Best Practices for a Translingual Pedagogy: An Undergraduate Perspective

Jacob Wilson | Portland State University

This article traces the last nine years of translingual scholarship to highlight the need for more pedagogical experimentation. Despite translingual theory's high profile in the field, scholars like Ligia Mihut have brought attention to the fact that little has been done to bring translingual theory into classrooms. After reviewing how other scholars in the field have implemented translingual tenets, the author explores how instructors can continue advocating for underrepresented students within current university curricula. Through three well-established pedagogical approaches, the author suggests, instructors can adopt translingual practices that support students' linguistic agency and challenge monolingual ideologies. Ultimately, this work hopes to advance meaningful conversations among scholars and teachers developing best practices in translingual FYC pedagogy.

The imperatives to enact a translingual pedagogy are growing around a body of scholarship with a strong theoretical base. Translingualism challenges the current paradigm that sees language difference as a barrier to learning and therefore discredits the languages and language varieties of many marginalized and minority students. Given the increasing number of linguistically diverse students in universities, translingual proponents argue, we must change the role of language in the writing classroom. After years of upholding dominant language discourses and monolingual ideologies, writing instructors are realizing they must confront these inequities to help students navigate them. Nevertheless, as Ligia Mihut recently stated, there has thus far been "an overemphasis of theory and thereby, failure to achieve praxis when it comes to language rights and social justice" (80). My work will contribute to efforts to fill the gap between theory and practice by suggesting how and why particular practices in the field of Composition Studies can be useful for implementing translingual tenets in First Year Composition (FYC).

This article looks back at the last nine years of translingual scholarship to contextualize the need for more pedagogical experimentation. Following scholars such as Alyssa G. Cavazos and Mihut, I argue that there are small steps that can be taken in the classroom, within current institutional structures, by implementing pedagogical approaches such as Writing about Writing (WAW), literacy narratives, and contract grading. I further argue for why experimenting with these pedagogical approaches can help those teaching FYC courses to take

steps toward a translingual approach. By doing so, instructors can confront the racist and discriminatory ideologies in writing instruction and support the linguistic diversity of their students.

What Is Translingualism?

The translingualism movement began in 2011 in an opinion piece titled, "Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach." Bruce Horner et al. ask the field to consider the ramifications of language ideologies in their composition courses. They argue that current models in composition view language as static and constrained by rigid rules and suggest a reorientation to language that "insists on viewing language differences and fluidities as resources to be preserved, developed, and utilized" (Horner et al. 304). According to the authors, a translingual approach challenges the myth of Standard Edited American English (SEAE) and reflects the reality of language usage better than current practices in the field. While it seems revolutionary in thought, translingualism simply seeks to help students understand how "writers can, do, and must negotiate standardized rules in light of the contexts of specific instances of writing" (305). In short, translingualism asks instructors to stop seeing language difference as a barrier to learning how to write.

Translingualism seeks to interrogate the practices and assumptions from which the field has grown. It is why instructors must seek to confront these assumptions head on to begin reversing and challenging these harmful practices.

The Tradition behind Translingualism

Translingualism builds on the long history of language rights advocacy in the field. One pivotal moment was the Conference on College Composition and Communication's (CCCC) "Student's Right to Their Own Language" (SRTOL) statement of 1974. Given the increasing recognition of domestic linguistic diversity and multilingual students, scholars recognized the need to address the new challenges that these students presented to writing instruction. SRTOL was commissioned as an institutional statement that affirmed and invited other languages and dialects of English into the academic sphere. Geneva Smitherman, one of its key contributors, highlights the important role SRTOL played in the battle for language rights in the field of Composition Studies. She claims that CCCC "was responding to a developing crisis in college composition classrooms, a crisis caused by the cultural and linguistic mismatch between higher education and the nontraditional (by virtue of Color and class) students" (19). Her work stands as a testament to the long-fought battle for student language rights within the discipline and the need to continue fighting this battle.

As more students with various linguistic backgrounds entered universities, fields like English as a Second Language (ESL) and Second Language Writing (SLW) became increasingly important. Their work to provide student-centered pedagogies to prepare students for English-heavy curricula is crucial to the success of many students in the academy. Despite the work of experts in ESL and SLW, however, Paul Kei Matsuda argues in "The

Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity" that universities are making harmful assumptions about the linguistic resources students have: universities believe that student populations are largely monolingual, when, in fact, a majority of these students are multilingual or speak a different variety of English. He uses current university practices as evidence of these assumptions in a damning work that highlights the ingroup mentality within higher education, but also within English and writing departments across the nation. The long history of advocacy in student language rights has been foundational to the current translingualism movement as it works towards dismantling the discriminatory practices within Composition Studies.

Critiques of Translingualism

Since 2011, numerous scholars have attempted to develop translingualism as an approach. As indicated above, the fight for student language rights has a long history in the discipline, and as a result, the recent translingual conversation has grown alongside conversations within ESL and SLW. Questions of disciplinarity arose when translingualism as a field began being privileged and ultimately confused with ESL and SLW disciplines. Dwight Atkinson et al. brought attention to the fact that work being done in both ESL and SLW was being minimized by translingualism. While these scholars are supportive of the translingual movement, the authors ask for instructors and institutions to see translingualism not as a replacement for these fields but as a parallel yet distinct conversation. Given that translingualism has grown out of conversations that have long been a part of ESL and SLW scholarship, such discussions have been crucial to understanding the disciplinary boundaries of translingualism. Working to mend and foster these boundaries is what will allow for the cross-disciplinary work that should occur in order to implement translingual theory into the classroom.

Related to this discussion is the conflation of code-meshing and translingual writing. Early attempts at implementation came in the form of exploring the role of code-meshing in a translingual pedagogy. Briefly, code-meshing refers to a writer's ability to combine various linguistic registers into one's writing (Canagarajah, "Codemeshing"). The conflation of the two terms has led to the problematic viewing that translingual theory demands students to produce visible differences in their writing. Matsuda's "The Lure of Translingual Writing" outlines how and why this came to be in scholarship. The analogy he makes between tourism and scholars seeking out visible language difference is an effective argument for instructors to teach students how to use language as a writing heuristic. In other words, this focus on visible difference (i.e., code-meshing) in student writing glances over more nuanced understandings of language usage that appreciate the rhetorical agency in small acts of defiance against dominant discourses. If the goal of a translingual approach is to give students the tools to negotiate standardized rules in light of a rhetorical context, instructors need to do more to appreciate and value the other ways their students are negotiating such standards.

Throughout the many critiques of translingualism, there lies a common thread of

needing to address dangerous theorizations to better situate translingual practices. Keith Gilyard's 2016 article, "The Rhetoric of Translingualism," echoes such concerns by arguing for the field to align itself more with language rights advocacy. He also suggests how the field can resist particular concepts so that translingualism as a field can "forge a stronger narrative" about itself (284). His poignant argument showcases the need to be attentive to how scholars and proponents are approaching translingual theory. Resisting concepts such as "language as an abstraction" and the "sameness-of-difference model" are important for the field of translingualism since these concepts arguably take away from the need to front language rights discourse and dismantle the monolingual paradigm (287). By recognizing these inconsistencies in the field, Gilyard wants instructors to continue developing translingual approaches in the best way possible, thus pushing the field of translingualism to align itself with making the university accessible to marginalized and minority students whose languages and cultures have historically been discredited by SEAE.

The critiques of translingualism help the field of Composition Studies reorient itself to better advocate for students who have been marginalized by the practices and assumptions related to SEAE. By embracing a translingual approach, Composition Studies can subvert the gate-keeping practices related to monolingual ideologies that prevent students from maximizing their rhetorical potential. So how have instructors begun to address these issues in their classrooms?

How Has Translingualism Theory Been Implemented?

The question of how to implement translingual theory into the classroom has woven its way through scholarship for the last nine years. Again, when considering the fact that translingualism was built upon years of language rights advocacy, asking why instructors should adopt a translingual approach to language has become clear. Rather than asking students to produce visible language difference in their writing, scholars have reiterated the need to advocate for underrepresented and minority student populations as a means to subvert dominant language discourses.

Examples of Implementation

In what follows, I discuss three examples that demonstrate how instructors have implemented translingual tenets in their writing classroom within current institutional structures. They all show how instructors can empower their students to consider the role of SEAE in their daily lives so that students can inform themselves to make critical and rhetorical language choices in their writing. While these are only a few examples of implementation out of many, they are the most influential to my own perspective on translingualism as an undergraduate student. Most importantly, though, they highlight the need to inform and educate students about language so that instructors, scholars, and universities can better support students with various linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

While discussions regarding code-meshing often overshadow earlier attempts at implementation, such works are still valuable to refer to. With this in mind, the works of Suresh Canagarajah are useful for theorizing how to invite diverse perspectives into the classroom ("Codemeshing"; "Negotiating"). Particularly, his emphasis on increased dialogue between instructor and students, along with the practice-based approach he advocates for, help one imagine how translingual tenets can be better situated in a classroom with similar approaches. Canagarajah's classroom ethnographies are useful for seeing how student writing can be negotiated in a variety of ways, such as in one-on-one conferences or even over email. His position as instructor allowed him to leverage his practice-based approach to create an environment that allowed for his students to challenge him and ultimately let him learn from his students. I maintain that such approaches are useful for translingual theory in that they imagine a classroom space that is accepting and supportive of negotiation of student writing between instructors and students. Even though they were situated to forward how code-meshing could be implemented in the classroom, such practices can hopefully lead the way towards a classroom that is dedicated to learning how to resist standardized rules instead of upholding them. As I will discuss later, keeping an open dialogue between instructors and students will be key to experimenting with translingual tenets in FYC.

Another pedagogical approach comes from Jay Jordan's *Redesigning Composition for Multilingual Realities*, which documents his experience implementing an intercultural rhetoric framework in an FYC context. He discovered that an intercultural rhetoric framework benefits students by illuminating the various perspectives and literacies their peers bring to the classroom. He achieved this by grouping students up for peer review across two classrooms: a composition course and an ESL classroom. Given the various backgrounds that students in each class possessed, it led them to learn from and about their peers. As a student myself, this could be helpful in order to see the need for a translingual approach in FYC. Given FYC's position in the university as an introductory course, an intercultural rhetoric framework could prime students to begin thinking about how language users shape language. It is also interesting to consider how simply implementing peer review in a new way can lead the way for students to bear witness to multilingualism in a university setting. This framework helps establish how practices within the field of Composition Studies can actually aid in implementing translingual tenets into the classroom. While not expressly translingual, Jordan's work contributes immensely when it comes to introducing to students the need for translingual approaches. It is a first step for students to begin unraveling SEAE as a system of oppression. Hopefully, as a result of students witnessing multi-linguistic and multi-cultural formations, they can begin considering how they can make informed language choices for themselves as emerging writers.

Approaching translingualism through a multiliteracies perspective, Laura Gonzales affirms the importance of acknowledging these

perspectives and literacies in "Multimodality, Translingualism, and Rhetorical Genre Studies." In this article, Gonzales outlines how multilingual students can inform student perspectives on genre and multimodal projects. Most surprising about her findings was that multilingual students were approaching multimodal projects in a more complex way than their native English-speaking counterparts. For example, the multilingual students she interviewed claimed that they were able to "layer meaning" in their projects as opposed to their monolingual counterparts who thought of such projects as ways to repeat ideas (Gonzales). Thus, demonstrating how multilingual students can be experts in multimodal composing. She asserts that a translingual approach to genre studies would allow teachers to appreciate the skills and perspectives that multilingual students bring into composition courses. Gonzales here successfully demonstrates an additive perspective towards multilingualism in the composition classroom. Finding ways that multilingual students can inform the classroom should be further explored as translingualism grows as a field. Nevertheless, scholars should resist seeking out visible difference in student writing. This is so instructors can instead advocate for underrepresented students of color who have historically been marginalized by SEAE. Arguably, if translingualism as a field can demonstrate to students how language is a tool for writers, it would be a strong argument for students themselves to embrace translingual tenets in the FYC classroom and beyond. Recruiting students will not only be helpful in developing an expressive translingual pedagogy, but it will also be useful in the interim to continue fostering dialogue between instructors and students as scholars continue to experiment.

As is evident, instructors are finding effective ways to integrate translingual tenets into their classrooms. They strive to help students navigate their linguistic resources so that instructors in FYC can respect and invite marginalized voices, all the while working within current institutional structures. Inspired by these attempts and theoretical discussions, I will now discuss my own ideas for integrating translingual theory into FYC.

How Might Translingualism Theory be Integrated?

In this section, I will focus on three pedagogical strategies in Composition Studies that seem well-positioned to integrate a translingual approach. What I am suggesting is a means to implement translingual tenets in the classroom within current institutional structures. Instructors can then invite and acknowledge the diverse linguistic repertoires of their students in the classroom. While each strategy described here deserves an in-depth discussion, such coverage is simply outside the scope of this thesis. Nevertheless, I hope to acknowledge the important work that is being done within each and their further potential. At the scale of classroom design, I consider the efficacy of a Writing about Writing (WAW) approach to translingual scholarship in FYC contexts. Via such an approach, students can then make informed decisions for their own language goals.

Then, I explore the use of literacy narratives to give students the space to practice their language goals. What is meant by language goals is simply the action of letting students decide for themselves what language or language varieties suit their writerly needs. Finally, I approach the challenging question of assessment by advocating for the use of grading contracts. Together, these recommendations demonstrate how well translingualism can be integrated within popular teaching approaches. My perspective as an undergraduate student has given me the opportunity to research these approaches through the eyes of a student. Through such a perspective, I want to advocate for instructors to consider how they can take an "activist stance," as Mihut argues, against monolingual ideologies (81). I also maintain that there can be real benefits to letting undergraduate students weigh in on translingual theory, especially when instructors begin formulating best practices for a translingual pedagogy.

For that reason, the approaches I have chosen are meant to give students power in the classroom, which will provide them the opportunity to see how they can help shape our practices as a field. By providing students with opportunities to see language as negotiable and allowing them the space to exert their own agency over their linguistic resources, the FYC classroom could emerge not as a space to police standards but as a space to support growing writers.

Translingualism and Writing about Writing

In order to embrace a translingual approach in FYC, students will need to understand what it means and why it matters. One way to achieve this is through a WAW approach to translingualism, as Cavazos suggested. This will entail teaching translingual debates to students and having them engage in the scholarship via assignments and class discussion. As a result, many of the current practices in Composition Studies can be utilized in a translingual approach by first situating the classroom to challenge SEAE as the language of the academy. After Douglas Downs and Elizabeth Wardle's initial articulation in 2007, they later argue that a WAW pedagogy takes advantage of Jan Meyer and Ray Land's "threshold concepts" to select content that will be taught to students (Wardle and Downs). Put simply, a threshold concept is one that challenges prior understanding of a topic. Often, it is a discipline-specific topic that leads to a new, more profound understanding of said topic. Much like some theories or approaches in Composition Studies can act as threshold concepts, translingual theory seems adept to challenge students' assumptions, particularly those related to language.

For this reason, I think translingualism can arguably be a threshold concept for the field of Composition Studies. This would position the translingualism field, and its scholarship, in a unique position that would allow instructors to teach the field's findings in language while also practicing them in the classroom. Since its inception, WAW has aimed to let students learn about writing from scholarship in the field of Composition Studies and develop an awareness of writing as discipline-specific. Using translingual scholarship in a WAW pedagogy would reinforce these outcomes and support an understanding of writing and language as

specific to the context to which the writer is contributing. In other words, WAW and translingual scholarship could help create a holistic view of language usage as rhetorical and situated. Instructors can then begin the important work of helping students make informed language choices for themselves by helping them navigate dominant language discourses.

Like Downs and Wardle, I believe that students will find interest in scholarship that pertains to them, especially topics that have had long-standing ramifications for them. While many readings would seem potentially helpful for students to engage in translingual scholarship, I avoid suggesting readings in this work. I merely want to advocate for instructors to consider teaching these debates to their students in order to demystify both a translingual approach and the role of SEAE. By having students read and discuss translingual scholarship, instructors can then situate their classroom practices to reinforce translingual tenets. As scholars such as Cavazos and Gonzalez have suggested, instructors have a lot to learn from students and the linguistic backgrounds they bring into the classroom. By allowing undergrads to read translingual theory through a WAW approach, students would then be able to see that language is shaped by its users and not by a rulebook. Classroom discussions can guide students to explore how language ideologies impact their lives and education. These discussions will prove useful in allowing students to develop the critical awareness and understanding needed to make rhetorical language choices in their writing and everyday lives. This critical agency is especially important to foster for multilingual students whose linguistic repertoires are able to traverse across contexts and audiences. As Min-Zhan Lu and Bruce Horner advocate, instructors should locate agency in all instances of students negotiating SEAE. Such a perspective in the classroom would provide students with a range of tools and skills to shape their texts for whatever audience they are writing for. Therefore, using translingual scholarship in a WAW pedagogy should give students the option to put forth what they want about their language and culture in their writing. By positing the classroom as a space to interrogate language and monolingual ideologies, instructors can not only acknowledge how the field has contributed to the assimilationist agenda in the United States but also, in a much stronger way, ask students for help in finding a solution.

The value of learning about Composition Studies while practicing writing challenged my preconceived notions about the practice and introduced me to the scholars who are dedicated to the study of writing and writing studies. I suggest a WAW approach to translingual theory because this same orientation can lead to students discovering the nuances between language and writing through the vast amounts of scholarship dedicated to these topics. Students who come into FYC might assume that SEAE is the standard for correctness in academia and in life after college. Challenging that notion by teaching translingual debates in FYC can prepare students for the various rhetorical situations they will encounter during and after their university studies. Instructors must be critical of SEAE because the current paradigm

is limiting and discriminatory for many students. Opposing this dominant discourse will then allow students to make language choices from an informed stance. In other words, a WAW approach in the classroom will give students the ability to make the right language decisions for themselves in the classroom. From here, students can then learn what it looks like and means to challenge SEAE in their writing. The next step then is to figure out how to support these rhetorical language choices in the classroom.

Translingualism and Literacy Narratives

The second approach is to use literacy narratives in a translingual pedagogy. A literacy narrative is a genre of writing that relies on reflection and analysis to explain to readers the importance of a particular moment for someone's literacy development. In translingual scholarship, literacy narratives have been used as a means to let students explore code-meshing strategies (Canagarajah "Codemeshing"; Canagarajah "Translingual Writing"). Utilizing literacy narratives, instructors can invite and acknowledge their students' various cultural and linguistic backgrounds into the classroom. Students can then exert their linguistic agency in a writing situation meant for personal exploration. For these reasons, it seems like a well-fitting assignment for students who might want to explore how SEAE has influenced their lives. As a result of these explorations, students will be able to practice making critical decisions about what to put forth regarding their linguistic and cultural heritage. In short, the literacy narrative is a promising genre in FYC pedagogy, offering an important opportunity for students to explore their personal literacy development.

Within a translingual approach, literacy narratives allow students to reflect on how their past literacy experiences have led them to the present moment. Canagarajah usefully demonstrates how the literacy narrative genre allowed one of his students to code-mesh and practice her language goals ("Codemeshing"). While his study focused on what kinds of code-meshing strategies she used, it innately shows how the literacy narrative is a flexible and negotiable genre of writing that gave the student the space to challenge SEAE in various ways. Also, his open-minded approach as an instructor to her code-meshing strategies gave way to a more nuanced negotiation of meaning that allowed his student to also teach him about language. His use of one-on-one conferences in particular allowed the student to explain why she made certain choices in her writing. Just as much as the literacy narrative itself, Canagarajah's practices as the instructor further supported the student to reflect on her rhetorical language choices. In short, Canagarajah's theorization suggests how students can begin exercising the linguistic agency that a translingual pedagogy affords. Moving forward, though, the literacy narrative can be situated in a translingual pedagogy because it not only gives students the literal space to be creative with their writing, given the flexibility of the genre but also a chance to enact their language goals. What I mean to suggest is that the literacy narrative project in FYC allows students to negotiate and challenge SEAE in

various ways. It would also be an opportunity for instructors to get to know each student's literacy background, which can yield many benefits. Because literacy narratives are already well supported by scholarship, they are ripe for experimentation within translingual pedagogy.

Literacy narratives can be a space for students to reflect on how SEAE has shaped their own language practices throughout their lives. Through Jordan's intercultural rhetoric framework, literacy narratives may also help students discover the diverse perspectives that their peers have brought with them into the classroom via peer review. In many ways, the literacy narrative not only helps instructors bear witness to these diverse perspectives in the university, but it also gives students this chance as well. This move is one of the more powerful ways instructors can give students the opportunity to practice and acknowledge translingual perspectives in the classroom. Doing so would help students confront SEAE in an academic context. Thus, a literacy narrative project within a translingual approach accomplishes two outcomes: it gives students space to practice and negotiate their language goals in relation to a rhetorical context, and it allows students to examine dominant discourses through witnessing how their peers' literacies have developed in relation to those discourses. By reading and writing literacy narratives in dialogue with translingualism, students have the opportunity to continue developing agency and critical awareness about language. The genre and the multiple ways that literacy narratives can be leveraged in the classroom open up many possibilities to respect linguistic and cultural diversity. From here, it is important to consider how to assess students, a complicated question for translingual scholars. I suggest instructors look to growing research on anti-racist assessment practices.

Translingualism and Grading Contracts

After instructors both demystify a translingual approach to students and invite them to practice their own language goals, the next step is considering how to assess student writing in a translingual pedagogy. Recent work on contract grading can be useful for implementing translingual tenets in assessment. Over the years, contract grading has become more than an alternative to grading; it is now also a way to subvert discriminatory practices in writing assessment. Asao Inoue's recent work on labor-based grading contracts has furthered such a perspective on assessment. A labor-based grading contract is one that recognizes student labor as the means of assessment. Students are solely graded based on the labor they have achieved with no attention given to "standards." Therefore, the only grade in the course is the final grade, which is determined by the amount of labor performed. Inoue argues that this approach "changes the rules of the grading game in such a way that White language supremacy can not only be seen for what it is, but effectively countered" (9). For this reason, Inoue contends that labor-based grading contracts resist this agenda and subvert discriminatory practices that marginalize underrepresented and minority students. Using labor-based grading contracts, then, is a way to further invent the classroom as a space for learning and understanding.

This method answers many doubts about assessment within possible translingual pedagogies. For one, labor-based grading contracts resist the idea of grading based on standards, allowing instructors the position to negotiate writing with students without having to appease a dominant discourse. Instructors can then support student language goals by working with them to build a rhetorical understanding of language. In addition to this, grading contracts allow for assessment of student writing from a position of respect and tolerance. It advocates for more negotiation of meaning between writer and reader, which will be needed if instructors are to invite diverse linguistic formations into FYC. It further sediments another translingual tenet by establishing the classroom as a space for practice. By using contract grading, the classroom can be seen as one where students can take risks in their writing without the fear of the instructor's red pen. More importantly, though, since every student will have very different language goals, assessment will need to be individualized. Labor-based grading contracts afford individualization by circumventing subjective grading practices that are within a one-size-fits-all model. It asks instructors to negotiate student writing as readers and not assessors of standards. Therefore, feedback can be focused on each student's learning needs and goals. What is more is the fact that there are many different kinds of grading contracts, which can give instructors a level of flexibility under institutional demands. For example, there are subtractive or rubric-style contracts that approach assessment a little differently, yet they all emphasize student cooperation in creating an equitable approach to assessment in the FYC classroom. Approaching assessment through a lens of equity and inclusivity will be a productive way to move translingual tenets into the classroom.

Grading contracts are tools that can further sediment the classroom as a space for negotiation and practice, which will allow students to practice their language goals if they so choose. No matter the type of grading contract that is to be used, de-emphasizing grades will help instructors invite students to think about their writing as a learning process, not a product. Moreover, as Inoue demonstrates, contract grading can resist discriminatory practices that harm marginalized and minority students (3). As proponents of translingualism have argued, scholars, researchers, and instructors in Composition Studies need to advocate for and support these students to be pedagogically viable (Gilyard 285). Contract grading is one way to align translingualism with current discussions surrounding critical pedagogy and questions of access. For this reason, I hope that instructors consider implementing contract grading and report on their classroom experiences.

Conclusion

Composition Studies has a rich history of advocating for our students, and translingualism advances that mission. The practices I have suggested above are a means to begin taking action to improve access and combat monolingual ideologies in FYC. If there is one thing I can say for certain as an undergraduate student, it is that students in FYC will have an opinion

about translingual theory—they too will want to be a part of the process. In short, involving students in this pursuit may help shape future approaches for a translingual pedagogy. The pedagogical tools that I have suggested work to support students' linguistic agency within FYC. They endow students with knowledge of the field, spaces to practice their language goals, and an equitable assessment framework. All of these aspects then position the classroom as an inviting space meant for learning and growth. Students will notice instructors' efforts to listen and will inevitably become an important ally for instructors if they are allowed to participate in these discussions.

As a translingual approach becomes more realizable, it will be crucial to keep in mind a few things as instructors move forward. For one, there will be flawed applications of translingual pedagogies; it is inevitable, but that should not stop instructors from exploration. After such practical experiments, it will be even more crucial for instructors to report on their experiences. Secondly, given the flexibility of language, translingual pedagogies should be just as flexible to fully acknowledge the realities of language usage. If we acknowledge that language is forever changing, pedagogies will have to constantly change to accommodate these fluctuations. It will be difficult to articulate a full translingual pedagogy for this reason, but again, this should not stop instructors from attempting to be flexible in their approaches. Watching out for these obstacles will keep our sights on bringing equitable practices that invite linguistic and cultural diversity into the writing classroom. As many have stated before, these small steps in the classroom and in our departments will lead to the larger institutional changes for which the field should continue advocating. Beginning to combat these dominant discourses by letting students learn and challenge them is what will make a difference for marginalized and minority students in the university.

If students want to advance and practice their linguistic resources in their writing, writing instructors should support them in this goal. This is because, from here, students can then be better prepared for the variety of writing situations and discourses they will encounter after their studies.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank Dr. Kate Comer for their thoughtful guidance and support in crafting this project. The author would also like to thank Zhaozhe Wang for their useful feedback in the revision process.

Works Cited

Atkinson, Dwight, et al. "Clarifying the Relationship between L2 Writing and Translingual Writing: An Open Letter to Writing Studies Editors and Organization Leaders." *College English*, vol. 77, no. 4, 2015, pp. 383-386.

Canagarajah, Suresh. "Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging." *The Modern Language Journal*, vol. 95, no. 3, Sept. 2011, pp. 401–417, doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x.

—. "Negotiating Translingual Literacy: An Enactment." *Research in the Teaching of English*, vol. 48, no. 1, 2013, pp. 28.

—. "Translingual Writing and Teacher Development in Composition." *College English*, vol. 78, no. 3, 2016, pp. 265-273.

Cavazos, Alyssa G. "Encouraging Languages Other than English in First-Year Writing Courses: Experiences from Linguistically Diverse Writers." *Composition Studies*, vol. 47, no. 1, 2019.

Downs, Doug, and Elizabeth Wardle. "Teaching about Writing, Righting Misconceptions: (Re)Envisioning 'First-Year Composition' as 'Introduction to Writing Studies.'" *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 58, no. 4, 2007, pp. 552–584.

Gilyard, Keith. "The Rhetoric of Translingualism." *College English*, vol. 78, no. 3, 2016, pp. 284-289.

Gonzales, Laura. "Multimodality, Translingualism, and Rhetorical Genre Studies." *Composition Forum*, vol. 31, no. 7, 2015, compositionforum.com/issue/31/multimodality.php

Horner, Bruce, et al. "Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach." *College English*, vol. 73, no. 3, 2011, pp. 303-321.

Inoue, Asao B. *Labor-Based Grading Contracts: Building Equity and Inclusion in the Compassionate Writing Classroom*. The WAC Clearinghouse, 2019.

Jordan, Jay. *Redesigning Composition for Multilingual Realities*. National Council of Teachers of English, 2012.

Lu, Min-Zhan, and Bruce Horner. "Translingual Literacy, Language Difference, and Matters of Agency." *College English*, vol. 75, no. 6, 2013, pp. 582-607

Matsuda, Paul Kei. "The Lure of Translingual Writing." *PMLA*, vol. 129, no. 3, May 2014, pp. 478–483, doi:10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.478.

—. "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition." *College English*, vol. 68, no. 6, July 2006, pp. 637-651, doi:10.2307/25472180.

Mihut, Ligia. "Linguistic Pluralism: A Statement and a Call to Advocacy." *Reflections,* vol. 18, no. 2, 2019, pp. 66-86.

Smitherman, Geneva. "'Students' Right to Their Own Language': A Retrospective." *The English Journal*, vol. 84, no. 1, Jan. 1995, pp. 21-27, doi.org/10.2307/820470.

Wardle, Elizabeth, and Doug Downs. "Reflecting Back and Looking Forward: Revisiting 'Teaching about Writing, Righting Misconceptions' Five Years On." *Composition Forum*, 27, 2013, compositionforum.com/issue/27/reflecting-back.php.