STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF TRANSLANGUAGING IN THE COLLEGE CLASSROOM

by

Sarah Willey

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of English in
Applied Linguistics

Charlotte

2023

Approved by:

_____
Dr. Elizabeth Miller, Ph.D.

_____
Dr. Rebecca Roeder, Ph.D.

_____
Dr. Pilar Blitvich, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

SARAH WILLEY. Student Perceptions of Translanguaging in the College Classroom.
(Under the direction of DR. ELIZABETH MILLER)

This qualitative empirical study explores the perspectives of college students around translanguaging: a theory, practice, and pedagogy that has grown in popularity over the past decade, particularly within the field of applied linguistics. The majority of studies applying this pedagogical approach have taken place in K-12 classrooms and have focused on the experiences and behaviors of multilingual students. This study took place in a general education classroom at UNC Charlotte, where both monolingual and multilingual undergraduate students developed the knowledge to better understand multilingualism and dialect variation in the United States. Twenty-five participants from the fall 2022 semester completed surveys, provided coursework, and/or participated in follow-up interviews. Thematic analysis of the data revealed how and why students may uphold the role of SAE in the college classroom despite holding an understanding of linguistic subordination and an appreciation for linguistic diversity. It also provided insight into the many barriers and considerations which need to be taken into account when applying a translanguaging pedagogy in a setting where monoglossic pedagogy is the established default.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Elizabeth Miller, for her encouragement and insightful guidance throughout the process of preparing this thesis. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Rebecca Roeder and Dr. Pilar Blitvich, whose questions and suggestions challenged me to delve deeper into the nuances of translanguaging theory and its various interpretations. Finally, I would like to thank Mrs. Ellen Ruff and Mr. Tom Ruff for their generous support for this project and their belief in its impact from the very beginning.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

As student populations enrolled in universities across the U.S. become increasingly diverse, professors, scholars, and administrators have been seeking innovative ways to accommodate larger proportions of multilingual students. Traditionally, expectations for standardized English have placed barriers between these students and their success, excluding those not fluent in Standard English and marginalizing those who speak varieties deemed deficient. Over the last several decades, scholars in the fields of writing studies, bilingual education, and TESOL have all begun experimenting with theoretical approaches which seek to build upon students' language-in-practice rather than imposing the rules and dogma of dominant varieties (Young, 2007; Horner et al., 2011; García & Kleyn, 2016; Robinson et al., 2020). The concept of "translanguaging" emerged in the 1980s as a pedagogical strategy in Welsh schools, but later came to be understood by scholars as a naturally occurring phenomenon in which multilingual individuals engage on a daily basis (Lewis et al., 2012). Translanguaging as a theory conceptualizes that each mono-, bi-, or multi- lingual person is endowed with a unified linguistic repertoire; translanguaging as a pedagogy seeks to empower students by allowing them to draw from the breadth of this linguistic repertoire when constructing meaning. More recently, scholars have been applying translanguaging theory in classroom settings as a means of uprooting long-held monoglossic ideologies and honoring students' varied language practices as resources for their education. The majority of these studies, however, have been in K-12 bilingual schools and have focused on the experiences of bilingual or multilingual students. Fewer studies have explored the potential benefits of translanguaging pedagogy with regards to monolingual students in general education at the college level.

The goal of this study is therefore to further research on an innovative pedagogical approach that remains underrepresented in majority monolingual classrooms at the college level. A review of the current literature on translanguaging will help to identify those materials, activities, and instructional methods which have been successfully employed in K-12 and/or bilingual settings and to determine how they may be adapted to fit the context of a majority monolingual, college-level liberal studies classroom at UNC Charlotte. The literature review will begin with a background on U.S. language policy to situate translanguaging theory in its historical and sociopolitical context. This background will be followed by three longer sections which discuss the theoretical framework of translanguaging, the rationale for introducing and testing translanguaging pedagogy in the classroom, and the benefits of translanguaging pedagogy as evidenced by prior studies. Following the review of literature, the methodology for the study will be laid out in detail, including the research setting and participants, forms of data collection, and thematic analysis. Finally, results will be presented and discussed in relation to the following research questions: (1) What are the perceived advantages, risks, and barriers to embracing a translanguaging pedagogy in a classroom where Standard English is the default? (2) How do students respond to the incorporation of diverse language practices into a classroom where Standard English is the lingua franca? (3) How does translanguaging pedagogy in a majority monolingual setting impact college students' perceptions of their own lived experiences? The aim of this research is to shed light on students' experiences and perceptions surrounding language in education, and to utilize that knowledge for the strengthening of pedagogical strategies that support translanguaging approaches.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Background on U.S. Language Policy

The domination of English in academic and professional spheres around the world has spread rapidly with globalization but cannot be untethered from the colonial violence which first enveloped North America in the 1500s. According to Trimbur (2006), the fact that America today lacks any official language directly echoes the Founding Fathers' willful ignorance towards the multilingual reality of the land. European colonizers disregarded native North American languages in their documents while the Atlantic slave trade attempted to erase African ones before they could begin to take root. It is only in recent decades that scholars, journalists, and activists have started to uncover the atrocities faced by attendees of assimilation schools which punished indigenous children for speaking in their native tongues (Adams, 1995). Slave auctioneers and plantation owners separated Africans from their tribes so that those who spoke Yoruba, Ibo, Hausa, or other West African languages were isolated and restricted in communication (Trimbur, 2006), thereby relying upon what some scholars have deemed a creole, a combination of English vocabulary with West African grammars (Smitherman, 1977, pp. 5-7). At the same time, colonizers attempted to prevent enslaved individuals from becoming literate in English through compulsory ignorance laws that made it illegal to teach them to read or write (Trimbur, 2006). Subversive language policies like these helped shape creolized forms of English, which were then relegated to the private sphere in the same way that African American English (AAE) varieties have since been deemed deficient in academic and professional settings. A laissez-faire approach to language policy freed colonizers from the responsibility of protecting linguistic rights while it allowed for more covert, culturally driven ways to infringe upon them.

Today, our nation remains neutral regarding official language policy, yet pressures to approximate Standard English continue to marginalize immigrants and communities of color (Horner et al., 2011), as will be discussed in the sections to follow. Paradoxically, as scholars in the field of linguistics work to develop more inclusive approaches to education, there has been a resurgence in an "Official English" political movement that seeks to establish English as the official language and further exclude vulnerable populations (Horner et al., 2011). Whether U.S. language policies become embedded in state legislative frameworks or remain implicit in cultural practices, research that seeks to address the needs and strengths of multilingual students must be situated within this historical context of exclusion so that we may better grasp its significance. Reminders of this history enable us to draw connections between colonial attitudes and monoglossic pedagogies so that we may maintain a critical stance toward language policy and pedagogy in education today.

Students' Right to Their Own Language

The concept of translanguaging owes much of its theoretical groundwork to major reconfigurations in the field of writing studies which began to address colonial attitudes in American schools in the 1970s. Brown (2020) outlines the social reckoning with diversity that occurred within the field during this time. In response to Black and Puerto Rican activists who protested the segregation of white institutions, state legislators enacted Open Admission policies across the City University of New York system (CUNY). The influx of new students with drastically different language patterns prompted the creation of remediation programs that sought to correct and erase those differences (Brown, 2020). It was not until 1972 that the Conference on College Composition and Communication's (CCCC, 1974) "Students' Right to Their Own Language" (SRTOL) resolution sparked a shift in the way language variety was discussed

amongst educational leaders. For the first time, academic institutions' preoccupation with the rules of Standard English was explicitly linked with social domination. The resolution affirmed the rights of students to learn subjects in their own varieties of English, backed by research demonstrating the benefits of this approach (CCCC, 1974). Although the emphasis then was on variations within the English-speaking population, this declaration has since become a reference point for linguistic scholars seeking increasingly inclusive approaches toward language in education.

One of these scholars is Young (2007), who advocated for the term "codemeshing" to replace the still commonly used "code-switching" as a means of promoting the more fluid language use of Black Americans who may blend their home language practices with those taught in academic settings. Canagarajah (2011) has since expanded "codemeshing" to also include the fluid language use of multilingual students and has published several studies on teaching strategies that enable it (Canagarajah, 2013). Related to codemeshing is Horner et al.'s (2011) translingual approach, framed as a direct extension of the SRTOL resolution, but with a broadened application to "differences within and across all languages" (p. 304). Though there is significant overlap across these concepts, each of them has contributed in some way to the emergence of translanguaging, a term whose breadth and flexibility make it applicable to not only minoritized students but to all students at the college level, proficient in Standard American English, who may or may not identify as multilingual.

Translanguaging Theory

The scholar most often credited with pushing forth this term and its related pedagogy is Ofelia García, who is currently Professor Emerita at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. García (2011) herself credits the Welsh schoolteacher Cen Williams for coining the

term in the 1980s when he leveraged students' existing Welsh and English language practices by allowing them to read in English and write in Welsh, combining their productive and receptive strengths to maximize learning. The ways in which translanguaging theory has been applied to U.S. schools, however, have included a wider variety of skills and modalities than reading and writing alone, often drawing from students' observed language practices and leveraging them for collaborative learning. In its popular use, the term refers simultaneously to the structural theory of a unified linguistic repertoire, the naturally occurring language use of multilinguals, and the progressive pedagogy employed by language teachers geared towards sociolinguistic justice.

In explaining the theory and the pedagogy, García (2011) situates translanguaging as a theoretical alternative to traditional models of bilingualism that have permeated the U.S. educational system. While the shift away from subtractive bilingualism (learning a second language to replace the first) has represented a growing appreciation of bilingualism as a resource, additive models still work from the assumption that bilingual students have two separate codes which they must learn to alternate between (García, 2011). Translanguaging is instead defined by García and Leiva (2014) as an "enactment of dynamic bilingualism," where language practices are seen as multiple and continuously adapting to multilingual and multimodal communicative contexts. Canagarajah (2011) describes translanguaging (the practice) as the naturally occurring "ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system" (p. 401). Canagarajah (2013) cites examples from South Asia where "translingual practices," as he alternatively refers to them, predate colonization, and where monolingualism itself is understood as a colonialist concept imposed upon communities. Translanguaging is therefore a new name applied to a very old practice, a term used in the hopes of awakening educators and policymakers

to the stifling nature of a monolingual ideology. For as long as monolingualism has been the "norm" and multilingualism the exception in modern, Western nation-states, code-switching, codemeshing, translingual practice, and other forms of hybrid language have been deemed by monolinguals in American schools as outside the norm, and often as deficient. Translanguaging, in the perspective of García (2011) and Canagarajah (2011), involves a major shift in emphasis from prescribed monolingualism being at the center of education, to the fluid language practices of multilingual communities being recognized as the norm.

Nevertheless, the tendency for scholarly references of "translanguaging" to overlap with similar terms cannot be overlooked. Williams' (1994) original use of the Welsh word "Trawsieithu" and Baker's (2001) subsequent translation as "translanguaging" were both descriptive labels for a particular language practice which can and has been alternatively described as code-switching, code mixing, codemeshing, diglossia, heteroglossia, translingual practice, or hybrid language use, depending on one's perspective. Translanguaging, for better or for worse, appears to have outpaced nearly all of the aforementioned terms in popularity in recent years, yielding over 17,700 results since 2018 on Google Scholar (excepting code switching, which yields over 20,000). Where translanguaging differs from other related terms, and perhaps what has led to its overwhelming uptake in the field of applied linguistics, is its repositioning of multilingualism as the universal norm, its emphasis on the individual learner, focus on pedagogical strategies, incorporation of multimodal semiotic systems (Wei, 2018; Burten & Rajendram, 2019; Lau, 2020) and, most controversially, its assertion that named languages are more sociopolitical constructs than discrete linguistic entities.

In regards to this last feature, García and Kleyn (2016) present translanguaging as "transcending" the named languages that society has constructed to acknowledge that each

individual has a "single linguistic system (the inside view) that society (the outside view) calls two or more named languages" (p. 10). It is in this vein that Wei (2018) also frames translanguaging as a "practical theory" which holds unique potential to address the challenges of a "Post-Multilingualism era" (p. 15). Drawing from examples of so-called "Chinglish" expressions and Singaporian conversations, Wei (2018) shows how the ownership and interweaving of languages are becoming increasingly complex in today's world, due to widespread forces of globalization, transnational mobility, displacement, and Information and Communications Technology (Cenoz & Gorter, 2007, p. 1). As a result, Wei (2018) asserts we are left with little choice but to constantly reassess terms like "foreign," "native," "indigenous," and "minority languages" (p. 15). From this perspective, the terms "bilingual" and "multilingual" themselves are useful only to the extent that they continue to reflect society's constructed view of various groups and their language practices.

Integrated Multilingual Model

While scholars engaged in translanguaging theory seem to converge around languaging as a process, not a product, they diverge when it comes to the role of named languages as structurally relevant entities in its study. MacSwan (2017), in particular, problematizes the unitary model put forth by "García and colleagues," instead advocating for an "integrated multilingual model" on translanguaging (p. 179). Like García (2011), he describes individual multilingualism as the possession of a "single linguistic repertoire," yet is careful to distinguish "repertoire" from "grammar." While a repertoire refers to the full potential range of utterances for an individual, a grammar is but one segment of this knowledge, which is likely one of many within an individual's larger repertoire (p. 189). MacSwan (2017) explains that our repertoire may include grammars representative of multiple named languages, as well as the various speech

styles we use across diverse social contexts (p. 189). Though both MacSwan (2017) and García reject the dual competence model which underlies subtractive bilingualism (two distinct linguistic systems which don't interact), MacSwan argues that denying the existence of named languages altogether would refute decades of empirical research promoting positive views towards code-switching as rule-governed and systematic (p. 169). MacSwan argues that "the political use of language names can and should be distinguished from the social and structural idealizations used to study linguistic diversity," further explaining that "whether we can reasonably speak of discrete languages or speech communities depends on the analytic utility of these constructs, not their political associations" (p. 177). Recognizing the structural differences across named languages allows us to examine the ways in which individuals both switch between and combine grammatical systems into single utterances. This type of examination is necessary if we are to support students in their rhetorical and communicative effectiveness, and especially if we are to begin to accept multilingualism as the universal norm, as both MacSwan (2017) and García (2011) suggest we should.

Reconciling Translanguaging with Named Languages

Many scholars have more recently been seeking to reconcile translanguaging theory, as first popularized by García, with the sociopolitical reality of named languages which we as learners, speakers, and researchers continue to perpetuate, for better or worse. Sah and Kubota (2022) expose the potential of translanguaging to exacerbate existing language hierarchies if and when mother tongues become excluded for the sake of "elite bilingual translanguaging" (p. 141). This was the case observed in several English Medium Instruction (EMI) classrooms across Nepal, Pakistan, and India, where dominant second languages were prioritized over minority languages when negotiating meaning in the classroom (Vaish, 2009; Phyak, 2018; Zahra et al.,

2020; and Sah & Li, 2020, as cited in Sah & Kubota, 2022, pp. 140-41). Without sociopolitical criticality and a recognition of discrete languages, dialects, and varieties, translanguaging pedagogy can quickly become another neoliberal tool (mis)used to displace minority languages. Sah and Kubota (2022) therefore suggests that maintaining MacSwan's (2017) multilingual approach to translanguaging can help account for power dynamics in/across languages (p. 137), a central issue that translanguaging pedagogy has been called upon to address.

Turner and Lin (2017) further attest that "harnessing named languages to develop a speaker's linguistic repertoire or idiolect is key" when considering ways to operationalize translanguaging theory in the classroom (p. 423). Recognizing the often-overlooked role which the desire for named languages plays in a learner's linguistic development, Turner and Lin (2017) argue that García's translanguaging model should be inverted to make better use of that force. Whereas much of García and colleagues' work has focused on translanguaging in bilingual education (García, 2011; García & Leiva, 2014; García & Kleyn, 2016), Turner and Lin (2017) problematize the idea of using a unified linguistic repertoire to obtain bilingual status, because it appears to perpetuate the very type of linguistic separation that translanguaging is supposed to erase. Turner and Lin (2017) propose instead learning a named language as the means to expanding one's linguistic repertoire:

> "If translanguaging theory is to move beyond its current focus on minority/subordinate speakers in an immersive English-speaking environment, or speakers who are exposed – whether they like it or not – to at least two named languages in their everyday lives, the desire for a named language to which the speaker gets little daily exposure can play an important role in bringing the speaker to the table, so to speak. Facilitating the visibility of this desire, critiquing it and exploring how the named language, as a social construct, can be used as a tool to develop first order languaging[1] (rather than the other way around) may help the integration of majority language speakers into translanguaging theory. This could be achieved through guided class discussion and the encouragement of student reflection on (1) their beliefs around language, (2)

---

[1] First order languaging here refers to the dialogic form of language as theorized by Thibault (2011), according to whom second order language aligns with the lexicogrammatical patterns that enforce cultural expectations, or named languages (as cited in Turner & Lin, 2017, p. 427).

the myriad ways they use (and desire to use) language, and (3) the ways in which a particular named language may be adding to their repertoire as a whole" (p. 430).

As we will see in coming sections, reversing the role of translanguaging from the means to the ends is an underrepresented approach in classroom-based studies of translanguaging pedagogy, but it is particularly relevant to a study which seeks to bring new (monolingual) speakers to the table and to better understand its applicability to diverse contexts.

Summary

In summary, translanguaging points to the theory that individuals draw from a complex, integrated linguistic repertoire consisting of multiple overlapping grammars in order to construct meaning. It is the naturally occurring practice of languaging as a process, not a product, and it centers on multilingualism as the societal norm. As an educational pedagogy, it posits that any attempts to separate components of one's linguistic repertoire to approximate prescribed norms (i.e. Standard American English) may limit an individual's learning potential by denying them the expression of their full range of linguistic resources. While it does not require the disposal of terms like "native," "nonnative" "bilingual," or "multilingual," it does inspire a renewed recognition that named languages, as we know them, are in large part socially constructed and should be critically observed as such in the classroom. It encompasses not only the inter-lingual complexities of a post-multilingual society, but also the intra-lingual diversity of learners who represent a wide range of regional and ethnic linguistic varieties. Studies that look to build upon the current translanguaging scholarship should maintain a critical eye towards both unified and diversified aspects of an individual's linguistic repertoire, balancing attention to both interlingual and intralingual diversity, all the while being careful not to assume or prescribe any one-size-fits-all type applications from its results.

Need for Linguistically Informed Pedagogy

We now turn to a review of studies in K-12 ESL and dual-language classrooms, K-12 subject area classrooms, and university contexts that have revealed the continued prevalence of dominant language ideologies embedded in school structures, and the detrimental effects of those beliefs on students. Although the current study at UNC Charlotte focuses on the perspectives of first-year college students who may or may not have learned English as Second Language (ESL), each section provides additional context to those perspectives, the large majority of which are a product of having grown up in the U.S. school system.

K-12 ESL and Dual-Language Programs

At elementary through secondary levels of schooling in the U.S., the separation of English language instruction for first or subsequent-generation immigrants and American-born native speakers has led to ESL students' proficiency in English being negatively compared to that of the majority, white native speakers, despite the wider range of linguistic skills they may hold. Cummins' (1979) interdependence hypothesis was an important step along the theoretical path toward translanguaging which recognized bilingualism as a strength rather than a deficit. It identified a "Common Underlying Proficiency" behind students' L1 and L2 use which allowed bilinguals to transfer knowledge from one language to another in ways that were beneficial to learning. According to García and Kleyn (2016), however, the hypothesis was ultimately misused by educational administrators who continued to legitimate the separation of language instruction (p. 11). The Cummins hypothesis itself did not move beyond the notion of two separate linguistic systems; it emphasized the benefits of cross-linguistic transfer to help develop two separate proficiencies, rather than integrated meaning-making through fluid language use. The result, which continues to be seen in dual-language programs today, is that bilingual students

struggle to meet the expectations of teachers who are trained to elicit learning in (mostly) one language at a time, and who expect students' use of each language to align with that of its respective native speakers. García and Kleyn (2016) argue that expectations for "double monolingualism," while well-intentioned, are simply unrealistic in situations where English and other named languages are used in different spheres to fulfill different functions (p. 11). A student born and raised in the United States may hear and speak English in public on a daily basis, and only hear and speak Spanish at home, yet still somehow be expected to produce English and Spanish at similar proficiency levels across contexts.

In 2002, enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act shifted focus from bilingualism to English learning, classified bilinguals as "English Language Learners" (ELLs), and required schools to demonstrate "adequate yearly progress" in English proficiency (García & Kleyn, 2016, p. 37). This added burden for schools to meet state benchmarks fell disproportionately onto students of color, who struggled to replicate the standard variety of white native English speakers. While the well-known and often disputed "achievement gap" between white students and Latinx students has fueled many of the aforementioned policy changes in language education over recent decades, scholars like Nelson Flores have been working relentlessly to show that a continued focus on "academic language," regardless of positive intentions to address the needs of Latinx students, has only further isolated and disempowered them. A study by Flores et al. (2020) in a Philadelphia dual-language program elucidated the racialized identities imposed upon students through language assessments and labels. Latinx students who were labeled simultaneously as L1 speakers of English and English-language Learners (ELs) were more likely to be subjected to deficit-based discourses and assumptions on the part of well-meaning teachers who were not presented with the tools to make sense of such categories (Flores et al., 2020).

Linguistic categories and dual-language education (DLE) programs themselves fail to get to the heart of a much larger systemic issue, one that may appear nuanced in many contexts but becomes clear when looking at highly segregated cities such as Philadelphia, PA. Flores and McAuliffe's (2022) interviews across newly established Spanish–English DLE programs in North Philadelphia revealed teachers' concerns "that they and their students were expected to meet the same benchmarks in English as other students despite the fact that the DLE students were receiving half of their instruction in Spanish" (p. 1354). Interviews also revealed that Spanish-language materials were not made readily accessible to teachers, leading to the added stress of having to create their own materials, a high turnover rate, and the hiring of individuals without a background in bilingual education, out of desperation. Ultimately, the "heavy focus on standardized assessments obscured the impact of segregation and poverty on North Philadelphia schools" (p. 1354). Many of the factors affecting students' success rates, including inconsistent funding, large class sizes, and frequent student transfers, were out of the local administrators' control. A common theme exemplified by this study and by Flores and Chaparro's (2018) earlier study across dual-language charter schools, was that the root causes for linguistically-minoritized students' academic failure were separate from any perceived deficiency in academic language. Each of these studies points to the same underlying pattern: the deflection of systemic inequalities toward claims of linguistic deficiency. This perceived deficiency, which happens to fall along racial lines, further isolates and racializes bilingual individuals in a way that is inherently unequal, and will remain so as long as the myth of "separate but equal" prevails. The question therefore emerges of whether an approach that integrates multiple named languages fluidly into the classroom and meets students where they are linguistically can provide a more

equal footing to bilingual students. As we will see in the "Benefits of Applied Translanguaging Pedagogy" section below, much of the recent work on translanguaging has focused on this issue.

Dialect Variation in K-12 Subject Areas

Despite the breadth of research on the benefits of culturally sustaining pedagogies that empower students by embracing their diverse linguistic backgrounds (Alim, 2007; Paris & Alim, 2014; Bucholtz et al., 2014; Bucholtz et al., 2016), less attention has been paid to the treatment of dialect variation in subject areas outside of language learning itself. The majority of studies on linguistically inclusive pedagogies such as translanguaging have been geared towards English language learners and emergent bilinguals rather than speakers of African American English, Appalachian English, Latinx Englishes, or other nonstandard varieties of English (Charity Hudley & Mallinson, 2015, p. 639). Those studies that do focus on the latter groups tend to take place exclusively in humanities or language arts classrooms. There is therefore a significant gap in the research on the precise ways in which dominant language ideologies pervade subject areas beyond the humanities, or how linguistically-informed pedagogies such as translanguaging may be beneficial to populations of native speaking English students across disciplines.

What we do know is that large-scale studies over the past several decades have repeatedly shown the aforementioned "achievement gaps" for students of color, most notably African American students, across subject areas (Camara & Schmidt, 1999; Slavin & Madden, 2006; Owens, 2018; Hanushek et al., 2022). While for Latinx students (as previously discussed), these achievement gaps have been attributed to language deficits, for Black students, they have more often been examined in correlation to socioeconomic disparities across highly segregated school districts, without consideration of the linguistic differences across those districts. For decades, sociolinguists have worked relentlessly to expose the linguistic outcomes of segregation (Labov,

1972), the systematicity of "Black English Vernacular" (Labov, 1969) the negative stereotypes around it that get internalized by students of color from their earliest years of schooling (Lippi-Green, 2012), as well as the detrimental effects those deficit-based beliefs can have on student engagement, learning outcomes, and retention rates (Charity Hudley & Mallinson, 2011; Reaser et al., 2017). Misinformed approaches to language variation in schools should be taken seriously as a major factor, alongside socioeconomic ones, exacerbating large scale inequalities.

In an attempt to connect sociolinguistic research on language variation to those subject areas where it lacks representation, Charity Hudley and Mallinson (2017) conducted a professional development workshop geared towards K-12 STEM educators across Maryland and Virginia. The workshop aimed not to simply pass along pedagogies in a top-down manner, but to listen and respond to these educators' reported needs. Interviews, focus groups, and survey results from the study revealed that many of the perceived challenges for African American students revolved around issues of culture, miscommunication, unfamiliarity with technical jargon, and difficulties understanding word problems, rather than the STEM-related content itself. Despite the linguistic nature of these challenges, teachers reported feeling ill-prepared to address them. Without the critical awareness and operational solutions that the workshop eventually provided, the effects of these language-related issues were far-reaching. According to one interview, a teacher had observed students' tendencies to self-segregate in the classroom according to "gifted" and "non-gifted" status which related to test scores and fell largely across racial lines. The white students who were part of the "gifted" class tended to socialize more with one another outside the classroom and demonstrated higher confidence and participation levels, whereas the majority Black "non-gifted" students were more likely to remain silent in class discussions (Charity Hudley & Mallinson, 2017, p. 655). While the workshop did provide

teachers with the linguistic knowledge to better understand students' challenges, it did not necessarily move beyond a deficit-based approach to rectifying those inequalities. Providing students with more scaffolded vocabulary introductions and longer wait time before answering questions, for example, still places more of the communicative burden on students who struggle with standardized English. More research is needed to show the precise ways in which monoglossic pedagogies prioritize standardized English in subject areas outside of the language arts, as well as potential avenues for increasing dialect representation in those contexts.

While the major issue exposed by Charity Hudley and Mallinson's (2017) work with STEM educators was a lack of training and awareness on linguistic issues, Metz and Knight (2021) suggest that even with the relevant linguistic knowledge, teachers are likely to perpetuate the linguistic prejudices of society. Their study explored high school teachers' beliefs as they related to teaching English grammar and language classes in an unidentified midwestern state. In their work, Metz and Knight (2021) sought to uncover not only the contradictory ideologies at play behind participants' teaching practices, but also the narrative structures which allowed them to hold a multiplicity of contradictory beliefs about language. The study revealed teachers' "tension between wanting to validate all forms of language and a belief that students need Standardized English to be successful in their academic and professional lives" (p. 247). Though most teachers acknowledged the importance of students' nonstandard language use in forming their identities, they all felt students would need to shift their language use to meet societal expectations for standardized English, particularly in regards to job interviews, college admissions essays, and standardized tests (pp. 248-49). Despite the variety of participants' identities and backgrounds, there was an overwhelming commonality across narrative structures

tying these conflicting beliefs together. Metz and Knight (2021) called this narrative the

"dominant school narrative structure" and illustrated it as follows:

> "While I, the teacher, understand that there are many correct ways of using English, the rest of the world expects Standard English. I need to prepare my students for the world, and I need to protect them from discrimination. So, it is my job and my responsibility to make sure they use Standard English" (p. 251).

Metz and Knight (2021) conclude that the only way to change teaching practices embedded in

this type of narrative is to create an alternative one which involves a critical stance towards

language and sounds something like:

> "While I, the teacher, understand that there are many correct ways of using English, the majority of the society currently expects standardized forms of English. I need to prepare my students for these expectations, and I need to protect them from discrimination. Thus, it is my job and my responsibility to help them understand when they are facing linguistic discrimination and to help them address that discrimination. It is also my job to make sure my students don't perpetuate linguistic discrimination against others. Thus, I will teach students to understand and appreciate the wide-ranging communicative practices they may encounter in the world" (Metz & Knight, 2021, p. 252).

As mentioned in the study, standardized tests and college admissions requirements play a large

role in determining students' "success," and therefore pose a significant challenge for K-12

educators seeking to maintain a critical stance. This is why we turn next to the university level,

where student learning outcomes are more subjective and may provide the needed flexibility for

educators to take a more critical approach to language use.

Challenges for ESL and International Students at the University Level

By the time of entry into American or English Medium Instruction (EMI) universities,

students have already been tested for proficiency in Standard Academic English through major

examinations such as the SAT, ACT, IELTS, TOEFL, Duolingo, or Pearson Test of English

(Jenkins, 2015; UNC Charlotte). It is perhaps for this reason that few studies have been

conducted to look at the treatment of dialect variation or the challenges for linguistically

minoritized college students. It is important to recognize, however, the barriers to higher education that requirements for proficiency create, as well as the influence that such expectations have on educational programs at lower levels and around the globe. In terms of access, Kanno and Varghese's (2010) study revealed that "being an ESL learner significantly constrains immigrants' and refugees' access to higher education and, once they are in college, brings a set of challenges that few native-speaking students encounter" (p. 323), including structural constraints, financial struggles, and self-censorship, in addition to linguistic challenges. Data showed these challenges derived more from "institutional, sociocultural, and material disadvantages" than from lack of sufficient English proficiency, although policy in higher education has, more often than not, focused on the latter aspect (Kanno & Varghese, 2010, pp. 323-324). Shifting the focus away from remediation for ESL learners towards more inclusive linguistic expectations for everyone at the college level may open the door to a more equally accessible university education.

With regards to international students, English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) research has revealed a "mismatch between the kinds of English that are taught to non-native English speakers (NNESs) at all educational levels, and the kinds of English they need and use in their lives outside the classroom" (Jenkins, 2015, p. 155). The IELTS, TOEFL, and other standardized English-language tests continue to hold American or British Englishes as the target language, despite a higher prevalence of regional varieties and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) in international, everyday use (Jenkins, 2015). Wang's (2013) qualitative research with 502 Chinese university students revealed a nuanced conflict between students' functional motives to approximate English as a Native Language (ENL) for socioeconomic advancement, and recognition of their own ELF varieties as communicatively effective and more strongly tied to

their cultural identities. Institutionally, English as a Native Language (ENL) is the imagined goal (albeit a moving target) for these students, regardless of their communicative effectiveness and identity demarcation in their own varieties. A translanguaging approach at the university level would not only invite traditionally named languages such as Spanish, Cantonese, and Tagalog into one classroom, but also make space for non-conformity to ENL norms, prioritize communicative effectiveness over acculturation, and honor the creative expression of diverse identities from international contexts.

In regards to linguistically minoritized English-speaking students, the effects of the achievement gap often carry over to those students' lower rates of college admission (Perna & Jones, 2013, p. 4). Even for those who make it to college and whose nonstandard varieties have not yet been stamped out by the "dominant school narrative structure" (Metz & Knight, 2021), there remains significant pressure to adhere to dominant norms once in college. Dunstan's (2013) study at a Southern urban university, for example, found that Appalachian students using a variety of "mountain speech" experienced lower levels of class participation, lower perceived intelligence by professors and peers, and a lower overall sense of belonging on campus (as cited in Reaser et al., 2017, p. 257). Furthermore, some students reported even less tolerance of language variation in their social sciences and humanities courses than in economics, physical sciences, or other unrelated disciplines (p. 257). Reaser et al. (2017) and Dunstan et al. (2015) both stress the importance of professional development for faculty and educators across disciplines to intervene with models of language subordination (Lippi-Green, 2012), but Dunstan et al. (2015) also advises researchers to seek better understandings of the impact of language diversity on students before trying to implement more inclusive, top-down pedagogies (p. 796). This study will therefore look not only at students' perceptions around translanguaging, but the

nature and extent to which dominant language ideologies have affected students personally, if and how a translanguaging pedagogy may be appropriate to address their needs, and potential gateways to establishing a more critical narrative around language use.

Applied Translanguaging Pedagogy

The applied pedagogies and observable benefits of translanguaging have thus far been studied for the most part in primary and secondary bilingual or dual-language classrooms, although the outcomes of these studies hold significant implications for monolingual students in traditional college classrooms, as well. Several studies observe classrooms in international contexts from a translanguaging perspective, and several explore the effects of critical pedagogies on high school and college students. This latter group, though not explicitly connected to translanguaging, will be discussed in an attempt to show the inherent similarities between the goals of translanguaging pedagogies, catered more to multilingual populations, and those of critical pedagogies already operationalized for U.S. monolingual students. All studies will be discussed to the extent that their approaches and findings align with the goals and tenets of translanguaging pedagogy, as outlined in the section titled "Translanguaging Theory." The following subsections are organized according to the demonstrated benefits of applied pedagogies, including: activation of prior knowledge, identity construction and expression, development of empathy, critical literacy, and collaboration, engagement with sociolinguistic justice, expansion of rhetorical strategies, and the development of plurilingual competence. Although there is significant overlap across these benefits, they are presented below in an order which I believe reflects the potential to scaffold learning outcomes in the classroom.

Activation of Prior Knowledge

One idea that scholars and educators share around translanguaging pedagogy is that it requires teachers start by listening and observing students' language-in-practice to create content that better represents their needs and builds off their prior knowledge (Canagarajah, 2011; García, 2011; Ahn et al., 2021; David et al., 2021). David et al.'s (2021) study observed multilingual word walls and literature discussion groups as two activities which encouraged student engagement and increased teachers' knowledge about students in grades 6-12. Eliciting translations of key concepts from students and displaying those translations around the room helped the teacher to better understand refugee students' home languages while it also allowed students to think more deeply about the meaning of each concept (pp. 5-7). Discussion of literature, presented in the languages of students' home countries and communities, also offered opportunities for them to access prior linguistic knowledge and better understand the texts (David et al., 2021). Although a physical "word wall" may not be as age-appropriate for university students, discussion groups certainly are, and both activities could be easily adapted according to the context of the lesson. Inviting multilingual students to provide translations of key concepts to their home languages, when relevant, and providing multilingual or translated texts, when available, can provide opportunities for certain students to exhibit their prior knowledge while others may learn from it.

García and Leiva's (2014) case study presented similar benefits from a different activity in an English Language Arts classroom where Spanish-speaking, newly-arrived immigrants were the majority. Here, the presentation of a (bilingual) Mexican rap video about immigrant rights and deportation crackdowns by ICE sparked critical conversations among 9th and 10th grade students around histories previously underrepresented in this context, though familiar due to

lived experiences. The discursive functions of translanguaging in this discussion included participation, elaboration of ideas, and the raising of questions (p. 210). Discussing the video as a class, using a translanguaged combination of Spanish and English, allowed those students less fluent in English to express their ideas and engage with the material at the same level as those with higher proficiencies in English, where they otherwise would have been silenced (García & Leiva, 2014). In a majority "monolingual" college classroom, where some students nevertheless may be more proficient in Standard English than others, using materials that incorporate home languages or nonstandard varieties can provide opportunities for those less proficient in Standard English to activate prior knowledge about that dialect and share it with peers and instructors.

Activating prior linguistic knowledge is equally feasible and important for monolingual students as it is for multilingual students. Bucholtz et al. (2014) describe "emphasizing the shared history of nearly all U.S. residents as either members or descendants of linguistically minoritized groups of one kind or another" as an important perspective for engaging white youth, "who often feel either resentful of or excluded by educational programs with multicultural goals" (Bucholtz, 2011 as cited in Bucholtz et al., 2014, p. 150). While translanguaging research is currently heavily geared towards multilingual populations, the theory itself is fundamentally inclusive of monolingual individuals who, like multilinguals, possess a "unified linguistic repertoire" (Garcia, 2011). Despite the outside "societal view" of monolinguals having only one language, there is a rich bank of slang words, jargon, registers, dialects, accents, colloquialisms, and styles that they may also have access to, often without realizing it. Achieving greater awareness of this intrinsic diversity is the goal of professional development programs like the ones mentioned earlier (Dunstan et al., 2014; Reaser et al., 2017), but when targeted at students, such programs can also have a significant positive effect. One program established at the

University of California, Santa Barbara in 2010 named "The School Kids Investigating Language in Life and Society" (SKILLS) program is a prime example. Through this program, graduate teaching fellows and undergraduate mentors partner with local schools to implement curriculum based on the five tenets of sociolinguistic justice, which range from valorizing students' diverse language practices to recognizing their potential for linguistic expertise. Bucholtz et al. (2014) described one student researcher from this program, "who was often positioned as a problematic student within the context of the school, [but] emerged as one of the most knowledgeable and insightful participants in the SKILLS program" (p. 151). Through his presentation of a student-driven slang research project, "he was able to share considerable linguistic and cultural expertise of a type not usually valued by schools" and the "formerly disengaged student enthusiastically and successfully pursued higher education after his experience in the class" (Bucholtz et al., 2014, p. 151).

Identity Construction & Expression

The activation of prior knowledge and recognition of the students' expertise are key factors that allow for individuals to build confidence in their identities and increase their comfort levels in and out of the classroom. Rossiers et al.'s (2018) study comparing the functions, purpose, and effects of translanguaging in multilingual and monolingual classrooms in Belguim found the practice to have socioemotional functions in both settings (Brussels and Oudenaarde, respectively). For the school in Brussels, Standard Dutch was the de jure language of instruction, and instances of interlingual translanguaging represented deviation away from that norm. Teachers and students in Oudenaarde, on the other hand, primarily used an informal regional dialect of Dutch as the de facto language in most contexts, and any instances of intralingual translanguaging therefore represented a return to the officially sanctioned, standardized norm.

Despite this key difference across settings, the ways that translanguaging functioned in each school were similar, facilitating students' socio-emotional recognition of authority and peer figures, allowing for fluid navigation of peer and pupil identities, and shaping teachers' attitudes towards students to offer better socio-emotional support. It was only in the multilingual context, however, that translanguaging provided pedagogical support in addition to socio-emotional benefits (Rossiers et al., 2018). This suggests that further research is needed in a setting where translanguaging is both primarily intralingual and represents a deviation from the prescribed language of instruction, to see if deviation from the dominant variety may also facilitate learning.

Other studies in primarily multilingual settings have reinforced the concept of translanguaging promoting positive identity construction and expression. Drawing from students' recorded discourse in García and Leiva's (2014) previously mentioned study, it was found that the translanguaged discussion of a multilingual rap video allowed for the establishment of a Latinx pan-ethnicity in the classroom which transcended the national differences among high school freshmen and sophomores (García & Leiva, 2014). It created an "in-between space" where "new realities […] offer possibilities of being released from subjugation," as demonstrated by the teacher's question, posed to the class: "Latinos are we the majority or the minority?" The mixed responses "mayoría" and "minority" create an unresolved tension, shifting perspective away from the dominant and dominated views, towards a newly emerging combination of the two, a space where transnational individuals could exist without having to adhere to one side or the other (pp. 211-12).

Positive identity construction was observed on a more personal level in Ríos' (2016) 12th-grade Chican@/Latin@ literature class in Pomona, CA. Here, the instructor's presentation of *La Panza Monologues* served as a translanguaging model for students, who, when encouraged

to write their own multilingual monologues, demonstrated "unwavering cultural and linguistic pride" (p. 78). One student wrote, in Spanish, "my braid is the one thing I have always felt was most powerful about me. It's thick and strong. My mom has a braid that to her waist, just like my grandma. It's a symbol of the strength, storytelling, and wisdom of the women in my family" (p. 78). Other students wrote personal stories of heartbreak, deportations, and family members' sacrifices, mostly in English, with Spanish words added supplementarily. Despite what language they chose to use in their writings, the initial presentation of both "home" and "school" languages in the same space invited them to write from a more intimate and expressive place.

Adapting such an activity to a college classroom made up of more diverse backgrounds could involve a rotation of materials incorporating the home languages of multiple students, an invitation for students to bring in their own materials, or a strategic selection of texts to resonate with students' experiences. This third approach was the one taken in an English Language Arts classroom of a New York City high school, where Seltzer et al. (2016) observed:

> "though the poems were written in English, save two Spanish phrases, we thought that their connections to students' own experiences would open the door to translanguaging. This was indeed the case. Having so much to say about the texts pushed students to use all of their linguistic resources to "talk back" to the poems and make their ideas understood to one another and to us. Once they were engaged in translanguaging, students were able to do more with the English texts than they could have done if they had only used their emerging English" (p. 146).

Regardless of the precise structure of the activity or demographic make-up of the classroom, students appear to react well to having their natural language practices deemed worthy of academic use and recognition. The challenge, which is underrepresented in the literature, is how to work with and support students' language practices when they vary across both dialectal and discrete language boundaries. We will return to this issue in the "Engagement with Sociolinguistic Justice" section, after first looking at the demonstrated benefits of empathy, critical literacy, and collaboration.

Empathy, Critical Literacy, and Collaboration

The theme of increased critical thinking and empathy can be found in Ríos' (2016) qualitative analysis of students' monologues, where students followed the model shown to them and related their lived experiences to those of others through fluid language use. *La Panza Monologues,* the translanguaged performance initially shown to the class, centers on themes of obesity, body image, feminism, LGBTQ struggles, anti-immigrant sentiments, and lack of access to organic foods and recreational parks. After watching the performance in class, one student claimed, "I know what Vicki is saying. Our bodies carry pain and need to be free [...] You know free to be who you are, who you want to be without fear. I have dreams but sometimes they controlled by society, by men" (p. 78). Having the voice of someone with a similar identity presented in the room allowed for the student to better grasp the societal issue of sexism and harmful body image expectations, as they related to her ethnicity, language, gender, and culture. The activity revealed the important role of translanguaging in helping students empathize with others as a crucial step towards thinking critically and investing in solutions to societal issues. Students went on to research the issues presented in the performance by gathering information from both Spanish and English-language websites to create Prezi presentations on the topics.

Lau's (2020) action research study in a Quebec elementary school classroom also emphasized this link between translanguaging, empathy, and the development of critical literacy skills. A class of 43 students from grades 4 to 6 was co-taught by an English Language Arts teacher (ELA) and a French as a Second Language (FSL) teacher, each of whom simultaneously wove their target language into class discussions about migration and refugee resettlement. Lau's (2020) qualitative analysis showed how creating a multimodal, multilingual, and multisensory experience for students allowed them to empathize with the refugee experience through the use

of French, English, and artistic expression. Through translanguaging, the co-teachers encouraged students to focus on political discourse around migration rather than the precise language used.

Lau (2020) observed translanguaging to create not only meaning-driven discussions in the classroom, but also a space for collaborative learning where students could help one another develop the weaker of their two languages. This strand of collaboration was beautifully demonstrated when a fourth grader declared, "I like it [English-French connection] coz if there is a word in English that I do not know how to say in French then…" and their classmate finished the sentence, "then you ask me" (p. 52). Duarte's (2019) study across German 10th grade classrooms also revealed that translanguaging, while rare, functioned in peer-to-peer interactions as a form of "exploratory talk in which knowledge is shared and interlocutors critically build upon one another's ideas" (p. 162). Video-recorded interactions from this study demonstrated that on-task instances of translanguaging were just as common as off-task ones, with no noticeable difference in proportions for monolingual and translanguaged interactions. Results went against the common misconception that translanguaging occurs between peers only in off-task discussions, instead proving its relevance in collaborating to understand instructions and complete tasks (Duarte, 2019).

Engagement with Social and Sociolinguistic Justice

Shifting away from the "dominant school narrative structure" (Metz & Knight, 2021) towards a critical, linguistically-informed pedagogy requires a recognition of both social and sociolinguistic justice as major goals for teachers and learners. Bucholtz et al. (2014) define sociolinguistic justice as "self-determination for linguistically subordinated individuals and groups in sociopolitical struggles over language" (p. 145). This definition reconceptualizes "language rights" as not predetermined or government-ordained, but rather "contextually

emergent from individual community members' own (often differing) priorities" (p. 145). According to Bucholtz et al. (2016), it is achieved through grassroots efforts and practice rather than policy, and it encompasses five major (linguistic) goals: linguistic valorization, legitimation, inheritance, access, and expertise. The SKILLS program in Santa Barbara County, CA has been designed around a curriculum which works towards these goals, and is therefore a useful model to examine in relation to translanguaging pedagogy. Though not explicitly described as such, it has much in common with the previously discussed translanguaging applications, namely its encouragement of students to use non-dominant languages and varieties in the academic setting. It therefore provides useful insight into the barriers that may arise in implementing a translanguaging pedagogy, particularly among student communities more diverse than the bilingual ones where translanguaging has more commonly been observed.

In their work towards the first goal, valorizing language varieties by promoting the use of minority languages in the classroom, Bucholtz et al. (2016) report that SKILLS students acknowledged "feelings of vulnerability in using the language, either because of their own linguistic insecurity as speakers of non-normative varieties [...] or because of the ideological clash involved in using such a politicized and racialized language in the 'white public space'" (p. 33). Similarly, at a SKILLS partner site serving local members of the Chumash Indian tribe, Bucholtz et al. (2016) reported, "some students we worked with were eager to learn the tribal language through after-school classes with community elders, while others felt stereotyped and constrained by discussions of their Native heritage" (p. 34). These mixed responses reveal the dangers of essentializing students' cultures and identities and evokes the importance of a bottom-up approach which allows them to explore their own linguistic interests, "even when these diverge considerably from our own initial expectations and plans" (Bucholtz et al., 2016, p.

34). Despite the undeniable barriers in implementing a pedagogy which seeks to resist dominant educational ideologies, surveys conducted by SKILLS researchers reveal that compared to their peers, high school students in SKILLS enter college at higher rates and "report feeling more prepared for college in a range of areas, as well as having a greater knowledge of and appreciation for their own and others' linguistic and cultural backgrounds" (p. 36).

Anecdotes from the SKILLS program reveal potential barriers and benefits for a pedagogy explicitly designed around sociolinguistic justice, but studies on translanguaging in more traditional classroom settings have also resulted in open conversations around societal injustices. García and Leiva's (2014) study in a high school English Language Arts classroom (mentioned earlier) observed the translanguaged conversation of the whole class around a Spanish-English rap video which broached sensitive topics of immigration, ICE, deportation, and xenophobia. Another study by Ríos and Seltzer (2017) revealed emergent themes of resistance to monolingual norms through translanguaging in two New York City classrooms, one taught by a bilingual, Mexican teacher, and another by a monolingual, white teacher. While the monolingual teacher could not demonstrate translanguaging in her instruction in the same way that the bilingual teacher did, her presentation of translanguaging through spoken word videos, as well as metalinguistic discussion around language practices, invited students to explore the intersections of language with identity and power. As a result, both bilingual and monolingual teachers "were able to leverage students' bilingualism through student-centered, culturally sustaining curricula," and both "created literacy units that paired translingual texts with critiques of linguistic colonization to mobilize students' racial, ethnic, and linguistic social worlds towards the center of their writing" (p. 69).

Although fewer studies have been done at the undergraduate level and/or among white

monoglossic students, Brown (2020) describes a college writing studies classroom where English was the sole "lingua franca" and "communicative ether" for students, yet metalinguistic discussions of translingualism and the SRTOL Resolution, as well as the presentation of hip-hop texts, helped to decentralize whiteness in the classroom (p. 600). When presenting the class with a quote from rapper Jay-Z's book *Decoded*, one student was drawn to the word "cuz," claiming it invalidated the writer's argument because "the majority of people" would dismiss his ideas after seeing the misspelled word (p. 598). Brown (2020) highlights this moment as a derailed attempt to center a lesson on a Black community's literacy practices. However, it also reveals the steep learning curve faced by a student when presented with materials outside the dominant norm. Brown's (2020) choice to intervene and "make visible the whiteness of that 'majority of people' who determines whether or not someone's writing or spelling is valuable" may or may not have led to the student's rethinking of his argument, but it did, nevertheless, broach the topic of racial privilege (p. 599). Although not explicitly referred to as translanguaging pedagogy in the article, this use of non-standard "hip hop texts" in the classroom, complemented by critical discussion of race, is a practical example of how students who don't typically translanguage may be challenged to reassess their attitudes towards language variation when faced with a pedagogy geared towards sociolinguistic justice.

Expansion of Rhetorical Strategies & Plurilingual Competence

One common misconception about translanguaging pedagogy is the idea that since translanguaging is a naturally occurring practice, it does not need to be "taught" – at least not to bi- or multi- lingual students. In reality, the translanguaging approach demands that texts reflect a broad variety of rhetorical strategies, not only to spark critical discussions around language and social justice, but also to serve as models for students' own writing and literacy development.

García's (2011) *biliteracy workshop* model, for example, has the explicit aim of expanding literacy by providing multimodal texts in various languages and scripts (p. 354). Nevertheless, this model remains restrictive in its focus on bilingual educational contexts and lack of specific writing assignments representing more than two or three majority languages. At the same time, studies on translanguaging in subject area classrooms have focused exclusively on rhetorical strategies for nonstandard varieties of English, with little or no consideration of non-native speakers' other languages (Alim, 2007; Paris & Alim, 2014; Brown, 2020). The question remains of how to represent, support, and assess the development of students' full scope of linguistic skills, which may range from Standard English to non-standard varieties of English and from foreign languages to all the nonstandard variations therein.

One study has been conducted by Canagarajah (2011) which takes a microanalyatical approach to one graduate student's "codemeshing" in writing. Canagarajah (2011) warns against idealizing multilingual students' language use as already sufficient and instead proposes a "practice-based model": one that encourages students to build upon their existing language practices in order to become more effective communicators. This approach broadens the focus of translanguaging from spoken communication alone to also consider rhetorical strategies when writing. Ethnographic data from Canagarajah's (2011) study included multiple drafts of a graduate-level Saudi Arabian student's literacy narrative, which she revised throughout the course. Each draft was marked with Canagarajah's queries and the student Butainah's responses about her own rhetorical choices. The four major strategies that emerged from the data were as follows: (1) recontextualization: assessing the rhetorical situation and framing one's language accordingly, (2) voicing: employing the "microecology" of the text to aid interpretation through formatting, typeface, font, and emojis, (3) interaction: use of parentheticals, questions, and

delayed or omitted translations to negotiate meaning with the audience, and (4) textualization: a performative process which focuses on content before form (Canagarajah, 2011, pp. 404-13). This analysis represents a crucial step forward in the development of an applicable translanguaging pedagogy at the university level because it reveals the multitude of nuanced choices involved in translanguaging and how those may be broken down, named, improved upon, and assessed in writing. Beyond implications for assessment, the participant herself reported that the flexible assignment "enabled her to 'play' with writing and adopt creative and bold strategies of experimentation" (p. 415).

Though the benefits of multilingualism are now frequently discussed in scholarly studies, the continued emphasis on named languages as singular, isolated linguistic systems may prevent so-called "monolinguals" from ever achieving those advantages. Among those cited by García (2011) are metalinguistic awareness, divergent thinking, communicative sensitivity, heightened ability to learn languages, socioeconomic benefits, maximized global and local interactions, potentialized identity expression, and cultural awareness (pp. 93-94). In other words, the benefits of multilingualism are the basic requirements of active participation in a post-global society. If multilingualism remains an exceptional quality that may only be achieved through travel, foreign language study, or displacement, a large portion of American society will continue to lack the resources to do so, while others continue to fight for their basic right to be heard. García (2011) and Canagarajah (2013) discuss the synonymous concepts of "plurilingual competence," "plurilingualism," and "translingual practice" as covetable skills that can and should be developed by anyone using language to communicate in today's world (p. 54; p. 6). García (2011) points out that whereas plurilingual competence has been taught in European contexts as a positive trait, the same sort of hybrid language use has typically been neglected in American

schools (p. 54). More research is needed to address the potential of translanguaging pedagogy to expand multilingual students' rhetorical effectiveness while simultaneously developing monolingual students' plurilingual competence, within the same educational context.

Summary

Translanguaging theory posits that each individual is endowed with a unified linguistic repertoire from which we draw resources when constructing meaning, and that institutional attempts to limit or separate aspects of that repertoire may also limit individuals' ability to learn. Incorporating translanguaging pedagogy into the classroom involves a teacher's careful assessment of internal biases towards monoglossic pedagogies and the willingness to take a bottom-up approach.

Existing literature on language and literacy in K-12 ESL and dual-language programs, K-12 subject area classrooms, and American and EMI universities reveals the need for a pedagogical approach that better integrates and builds upon the skills of English language learners and users of non-standard English varieties in order to avoid the continued isolation, racialization, and deficit-based discourse towards those students. The literature also demonstrates the potential of translanguaging and closely related pedagogies to activate both monolingual and multilingual students' prior knowledge, empower them in their language use, allow them to grow in empathy, critical literacy, and collaboration, promote their engagement with social and sociolinguistic justice, expand their rhetorical knowledge, and develop their plurilingual competence.

The majority of the literature on translanguaging pedagogies has been geared towards multilingual populations, but the theory itself is inclusive and applicable to monolingual students, as well. Therefore, more research is needed to bridge the emerging body of

translanguaging research with existing studies on dialect variation in U.S. schools. Both bodies of research support the centering of students' language-in-practice and promote bottom-up approaches rather than top-down pedagogies. Both bodies of research also focus on addressing social and sociolinguistic injustices, which, according to Metz & Knight (2021), involves establishing a new, critical narrative around language use in education. Research is therefore needed that centers on both mono- and multi- lingual students' informed perspectives on translanguaging in the college classroom, with the aim of identifying shared critical entry points into a new narrative around language use in education. Finally, most of the literature discussed has focused on the perspectives of students and teachers at K-12 levels where state curriculum standards and college admissions requirements pose a significant barrier to implementing linguistically-inclusive pedagogies. Research which incorporates the perspectives of university students may reveal more nuanced ideas about language as participants' ideas of success will be relatively unhindered by those institutional barriers.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

The study took place on the University of North Carolina Charlotte campus. Because the principal researcher was also the course instructor for the participants involved, the entire body of data and results comes from an emic perspective. As a teaching assistant in the Department of English, I designed and led a course for undergraduate students which fulfilled liberal studies requirements in the general education program (LBST 2101) and addressed various sociolinguistics concepts, including language change and variation, global Englishes, and language policy in the U.S. My pedagogical approach was grounded in translanguaging as a practice-based theory, meaning that I sought to maintain an open space for students to feel confident using their natural language practices, encouraging them to draw on multiple grammars from within their larger repertoire wherever possible. When it came to their written work, it was explicitly stated throughout the course that audience design and rhetorical effect should be prioritized over Standard English grammar rules. When giving students feedback on their writing, I did not point out or correct any grammatical "errors," but instead focused on the content of their work, the organization of their ideas, and the structuring and support of their arguments. If students mentioned learning or knowing other languages in their written coursework, I probed them to provide more specific examples and to elaborate on the phonological, morphological, syntactical, lexical, semantic, and pragmatic elements of those phrases, in an effort to increase their metalinguistic awareness. Due to the fact that I myself am monolingual and speak Standard English as my primary dialect, I was limited in my ability to model translanguaging in the classroom. I instead had to rely upon external sources to introduce the concept to students; this involved introducing texts (written and audiovisual) such as Jamila Lyiscott's "3 Ways to Speak English," Gloria Anzaldúa's *Borderlands,* Geneva Smitherman's

Talkin' and Testifyin', Vershawn Ashanti Young's essay, "Should Writers Use They Own Language," and documentaries from NC State's Language & Life Project, all of which demonstrate translanguaging in action. The course also involved in-class discussions, journals, and written assignments that encouraged students to critically reflect on language use in their lives, as well as the real and potential effects of language policy on various communities.

Research Questions

The research questions to guide this study are as follows:

> RQ 1: What are the perceived advantages, risks, and barriers to embracing a translanguaging pedagogy in a classroom where Standard English is the default?
>
> RQ 2: How do students respond to the incorporation of diverse language practices into a classroom where Standard English is the lingua franca?
>
> RQ3: How does translanguaging pedagogy in a majority monolingual setting impact college students' perceptions of their own lived experiences?

Research Participants

Voluntary participants for this study were recruited based on the following eligibility criteria: undergraduate students at UNC Charlotte, 18 years or older, and enrolled in LBST 2101 Section 111 for the fall 2022 semester. Recruitment of research participants took place in person during the first week of the fall semester in Fretwell 202. Because I was simultaneously instructor of the course and principal investigator for the study, faculty advisor Dr. Elizabeth Miller took my place in the classroom and followed a verbal script for the recruitment session. This was to help avoid unintended biases or undue influence on students' choices. Students were given the opportunity to voluntarily participate or decline to participate in one of four tiers of the study. Those who voluntarily agreed to participate in Tiers One, Two, Three, or Four all

completed pre-course surveys, and those who were present in November also completed

end-of-course surveys, including the questions below:

1. Which of the following do you consider yourself to be?

   - (monolingual, bidialectal, bilingual, multilingual, or other)

2. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

   - The best way for people from diverse backgrounds to communicate effectively in an American college classroom is by using the same variety of Standard English.

   - All students' languages and varieties of English should be valued and represented in university coursework.

3. Do you think it is mostly helpful or harmful to read, watch, and listen to texts that mix languages or varieties of English in a university classroom?

4. Do you think it is mostly helpful or harmful to allow students to mix languages or varieties of English in university classroom discussions?

5. Do you think it is mostly helpful or harmful to allow students to mix languages or varieties of English in university writing assignments?

6. What do you think are some of the risks or disadvantages of mixing languages in the college classroom?

7. What do you think are some benefits of mixing languages in the college classroom?

Consent forms, pre-course surveys, and end-of-course surveys were collected, sealed, and stored in Dr. Elizabeth Miller's office, where they remained until the end of the semester to ensure that no unintended biases in grading or conduct resulted from students' choices. The four options for participation included: Tier One - survey participation only; Tier Two - survey and coursework submission; Tier Three - survey, coursework, and reflection submission, and Tier

Four - survey, coursework, and reflection submission, plus a follow-up interview. Twenty-five total students agreed to participate in the study: seven at Tier One, two at Tier Two, ten at Tier Three, and six at Tier Four. I did not have access to consent forms until after the close of the fall semester and submission of final grades; at that point I removed identifying information from the surveys, assignments, and reflections of those students who consented to participate in the study. I then reached out to those students who agreed to participate at Tier Four and conducted follow-up interviews with them during the month of February, 2023.

Data Collection

Part of the methodology for data collection was inspired by Canagarajah's (2011) ethnographic classroom study, where qualitative data was collected from language-focused assignments similar to the ones assigned in this course. Data collected for this study came from coursework that participants were already required to submit as part of the course. This data mainly included Canvas discussion posts, in-class journal assignments, and digital annotations made on weekly readings through the social learning platform Perusall. Some data was also drawn from the two major assignments for the course: a language and literacy reflection and an investigative research paper on language policy. Data was triangulated through comparison of emergent codes and themes from multiple source types: survey answers, journal assignments, annotations on assigned readings, longer written assignments, and interview transcripts.

The purpose of the follow-up semi-structured interviews was to ensure, as much as possible, that no participants' words were misconstrued or taken too far out of context. The particular follow-up questions asked in each interview varied depending on each participant's field of study and the nature of the data drawn from their coursework. The main questions posed were as follows:

1. Here are some of the meaningful excerpts around translanguaging that I selected from your coursework. Is there anything that you feel should not be shared as data or is not properly de-identified? Is there anything that you would like to explain further?

2. Describe the language you used to communicate with your instructor (me) in and your peers in LBST 2101.

3. What did you feel was expected of you in terms of written work in LBST 2101, and did these expectations differ from those of other courses? How did these expectations affect your writing process?

4. Taking a look at the survey questions you answered, do you remember if/how any of your answers may have shifted over the course of the semester?

5. The most common risk and benefit associated with translanguaging on the surveys were miscommunication and broadened perspectives, respectively. Thinking about your own classes at UNC Charlotte, do you think it's possible and worthwhile to overcome the issues of miscommunication that may arise from incorporating diverse langauge practices into the classroom?

6. Is there anything else you would like to add about your experience as a student in LBST 2101, your language use in college, or the topic of translanguaging in general?

Data Analysis

Most of the data collected was qualitative, but a small portion drawn from survey multiple choice questions was also quantitative. Participants' (anonymous) answers to each multiple choice question were logged into a spreadsheet and aggregate results from the pre-course surveys were compared to aggregate results from the end-of-course surveys. Qualitative data analysis was a much more extensive process. Methodology for the qualitative

data analysis involved inductive thematic analysis that sought to draw themes by observing

patterns across emergent codes (Clarke & Braun, 2016). The qualitative analysis software NVivo

was used as a tool to aid in this process, which remained largely researcher-driven and reliant

upon the researcher's emic observations. During the spring of 2023, all surveys, course

assignments, reflections, and interview transcripts were compiled and uploaded into NVivo. Each

file type was analyzed separately, revealing a different set of codes for each. Because the surveys

and interviews directly asked participants for their thoughts on translanguaging in the college

classroom, codes from these two file types represent more explicit rationales for the stances

revealed in the quantitative data. The emergent codes from surveys were then used as a reference

point for thematic analysis of all other file types, in order to see to what extent those beliefs were

reinstated, complexified, and/or contradicted in other contexts throughout the course. The top

two most frequent codes from the surveys were shared with interviewees to gain more nuanced

insight into commonly shared beliefs.

Summary

The next chapter details the results in three main sections. The Quantiative Results

section presents participants' answers to multiple choice survey questions and interviewees'

explanations of if, how, or why their answers to those questions may have changed over the

course of the semester. The Qualitative Results section is split into three parts: Stance-taking &

Rationales, Responses to Translanguaged Texts, and Re-emergence of Earlier Themes. The first

section details the full range of themes that emerged from open-ended survey questions in

relation to RQ1, and explores interview responses that reinstated, contradicted, and complexified

those themes. The second section details the emergent themes from students' responses to two

translanguaged texts, in order to address RQ2. The third and final section illustrates some

recurring themes through more nuanced, individual examples, in an effort to provide some

insight around RQ3. Findings in response to all three research questions, as well as limitations to

the study and directions for further research, are summarized in the final chapter.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Quantitative Results

Quantitative results from this study were limited due to the variable presence of

participants and the required anonymity of their surveys. In a class of 25 students where all

students consented to survey collection, all 25 were present for the pre-course surveys and 19

were present for the end-of-course surveys. The frequency of responses for each multiple choice

survey question is shown as both a numeric and percentage value according to the total number

of students present that day. Responses from the pre-course survey are compared in the aggregate

to those of the end-of-course survey. Individual changes in stance-taking or perspective will be

discussed in the qualitative analysis section. All survey responses to the multiple choice

questions are listed below, with a short description following each data set:

Table 1.1 Participant Language Identification

QUESTION 1	Pre-Course Survey			Post-Course Survey		
Identity	**#**	**Total**	**Percent**	**#**	**Total**	**Percent**
Monolingual	21	25	84.00%	13	19	68.42%
Bidialectal	1	25	4.00%	3	19	15.79%
Bilingual	3	25	12.00%	3	19	15.79%
Multilingual	0	25	0.00%	0	19	0.00%
Other	0	25	0.00%	0	19	0.00%

Although the overall number of participants decreased from the pre-course to end-of-course
surveys, two more students identified as bidialectal by the end of the course. The number of
participants identifying as bilingual and multilingual remained consistent: three bilingual and zero
multilingual at both the beginning and end of the course. The number of monolingual participants
decreased from 21 to 13, indicating that most, if not all, students who were absent for the
end-of-course survey were those who initially identified as monolingual.

Table 1.2 Role of Standard English

QUESTION 2	The best way for people from diverse backgrounds to communicate effectively in an American university classroom is by using the same variety of (Standard) English.					
	Pre-Course Survey			**Post-Course Survey**		
Stance	#	Total	Percent	#	Total	Percent
Agree	8	25	32.00%	6	19	31.58%
Disagree	7	25	28.00%	8	19	42.11%
Neutral	10	25	40.00%	5	19	26.32%

Responses to Question 2 remained somewhat evenly split, with two fewer students agreeing, one more student disagreeing, and five fewer taking neutral stances by the end of the course.

Table 1.3 Attitudes Toward Linguistic Inclusivity

QUESTION 3	All students' languages and varieties of English should be valued and represented in university coursework.					
	Pre-Course Survey			**Post-Course Survey**		
Stance	#	Total	Percent	#	Total	Percent
Agree	16	25	64.00%	16	19	84.21%
Disagree	0	25	0.00%	2	19	10.53%
Neutral	9	25	36.00%	1	19	5.26%

Responses to Question 3 remained somewhat consistent, with more students agreeing rather than disagreeing at both the beginning and end of the course. The number of students agreeing remained consistent at sixteen, while the number of students in disagreement increased from zero to two, and the number of students taking a neutral stance decreased from nine to one.

Table 1.4 Classroom Texts

QUESTION 4	Do you think it is mostly helpful or harmful to read, watch, and listen to texts that mix languages or varieties of English in a university classroom?					
	Pre-Course Survey			**Post-Course Survey**		
Stance	#	Total	Percent	#	Total	Percent
Mostly helpful	17	25	68.00%	13	19	68.42%
Mostly harmful	0	25	0.00%	0	19	0.00%
Neither helpful/harmful	8	25	32.00%	6	19	31.58%

No participants found the exposure to translanguaged course material "mostly harmful." By the end of the course, two fewer students were neutral on this issue.

Table 1.5 Classroom Discussions

QUESTION 5	Do you think it is mostly helpful or harmful to allow students to mix languages or varieties of English in university classroom discussions?					
	Pre-Course Survey			**Post-Course Survey**		
Stance	#	Total	Percent	#	Total	Percent
Mostly helpful	19	25	76.00%	13	19	68.42%
Mostly harmful	0	25	0.00%	0	19	0.00%
Neither helpful/harmful	6	25	24.00%	6	19	31.58%

No participants found translanguaging in discussions "mostly harmful." By the end of the course, six fewer students found it "mostly helpful." The number of neutral stances remained the same.

Table 1.6 Writing Assignments

QUESTION 6	Do you think it is mostly helpful or harmful to allow students to mix languages or varieties of English in university writing assignments?					
	Pre-Course Survey			**Post-Course Survey**		
Stance	#	Total	Percent	#	Total	Percent
Mostly helpful	16	25	64.00%	8	19	42.11%
Mostly harmful	4	25	16.00%	6	19	31.58%
Neither helpful/harmful	5	25	20.00%	5	19	26.32%

Eight fewer students found translanguaging in written course assignments to be "mostly helpful" by the end of the course, with two more students finding it "mostly harmful." The number of students neutral on this issue remained consistent.

Looking at individual participants' answers to Questions 2 (on the role of SAE in the college classroom) and Question 3 (on the need for linguistic inclusivity in the college classroom) in combination provides some insight into whether these two ideas were perceived by students as dichotomous or compatible, and how they might have seen this relation differently by

the end of the course. Individual surveys were examined to tally up students' answers to Questions 2 and 3 in combination, interpreting and connecting each combination to an associated language ideology, ranging from "No Stance" (neutral responses to both statements) to a "Translangauging Stance" (disagreeing with SAE as the best form of communication in the classroom and agreeing that all students' language practices should be represented). Tallies of each combination and associated ideology can be seen in Table 1.7 below:

Table 1.7 Language Ideologies

Combined Answers 2 & 3	Associated Ideology	Pre-Course Survey			Post-Course Survey		
		#	Total	Percent	#	Total	Percent
Neutral/Neutral	No Stance	4	25	16.00%	0	19	0.00%
Agree/Disagree	Upholding Standards	0	25	0.00%	2	19	10.53%
Agree/Neutral	Upholding Standards	4	25	16.00%	1	19	5.26%
Disagree/Neutral	Business as Usual	1	25	4.00%	0	19	0.00%
Agree/Agree	Prioritize Standard	4	25	16.00%	3	19	15.79%
Neutral/Agree	Towards Inclusivity	6	25	24.00%	5	19	26.32%
Disagree/Agree	Translanguaging Stance	6	25	24.00%	8	19	42.11%

The two most prevalent stances at the beginning of the course were "Towards Inclusivity" (neutral towards the role of SAE in the classroom yet supportive of linguistic inclusivity) and "Translanguaging Stance" (critical of the role of SAE in the classroom and supportive of linguistic inclusivity). By the end of the course, these two stances remained the most common, with a slight preference for the Translanguaging stance.

Follow-up Interviews: Survey Recall

Students who participated in follow-up interviews were presented with the same survey questions again, but this time asked to recall if, how, or why their responses may have changed over the course of the semester. Of the six students interviewed, three said their answers didn't change. Participants 2, 3, and 5 are the ones who claimed their answers did change. Specific responses from these three interviewees are quoted in Table 1.8 below:

Table 1.8 Follow-Up Interview Responses Detailing Change in Perspective

Participant	Themes	Quote
2	Broadened perspective	"I think that for some of the last questions where it was asking about like, is it helpful or harmful to have varieties? I think at first I might have been like, neutral and not really thought about it. Just because I speak standard English and I've always been in a school where that was taught. So to me it was kind of like, not something I thought about and I kind of had the impression as well with like, if you're speaking in a different dialect, [...] it might be considered improper, not grammatically correct. Not something that like a teacher would accept. And so to me, it wasn't really something I thought about, but then after the class, I think I definitely switched it if I didn't already have it to be mostly helpful because **we kind of learned more that there is grammar in all dialects and that it's not just one** and that it should be open for like, you know, interpretation and discussion and stuff like that."
3	Improved writing techniques	"Well, maybe my interpretation of standard English being the best way to communicate changed. I think that definitely changed, because, I mean, for me now, incorporating more languages in the classroom, it seems more beneficial rather than hurtful. Like on one hand, with standard American English, it's standard. Everybody can see it and understand what you're saying. But if language was a little bit different, it would help people more, because they would be able to diversify, and they would **get access to different people's writing styles**, and that would probably help them in the future."
5	Broadened perspective students' openness	"So all student languages and varieties of English should be valued and represented in university coursework. I put neither, I think. I don't remember what I put for the first time, but **I know I changed to neither helpful or harmful because I saw both sides for that** [...] I could see in a discussion, intelligent, thoughtful, fruitful discussion, people using different languages to make points or examples or maybe like how, in one language you have a word that means like a phrase, and they're like, this connects, whatever they can. It's applicable. So I see that. That's helpful. [...] The downside I guess, would be if it wasn't a very healthy discussion environment and someone flipped their religion and started cussing in random languages."

The first quote above demonstrates a growing awareness of dialect variation affecting a more open stance towards translanguaging in the college classroom. The second quote demonstrates a newfound consideration for variation in writing as an important skill for students to develop, and translanguaging as one way to gain exposure to that skill. The final quote above demonstrates a conflicted stance wherein translanguaging in discussion has the potential to either

accentuate "fruitful" discussions or exacerbate issues in an unhealthy environment. Though the particular interview responses varied, half of those interviewed expressed that their views changed, indicating that they had not been asked to consider this issue before taking the course.

Summary

The small sample size and relatively large drop in total participants did not allow for meaningful comparison when it came to longitudinal quantitative data analysis. Overall, however, it did show a decrease in participants taking neutral stances on some of the issues presented, particularly in response to Question 2 on the role of SAE in the college classroom, and Question 3 on the need for linguistic inclusivity in the college classroom. Combined analysis of these two survey questions revealed a minor overall movement away from neutrality or upholding standards, towards inclusivity and towards a translanguaging stance. Combined analysis of responses to Questions 4, 5, and 6 reveal that students remained open to translanguaging pedagogy in terms of exposure to translanguaged texts and translanguaging in class discussions, but have become less open to translanguaging in written coursework.

In the follow-up interviews where students were asked to recall or detail their change in perspective, responses by Participants 2 and 3 aligned with this overall shift towards inclusivity and translanguaging stances, while Participant 5's response showed a shift towards neutrality, or as he described it, a more balanced consideration of risks and advantages. Participant 3's comment on the value of translanguaging in writing details an outlying change in perspective, since most students demonstrated a decrease in acceptance for this practice on surveys. Because the issue is a complex one that students are only beginning to formulate opinions around, the triangulation of their perspectives across data types is all the more important in ensuring reliable interpretations. More nuanced insight into these stances will be discussed in the next section.

Qualitative Results

After analyzing the quantitative results from surveys, qualitative analysis was applied to the open-ended questions to see how and why participants took the aforementioned stances. The first round of coding led to the emergence of 3 broad categories: "advantages," "disadvantages," and "considerations." While "advantages" and "disadvantages" are self-explanatory, the "considerations" category was used to highlight places where participants appeared to be conflicted about the issue, weighing pros and cons, and/or placing conditions upon the effectiveness of translanguaging in the college classroom. After a second round of analysis, nine child codes (NVivo, released in October 2020) emerged from "advantages", eight from "disadvantages," and six from "considerations." These themes are described in Table 2.1 below, with the number of students expressing each theme listed on the right:

Table 2.1 Open-ended Survey Questions

Advantages	**Pre-course # Ss**	**End-of-course # Ss**
● broadened perspectives	11	10
● multilingual representation/expression	5	8
● language learning	6	4
● diversity/inclusivity	4	3
● improved student relations	2	3
● improved writing techniques	1	0
● improved use of context clues	1	0
● address discrimination	0	1
● higher engagement	1	0
Disadvantages	**Pre-course # Ss**	**End-of-course # Ss**
● miscommunication/confusion	11	15
● inconvenience/inefficiency	3	1
● unfair grading	1	2
● monolingual exclusion	2	1
● meet societal/workplace expectations	2	0
● concerns about writing	2	0
● importance of homogeneity	1	0
● student division	1	0
Considerations	**Pre-course # Ss**	**End-of-course # Ss**
● teacher's grading practices	3	2

● teacher's scaffolding	2	1
● persistence of language hierarchies	2	0
● depends on students' future field of work	1	0
● students' openness to linguistic diversity	1	0
● requires change in societal expectations	1	0

Six fewer student participants were present in class on the day that end-of-course surveys were collected, leading to a less diverse range of responses in the second survey. Twenty-two of the emergent themes were represented in pre-course surveys, while only 12 were represented in the end-of-course surveys. The relative popularity of these themes were mostly consistent from the beginning to the end of the course, however, with *miscommunication/confusion* and *broadening perspectives/awareness* as the two most popular overall themes. These two themes, as well as *multilingual representation/expression*, *inconvenience/inefficiency*, *monolingual exclusion*, *importance of homogeneity*, *teacher's scaffolding*, and *students' openness to linguistic diversity* later reemerged in students' coursework, as will be discussed in the "New and Re-emerging Themes in Coursework" section.

Follow-up Interviews: Dissecting Emergent Themes

The two themes representing the most commonly perceived advantage and risk to translanguaging in the classroom were used as a combined starting point to elicit further elaboration from interviewees. I asked interviewees to consider the classes they've taken in their fields of study, whether they thought translanguaging in those classes would help or hinder communication of the material, and whether learning about other languages and cultures would be a reasonable goal within that setting (see Interview Question #5 in the "Data Collection" section for general paraphrasing). Table 2.2 below includes quotes that reveal students' explicit stances on translanguaging in the college classroom and the corresponding themes that emerged in response to this question, most of which overlapped with those found on the surveys.

Table 2.2 Stance on Translanguaging in the College Classroom[2]

Participant	Codes	Quotes
Participant 1 Computer Science Major	<u>Disadvantages</u> Funding Inconvenience/ inefficiency Importance of homogeneity	"I guess if we really focused **funding** and stuff like that, on being more inclusive, and, you know, in a linguistic sense in the classroom, I'm sure it could happen. Would it be, like, a worthwhile thing to do? I'm of the opinion no. And the reason for that is just like **academic efficiency**, if you think like to go into a classroom, communicating in **one standard form**, you know, just specifically for the purpose of learning, I think is always going to be superior to using more than one just because it's an added layer of complexity that doesn't need to be there. [...] And it just gets to the point where *how much efficiency are we willing to sacrifice for the sake of inclusivity?*"
Participant 2 Criminal Justice Major	<u>Advantages</u> Broadened perspective <u>Considerations</u> Teacher's scaffolding Students' openness	"I didn't really care if people spoke a different way or a different dialect or like a different language but because it was like everybody was like just everybody spoke something different. Yeah. But I would never say that there was a problem of like, respect or it hurting anyone's like learning abilities. I think if anything, **it made us like more tolerant of other people in other cultures** and like I still think to this day that I have a little bit more of like an understanding for other cultures and stuff just because that's how I grew up" "...If there's going to be different dialects and stuff, **maybe at the beginning have an open conversation** [...] I think sometimes things get miscommunicated just in Standard English. [...] So I think that maybe having an **open line of communication** in that situation would definitely be important, but I definitely think it's possible to have different dialects in a classroom *in a respectful way in a respectful setting that wouldn't hinder anyone's learning abilities.*"
Participant 3 Mechanical Engineering Major	<u>Advantage</u> Workforce Preparation	"... here in college there is a lot more professors from international backgrounds. So you kind of get a different sense of, Okay, he's got a he's got a pretty distinct Russian accent. I am kind of having a little trouble understanding this, but **I'd rather do that now in college, when I can make mistakes rather than on like a job site in engineering where a mistake could cost a bunch of money or potentially harm somebody**. [...] *I'd rather take the risk now, when I'm learning what to do rather than when I should know what to do, and there's just a miscommunication.*"

---

[2] Boldface font is used in the excerpts above to show the parts of the text that were coded with the corresponding labels to the left. Italicized text highlights the participants' overall stance/rationale.

Participant 5 Special Education Major	<u>Considerations</u> Teacher's Scaffolding	"*I feel as an educator, you're meant to find out those things in your context clues with your students.* And first find the problem like what's the what's the issue? So, if I was in a classroom, and it's all that I'd say I'm like, Alright, what's the student messing up on what's getting them? **And then dissecting that specific issue down if it involves miscommunication**."
Participant 6 Psychology Major	<u>Advantages</u> Multilingual representation/ expression Workforce preparation Language learning <u>Disadvantage</u> Inefficiency/ Inconvenience Mis-communication	"I think in my field of study maybe past school, I think, yes, it would be helpful and conducive. I think right now maybe it's not the time but I am interested in and want to apply like using all of my dialects and stuff which I feel like it's **part of my identity**, right, in some way. **When I work with people or you know, clients**, yes, I think that it will definitely- I think it's been a positive, the course has been a positive like a seedling of like, you know, **expression** and you know, using all of my dialects and languages" "I think a lot of learning happens in discussion and [...] **how we learn a language, like using it in conversation and dialogues is like, helpful,** so I don't think that it would be- *I think it'd be good.*" "I guess I think it would kind of hinder now that I think about it. And probably that's why I don't use it or speak my different dialects and stuff. Um, I think it would take time away from learning the material in the sense of like, when things are due and stuff. [...] **I don't think that time allows for it.** [...] when we start to broaden the languages in which we speak, each of us, like I think that there's going to be **miscommunication,** and so that takes time to like talk through and stuff like that, and I just think that alongside or congruently with, like, schools' schedules and, you know, courses and papers and assignments have to be put in by a certain time and *I think it can't happen there.*"
Participant 7 Nursing Major	<u>Advantage</u> Autonomy/ freedom of expression Improved communication <u>Disadvantage</u> Meet Societal Expectations	"I've always been more of the mind that like I think **people should be able to communicate how like they feel fit**." "This might just be because of how I grew up, like I do think it is important to like know, the, like standard variety, but at the same time, like, I think it's important to also like, **be open and know how to communicate** with those who might not know [...] It's almost like a **societal expectation**. So that's why I said, like, you know, *I go back and forth because sometimes it's like, are you going to be super judged outside of the classroom when you speak like that*, you know, so, because that was like what was what I learned too it was like, oh, **people are gonna judge you if you speak a different type of way than them**."

As shown in Table 2.2, four new themes emerged from these responses: *workforce preparation*, *autonomy/freedom of expression*, and *improved communication* under "advantages" and *funding* under "disadvantages." The rest of the codes aligned with those found across the surveys: *broadened perspectives, multilingual representation/expression, language learning,* with no clear hierarchy among them.

Neutrality

Participant 5 remained indirect and did not provide an explicit stance on the issue. He considered the issue of miscommunication from the teacher's standpoint rather than the students', claiming it would be the teacher's responsibility to figure out each student's issue and resolve any miscommunication that might arise.

Upholding Standards

Participants 1 and 6 considered translanguaging in the classroom to represent a trade-off between efficiency and inclusivity. Participant 1 was direct and definitive in his stance: translanguaging would involve extra time and effort that would not be worth the reward. He also communicated an assumption that incorporating more language variety into the classroom would necessitate funding, although there was no opportunity to discuss this idea further. Participants 6 and 7 both used a lot of hedging as they oscillated between stances and considered the pros and cons of translanguaging in the college classroom. Participant 6 wavered back and forth between her desire to expand and express her own bilingual repertoire and the belief that doing so would be inefficient within a highly time-restrictive college setting. Her ultimate conclusion aligned more with the stance taken by Participant 1, that despite its numerous benefits, the miscommunications that would inevitably result from translanguaging in the classroom would make it an inefficient pedagogy.

Towards Inclusivity

It should be noted that Participant 6 came to this conclusion only after I probed her to think about translanguaging in more detail with respect to her current classes. Her initial response involved considerations of language learning and identity expression in terms of her field of study, claiming that "it would be helpful and conducive," but only in settings outside of school. Participant 7 also saw the broadening of linguistic perspectives as a highly relevant goal, but was hesitant to completely disavow the role of Standard English in education. She claimed that her association of Standard English with professionalism was tied to her homeschooling background and the way she was taught, growing up, that "people are gonna judge you if you speak a different type of way than them." She acknowledged that the effectiveness of translanguaging in higher education rests upon societal expectations.

Critical Translanguaging Stance

While all interviewees demonstrated an appreciation for the importance of cross-linguistic communication in general, only Participants 2 and 3 demonstrated a fully critical stance towards the role of Standard English in the college classroom. Participant 2 first discussed her past experience attending an international school in Germany where translanguaging was the norm. She believed that exposure to and participation in translanguaging made her a more tolerant person towards other cultures. In terms of translanguaging at UNC Charlotte, she emphasized the importance of "open lines of communication" between the instructor and students to foster a respectful learning environment if more than one dialect were to be used in the classroom. She saw the broadening of perspectives towards languages and cultures as a relevant goal for college education, but one that must be discussed intentionally and agreed upon by everyone involved. Participant 3, like Participant 1, was direct and definitive in his response.

He recognized dialect and accent variation at UNC Charlotte as a current reality and saw these cross-linguistic interactions as an important part of the learning process that would prepare him for success at his future workplace.

Complexifying Workplace Language Expectations

Apart from students' explicit stance-taking on translanguaging in the classroom, interviews also revealed students' views on translanguaging in the workplace. This connection was made explicitly by Participant 3, who described translanguaging as a useful skill to develop in college as a means of workplace preparation (see Table 2.2). Several other participants discussed their language use at work, as well, however, as shown in Table 2.3 below:

Table 2.3 Workplace Language Expectations

Participant & Workplace	Codes	Translanguaging at Work
Participant 1 Restaurant	Advantage Language learning Consideration Workplace expectations	"**It lends itself to both parties learning more effectively**, you know, like I'll be talking to one of them, and I'll ask a question in Spanish, and they'll respond to me in English, and vice versa. So like, they'll come to me, and they'll say, like, how old are you? And I'll say, like, I can't remember it's like viene dos or whatever, you know, but it's just like, when we do it like that. **It's just helping both of us kind of meet in the middle.** Yeah. It's really enjoyable for me it's like part one of the funnest parts we're going to work is talking to the kitchen."
Participant 5 Special Education Classroom	Consideration Workplace expectations	"*I can't really connect it to my classes, but I can connect it to my experiences in teaching*. But sometimes in Special Ed., language can be really tricky, not only with speaking language, sign language, all those gestures or features. [...] so they use **ASL** a lot, especially with nonverbal students [...] Or they can write them and then I've seen some that they'll only speak **Spanish** sometimes, but can understand English and their parents speak Spanish"
Participant 7 Hospital	Consideration Workplace expectations	"I've seen people speak a bunch of different dialects, a bunch of different languages, people come in and don't even know English. So I will say I think not knowing [Standard English], [...] with barriers like that, like in the past, you didn't have resources to go, like you didn't have Google and you didn't have like translator systems [...] and it was it was more challenging than I think it is now [...] In my

	Availability of resources	work experience, in my experience in general, I haven't experienced that as much where it's like, it really truly matters because either way, like **there's systems in place now, like where full communication is possible**. *No matter what language you're speaking, what dialect you're speaking, like, you're getting your point across.*"

Although all interviewees except for Participant 3 claimed that Standard English was the main language of instruction used in LBST 2101 and other classes at UNC Charlotte, all of those who discussed their workplace language use observed dialect and language variation at work. Participant 1 discussed how discussions of translanguaging in this course encouraged him to communicate more effectively with his Spanish-speaking coworkers. He framed translanguaging as a beneficial skill for his current workplace, a local restaurant in Charlotte, NC, albeit not relevant for his future career goals in the field of computer science. Participant 6 briefly mentioned working with clients when she was considering the positives of translanguaging, but did not elaborate further. Participant 3 did not discuss a current workplace, but predicted that he would need to navigate and understand various accents and dialects at his future job site. Participants 5 and 6 discussed translanguaging practices at work in a more neutral way, not proclaiming it to have any risks or benefits, but simply describing the linguistic setting. Participant 5 said that ASL and Spanish were commonly used languages at his teaching site, but that in his special education classes, "we've learned a little ASL. A little tiny bit. A little smidge. I mean, we don't really." Participant 7 discussed how the patients who come into the hospital where she works speak a variety of languages, stating that language barriers are an everyday occurrence that can be quickly resolved with the aid of technology. Participant 2 was the only one who did not mention or discuss her current or future workplace.

Stance-taking & Rationales

The most prominently perceived disadvantage of translanguaging in the classroom was *inefficiency/inconvenience* as was discussed in connection with *miscommunication/confusion*. Participants saw miscommunication as a natural result of translanguaging in the classroom, but one that could be overcome with enough time, effort, and potentially funding, devoted. Differences in stances had to do with whether or to what degree that process of overcoming linguistic barriers would be worthwhile in the classroom. Main considerations discussed by interviewees were *students' openness towards linguistic diversity*, *teachers' scaffolding,* and *workplace expectations*. Perceived advantages included *broadened perspectives*, *language learning*, *multilingual representation/expression, autonomy/freedom of expression*, and *workforce preparation*. One difference was that autonomy/freedom of expression was discussed generally in the interviews instead of specifically for multilingual students as it was discussed on surveys. Other themes which emerged from both surveys and interviews were the *importance of homogeneity* and *failure to meet societal expectations*. The most patterned difference was between the language use observed by interviewees in classroom settings and that observed or expected in workplace settings. This pattern contradicts the belief cited by two students on pre-course surveys that translanguaging would threaten students' abilities to meet workplace expectations. It also challenges the common perception of Standard English as the "professional" choice and complexifies its role in helping students achieve their career goals.

Responses to Translanguaged Course Material

After analyzing the overlapping stances and rationales expressed in surveys and interviews, a new round of thematic analysis was conducted on a small selection of coursework. The assignments I focused on for this round of analysis included student responses to two

translanguaged texts: Gloria Anzaldúa's "How to Tame a Wild Tongue" from *Borderlands/La Frontera* and Vershawn Ashanti Young's essay, "Should Writers Use They Own English?" Both of these texts explicitly express the importance of language variation with respect to identity, but each is rooted in a different rhetorical technique and geared towards a different audience. Anzaldúa's text is a personal and poetic reflection on the author's experiences with "linguistic terrorism" and her own bilingual language practice being demonized from both sides of her community. Young's text is less personal, and is instead a strategic argument geared towards scholars and educators advocating for the role of "codemeshing" in school settings. Each text challenges the standard language ideology by incorporating non-standard variation into their writing of a genre where it is not the prescribed norm.

After reading Anzaldúa's chapter, students completed a follow-up journal assignment where they were asked to describe how they made sense of the text which was written in both Spanish and English. For both readings, students made annotations on the texts through the Perusall annotation software, highlighting specific parts as they read to make comments, pose questions, and respond to classmates. For Young's essay, no follow-up assignment was given because students did not express difficulty understanding it in their annotations. The two subsets of data therefore include annotations and journal entries in response to Anzaldúa, and annotations alone in response to Young. The first round of coding for this data set focused on the ways in which students made sense of the texts. The codes which emerged from this round are shown in Table 3.2 below:

Table 3.2 Emergent Codes in Response to Translanguaged Texts

Text	Code Description	Code	# Students
Gloria Anzaldúa's "How to Tame a Wild Tongue" *Borderlands/La Frontera*	Skipped/didn't try to understand Spanish parts	(SKIP)	4
	Used prior knowledge and context clues to partially understand Spanish parts	(PART)	4
	Became lost or confused	(CONF)	3
	Used prior knowledge, context clues, & outside resources to fully understand the text	(FULL)	3
	Didn't think Spanish was needed to understand	(ENGL)	3
	Shared prior knowledge with others	(SHARE)	2
	Expressed ease of understanding	(EASE)	2
Vershawn Ashanti Young's "Should Writers Use They Own English?"	Minimized difference b/t Young's dialect & SAE, expressed ease of understanding	(EASE)	5
	Moved towards critical translanguaging stance (questioned role of SAE in classroom; challenged societal expectations for SAE)	(CRIT)	5
	Defended role of standard English in classroom; upheld prescriptive standards	(DEF)	4
	Remarked on authenticity of expression	(AUTH)	2
	Identified text as communicatively effective	(COMM)	2
	Noticed or described difference	(DESC)	1
	Became lost or confused	(CONF)	1
	Mimicked author's voice in writing	(APPRO)	1

A total of thirteen comments in response to Anzaldúa's text were coded, representing the views of eleven participants. Responses to Anzaldúa's text revealed eight students either skipping (SKIP) over the parts in Spanish or only partially (PART) understanding the Spanish segments, with three students expressing confusion (CONF) and two students remarking on their ease (EASE) of understanding. Three students reported using outside resources (i.e. Google Translate) to gain a full (FULL) understanding of the piece. Those students who skipped over the parts in Spanish, however, also claimed to have understood the text as a whole, implying that only the parts in English (ENGL) were needed for comprehension. This sentiment was expressed directly by a student who claimed, "the spanish was supplementary to the text, and as a book written in english I could only assume that understanding it was not essential to my

comprehension." Additional quotes for each code are exemplified in Table 3.3 below:

Table 3.3 Making Sense of Anzaldúa's Text[3]

Part. #	Codes	Example Quotes
12	(SKIP); (ENGL)	"Personally, I just **skipped** through the Spanish and only read the English. I tried to test my Spanish with the first Spanish sentence and gave up. [...] Although the majority of readers may be non-spanish speakers, they are still able to get most of what she wants to imply through her English. [...] so it proves the idea of how **u need to only know english or be very good at english to climb up the ladders of society**"
5	(CONF); (PART)	"I kinda got a little **confused** with all the Spanish. [...] I just tried to gather what she was trying to convey. I pretty much understood this as there were several dialects and all were spoken in different contexts and that she learned them. **With the Spanish I tried to translate it by using context clues, kinda worked**."
4	(EASE) (FULL)	"I've taken a couple years of Spanish so it **wasnt really hard for me to understand the spanish** section of this passage. Anything else and **I just used google translate**. Also for some of the cases, the translation was given, so **I just used that with context clues**."
6	(EASE)	"I enjoyed reading in the ways that she chose to mix English and Spanish since this is the way I feel most comfortable. [...] **I felt this very easeful since I default to using both English and Spanish**."
6	(SHARE)	*Yes, **if you notice all of those words are feminine words because they end with "a."** Mal criada is for a girl/woman and Mal criado would be for a boy/man. But very rarely if ever where these used for boys/men.*

A total of eighteen comments in response to Young's text were coded, representing the views of ten students. For Young's text, the two most prominent themes were critical moves towards a translanguaging stance (CRIT) and students' ease of understanding (EASE) what Young called "Black English." The first theme (CRIT) was exemplified when students questioned or challenged the role of standardized English in the classroom or in society and

---

[3] Quotes from comments made on the text through the Perusall annotation software are italicized, and all other non-italicized quotes are from the post-reading in-class journal assignment. Boldface font is used throughout the excerpts to highlight parts of the text that were coded with the corresponding labels to the left.

advocated for more diverse means of expression. The second theme (EASE) was exemplified when students remarked on the similarities between Young's dialect and their own variety of Southern and/or Standard English. Four students also countered Young's argument by defending (DEF) the role of standard English in the classroom and upholding its place as "still the centerpiece of the English language." Finally, as shown in the final two rows of Table 3.4, one student neutrally described (DESC) the language used in the piece and another mimicked (APPRO) the author's voice. This last example exposes the controversial issue of language/dialect ownership that inevitably gets raised when incorporating nonstandard varieties into the classroom. Who counts as an authentic user of each variety, and what is the teacher's role in preventing instances of appropriation?

Examples for each code are listed in Table 3.4 below:

Table 3.4 Making Sense of Young's Text[4]

Participant	Code	Quotes
4	(EASE) (CRIT)	*In the reality **we are still speaking the same language, only a slight variation from one another**. Although many pretend to not be able to understand one's dialect for the sake of being arrogant. **Just like foreign language, dialects can be learned, spoken, and understood**.*
3	(COMM) (EASE)	***The author definitely shows this point well just by how he writes his paper.** He writes it in a dialect traditionally spoken by black people and the reader is given the task of understanding the content of the paper (which is **not hard to understand at all**.) This shows how people are able to understand different dialects in academic settings without it being terribly inconvenient.*
11	(DEF)	*To what point is a dialect accurate though? **In my eyes this reading has a lot of grammatical errors and has words spelled wrong**. Would this be considered a dialect with new words?*
12	(CONF)	*I think I understand why the "standard" English is taught in*

---

[4] All quotes in Table 3.4 come from comments made on the text through the Perusall annotation software. Boldface font is used throughout the excerpts to highlight parts of the text that were coded with the corresponding labels to the left.

		*school because **it just took me five times to reread this sentence to understand it**…*
8	(COMM) (AUTH)	*I really enjoy when authors write in the own dialect and not SAE because it really **helps get their point across** and solidify that this is **something they are familiar with and have experience to write about it**.*
2	(DESC)	*When you read this, **you can hear the way that they are speaking in an accent and in a dialect that is not what we would consider proper english**.*
15	(APPRO)	*OK NAH THEY SPITTIN HERE I CANT EVEN DENY IT*

It should be noted that in response to Young's text, in particular, several individual participants held seemingly contradictory beliefs simultaneously. For example, Participant 12's initial reaction, early in the text, read, "I think I understand why the "standard" English is taught in school because it just took me five times to reread this sentence to understand it…" Her next comment, however, moved from confusion to acceptance when she wrote, "I like reading this article. Although it is slightly difficult to understand some things, it feels real and is not as boring to read. Instead of the feeling of reading, it feels like I'm listening to a conversation/lecture." Finally, by the end of the essay, when Young's argument is reaching its culmination, she responds to his claim that standard academic English as it is used in schools "ain't natural or easy to understand" by saying, "I dont agree. I feel having standard english in one's pocket is beneficial. It can be a common language used by people. Didn't the author just say that we should learn different dialects to understand others? Standard English is still English and is just a common language used to communicate in a broad way." This progression of ideas gives us insight into how the standard language ideology may be constructed and upheld; when a dialect is unfamiliar, it can simultaneously lead to confusion and acceptance. This tension gets resolved for the individual when falling back onto the claim that standard English "is just a common

language" that we should learn "to understand others." While well-intentioned, this claim disregards the underlying power dynamic that inevitably prioritizes standard English as the default and as a result, detracts from any real potential for balanced, mutual understanding. It also overlooks the issue of acquisition, such that it is much more difficult for someone to learn and use a dialect that is not one's own. Another question raised for educators here is how can we scaffold assignments like these to help students see beyond their desire for immediate comprehension, to employ the resources available to them, and to embrace the process of learning content and language at the same time?

Summary

Qualitative results from the second data set showed that although several students expressed confusion while reading the translanguaged texts, the large majority of participants had little to no trouble understanding them. Those students who expressed confusion towards isolated parts of Anzaldúa's text still claimed to have understood the overall meaning. More students had to work harder to understand the text written in English and Spanish than they did for the one written in a dialect of "Black English," showing that although there is an overall acceptance and openness towards both language varieties, the latter is seen as a more mutually intelligible dialect of English than is "Spanglish" to students in this study. While participants demonstrated an overall positive attitude towards both texts and writing styles, nine students explicitly commented on Young's writing style as easy to understand, communicatively effective, and/or an authentic means of expression that was enjoyable to read. In contrast, no students explicitly praised Anzaldúa's writing style unprompted, yet more students explored her underlying reasons for choosing to communicate her message the way she did.

New and Re-emerging Themes in Coursework

The final round of qualitative analysis involved looking back through the entire data set for additional comments which related to the research questions and/or reiterated themes from earlier rounds of analysis. The three subsets of data focused on here include "Responses to Anzaldúa," "Responses to Young," and "Narrative Reflection Essays."

Responses to Anzaldúa

A total of twelve comments in response to Anzaldúa's text were coded in this subset, representing the views of six students. Most of the themes identified in this round confirmed previous themes discussed in "Stance-taking & Rationales," including *broadened perspectives*, *multilingual representation/expression*, *students' openness towards linguistic diversity*, and *monolingual exclusion*. One new theme to emerge from responses to Anzaldúa's text was *monolingual deficit*, exemplified when Participants 3, 13, and 18 remarked on their lack of proficiency when learning other languages. This sentiment was repeated throughout various other students' coursework, as will be discussed in the "Narrative Reflection Essays" section below. This theme is labeled here under the category of "Impact" because it relates less to students' stances or rationales around translanguaging in the classroom (RQ1) and more to the impact of translanguaging pedagogy on perceptions of their lived experiences (RQ3). The quotes where each of these themes appeared are found in Table 4.1 below:

Table 4.1 Re-emerging Themes in Responses to Anzaldúa

Part. #	Theme	Example Quote
1	<u>Disadvantage</u> Monolingual Exclusion	*This word ["Anglo"] is used reputedly throughout the text.* **To me it almost seems like the author is using it as a pejorative,** *although the literal definition is "a white person of European origin".*
3, 13	<u>Advantage</u> Broadened	**I never realized how having to translate would make people feel.**

	perspective	
18	<u>Consideration</u> Students' openness	*I find it very interesting how multiple different languages have different ways of expressing gender for objects and not just limited to pronouns like English.* **I would be interested in learning more about the derogatory gendered words used in Spanish.**
3, 13, 18	<u>Impact</u> Monolingual deficit	*I find it amazing that some people are able to learn so many languages fluently.* **I have never been very adept at learning other languages,** *and I have trouble memorizing things and relating a language to my own. It's crazy that this woman managed to fluently learn all these different languages.*
4	<u>Advantage</u> Improved use of context clues	"I've taken a couple years of Spanish so it wasnt really hard for me to understand the spanish section of this passage. Anything else and I just used google translate. Also for some of the cases, the translation was given, so **I just used that with context clues**."
6, 12	<u>Advantage</u> Multilingual Representation/ Expression	"I enjoyed reading in the ways that she chose to mix English and Spanish since **this is the way I feel most comfortable**."

New insight was provided for the theme of *monolingual exclusion*, which was previously inferred from comments on surveys where several students noted risks of translanguaging might include, "those who don't speak the language end up feeling left out" or "monolingual students would be lost." This theme emerges in part through one student's response to the word "Anglo." Anzaldúa uses this term throughout her book to refer to English-speaking Americans or native English speakers in general, linking them to their Anglo-Saxon ancestry. Participant 1 responds to the following quote by Anzaldúa:

> "For a people who live in a country in which English is the reigning tongue but who are not Anglo; for a people who cannot entirely identify with either standard (formal, Castillian) Spanish nor standard English, what recourse is left to them but to create their own language"

by saying:

> "This word ["Anglo"] is used reputedly throughout the text. To me it almost seems like the author is using it as a pejorative, although the literal definition is "a white person of European origin.""

Participant 1's interpretation of the word "Anglo" as a pejorative shifts the focus away from the

topic of linguistic exclusion and towards a potential (perceived) injustice wrought on native

English speakers. Other comments made by Participant 1 in response to the same text were

similarly defensive, as when Anzaldúa's states:

> "we are robbed of our female being by the masculine plural. Language is a male discourse,"

and he responds:

> "This is sentence is disingenuous for poignancy's sake. There is a very obvious difference
> between grammatical and societal gender. The neutral form of a whole host of words in Spanish
> and many other gendered languages is the masculine form, and while the origination of this
> grammatical structure is certainly something we can assume is based in old world patriarchal
> norms, I highly doubt that any native speaker of this language feels they are 'robbed of their
> female being' in any significant way when using the Spanish equivalent of 'you guys'."

Again, he shifts the focus of the topic away from the personal experience of the author, this time

in an attempt to establish an objective truth around the neutrality of grammatical gender. In doing

so, he denies the legitimacy of the author's lived experience and closes the potential for any

meaningful discussion around the topic by saying, essentially, "I doubt anyone feels this way."

Finally, when Anzaldúa ends her chapter with the statement:

> "until the white laws and commerce and customs will rot in the deserts they've created, lie
> bleached. Humildes yet proud, quietos yet wild, nosotros los Mexicanos-Chicanos will walk by
> the crumbling ashes as we go about our business. Stubborn, persevering, impenetrable as stone,
> yet possessing a malleability that renders us unbreakable, we, the mestizas and mestizos, will
> remain"

Participant 1 responds:

> "This is tribalism. The us verses them mentality of this paragraph is indicative of the author's
> entire worldview, at least of what limited exposure I've had to it. It seems odd to end a piece of
> writing that focuses on the struggle of a group of people who have had their cultural identity
> marginalized by an oppressive ruling class with 'we count the days the weeks the centuries the
> eons until the white laws and commerce and customs will rot in the deserts they've created, lie
> bleached.' Something about a pot and a kettle."

Here the student reminds us of the subjective nature of the text and points out the hypocrisy of

the author wishing for the demise of a group of people after having experienced firsthand the

psychological consequences of an "us versus them" mindset. The student's point, while well-intentioned and respectfully written, sidesteps accountability for the ways in which he, I, and other "Anglos" in the class have benefited from the forced assimilation of Mexican-Americans and other racialized groups throughout history, and ignores the fact that our interests are the ones prioritized in today's "laws and commerce and customs." This series of comments illustrates a huge barrier that stands in the way of instructors trying to implement a translanguaging pedagogy; that is that any increase in representation for racialized and marginalized individuals tends to invoke pushback from those who have indirectly benefitted from their subjugation in ways which they may not be aware, who may refuse to validate their experiences for the belief that inclusivity and subjectivity are a zero-sum game.

Responses to Young

Responses to Young's essay also confirmed and complexified earlier themes around the perceived advantages, disadvantages, and considerations for translanguaging in the college classroom. A total of six comments were coded in this round, representing the views of five students. Re-emerging themes included *higher engagement, inefficiency/inconvenience*, *workplace expectations*, *teachers' scaffolding*, *students' openness to linguistic diversity,* and *societal expectations*. The incongruence between academic and *workplace expectations* for language use, as discussed in "Complexifying Workplace Expectations," was once again pointed out, this time by Participant 16. Participant 6 demonstrated a new advantage of *linguistic self-efficacy* and a new consideration of the *inevitability* of translanguaging as the new norm of communication. The quotes where each of these themes appeared are found in Table 4.2 below:

Table 4.2 Re-emerging Themes in Responses to Young

Participant	Code	Quotes

12	Advantage Higher engagement	*I like reading this article. Although it is slightly difficult to understand some things, it feels real and is not as boring to read. Instead of the feeling of reading, it feels like I'm listening to a conversation/lecture.*
17	Disadvantage Inefficiency/ Inconvenience	*I don't think ["teaching how language functions within and from various cultural perspectives"] is necessarily possible in the classroom in elementary to high school. A new course would need to be required or change the curriculum of a current course just to talk about all of the differences. This would be difficult because the **schedules are already full** with the standard Language Arts courses and other core subjects.*
16	Consideration Workplace expectations	***We all have jobs, and we all know that we do not talk in formal or "proper" tones all of the time.** For example, I speak to costumers at my job with a formal and professional tone however, I talk to my coworkers in my own dialect. Even jobs that don't deal with customer service still talk differently. They may talk to their boss differently than their coworkers or talk different during a presentation. We all know that this tone is not used at all times in jobs, yet it seems we all expect others to carry it at all times.*
15	Considerations Teacher's scaffolding students' openness	*Honestly a pretty solid idea, **I'm just not sure how something like this could be executed properly and with the respect it would need to be effective.** I'm glad it's not my job to figure problems like this out, ill tell you what*
6	Consideration Inevitability	***I believe [blending dialects] is happening whether it is taught or not and whether it is accepted or not.***
6	Advantage Multilingual representation/ expression; Self-efficacy	*The more **I am finding validation and confidence in my own language of spanglish** the more I find myself speaking spanglish and not even thinking about it any more. It's almost like this knowledge has created this allowing for my natural way of speaking to come out organically.*
11	Consideration Societal expectations	*I think that over time this could happen but **would definitely take some drastic changes in society.** In most of my classes throughout college SAE has been the only way to communicate in a professional or academic way.*

Narrative Reflection Essays

While participants' responses to translanguaged texts provide insight into how students make sense of translanguaging as a practice, the narrative reflection essays offer a more individualized look into the ways in which this pedagogy affected each of their outlooks. In this final subset of data, quotes from 14 students' reflections were selected to provide fuller pictures of themes which came up in earlier analyses. Re-framed to reflect the examples discussed, these themes include: Early Struggles with Language and Identity, American Belonging, Overcoming the Monolingual Mindset, and Linguistic Self-efficacy.

Early Language Struggles & Identity

Three participants wrote about early experiences learning English as native speakers in the U.S., where they were expected to meet benchmarks that were not realistic for them. Participant 7, who struggled with dyslexia, was homeschooled by her parents and didn't learn about her condition until late in her childhood. She wrote about how when faced with the requirement to study a foreign language, ASL seemed like the only feasible option for her. Based on her struggles with reading and writing in English, she thought she would never be able to tackle a foreign alphabet. Participant 10 did not have dyslexia but also struggled severely with writing and spelling as a child. He expressed gratitude for his middle school teachers for helping him through what may seem like outdated, if not highly traditional, methods: studying Old English, reciting biblical scriptures, and rote memorization of vocabulary. In his reflection, these laborious tasks defined his literacy skills and made him "very grateful for how they turned out." Lastly, Participant 13 struggled with speech from an early age and had to work with a therapist. In her reflection, she looks back on this obstacle and connects it to her identity:

> "My learning experience with English was very different than I imagined it would be. Something that everyone is hardwired to be able to do was the hardest thing I had done. So when growing up

my identity with language was very "weak". I felt as if I didn't understand the world around me. When I began to understand I became more adventurous. I wanted to learn bigger words and how to write stories. Becoming confident changed how I identified with language."

These examples show how even for native English speakers, meeting societal expectations for language use is a difficult process that is achieved differently for each person and according to different timelines. The pride one feels when they've finally overcome these difficulties is well deserved, but could also prevent them from seeking ways to further expand their repertoires, as will be discussed in "Overcoming the Monolingual Mindset."

Speaking American to Belong

Participants 2 and 12 shared similar sentiments about language development and identity, only their narratives described the factors which led them to prioritize English over other aspects of their multilingual repertoires. Participant 2 was born in the U.S. but attended an international school in Germany and spent her early years speaking French with her father and other relatives. Looking back on these experiences, she wrote:

> "When I came back and visited the United States everyone thought it was so amazing that I was able to speak French and some German and that I lived in another country. However, when I was in France and Germany it was not the same way. German people would stare at me in public when speaking English and were oftentimes rude and rolled their eyes. [...] I have lost nearly all my German because I never practice it anymore, and spending so much time with friends and other Americans, I have also become less fluent in my French. Once I reached the age of 16 I was able to choose if I wanted to speak French or English with my dad and I chose English. I have strayed very far away from my European identity. I always say that nationality wise I am French-American. But culturally I am just American, and that is something I am proud of and will be for the rest of my life."

Even though Participant 2 was the only student to express a fully critical translanguaging stance in her interview, this quote from her reflection shows how her own experiences with linguistic discrimination led her to find a strong sense of belonging with English, and how positioning herself as an American required her to prioritize this language over the others.

Participant 12 grew up in the U.S., where she was placed in ESL classes throughout

elementary school and struggled to meet both her parents' and teachers' linguistic expectations. In her reflection, she writes:

"As I was transitioning from becoming more comfortable in English than Korean, my parents made sure I would not forget Korean. Even up until high school, I would hear phrases like "한국 말로 해" ("say that in Korean") and "한국말 더 연습해야돼" ("speak Korean more") at home. My parents, who are both fluent in Korean and English, were able to aid me in my journey to learn English and maintain my Korean, but because I grew up with both English and Korean, I am still not particularly good at either language. I am able to get my way through but vocabulary wise, I am not as advanced as I should be for a nineteen year old. I struggled a lot during English classes and the SATs. My scores for English would be much lower than my math scores. As an American student, it would make sense for me to use the language that would help me weave through society and positions in my future jobs. So, I pursued higher fluency in English."

Both of these narratives complicate the theme of *multilingual identity expression* that was brought up in earlier analyses. They show why instructors who are ready to support multilingual students' language-in-practice may instead be met with the most adamant speakers of "proper" English. Indeed, Participant 12 was one of the strongest defenders of the role of SAE in the classroom, as was in part shown through her perspective discussed in "Responses to Young." Taking this stance is her undeniable right, as she, like many other multilingual students enrolled at American universities, have already gone through nearly two decades of psychological, emotional, and academic hard work to meet the dominant standards and to gain a sense of belonging with peers. A translanguaging pedagogy never posits that instructors should push the comfort zones of students in ways that may further racialize or isolate them, and in many cases, multilingual students may simply not want or be ready to express parts of their identities that were previously excluded or overlooked.

Linguistic Self-efficacy

In other cases, broadening students' awareness of linguistic variation and valorizing diverse varieties can help individuals, both monolingual and multilingual, to step into their translanguaging practices more fully. This was the case for Participant 6, a bilingual speaker of

Spanish and English, who throughout the course was able to relate with class texts and connect them to her personal experiences easily. In her final reflection, she wrote:

> "Since starting this course and having discussions surrounding language, it has invited me to reflect on how I choose to access language to communicate. It has also created a deeper connection to myself regarding language while gaining a better understanding of others. I realize the ways that I have allowed others to interject their language ideals and in which ways I have internalized them throughout the years, causing shame around my ability to speak freely in my early childhood and adolescent years. These aspects still show up even in my adult life at times, and this course has helped me identify and observe them."

Participant 14, on the other hand, never outwardly identified as multilingual, but in his reflection began to think about his home language practices in ways he hadn't previously considered:

> "Although I mainly speak English at home with my family, I can understand select words in Mandarin, which helps me communicate with my parents when they don't know how to say something in English. Different words from Mandarin have become synonymous with certain contexts. I know some cuss words, I know hello, goodbye, the basic stuff. But specific and unique examples I recall are how to say I eat, or when my mom calls me her baby she says a certain phrase that I know means that. When I talk to my brother and he talks to me, there are words to say little brother and big brother that we have been using our whole lives. It is interesting to think about these examples as I had never thought about it before, but looking back and seeing what I know, I may know more than I had thought."

Participant 11 also reflected on the ways in which her parents' dialectal differences made up parts of her repertoire, and therefore identity:

> "My mom was born and raised in a small mountain town. Where she grew up, everyone spoke almost in their own language. Still using English but with a heavy mountain accent. This differs from my dad who was born and raised in a small town that was centered around teachers and education. [...] I believe these two different environments made me who I was today in terms of speaking and writing English."

These examples reaffirm the earlier perceived advantage of *identity expression*, which had come up with respect to multilinguals but here is interpreted more broadly. Simply giving these students the space and opportunity to reflect on their linguistic backgrounds seemed to clear a path towards new ways of looking at their own biases, abilities, and identities. None of these students, of course, proceeded to start translanguaging in discussion or coursework right away. It was only after an entire semester's worth of metalinguistic discussions and writing assignments

around linguistic variation and valorization that a small seed of self-efficacy was planted, and

personal topics that were previously untouched began to emerge.

Overcoming the Monolingual Mindset

The theme of *monolingual deficit* emerged in "Responses to Anzaldua's Texts," and was

also brought up by six participants in their narrative reflections. Participant 3 was the most

resolute in both his coursework and interview about the ways in which learning languages,

especially Spanish, would benefit him. Yet he wrote about the topic with a sense of regret:

> "I believe that if I personally had to learn Spanish or another common language early on, I would be fluent in Spanish by now and would have the skills necessary to learn new languages. Trying to learn Spanish in my sophomore year of high school wasn't easy. I struggled a lot and found that memorizing all the aspects of a language was hard to do in such a short amount of time. Language education should start early and should persist throughout school, rather than just be one class you can take."

Participant 4, who had also attempted to learn Spanish, French, and even his parents' native

language, Romanian, similarly wrote:

> "Overall, my experience learning the languages hasn't been the greatest. I've experienced struggle after struggle trying to absorb the content, and truly learn the languages, only to fail each time and time again."

Both quotes seem to imply a sense of resolve around language learning, based on beliefs that

after a certain age it's too late, or that it is a fixed skill that either you have or you don't.

Participant 7, after reflecting on how long it took for her to finally address her dyslexia, couldn't

imagine trying to read in another alphabet, saying:

> "I find it amazing how so many people have knowledge of and can communicate in so many different languages, whereas in the beginning, I struggled to even develop my own mother tongue."

Participant 8 also found sympathy in his struggle, claiming:

> "The hardest thing I have ever attempted in life as an English speaker was to try and learn two other languages," saying that it made him, "really appreciate people who move to America and develop a strong knowledge of English despite it being their second language."

Participants 1, 9, and 16 were able to overcome this deficit-based outlook by adopting a growth

mindset, and connecting *language learning* to *workforce preparation*. In both his interview and

reflection, Participant 1 described how class discussions around translanguaging inspired him to

start communicating differently with his Spanish-speaking co-workers:

> "I've been given a new appreciation for people who have to deal with communicating, when you don't speak the native tongue, and how a little effort can enable you to form relationships with people you might have once thought unreachable because of your difference in language. What's more is that I've been able to experience the formation of my very own pidgin, Using what Spanish words I know and English to fill the gaps in between. Every day that I interact with the kitchen staff I can understand a bit more."

Like Participants 1 and 3, Participant 9 saw learning Spanish to be an essential skill for her future

career goals, and was ready to try again:

> "I now know that there is not one way to correctly use a language. [...] I would like to take Spanish again. I'd like to take it on my own time so that the pace of learning is much slower and I would really have time to dive deep into all the concepts [...] I feel like this would be really beneficial for me in the long run and for my career. Being in the medical field I think this would give me a better connection to my patients. The standard American schooling system is very strict on only teaching what they consider "standard" Spanish and "standard" English although most students don't speak either in their day-to-day lives outside of school."

Finally, Participant 16 reflected on his informal experiences over the years learning bits of

Spanish and Tagalog through personal relationships outside of school settings:

> "These experiences have helped me to become very good at pragmatics and phonetics over time. [...] looking at how these events and the skills I have developed from them have given me the ability to better communicate with speakers of other languages and people I had yet to meet. [...] This writing has also given me the chance to reflect on my parents beliefs and values on literacy. [...] one thing I don't think they ever thought of was how literacy can be so widely expanded outside of an academic setting."

Foreign language learning in the U.S. is not an easily accessible skill and opportunities to

practice depend on one's ability to travel or devote large amounts of time to intensive study.

Beyond a strong desire to learn other languages and the belief that doing so will benefit them in

their future, students shared a sense of disappointment around previous attempts at learning

foreign languages in school. More research needs to be done to see if a translanguaging approach more involved than the one represented in this study could help monolingual students address these concerns, by combining subject-area content learning with language instruction.

Each of these students surprised me in their final reflections with one or more aspects of their linguistic background which they had not previously disclosed to me. These excerpts may not provide definitive answers to the question of how translanguaging pedagogy impacts students' perceptions, but they do color each participant's story with more detail and remind us of how deeply personal issues of language and identity can be. Together, these stories create a challenging landscape for educators to navigate: how can we support every individual to embrace their unique linguistic repertoire, yet still to strive for more?

Summary

Several themes from the open-ended survey questions and interviews re-emerged in the coursework. In "Responses to Anzaldua," two students demonstrated *broadened perspectives* around dialect variation, two students' comments evoked *multilingual representation/expression*, and one student's comments illustrated the feeling of *monolingual exclusion.* A new theme emerged, where three students expressed *monolingual deficit*-based views of their own linguistic repertoires. This theme was explored further through students' "Narrative Reflection Essays," where connections were drawn between *language learning* and *workforce preparation*. "Responses to Young" did not lead to as many broadened perspectives, but it did evoke more stance-taking, with five students moving towards a critical translanguaging stance, and four defending or upholding the role of SAE in the classroom. One student expressed *multilingual representation*, while other individuals brought up the *inefficiency/inconvenience* of translanguaging or considered *societal expectations* and *teachers' scaffolding*. One student pointed out the incompatibility of academic and *workplace expectations* for language use once

again. A new theme which emerged was the *inevitability* of translanguaging as the new norm. Overall, responses to both texts illustrated *students' openness* to linguistic diversity.

"Narrative reflection essays" provided a final, more comprehensive view of the stories in which each participants' beliefs may be situated. The four overarching themes in this subset were *Early language struggles, Speaking American to belong, Linguistic self-efficacy*, and *Overcoming the monolingual mindset*. Examples were given to illustrate the diverse linguistic backgrounds from which even "monolingual" students construct their identities, the pride and self-efficacy that results from overcoming language barriers, and the connections several students made to move past a deficit-based monolingual mindset. One important pattern from interviews and coursework which re-emerged in reflections was the connection between *language learning* and *workforce preparation*.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

RQ 1: What are the perceived advantages, risks, and barriers to embracing a translanguaging pedagogy in a classroom where Standard English is the default?

Responses to open-ended survey questions brought about twenty-three themes around the perceived advantages, disadvantages, and considerations for translanguaging in the college classroom. Seventeen of these themes re-emerged in either interviews or coursework. The seven themes which emerged from all three datasets are described below, grouped into three categories: "Perceived Advantages," "Perceived Disadvantages," and "Barriers & Considerations."

Perceived Advantages

When asked to think about the advantages that translanguaging in the college classroom would provide to students, eleven participants wrote on pre-course surveys something along the lines of, "exposure to different cultures serves to expand our worldview," and at least ten students maintained the belief that translanguaging would lead to *broadened perspectives* by the end of the course. Also on the pre-course surveys, five students wrote that translanguaging in the classroom would be beneficial for *multilingual students to feel represented*, and by the end of the course, this number grew to eight. Quotes such as, "those who speak the language feel more included/can express themselves better" seem to imply that in what was a majority monolingual class, many monolingual students were considering the advantages of translanguaging from the perspectives of multilingual speakers rather than from their own perspectives. These two themes re-emerged in coursework and interviews not as explicit rationales for translanguaging in the classroom, but as observed effects of coursework and discussions.

Language learning was the third most popularly perceived advantage which emerged from the surveys, and this theme later re-emerged from the coursework and interviews in connection to *workforce preparation*. Six participants wrote on pre-course surveys something

along the lines of, "[translanguaging] helps other students become more familiar with other languages and dialects allowing students to overcome language barriers much easier," and at least four students maintained this belief by the end of the course. Five students discussed the linguistic diversity at their workplace in contrast to the emphasis on SAE at school without taking a stance, while two additional students used this comparison to justify a translanguaging stance. Overall, however, language learning was discussed throughout coursework and interviews more in terms of acquiring additional named languages than in terms of developing proficiencies in new dialects.

Perceived Disadvantages

When asked to think about the risks or disadvantages of translanguaging in the college classroom, eleven participants wrote on pre-course surveys something along the lines of, translanguaging "will cause lots of confusion & misunderstandings," and this number grew to fifteen by the end of the course. Conversations with two interviewees showed those students did not believe it was impossible to work through this sort of *miscommunication/confusion*, but that doing so would be *inefficient/inconvenient* in the context of a college classroom. Although this latter theme was not as prevalent on surveys as the first, analysis of coursework also showed that students saw the two as connected. Several students who upheld the role of SAE in the classroom appeared to view translanguaging as a tradeoff between inclusivity and efficiency, where any increase in inclusivity for those less proficient in SAE would inevitably lead to a decrease in efficiency for those highly proficient.

Another risk that was mentioned on surveys and which re-emerged in interviews and coursework was the *failure to meet workplace and/or societal expectations*. Although the failure to meet workplace expectations was only mentioned on two surveys (e.g., "future jobs that use

proper or 'grammatically correct' language might suffer from students not speaking that way"), it did re-emerge in coursework (e.g., "jobs look for you to be able to speak professionally. Schools may have no choice but to force SAE on students in order to do their jobs"). This belief was complicated throughout interviews, however, (see "Barriers & Considerations") and the belief that translanguaging in the classroom would lead to failure to meet *societal* expectations appeared to be a stronger rationale preventing students from taking a critical translanguaging stance (e.g., "people are gonna judge you if you speak a different type of way than them").

The final disadvantage to translanguaging as perceived by two students on pre-course surveys (e.g., "monolingual students would be lost"), one student on the end-of-course survey, and demonstrated throughout one student's comments in "Responses to Anzaldua" was *monolingual exclusion*. Monolingual students who may perceive a translanguaging pedagogy to be designed more for multilingual and multidialectal students than for themselves may push back against texts or discussions that appear to threaten the status of the dominant culture. While an outlying perspective within this study, monolingual exclusion is an important disadvantage to consider because it represents deeply rooted assumptions about monolingualism that should be addressed carefully by any instructor striving for more linguistically inclusive pedagogies.

Barriers & Considerations

Closely related to the perceived risk of monolingual exclusion was the consideration of *students' openness towards linguistic diversity*. Although it only came up once on the pre-course survey (e.g., "I think it depends on the willingness of the students in the class"), Participant 2 applied the same condition upon her critical translanguaging stance, claiming, "I think that maybe having an open line of communication in that situation would definitely be important,"

and Participant 5 expressed his own support for translanguaging in the classroom depended upon the maintenance of a, "healthy discussion environment." These same two participants also saw *teachers' scaffolding* as an important factor determining the success of translanguaging in the classroom, requiring instructors to "have an open conversation" about dialect variation in the beginning of the course. This was a theme mentioned by two students on the pre-course survey, one student on the end-of-course survey, and also implied in coursework (e.g., "Honestly a pretty solid idea, I'm just not sure how something like this could be executed properly and with the respect it would need to be effective").

Although the theme of *workplace/societal expectations* initially came up on surveys as a factor that would negatively impact the effectiveness of translanguaging in the classroom, it was later discussed in interviews and coursework as more compatible with a translanguaging pedagogy than one might expect. As one student claimed on their pre-course survey, the advantages of translanguaging in the college classroom largely depends on one's future field of work (e.g., "For my response of "mostly harmful" during writing assignments I mean only if the students plans on going in a direction of written work. But me for example mixing languages could be helpful since a lot of the trades I worked with this summer spoke Spanish"). This contradiction was summed up well on the pre-course survey, where one student wrote, "while I think it's a neat idea to include mixed languages in the classroom it can also cause confusion when applied to the outside world or society because I don't believe that mixed languages is socially acceptable. While I still think we should start somewhere to change that."

RQ 2: How do students respond to the incorporation of diverse language practices into a classroom where Standard English is the lingua franca?

Broadened Perspectives

Broadened perspectives was the most popular, if somewhat vague, advantage to translanguaging noted on surveys, but throughout the coursework this perceived outcome became an individualized reality. Exposure to translanguaged texts and engagement in metalinguistic discussions helped individuals build empathy (e.g., "I never realized how having to translate would make someone feel"), valorize stigmatized language varieties (e.g., "we kind of learned more that there is grammar in all dialects and that it's not just one"), and see their own experiences in a different light (e.g., "I realize the ways that I have allowed others to interject their language ideals and in which ways I have internalized them throughout the years"). Participants did not only learn and accept new information, but began to open new lines of inquiry which they hadn't previously considered (e.g., "I have never heard this term [bidialectalism] before. How would a person be able to speak in 2 different dialects?"). Two other perceived advantages of translanguaging in the college classroom that were stated on surveys and later demonstrated through coursework were the improved use of context clues (e.g., "I used context from the surrounding sentences to make sense of the parts that were in spanish") and higher student engagement (e.g., "it feels real and is not as boring to read").

Miscommunication/Confusion

The other highly prevalent theme on the surveys was the risk of *miscommunication or confusion*, which was shown to be a non-issue for the majority of students who read the two translanguaged texts in a combined form of Spanish and English, and a dialect of African American English, respectively. The issue for those students who did become lost or confused in response to Spanish parts of Anzaldua's text was the lack of scaffolding presented to students

who did not know they could or would be expected to use outside resources to gain a fuller understanding. This affirms another prominent theme in the data, that *teachers' scaffolding* is an important consideration determining the effectiveness of translanguaging in the classroom.

RQ 3: How does translanguaging pedagogy in a majority monolingual setting impact college students' perceptions of their own lived experiences?

Monolingual Deficit

Almost every participant in the study expressed strong desires in the past or present to learn another language, including Spanish, ASL, Tagalog, and Romanian, with Spanish the most common. Participants 4 and 6 desired to learn or improve their heritage languages, Participant 14 and 16 desired to learn their partners' languages, and Participant 3 and 9 believed becoming bilingual would improve their chance of success in their future careers. Participants 6 and 9 also expressed desires to expand proficiencies in regional Spanish dialects. While most of these participants expressed deficit-based views around their monolingualism in response to translanguaged texts and metalinguistic discussions, several were able to adopt a growth mindset by accepting the idea that "I now know that there is not one way to correctly use a language."

Linguistic Self-Efficacy

Each of the three students in the class who identified as bilingual interacted with texts and discussions in ways that affirmed the belief stated on surveys that translanguaging in the classroom would help multilingual students feel represented or included. In some instances, *multilingual representation/expression* meant relating personal experiences around bilingualism to those of an author or classmate (e.g., "While there are obvious differences in the sense that the French language is not dying, and both my parents speak it, I feel that culture wants to push you to be like them and not different."). In others it meant finding familiarity in writing styles (e.g., "I enjoyed reading in the ways that she chose to mix English and Spanish since this is the way I

feel most comfortable"), and still in others it meant expressing self-efficacy around tranlanguaging as a practice (e.g., "There are times when I use both Korean and English because I want to communicate how I truly feel and sometimes English does not have a word that Korean does"; "I love being able to speak another language").

Language & Identity

There was also a greater recognition of how various dialects or languages, no matter one's proficiency in them, may play a role in a person's identity. At least two students in the class who initially identified as "monolingual" later identified as "bidialectal" on end-of-course surveys, and several participants wrote about their parents' language practices in addition to their own in their reflections. Despite having learned or chosen *not* to speak their parents' languages or dialects, the inclusion of those practices into their own narrative reflections represented a small nod to their linguistic heritage. One student who did not identify as bilingual even began to appreciate the breadth of knowledge he had of Mandarin, simply by reflecting on his language use with family at home (e.g., "I may know more than I had thought").

Limitations

Quantitative data showed students as a whole became less open to the idea of translanguaging in written coursework by the end of the semester, although the group as a whole became more open to translanguaging in terms of discussion or exposure to diverse texts. This discrepancy could have to do with the nature and structure of the course, which tended to focus on topics of spoken language and speech variation over written language or rhetorical techniques. The writing expectations for the course were intentionally left open for students to express their perspectives in ways that made sense to them, but few tools or resources were provided to help them break away from the tenets of standard English. As a result, students who openly contested the validity of prescriptive grammar rules ended up focusing on or reinscribing

those very rules in reviews of their peers' work. This was demonstrated in the short paragraphs describing revisions made to students' final reflections, including comments like, "most revision recommendations were of grammatical and punctuation mistakes" or, "Participant 4 was able to give me many great grammar tips" Further research in this area needs to focus on implementing strategies to help students incorporate their full range of grammars in ways that are rhetorically effective and move beyond a simple approach of content over form.

Looking at how students responded to translanguaged texts in their written coursework provides us with one small glimpse into the actual effects of a translanguaging pedagogy, but it is only one facet of an approach with much broader potential. The limitations of incorporating translanguaging into discussions and written work in a majority monolingual, Standard English-speaking class left little room for experimenting with other facets of the pedagogy, such as translanguaging in discussion or rhetorical techniques for writing. Future studies that seek to look at college students' perceptions around translanguaging in the college classroom will need to strike a stronger balance between multilingual and monolingual participants and instruction.

Summary

This study sought to fill a significant gap in the literature by drawing together two fields of inquiry: translanguaging pedagogy as it applies to multilingual students and linguistically sustaining pedagogies as they apply to multidialectal students. Analyzing the perspectives of college students around this combined approach to education, in a majority monolingual class where Standard English was the default, exposed some of the ways in which society's dominant ideologies around language get reinforced at the individual level. It also brought the lived experiences of bidialectal college students into a discussion which has been dominated by scholars observing the behavior of lower level students in K-12 multilingual settings.

Judging from twenty-five students' survey responses, eighteen students' coursework, and six students' interviews, overall awareness and openness towards linguistic diversity appears to have grown by the end of the semester, and translanguaging in the college classroom became a slightly more imaginable reality, if still far from agreed upon as an effective educational strategy. The decrease in neutral responses from pre-course to end-of-course surveys showed students likely had not heard of or considered this practice in an academic context prior to taking the class. Throughout the course, however, they were able to broaden their understandings of dialect variation and gather enough knowledge to take more informed stances – stances which were both contradicted and upheld in coursework, stances which faltered when interviewees were asked to explain their rationales several months later, and stances which will likely continue to waver as they progress through their college education.

The goal in asking students to take a stance on such a complicated and abstract issue was not to gather their definitive opinions but to dive into the messy collection of contradictory beliefs which allow them to form and defend certain ideologies around language. The picture that emerged was unsurprisingly similar to that presented by Metz and Knight in their 2021 interviews with English high school teachers, which as a reminder, sounded like this:

> "While I, the teacher, understand that there are many correct ways of using English, the rest of the world expects Standard English. I need to prepare my students for the world, and I need to protect them from discrimination. So, it is my job and my responsibility to make sure they use Standard English" (Metz & Knight, 2021, p. 251).

Making adjustments according to the results, the locally dominant narrative structure becomes:

> "While I, the student, understand that there are many correct ways of using language, the rest of UNC Charlotte expects Standard English and using it is the best way to avoid miscommunication that we do not have time to overcome in the classroom. I need to prepare for societal expectations and protect myself from discrimination. So, it may be a great idea to include other language varieties in coursework or discussion but it is still best to focus on Standard English, at the very least in writing."

It should be noted that some participants were likely not open to translanguaging pedagogy in any form, but either did not consent to provide all their coursework or did not feel comfortable fully expressing that stance beyond the multiple choice questions on the survey. Even those participants who demonstrated a critical translanguaging stance on paper, struggled to maintain that stance when probed to apply it to their college experience at UNC Charlotte, ultimately falling back to the argument that linguistic inclusivity and efficient communication are mutually exclusive, or that taking the time to understand diverse language practices is not worth the inconvenience amidst strict deadlines and grading policies.

To move past this narrative, research and awareness of linguistic variation in our local community needs to be made an integral part of the college experience in all contexts and across all disciplines, not just in the liberal studies classroom. This was the view shared by Participant 3, who wrote that "Language education should start early and should persist throughout school, rather than just be one class you can take," and Participant 16, who claimed, "I believe too many people focus on not making yourself a target instead of how to stop the people shooting. People should worry of possible racism however; more work should be done educating others of the importance and value of all dialects, not education on how you need to change to avoid being discriminated against." That is, of course, only if we accept what Metz and Knight (2021) suggest; that is our responsibility as educators to help students "understand when they are facing linguistic discrimination," "to help them address that discrimination," "to make sure students don't perpetuate linguistic discrimination against others," and to "teach students to understand and appreciate the wide-ranging communicative practices they may encounter in the world" (Metz & Knight, 2021, p. 252).

REFERENCES

Adams, D. W. (1995). *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience*, 1875-1928. University Press of Kansas.

Ahn, H., Salazar, D., & Khan, S. (2021). Enhancing teachers' awareness of global Englishes using the Oxford English Dictionary. In Ali Fuad S. & Bedrettin Y. (Eds.), *Language Teacher Education for Global Englishes* (pp. 100-107). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003082712

Alim, S.H. (2007). Critical hip-hop language pedagogies: Combat, consciousness, and the cultural politics of communication. *Journal of language, identity, and education*, *6*(2), 161-176.

Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/La frontera: The new mestiza*. Aunt Lute Books.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Multilingual matters.

Brown, T. (2020). What else do we know? Translingualism and the history of SRTOL as threshold concepts in our field. *College Composition and Communication, 71*(4), 591-619.

Bucholtz, M., Lopez, A., Mojarro, A., Skapoulli, E., VanderStouwe, C., & Warner‑Garcia, S. (2014). Sociolinguistic justice in the schools: Student researchers as linguistic experts. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, *8*(4), 144-157.

Bucholtz, M., Casillas, D. I., & Lee, J. S. (2016). Beyond empowerment: Accompaniment and sociolinguistic justice in a youth research program. In R. Lawson & D. Sayers (Eds.), *Sociolinguistic Research: Application and Impact* (pp. 25-42). Routledge.

Burton, J., & Rajendram, S. (2019). Translanguaging-as-resource: University ESL instructors' language orientations and attitudes toward translanguaging. *TESL Canada Journal*, *36*(1), 21-47. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v36i1.1301.

Camara, W. J., & Schmidt, A. E. (1999). Group Differences in Standardized Testing and Social Stratification. Report No. 99-5. *College Entrance Examination Board*.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, *95*(3), 401–417. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. Routledge.

CCCC (1974). Students' Right to Their Own Language. *College Composition and Communication,* Fall, Vol. XXV. https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/srtolsummary

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2007). *Multilingual Education: Between Language Learning and Translanguaging*. Cambridge UP.

Charity Hudley, A. H., & Mallinson, C. (2011). *Understanding English language variation in U.S. schools*. Teachers College Press. pp. 44-46

Charity Hudley, A.H., & Mallinson, C. (2017). "It's worth our time": A model of culturally and linguistically supportive professional development for K-12 STEM educators. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, *12*(3), 637-660.

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(3), 297–298. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1262613

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of educational research*, *49*(2), 222-251.

David, S.S., Shepard-Carey, S., Swearingen, A.J., Hemsath, D.J., & Heo, S. (2021). Entry points and trajectories: Teachers learning and doing translanguaging pedagogy. *Tesol Journal, 13*(1), 1-17. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/tesj.603.

Documentaries. (2022). The Language & Life Project. North Carolina State University. https://languageandlife.org/documentaries/

Duarte, J. (2019). Translanguaging in mainstream education: a sociocultural approach. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *22*(2), 150-164.

Dunstan, S. B., & Jaeger, A. J. (2015). Dialect and influences on the academic experiences of college students. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *86*(5), 777-803.

Flores, N., & McAuliffe, L. (2022). "In other schools you can plan it that way": A raciolinguistic perspective on dual language education. I*nternational Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 25*(4), 1349–1362. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1760200

Flores, N., & Chaparro, S. (2018). What counts as language education policy? Developing a materialist anti-racist approach to language activism. *Language Policy, 17*(3), 365-384. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-017-9433-7

Flores, N., Phuong, J., & Venegas, K.M. (2020). "Technically an EL": The production of raciolinguistic categories in a dual language school. *TESOL Quarterly, 54*(3), 629-651. doi: 10.1002/tesq.577

García, O. (2011). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. John Wiley & Sons.

García, O., Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and Enacting Translanguaging for Social Justice. In Blackledge, A., Creese, A. (Eds) *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy. Educational Linguistics*, vol 20. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7856-6_11

García, O., & Kleyn, T. (Ed.s). (2016). *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students*. Routledge.

Hanushek, E. A., Light, J. D., Peterson, P. E., Talpey, L. M., & Woessmann, L. (2022). Long-run Trends in the US SES—Achievement Gap. *Education Finance and Policy*, *17*(4), 608-640.

Horner, B., Lu, M., Royster, J. J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Opinion: Language difference in writing: Toward a translingual approach. *College English, 73*(3), 303-321.

Jenkins, J. (2015). *Global Englishes: A Resource Book for Students*. Routledge, New York.

Kanno, Y., & Varghese, M. M. (2010). Immigrant and refugee ESL students' challenges to accessing four-year college education: From language policy to educational policy. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 9*(5), 310–328. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2010.517693

Kim, J.S. (2017). Translingual identities of international graduate students and monoglossic language ideologies in a U.S. university ESL classroom.응용언어학, *33*(3), 3-31.

Labov, W. (1969). Contraction, deletion, and inherent variability of the English copula. *Language*, 715-762.

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English vernacular* (No. 3). University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lau, S.M.C. (2020). Translanguaging as transmediation: Embodied critical literacy engagements in a French-English bilingual classroom. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 3*(1), 42-59.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *18*(7), 641-654.

Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203348802.

Lyiscott, J. (2014). *3 Ways to Speak English* [Video]. TEDSalon NY2014. https://www.ted.com/talks/jamila_lyiscott_3_ways_to_speak_english?language=en

Metz, M., & Knight, H. (2021). The dominant school language narrative: Unpacking English teachers' language ideologies. *Language*, *97*(3), e238-e256.

Owens, A. (2018). Income segregation between school districts and inequality in students' achievement. *Sociology of Education, 91*(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040717741180

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard educational review*, *84*(1), 85-100.

QSR International Pty Ltd. (2022) NVivo (released in October 2022), https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-software/home

Reaser, J., Adger, C. T., Wolfram, W., & Christian, D. (2017). *Dialects at school: educating linguistically diverse students.* Routledge. pgs. 209-21

Rios, C. V. de los. (2016). Writing from La Panza: Exploring Monologue Literacies with Emergent Bilinguals. *English Journal*, *105*(5), 75–80.

Ríos, C. V., & Seltzer, K. (2017). Translanguaging, coloniality, and English classrooms: An exploration of two bicoastal urban classrooms. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 55-76.

Robinson, H., Hall, J., & Navarro, N. (2020). *Translingual Identities and Transnational Realities in the U.S. College Classroom* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Sah, P. K., & Kubota, R. (2022). Towards critical translanguaging: a review of literature on English as a medium of instruction in South Asia's school education. Asian Englishes, 24(2), 132–146. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2022.2056796

Seltzer, K., Collins, B.A., & Angeles K.M. (2016). Navigating turbulent waters: Translanguaging to support academic and socioemotional well-being. In O. García & T. Kleyn (Eds.), *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments* (pp. 140-160).

Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (2006). Reducing the gap: Success for all and the achievement of African American students. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 389-400.

Smitherman, G. (1977). *Talkin and testifyin: The language of Black America* (Vol. 51). Wayne State University Press.

Trimbur, J. (2006). "Linguistic memory and the politics of U.S. English." *College English*, *68*(6), 575–588. https://doi.org/10.2307/25472176

Turner, M., & Lin, A. M. (2017). Translanguaging and named languages: Productive tension and desire. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *23*(4), 423-433.

UNC Charlotte. *Proof of English proficiency.* Undergraduate Admissions.
https://admissions.charlotte.edu/international/proof-english-proficiency

Wang, Y. (2013). Non-conformity to ENL norms: A perspective from Chinese English users.
Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, *2*(2), 255-282.
https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2013-0015

Wei, L. (2018). "Translanguaging as a practical theory of language." *Applied Linguistics, 39*(1),
9-30. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039.

Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd
ddwyieithog*. Bangor University (United Kingdom).

Young, V. A. (2007). *Your Average N—-: Performing Race, Literacy, and Masculinity*. Wayne
State UP.

Young, V.A. (2010). Should writers use they own English? *Iowa Journal of Language Studies,
12*(1), pp. 110-18.