 1). Thus, I see this study as a way of exploring the possibilities. But it is also affirming that a teacher’s being multilingual matters quite a lot when working with a translingual

approach, especially when working with multilingual students.

Taking the view of translanguageing as a process expands what counts as teacher translanguageing. For example, an instructor bringing in materials in their other languages or language varieties helps to demonstrate the ways that they may use languages for various situations and purposes. In my own case, I realized that I could bring in sources written in non-English languages into the example annotated bibliographies that I provided students. Doing so, along with a discussion about how research can be done in multiple languages, helps to both make visible and make space for the ways that students can work across their language repertoires for academic purposes. Composition studies needs to engage more with discussions on translanguageing in other fields—and in bilingual education especially—to expand what instructors can do with their own language practices in the classroom.

However, although the study is framed as looking at practices, what became clear is that the language histories of instructors were in some ways more important than their language practices. Overt translanguageing is still important for connecting with students who share that language and for making space for students to translanguage as well, but the experience of working in another language and across language difference turned out to play a larger role in the classroom. Even though most of these instructors were not overtly translanguageing in the classroom, they demonstrated a range of language and teaching practices that stemmed from their own language histories. For those of us trying to figure out how to be more multilingual or translingual in our language practices, these instructors point to ways that we can use our own language histories in the class.

These language histories are not exclusively linguistic but also cultural. As Joelle pointed out, language and culture are entwined, and the one should be discussed with the other. “Language works to create, manage, and situate culture” (Lindquist, 2002, p. 4, cited in Powell et al., 2014, 2.3), and culture shapes how we enact relationships through language. Discussions around pragmatics, such as Mary’s example of writing e-mails in Spanish versus English, are intrinsically cultural, shaped by cultural norms regarding communication and practicing relationships. In French, to give another example, the singular pronoun *tu* [you] is used for more informal and personal contexts and relationships while the plural form *vous* [you] is reserved for the formal as well plural contexts. In France, to use *tu* when speaking to a boss or leader would be rather shocking. However, in French Canada, the use of the formal *vous* would seem too distant or snobbish. Cultural rhetorics can offer a valuable insight into understanding language practices as both rhetorical but also cultural. As Powell and her colleagues (2014) observe, cultural communities are defined in large part by a “set of shared beliefs and practices” (1.1), including language practices and beliefs around how language is used. This study used the term “social languages” (Gee, 1996; MacSwan, 2017) to describe the many language varieties (including dialects and discourses along with named languages) that people acquire and use in particular social contexts. These social contexts are akin to the cultural communities described by Wardhaugh (1998) and Powell et al. (2014), and we can therefore see that cultural rhetorics are a part of the language histories of instructors as well in the form of knowledge about how particular cultural communities engage in language practices.

This study used three metaphors, making space, making visible, and being open,

to frame translingual teaching practice. Although these metaphors are teacher-driven, that is, they are actions that the teachers enact in the classroom, they create the room for student-driven languaging. Prada and Nikula (2018) observe the transgressive qualities of translanguaging and the translingual space, particularly the way that student-initiated translanguaging can prove a path of resistance to the language ideologies that demean their linguistic and cultural histories.

For instance, when people from higher socio-economic backgrounds engage in similar practices, they are commonly congratulated for trying, often portraying their practices as remarkable, but not transgressive. Conversely, when minoritized speakers and/or individuals from low socio-economic backgrounds engage in these practices, they hold additional disruptive value. This is one way that translanguaging moves beyond transformation to transgression: when enabled in a top-down manner (e.g., by the teacher in the classroom setting) translanguaging holds transformative potential; when initiated from the bottom up (e.g., by a student), it can be a form of resistance. (p. 3)

Prada and Nikula argue for “disturbing the bedrock of top-down activities” that continue to perpetuate the monolingual ideologies that see no place for languages other than *Standardized English in contexts of power, including higher education. In observing all cultures are rhetorical, cultural rhetorics helps us to challenge the ways that composition studies and its classroom spaces have practiced centering *Standardized English and a monolingual ideology, particularly through terms such as

“non-standard” and “neutral.” Translingualism shares with cultural rhetorics the hope of decolonizing the classroom by pushing us to reconsider what we value as a discipline and to reposition *Standardized English as one “code” or language variety among many potential options.

By opening up the space to more ways of writing, the translingual classroom can serve as a place for students to feel “safe,” as Elena and others put it, but also to hone their resistance to the pressures they face around language. Instructors therefore play an important role in creating that space and giving students the opportunities to practice this resistance or, more simply, to find ways of using their full repertoire, their full voices. In other words, the teaching and language practices that this study observes are ways that teachers can create the space for student-centered and student-driven language practices.

There is an interplay between the language practices and knowledge that a teacher brings into the classroom and the translingual practices that students develop. Teachers can bring their language histories into the classroom in different ways to make space, make visible, and be open. When we take a broader view of translanguaging as a process, we can then begin to visualize the translingual classroom as a translanguaging space,³⁵ a place where multiple languages, language varieties, and social languages are welcomed in to be used for communication and various learning activities. Wei defines a translanguaging space as “a space for the act of translanguaging as well as a space

³⁵ Although I distinguish translanguaging space from the translanguaging classroom epitomized by Lewis et al. (2011) and Velasco and García (2014), a translingual classroom could conceivably utilize pedagogical translanguaging to support students’ learning and development as writers, which Prada and Nikula (2018) argue.

created through translanguaging” (2011, p. 1234), created by individuals interacting with others through “strategic use of social resources, including linguistic resources, that are available to them” (p. 1234). The space that Wei is imagining is a more metaphorical space created by the interlocutors, but I use it here to describe the space in the classroom environment in which students and instructors carve out these various spaces to translanguage in different ways.

Wei is less interested in naming the languages or language varieties that individuals use and more interested in how the practices carve out the space for interactions and performances. As such, he offers a different perspective of translanguaging and multilingualism:

For me, Translanguaging has never intended to replace code-switching or any other term, although it challenges the code view of language. It does not deny the existence of named languages, but stresses that languages are historically, politically, and ideologically defined entities. It defines the multilingual as someone who is aware of the existence of the political entities of named languages and has an ability to make use of the structural features of some of them that they have acquired. (Wei, 2018, p. 27)

To a certain extent, a translanguaging space can create the opportunities to transcend or at least move beyond attempts to peg a language practice as coming from one language or another.

One activity that Molly described when introducing her artifact gives a sense of

what transcending language could look like. Inspired by Jay Jordan's material ecologies (2015), Molly created an opportunity for her students to compose poems collaboratively, with each student putting up one word magnet after the other but working together to decide how the poems would flow, where lines would break, and so on. As they discussed syntax and word order, students from various language backgrounds made meaning together that went beyond the word of the poem in front of them. Sometimes the co-creation meant changing the poem to make it more understandable; sometimes it meant keeping unusual (for English) syntactic structures that offered new and creative forms of expression. Importantly, Molly notes, the discussions were collaborative; the English-speaking students were not driving the decisions but were negotiating the writing with their fellow students.

This activity is a good example of how "the act of translanguaging creates a space where one's creativity and criticality are manifested" and which challenges "a dominantly monolingual and monocultural space" (Lee & Canagarajah, 2018, p. 11). These poems are not being held up as a new way of writing for academic purposes, but the act of writing these poems and negotiating language and meaning helps the students reflect on the norms of writing and opens them up to a more translingual orientation to language and language difference or what Lee and Canagarajah label as a "transcultural disposition."

Building off of Canagarajah's (2013b) concept of "cooperative dispositions," a transcultural disposition includes "language awareness (fluidity, functionality, and porosity of language), social values (openness to diversity, willingness to collaborate, desire for voice), and communicative strategies (adaptiveness, use of resources, learning

from experience)” (Lee & Canagarajah, 2018, p. 6). When we look back at the orientation practices of the instructors of this study, we can see how they align with a transcultural disposition. Moreover, the activities and practices that they bring to the translingual classroom help students to develop this same disposition toward language difference and the negotiation of meaning. Joelle observes this development in her students,

I can see it happen where they'll talk about this because they'll talk about it sometimes in the final reflections of the class or in their course evaluations that they've come to respect other people's languages or cultures or see other people's languages and cultures in a different way. Or in a more open way. Or “I always thought this about this culture or this language. Now, I think it's much more complicated than I thought.” They'll say things like that and I see them as the course goes on, because I'm so interested in all of them, they get really interested in each other. That's really exciting, because it means that they're open to the world, and the world is complicated and linguistically and culturally so rich. I close that off instead of opening ourselves up to it. (Joelle, Int. 2)

This transcultural disposition is thus a goal of a translingual classroom—not overt code-meshing in students’ writing. Lee and Canagarajah connect the transcultural disposition to translingual practice noting that the language awareness and subsequent willingness to negotiate and adapt language practices that come with a transcultural disposition lead to the language practices that have been discussed here. Importantly, they show that the

willingness of one person to engage in translingual language practices can open up the space for others to engage them as well. In this way, a translanguaging space is created “where one’s creativity and criticality are manifested and interlocutors change their footing for negotiation and their dispositions” (p. 11).

Composition studies can do more to investigate translanguaging in the classroom, starting with reading the scholarship on translanguaging and pedagogical translanguaging in bilingual education studies (Lewis et al., 2011; Creese & Blackledge, 2015; García & Kleyn, 2016; Cahyani et al., 2018). The parallels become evident in the ways that Prada and Nikula (2018) link pedagogical translanguaging to what they call the translingual space:

A translanguaging approach instead enables pedagogical strategies which operationalize a diversifying, anti-racist philosophy, first, by generating translingual spaces through the participants’ repertoires, second, by opening opportunities for students to articulate their histories and trajectories, as well as explore their shared and non-shared experiences, and third, by fortifying a positive attitude towards being and becoming multilingual and to engaging multilingually. (p. 3)

Prada and Nikula link translanguaging pedagogy to creating a translingual space. In their description, we see the same moves that the participants of this study do already to be open, to make visible, and to make space for their students to explore and value their own language practices as well as to engage in positive ways with others across

difference.

The challenge is, however, that many composition instructors—including many in this study—maintain a view of translanguaging and pedagogical translanguaging as the instructor sharing two or more languages with students and using both of those languages equally in the classroom. We can see this conceptualization of translanguaging at play in Joelle's understanding of the term but also in Mary's view. However, the ideas around translanguaging pedagogy in bilingual education have shifted over recent years (just as ideas around translingualism have as well) to an understanding more like what we see with Prada and Nikula above, that emphasizes building learning off of students' existing repertoires. Allowing for the interplay of languages and cultures helps students to find creative ways to bring their language histories into their writing. Translanguaging is seen not just as a final product of writing but as an activity that can happen in different ways throughout the process of learning and writing.

Translanguaging classrooms such as the ones that García and Sylvan (2011), Rosiers et al. (2017), or Woodley and Brown (2016) describe, in which students from many different linguistic backgrounds are learning together, are similar to Joelle's, Molly's, and Elena's classrooms in their high degree of diversity and the fact that a teacher will not know all of the languages of their students. However, many of the teaching practices and activities described in Sylvan and García's and Woodley and Brown's studies describe teaching practices that are not only easily adaptable to college composition classrooms but are already being used by the instructors in this study. In other words, the translingual classrooms are already on their way to being

translanguaging spaces; composition studies needs to embrace this idea more fully and learn from other disciplines.

Additionally, we can extend the idea of the classroom space beyond the traditional borders of the classroom. In Chapter Four, I described how instructors of this study already engaged in translanguaging before and after class, in personal communications with students, and in face-to-face conferences. These “marginal” spaces are actually important areas for practicing relationships—and practicing language—and should be considered as translanguaging spaces of the translingual classroom. Cultural rhetorics can help to frame a translingual pedagogy that focuses on the building of relationships with students and on understanding the translingual classroom as a rhetorical space around language and writing. As Powell and her colleagues observe, “instead of letting ourselves get caught up in ‘center/margins’ binaries, we’re more interested in offering a way of thinking about practices like ‘culture’ and ‘rhetoric’ that makes it clear that everyone has them” (2014, 1.1). Decentering *Standardized English and knocking down some walls around the classroom space are then important work for a translingual approach.

Another discipline that composition studies and writing instructors more specifically need to learn from is linguistics (Horner & Lu, 2010; Geller, 2011; Matsuda, 2014; Severino, 2015; Sugiharto, 2015). As Hartse observes (2016), sociolinguistics can offer a valuable insight into understanding how we use language when writing. A working knowledge of linguistics can also help instructors understand language acquisition (Atkinson & Tardy, 2018) and make comparisons across languages to reveal language structures and expectations (Otwinowska, 2017). Studies

of language varieties, such as African-American English (Perryman-Clark, 2012; Williams, 2013) or Jamaican Creole (Milson-Whyte, 2014), help to legitimize traditionally minority languages rather than as “bad” writing or speech. Sugiharto (2015) and Taylor and Cutler (2016) point to the importance of developing instructors’ metalinguistic awareness—which depends on training in areas of linguistic knowledge—to better prepare them for working with linguistically diverse students and to work towards a translingual pedagogy.

Importance of Being Multilingual and Going Further

Returning to some of the original impetus for this project, I come back to the question of how composition instructors use their language histories in the classroom. An important corollary to this question is whether it really matters if composition instructors are multilingual³⁶ or not. As Joelle points out, the focus of the translingual classroom is on developing students’ own translingual awareness and practice: “I’m more interested in them using their languages and cultures than in me sharing what I have” (Int. 2). Likewise, translingual writing and translanguaging can be understood as activities that all writers can do because all writers are linguistically diverse, all writers are unconscious plurilinguists:

³⁶ By “multilingual,” here, I am referring primarily to speakers of two or more named languages. However, I understand “multilingual” to also include speakers of two or more language varieties that tend to be perceived as different.

No matter how monolingual we consider ourselves to be, we are fundamentally plurilingual, albeit unconsciously so. No matter how standard and pure we consider each language, it is inevitable that all languages are ensembles of different elements in a dynamic and constantly changing relationship. (Piccardo, 2013, p. 605)

Piccardo's argument follows the same lines as translingual scholars in drawing attention to how all of us work across a variety of social languages (Gee, 1996) as well as named languages. However, even though Lorimer Leonard (2014), Ellis (2013), as well as Piccardo (2013) acknowledge that monolinguals have the same capacity for a sensitivity to the richness that comes from language and language difference, it is also true that experiences, whether past or current, of working across clearer language and cultural borders leads to a different perspective on language and language practices. In other words, there is something important to being multilingual.

Being multilingual as an instructor provides several affordances. Certainly, sharing a language or language variety other than English with students can be a powerful tool within a classroom. Delpit (1995), Cushman (2016), and Ellis all stress the importance of giving diverse students an instructor who looks and sounds like them. Mary mentions that students chose her class because of her identity as Latina and her use of Spanish. She is able to use Spanish with students in conferences to ensure they understand assignments and to build their biliteracy. The importance of representation was also anecdotally supported by Molly, who mentioned a colleague who uses Chinese (as well as a Chinese-English hybrid) in the writing classroom and often has Chinese

students take the course because of this. There is more to learn about how professors use their languages, but there is a clear indication that sharing a language other than English with students is valuable.

Yet even for those instructors who do not share the languages of their linguistically diverse students, being multilingual is important. As participants have demonstrated, they drew on their language histories of learning languages and working across language and cultural differences in a range of ways: offering language practices and patterns for comparison; modeling negotiation strategies; creating a welcoming space by sharing language mishaps and learning; and being familiar with language difference and how to navigate it. In fact, apart from a knowledge of other languages for the purpose of comparison, it is not so much the fact of being multilingual as the *rhetorical attunement* and the lived experiences of language difference that offered the greatest resource to teachers.

Ellis draws a similar conclusion in her study of the language backgrounds of instructors of English as a second language (ESL or L2). She found that being multilingual and having experiences with learning and using new languages meant that instructors held the belief that language learning is possible and positive. The monolingual teachers, in contrast, “overwhelmingly saw language learning as difficult and damaging to their self-esteem, suggesting that they perceived the task confronting students as primarily an obstacle rather than an achievable goal” (p. 465). Ellis also found that monolingual teachers had no experience or insight into experiences such as code-switching and translanguaging or into a multilingual identity.

Although a composition course does not focus on language learning the same

way that an ESL course does, “language has always been at the heart of writing research and teaching” (Donahue, 2018, p. 134), and for many composition classrooms in the United States with multilingual students, particularly emergent bilinguals, language learning is very clearly a part of learning to write. What Ellis’s study indicates is that instructors with no multilingual background nor the experience of working across differences may not fully grasp what it means for their linguistically diverse students to be in between languages or to have their languages “stepping on each other” or bumping up against each other. Moreover, they might have difficulty understanding the challenges and consequences of language difference and might not even be able to see the possibility of rich language use and language learning that their students can achieve. As the United States, and by consequence the college writing classroom, becomes more linguistically diverse, writing instructors will need these multilingual insights in order to support students in their learning.

Being linguistically diverse, however, does not immediately translate to a translingual orientation (Jaspers, 2015) because linguistically diverse people can also maintain a monolingual ideology (Baker-Bell, 2013; Haukås, 2016; Otwinowska, 2017). As Cat and Elena point out, many multilinguals have inherited a monolingual ideology that has trained them to keep their languages separate and to link successful communication with mastery over grammatical forms. As Kopelson (2014) points out, translingual ideology often portrays linguistically diverse writers and speakers as having a natural understanding of the fluidity of language and that they do not feel attached to any one particular language; however, she argues, “it is necessary to remember that [attachments to language] often are experienced as fixed, and this affective attachment

is affixed further still by powerful ideological supports” (p. 212). Lorimer Leonard (2014) points out that the rhetorical attunement of her linguistically diverse writers was developed over repeated experiences of working across language and cultural differences. A multilingual background is valuable, but it must be paired with a translingual orientation to achieve the goals outlined in this study. Therefore, even linguistically diverse teachers need support and development in understanding the translingual approach.

Canagarajah (2016) notes that training for teachers in the translingual approach cannot follow traditional development practices which “arm” teachers with previously defined assignments and models. Instead, he argues, “Teacher preparation for translingual writing would focus on encouraging teachers to construct their pedagogies with sensitivity to student, writing, and course diversity, thus continuing to develop their pedagogical knowledge and practice for changing contexts of writing” (p. 266). This sensitivity to diverse writing builds on the rhetorical attunement (Lorimer Leonard, 2014) and rhetorical sensibility (Guerra, 2016) of linguistically diverse writers, a sensitivity that is developed through a knowledge of other languages and through the experience of working in a second language. Therefore, having a history of multilingual experiences is valuable for creating the translingual classroom: not just for the rhetorical capacity of translanguageing that it affords (Wei, 2018) but for the ability to appreciate the challenges of working in a second language and frame language issues and practices for students, and the openness to students’ language and cultural difference. Similarly, default assignments and activities do not easily transfer from context to context. As this study demonstrates (“Localizing the Translingual Classroom” in the previous chapter),

a translingual pedagogy is shaped by the local context, including the language histories of the students as well as that of the instructor and the constraints and affordances of the institutional structures and local communities.

Drawing attention to the value of being multilingual echoes the repeated calls in the scholarship on translingualism and working with linguistically diverse writers for building up composition instructors' multilingual competence. In their statement on the teaching of second-language writers, the Conference on College Composition and Communication (2014) emphasized not only the importance of understanding second language development but the value of teachers being second language learners themselves in order to understand the experience of working in another language. In a reflection on her own journey to learn another language, Severino (2015) notes how second language learning increases teachers' own language awareness and pedagogical awareness. Sugiharto (2015) also emphasizes the importance of the practice of translanguaging and that this practice must be combined with "sufficient understanding about it, coupled with one's proficiency in multiple languages and metalinguistic awareness" (p. 136), a call echoed by Canagarajah (2016). Also important is that instructors, particularly those whose native language is English, build up their own translanguaging and translingual writing practice by learning other languages and pushing themselves to research and write in other languages (Fraiberg, 2010; Horner, NeCamp, & Donahue, 2011).

Conclusion

This study illustrates the importance of considering instructors' language histories—their linguistic repertoires but also their language knowledge and experiences—as an important part of the translingual classroom. Experiences with language difference and working between languages are invaluable for making visible the role that language plays in writing and for developing students' own metalinguistic awareness and a translingual orientation to their own language practices and others'. Even more importantly, when instructors are open about their own linguistic diversity and the challenges that come from working between languages, they create the space for students to also take on that work and for important discussions around language, identity, and power and political dynamics of language difference.

These discussions and work take place in the translingual classroom, which serves as a translanguaging space. However, translanguaging is often understood in composition studies as either overt code-meshing or as a pedagogy that demands an instructor be able to use two or more languages in the classroom with their students. These narrow definitions of translanguaging constrict the possibilities for instructors and students to work across their full language repertoires for the purposes of communication and learning.

However, this study also demonstrates that there is more that we need to look at. First is the need to better understand how translanguaging works with writing (Fraiberg, 2010). Although important scholarship such as Canagarajah (2011; 2013b) and Fraiberg (2010) show the ways that translanguaging can happen in textual forms, but a more comprehensive view of translanguaging as part of translingual writing—particularly the

ways that other textual and semiotic resources can be used to help with the negotiation of meaning—needs to be developed. This kind of comprehensive work would require working across various fields of study, including comparative rhetoric (Mao, 2018), multimodal composing and material ecologies (Fraiberg, 2010; Jordan, 2015; Shipka, 2016), and bilingual education (Velasco & García, 2014; García & Kleyn, 2016).

Another concern is that this study focuses on the importance of valuing students' language practices without situating them more firmly in the challenging language dynamics and politics of educational, professional, economic, and sociocultural institutions. Watson and Shapiro (2018) pointed out that a translingual approach must be paired with forms of critical pedagogies that make visible the ways that language is racialized and used to uphold unjust social and economic practices (Kinloch, 2005; Baker-Bell, 2013; Turner & Ives, 2013). Although quite a few of the participants in this study embraced translingualism in part because of its challenge to monolingual and racist language ideologies, their approaches often seemed³⁷ to rest on valuing students' language histories rather than explicitly discussing and challenging language ideologies, an approach that Watson and Shapiro argue does not go far enough in moving the translingual approach from an ideal to a reality (Bratner et al., 2016).

Finally, the connections between culture and language need to be more firmly made. Although the terms “transcultural” (Lu, 2009; Bizzell, 2014; Guerra, 2016; Tougas, 2016) and “translingual” seem to focus on different things, in reality, they often

³⁷ The topic of challenging monolingual ideology and power dynamics was not a focus of the study, so it is quite possible that these participants do indeed do this work in class.

reflect the same types of practices and attitudes toward difference and writing (Lee & Canagarajah, 2018). As Keiko and Joelle demonstrated, exploring difference through a cultural lens can also help students to develop the openness to difference that a translingual approach values. Moreover, language practices emerge out of cultural ways of being and making meaning and are closely tied to rhetorical practices of cultural communities. Discussing African-American language practices, Turner and Ives (2013) observe that

Language use and literacy practices are about more than syntax, lexicon, or rhetorical devices; they are also about identity and power. They reveal the narratives about, or histories of, groups of people including their interactions to and relationships with others across time and space. (p. 285)

This recognition that language practices are formed in relationship to others and within linguistic communities (Wardhaugh, 1998) points to the ways that translingualism could connect more directly to cultural rhetorics (Powell et al., 2014; Bratta and Powell, 2016). Connal uses the term “transcultural rhetoric” to describe the practice of writing or speaking that draws from more than one culture and language. She presents transcultural rhetoric as a creative process of composing identity which involves “fluidity of movement between two languages” (p. 201) and “a way of engaging with multiple cultures” (p. 200). As this study reframes translanguaging as something that is more than code-meshing, we also need to look more closely at how the cultural and rhetorical are involved in translingual writing as they are interconnected.

Another element present in this study was the “elision” of oral and written code-meshing in our conversations. Atkinson and Tardy (2018) point out the lack of distinction that translingual discussions make between the two forms of code-meshing, despite the differences in form and rhetorical purpose. Although I asked if participants translanguaged in course documents, such as syllabi or assignment sheets, neither I nor the participants distinguished greatly between the two. This lack of distinction is problematic because, as Guerra (2016) points out, translanguaging in speech does not automatically transfer to the written page. The ways that instructors could use translanguaging with course documents is certainly an area that warrants further study.

APPENDIX A – Interview Scripts

Interview 1

I would like to start by verifying that you have read the consent form.

I would also like to confirm that you're willing for this interview to be audio-recorded as part of data collection for this study.

Do you have any questions?

A. For this first interview, I asked if you could bring in an item that represents how you practice translingualism. Could you describe the artifact and tell me a story about that artifact?

B. Can you tell me about a class or an activity that you did that you felt really exemplified translingualism?

C. What are some activities or materials or practices that you use in your class(es)?

D. Can you tell me when you first started hearing about a translingual approach, and how and why you started incorporating it in your class?

E. How do you feel about teaching in the translingual approach?

F. What do you think the goals of translingualism are?

G. Can you describe the writing program at *Institution* for me? (→ school, classes, approach)

H. Can you describe how you practice translingualism as compared to others you know who also practice translingualism?

I would like to ask you a few questions to get some information about the context in you teach:

1. How many years have you taught college composition?
 2. How many semesters have you used the translingual approach in your classroom?
 3. What level of courses do you teach using the translingual approach?
 4. What is the make-up of the student body at your college? (Ethnicity, languages, socioeconomic class, etc.)
 5. What languages do you know your students to speak?
-

As part of this research study, I want to include participants as much as they would like in the process, to give you a voice in the collection and analysis of the data from your interview. Would you like to receive or access a copy of the interview that we had today?

If they do want a copy: Before the next interview, you are welcome to review your recording and identify anything you would like to discuss further. I will be using my analysis of this interview as a starting point for the next, and your input is welcome.

Also, to maintain confidentiality, I will be using pseudonyms to present the data. Would you like to choose your pseudonym? Is there a name you've always wanted to be called?

Thank you so much for talking with me today. I will be sending you a \$10 Amazon voucher (to your e-mail) in thanks for your participation today. Would you like to go ahead and schedule the second interview now?

Interview 2

it's wonderful to talk with you again! Thank you for letting me interview you again.

If they got the interview recording or transcript: You got a copy of our first conversation. Did you have any questions or anything you wanted to add based on that interview?

If they did not get the interview recording: We last spoke TTTT. Did you have any questions or anything you wanted to add based on that interview?

Ask any questions about things from the first interview that I want to explore further.

Today I would like to focus more on how language plays into your teaching with translanguaging.

- A. Gallagher and Noonan wrote "We cannot claim to *be* translingual; we can only learn to practice translanguaging." This line really struck me, and I'm wondering, first, if you agree with them, and second, how you would describe yourself as either translingual or as practicing translanguaging?
- B. How would you define *translanguaging*? [Keep this answer in mind when exploring the following questions.]
- C. How would you describe your own language background? [Asking about both the languages spoken and written but also dialects and class variants that they might have.]
- D. How does that language background factor into the ways that you write or speak to your students or in class?
- E. What languages or language varieties do you share in common with your students?

- F. Could you describe the way you speak or write in the classroom or with your students? [Are there differences in how you talk or write to students, whether in class or in person?]
- G. When teaching, do you write or speak two or more languages or language varieties? Can you describe for me a particular time that you shifted or blended ways of writing or speaking?
- H. [If they do translanguage in the classroom] Why do you blend or move between languages? What benefits do you see from it, or what does using more than one language type help to achieve?

Would you like to receive or access the recording of our interview today? I could either send it to you or share a secure copy with you on Dropbox.

It is important to me that I represent your words and ideas accurately in the write-up of my data. When I have done the write-up of this study, would you like to read it over? [I will accommodate minor adjustments; if there are major convergences with my write-up, I will include your feedback as an additional interpretation in the final reporting of data.]

I want to thank you again for doing these interviews with me. I will be sending a \$30 Amazon gift voucher to you as thanks, and I will follow up with you [or not] with the write-up.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmad, D., & Nero, S. J. (2012). Productive Paradoxes: Vernacular Use in the Teaching of Composition and Literature. *Pedagogy*, 12(1), 69–95. <http://doi.org/10.1215/15314200->
- Armstrong, V., Barnes, S., Sutherland, R., Curran, S., Mills, S., & Thompson, I. (2005). Collaborative research methodology for investigating teaching and learning: The use of interactive whiteboard technology. *Educational Review*, 57(4), 457–469. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00131910500279551>
- Atkinson, D. (2003). Writing and culture in the post-process era. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(1), 49–63. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(02\)00126-1](http://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(02)00126-1)
- Atkinson, D., Crusan, D., Matsuda, P. K., Ortmeier-Hooper, C., Ruecker, T., Simpson, S., & Tardy, C. (2015). Clarifying the relationship between L2 writing and translingual writing: An open letter to writing studies editors and organization leaders. *College English*, 77(4), 383–386.
- Atkinson, D., & Tardy, C. M. (2018). SLW at the crossroads: Finding a way in the field. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 42(November), 86–93. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.10.011>
- Auerbach, C., & Silverman, L. B. (Eds.) (2003). *Qualitative Data*. New York, NY: NYU Press. Retrieved from <http://muse.jhu.edu/book/7874>
- Baker-Bell, A. (2013). “I Never Really Knew the History behind African American Language”: Critical Language Pedagogy in an Advanced Placement English Language Arts Class. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 46(3), 355–370. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2013.806848>
- Bartholomae, D. (1985). Inventing the university. In M. Rose (Ed.), *When a writer writes: Studies of writer's block and other composing processes problems* (pp. 134–165). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Bean, J., Eddy, R., Grego, R., Irvine, P., Kutz, E., Matsuda, P. K., Cucchiara, M., Elbow, P., Haswell, R., Kennedy, E., Lehner, A. (2003). Should we invite students to write in home languages? Complicating the yes/no debate. *Composition Studies*, 31(1), 25–42.
- Belcher, D. (2014). What we need and don't need intercultural rhetoric for: A retrospective and prospective look at an evolving research area. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 25(1), 59–67. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.06.003>
- Bizzell, P. (2014). Toward “transcultural literacy” at a liberal arts college. In B. Horner & K. Kopelson (Eds.), *Reworking English in Rhetoric and Composition: Global Interrogations, Local Interventions* (pp. 131–149). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. Retrieved from <https://muse.jhu.edu/book/33263%0AAc>
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). Translanguaging as pedagogy in the bilingual classroom.

- Multilingualism: A Critical Perspective*, 94(1), 201–214. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>
- Bommarito, D. V., & Cooney, E. (2016). Cultivating a Reflective Approach to Language Difference in Composition Pedagogy. *Composition Studies*, 44(2), 39–57.
- Bou Ayash, N. (2014). U.S. Translingualism Through a Cross-National and Cross-Linguistic Lens. In B. Horner & K. Kopelson (Eds.), *Reworking English in Rhetoric and Composition: Global Interrogations, Local Interventions* (pp. 116–128). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Boyer, H. (1997). *Plurilinguisme : « contact » ou « conflit » de langues?* Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Brantner, M., Frost, A., & Blum Malley, S. (2016). The translanguaging conversation: A dialogic review. *Composition Studies*, 44(1), 97–101. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09614529754819>
- Bratta, P., & Powell, M. (2016). Introduction to the special issue: Entering the cultural rhetorics conversations. *Enculturation*, 21. Retrieved from <http://enculturation.net/entering-the-cultural-rhetorics-conversations>
- Brinkmann, S. (2014). Doing without data. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6), 720–725. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1077800414530254>
- Broad, B. (2012). Strategies and Passions in Empirical Qualitative Research. In L. Nickoson, M. P. Sheridan, & G. E. Kirsch (Eds.), *Writing Studies Research in Practice* (pp. 197–209). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. Retrieved from <https://muse.jhu.edu/book/17157>
- Brogden, L. M. (2009). François, f / Fransask-qui ? Franco-quoi ?. Constructions identitaires d'un enseignant en formation en situation linguistique minoritaire. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 66(1), 73–99. <http://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.66.1.073>
- Cahyani, H., de Courcy, M., & Barnett, J. (2018). Teachers' code-switching in bilingual classrooms: exploring pedagogical and sociocultural functions. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(4), 465–479. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1189509>
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006a). The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralisation Continued. *College Composition and Communication*, 57(June), 586–619.
- Canagarajah, S. (2006b). Toward a Writing Pedagogy of Shuttling between Languages: Learning from Multilingual Writers. *College English*, 68(6), 589–604.
- Canagarajah, S. (2009). Multilingual Strategies of Negotiating English: From Conversation to Writing. *JAC*, 29(1/2), 17–48.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 401–417. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540->

- Canagarajah, S. (2013a). Negotiating Translingual Literacy: An Enactment. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 48(1), 40–67. <http://doi.org/10.2307/24398646>
- Canagarajah, S. (2013b). *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Canagarajah, S. (2016). Translingual writing and teacher development in composition. *College English*, 78(3), 265–273.
- Caruso, E. (2018). Translanguaging in higher education: Using several languages for the analysis of academic content in the teaching and learning process. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, 8(1), 65–90. <http://doi.org/10.1515/cercles-2018-0004>
- Catalano, T., & Hamann, E. T. (2016). Multilingual pedagogies and pre-service teachers: Implementing “language as a resource” orientations in teacher education programs. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 39(3–4), 263–278. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2016.1229701>
- Cavazos, A. G., Hebbard, M., Hernández, J. E., Rodriguez, C., & Schwarz, G. (2018). Advancing a Transnational, Transdisciplinary and Translingual Framework: A Professional Development Series for Teaching Assistants in Writing and Spanish Programs. *Across the Disciplines*, 15(3), 11–27.
- Cenoz, J. (2017). Translanguaging in School Contexts: International Perspectives. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 16(4), 193–198. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1327816>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(10), 901–912. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2017.1284855>
- Clarke, A. E. (2005). *Situational analysis: Grounded theory after the postmodern turn*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Conference on College Composition and Communication. (1974). Students' Right to Their Own Language. Special issue *College Composition and Communication*, 25(3), 1-32.
- Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2014). Statement on Teaching Second Language Writing and Writers. *NCTE*. Web. Accessed 7 June 2017. <http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/secondlangwriting>.
- Connal, L. R. (2004). Hybridity: A lens for understanding mestizo/a writers. In A. Lunsford & L. Ouzgane (Eds.), *Crossing Borderlands: Composition and Postcolonial Studies* (pp. 199–217). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Cooper, M. M. (2014). The Being of Language. In B. Horner & K. Kopelson (Eds.), *Reworking English in Rhetoric and Composition: Global Interrogations, Local*

- Interventions* (pp. 13–30). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Coronel-Molina, S. M., & Samuelson, B. L. (2017). Language contact and translingual literacies. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(5), 379–389. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2016.1186681>
- Cushman, E. (2016). Translingual and Decolonial Approaches to Meaning Making. *College English*, 78(3), 234–242.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35(2015), 20–35. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233>
- Cresswell, J. (2010). *Research Design* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Davila, B. (2016). The Inevitability of “Standard” English: Discursive Constructions of Standard Language Ideologies. *Written Communication*, 33(2), 127–148. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0741088316632186>
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people’s children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Donahue, C. (2016). The “Trans” in Transnational-Translingual: Rhetorical and Linguistic Flexibility as New Norms. *Composition Studies*, 44(1), 147–150.
- Donahue, C. (2018). We are the “Other”: The future of exchanges between writing and language studies [Special issue on transdisciplinary and translingual challenges for WAC/WID.]. *Across the Disciplines*, 15(3), 130–143. Retrieved from http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/trans_wac/donahue2018.pdf
- Dryer, D. B. (2016). Appraising Translingualism. *College English*, 78(31), 274–283.
- Dryer, D. B., & Mitchell, P. (2017). Seizing an Opportunity for Translingual FYC at the University of Maine: Proactive Complexities, Unexpected Consequences. In B. Horner & L. Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing Divides: Exploring Translingual Writing Pedagogies and Programs* (pp. 135–159). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press. <http://doi.org/10.7330/9781607326205.c008>
- Elbow, P. (2002). Writing, Dialects, and the Culture of Literacy. In P. Bizzell, C. Schroeder, and H. Fox (Eds.), *ALT DIS: Alternative Discourses in the Academy*. (p. 126-138). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Heinemann.
- Ellis, E. (2013). The ESL teacher as plurilingual: An Australian perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 446–471. <http://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.120>
- Ford, A. C. (2013). “Verbal Ping Pong” as Culturally Congruent Communication: Maximizing African American Students’ Access and Engagement as Socially Just Teaching. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 46(3), 371–386. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2013.806852>

- Fraiberg, S. (2010). Composition 2.0: Toward a multilingual and multimodal framework. *College Composition and Communication*, 62(1), 100–126.
- Gallagher, C., & Noonan, M. (2017). Becoming Global: Learning to “Do” Translingualism. In B. Horner & L. Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing Divides: Exploring Translingual Writing Pedagogies and Programs* (pp. 161–177). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press. <http://doi.org/10.7330/9781607326205.c009>
- García, O. (2017). Translanguaging in Schools: Subiendo y Bajando, Bajando y Subiendo as Afterword. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 16(4), 256–263. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1329657>
- García, O., & Kleyn, T., Eds. (2016). *Translanguaging with Multilingual students*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- García, O., & Sylvan, C. E. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 385–400. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01208.x>
- Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. (2nd. ed.) New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Geller, A. E. (2011). Teaching and Learning with Multilingual Faculty. *Across the Disciplines*, 8(4), 1–19. Retrieved from <https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/ell/geller.pdf>
- Gilyard, K. (2016). The rhetoric of translingualism. *College English*, 78(3), 284–289. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2015.1076247>
- Gonzales, L. (2015). Multimodality, Translingualism, and Rhetorical Genre Studies. *Composition Forum*, 31(Spring). Retrieved from <http://compositionforum.com/issue/31/multimodality.php>
- Gonzales, L., & Zantjer, R. (2015). Translation as a user-localization practice. *Technical Communication*, 62(4), 271–284. Retrieved from <http://www.thecornerhouse.org.uk/resource/translation-class-struggle>
- Guerra, J. C. (2016). Cultivating a Rhetorical Sensibility in the Translingual Writing Classroom. *College English*, 78(3), 228–233.
- Guerra, J. C., & Shivers-McNair, A. (2017). Toward a New Vocabulary of Motive: Re(con)figuring Entanglement in a Translingual World. In B. Horner & L. Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing Divides: Exploring Translingual Writing Pedagogies and Programs* (pp. 19–30). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press. Retrieved from <http://muse.jhu.edu>
- Halbritter, B., & Lindquist, J. (2012). Time, lives, and videotape: Operationalizing discovery in scenes of literacy sponsorship. *College English*, 75(2), 171–198.
- Hall, J. (2014). Multilinguality is the Mainstream. In B. Horner & K. Kopelson (Eds.), *Reworking English in Rhetoric and Composition: Global Interrogations, Local*

- Interventions*, 31–48. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. Retrieved from <https://muse.jhu.edu/book/33263>
- Hartse, J. H. (2016). Writing as language in use: On the growing engagement between sociolinguistics and writing studies. *Composition Studies*, 44(1), 169–177.
- Haukås, Å. (2016). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 13(1), 1–18. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2015.1041960>
- Heugh, K. (2015). Epistemologies in multilingual education: translanguaging and genre – companions in conversation with policy and practice. *Language and Education*, 29(3), 280–285. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2014.994529>
- Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3), 261–278. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2012.658016>
- Horner, B. (2017). Teaching Translingual Agency in Iteration: Rewriting Difference. In B. Horner & L. Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing Divides: Exploring Translingual Writing Pedagogies and Programs* (pp. 87–97). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press. <http://doi.org/10.7330/9781607326205.c005>
- Horner, B., Lu, M., Royster, J. J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach. *College English*, 73(3), 303–321. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25790477>
- Horner, B., NeCamp, S., & Donahue, C. (2011). Toward a multilingual composition scholarship: From English only to a translingual norm. *College Composition and Communication*, 63(2), 269–300.
- Horner, B., & Tetreault, L. (2017). Crossing Divides: Exploring Translingual Writing Pedagogies and Programs. In B. Horner & L. Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing Divides: Exploring Translingual Writing Pedagogies and Programs* (pp. 3–16). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press. <http://doi.org/10.7330/9781607326205.c000>
- Horner, B., & Trimbur, J. (2002). English Only and U.S. College Composition. *College Composition and Communication*, 53(4), 594–630. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1512118>
- Inoue, A. B. (2017). Writing Assessment as the Conditions for Translingual Approaches: An Argument for Fairer Assessments. In B. Horner & L. Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing Divides: Exploring Translingual Writing Pedagogies and Programs* (pp. 119–134). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press. <http://doi.org/10.7330/9781607326205.c007>
- Jackson, R. C. (2014). The People Who Live Here: Localizing Transrhetorical Texts in GI/Oklahoma Classrooms. In B. Horner & K. Kopelson (Eds.), *Reworking English in Rhetoric and Composition: Global Interrogations, Local Interventions* (pp. 90–102). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

- James, W. L. (2018). Translanguaging at TCU.
<http://www.whitneylewjames.com/translanguaging-tcu/>. Accessed 10 April 2019.
- Jaspers, J. (2015). Modelling linguistic diversity at school: the excluding impact of inclusive multilingualism. *Language Policy*, 14(2). <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-014-9332-0>
- Jaspers, J. (2018). The transformative limits of translanguaging. *Language and Communication*, 58, 1–10. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2017.12.001>
- Hartse, J. H. (2016). Writing as language in use: On the growing engagement between sociolinguistics and writing studies. *Composition Studies*, 44(1), 169–177.
- Kiernan, J., Meier, J., & Wang, X. (2016). Negotiating languages and cultures: Enacting translanguaging through a translation assignment. *Composition Studies*, 1, 89–107.
- Kilfoil, C. B. (2015). Beyond the “Foreign” Language Requirement: From a Monolingual to a Translingual Ideology in Rhetoric and Composition Graduate Education. *Rhetoric Review*, 34(4), 426–444. <http://doi.org/10.1080/07350198.2015.1073560>
- Kinloch, V. F. (2005). Revisiting the Promise of “Students’ Right to Their Own Language”: Pedagogical Strategies. *College Composition and Communication*, 57(1), 83–113.
 Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30037899>
- Kopelson, K. (2014). Afterword: On the politics of not paying attention (and the resistance of resistance). In B. Horner & K. Kopelson (Eds.), *Reworking English in Rhetoric and Composition: Global Interrogations, Local Interventions* (pp. 207–218). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Kubota, R. (2004). The Politics of Cultural Difference in Second Language Education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 1(1), 1–19. <http://doi.org/10.1207/s15427595cils0101>
- Lalicker, W. B. (2017). Enacting Translingual Writing Pedagogy: Structures and Challenges for Two Courses in Two Countries. In B. Horner & L. Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing Divides: Exploring Translingual Writing Pedagogies and Programs* (pp. 51–69). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1469540509104374>
- Lavelle, T. (2017). The ins and outs of translingual work. In B. Horner & L. Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing Divides: Exploring Translingual Writing Pedagogies and Programs* (pp. 190–198). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press. <http://doi.org/10.7330/9781607326205.c011>
- LeCourt, D. (2006). Performing working-class identity in textual practice. *College English*, 69(1), 30–51.
- Lee, J. W. (2016). Beyond translingual writing. *College English*, 79(2), 174–195.
- Lee, E., & Canagarajah, S. (2018). The connection between transcultural dispositions and translingual practices in academic writing. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 1–15.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2018.1501375>

- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 655–670. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718490>
- Leonard, R. L. (2014). Multilingual writing as rhetorical attunement. *College English*, 76(3), 227–247.
- Losey, K. M. (2009). Written codeswitching in the classroom: Can research resolve the tensions? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(2), 213–230. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13670050802153228>
- Lu, M.-Z. (2009). Metaphors Matter: Transcultural Literacy. *JAC*, 29(1/2), 285–293. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20866902>
- Lu, M.-Z., & Horner, B. (2013). Translingual literacy, language difference, and matters of Agency. *College English*, 75(6), 582–607. <http://doi.org/10.4324/9780203120293>
- Mackinney, E., & Rios-Aguilar, C. (2012). Negotiating Between Restrictive Language Policies and Complex Teaching Conditions: A Case Study of Arizona’s Teachers of English Learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 35(3), 350–367. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2012.734545>
- MacSwan, J. (2017). A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(1), 167–201. <http://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216683935>
- Malcolm, K. (2017). Disrupting Monolingual Ideologies in a Community College: A Translingual Studio Approach. In B. Horner & L. Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing Divides: Exploring Translingual Writing Pedagogies and Programs* (pp. 101–118). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1469540509104374>
- Mangelsdorf, K. (2017). Language Difference and Translingual Enactments. *Crossing Divides: Exploring Translingual Writing Pedagogies and Programs*, 199–205. <http://doi.org/10.7330/9781607326205.c012>
- Mao, L. (2002). Re-Clustering Traditional Academic Discourse: Alternating with Confucian Discourse. In P. Bizzell, C. Schroeder, and H. Fox (Eds.), *ALT DIS: Alternative Discourses and the Academy*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Heinemann.
- Mao, L. (2018). Thinking Through Difference and Facts of Nonusage: A Dialogue Between Comparative Rhetoric and Translingualism. *Across the Disciplines*, 15(3), 104–113. Retrieved from http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/trans_wac/mao2018.pdf
- Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in U.S. college composition. *College English*, 68(6), 637–651. <http://doi.org/10.2307/25472180>
- Matsuda, P. K. (2013). It’s the Wild West Out There: A New Linguistic Frontier in U.S. College Composition. In A. Suresh Canagarajah (Ed.), *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms* (pp. 128–138). New York: Routledge.

- Matsuda, P. K. (2014). The Lure of Translingual Writing. *PMLA*, 129(3), 478–483.
- McDougall, B. N., & Nordstrom, G. (2011). Ma ka hana ka 'ike (in the work is the knowledge): Kaona as rhetorical action. *College Composition and Communication*, 63(1), 98–121.
- Mendoza, A., & Parba, J. (2018). Thwarted: relinquishing educator beliefs to understand translanguaging from learners' point of view. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1441843>
- Miles, M. B., and M. Huberman. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. (2nd ed.). SAGE.
- Milson-Whyte, V. (2014). Working English Through Code-Meshing: Implications for Denigrated Language Varieties and Their Users. In B. Horner & K. Kopelson (Eds.), *Reworking English in Rhetoric and Composition: Global Interrogations, Local Interventions* (pp. 103–115). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Molina, C. (2011). Curricular Insights into Translingualism as a Communicative Competence. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(6), 1244–1251. <http://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.2.6.1244-1251>
- Moore, D. (2002). Code-switching and learning in the classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5(5), 279–293. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13670050208667762>
- Nordquist, B. (2014). English Only through Disavowal: Linguistic Violence in Politics and Pedagogy. In B. Horner & K. Kopelson (Eds.), *Reworking English in Rhetoric and Composition: Global Interrogations, Local Interventions* (pp. 49–63). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Otwinowska, A. (2017). English teachers' language awareness: Away with the monolingual bias? *Language Awareness*, 26(4), 304–324. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2017.1409752>
- Perryman-Clark, S. M. (2012). Africanized Patterns of Expression. *Pedagogy*, 12(2), 253–280. <http://doi.org/10.1215/15314200->
- Piccardo, E. (2013). Plurilingualism and curriculum design: Toward a synergic vision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 600–614. <http://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.110>
- Pietikäinen, S., Alanen, R., Dufva, H., Kalaja, P., Leppänen, S., & Pitkänen-Huhta, A. (2008). Languaging in Ultima Thule: Multilingualism in the Life of a Sami Boy. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(2), 79. <http://doi.org/10.2167/ijmb083.0>
- Point, S., & Fourboul, C. V. (2006). Le codage à visée théorique. *Recherche et Applications En Marketing*, 21(4), 62–78.
- Powell, M. (2002). Rhetorics of Survivance: How American Indians Use Writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 53(3), 396–434.

- Powell, M., Levy, D., Riley-Mukavetz, A., Brooks-Gillies, M., Novotny, M., Fisch-Ferguson, J., & Lab, T. C. R. T. (2014). Our story begins here: Constellating cultural rhetorics. *Enculturation*, 18, 1–25.
- Prada, J., & Nikula, T. (2018). Introduction to the special issue: On the transgressive nature of translanguaging pedagogies. *EuroAmerican Journal of Applied Linguistics and Languages*, 5(2), 1–7. <http://doi.org/10.21283/2376905x.9.166>
- Pratt, M. L. (1991). Arts of the Contact Zone. *Profession*, (1991), 33–40. <http://doi.org/10.2307/25595469>
- Ramos, S. F. (2016). Building a Culture of Solidarity: Racial Discourse, Black Lives Matter, and Indigenous Social Justice. *Enculturation*, (21). Retrieved from <http://enculturation.net/building-a-culture-of-solidarity>
- Riley-Mukavetz, A. (2016). On working from or with anger: Or how I learned to listen to my relatives and practice all our relations. *Enculturation*, 21, 4–9. Retrieved from <http://enculturation.net/on-working-from-or-with-anger>
- Rosiers, K., Van Lancker, I., & Delarue, S. (2017). Beyond the traditional scope of translanguaging. Comparing translanguaging practices in Belgian multilingual and monolingual classroom contexts. *Language and Communication*, (April), 1–14. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2017.11.003>
- Royster, J. J. (2002). Academic Discourses or Small Boats on a Big Sea. In P. Bizzell, C. Schroeder, and H. Fox (Eds.), *ALT DIS: Alternative Discourses and the Academy* (p. 23–30). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Heinemann.
- Safford, K., & Kelly, A. (2010). Linguistic capital of trainee teachers: Knowledge worth having? *Language and Education*, 24(5), 401–414. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09500781003695567>
- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Severino, C. (2017). “Multilingualizing” Composition: A Diary Self- Study of Learning Spanish and Chinese. *Composition Studies*, 45(2), 12–31.
- Shaughnessy, M. (1979). *Errors and expectations*. Oxford University Press.
- Shipka, J. (2016). Transmodality in/and Processes of Making: Changing Dispositions and Practice. *College English*, 78(3), 250–257.
- Smitherman, G. (1974). Soul’n Style. *The English Journal*, 63(3), 14–15.
- Smitherman, G. (1999). CCCC’s Role in the Struggle for Language Rights. *College Composition and Communication*, 50(3), 349–376.
- Smitherman, G. (2000). *Talkin that talk: Language, culture, and education in African America*.

New York, NY: Routledge.

- St. Pierre, E. A., & Jackson, A. Y. (2014). Qualitative data analysis after coding. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6), 715–719. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1077800414532435>
- Sugiharto, S. (2015). Translingualism in Action: Rendering the Impossible Possible. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 12(2), 125–154.
- Sullivan, P., & Porter, J. E. (1997). *Opening spaces: Writing technologies and critical research practices*. (A. Publishing, Ed.). Westport, CT.
- Tardy, C. M. (2011). Enacting and Transforming Local Language Policies. *College Composition and Communication*, 62(4), 634–661.
- Tardy, C. M. (2016). Beyond convention: Genre innovation in academic/professional writing. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Tardy, C. M. (2017). Crossing, or Creating, Divides? A Plea for Transdisciplinary Scholarship. In B. Horner & L. Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing Divides: Exploring Translingual Writing Pedagogies and Programs* (pp. 181–189). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press. Retrieved from <http://muse.jhu.edu/52676>
- Taylor, S. K., & Cutler, C. (2016). Introduction: Showcasing the translingual SL/FL classroom: strategies, practices, and beliefs. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 72(4), 389–404. <http://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.72.4.389>
- Tougas, M. (2016). Enacting transcultural citizenship by Writing Across Communities. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 40(1), 188–194.
- Trimbur, J. (2016). Translingualism and Close Reading. *College English*, 78(3), 219–227.
- Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (1st ed.). London: ZED Books.
- Turner, K. C. N., & Ives, D. (2013). Social Justice Approaches to African American Language and Literacy Practices: Guest Editors' Introduction. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 46(3), 285–299. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2013.808892>
- Vaudrin-Charette, J., & Fleuret, C. (2016). Quelles avenues vers une pedagogie postcoloniale et multimodale en contexte plurilingue? *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne Des Langues Vivantes*, 72(4). <http://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.3360>
- Velasco, P., & García, O. (2014). Translanguaging and the Writing of Bilingual Learners. *Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education*, 37(1), 6–23. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2014.893270>
- Watson, M., & Shapiro, R. (2018). Clarifying the Multiple Dimensions of Monolingualism: Keeping Our Sights on Language Politics Keeping Our Sights on Material Consequences. *Composition Forum*, 38(Spring 2018), 1–20. Retrieved from

<http://compositionforum.com/issue/38/monolingualism.php>

- Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1222–1235. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035>
- Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30. <http://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>
- Williams, B. J. (2013). Students’ “Write” to Their Own Language: Teaching the African American Verbal Tradition as a Rhetorically Effective Writing Skill. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 46(3), 411–429. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2013.808099>
- Williams, J., & Condon, F. (2016). Translingualism in Composition Studies and Second Language Writing: An Uneasy Alliance. *TESL Canada Journal/ Revue TESL Du Canada*, 33(2), 1–18. <http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/1018806/tesl.v33i2.1232>
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.
- Woodley, H. H., & Brown, A. (2016). Balancing windows and mirrors: Translanguaging in a linguistically diverse classroom. In O. García & T. Kleyn (Eds.), *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments* (pp. 83–99). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Young, V. A. (2009). “Nah, We Straight”: An Argument Against Code Switching. *JAC*, 29(1/2), 49–76. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20866886>
- Zentz, L. (2017). *Statehood, scale, and hierarchy: History, language, and identity in Indonesia*. Blue Ridge Summit, PA: Multilingual Matters.