LINGUISTIC JUSTICE IN WRITING STUDIES: TRANSLINGUALISM AND CRITICAL RHETORICAL AGENCY

by

Thir Bahadur Budhathoki

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

2023

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Dissertation Committee, we certify that we have read the dissertation prepared by Thir Bahadur Budhathoki, titled *Linguistic Justice in Writing Studies: Translingualism and Critical Rhetorical Agency* and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Aimee Mapes — Date: May 1, 2023

Damián P Baca — Date: May 1, 2023

Ann Shivers-McNair — Date: May 1, 2023

Ragini T Srinivasan
Ragini T Srinivasan (May 1, 2023 21:46 GMT+2) — Date: May 1, 2023

Ragini Srinivasan

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate's submission of the final copies of the dissertation to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

Aimee Mapes — Date: May 1, 2023
Dissertation Committee Chair
English Department

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to take this opportunity to thank my dissertation Chair Dr. Aimee Mapes for the continued support and guidance throughout this project. You made this long and arduous journey a lot more manageable. My thanks are due to other members of the committee—Dr. Damián Baca, Dr. Ann Shivers-McNair, and Dr. Ragini Tharoor Srinivasan—for all the intellectual and emotional support that made this work possible. I am forever grateful to you all for this opportunity to work, learn, and grow with you. I couldn't ask for a better committee!

I would like to thank Institute for Citizens and Scholars for the external funding in the final year of my dissertation, and the RCTE program and College of Social and Behavioral Sciences at the University of Arizona for the internal funding at various stages of my research.

Most importantly, I want to thank my wife Sabita, daughter Rahi, and son Raman for always being on my side during the highs and lows of my doctoral studies.

LAND ACKNOWLWDGEMENT

We respectfully acknowledge the University of Arizona is on the land and territories of Indigenous peoples. Today, Arizona is home to 22 federally recognized tribes, with Tucson being home to the O'odham and the Yaqui. Committed to diversity and inclusion, the University strives to build sustainable relationships with sovereign Native Nations and Indigenous communities through education offerings, partnerships, and community service.

DEDICATION

To my late parents who never ceased to believe in the power of education and continued to support me even during the worst hardships of their lives. You would be proud today!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This dissertation seeks to answer a broad and complex question that the field of writing studies has been grappling with: How do we promote linguistically just writing practices that are inclusive, effective, and ethical? As an individually and institutionally situated response, this dissertation proposes a linguistic justice framework for writing studies pedagogy that works toward redressing the harms of English monolingual and monocultural ideologies. These ideologies are entangled with racial and colonial differences and are operative in all writing classrooms today and we must help our students to confront and work through those ideologies as writers. I build and expand on the major tenets of translingualism using critical insights of from raciolinguistics, critical language awareness, antiracist Black language pedagogy as well as decolonial theories to make it more inclusive and responsive to pave the way for linguistically just writing practices that cultivate critical rhetorical agency of all students. In the next section, I share a critical autoethnographic study that examines my positionality as an international graduate teaching associate (IGTA), explores the ways my lived experiences have informed my research, and questions the West-centric notions of knowledge, research, and disciplinary narrative. Finally, I propose an equity-based writing curriculum that doesn't allow English monolingual and monocultural ideologies to harm nondominant linguistic subjects–students whose first language isn't English and/or standardized English–and ensures that all students actively participate in and mutually enrich each other's learning experience as writers. With three assignments of different yet interrelated nature, this chapter shows that all language use and all writing involve translation and translanguaging and invites students to debunk the myths of Standard (Written) English.

Chapter-1: Linguistic Justice in Writing Studies: An Introduction

I grew up in rural Nepal where English was and still is a status marker and a language associated with employability and boundless other opportunities to explore the outside world[1]. I learnt the English alphabet in the fourth grade and grew up listening to the adulations conferred to people who could speak English, a select few who were born in an educated family or went to a private or missionary school in the big cities within the country or in the neighboring cities of India. However, none was true of me. I went to a public primary school in a neighboring village because it was closer to my home. Like all public schools in my area, it was a one-storied, U-shaped building with six rooms–one office room for five teachers and a staff and five classrooms for grades one to five. I vividly remember the wall of stone and mud and the roof of corrugated metal sheet under which there were rows of long desks and benches for at least four students to sit on each, a chalkboard, and a chair for the teacher as the only amenities in the classroom. Although there was no electricity, toilet, or drinking water supply, let alone a library, it was still better than many public-school buildings in other parts of the country that did not have a strong roof to protect against rain and extreme temperatures. When I reflect on how I was drawn to English language despite no exposure to a conducive learning environment other than one textbook in each academic year, I think it mostly came from the concept of English as a pathway to upward mobility I had subconsciously developed, and partly from a very inspiring teacher I had in the fourth and fifth grades. In fact, he was the first person I heard speak English. After I went to another school in the sixth grade, I missed him very badly because the English instruction there was perfunctory at best. It changed when a new teacher came in the middle of

[1] See Aamir R. Mufti, *Forget English! Orientalisms and World Literatures*; Ram Ashish Giri, "Nepali English" in *The Handbook of Asian Englishes*

the tenth grade, but we had less than six months before the high school board exams. I did well in English in the exams by the local standard and graduated without ever knowing there could be a thing called a library or supplemental reading materials. As a first-generation student, I had no family guidance or any professional career counseling whatsoever. I went to college to enroll for an Intermediate of Arts degree (equivalent to class 11 and 12) with the elder brother of my future roommate at college. When presented with a choice between Nepali and English majors, he chose Nepali for his younger brother, and I chose English. It was just an instinctual move. Looking back, I feel that all the impressions and ideologies that I had internalized over the years must have prompted me to major in English.

Fast forward twenty-five years: I am writing this dissertation in a public research university in the United States. Before joining the graduate program in Rhetoric and Composition at the department of English in this Hispanic Serving as well as American Indian Alaska Native Serving University located near the US-Mexico border in 2017, I had acquired a masters in English and worked as a teacher of English at both school and college levels for over a decade. It was my dream career, a dream that I now realize was shaped by the social capital enjoyed by the English professionals in my community and a hope for upward mobility it offered.

However, my journey as a student and teacher of English has been anything but easy. I have experienced a complex negotiation with English as a foreign language with a latent desire to acquire “authentic” English and its impossibility resulting in a sense of perpetual inadequacy. My relationship with English only got more complicated when I started teaching writing as a part of college General English curriculum first in a private college after my master’s degree and later academic writing courses in a public university in Nepal without any formal training on it. The

paradox of teaching writing without doing much writing myself put me in a position of discomfort which motivated me to pursue a Ph.D. in writing studies in the birthplace of the discipline itself. However, my negotiation with English was far from over.

My first experience of teaching First-Year Writing (FYW) as an International Graduate Teaching Associate (IGTA) after an intensive five-day orientation was intimidating at best. Being 8000 miles away from home for the first time and teaching a class full of US domestic students and navigating new technologies at the same time was a real test of my teacherly self. What is more, exploring the new academic culture as a student returning to graduate school after more than a long gap was not easy either. What followed in the months and years was an experience of being in a position of privilege and marginality at the same time. Comparing where and how I learned English to the resources and support I receive as a student and an instructor here was a huge privilege. But the additional labor that I had to invest as an IGTA "trapped by invisible forces in difficult pedagogical relationships and the subsequent emotional drain" was both exhausting and frustrating to say the least (Zhang 486). Besides, many international students cannot perform on par with the perceived standard of academic and professional development, which like any other "standards" is ideologically constructed. As B. Kumaravadivelu argues, international graduate students experience self-marginalization that, in most cases, results in a prolonged imposter syndrome, and I was one of them. This is where lies the personal exigency of this research that aims at creating a responsive and inclusive framework of linguistic justice in writing studies.

As important as my personal experience is, the current social, cultural, and political climate provides a greater credence to my research. Growing racial tensions, the rise of ultra

nationalist, anti-immigrant and anti-minority rhetorics and violence, recurrent police brutality against Black people and the resultant Black Lives Matter movement, countless protests and riots across the United States and other parts of the world have raised new questions about what so far have been commonly accepted as basic human values like liberty and equality. These tensions got even worse with the onslaught of COVID-19 pandemic that coincided with one of the most contentious and divisive presidential elections that made 2020 an unprecedented year in the history of the United States. COVID-19 killed way more people in the world's richest and most powerful country than any other country on the planet and it has had a disproportionate impact on the minority, immigrant, and a range of low-income populations. All these events stand as a strong refutation of the rhetoric of post-racial America and a clarion call for a long and difficult journey toward a just society where every human is treated with dignity and equality.

Although these issues are much more complicated in nature and wider in scope than we would like them to be, writing studies as a field that teaches students about the purposeful and effective use of language to engage in academic, professional, and civic discourses must account for the language-race connections. April Baker-Bell in *Linguistic Justice: Black Language, Literacy, Identity, and Pedagogy* shows how language and racism are intertwined, makes a strong case against anti-black linguistic racism that is affecting millions of lives both inside and outside the classroom, and offers an Antiracist Black Language Pedagogy to deal with linguistic injustice. She urges us to imagine a world without anti-blackness where another George Floyd doesn't get killed despite his repeated plea--"I cannot breathe" --in "Standard American English." Baker-Bell's 2020 monograph *Linguistic Justice* is one of the latest contributions from the field of Literacy and Language Arts to a long scholarly tradition sustained by figures like

Geneva Smitherman, bell hooks, and so on. The field of college composition has a long history of dealing with the issue of language differences and linguistic justice.

After the inception of college composition at Harvard in the 1870s, professionalization of composition studies formally started with the foundation of Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) in 1949. The socio-political changes in the aftermath of the Black Civil Rights movement and the fourth wave of immigration from Latin America and Asia shook the fundamental character and beliefs of American society. What multiculturalism and its major constituent part multilingualism embraced as cultural and linguistic diversity significantly weakened the monolingual ideologies that unjustly privileged the language of the majority and the powerful. CCCC's adoption of Students' Rights to Their Own Languages (SRTOL) in 1974 was an important milestone toward linguistic justice in college writing classrooms and it reflects these changes taking place in American society. As great as the achievements like the Civil Rights Acts and SRTOL were on their own, the journey to social justice was far from over, and this has been proven more than once. Countless protests after the incidents of racially motivated violence and police brutality of which Black Lives Matter is the latest and most vocal response on the civic front, and numerous position statements from CCCC, including the latest "CCCC Statement on Language, Power, and Action" November 2022, reiterate the fact that language differences must be understood within the asymmetrical power relations in the society.

As an academic discipline focused on higher education, writing studies has its own limitations and it cannot solve all these problems once and for all. However, what it can and should do is build and promote the type of research, scholarship, and teaching that foreground these crucial issues rather than gloss over them and invite a healthy civic engagement on these

uncomfortable topics. Such efforts lead us toward an inclusive, effective and ethical approach to writing in college writing classrooms that are becoming more and more diverse every day. A major breakthrough in composition studies that resonates the 1974 SRTOL took place when Bruce Horner and colleagues in 2011 introduced a translingual approach to writing that "sees difference in language not as a barrier to overcome or as a problem to manage, but as a resource for producing meaning in writing, speaking, reading, and listening" (303). Concepts of language differences were developed around the same time such as polylingual languaging (Jørgensen), polylingualism, (Jørgensen and Moller), translanguaging (Li Wei), truncated multilingualism (Blommaert), metrolingualism (Otsuji and Pennycook), transglossia (Sultana et al.), linguascapes (Dovchin), and translingualism with multiple phraseologies such as translingual practice (Canagarajah), translingual approach (Lu and Horner), translinguality (Horner and Alvarez), translinguistics (Lee and Dovchin), and translingual dispositions (Frost, et al.). Despite the different disciplinary orientations and subtle differences in these concepts, they all critique the hegemonic monolingual and monocultural notion that there is one version of "standard" English that all student writers must adhere to regardless of and often at the cost of their unique linguistic and cultural identities, and traditional (complacent) multilingualism with 'the more, the better' approach that perceives language more as a discrete category and doesn't fully account for the complexity and fluidity of language relations.

This dissertation both builds on and interrogates the major tenets of translingualism with a hope to make it more responsive and inclusive by foregrounding the racial and colonial differences that lie on the foundation of all language relations and the ideologies that lead to hierarchies and injustices, including devaluation, exclusion, and even erasure of the language and literacy practices that are deemed inadequate or unworthy. It is by exploring and amplifying the decolonial potentials

of translingualism as an epistemic break and its social justice concerns that we can move toward a more inclusive and responsive linguistic justice framework (Cushman; Horner and Alvarez). To develop an inclusive and responsive framework of linguistic justice, I will build and expands on the translingual approach to writing (Horner et al.; Canagarajah; Horner and Treteault; Frost et al.), with the insights from raciolinguistics (Smitherman; Rosa and Flores), linguistic justice framework with an Antiracist Black Language Pedagogy (Baker-Bell), and decolonial potentials and options (Anzaldua; Quijano; Mignolo; Baca; Cushman; Garcia and Baca). The broader focus of this dissertation is the big question of linguistic justice that the field of writing studies has been grappling with: How do we promote linguistically just writing practices that are effective, inclusive, and ethical? But for the sake of delimitation, my dissertation seeks to answer a subset of following questions:

- What are the relevant tenets of translingualism, raciolinguistics, critical langauge awareness, antiracist Black linguistic justice, and decolonial theory that ground a more inclusive and responsive linguistic justice framework in writing studies? How can we articulate such a framework in the way that foreground students—their needs and roles as writers?
- How do the embodied experiences of an International Graduate Associate Teaching (IGTA) of color teaching decolonize the West-centric notions of knowledge research in the field?
- In what ways do personal narrative, intralingual translation, and critical language awareness contribute to the linguistically just writing practices?

Chapter Outline

The first chapter being the introduction, chapter two establishes a theoretical framework of an inclusive and responsive framework of linguistic justice that foregrounds the racial and colonial differences that undergird all language relations, and the way language differences result into linguistic injustice through the hierarchization, marginalization, and erasure of language and literacy practices that are deemed inadequate and unworthy in the dominant discourse. It paves the way for four basic principles of linguistically just writing practices that:

- affirms diverse student voices and uses differences as resources for agentive writing practices
- emphasizes translation and differences as fundamental to *all* writing
- invites students to debunk the harmful ideologies of Standardized English
- cultivates critical rhetorical agency

Chapter three as an autoethnographic study interrogates the politics of my positionality as a first-generation college student who learned and taught English as a foreign language in Nepal before coming to the US. Turning the ethnographic gaze toward the personal experiences as the main source of data accompanied by a few students' perspectives, this chapter connects the personal with the cultural with the strategic use of self-reflection and self-reflexivity. Through an embodied experience of teaching and researching as an IGTA, this chapter will explore the ways and the extent to which inclusive and responsive linguistic justice framework helps us account for the additional labor required of the international students whose first language is not English and the U. S. domestic students who speak non-standardized English and yet considered as "native" English speakers. It will also interrogate if, how, and to what extent autoethnography contributes to the decolonization of knowledge making process in the field and my personal

experience of negotiating cultural and linguistic differences as an IGTA informs my understanding and theorization of linguistic justice in writing studies.

With the new linguistic justice framework, chapter four proposes curricular intervention to promote linguistically just writing practices with an assignment sequence that exemplifies these basic principles. The Language and Literacy Autobiography assignment has evolved from the literacy narrative assignment I have been using since Fall 2017 and a qualitative case study I conducted to understand the role of cross-cultural conversations and border crossing in a first year writing classroom. Likewise, I have used part of the translation assignment, the paraphrase activity, with great success in writing classrooms, whereas other intralingual translation activity and the research assignment debunking the myths of standardized English are yet to be tested in the writing classrooms. At any rate, all these assignments are deeply informed by scholarship and research on linguistically just approach to writing that is deeply rooted in my lived experience The first assignment—Language and Literacy Autobiography—affirms diverse student voices and allows students to capitalize on their language and literacy experiences to develop a deeper understanding of their literate selves as a writer. This assignment also helps students to confront misconceptions about writing and research--academic writing is always neutral and impersonal, and research is either a sophisticated project meant for gifted researchers, or it is just about finding a few sources and summarizing them in addition to creating a bibliographic citation—and develop a nuanced understanding of the complex nature of writing and research. The second assignment—Writing as Translation and (Trans)Languaging—uses intralingual translation including paraphrase to let students experience how language differences are the natural part of all language relations and how writing, translation, and paraphrase are the negotiation language differences in different ways. The final assignment—Debunking the Myths of Standardized

(Written) English: A Research Report—provides students with an opportunity to research the history of language standardization and develop a critical awareness about the way standard language ideologies came into existence and they operate in the writing classroom as well as our day-to-day life. This assignment provides ample opportunities for students to learn secondary research skills as well. Chapter five sums up the main ideas of each preceding chapter and discusses the implication of this research in the field, acknowledges the limitations, and suggests potential future research issues.

Chapter-2: Linguistic Justice in Writing Studies: Toward Critical Rhetorical Agency

Looking back at the historic resolution Students' Rights to Their Own Language (SRTOL) passed by the executive committee of Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) in 1972 and a slightly different and weaker version of it passed by the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) in 1974, Stacy Perryman-Clark, David E. Kirkland, and Austin Jackson in their introduction to 2015 edited collection *Students' Rights to Their Own Language: A Critical Sourcebook* pose thought-provoking questions for teachers and scholars of college writing:

> How might instructors within and across [the] fields [dealing with languages, texts and cultures] teach across multiple lines of linguistic and cultural difference to help students broker effective communication skills? What frameworks, both theoretical and practical, might be available to guide these various fields in fostering just policies and enhanced practices that respect, value, use, and affirm the linguistic resources that *all* students bring with them to class? How might shifting notions of language, text, space, and culture, particularly as each catalyze linguistic hybridity and pluralism, inform and expand how language and literacy are understood, arranged, and facilitated at sites of inquiry and study? (2-3)

The efforts to answer these questions date back to the pre-SRTOL years and have continued till date in the fields of language, literacy, and writing studies. But it was the strong political exigency created by Black Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s that prompted the adoption of SRTOL, which was followed by the publication of a detailed background document in the special issue of *College Composition and Communication* in 1974. However, the response to the CCCC's progressive stance on linguistic justice and equality was very divided, to say the least.

Even NCTE, the parent organization of CCCC, did not fully own the 1972 resolution. Instead, they passed Resolution #74.2 in 1974 effectively avoiding the phrase 'Students' Rights.' While NCTE accepted "the linguistic premise that all these dialects are equally efficient as systems of communication" it dutifully reminded that students must learn the "conventions of what has been called written edited American English" (qtd. in Smitherman, "CCCC's Role" 77). This is but one example of how SRTOL was received within the field and an indication that "part of the challenge to enacting SRTOL [is] the perceived inevitability of SEAE [Standard Edited American English]" (Davila 128).

Between the SRTOL in 1972 and "CCCC Statement on Language, Power, and Action" in November 2022 preceded by "This Ain't Another Statement!This is a DEMAND for Black Linguistic Justice" in July 2020, CCCC has released more than a dozen position statements and revised and updated several others to address the new exigencies. If it was the political climate of the 1960s that had propelled the adoption of SRTOL, it was the political climate again, albeit of a different type, in the Reagan era of the 1980s that stalled the progressive ideas of linguistic justice along with the social justice movement at large. In about half a century since the adoption of SRTOL, a lot of work has been done toward transforming the promise of linguistic justice into reality while new and more complicated challenges have surfaced at the same time. This is reflected in the most recent position statement that explains how "language, power, and action are interconnected" ("CCCC Statement on Language, Power, and Action").

This statement means at least two things: in terms of rhetoric, it displays greater clarity and audacity in calling out language-power connections, but the very fact that there is a need for yet one more statement indicates that the mission of linguistic justice has not been accomplished yet. It also means that the basic questions raised in Perryman-Clark and colleagues above are still

pertinent. Therefore, this chapter proposes a theoretical framework of linguistic justice, particularly for writing studies, that is responsive enough to redress the ills of what Horner and Trimbur call "a tacit language policy of unidirectional English monolingualism" and inclusive enough to let linguistic and cultural differences work as resources for all student writers (594). But rather than attempting an exhaustive survey of all the efforts made since 1972 to achieve the goals of SRTOL, this chapter draws on the multiple strands of scholarship that address language differences and the resultant discrimination and injustice from different perspectives such as translingualism, raciolinguistics, antiracist Black language pedagogy, critical language awareness, and decolonial theory--particularly the concepts like borderlands and epistemic delinking–to define what linguistic justice means and how this framework can be more inclusive and responsive to the needs of both bi- and multilingual students whose first language is not English, Black English users, and other minority students whose first language is not standardized English (nondominant linguistic subjects hereafter). My approach to linguistic justice framework embraces the view that "research on the classroom benefits of SRTOL matter not only for students whose language patterns differ from LWC [Language of Wider Communication], but for all students regardless of sociolinguistic location" (Perryman-Clark et al. 6).

To this effect, I propose an inclusive and responsive framework of linguistic justice developed through a critical conversation among the major tenets of translingual approach to writing (Horner et al.; Canagarajah; Lu and Horner); raciolinguistic notion of conaturalization of language and race (Smitherman; Rosa and Flores); antiracist Black language pedagogy (Baker-Bell), Critical Language Awareness (CLA) pedagogy (Fairclough; Shapiro; Smitherman; Baker-Bell; Alim) and decolonial potentials and options embedded in the concepts like

borderlands (Anzaldua), epistemic delinking (Quijano), border thinking (Mignolo). This framework proposes possible ways to deal with the linguistic injustice caused by the dominance of monolingual and monocultural ideology of Standard Written English (SWE) in college writing. In doing so, it also offers a way to deal with the false binary of pragmatic and progressive approaches to language differences where the former is portrayed as total conformity to English monolingualism and the latter as a radical denial of all conventions. As important as it is to call out the linguistic injustices and language-race connections, we as writing teachers-scholars must ensure that a candid yet critical conversation on these topics with an open mind and heart continues in each writing classroom and all students actively participate in it. This becomes possible only if we go beyond the way and the extent to which monolingual and monocultural ideologies allow us to think about language differences and embrace the pluriversal realities of language and literacy practices that students bring to the classroom. Therefore, with an eclectic framework of linguistic justice that foregrounds the racial and colonial differences that undergird all language relations and hierarchies developed in this chapter, this dissertation will propose a curricular intervention in first year writing and a critical autoethnography of the researcher as a nondominant linguistic subject as two potential sites of intervention.

All nondominant linguistic subjects share a common experience of being devalued and othered by the dominant monolingual and monocultural ideology that is most effectively reflected in the emphasis on standardized English as the only way to legitimate knowledge production and dissemination. So, the way we treat and teach these students in the college writing classrooms is a matter of pedagogical ethics as well because it significantly impacts their transition to and success in higher education. As Christina V. Cedillo and Phil Bratta claim, first year writing classrooms are “make-or-break spaces, where students are encouraged to see

themselves as effective (or at least potentially effective) writers" (224). College writing courses could become the space "where students begin to lose interest in higher education if they fail to see themselves in the expected ethos demanded by a course" (224). The devaluation of "othered" linguistic and cultural resources in college writing not only impacts the academic performance of the nondominant linguistic subjects, but it also leads to more serious forms of discrimination and injustices. Also, it is a missed opportunity to equip college students with the writing skills they can develop through a critical understanding of language differences and the politics and ideologies involved in the ways those differences are represented and addressed. At this point, the pedagogical ethics of college writing intersects with the decolonial ethics that challenge the consequences of coloniality—perpetuation of Western colonial power structures and mindset even after the end of colonialism--that often goes unquestioned.

While this framework focuses more on bi- and multilingual students--both international and the US domestic students--it by no means overlooks the presence of English monolingual students in the college writing classrooms. With an empathetic approach to the needs of nondominant linguistic subjects, this framework goes beyond mere tolerance of differences and cosmetic changes toward the "pluriversal realities within composition studies, realities that could well change both the disciplinary and pedagogical tenets and content of the field" (Cushman, "Translingual and Decolonial" 235). By using decolonial concepts like borderlands, epistemic delinking, and border thinking to synthesize the decolonial potential of translingualism, theoretical and pedagogical implications of raciolinguistics, Critical Language Awareness, and antiracist Black language pedagogy, this framework argues for the space to navigate, interrogate and negotiate monolingual and monocultural ideologies represented by Standard (Written) English, and have a critical conversation with an open mind and heart about the disproportionate

impact of these ideologies among people of different class, race, gender, and national origins. It is a conversation that invites all students–regardless of their linguistic and cultural backgrounds–as equal stakeholders. This framework treats English as "a language always in translation" (Pennycook 34), foregrounds the value of labor invested in engaging the opacity of language differences, a concept that Bruce Horner and Sara P. Alvarez draws from ´Edouard Glissant. Glissant expands the notion of right to difference and its inevitability into "right to opacity that is not enclosure within an impenetrable autarchy but subsistence within an irreducible singularity" and that "opacities can coexist and converge, weaving fabrics" (191). Glissant's notion of opacity underscores the fundamental nature of human communication as well as all human interactions and existence as anything but transparent. Therefore it is negotiation and mutual respect, not us-them binary, that reflects the nature of all language usage, i. e., languaging. This linguistic justice framework also amplifies translingualism's potential for "moments of epistemic delinking in composition studies classrooms" (Cushman, "Translingual and Decolonial" 237) and "social justice concerns" (Horner and Alvarez 2). It draws on April Baker-Bell's antiracist Black language pedagogy that centers Black language and literacy practices and envisions college writing classrooms as what Gloria Anzaldua calls "borderlands" and students and instructors as border crossers (Giroux; Budhathoki). This framework also uses the raciolinguistic perspective to foreground the language-race interconnections as an integral part of border crossing in the writing classroom. Ultimately, this framework aspires to operate in what Walter Mignolo calls the exteriority "created by the rhetoric of modernity," of which monolingual and monocultural ideologies are the offshoots ("Delinking"462). It is the space where all binaries like pragmatism and progressivism can be resolved and pluriversal realities co-exist.

Linguistic Justice and Writing Studies: An Overview

My take on linguistic justice is informed by Amartya Sen's concept of realization-based justice. Sen approaches justice from a pragmatic perspective focusing on "'how would justice be advanced?'" as opposed to "'what would be perfectly just institutions?'" (9). Sen argues for an "accomplishment-based understanding of justice" to effectively deal with the injustice in the society because "justice cannot be indifferent to the lives that people can actually live" (18). In fact, absolute and transcendental justice is neither achievable nor necessary to deal with the injustices that we experience in society every day. Ingrid Piller builds her concept of linguistic justice drawing on Sen's pragmatic approach and Nancy Fraser's negative approach to justice through injustice. According to Fraser:

> We do not need to know what justice is in order to know when something is wrong. What we need, rather, is to sharpen our sense of injustice, to cut through obfuscation and ideology. Focusing on the wrong, we need to determine why it is so and how it could be made right. Only through such a process of negative thinking can we activate the concept of justice, redeem it from the realm of abstraction, concretize it, enrich it and make it fruitful for this world. (50)

And, injustice, as Gere et al. argue "is something Writing Studies infrastructurally inherits, irrespective of the 'good' intentions and actions of individual educators" (402). They propose a concept of communal justicing as an "ongoing, iterative, and collective project of working toward justice" through critical language awareness (385). This process of justicing "begins at the point where we collectively acknowledge this disciplinary inheritance, reckon with it, and revise what it means to participate in Writing Studies" (402). Needless to say, acknowledging the existence of injustice is the first step toward addressing it.

In the context of highly polarized conversations about the ways to deal with language differences in college writing, my take on linguistic justice aims at addressing the practical aspects of college writing in general while not ignoring the unique historical experiences of linguistic injustices disproportionately endured by peoples who have unequal access to power and privilege. The way "sexism cannot be understood without paying attention to male privilege . . . the cause of linguistic justice cannot be advanced without examining linguistic privilege" (Piller 207). The nature of privilege is such that the privileged are not and/or do not have to be aware of the unearned benefits of who they are. According to Piller:

> 'Language' obviously will seem less important to those who never felt the necessity to learn another language in order to get an education, to find a job, or to participate in the life of a community they wished to join; those who never needed to worry about how their accent might sound to a potential employer; those who never needed to contemplate whether their linguistic proficiency was adequate to participate in classroom discussions, or whether they would be considered worth listening to when trying to call emergency services. (208)

It is imperative that we call out the tendency to normalize standardized English as the given, a tendency akin to zero point epistemology that considers West, Europe in particular, as the center and origin of all knowledges. In addition to treating standardized English as a dialect–a particular form of a language which is peculiar to a specific region or social group–that it is, we should be mindful of the fallacy of individual responsibility in language learning that Piller discusses as a neoliberal construct that blames learners for not being able to learn other languages with native-like competence. Therefore, I draw on the language rights discourse of SRTOL and raciolinguistic perspectives on language-race nexus to account for the unique historical

experiences of language minoritized groups and avert the risk of creating sameness of difference as Keith Gilyard warns about the translingual approach to language differences ("The Rhetoric of Translingualism").

I deliberately use the term writing studies instead of composition because it is more compatible with the linguistic justice framework and the sites of intervention and analysis used in my dissertation project as it allows a more sustained focus on writing as a rhetorical activity. Douglas Down and Elizabeth Wardle introduced the concept of writing about writing in 2007 as 'Introduction to Writing Studies Pedagogy' and imagined "first-year composition from teaching 'how to write in college' to teaching *about writing*" (553). It was also a shift from "acting as if writing is a basic, universal skill to acting as if writing studies is a discipline with content knowledge" that would change students' "understandings about writing" as well as "the ways they write" (553). This notion of teaching about writing strongly refutes the monolingual view of writing as a skill set–a commodity–that is transferred by an ideal instructor who is conversant with the Standard Written English to a group of students (consumers). In so doing, it provides both discursive and pedagogical space to treat "writing [as] content-and context-contingent and irreducibly complex" activity and encourage students' active participation (558). Wardle and Down in their 2013 article further elucidate the underlying concepts of writing about writing as follows:

> What we advocate for, and what remains stable in our own classrooms, is simply the underlying set of principles: engage students with the research and ideas of the field, using any means necessary and productive, in order to shift students' conceptions of writing, building declarative and procedural knowledge of writing with an eye toward

> transfer. That seems to us the heart of writing-about-writing: a basic belief that, as a field, we know some things and should teach them. (4)

Although the focus of their argument is on establishing the disciplinary work of teaching writing in the U. S. colleges and universities, the idea that student writers must know about the theories and research on writing is a welcome move compatible with the writing pedagogy informed by critical language awareness that "focuses on the intersections of language, identity, power, and privilege, with the goal of promoting self-reflection, social justice, and rhetorical agency" (Shapiro 55). I will later build on Shaprio's concept of rhetorical agency to propose critical rhetorical agency as both conceptual and practical tool to promote linguistically just writing practices.

However, the concept of writing studies and writing about writing has been criticized as exclusionary and complicit with neoliberal ideologies that commodifies the teaching-learning process of writing. Tessa Brown contrasts Elizabeth Wardle and Douglas Down's textbook *Writing about Writing* that, she claims, "appeals to neoliberal notions of students; individual successes and career readiness" with the discourse of SRTOL which "is oriented toward antiracism, solidarity, and communal uplift" (597). Brown's caution against the risk of treating the writing classroom "as an ideologically neutral space" is a useful reminder to take a more critical approach to writing studies as well as the linguistic justice framework that accounts for the language rights of historically marginalized people while catering to the agency of individual language users/writers and the labor they invest in languaging. It also signals a move from the neoliberal ideologies and commodification of writing represented by a transaction model towards a model that focuses on translation and labor of languaging.

The notion of linguistic justice has been around for quite some time both in and outside the field of writing studies. Philippe Van Parijs talks about linguistic justice in terms of distributive justice which is not "best served by protective or compensatory measures in favour of non-Anglophones, but instead by democratizing proficiency in the lingua franca throughout the world as quickly and thoroughly as possible, using for this purpose the modern media's powerful and cheap learning tools at least as much as formal schooling" (208). Interestingly, Parijs finds a prospect of linguistic justice in the expansion of English as a global lingua franca providing some protection to linguistic communities with "the right to impose its language as the medium of instruction and public communication in some territory" (208). Needless to say, there is not much to salvage from Van Parijs' approach to linguistic justice that promotes English as a global lingua franca for writing studies other than what Ingrid Piller observes as a "focus on the linguistically favored [that] constitutes an important innovation in sociolinguistic thought" (207). This contributes toward creating a more responsive and inclusive linguistic justice framework that doesn't solely focus on the nondominant linguistic subjects, but also invites English monolingual writers to actively participate in the learning process.

Ligia A. Mihut in her 2020 book chapter "Enacting Linguistic Justice: Transnational Scholars as Advocates for Pedagogical Change" contextualizes linguistic justice in the pedagogical approaches of transnational scholars of writing studies. In "a linguistic justice frame", according to Mihut, "both actions—critique of monolingualism and integration of plurilingual practices and theories—are essential to centering and valorizing linguistically-rich practices" (270). Mihut examines the pedagogical approaches used by transnational teacher-scholars of college writing to "*reorient* and *attune* students' discursive practices to language difference, global geopolitical and social contingencies, and cross-cultural rhetorics"--an

approach to writing she calls linguistic justice (270). It is the linguistic justice approach to writing that enables us to meet the responsibility as instructors to "educate [students] to communicate effectively and ethically in a globalized world" (271). Given the fast changing demographic structure of the US college writing classrooms where the number of nondominant linguistic subjects–writers whose first language is not English and /or standardized English–is growing day by day, how we treat those "other/ed" language and literacy practices that do not conform to the mainstream practices is of great concern. Therefore, language difference in college writing has an ethical dimension while the matter of linguistic justice fits in the larger framework of social justice. Mihut situates linguistic justice "within a social justice frame" as "we have affirmed that students should have the right to their own languages; we have stated language relations expressed in writing are shaped by socio-economic and political factors" (274).

My take on linguistic justice shares Mihut's concern for students' rights to their own languages and her two-prong approach to language justice as "a critique and action toward change"–deconstructing monolingual ideologies and promoting linguistically rich practices and alternative models of writing (289). However, unlike Mihut whose focus is on the translingual approaches to teaching writing by transnational writing scholars, I draw on a wider variety of scholarships to develop a more inclusive and responsive framework of linguistic justice that centersstudents' needs and roles in the writing classrooms. Regardless of this difference, I share Mihut's conviction that a writing instructor's personal experience may serve as "a catalyst for change" and "the glue that connect[s] the self to others, and then, to pedagogies of language difference" (290). I significantly draw on my lived experiences as a nondominant linguistic subject throughout this dissertation.

The renewed interest in the issue of linguistic (in)justice in college writing is evidenced by the number of publications on the topic. In the introduction to the 2021 edited collection *Linguistic Justice on Campus: Pedagogy and Advocacy for Multilingual Students*, Eunjeong Lee, Jennifer T. Johnson, and Brooke R. Schreiber explain the need for linguistic justice and why it is the need of the hour. In their view, linguistic justice:

> must be grounded in efforts to recognize, sustain and advocate for students' relationships, experiences and histories with different languages and literacies, away from the racializing and monolingual ideologies. Beyond continuously building on students' existent rhetorical sensitivities, as educators we must center students' embodied experiences across different language varieties and practices and facilitate their reflections on and interrogations of power relations interwoven in their experiences. (5-6)

While the focus of this edited collection is on multilingual writers, the basic premises of linguistic justice work in college writing outlined in the introduction inform my take on linguistic justice too. Rather than focusing on differences only, Lee, Johnson, and Schreiber draw our attention to the students' historical as well as embodied experiences and the power relations that punctuate those experiences. It lies in the heart of my linguistic justice framework as well. The only difference is that my take on linguistic justice is geared towards accounting for the needs of students, including English monolinguals. To that end, I will take a trasdisciplinary approach to linguistic justice drawing on the major tenets translingualism, raciolinguistics, critical language awareness, anti-racist Black language pedagogy, and decolonial theory.

Decolonial Potential of Translingualism

The linguistic justice framework that I propose embraces the basic premise of the translingual approach that "extends the CCCC resolution [SRTOL] to differences within and

across all languages" with a "recognition that the formation and definition of languages and language varieties are fluid" and "language differences and fluidities as resources to be preserved, developed, and utilized" (Horner et al. 304). Their call for responding to language differences not "only in terms of rights" but use "them as resources" has a potential to transform the way we approach students' language and literacy practices that do not necessarily reflect the norms of "standard" English (Horner et al. 304). However, there is also a risk of inadvertently reinforcing the same monolingual and monocultural "norm" against which these differences are measured. The tendency to "celebrate and thus privilege the presumed creativity or eccentricity of such language practices" overlooks the fact that "there is nothing exotic, odd, or perhaps even 'exciting' about linguistic creativity, as it is inevitable that peoples and cultures have always been mixing and mingling" (Dovchin and Lee 2). In the context of writing classrooms, too much of attention to the marked differences in language use, which Paul Kei Matsuda criticizes as "linguistic tourism" might give a false impression that drawing on diverse linguistic and cultural resources is more desirable and create a new "norm" and potentially makes the English monolingual students feel excluded ("The Lure" 482).

Needless to say, our approach to language difference warrants a nuanced approach because it puts us in a position where the acknowledgement of difference presupposes the "norm" from which the difference is perceived. Suresh Canagarajah in his recent article "Challenges in Decolonizing Linguistics: The Politics of Enregisterment and the Divergent Uptakes of Translingualism" discusses translingualism in relation to decoloniality. I agree with his caution against celebrating translingualism as a theory leading to a new orthodoxy, or commodifying it as a product, but instead treat is as an emergent practice–like all languages including English–that "involves constant repositioning in relation to the changing

configurations of power to achieve ethical, inclusive, and just interests" (41). Additionally, Canagarajah calls it a resistant practice, like Homi K. Bhabha's hybridity, "that changes its positioning in relation to the assemblages of power in every context" (45). Such a dynamic and nuanced approach to translingualism allows us to develop a more inclusive framework of linguistic justice that is both responsive and ethical.

One of the strongest traits of translingual practice is its decolonial potential–an ability to go beyond the confines of English monolingual and monocultural ideologies to imagine the pluriversal realities of language relations. A major proponent of the decolonial potential of translingualism is Ellen Cushman. In her 2016 article "Translingual and Decolonial Approaches to Meaning Making," Cushman expresses optimism about the extent to which composition studies as a field embrace decolonial hopes, visions, and options. With a focus on the emergent nature of language relationships and negotiability of all meaning-making processes, translingualism questions the hegemony of English as a global lingua franca and treats it as one language among many and thereby initiates a journey toward pluriversality of languages. According to Cushman, "translingual approach to meaning making evokes a decolonial lens with its focus on the ideologies implicit in any tool chosen for meaning making (be it mode, media, or genre), as these are always laden with cultural, historical, and instrumental import for the people who use them" (236). Indeed, translingualism emphasizes the nature of language differences, how we perceive those differences and are affected by them differently depending on our positionality to the language. In this regard, translingualism makes a strong critique of monolingual and monocultural ideologies that are steeped in coloniality, paves the way for exploring language-race connections, and imagines a world beyond the hegemony of one language and one culture.

If we want to move away from the commodified notion of language as something that human merely possess towards language as "something human beings are, then it behooves scholars and teachers to consider seriously what methodological and pedagogical possibilities for decolonizing knowledge translingualism can potentially offer" (Cushman 234). The first and major step toward that possibility is to ask how can we as "teachers and scholars move beyond the presumption that English is the only language of knowledge making and learning?" (Cushman 234). Likewise, how can we question the hegemony of Standardized (Written) English as the only legitimate language to engage in knowledge creation and dissemination in college writing classrooms? What can we do to capitalize on the students' home language practices to engage them productively and meaningfully in the process of creating knowledge and sharing it through writing? I share Cushman's understanding of the hegemony of English monolingual and monocultural ideologies, and hierarchization between standardized and othered language practices in composition studies that intersect with "several structuring nodes in the colonial matrix of power that include authority, knowledge, gender and sexuality, economy and racism" (238). Colonial matrix of power, a concept originally developed by Aníbal Quijano, refers to the geographical, political, and onto-epistemological expansion of the West through the domains of race, knowledge, capital, authority, and gender/sexuality across the globe. It is based on the "dualistic thinking" that "maintains the center/periphery of knowledge-making efforts" where "knowledge reproduces itself by creating necessary others through other forms of thought or expression" (239). In order to effectively resist West's monolingual and monocultural totalization, and subalternization of othered language and literacy practices in college writing, "translingual approaches need to avoid simply changing the content of what is studied and taught and work toward dwelling in the borders to revise the paradigmatic tenets of thought structuring

everyday practices" (236). What Cushman proposes as "three epistemological and pedagogical moves"-- (trans)languaging, translation, and dwelling in the borders– "imagine translingual approaches to meaning making that might further epistemic delinking and border thinking" (235). The linguistic justice framework that I propose moves toward similar ends building on the epistemological and pedagogical moves with additional insights from raciolinguistics, critical language awareness, and antiracist Black language pedagogy.

Decolonial potential of translingualism has drawn more scholarly attention lately. Esther Milu in her 2022 article "Hip-Hop and the Decolonial Possibilities of Translingualism" explores Kenyan hip-hop to show decolonial possibilities of translingualism, including linguistic decolonization. While the term translingualism is new, the practice of crossing linguistic borders for communicative efficacy is not new. In fact, communities in Asia and Africa have always used multilingual, multimodal, and multisensory approaches to communication. It was "the colonial matrix of power [that] suppressed translingual communication and Indigenous approaches to preserving cultural knowledge in Africa" and other non-Western parts of the world (Milu 384; see Canagarajah, *Translingual Practice*). Analyzing Kenyan artist Jua Cali's hip-hop music, Milu argues that Cali uses translingualism "to counter the rhetoric of modernity that promotes superiority of English and standard language ideologies that marginalize Indigenous languages and translingual practices in the country" (380). Although translingualism has potential to delink from the colonial matrix of power, there is imminent risk of cooptation by neoliberal global capitalist forces that commodifies indigenous knowledge systems and language practices. Milu's view on the potential of translingualism to work toward decolonizing hitherto othered language practices and the need for a strong resistance against commodification helps me develop a balanced approach to deal with language differences in the context of college

writing. In her view, it is imperative to "understand not only the history and implications of European colonialism and imperialism on Indigenous knowledges and languages, but also how new logics of coloniality and rhetorics of modernity are being perpetuated through appropriation and the commodification of Indigenous people's translingual practices" (Milu 403).

While treating language differences as the norm rather than an aberration is at the heart of translingualism, it is important to understand how those differences have different material consequences in people's lives based on their positionalities. It is only with such nuanced understanding of language differences, their representation, and consequences that we can develop a more inclusive and responsive linguistic justice framework. A decolonial perspective on linguistic justice unearths/acknowledges the racial entanglement of language relations. In Mignolo's words:

> Modern/colonial racism, that is, the logic of racialization that emerged in the sixteenth century, has two dimensions (ontological and epistemic) and one single purpose: to rank as inferior all languages beyond Greek and Latin and the six modern European languages [English, French, German, Italian, Dutch, and Spanish] from the domain of sustainable knowledge and to maintain the enunciative privilege of the Renaissance and Enlightenment European institutions, men and categories of thought. Languages that were not apt for rational thinking (either theological or secular) were considered languages that revealed the inferiority of the human beings speaking them. (Mignolo, "Geopolitics" 275)

What Mignolo says about non-European and indigenous languages is also true for the so-called nonstandard language practices that are deemed incapable of production and dissemination of "knowledge" and are also associated with what their users look like and where they come from.

It is because of such a racialized history of language relations and unique experience of marginalization of the colonized and minoritized others that we need to be critical in celebrating language differences. Like Keith Gilyard who cautions against generalizing all language differences as one and the same to a great disadvantage of historically marginalized peoples, Ellen Cushman also believes that "understanding the differences within difference as the norms of all utterances can help imagine one type of epistemic delinking that invites a pluriversality of knowledges and languages" (238). In this sense, the decolonial potential of translingualism accounts for the issue of language-race connections that are at the center of raciolinguistics and language rights discourse of SRTOL in writing studies. To quote Cushman again, translingualism operates both on paradigmatic and pragmatic levels and has "the potential to change the systemic inequalities and imperialism of composition studies" and "help the process of decolonizing thought and everyday languaging practices in composition scholarship and classrooms by helping scholars, teachers, and students dwell in the borders of colonial difference" (240).

Raciolinguistics, Critical Language Awareness, and Antiracist Black Language Pedagogy

The origin of college composition as a discipline is steeped in a deficit perspective to students' literacy and writing skills–a perspective that is not so innocent from racialized notions of languages and their users. As Eunjeong Lee and Sara P. Alvarez observed "the US postsecondary writing classroom has long reinforced the idea of English as a rigid, monolithic entity" (265). When the very conception of higher education is imagined and designed for a certain group of people–young white men in this case–it is no surprise that college writing in the US has remained complicit to "the extension of exclusion, segregation, and monoculturalism"

and “participated in monolingual and racialized ideologies” (265). The inception of college composition at Harvard University in the late nineteenth century was based on the idea of how high school graduates were not prepared for college writing tasks. Such discourses on remedial education conflated writing structures and mechanics with knowledge and literacy level while largely ignoring the issues of structural inequities and racialized experiences of marginalized students. This discourse of remedial education is still prevalent mainly because of the way writing is taught in the majority of secondary schools with an uncritical emphasis on mastering three- and five-paragraph essays, Advanced Placement and other standardized test scores. This is but one example of how neoliberal, utilitarian ideologies reduce the complexity of cultivating language and literacy competence into numbers. Although Things have changed for the better in the past century, “the monolingualist ideology of ‘a’ SWE [Standard Written English] still stands for English and writing” where “academic discourses of language appropriateness and articulation have been imagined (and rewarded) within and from the privileged position of whiteness” (266).

Despite the fact that student demographics in the U. S. higher education replicates the global demographic trend where nonnative speakers of English outnumber the native speakers, the nondominant linguistic subjects like multilingual writers are “often framed as unique and in need of language, specifically an ideologized form of academic English that does not change as language does” (Sara P. Alvarez 343). Because their writings do not conform to the ‘norm’ they are “often subjected to a hypersurveillance of difference, informed by dominant monolingual ideologies of what counts as different or appropriate to the writing classroom” (343). In other words, monolingual and monocultural ideologies are still prevalent in the U. S. higher

education. Therefore, imparting linguistic justice in writing studies wouldn't be possible without first accounting for the racialized language relations and ideologies.

There is no dearth of evidence to prove that language discrimination is more about who you are and what you look like than it is about the 'quality' of your language[2]. Christine Ro discusses "linguistic racism" where "not everyone who speaks English is treated the same way" but it hurts more to people of color. Ro quotes Sender Dovchin, a sociolinguist at Curtin University, Australia to show the difference between the reception of "accented" Englishes spoken by Europeans and Asian or African people. Dovchin says, "When English is spoken by some Europeans, including for example French-, German-, Italian-accented English, they can be considered cute, sophisticated, stylish, and so forth" whereas "English spoken by Asians, Africans or Middle easterners may be viewed as challenging and unpleasant" ("The Pervasive"). Rosa also exposes the double standard used in the "mandatory language policies" that "create a stratified, class-based distinction between elite and remedial bilingualism" where "bilingualism is understood as a valuable asset or goal for middle-class and upper-class students" but "for working class and poor students it is framed as a disability that must be overcome ("Standardization"171).

Yet there is another empirical study on the raciolinguistic bias based on the color of skin and/or physical traits. Yi Zheng and Arthur G. Samuel examine if and how seeing an Asian face makes the speech sound more accented to native listeners. Building on the past studies about how the ethnicity of the speakers, signaled by a photograph, would affect people's perception of the speakers' accent, Zheng and Samuel look into "the nature of this effect" and go on "to test

---

[2] See Jonathan Rosa, *Looking Like Language, Sounding Like Race: Raciolinguistic Ideologies and the Learning of Latinidad*, Oxford UP, 2019.

whether the effect was taking place at a perceptual lever, or was instead based on later interpretation" (1857).Their study on Asian and Caucasian speakers show that "visual information affects the interpretation of accented speech on the decision level, rather than actually altering the way the speech sounds" and go on to offer "hope in the sense that it should be easier to change decisions/interpretations than perception itself" (1857). This shows a possibility of working toward changing this bias through "face-to-face personal interactions [that] will offer more opportunities to gain a deeper understanding of the individual, and thereby reduce decision level bias" (1858). The findings of this study underscore the need and effectiveness of critical language awareness.

To understand the racialized position of the nondominant linguistic subjects the concepts of language ownership and languagelessness, among others, are particularly useful. Language ownership, the phrase as such, is steeped in neoliberal consumerism that only prizes commodities for their use value. This is also the value that monolingual and monocultural ideologies embrace no matter how fraught and abstract the concept of 'owning' language may be. Lee and Alvarez discuss language ownership in terms of assigning meanings to the existing terms or inventing neologisms as English as a global language is used in different contexts for various rhetorical purposes and how this process is racialized. They discuss H. G. Widdowson's[3] take on how two lexical innovations–depone and prepone–the former a "native" speaker's coinage and the latter an Indian English neologism– "receive a different status (as in legitimate vs. othered English) despite a similar process" and argue "that language ownership is an issue of a racial hierarchy in a sense that 'who' is inventing a new meaning matters in calling the new language as innovative or just nonconforming" (268).

[3] Also see "The Ownership of English." *TESOL Quarterly*, 28,1995, pp. 377–89.

Likewise, there is a tendency not just to question but completely deny the nondominant linguistic subjects like bi- and multilingual people any sense of linguistic competence that Rosa calls 'ideology of languagelessness'. Analyzing the language practices and identities of Latina/o in the US, Rosa shows how the linguistic skills of bilinguals are always measured "only in relation to their purported limited English proficiency" offering "no formal way in which their Spanish language abilities were recognized as academically useful" treating them as if "to be bilingual was not to use more than one language" but instead "less than one language in particular" (169). Due to the racially motivated monolingual and monocultural outlook, when "'bilingual' students' language use [is] not perceived as corresponding to standardized written English, they [are] understood as not knowing any legitimate language at all" resulting in the "racialized ideology of languagelessness" (169). What Lee and Alvarez say about language ownership is true of languagelessness as well: both are "an extension of the monolingual and racializing ideology, operating within the colonial paradigm of language and race" (268). Needless to say, language differences and relation are fraught with racial and other socio-cultural hierarchies. Flores and Rosa look at the entire language difference debate from the perspective of raciolinguistics and emphasize "the racializing language ideologies through which different racialized bodies come to be constructed as engaging in appropriately academic linguistic practices" (150). They define English Only policies and /or unequivocal promotion of Edited American English/Standard Written English as the norm to be "the ideological construction and value of standardized language practices that are anchored in what [they] term raciolinguistic ideologies that conflate certain racialized bodies with linguistic deficiency unrelated to any objective practices" (150). It is also evident in the discourse of language ownership and

languagelessness where knowing multiple languages is ironically construed as not having a language.

Fortunately, there is a strong scholarly voice against such discrimination. As Rosina Lippi-Green says, if "it is not acceptable or good to discriminate on the grounds of skin color or ethnicity, gender or age, then by logical extension it is equally unacceptable to discriminate against language traits which are intimately linked to an individual's sense and expression of self" (332). Scholars have suggested various possible ways to deal with it and a translingual orientation to language difference is one of them. Even though translingualism doesn't explicitly talk about language ownership, it has the potential to confront the racialized language relations as it 'sees multilingualism, rather than monolingualism, as the norm" and "presents a possibility of reenvisioning what it means to experience a sense of language 'ownership' from a multilingual perspective"(Lee and Alvarez 269). In addition to raciolinguistics, we should draw from critical language awareness and antiracist Black language pedagogy to make translingualism more inclusive and responsive.

Critical Language Awareness (CLA) has a strong potential to resist hegemonic language ideologies that perpetuate various forms of linguistic injustice. According to Norman Fairclough, CLA:

> highlights how language conventions and language practices are invested with power relations and ideological processes which people are often unaware of. It criticizes mainstream language study for taking conventions and practices at face value, as objects to be described, in a way which obscures their political and ideological investment. (7)

It is the attention to power relations and ideologies that differentiate CLA from its predecessor Language Awareness movement that started in the UK in the 1970s with a rather pragmatic and

neutral approach to the study of language and makes it more compatible with raciolinguistics that explores the intricacies of language and race relations. Veteran linguist Geneva Smitherman, and scholars like H. Samy Alim, and April Baker-Bell whose works foreground raciolinguistic perspectives have used CLA as a useful tool to deal with racialized language relations and practices. Despite its origin in linguistics, CLA is popular among the composition/writing studies scholars as well.

Juan C. Guerra advocates for the use of critical language awareness in writing classrooms where "all students, but especially the disenfranchised, must be made explicitly aware of the competing ideologies that inform their language use and the language use of others" (31). Although CLA is not perfect, it is "the most viable response to language difference currently available to us" (31). Given the growing number of nondominant linguistic subjects–student writers whose first language is not English and/or standardized English–in college writing classrooms on one hand, and the increase in intolerance of differences of all forms–including linguistic and cultural difference–that is fueled and entrenched by ultranationalist political rhetorics and policies on the other, we the college writing instructors are presented with both challenge and opportunity.

In *Cultivating Critical Language Awareness in the Writing Classroom*, Shawna Shapiro reminds writing teachers that we "must find ways to work creatively with [the] tension" between pragmatic and progressive approaches to language difference and "enact our commitment to linguistic diversity, social justice, and rhetorical effectiveness, for and with all of our students in our classrooms" (13). What Shapiro proposes as a CLA-informed both/and approach to writing "aims to promote a more just future, while also preparing students for the (often unjust) present" (13-14). While my take on the linguistic justice framework shares Shapiro's emphasis on

teaching all students and promoting a more just future, I feel a greater level of urgency to address the often unjust present. This sense of urgency must have to do with my different positionality and lived experience as a nondominant linguistic subject who learned English as a foreign language in a small village in Nepal and is now studying and teaching writing in Arizona–the only state of the U. S. where English-only legislation known as Proposition 203 is yet to be repelled–at a time of growing hostility toward different worldviews. I strongly believe that true linguistic justice is not possible without confronting the colonial and racial dynamic of linguistic injustice.

April Baker-Bell's antiracist Black language pedagogy offers a radical critique of standard language ideology by placing Black language and literacy practices on an equal footing with White Mainstream English. Baker Bell claims, we tell our children the White Mainstream English "is needed for survival," but this "can no longer be the answer, especially as we are witnessing Black people being mishandled, discriminated against, and murdered while using White Mainstream English, and in some cases, before they even open their mouths" (*Linguistic Justice* 7). This is a compelling argument that compels us to think about linguistic (in)justice, which is not just about classrooms, papers, and exams, rather a life-and-death issue for so many people who can never learn enough standardized English to be treated as equal because the problem is not in their in/ability to learn, but in the very notion of standardized English and all the expectations and requirements it entails. Therefore, my use of critical language awareness in the linguistic justice framework takes important insights from Baker-Bell's Black Linguistic Conscious-raising–an integral part of antiracist Black language pedagogy– that "help[s] the students challenge, interrogate, unlearn, and work toward dismantling Anti-Black Linguistic Racism" (8-9). It also shares Nelson Flores and Jonathan Rosa's "critical heteroglossic

perspective that both legitimizes the dynamic linguistic practices of language-minoritized students while simultaneously raising awareness about issues of language and power marks an important starting point for developing an alternative approach" (167). Baker-Bell's foregrounding of Black language and literacy in her pedagogy imparts decolonial hope and imagines pluriversal world where all languages and literacy practices coexist on an equal footing. Interestingly, the same decolonial hope and vision of a pluriversal world connects antiracist Black language pedagogy with raciolinguistics and critical language awareness, which, in turn, connects to the translingual notion of language relation and differences.

Language Rights and Writer Agency

Although there is unanimity among scholars about the basic tenets of translingualism such as difference as the norm of all language practices that are always emergent, and multisensory, multisemiotic, and negotiable nature of communication, there are some differences with regard to language rights and agency. These differences stem from how we approach language differences and what we emphasize in doing so. An overemphasis on difference poses the risk of valorizing surface-level differences that may not always have to do much with empowering students or improving their writing skills. Paul Kei Matsuda calls such a celebratory approach to differences "linguistic tourism" and compares a teacher who expects and rewards exotic linguistic features in students' writing with a "tour guide [who] picks out a few notable landmarks and restaurants that would appeal to the tourists and provides a brief explanation without going into too much detail about the complex political issues or the mundane reality that local residents live day in, day out" (482). Likewise, Keith Gilyard calls it an act of creating a "linguistic every person, which makes it hard to see the suffering and the political imperative as clearly as in the heyday of SRTOL" (285). Both Matsuda and Gilyard call for a more critical

approach to language differences and draw our attention to the lived experiences of language users, the nondominant linguistic subjects in particular, and the material consequences of language-based discriminations that are disproportionately distributed among different groups of people.

Scholars have emphasized the role of SRTOL in college writing in promoting linguistic justice and discussed the roles that writing teachers and scholars could play in working toward social justice through linguistic justice. According to Min-Zhan Lu, teacher-scholars committed to SRTOL should "fight not only for the students' rights to use their 'home' or 'first' languages but, more important, for their right to own the 'language of wider communication': to learn to use actively fashion and transform–rather than merely imitate its standard rules" ("Living-English Work" 47). Lu's argument adds a new dimension to SRTOL and helps us navigate the false binary of convention and deviation that is overemphasized when it comes to the language practices of nondominant linguistic subjects. This means that one doesn't have to choose one or the other, but instead actively play with the conventions while relying on their home or first language to participate in the writing process.

In the 2020 article–"What Else Do We Know? Translingualism and the History of SRTOL as Threshold Concepts in Our Field"--Tessa Brown shows why it is important to draw on the history of SRTOL if we want to build a robust and inclusive field of writing studies. Brown shares her experience of developing a deeper understanding of writing studies movement and its color-blindness through the lens of SRTOL. Her engagement with the scholarship on the history of SRTOL has transformed her approach to teaching writing:

> Today when I teach hip-hop languaging, I do so explicitly in the tradition of the Students' Right to Their Own Language resolution and in the context of the translingualism

> movement, with lessons and readings on the sociolinguistics of African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and hip-hop language alongside readings on how hip-hop's sampling and compositional practices have Afrodiasporic roots. I use reflective writing to ask students to identify their home literacy practices so that the diversity of language experiences and norms in the room never intrudes as a surprise. Contrary to detractors' worst fears, my classroom isn't a pedagogical Babel . . . Since English is the lingua franca of our classroom, that's still our communicative ether. But unlike that moment six years ago, my students now know from the get-go that all languages are valid, and effectiveness is contextual. (600)

Brown's account shows the discourse on language rights and translingual approach can go hand in hand in college writing classrooms. The pedagogical success that Brown recounts here proves that there is not always an 'either-or' situation where writing instructors have to choose between standardized English and other options. It also demonstrates that familiarizing students with the history of SRTOL could be the first major step toward critical language awareness, which is an integral part of my linguistic justice framework.

Moreover, the concept of agency is also intertwined with the way we approach language difference in writing, and it is defined in two distinctive, even conflicting ways. When language difference is conceived exclusively in spatial terms, as often the case is, the language relations become hierarchical because they are identified "in terms of [binaries like] insides and outsides, borders and margins" (Lu and Horner, "Translingual Literacy" 587). Such a binary, and therefore hierarchical, thinking results in a limited view of agency because it "sets writerly agency against structure, measured by the degree to which the writer resists or works 'against' the constraints of convention and/or context" (587). This notion of agency gives way to uncritical celebration of

difference for the sake of difference and overlooks the very nature of language which is always emergent and different in each iteration. Lu and Horner's translingual approach to language difference and agency uses a temporal-spatial framework "that locates language and language users, practices, conventions, and contexts in terms of time as well as space" and "instead of treating these as discrete, preexisting, stable, and enumerable entities . . . treats all of them as always emergent, in process (a state of becoming), and their relations as mutually constitutive" (587). It means, an utterance or a text is different not just because it deviates from or falls outside the set conventions, even a seemingly identical iteration is different because it occurs in a different time and context no matter how negligible the difference may be. It leads to a different understanding of agency where it is not solely defined by whether there is a deviation from the so-called norm, but instead user agency lies in all acts of language use.

While Lu and Horner's concept of agency is more inclusive of all language users and it embraces the fundamental nature of language as emergent and language relations as mutually constitutive, it poses a risk of an overgeneralized view of agency that doesn't fully account for the unique historical experiences of minoritized peoples. It is important to note that language rights and writer agency are not mutually exclusive as they appear to be. We can and should find a way to account for the history of discrimination and marginalization by making it an integral part of conversation with an open mind and heart in the writing classrooms, and also foster writer's agency through linguistically just approaches to college writing. Since a translingual orientation is more about what "a different understanding of what language practice entails" than "a break from ordinary language practice," Horner argues, "the political edge to arguments for a translingual orientation arises less from the language rights such an orientation demands and more from its recognition of the agency of language users operating in all language use"

("Reflecting" 108). In other words, "a translingual approach demands greater responsibility from and ascribes greater agency to writers for deciding how to use language" because it doesn't ask writers "whether to be different from a norm of sameness but, rather, what kind of difference to make, how, and why, given difference as the inevitable norm of utterances" (Horner, "Reflecting" 113). Building upon the strength of translingualism that offers an insightful and incisive understanding of language relation and user agency, we need to invite other areas of scholarship, namely, raciolinguistics, critical language awareness, and antiracist Black langauge pedagogy in conversation with translingualism to historicize the language differences beyond touristic fetishization and develop a more inclusive and responsive framework that balances rights and agency.

Linguistic Justice with Critical Rhetorical Agency

What I propose as an inclusive and responsive linguistic justice framework moves beyond what Matsuda characterizes as 'linguistic tourism' and fetishization of difference and underscores the need to historicize language difference. The insights from raciolinguistics, critical language awareness, and antiracist Black language pedagogy that I use to build and expand on the major tenets of translingualism to make it more inclusive and responsive share with the decolonial theory the centrality of colonial and racial differences in dealing with language difference. They all call out the monolingual and monocultural ideologies, the history of which goes back to the early Christianization mission and "discovery" of America followed by the civilizing mission carried out by the West on the rest. The West's assumption that the rest of the world are in need of civilization resulted in "the denial of coevalness [that] became one of the most powerful strategies . . . in the subalternization of languages, knowledges, and cultures"

(Mignolo, *Local Histories* 285). Therefore, "contemporary raciolinguistic ideologies" that offer an important lens to understand the politics of language difference in writing studies "must be understood within this broader history of European colonialism" and by extension, Euro-American coloniality that continues till date (Rosa and Flores 627). In other words, racialization of language differences is a part and parcel of human tendency to dislike and fear differences and creating 'others' to define 'self'. Since the politics of language difference in the context of college writing boils down to how we treat the 'other', linguistic justice becomes an ethical call. It is the ethical dimension of the language justice work that allows me to use the rather capacious phrase 'nondominant linguistic subjects' for international, bi-, and multilingual students whose first language isn't English and/or standardized English despite the differences between the users of English as a second and/or additional language and African American Vernacular English or Black English. Given the complex nature of language justice work in college writing classrooms that are becoming more diverse everyday, we need a framework that addresses both pragmatic and progressive sides of the debate. In other words, we as writing teachers-scholars must account for what we teach in the writing classrooms, which is inevitably connected to the institutional expectations and policies as well as the broader socio-political climate. Therefore, having discussed the major tenets of translingualism in relation to the insights from raciolinguistics, critical language awareness, antiracist Black language pedagogy, and decolonial theory, I propose critical rhetorical agency as the linchpin of language justice work in college writing classrooms.

As discussed in the introduction chapter, the broader concern of this dissertation is promoting linguistically just writing practices that are inclusive, effective, and ethical. It means, what, how, and why we teach college writing in the way we do is at the heart of this project.

Needless to say, our teaching, research, and scholarship must center students and their needs and concerns as writers. Therefore, I propose critical rhetorical agency as the theoretical concept that synthesizes the strengths of the discourses on language rights and user agency and foregrounds language difference and linguistic (in)justice as the mainstream issue of our field rather than a special topic of interest for international and language minoritized students and scholars.

Critical rhetorical agency I propose in this chapter builds and expands on the concept of rhetorical agency Shawna Shapiro uses as one of the three pillars of critical language awareness pedagogy, namely, "self-reflection, social justice, and rhetorical agency" (58). To quote Shapiro at length:

> CLA [Critical Language Awareness] pedagogy offers opportunities, tools, and strategies for critical reflection on our experiences as language users, including on how our linguistic attitudes and judgments might impact others. This self-reflection helps us understand how our linguistic prejudices and practices might contribute toward or against social justice. And that understanding can in turn increase our sense of agency as language users who can make thoughtful and impactful linguistic choices. (58)

Shapiro defines rhetorical agency as the students' ability to make deliberate linguistic choices and connects its source to critical self-reflection. While I agree with her basic premise of the agentive role, we want our students to play in using language, I see a potential to broaden the concept of rhetorical agency into a critical rhetorical agency framework that anchors all the efforts we make to promote linguistically just writing practices.

I take students' agentive role in the writing process as a precondition for effective and meaningful learning. Since we cannot teach all possible writing tasks that students encounter in and beyond college, we must equip them with rhetorical skills to approach each writing situation

rhetorically and make the best possible choices in the given rhetorical situation. However, it is not enough to look at the immediate rhetorical situation such as audience, purpose, context/exigence, genre, and modality only. As important as it is to understand the basic component of rhetorical situations, there is a greater exigency for each act of writing in the face of growing intolerance of different viewpoints and identities in the U. S. and across the globe. So, we as writing teachers-scholars must ensure that our students are exposed to diverse perspectives and are allowed to share their lived experiences and have hard conversations with open mind and heart to develop a nuanced understanding of complex issues like linguistic and cultural differences. We can cultivate critical rhetorical agency in our students by helping them develop an ability to assess each rhetorical situation with clarity and decide what choices they make to what rhetorical effect. An ability to make appropriate linguistic choices is an integral part of rhetorical agency, but it should not be motivated by an urge to create something different for the sake of difference only. Instead, we should contextualize rhetorical choice and agency in the interplay of dominant discourses of English monolingual and monocultural ideologies and their origin in colonial and racial differences. In other words, it is not enough to make students aware of rhetorical situations and rhetorical choices they have at their disposal, we must enable and empower them to own each rhetorical choice they make, see through the dominant ideologies that always and already shape the rhetorical choices available to them, and find ways to work with and through those dominant ideologies as writers in the way that enhances their writing skills.

In sum, critical rhetorical agency serves both as a theoretical concept and practical tool to promote linguistically just writing practices. The next chapter will demonstrate how affirming diverse student voices and using differences as resources for agentive writing practice,

emphasizing translation and differences as fundamental to *all* writing, and inviting students to debunk the harmful ideologies of Standardized (Written) English work toward cultivating critical rhetorical agency of students. I propose critical rhetorical agency as language justice praxis.

Chapter-3: A Critical Autoethnography of an International Graduate Teaching Associate (IGTA)

Given the history of composition studies that is steeped in English monolingual and monocultural ideologies, teaching writing in the U. S. higher education is a fraught endeavor with a constant struggle between practices of freedom and practices of hegemony. It is more complicated for International Graduate Teaching Assistants (IGTAs) because their accented English and racialized bodies often become additional liabilities as they struggle to navigate their role as a graduate student and a writing instructor in a new space. Discussing the issues of IGTAs identity and pedagogical struggles in the US college classrooms, Tao Zhang shows how "'accented' English, racialized experiences, and contested teacher–student relationship, are implicated with the negative becoming of IGTAs' identities due to border crossing" (477). As an international student from Nepal, who learned English as a foreign language, I went through a similar experience when I started teaching first-year composition at the University of Arizona in Fall 2017.

In this autoethnographic study of my experience as an IGTA, I use a self-reflexive methodology of critical autoethnography to explore my positionality as a nondominant linguistic subject–a term used for people whose first language isn't English and /or standardized English. In order to understand how these lived experiences are related to my scholarship, teaching, and research about linguistically just and effective writing practices, I turn "the ethnographic gaze inward on the self (auto), while maintaining the outward gaze of ethnography, looking at the larger context wherein self-experiences occur" (Denzin 227). Consistent with the broader point of my dissertation, this critical autoethnographic account will show why it is important to foreground the implicit racial and colonial differences in the conversations of diversity and

language differences in our field. Such autoethnographic accounts of nondominant linguistic subjects provide valuable perspectives toward a future of hope for linguistic social justice. To this effect, I will briefly discuss my choice of critical autoethnography as a method and offer a self-reflexive account of my relationship with English language in general and college writing in particular. In doing so, this narrative will lay bare my complex journey which was marked with interpellation and hegemony. My story is a story of complicity and disillusionment that ultimately transitions toward a complex understanding of language differences and search for the effective, empathetic and ethical ways to address those differences in college writing.

This autoethnographic account is not just about understanding the past, but it is also about envisioning a better future. Similar to other genres of self-narrative, autoethnography "shares the storytelling feature . . . but transcends mere narration of self to engage in cultural analysis and interpretation" (Chang 43). Unlike the canonical research methods that valorize 'rigor' and 'objectivity', autoethnography is "a useful method for working with topics of diversity and identity because it is predicated on the ability to invite readers into the lived experience of a presumed "Other" and allow them to experience it visceral" (Boylorn and Orbe 2). If autoethnography, as Carolyn Ellis claims, "asks that we not only examine our lives but also consider how and why we think, act, and feel as we do," we cannot answer these questions without understanding the politics of our positionality and what that means to the changes we want to see in the future (10). Hence, critical autoethnography shares an emphasis on the politics of positionality that "forces us to acknowledge our own power, privilege, and biases just as we are denouncing the power structures that surround our interlocutors" (Madison 6). Critical autoethnography, as Robin M. Boylorn and Mark P. Orbe claim, "allows for critical self-reflexivity and cultural commentary to examine embodied experiences, relational encounters,

and intercultural conundrum. It moves beyond simply documenting an experience to deconstructing it through theorization and critical analysis" (6). Therefore, a major focus of my autoethnography will be to understand how and to what extent my experience as a nondominant linguistic subject in the U. S. changed my perception of and relation with the U. S. higher education in general as well as my scholarship, research, and professional development in writing studies in particular. I will explore how these experiences informed my research interest in justice-oriented work that calls for anticolonial, antiracist, and culturally sustaining writing practices and vice versa.

Throughout this autoethnography, I will reflect on my positionality in an effort to understand it in a larger socio-cultural context and juxtapose the personal narrative of embodied experiences with the theories of language differences and (in)justice. I use the reflexive methodology of critical autoethnography to explore my positionality as a nondominant linguistic subject who learned English as a foreign language and is now studying and teaching writing as an international graduate student at a public research university in the U. S. I examine the historical context of my positionality as a student, teacher and researcher of writing focusing on my relationship with English language in general and the field of writing studies in particular with a hope to understand how my lived experiences inform my scholarship, teaching, and research about linguistically just writing practices that are inclusive, effective, and ethical. The ultimate goal of such critical self-reflexivity is to connect my lived experiences as a nondominant linguistic subject with the changes that I believe are essential in the field of writing studies to make it more inclusive and responsive. In this sense, my critical autoethnography is a counterstory with a " critique of dominant ideology (e.g., liberalism, whiteness, color

blindness)", and an "admission of and critical self-reflection on privilege . . . and to use this privilege to be an accomplice" (Martinez 17).

Although all Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs), regardless of their nationality, share the common struggle in graduate school as, what David L. Gregory calls, "a huge pool of cheap labor for university employers" and have different lived experiences, the stories of IGTAs offer additional nuance and complexities because of their experience of crossing physical, linguistic, and cultural borders (qtd. in Crudele 743). For example, my story of learning English in rural Nepal in the 1980s with no contact with English speakers or access to any cultural products, not even reading materials other than a textbook, speaks about the power of English as a language of global communication and economic capital. As a first-generation student, I had very little or no idea what I wanted to study in college. Almost instinctively, I majored in English. Perhaps, I wanted to become an English teacher. As a student, I wished I had had the opportunity to attend an English-medium school and as a teacher in different private schools, I participated in enforcing English-only policy to young learners. In short, a good part of my teaching career in both K-12 and higher education has been about upholding the "standard" of English, not knowing what those "standards" actually were. I did everything back then that now I am critical of in my research and scholarship–uncritically accepted standard language ideologies and became complicit in their reproduction as an educator.

Navigating the U. S. Higher Education as an International Graduate Student

I came to the University of Arizona in Fall 2017 as a Ph. D. student in rhetoric and composition. It was an ordinary event–I was just one among thousands of international students

who come to study in the U. S. every year. Yet, my transition to graduate school as an international graduate student and a writing instructor was anything but ordinary, at least to me, on multiple levels. To begin with, my long-held persona of an English teacher with a mix of privilege and authority back home got badly shaken when I realized that I now was a nondominant linguistic subject with an accented English. It reminded me of another privilege I had back home as a so-called "upper caste," cisgender man with the mainstream Nepali as my mother tongue in a country with more than 123 languages. Unlike many Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs), I had a long experience of teaching English in Nepal, but the field of college composition was completely new to me and to find myself in a classroom full of US domestic students just after a week of my arrival was an unsettling experience, to say the least. I survived the first semester navigating a strange position of acting like a resource person to my students while struggling to find adequate support for myself. And it was just the beginning. I continued to experience the real, material consequences of linguistic and cultural differences both in and out of the classroom.

> *Linguistic social justice entails confronting the inequitable discursive economies that afford disproportionate amounts of social capital to certain language practices over others*.
>
> ~Jerry Won Lee, 2016, p. 176.

My day-to-day experience as a nondominant linguistic subject in the classrooms–both as the only international graduate student and as an instructor of first-year writing–offered a realistic lens to engage the scholarships on language diversity in the field of writing studies. I

was able to understand my relationship with the English language and the ideologies associated with it in a new light. For the first time, I was having first-hand experience of what it is like to be a person with an "accented" English–an experience punctuated by irony as I had spent a lot of time and energy correcting students' pronunciations back in Nepal. A sense of marginalization replaced the sense of privilege that I enjoyed back home as a teacher of English. I felt scrutinized by a host of "human and non-human perceiving subjects" operating with a "set of hegemonic perceptions that apprehend and often overdetermine not only linguistic forms, but also a wide range of semiotic resources" (Rosa and Flores 95). This newfound awareness of my positionality motivated me to explore the role and importance of cross-cultural literacies and justice-centered work in writing studies. I began to realize why the personal is indeed political and how my lived experiences coalesce with my scholarship, research, and teaching.

As I struggled to grapple with my new role as an IGTA, I couldn't help but reflect on my relationship with the English language and the ideologies associated with it. I started to look back to the days I first learned English, learning the alphabet in the fourth grade and studying English as a subject rather than a language, in rural Nepal. Nepal is a multilingual and multicultural country where 125 caste/ethnic groups and 59 indigenous communities speak more than 123 languages as their mother tongues. But Nepali spoken by so-called upper caste Brahmans and Kshetris residing in the hilly regions, collectively known as Parbatiya (people of the hills) was the only official language until the latest constitutional change in 2015. Although the new constitution recognizes other languages as national languages, the legacy of the long-held one-nation-one-language ideology is still alive and well. Therefore, Nepali is still a dominant language, and I am on the privileged side because it is my mother tongue. But for so many ethnic minorities people with a mother tongue other than Nepali, there is no even playing

field because they must master the mainstream Nepali to succeed academically and professionally. However, I didn't think much about my privilege until I found myself in their shoes in the United States. Compared to where and how I learned English, the resources and support I receive here in the U.S. as a student and an instructor is a privilege. But the dual privilege that I had back home as a speaker of mainstream Nepali and a teacher of English–a language with a relative social prestige and employability–was replaced with a sense of marginality as a speaker of an "accented" English. Suddenly, I found myself weighing each word twice before I utter it with additional self-consciousness, particularly in the early days and months at the University of Arizona.

Given my positionality as an international student and a writing instructor at The University of Arizona, I decided to explore the area of cultural and linguistic differences among students and the way those differences impact their understanding and identities as a writer. I designed a case study to understand how students in first-year writing classrooms–a space that is becoming more diverse every day due to the global demographic shift–can benefit from cross-cultural exchanges through conversations about their literacy experiences, collaborative activities like peer and group work, engaging with diverse readings, and interaction with the instructor. A literacy narrative assignment was a central component of this work. Just like first-year composition, the genre of literacy narrative was new to me. I had never encountered this genre before. I had always approached academic writing as a purely impersonal endeavor that must adhere to the "standard". The "norms" of the standardized written English had been presented as universals to me, and therefore I had no opportunity to question the discourse of "standard" language ideologies, let alone the opportunities to negotiate the conventions, stretch the genre conventions, and build on the linguistic and cultural resources that were at my disposal.

Proper format and mechanics almost always took precedence over ideas and rhetorical effectiveness in my encounter with academic writing, both as a student and an instructor. As a result, I approached each genre of writing as sacrosanct, something beyond questionings. I never attempted to build on the comparable writing tasks in my first language, Nepali. Playing around with the conventions and building off of what I already knew would have boosted my agency as a writer. This realization came rather late in my career.

Personal Narrative as a Tool to Agentive Writing Practices

> *In the current educational crisis, curriculum should provide a counterscript to pervasive constructions of student deficits. The power to showcase literacies rests firmly in first-year writing, where narrow scripts of learning can be grappled with, explored, and resisted through effortful reflections of students' cultural histories and shared literacies. Provide students opportunities to voice their stories, and you will create meaningful reflections on the wonderfully insufferable complexities of literacy.*
>
> ~Aimee C. Mapes, 2016, pp. 690-91.

I joined the Ph. D. program in Rhetoric, Composition, and the Teaching of English with an expectation to gain mastery over academic writing. In retrospect, I was perhaps looking for the most authentic academic training in writing in the disciplinary home of rhetoric and composition so that I could overcome all the shortcomings I had experienced in writing as a student and teacher. In my mind then, there was THE proper way to approach academic writing which I lacked.These expectations were rooted in the sociopolitical and academic context where

I learned and taught English. I too had internalized so many (mis)conceptions such as never to use 'I' and always maintain an "impersonal" and "objective" stance in writing. It was with great amusement that I first used a literacy narrative assignment in my first ever first-year writing class and found it to be a powerful means to encourage student writers to reflect on and give meanings to their experiences while learning from others' experiences and producing a narrative of their own. I found this assignment so empowering that I wrote a narrative of my own and reflected on my literacy experiences, which offered new insights into my academic journey.

As I continued to engage with students from different backgrounds, I realized that understanding the importance of cross-cultural exchanges among students would shed additional light to the instruction of college writing. Therefore, I designed a qualitative case study for which I designed a literacy narrative assignment encouraging students to cross cultural, linguistic, and experiential borders to mutually enrich their understanding. The findings were encouraging: Both English monolingual and bi- and multilingual students reported to have developed a more nuanced understanding of literacy and their literate selves as writers. I actively participated in cross-cultural conversations and border crossings as an instructor working closely with the students. As a part of this process, I shared my literacy experiences with them–a story that was so different yet insightful on many levels to a class of U. S. domestic students with a significant number of bi- and multilinguals and listened to their stories and worked alongside them to make those stories more effective. This case study was a part of the larger process of my coming to terms with the new reality–a graduate student studying rhetoric and composition and teaching college writing in a very different institutional and cultural context while living through the material consequences of language differences and the normative discourse and ideologies undergirding those differences, of which I had a different understanding back home in Nepal.

This experience of understanding the role and importance of cross-cultural interactions in the writing classroom became a major part of my journey as a graduate student and instructor. It helped me understand my lived experiences and connect them to the coursework and my research interests in language differences, standardized language ideologies and their material consequences, and possible ways to address them while promoting linguistically just ways to teach college writing. Although I began to develop an asset-based perspective to my lived experiences and connect them to the scholarship, my daily struggle as an IGTA was far from over.

(Self) Marginalization of IGTAs

> *IGTAs' ['International Graduate Teaching Assistants'] transnational identities encounter many constellations in U. S. academia. As ESL/EFL [English as a Second/Foreign Language] speakers, we strive to prosper in our academic career and professional relationships. However, under the seeming prosperity are many unseen and unspoken struggles within ourselves that are complicit to our marginalization.*
>
> ~Tao Zhang, 2021, p. 492

Language difference significantly impacts IGTAs' experiences, and it plays a crucial role in their success and wellbeing. Yet this doesn't mean that it's only IGTAs that struggle at graduate school. In fact, in the neoliberal corporate model of the U. S. higher education, all graduate students, as David L. Gregory argues, "have become a huge pool of cheap labor for university employers" (qtd. in Crudele 743). In addition to the common experience of

powerlessness, however, IGTAs struggle for different reasons and perhaps in different ways because of their different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. To begin with, the racialized bodies and accented English of IGTAs become a prime source of stress and insecurity for them. It was no different in my case. In terms of the intellectual labor of teaching, I and IGTAs like me are no different than other graduate students, but the whole process of navigating the university as a graduate student and an instructor, especially in the first semester, takes a toll on our emotional wellbeing. No matter how hard they work as an instructor, IGTAs constantly experience the gaze of what Nelson Flores and Jonathan Rosa characterize as "the white listening subject" that "often continues to hear the linguistic markedness and deviancy regardless of how well language- minoritized students model themselves after the white speaking subject" (Flores and Rosa 152). IGTAs are in a unique position to experience the complex and subtle effects of standardized language ideologies that come from a long history of English monolingual and monocultural hegemony.

It is not that there are no well-meaning people at the university, but the residue of monolingual and monocultural ideologies are so ingrained in the system that they manifest as a benign notion of meritocracy, quality, and fairness, and therefore often go unnoticed. It is only through the embodied experience of nondominant linguistic subjects like IGTAs that such implicit biases and their effects can be foregrounded.

> *Both the hegemonic forces and the subaltern professionals [like IGTAs] have been playing a persistent role in the processes of marginalization and in the practices of self-marginalization, respectively.*
>
> ~B. Kumaravadivelu, 2016, p. 80

Despite a significant teaching experience after my master's back home in Nepal, I experienced a prolonged imposter syndrome as a Ph. D. student in the U. S. As I look back to these experiences, I find a complex interplay of marginalization and self-marginalization resulting from both external and internal factors. Although the university supposedly is a place where differences are welcomed and celebrated, the residue of monolingual and monocultural ideologies persist in subtle and deceptive manners. My experience as the only international graduate student in my class and an IGTA on campus has mostly been positive. Yet there are numerous instances that reminded me of my status as a nondominant linguistic subject navigating a space where the legacy of English monolingual and monocultural culture continues. Here, I capture the most illustrative moments that connect my lived experience in the U. S. to my research interests, which provide a lens to recast my experiences back home in Nepal as an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) student and teacher.

As an English as a Foreign Language speaker, I have always encountered different levels of challenge between academic discourse and casual conversation. I feel more comfortable and confident talking about the subject matter in the classroom but lack that level of ease and confidence in casual conversation. As a result, I came across numerous interlocutors whose facial expressions would change during the conversation giving an air of discomfort, frustration, and also empathy in some cases. Although I interpreted those expressions in a positive light as an effort to navigate my accented English that was different from what they were used to, it heightened the level of my self-consciousness, which I struggled with for a long time. However, not all instances were equally innocuous. On several occasions, I felt that I was not taken seriously. It happened more often outside the instructional setting of the university. I worked

with the university's Museum of Art to curate an exhibition as a part of my graduate program's Immersive Cultural Requirement. I got all the support I needed from the faculty as well as the museum staff throughout this process. However, one incident made me think that my accented English cost me an important opportunity. Just before the opening of the exhibition, I was supposed to give a brief talk as an orientation to the museum staff who would later interact with the visitors. Two museum employees with whom I had worked for weeks to put the exhibition together explained the orientation to me. The conversation ended in an agreement that they would email me the date and time for this event, but I never heard back from them. Although I cannot completely rule out other possible reasons, I strongly felt that my "less-than-perfect" English conversations with them had a role in it.

On numerous other occasions, I have felt that I was not taken seriously during conversations, particularly the phone conversations outside the university, and some interlocutors preferred to hang up on me than take the time to navigate the opacity of the exchange. As much as I would like to ignore such responses as an outlier, especially because they occurred outside the academic orbit of the university, I couldn't do so because I noticed similar intolerance for "accented" English inside the writing program. What makes this incident more interesting is that I was picked on for my "accented" writing –emails with slightly awkward phraseology or tone– on more than one occasion. Once I emailed a WPA requesting some information that I needed again stating that I lost track of the emails. In fact, I was just getting used to the huge volume of emails I received every day. I actually intended to say that I was unable to locate the information that I needed. In response, the WPA replied with the phrase "lost your emails" followed by multiple question marks. I felt so stupid. Recently, I sent an email to a WPA with a request to provide information about my employment at the writing program if and when they are

contacted. I foolishly wrote 'Heads up' in the subject line, however, the body of the email was polite and professional as it should be. In response, I was sarcastically thanked for the "warning" (which I was not giving) and assured that they would remain "prepared" as if there was an impending catastrophe (which I never meant). I am not defending my poor choice of words nor am I saying that anything goes in communication. But I think we can and should display a cooperative disposition to such slippage as long as they convey the same message with a good intent and politeness.

Let me come clear about these incidents: I, as a student and teacher of writing, am not arguing that anything should pass as correct, much less in a written correspondence. But the sloppiness I am talking about was unintentional, inoffensive, and not serious enough to impair the communication. What was missing in these communicative acts on the part of the interlocutor is the "openness of the cooperative disposition" --a quality that Suresh Canagarajah claims is a hallmark of "dialogical cosmopolitanism" (*Translingual Practice*, 196). It shows that the institutions of higher education have not yet fully embraced the values of "dialogical cosmopolitanism" that is "interactive and negotiated. It is not given but is achieved in situated interactions. It is based on mutual collaboration, with an acceptance of everyone's difference" (*Translingual Practice*, 196). These experiences came as a double-edged sword to me–they helped me identify my research interests in language differences in our field, but they also had some corrosive effects on my self-confidence and heightened the level of my self-consciousness.

Ironically, lack of visibility is an equally pervasive form of marginalization for minoritized IGTAs. All minoritized people in the workplace and academic institutions have a hard time maintaining visibility, something that people of mainstream culture take for granted. More often than not, "for marginalized individuals, hypervisibility and invisibility are contrasts

to visibility and represent different manifestations of the same oppressive forces–subjugation and devaluation" that "reflect distortions of individuals and the groups to which they belong, and both function to maintain a social hierarchy where marginalized groups are constrained to the periphery" ("Managing (In)visibility" 2). It was in the fifth year of my graduate program that I experienced invisibility in my home department of English. I received a dissertation fellowship of national level for the year 2022. My faculty mentors and Graduate Center supported me during this highly competitive application process. But the English department did not notice or acknowledge a significant achievement of its student in any form or shape. I wouldn't feel this way if there was no practice of celebrating student and faculty success at the department. After the fellowship was announced in May 2022, the news section on the department's website was updated several times acknowledging numerous big and small achievements of the students and faculty. I cannot rule out other possible reasons for this oversight, but it's hard to believe that it was just a matter of newsworthiness. For the minority students, transition is an ongoing process because they constantly have to think about their (in)visibility in the space where they are an "Other," not the norm. It could be one of the many reasons why I experienced a prolonged transition to graduate school and sporadic bouts of imposter syndrome, even at the advanced stage of my graduate studies.

In the fourth year of my GTAship, I designed and taught a 400-level course–Professional and Technical Writing with Diverse Audiences–as a part of my dissertation research. I had total autonomy in designing the assignments and deciding on the readings. But this freedom brought a lot of anxiety as I started working on the course in the summer of 2021. Despite the encouragement and support from my faculty mentor, I spent over one hundred hours preparing for the course. The amount of time itself may not tell anything as people work at different pace

with different levels of productivity, but I was hyper aware of my anxiety and insecurity. I believe this is a common experience of IGTAs who constantly feel insecure about their classroom delivery even if they are confident about the content they teach. It becomes a source of their (self)marginalization as they become less assertive in their academic and professional pursuits on the one hand and are subjected to disproportionate amounts of physical, intellectual, and emotional labor on the other.

Most poignantly, it has been the act of teaching where I have internalized the most insecurity with my ethos and authority as an IGTA. Having spent a good part of my life as a student and teacher in a teacher-centered environment in Nepal where lecture was the be-all and end-all of instruction, I had to make a major shift to the student-centered pedagogy, which is the norm of process-oriented writing instruction in the writing program in the University of Arizona. I struggled with balancing teacher presence and student participation and agency. To complicate the matter, self-consciousness about “accented” English and lack of assertiveness often was perceived to be a more hands-off approach, which some students interpreted as lack of teacherly presence and authority. For example, I sent out an anonymous mid-semester Google survey to get students' perspectives on the Professional and Technical Writing with Diverse Audiences course in Fall 2021, I received a very positive and constructive response as a whole, but there were a few students who wanted more time for the teacher to explain core ideas. These students wanted less class time dedicated to activities or student collaboration, and more leadership from me as the teacher. This was not the first time I experienced this dilemma, and I assume that this is a common pedagogical decision that all instructors have to make, and no one has full control over its outcomes. However, my positionality as a non-dominant linguistic subject in the role of IGTA with training and professional experience in Nepal complicates this matter even further.

However, it would be a mistake to generalize the experience of all IGTAs in all institutional contexts because it is a complex issue. Let me share my experience of teaching a course that calls for linguistically just writing practices in professional and technical writing. In the Spring 2022 class, one of my students **(Student A**) completely disagreed with the basic premise of the course that professional and technical writers should learn to apply localization strategies to the development, editing, and management of content in ways that are responsive to and inclusive of linguistic and cultural differences. This student was not ready to question the sanctity of professional and technical communication as "objective" and "universal". We had long and passionate (sometimes borderline contentious) conversations in the class. The student completed the course but didn't change their position. But in sharp contrast to this response, I received one of the most affirming and empathetic responses in Fall 2021 when I sent out an anonymous survey to understand if my language status as an IGTA had any bearing on the students' engagement with the course materials and learning objectives. I am quoting two excerpts from the students' survey responses verbatim:

> **Student B-Fall 2021:** "Reflecting on my experience, the only real affect this had was occasional difficulty to understand certain words that the instructor would say. However, this was minimal and did not prevent me from understanding what he was saying and teaching overall. Overall, I don't think that my instructor's [language] status negatively impacted by experience with the course and its outcomes. If anything, I feel it had a positive impact, as his experience related to the course, especially when discussing things like localization and creating technical documents that accommodate people of various backgrounds."

> **Student C-Fall 2021:** "One thing that I have learned over time is that everyone has an accent, and every accent requires an adjustment period. It was no different in this class. After the first couple of weeks, I believe the whole class could understand the instructor's speech well. I would also say that the instructor's language status created an additional learning experience for a class about Diverse Audiences. The instructor's language status as a person who learned English as a second language enhanced the course objectives and learning outcomes. It enhanced student learning with in-person and real-time understanding of concepts covered during the course of the class."

These student responses indicate both the prevalence of English monolingual and monocultural ideology and growing awareness of and openness to language differences at the same time. We encounter students like Student A above who are not willing to participate in the conversations that shake their foundational beliefs about language, culture, and identities. But on a brighter note, we also come across many others, like Students B and C, who are open and empathetic to differences and are willing to join the conversation. This indeed is a very promising sign! In order to fully account for my experience as an IGTA, it is important to go to the back story: How I learned and taught English in Nepal before I came to the U. S. in 2017.

Learning and Teaching English as a Foreign Language in Nepal

Language is not just social practice (a central tenet of linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics) but is also and always infused with and caught up in the political

> *economic, national, (post)colonial, and political circumstances that shape its use and its role as an object of study, political manipulation, and cultural value.*
>
> ~Jillian R. Cavanaugh, 2020, p. 51

Born in rural Nepal in the late 1970s, I went to a public school where the medium of instruction was Nepali and English as a subject was introduced in the fourth grade. I have no memory of singing English rhymes or reading colorful alphabet books. It was the pre-digital era, at least in Nepal--there was no television, no telephone; even a transistor radio was not common in the village. English was not used at all for communication. Any person's ability to speak English would be a topic of household discussion for days. I grew up listening to the adulations conferred to people who could speak English, a select few who were born in an educated family or went to a private or missionary school in the big cities within the country or in the neighboring cities of India. However, none was true of me. In retrospect, I was internalizing the power differential between the local, vernacular Nepali and English as an international language. I wasn't aware of any language politics, including my privilege as the speaker of mainstream Nepali as the mother tongue. I rarely considered how my fellow students from other ethnic minorities with a different mother tongue might struggle to perfect Nepali. Growing up in a place with an open border with India, I interacted with Hindi-speaking people–both from India and the southern part of Nepal where Hindi is spoken as a contact language. But more importantly, it was the Bollywood Hindi movies and Indian television channels–the only TV channels available then–that helped me learn to speak Hindi, and thus I became multilingual at an early age. In fact, learning to speak Hindi was much easier than English even without any formal training, maybe because of its similarity with my first language Nepali as both Hindi and Nepali have the same

script and origin in Sanskrit. But English was a different beast. English, to me, was less a language than what Aamir Mufti calls "the *cultural system*" that had a direct impact on my social and economic life (12). Although Nepal was not colonized, it couldn't remain untouched by English as "the language of two successive world empires—the territorial British empire for 200 years from the middle of the eighteenth century and the (for the most part but not exclusively) nonterritorial imperial structures of U. S.-led global capitalism since the middle of the twentieth" (Mufti 16).

Therefore, despite little to no exposure to the English language as a child, I developed a strong penchant for it. By the time I reached fourth grade English was first introduced as a subject. We had one more textbook–'English Book', we called it. In a centralized education system, all the public schools used the same textbooks across the country, and like the majority of students in the rural public schools, we had no additional reading materials other than the textbook. English language texts were even more scarce. But in society, English was (and still is) a status marker, a symbol of power, sophistication, and intelligence. Fortunately, a new teacher came to our school from a neighboring district, and he wasn't any new teacher whom we would call "new sir" for years, but an English teacher. We had additional respect for him. What's more, he was our first teacher who would speak English in the classroom and encouraged us to join the conversation. It was a rare coincidence that a qualified person with a college degree in English was there in a rural public school to teach us. He was a true inspiration. I recall one class activity where he involved the class in a translation activity. He would write a sentence in Nepali on the chalkboard and invite us to write its English equivalent. I was so elated to get one translation right: "Dr. Chakravarty is driving a car" from the Nepali equivalent–"डा. चक्रवर्ती कार हाँकिरहेको

छ.” I became a huge fan of my English teacher. Once I waited for over an hour at a social event in my neighborhood to greet him so I could demonstrate my learning of the English greetings he had taught us for the morning, noon, evening, and night. Since it was late evening, I greeted him saying “Good night, sir”. It was years before I realized that ‘good night’ is not used for greetings.

> *By and large, the spread of English is considered to be natural, neutral and beneficial. It is considered natural because, although there may be some critical reference to the colonial imposition of English, its subsequent expansion is seen as a result of inevitable global forces. It is seen as neutral because it is assumed that once English has in some sense become detached from its original cultural contexts (particularly England and America), it is now a neutral and transparent medium of communication. And it is considered beneficial because a rather blandly optimistic view of international communication assumes that this occurs on a cooperative and equitable footing.*
>
> ~Alastair Pennycook, 2017, p. 9

After two years with the first (and new) English teacher in the 4th and 5th grades, I had started to think about becoming like him in future. How wonderful it would be to speak English like him! English offered the potential for upward mobility. Becoming an English teacher was a glamorous call. When I went to another school in the sixth grade, unfortunately, everything changed. The instruction of English there was perfunctory at best. One of the most resource constrained areas, there was no government funding for the secondary level. The community had to manage resources, which resulted in scarcity of basic amenities, including qualified subject

teachers. At the same time, the political upheaval that culminated in the end of monarchy in 1990 made the situation worse. I have no memorable events from the 6th to 10th grades, except for a short interaction with volunteer teachers from the U. S in the seventh grade. I recall the excitement in the class of over 50 students learning to sing songs like "Old McDonald Had a Farm" and participating in some hands-on activities–a rare occurrence in the classroom then. Although I cannot recall any specific learning moments, the opportunity to interact with the 'native' speakers of English from a different part of the world was a formative experience for a seventh grader.

The state of English instruction improved when a new teacher came in the middle of the tenth grade, but we had less than six months before the high school board exams. I graduated high school with an above average score in English without seeing a library or having access to additional reading materials other than textbooks. Going to college as a first-generation student, I had no family guidance or any professional career counseling whatsoever. When I enrolled for Intermediate of Arts (equivalent to class 11 and 12, but it was part of college education then), there was a choice between Nepali and English majors. Most students would choose Nepali, and my future roommate at college did the same. I decided to major in English–a decision I made with no clear rationale other than a vague idea that English might bring more opportunities. It was mostly an instinctual move. I had no explanation of my choice at the time, nor did I think I needed one. Jillian R. Cavanaugh defines language ideologies as "the beliefs and attitudes that shape speakers' relationships to their own and others' languages, mediating between the social practice of language and the socioeconomic and political structures within which it occurs" (52). Since early childhood, I must have internalized that English was a language of power, access,

and upward mobility, and the effect of such internalized beliefs are reflected in the choices I made as a student and later as a teacher.

Admittedly, as a student of English language and literature, I developed a mythical sense of "standard" English toward which I needed to strive. While I had no concrete idea of what that "standard" was (nobody knows what it is), it continued to shape my perception and action as a language user. I was interpellated by the "standard" language ideology, which I acknowledged, albeit subconsciously, and responded to as a subject. According to Louis Althusser, "the existence of ideology and the hailing or interpellation of individuals as subjects are one and the same thing" (118). The manifestation of such ideological interpellation looked different in the EFL context with no presence of 'native' English speakers. As a college student, I wished I had had the opportunity to attend private schools where the medium of instruction was English. I envied the way some of my classmates were able to interact with the professor in English. In sharp contrast to high school, college English classrooms had a nonnegotiable "English only" policy that prevented the majority of the students like me from meaningful interaction with the professor and the course content in the classroom. Although I struggled in the English major classes with heavy lectures and English-only policy, I revered my professors and began to dream of becoming one of them in the future. Maybe it was their ability to teach in English only. By the time I graduated college and began teaching English in private schools, I had calcified a number of (mis)conceptions like a good English teacher must speak English only in the classroom and should NEVER use Nepali, or any other language other than English for that matter, and fluency means to speak fast, without a long pause.

> *Linguistic hegemony is achieved when dominant groups create a consensus by convincing others to accept their language norms and usage as standard or paradigmatic. Hegemony is ensured when they can convince those who fail to meet those standards to view their failure as being the result of the inadequacy of their own language.*
>
> Terance G. Wiley, 1996, p. 113.

Simply put, I developed a deficit perspective on language and literacy, and it was reflected in my approach to teaching. One particular incident stands out to me. I was a high school English teacher in a private school while I was working toward my M. A. thesis. This was my fourth private school as a teacher. The English course focused on four skills–reading, writing, speaking, and listening–with different levels of emphasis. I assigned writing assignments from time to time and offered written feedback to each student. I recall one instance where I was commenting on the assignment of a female student who had topped the ninth grade and was at the top of the ranking in the tenth grade as well. I remember sitting in the classroom with a group of students and using a red pen to suggest multiple changes to a short one-page writing. Red marks were everywhere. Looking at the page, one male student wondered how his writing assignment would fare when the writing of the top-ranking student was getting so many red marks. I had no definitive answer or explanation to his concern at the time other than reiteration of my purpose as a teacher to make their writing better. Now I realize that I was reenacting the prescriptive model of instruction that operated from a deficit perspective. It was the model of instruction that I was most familiar with as a student. In addition to the efforts to "fix" student writing, I was complicit in imposing the "English only" policy both inside and outside the classroom because the school administration was very scrupulous about maintaining the image of

"English medium school." It was the most effective marketing strategy to convince parents to pay exorbitantly expensive fees.

The impact of "standard" language ideologies and deficit approach to language and literacy continued to manifest even after I entered the state university in Nepal as a faculty. Around the same time, the university introduced semester-based academic calendars replacing the annual system to ensure more student-centered instruction and formative assessment. As I started teaching academic writing in addition to the literature courses, I came to understand how academic writing has continued to remain a challenge for students, yet no major steps were taken to address it. I reflected on my struggle writing two master's theses with very little resources and support in the writing process. It helped me relate to the students' struggles and motivated me to explore the field of writing studies. Eventually, I decided to apply for a Ph. D. in rhetoric and composition in the U. S. The fact that rhetoric and composition as a discipline is native to North America incentivized me to go through the rigorous application process of graduate school because deep down my heart, I was looking for a 'universal' approach to academic writing as I hadn't worked enough on the standard language ideologies I had internalized for years.

From Interpellation to Disillusionment and Proactiveness: Concluding Thoughts

With a long and complicated relationship with the English language as a student and teacher in Nepal, I entered graduate school in the U.S. with complex and often conflicting ideas, ideologies, experiences, and aspirations, which made my transition as an international graduate student and teaching associate anything but linear. As paradoxical as it is, I had not only internalized the "standard" language ideology but also acted on it as an English teacher. With a sense of privilege, I had come to value English as a language of power and upward mobility. But in my new role as an international graduate student and teaching associate at the University of

Arizona, I had a new positionality. I was first and foremost a nondominant linguistic subject with an "accented" English. And that changed the entire equation. The loss of my perceived privilege as an English teacher back in Nepal led to new awareness and understanding. First, I began to realize privilege and non-privilege are relative to our positionality and level of awareness. Likewise, I started to see how absurd it was to feel privileged in teaching a foreign language and perpetuating its ideologies but remain oblivious to the actual privilege I had as a speaker of mainstream Nepali serves serves as a gatekeeping tool against the minoritized communities in a country with more than 123 mother tongues. For the first time in my academic journey, I critically reflected on my experiences and actions, particularly my relationship with the English language as a student and a teacher. I was able to see through the interpellation of "standard" language ideologies, connect the material consequences to language differences that I was living through at the moment to those ideologies, and develop a more nuanced, empathetic, and ethical understanding of what it is like to be Other.

This newfound awareness came when I had to confront my new positionality as a nondominant linguistic subject with an "accented" English in the U.S. In my role as an English teacher in Nepal, I had cultivated an ideological position in many ways similar to whiteness or whiteliness. According to Rosa and Flores, "whiteness functions as a structural position that can be inhabited by whites and non-whites alike depending on the circumstances" ("Reimagining Race" 94). It is more about the stance or disposition people have rather than a particular racial, national, or ethnic identity. In a similar vein, Frankie Cordon and Vershawn Ashanti Young use the term 'whiteliness' referring to the "learned ways of knowing and doing–of thinking, speaking, and writing–characterized by a racialized sense of oneself as best equipped to judge, preach, and to suffer" (14). As a deep-seated ideology, whiteliness is also not limited to white

people; people of color may develop such dispositions because of ideological interpellation and false sense of privilege. In my case, ironically, it was not until I found myself between a rock and a hard place where all "racialized speaking subjects face a catch-22 in mainstream institutional contexts that I became aware of it: 'You need to sound like me but I will never acknowledge that you do'" (Flores and Rosa, "The Raciolinguistic Catch-22") that I became aware of it..

Over time, I gradually solidified my research interests in linguistically just writing practices, which in turn broadened and deepened my understanding of linguistic (in)justice and inspired me to find possible ways to address it as a teacher-scholar of writing. From my lived experience as framed through linguistic justice, I understand how IGTAs' stories and scholarship can contribute toward countering the English monolingual and monocultural ideologies. Our stories shed light on racial and colonial differences. Our stories provide insights toward more inclusive, effective, and ethical writing practices. I agree with Flores and Rosa in their assessment that we need a shift in "the conversation from trying to improve the linguistic practices of language-minoritized students toward challenging the ways that their linguistic practices are taken up and interpreted by the white listening subject" ("Undoing Appropriateness" 167). For this, we as a field need to question all the "standard" language norms that go unnoticed in the guise of 'neutrality', 'objectivity', 'merit', 'efficiency', 'clarity and precision' and so on. As a person with an accented English, which is an integral part of my identity, I believe that we need to think about accents in a new way. Rather than looking at one's accent as mere deviation from the "norm" and therefore deficiency, we can and should develop a resource perspective that is more accepting and empathetic. There is a need to move "from a conceptualization of accent as defect or stigma to accent as skill, currency, or enactment of expertise; from accent as uttered, spoken, and read to accent as *also* received, interpreted, and perceived" (Rangan et al. 5-6). With my

scholarship, research, and teaching experience in the area of language difference over the years, my understanding and acceptance of my accent as a "biography of migration" rather than "an immediately distinguishable sound that avows its unshakable roots within the confines of a nation-state" has become stronger, and I encourage my students to understand accent in the similar vein (Abu Hamdan 73).

But we as a field cannot move in this new direction as long as we are confined to the current discourse of diversity in higher education. Sara Ahmed rightly points out that institutions of higher education must question "what diversity does by focusing on what diversity obscures, that is, by focusing on the relationship between diversity and racism as a way of making explicit a tendency that is reproduced by staying implicit" (14). A critical autoethnography of an IGTA makes this relationship explicit by interrogating power, privilege, and biases; the power is in sharing our embodied experiences navigating differences across multiple borders. Therefore, the stories of IGTAs, as complex and layered as they are, should be used to make the diversity initiatives in higher education more effective and utilize them as pedagogical resources to promote difficult conversations about diversity and race in writing classrooms. These stories have a potential to shift the "locus of enunciation" and reverse the usual practice of "looking at marginal societies from the perspective of academic centers" to "look[ing] at the cultural and political centers from the academic margins" (Mignolo, *The Darker Side* 312). It is by confronting the racial and colonial differences and listening to the marginalized voices that we create a future of hope and justice, not by avoiding them. My autoethnographic narrative is a small effort in that direction. Although at a slow pace, we as a field are heading in the right direction at least by providing space for such conversations on and around linguistic (in)justice, but still there is a long way to go.

Chapter-4: Enacting Linguistic Justice in College Writing Classrooms

Why We Need Linguistically Just Writing Practices

The purpose of this chapter is to answer calls in our discipline for an equity-based writing curriculum that doesn't allow English monolingual and monocultural ideologies to harm nondominant linguistic subjects–students whose first language isn't English and/or standardized English–and ensures that all students actively participate in and mutually enrich each other's learning experience as writers. With three assignments of different yet interrelated nature, this chapter shows that all language use and all writing involve translation and translanguaging, and therefore these principles should be presented as the norms of language use and core attributes for teaching writing. The first assignment–Language and Literacy Autobiography–is a revised version of the literacy narrative that I have been using in the first year writing course since 2017. It is also informed by a qualitative case study that I conducted at the University of Arizona. The second assignment–Writing as Translation and (Trans)langauging–is appropriate for first year writing as well advanced composition and/or upper-division writing studies courses. I have taught part of this assignment–Paraphrase as Translation and Writing activity–in different institutional settings and received positive response from students and faculty alike. The third assignment–Debunking the Myths of Standardized (Written) English: A Research Report–however, is completely new. Like the second assignment, this assignment is designed for both first year writing and advanced composition and/or upper-division writing studies courses. These assignments together create an inquiry and invite students to recast writing beyond standardized language ideology and in doing so, they exemplify the core concepts/principles of linguistic justice pedagogy that:

- affirms diverse student voices and uses differences as resource to agentive writing practices
- emphasizes translation and differences as fundamental to *all* writing
- asks students to debunk the harmful ideologies of Standardized English
- cultivates critical rhetorical agency

The inclusive and responsive framework of linguistic justice that I propose adopts a multipronged approach to language differences to redress the harms of linguistic injustice perpetuated by English monolingual and monocultural ideologies that are manifested in the forms of 'English Only' policy and/or advocacy of "Standard (Written) English" as the only legitimate means of knowledge production and dissemination in the US higher education. Building on the theoretical and pedagogical concepts like translingual orientation, raciolinguistics, critical language awareness, antiracist Black language pedagogy, and epistemic delinking and border thinking, the linguistic justice framework advocates for critical rhetorical agency of all student writers. Informed by decolonial visions, options, and hopes, the linguistic justice framework introduced in chapter two defies the binary between theory and praxis. Instead, with a focus on the historical reality of othering language and literacy practices, it foregrounds the ethical aspect of what we do as teachers-scholars of writing in a world that is becoming more and more diverse every day on one hand, and there is growing intolerance to differences on the other. Afterall, how we treat 'others'–the othered people, language, literacy, and writing practices–is at the heart of the ethical choices we make as an educator and help our students to make the similar choices both in and beyond college classrooms. The issue of language difference engenders different and sometimes contradictory responses from people

depending on from what perspective they look at the issue. Needless to say, it is not just an innocuous linguistic reality as we may like to believe, but instead a politically and culturally fraught issue steeped in monolingual and monocultural ideologies that cannot and should not be separated from the racial and colonial differences that operate within the binaries of 'Us' versus 'Them'. If the central work of our field is "communicating equitably and ethically across the differences" then we must focus on "the labor of understanding and responding to the unjust structures of racial capitalism, settler colonialism, and other frameworks that unevenly shape literacy education and the terrains of communication" (Daniel, et al. 3).

Because racial and colonial differences are central to the matter of linguistic (in)justice, it is not easy to discuss such issues without generating some heat in the classroom. Lately, the rise of ultra-nationalistic sentiments that fuel toxic and divisive rhetoric and even acts of violence have added additional challenges to writing teachers and scholars. We are living in times of growing intolerance toward concepts like critical race theory and gender studies, and acts of banning and burning books as well as indiscriminate labeling of all critical and justice-oriented academic work as identity politics, or worse, wokism–a catch-all term that is often defined–sometimes not defined–in the way that fits one's narrative and worldview. The cumulative effect of these efforts to silence the voices of dissensus have created an undeclared state of self-censorship among educators. Such a reductive approach to different and dissenting viewpoints forecloses any meaningful conversation on these complex issues and thereby denies meaningful learning opportunities to students. Therefore, it is incumbent upon us who teach required college writing courses as a part of General Education to provide students with the learning opportunities that prepare them to navigate and negotiate all forms of differences, including linguistic and cultural differences, as they participate in the civic, public discourses.

The curricular intervention with a series of assignments I propose in this chapter speaks to this new exigency as much as it aligns with the expectations of the General Education curriculum that aims at equipping students with fundamental knowledge and skills to succeed in and beyond college. In the politically fraught climate where higher education operates, writing instructors have a responsibility to engage students in an open discussion of the issues like language differences, ideologies, and their sources, and work with them toward linguistically just writing practices. In the meantime, educators who adopt such justice-centered approaches have to navigate and negotiate a range of institutional policies that are not immune to the influence of realpolitik. Therefore, it is important to find the curricular and pedagogical models that provide learning opportunities for students to understand harmful language ideologies and find ways to deal with them as writers while not shutting down the much-needed conversation and not letting it fall into the trap of cultural politics of identity–an easy target for the detractors to muddy the water. Therefore, this curricular intervention provides students with an opportunity to not only understand English monolingual and monocultural ideologies but also cultivate a critical disposition to interrogate and resist those ideologies that shape the rhetorical choices they make as writers. In doing so, these assignments also contribute to the development of critical rhetorical agency among student writers. Each of the three assignments is built on one of the three major principles of linguistic justice pedagogies listed above; however, these principles significantly overlap in and across the assignments. What follows is a brief overview of each assignment in the order they can be assigned in a first-year writing course. However, these assignments can be adapted to upper division writing studies courses as well.

Assignment Details

I. Language and Literacy Autobiography

20-25% of Course Grade

An Overview:

Language and Literacy Autobiography falls under the broader spectrum of personal narrative where students recall and reflect on their experience of learning language and literacy skills and give meanings to those experiences that have shaped their literate selves as writers. While language and literacy autobiography shares common attributes with literacy narratives, it foregrounds personal and embodied experiences of the writer in first person narrative and provides space for the discussion of language differences, politics, and ideologies so that students can share their experience of learning language/s, their relation to it, and the roles language/s may have played in their identity as a writer. Suresh Canagarajah makes between literacy narrative and literacy autobiography in *Transnational Literacy Autobiography as Translingual Writing*. Even though literacy narrative "also narrates literacy development, the distinction is that LA [literacy autobiography] is written in the first-person voice about oneself" whereas literacy narratives "can be written in the third-person voice, in biographical or fictional accounts about others" (21). Because the purpose of this assignment is to encourage writers to reflect on their experiences of acquiring language and literacies and share them in their own voice, I call it language and literacy autobiography. This assignment contributes to the larger goal of linguistic justice by allowing students to meaningfully reflect on their language and literacy experiences and build critical rhetorical agency at the same time. I encourage students to capitalize on the performative nature of literacy autobiography as "an academic genre that

bridges personal and academic writing and provides opportunities for constructing new identities in a relatively safe space" (Schmertz 279). It means, writing a language and literacy autobiography is not a mere narration of their experiences but an assertion of their literate selves.

Drawing insights from a long-standing research and scholarship that backs the importance of personal narrative in college writing, this assignment affirms diverse student voices and uses linguistic and cultural differences as a resource to promote agentive writing practices. To begin with, personal narratives help students correct the misconceptions they have about writing and research. For example, most students stick to the view that academic writing should always be formal, impersonal, and about hard facts where personal experiences, feelings and emotions are not unacceptable. I always have students who strongly believe that they should never use 'I' in academic writing, a concept that comes from the 'universal' notion of academic writing as objective and impersonal reinforced by many textbooks and test preparation books. Likewise, many students have an extreme view on research–either they understand it as a complex and sophisticated task meant for super intelligent people or reduce it to finding a few sources in the library or on Google and summarizing them. We can use personal narratives to validate students' lived experiences shared in first person narratives and help them understand research in a localized form and context such as interviewing people in the family and/or community (e. g., grandparents) or revisiting old artifacts to recall and understand important literacy events and reflect on the larger significance of those events. By demystifying the myths about academic writing and research, we pave the way for the interrogation of standard language ideologies as well.

The proponents of 'rigor' and 'objectivity' do not acknowledge the merits of personal narratives in college writing classrooms, but as early as 1980, Byrd Boegeman argued that

writing becomes "alive and fresh when students write about their real and immediate problems, that is, when they write in the first person and draw on material from their own lives" and it is "particularly effective for marginal students, providing them with motivation, confidence, and a greater opportunity for success than traditional writing assignments" (662). Many scholars of composition studies have consistently reported the positive impact of personal narratives in students' writing. For example, Mary Soliday discusses how literacy narratives provide students with "a way to view their experience with language as unusual or strange" and expand their "sense of personal agency" (511, 512). Similarly, William Carpenter and Bianca Falbo reported how the reflective nature of literacy narratives "improved awareness of themselves as individuals who think, read, write, and speak in the world" (107). However, there are scholars who approach personal narratives critically and question the inherent usefulness of the literacy narrative in college writing courses. Anne-Marie Hall and Christopher Minnix find the portrayal of the literacy narrative "as a bridge to academic writing" problematic because it creates a hierarchy between the genres by touting the academic writing as superior to personal narratives (58). Similarly, Caleb Corkery acknowledges the empowering nature of literacy narrative but questions the way it "presumes the hegemony of written literacy" at the cost of oral literacies (64). These concerns point to the sedimented practices that treat academic writing as sacrosanct and perpetuate the hegemony of alpha-numeric literacy over other literate practices. What Corkery suggests as an alternative way to "steer students into narratives of lessons learned, moments of communicative mastery—oral and written" is undoubtedly a right move (64), but we should go one step ahead to reframe the concept of literacy itself for a broader and more nuanced understanding: a shift from literacy as "autonomous and situated to negotiated" that a translingual orientation to literacy requires (Canagarajah, "Negotiating" 40). From a translingual

perspective, “reading and writing are understood as actively producing texts—worlds and the very languages employed—and asymmetrical relations of power are understood as both mediated by as well as mediating—transformed by and transforming—individual instances of languaging” (Lu and Horner, “Translingual Literacy and Matters of Agency” 28). A translingual orientation to literacy and writing is an integral part of the linguistic justice framework and it also informs this language and literacy autobiography assignment.

Assignment Description:

This assignment is primarily for first-year writing class even though it can be adapted for upper-division courses as well. Based on the published research on the use of personal narratives in college writing courses and my personal experience as a writing instructor, I recommend Language and Literacy Autobiography be used as the first major project of the semester or term. In this assignment you will recall and reflect on your experience of learning language/s and developing other literacy skills, give meanings to those experiences as a way to understand what they might mean to your literate self as a writer, and compose a compelling personal narrative that foregrounds your lived experiences along with the contextualized anecdotes, vivid sensory details, and meaningful reflection. You will start by drawing a chronology of your literacy development such as the experience of learning your first language and/or additional languages, if applicable, the early phase of learning to read and write, transition to school, and any other significant learning experiences thereafter that have shaped your literate self as a writer as well your identity as a whole. This recollection is followed by a reflection where you critically examine those events and experiences, the underlying values, assumptions, power dynamics, and

ideologies that might have shaped them, how those events and experiences have been represented and interpreted, and how they may have contributed to shape your identities and worldviews. Although we all have different experiences of learning language/s and developing literacy competencies, the focus remains the same: what those experiences meant then, what they mean now, and how they have shaped you as a literate being. You will follow the steps outlined below to create an autobiographical account–either an alphabetic, text-based or a digital, multimodal–accompanied by a reflective memo.

Objectives/Learning Outcomes:

By the end of this assignment, you will be able to:

- Recall your language and literacy experiences and reflect on them to understand what they mean to your literate self as a writer. (**Recall and reflect)**
- Reconstruct your language and literacy experiences from the present vantage point and retell them appropriately in a new rhetorical situation. (**Reconstruct and retell)**
- Resist the universal notion of literacy with a capital 'L' and monolingual and monocultural ideologies that undergird it with your personalized, embodied, and localized experiences and reposition your literate self to the present. **(Resist and reposition)**

Invention:

You start off with basic questions about your language and literacy experiences: What is your earliest memory of communicating with others? What do you recall about the language/s used in the family? Did everyone in the community use the same language, or there were people whose

language was different than yours? Did your teachers and friends in school communicate in the same way? Did you experience any change, difficulty/challenge in communication? Where did you first learn to read and write? Who did you learn it from? What was the experience like? While you recollect your experience and take notes, you will read a number of personal, autobiographical narratives written by people from different linguistic, cultural, and social backgrounds to be familiar with the many different ways people develop their language and literacy competencies. You will use active reading strategies [linked here] to fully appreciate the writers' ideas and perspectives and make them work for your own writing. In doing so, you will complete Reflective Reading Responses (RRRs) on the D2L Discussion Board, read and respond to your classmate's posts, and actively participate in class discussions.

Readings: (Shared in the Google Drive):

1. Emily Vallowe, "Write or Wrong Identity"
2. Gloria Anzalduá, "How to Tame a Wild Tongue"
3. Amy Tan, "Mother Tongue"
4. Suresh Canagarajah, "The Fortunate Traveler: Shuttling between Communities and Literacies by Economy Class"
5. Malcolm X, "Literacy Behind Bars"
6. Louise Erdrich, "Two Languages in Mind, but Just One in Heart"
7. Salvatore Scibona, "Where I Learned to Read"
8. Eudora Welty, "One Writer's Beginnings"
9. Ofelia Zepeda, "A Language Story"
10. Richard Rodrigúez, "Aria: A Memoir of a Bilingual Childhood"

11. Victor Villaneuva, “Spic in English!” from *Bootstraps* (pp.34-50)
12. Keith Gilyard, “The Self, Advancing Literacy, and Sidewalk University” from *Voices of the Self* (pp. 105-19)
13. Geneva Smitherman. “Steppin Out on Faith” from *My Soul Look Back in Wonder* (pp. 1-17)
14. Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives (DALN)

As a part of your invention process, you will ask more specific questions about your language and literacy experience to better understand how it has shaped your identity and worldviews, and the path to this understanding is self-reflection. Therefore, one of the areas you are encouraged to examine your linguistic attitude and prejudices. Depending on what your first language is and where you grew up and now live, you may have either experienced or perpetuated linguistic prejudice. Examine your linguistic attitudes and potential biases and find out where they may have come from. Here are some of the questions you may want to ask yourself: Are there any instances of you judging someone or being judged by others because of the way of speaking or writing? If so, where do you think those judgments come from? What underlying values, assumptions, or stereotypes are associated with such judgments? Have you ever felt insecure or humiliated about your speech or writing? Have you ever looked down at someone because of the way they speak or write? If so, what do you think prompted such acts? When did you realize the existence of linguistic prejudices and discriminations? How do you think we can resist them?

Writing Process:

First Draft: 15% of the Assignment Grade [5% for the first 2 pages and 10% for the complete draft]

Before you start working on your autobiography, you will participate in a class discussion where you will work in a group of 3-4 people each. The instructor will facilitate this discussion with guiding questions that draw insights from the readings and are tailored to address the assignment requirements. At the end, each group will report on their conversation and shared understandings. Based on the readings, class discussion, and the guiding questions above, work on the first draft of your language and literacy autobiography, which in general is an alphabetic text. However, if you believe that digital and multimodal representation would be more effective for your autobiography, you can work on a multimodal project. The instructor will work with you to develop a detailed assessment rubric for both alphabetic and multimodal projects. In any case, you must submit an initial draft (1-2 pages) on the date specified in the schedule and schedule a brief meeting with the instructor before you work on the complete first draft.

Peer Review: 15% of the Assignment Grade

Once you have completed the first draft, you will participate in the peer review process. You will have a detailed discussion on peer review–its rationale and process– accompanied by short readings in the class. On the day of peer review, you will receive a stepwise instruction in writing and a comment table to fill out as you review the drafts of two of your classmates. You will return the reviewed drafts with the completed comment sheet to the reviewees and upload its pictures to the D2L to receive the credit for peer review.

Revised Draft, Reflective Memo-I, and One-on-One Conference: 15 % of the Assignment Grade [5+5+5]

Based on the comments and suggestions from your peers, you will revise your autobiography before you send it to the instructor for the next round of review and discussion. Note that peers' comments are not binding; you as a writer have total autonomy to accept the helpful suggestions and ignore the ones that you think are not helpful. Along with the revised draft, you will attach a one-page reflective memo in which you answer the following questions:

- What revision have you made based on the peers' comments?
- What revision do you think you still need to make?
- What specific question do you have for the instructor about the assignment or where your draft stands now?
- What specific areas of your draft would you like the instructor to respond to?

Once you have submitted the revised draft with the reflective memo, sign up for the one-on-one conference with the instructor to discuss your draft. You must attend a 20-minute meeting with the instructor, either in-person or virtually, to earn a full credit for the conference.

Revised Draft with a Reflective Memo-II: 55% of the Assignment grade (50% and 5%, respectively)

Based on the discussion on your draft during the one-on-one conference, you will revise, edit, and proofread your language and literacy autobiography before final submission. Along with the revised draft, you will write a final reflective memo (1-2 pages) in which you look back at both the process of composing your language and literacy autobiography and the product itself. Particularly, you will focus on the following:

- Identify the strongest parts in your autobiography. Why do you think they are strong? What do you think makes them strong? How did you get that done?
- If you were to revise this draft again, what changes would you make and why?
- What aspect of this assignment do you think will help you in completing future writing assignments? How? Why?
- What writing tips would you offer to the future writers of language and literacy autobiography?

Language and Literacy Autobiography assignment offers an opportunity for students to reflect on their literacy experiences and literate self as a writer and make rhetorical choices that help them share their story in an effective and purposeful way. Besides, this assignment invites them to question the nature of writing in college writing classrooms–academic writing often loaded with standardized language ideologies. This assignment allows them to re-envision academic writing as local and rhetorical and participate in a conversation with fellow students and instructor and develop a nuanced understanding of literacy, standardized language, academic writing, genre, and conventions—concepts that are not often used without any critical scrutiny even though they are entangled with the power dynamics of dominant discourse. Given the growing linguistic and cultural diversity in the U. S. college writing classrooms, this assignment provides additional opportunity to cross linguistic, cultural, social, and experiential borders and learn more about each other's language and literacy experiences and how their identities have been shaped by those experiences. The findings of my case study on literacy narrative where a

translingual approach to literacy was a major point of intervention in a first year writing class proved the same. To quote one of the findings at length:

> In fact, translingual literacy that informs the literacy narrative assignment in this study encouraged students to draw on their experiences without having to conform to the narrow concept of literacy. Their experiences and ideas were treated as resources and not as aberrations, and they were encouraged to listen to each other's literacy experiences that mutually enriched their understanding. It was due to the cross-cultural conversations and translingual orientation to literacy along with an emphasis on little narratives of literacy that the students' perception of literacy changed, and they developed a nuanced understanding of it. (Budhathoki 62-63)

In sum, this personal narrative assignment provides students with the opportunities to share their lived experiences of language and literacy development in their own voice and reflect on and give meanings to those experiences that have shaped their literate selves as writers. This assignment helps students realize three major principles of linguistically just writing pedagogy: It welcomes their lived experiences in their unique voice and encourages them to be in charge of their story. It motivates them to negotiate the conventional expectations of college writing that are immersed in standardized language ideologies. And finally, it cultivates their critical rhetorical as writers as they make deliberate rhetorical moves and choices in their stories and also develop an understanding of how dominant ideologies of language and literacy come into play in their stories.

II. Writing as Translation and (Trans)languaguaging

[20-25% of Course Grade]

An Overview:

This assignment foregrounds language differences through the acts of translation and (trans) languaging and equating them to writing in general to demonstrate that differences and translation are fundamental to *all* writing. A monolingual notion of translation, like language relations in general, is limited at best. When translation is projected as a mechanical process of finding equivalents between two languages, or a neutral process of transferring meaning as if meaning is a singular, concrete entity always present there, it occludes all the complexities of language relations and overlooks the labor that users invest in navigating and negotiating those complexities. Such a transactional understanding of translation aligns with the neoliberal commodification of language and literacy skills as a toolkit. Bruce Horner and Laura Tetreault push back against such utilitarian notion of translation with a translingual understanding of language relations to argue that "translation is not a mechanical erasure of surface linguistic differences but, instead, an inevitable feature of all language practice insofar as the norm of such practice is not sameness, but difference" ("Translation" 15). Such a broad and dynamic understanding of translation promotes critical understanding of language relations and ideologies and paves the way for linguistically just writing practices. While both inter- and intra-language translation activities are equally important in fostering a nuanced understanding of language differences, this assignment, in the interest of space, focuses on intra language translation. According to Roman Jakobson, "intralingual translation or *rewording* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language" (233). The purpose of this assignment is to create an opportunity for students to understand how translation is embedded in

each act of language use, i. e. languaging. As Alastair Pennycook points out, English as a global language is (mis)understood "as a monolingual enterprise," but in reality "English always needs to be seen in the context of other languages . . . as a language always in translation" (34). Horner and Tetreault build on Pennycook's ideas to forward a translingual approach to writing and argue that all acts of writing are translation:

> Translation provides a particularly useful analytical framework by which composition teachers and students can address the negotiation of difference in and through language. This negotiation operates by challenging dominant, monolingualist ideological models of language, language relations, and language users as stable, discrete, internally uniform sets–models that provide the foundation for neoliberalism notions of and demands for translation as ideologically neutral and friction-free bridging of difference to communicate the 'same'" (25-26).

This assignment shares Horner and Tetreault's optimism on the potential of translation in college writing curriculum to take on the monolingual and monocultural ideology of standardized English and let all students participate in the acts of translation that exposes them to the politics and ideologies of language differences, and help them understand how writing, translation, and (trans)languaging are interrelated.

In order to grasp the fluid, rhetorical, and performative nature of language and foreground the agentive role of the writers as language users I use the term languaging. When used as a transitive verb rather than a noun, languaging "emphasizes the construction of intertextuality, recontextualization, memory, the adaptation of previous uses of language and texts to new circumstances" (Bloome and Beauchemin 153). In other words, languaging as doing language–process of making meaning, building knowledge, and solving real life problems–

brings together the rhetoricity, agency, and performativity. This assignment embraces the fundamental nature of language as "ongoing outcome of practices" (Horner, *Rewriting Composition* 55). Building on Calvet's notion of language as practice, Bruce Horner argues that "writing is one such practice" because all "representations of language," including writing, are "language practices contributing to the ongoing social accomplishment that is language" (*Rewriting Composition* 55; see Calvet, *Towards an Ecology of World Languages*)

However, there is a tendency to associate language justice work almost exclusively to the minority students as if they live in an isolated world communicating among themselves. As a matter of fact, we live in the world of superdiversity where a narrow understanding of diversity solely in terms of ethnicity has long become obsolete because a multitude of variables like "differential immigration statuses and their concomitant entitlements and restrictions and rights, divergent labor market experiences, discrete gender and age profiles, patterns of spatial distribution" have created an unprecedented level of heterogeneity (Vertovec 1025). This "super" level of heterogeneity is reflected in the diversity of language practices around the world and these "demographic and social changes are [further] complicated by the emergence of new media and technologies of communication and information circulation" (Blommaert and Rampton). In other words, language diversity is the norm rather than exception and this is reflected well in the college writing classrooms. Therefore, it is imperative that we approach language difference as the norm and not associate it "only with culturally and linguistically minoritized students [which] may result in dangerous ideologies among the 'mainstream' who mistakenly believe it simply is not their business to rethink and challenge [the] English-only" ideology and as a result of which the "zero-point epistemology is untouched and the English-only wall is strengthened." (Zhang-Wu 133). Therefore, this assignment invites all bi- and multilingual as well as English

monolingual students to navigate and negotiate language differences together and cross the linguistic, cultural, and experiential borders to better understand the nature and politics of language differences.

Assignment Description:

This assignment is appropriate for both first-year writing as well as upper-division writing studies courses. In a first-year writing course, it can be used as the second assignment after language and literacy autobiography.

Objectives/Learning Outcomes:

By the end of this assignment, you will be able to:

- Develop a broad and complex understanding of translation as a natural part of languaging–a process of reworking and reshaping the language.
- Connect writing with translation and paraphrase, and understand it as rhetorical, local, and negotiated.
- Explain why clarity and conciseness are relative, and friction and opacity are inevitable in writing.

In this assignment, you will participate in intra-language translation activities that take you beyond the narrow, utilitarian concept of translation as a mechanical process of finding word equivalents between two languages. Such a transactional notion of translation, which is steeped in neoliberal utilitarian ideology and monolingual understanding of language as a discrete and bounded system where meaning is always stable, prevents us from appreciating the complex and fluid nature of language and language relations. In this assignment you will complete two

intralingual translation activities to develop a broad and nuanced understanding of translation, which allows you to see through the monolingual, monocultural, and neoliberal language ideologies and understand that writing inevitably involves translation because each act of writing requires negotiations of differences, and it reshapes and redefines language relations. In other words, both writing and translation are acts languaging that constantly rework and recreate the language as a part of the natural process.

There are two different but interrelated activities in this assignment–paraphrase and translation. Both activities will question the narrow, monolingualist understanding of language differences and allow you to see how paraphrase has so much in common with translation, and it is not just a superficial substitution of words. To this end, you will complete a paraphrase activity working individually and in pair and/or group, and a translation activity where you will translate excerpts from two novels that are known for the use of hybridized English to standardized English and reflect on the process of navigating and negotiating the language differences. Together with these two activities, you will understand how translation, paraphrase, and writing are all acts of languaging and therefore, the inherent characteristic of all language relations.

Activity-I: Paraphrase as Translation and Writing

Context: How Paraphrase is Used in College Writing

Paraphrasing is a common writing activity in the college writing context. Used as an alternative way to summarize, paraphrasing is considered to be a mechanical process of representing the same ideas from a source without using the same words and therefore avoiding the risk of plagiarism. Resources available on the websites of different university writing centers present paraphrasing alongside quoting and summarizing to help you choose the right way to

represent the information from the source you are using. For example, according to Purdue University Online Writing Lab (Purdue OWL),

> Paraphrasing involves putting a passage from source material into your own words. A paraphrase must also be attributed to the original source. Paraphrased material is usually shorter than the original passage, taking a somewhat broader segment of the source and condensing it slightly.

This is a basic explanation of what it means to paraphrase when you use a source in your writing. The focus is on representing the ideas in your own words and attributing them to the original source as opposed to summarizing and quoting. Likewise, The Writing Center of University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill outlines what students need to do when they paraphrase a source, but the emphasis is on avoiding plagiarism:

> Paraphrasing means taking another person's ideas and putting those ideas in your own words. Paraphrasing does NOT mean changing a word or two in someone else's sentence, changing the sentence structure while maintaining the original words, or changing a few words to synonyms. If you are tempted to rearrange a sentence in any of these ways, you are writing too close to the original. That's plagiarizing, not paraphrasing.

Activity: What You Will Do in this Assignment

Although the approaches to paraphrasing above are both useful and effective, we can and should take paraphrasing beyond its supposedly mechanical and politically innocent function of representing information from a particular source to an act of intralingual translation that involves interpretation and negotiation of differences. Every time you read a text and paraphrase

it in your own words, you first interpret the text so that you capture the message correctly to represent it in your own words. It is a complex process of interpretation that involves multiple levels of translation as you must negotiate the differences between what the text says and how you represent it in your own words. Paraphrasing becomes more complex and nuanced depending on the disciplinary contexts of the source texts and your positionality in relation to the standardized English. In the wake of huge technological advancement such as Artificial Intelligence (e. g., ChatGPT), it is now more important than ever to foreground the interpretive aspect of all languaging work–translation, paraphrase, and writing–and its uniquely human dimension in the writing classroom.

1. **Setting the scene:**

Watch the short video and discuss the following questions:

It's Suntory Time

- What is your take on this translation? What stands out to you?
- Do you have any memorable experience of translation where you were a translator, or somebody translated to you, or you witnessed an act of translation?
- Do you consider yourself a translator? Please raise your hand.

Three types of translation:

- Interlingual Translation: Translation from one (source) language to another (target) language.
- Intersemiotic Translation: Translation into another, non-verbal system of symbols.
- Intralingual Translation: An interpretive act to express the same meaning in different

forms of the same language–paraphrasing/rewording/restating (Jakobson 233).

Writing=Translation=Paraphrase

- Both writing and translation have one thing in common: Negotiation of differences; comprehension & interpretation; rhetorical choices.
- Paraphrase as an instance of everyday translation. Restating the same ideas and information of the source text in different words.

2. Read the paragraph below and paraphrase it for your instructor and classmates.

> Both communities investigating cyclonic or hurricane activity—meteorologists and climatologists—generally accepted the principle that warmer tropical waters would provide a good breeding ground for more intense and/or more frequent hurricanes, yet sea surface temperature is just one among several factors affecting hurricanes. Wind shear and vertical temperature structure in the atmosphere are also contributing factors. Yet the meteorologists questioned the climatologists' argument that hurricanes had become more frequent and intense over the past century as a result of rising global temperatures because accurate hurricane data did not arrive until the satellite era beginning in 1965. They also did not agree with the climatologists that statistical models could establish a correlative relationship between climate change and hurricane frequency or intensity. (Reeves and Ross 19)

Your paraphrase:

3. Briefly reflect on the process of paraphrasing.

1	What changes did you make to the text when you paraphrased?	
2	What challenges did you experience in the process?	
3	What stood out to you in the process? Why?	

4. Paraphrase the same paragraph for a fifth grader.

5. Briefly reflect on the process of paraphrasing again.

1	Did you paraphrase the text differently this time? In what ways? Why?	

6. Work with a peer next to you and share with the class.

a) Exchange and read each other's paraphrases.

b) Briefly discuss your experience paraphrasing the same text for two different audiences–similarities, differences, challenges, takeaways, etc.

c) Share what you found interesting/insightful/useful/surprising or unsurprising.

7. What is this activity about?

- Understanding the nature of writing: rhetorical, negotiated, local
- No universal, unquestionable "standard" of writing–each act of writing is a different iteration
- Clarity and conciseness are relative. Friction and opacity are inevitable.
- Writing as translation allows us to question the ideologies of Standardized Written English and develop critical rhetorical agency as writer

Activity-II: Intralingual Translation

You will complete part of this activity individually and part in a group. First, you will read excerpts from novels that are known for linguistic innovation and experimentation and challenge the notion that there is supposedly one set of standardized language to write in. You will select an excerpt and rewrite it in the way that the English monolingual audience can understand it easily. Pay special attention to the words that are not commonly used by English speakers and their local context and cultural connotations. Work individually to complete the first iteration and upload it to the shared Google folder of your assigned group. This activity will challenge you to navigate and negotiate the language differences to be able to rephrase the excerpt written in a different variety of English for your intended audience. Then, all the group members will take turns to read each other's translation and take notes of all the striking similarities and differences. Then you as a group will discuss those notes–ask questions and offer explanations on the specific choices and/or moves you have made in your translation. Next, you will synthesize the ideas generated during the discussion and work together to produce a revised and refined version of the translation and submit it.

Reflective Translation Narrative

In this section of the assignment, you will reflect on the translation process and do some basic research about the novel from which the excerpt you translated is taken. You will find basic information about the author's background, the time of publication, and general reception of the work to better understand the context of the text you translated. You can also draw on your experience of the paraphrase activity above, if that helps you create a well-rounded picture of your translation experience and help you connect translation to writing in general. You will first reflect on the entire process and then write a reflective translation narrative. Here are some guiding questions to help you through the reflection process:

- What language difference issues did you encounter in the translation process?
- How did you deal with those differences? What strategies/techniques/skills/resources did you use in the process?
- What did you learn about navigating and negotiating language differences individually and collaboratively?
- How would you reflect on the labor–physical, intellectual, and emotional–that you invested in this process?
- What does this entire experience mean to you as a writer?
- What do you think was lost and/or gained in the translation process?
- Were there moments/instances of untranslatability? What are they? Why do you think you had those moments? How did you deal with them?
- What did you learn about linguistic and cultural norms and differences from this activity? What does it tell you as a writer?

Based on your reflection and other information you have gathered so far, write a reflective translation narrative 4-5 pages in length focusing on what you learned about the interconnections between writing and translation, and what you understood about language differences, relations, politics, and ideologies.

In sum, Writing as Translation and (trans)languagging assignment invites students to dwell in the world of language differences, particularly intralingual differences that are often overlooked in the discourse of translation. Students get hands-on experience of navigating and negotiating language differences and their nuances and intricacies that are often overlooked in the monolingual, monocultural, and neoliberal discourse of translation that views meaning as transferable without a change and is distinct from word. This assignment works very well in both first year and upper-division writing classrooms where student demographics are becoming more diverse every day. With a focus on intralingual translation, this assignment avoids the risk of excluding English monolingual students, which would not be the case with an exclusively interlingual translation assignment. I have used the paraphrase as translation and writing activity in different institutional contexts with success. The most effective part of this activity was the way this activity shakes students' stock ideas of translation, paraphrase, and writing when they realize that they were not aware of the fact that they constantly translate as a language user. Also, this activity promotes active learning as students work individually as well as in pair and group.

III. Debunking the Myths of Standardized (Written) English: A Research Report

[25-30% of Course Grade]

An Overview:

Debunking the Myth of Standardized (Written) English: A Research Project can be used in both first year and upper division writing courses as a major assignment. It embodies the third principle of the linguistic justice framework–debunk the harmful ideologies of Standardized English. Drawing insights from critical language awareness, raciolinguistics, decolonial theory, translingualism, and antiracist Black language pedagogy, this assignment provides students with an opportunity to critically interrogate the standardized language ideologies going back to their origins in racial and colonial differences. Compared to the first two assignments, this assignment is more research-focused, yet it shares with them the goal of cultivating critical rhetorical agency among students–a shared goal of linguistically just writing practices enables student writers to navigate each writing situation rhetorically making deliberate and appropriate rhetorical choices and also see through the power differentials of language relations and the dominant ideologies that always and already determine their rhetorical choices.

Exploring the interconnections between Critical Language Awareness (CLA) and writing, Rebecca Lorimer Leonard approaches "language as critical subject matter" associated with the "theories of translanguaging and translingualism that also aim to deconstruct power relations around language" and "treats language-minoritized writers as agentive meaning-makers who approach their writing as negotiable, imbued with labor" ("The Role of Writing" 178). Like Leonard's take on CLA, the multipronged approach to linguistic justice that I propose foregrounds the origin of language differences and ideologies in racial and colonial power differences. Scholars have been calling for a critical and nuanced approach to language

differences where fluidity and negotiability are often over emphasized. Keith Gilyard was one to warn translingual enthusiasts not to flatten all differences as the same because those differences have unique socio-political histories. (“The Rhetoric of Translingualism”). Likewise, raciolinguistics, an entire field of study, explores the intricacies of language-race relations (Alim and Smitherman; Rosa and Flores). There are other scholars like Kate Seltzer who proposes a critical translingual approach that attends to the language, power, identity connections and “asks that teachers make curricular and instructional choices that challenge the very idea of language itself, choosing different texts, asking different questions, promoting a different writing process, and setting up opportunities for students to voice their existing linguistic expertise and creativity” (298). Most recently, in a 2022 edited collection *Writing Across Difference: Theory and Intervention*, Sumyat Thu, Katie Malcolm, Candice Rice, and Anis Bawarshi propose antiracist translingual orientations to writing and argue that “translingualism’s normalization of language difference must be grounded in an antiracist critique of structural inequity and a decentering and decolonizing of normalized, White supremacist, racist institutional structures, practices, and pedagogies” (197). These are some of the recent scholarly interventions that call for a critical approach to language differences that emphasizes the racial and colonial power differences. If we as writing instructors want to promote linguistically just writing practices, we must create opportunities for their students to explore and interrogate the dominant and discriminatory language ideologies that still dominate writing classrooms across the nation.

One of the most pervasive of the language ideologies is the Standardized (Written) English that often goes unquestioned as a given in the writing classrooms. As a part of a linguistically just writing curriculum, this assignment invites students to research the history of standard language ideologies and debunk the myths that there is one, universal standard English

language that everyone is expected to follow. It is important for students to understand the history of these ideologies to be able to critique them while enhancing their critical rhetorical agency as writers. In other words, this assignment offers students the opportunity to develop research skills along with a critical understanding of the history and ideology of standard (written) English and develop rhetorical acumen to argue their positions in a persuasive manner.

Assignment Description:

This is a research-intensive assignment that can be used as the second or third project in the first-year or upper-division writing courses. The main purpose of this assignment is to cultivate a critical awareness of the language ideologies, their origins, and allow you an opportunity to debunk the myths of standardized (written) English. Beginning with the assigned readings that provide you with the context and then actively participating in the numerous individual, peer, and group activities that scaffold the project, you will explore the history of standard language ideology leading to its racial and colonial origins.

Learning Objectives/Outcomes:

By the end of this assignment, you will be able to:

- Trace the origin of standardized language ideologies in racial and colonial differences.
- Identify relevant scholarly and popular sources, evaluate, and synthesize them, and use them to strengthen your arguments in a rhetorically effective manner.
- Use this assignment as an opportunity to critically interrogate and/or stretch the boundaries of the research report genre.

Project Proposal:

You will prepare a 1-2-page proposal in which you propose a tentative title, a brief explanation of the topic–its relevance in general and why you care about it, research questions, and what kind of sources you will use to answer those questions. You will schedule a meeting with me to discuss your proposal in the week after the submission deadline.

Annotated Bibliography:

As you continue to read different articles and books/chapters related to your topic and research questions, you will summarize the most important sources that you need to build and support your arguments in the research report. An annotated bibliography is a list of citations of sources that are related to your topic. Each citation is followed by a summary of the source giving a concise description of the main findings focused on what is most important for responding to your research question. You will select at least six sources out of which three must be scholarly. Your annotated bibliography includes:

a. Complete bibliographic information in MLA style.
b. Concise summary/description of the source noting its topic, main idea/s, scope, stance, research method (if relevant).
c. Evaluative comments such as how authoritative, up to date the source is, also consider the strengths and limitations.
d. Relevance to your research: how you expect to use this source; how it relates to the research question/topic

Research Report:

After having explored both scholarly and popular sources on the topic and synthesized necessary information on the topic, you start working on the first draft of your research report. You have a choice between sticking to the typical, conventional research report genre and stretching the genre conventions and boundaries with experimental elements and rhetorical choices that help you express more authentically and persuasively. One of the ways to do so at the content level could be to connect your findings to your lived experiences. This could be yet another opportunity to interrogate and play with the "standard" academic research report genre, which is also a part of monolingual and monocultural ideology. This assignment offers you space to negotiate this "standard" in favor of rhetorical effectiveness and communicative efficiency. For example, in addition to the research and argument components, you will use anecdotes, vignettes, and testimonios about your experience with the ideology of standard English and reflect on the experience to give meanings to it. While negotiating the genre conventions, you are also free to incorporate multimodal features and decide to use strategies like code-mixing or code-meshing as long as they enhance rhetorical effectiveness. In other words, this assignment offers you sufficient space for exploration, negotiation, argumentation, and reflection. The final deliverable should focus on explicating how and why the notion of standardized English is a myth with the evidence from secondary sources and your personal experiences. Additionally, you are expected to discuss your relationship with standardized language ideologies, how they have shaped your choices as a writer, and how the findings of this project will change those dynamics.

Suggested Readings:

Deutscher, Guy. *The Unfolding of Language: The Evolutionary Tour of Mankind's Greatest Invention*. Henry Holt and Company, 2006. (Available at the university library)

Lippi-Green, Rosina. *English with an Accent: Language Ideology and Discrimination in the United States*, 2nd edition. Routledge, 2012. (Introduction & Chapter 1)

McWhorter, John. "Don't, Like, Overgeneralize Language." *The New York Times*, Jan 21, 2022.

McWhorter, John. "English is a Living Language. Period." *The New York Times*, Feb 8, 2022.

McWhorter, John. "Some Hear Grammar Don'ts. I hear the Future of English." *The New York Times*, Nov 2, 2021.

McWhorter, John. "Today's Faux Pas, Tomorrow's Lingua Franca." *The New York Times*, Jan 4, 2022.

McWhorter, John. *The Power of Babel: A Natural History of Language*. Harper Collins, 2003.

Rangan, Pooja, et al., editors. *Thinking with an Accent: Toward a New Object, Method, and Practice*, University of California Press, 2023. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1525/luminos.148.

Smitherman, Geneva. *Talking that Talk: Language, Culture, and Education in African America*. Routledge, 2000.

In sum, this assignment provides students with the opportunities to conduct secondary research to understand the history of standardized language ideologies and develop academic writing skills while cultivating critical rhetorical agency as writers. While the activities like exploring sources related to the topic, synthesizing and annotating them, and building project proposal provides them typical learning experiences of a writing class, there are numerous opportunities to interrogate the commonplace understandings of 'standard' and 'norm' and stretch the boundaries of academic writing genre like research report. All these activities together allow students to develop a critical understanding of dominant language ideologies and critical rhetorical agency as a writer.

Finally, the three assignments discussed above showcase how linguistic justice can be enacted in college writing classrooms. They affirm diverse student voices and use difference as a resource for agentive writing, foreground translation and differences as fundamental to *all* writing. invite students to debunk the harmful ideologies of Standardized English and cultivate critical rhetorical agency. However, these assignments are but one iteration of linguistically just writing practices and are open to adaptation and modification for different institutional and instructional contexts.

Chapter-5: Conclusion: Linguistic Justice—An Ongoing Project

In this dissertation, I have attempted to answer a major question that the field of writing studies is grappling with: How do we promote linguistically just writing practices that are effective, inclusive, and ethical? My research is deeply rooted in my lived experience as someone who learned English as a foreign language, internalized standard language ideologies at an early age, and ultimately came to terms with a different reality of being a nondominant linguistic subject in the U. S. As an international graduate student and writing instructor, I had the opportunity to develop a self-reflexive stance to examine my privilege and non- privilege while reflecting on my language and literacy experiences from vantage point and connecting them to my coursework and broader scholarship in the field. In other words, this dissertation speaks to three different exigencies: personal, institutional and disciplinary, and global.

My lived experience as a multilingual person who learned English as a foreign language in Nepal, a small country in South Asia, and worked as a teacher of English for over a decade before joining the graduate program in Rhetoric and Composition in the U. S. has had a profound impact on my research and scholarship. My first phase of learning and teaching English in Nepal was mostly marked by a sense of celebration and privilege because of the social prestige and employability that English language would bring. This situation drastically changed when I joined the graduate program at the University of Arizona in 2017. The experience of being the only international student in my class and teaching writing to the U. S. domestic students was unsettling at best. The sense of privilege turned into disorientation, marginalization, and a critical awareness of language difference and its material consequences. These experiences served as a catalyst for my research on linguistic and cultural differences and my commitment to justice-centered work in college writing.

The University of Arizona is a public, land grant research institution built in the ancestral homelands of lands of Native American Peoples–the O'odham and the Yaqui–near the U. S.-Mexico border. It is a Hispanic Serving as well as American Indian and Alaska Native Serving institution. It shares with other land grant institutions of higher education the history of the land acquisition process, which is not always as noble as expanding the access to educational opportunities for millions of working-class Americans that these institutions did. Also, the university is in the only U. S. state that has adopted an official English-only policy known as Proposition 203 since 2000. Currently, people of Arizona are expecting to decide the fate of this policy through ballot in the near future, but as of now the policy is in effect. Yet, the University of Arizona, like most other big public universities, is a vibrant community with growing diversity in the student demographics–White majority with the significant number of Hispanic or Latinx students and growing number of African American, Native American, Asian American, and international students.

The issue of language difference and linguistic justice was first institutionally addressed by the Conference on College Composition and Communication in 1974 with the publication of Students' Rights to Their Own Language. This was a historic moment not just for the field of college composition but for the broader civil rights movements in the U. S. and across the world. But the statement that affirmed **"** the students' right to their own patterns and varieties of language--the dialects of their nurture or whatever dialects in which they find their own identity and style" received strong feedback ("Students' Rights to Their Own Language"). The political climate of the 1980s was not favorable for such progressive ideas. The debates on the merits of bilingual education and a need for English-only policy continued while discourse of multiculturalism and multilingualism that replaced the analogy of 'melting pot' with 'salad bowl'

to represent the U. S. as a multicultural country. Although multicultural and multilingual values are important in that they acknowledge the importance of different linguistic and cultural identities, they do not go far enough to historicize those differences and trace their origins.

Translingualism emerged as an alternative approach to language difference and pointed out that multilingualism's focus on numerical multiplicity of language does not address the fundamental nature of language–difference is the norm of all languages rather than exception. Although the concept of translingualism as well as the term itself was used in the early 2000s in the field of linguistics, it was the 2011 *College English* article "Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach" that projected "language differences and fluidities as resources to be preserved, developed, and utilized" (Horner et al. 304). This article marks a translingual turn in the field of writing studies and in no time translingualism became a buzzword in the field.

Naturally, the meteoric rise of translingual orientation to language difference and writing was followed by critical scrutiny from within and outside the field of writing studies. Paul Kei Matsuda pointed out translingualism's excessive focus on differences runs the risk of "linguistic tourism" (Matsuda 482), whereas Keith Gilyard cautioned against "flattening of language differences" and creating a "linguistic everyperson" (285). Along the same lines, Ellen Cushman saw translingualism's potential to explore the "pluriversal realities within composition studies, realities that could well change both the disciplinary and pedagogical tenets and content of the field" ("Translingual and Decolonial" 235). Cushman's call for pluriversal realities in the field is possible only when writing teachers-scholars "work to highlight the colonialist legacies that inform the management and control of knowledges and subjectivities in literacy, composition, and rhetoric curricula" (García and Baca 3). In sum, what decolonial scholars like Cushman,

García, and Baca envision is a new story of the field told from a different vantage point that is not complicit to the grand narrative of Western modernity and coloniality. The first step toward this grand vision is to acknowledge the colonial and racial entanglements of language difference and language ideologies like English monolingualism and Standardized (Written) English. My dissertation moves toward this vision while speaking to the global exigency as well.

With the ever-growing demographic changes and connectivity, we as writing teachers-scholars must prepare our students to navigate and negotiate all forms of differences they encounter in the world. James Rushing Daniel, Katie Malcolm, and Candice Rai's 2022 edited collection *Writing Across Difference: Theory and Intervention* makes a strong case for writing across differences. They point out in the introduction that "communicating equitably and ethically across the differences that divide and unite groups is arguably the central work of composition studies" (Daniel, et al. 3). Needless to say, writing across differences requires a balanced approach. Since my dissertation shares this responsibility of the field, it works toward finding a balanced approach that provides students with the opportunities to confront the monolingual and monocultural ideologies and their colonial and racial origins and work through them as writers to develop necessary rhetorical skills. In doing so, it also aims at correcting the misconception that language differences are the issue exclusively for the minority students and teacher-scholars. Doing so "may result in dangerous ideologies among the 'mainstream' who mistakenly believe it simply is not their business to rethink and challenge [the] English-only" ideology and as a result of which the "zero-point epistemology is untouched and the English-only wall is strengthened." (Zhang-Wu 133). It is at this intersection, that I pondered the broader question that the field of writing studies is grappling with: How do we promote linguistically just

writing practices that are effective, inclusive, and ethical? And then posed a subset of other questions and answered in this dissertation.

First, I explored how the major tenets of translingualism in conversation with the insights from raciolinguistics, critical language awareness, antiracist Black language pedagogy, and decolonial theories contribute to an inclusive and responsive framework of linguistic justice. I further explored how we can articulate such a framework in the way that foreground students—their needs and roles as writers in the learning process. What I have proposed as an inclusive and responsive framework of linguistic justice for writing studies pedagogy works toward redressing the harms of English monolingual and monocultural ideologies that are entangled with racial and colonial differences and are operative in all writing classrooms today. They must be accounted for in order to promote linguistic justice in the U. S. higher education. The framework I develop builds on and extends the ongoing conversations on translingualism by drawing insights from raciolinguistics, critical language awareness, and antiracist Black language pedagogy and decolonial theories. The complex issues of linguistic (in)justice warrant a nuanced and eclectic approach. This framework amplifies the decolonial potential of translingualism, which offers a radical perspective on language relations and differences. Translingualism offers a lens to look at language differences not merely as marked by the monolingual ideologies but as a natural part of languaging process. Such a novel take on language difference comes with both liberatory and constraining potentials. With a total negation of monolingual hegemony, translingualism is, as Ellen Cushman claims, an epistemic break on the one hand, but on the other hand, there remains a risk of generalizing the logic that all language differences as a given and therefore the same, a fallacy that Keith Gilyard cautions us against. However, this contradiction by no means is the reason enough to disregard translingualism and its liberatory potential. Instead, this is a

reflection of the complexity and nuance of the issue of language differences that warrant an equally nuanced and eclectic approach. Hence a multi-pronged approach to linguistic justice foregrounds the racial and colonial differences that undergird all language relations, which is a major tenet of decolonial theory that binds raciolinguistics, critical language awareness, antiracist Black language pedagogy with translingualism. Raciolinguistics shades lights on conaturalization of language and race (Smitherman; Rosa and Flores) whenreas critical language awareness shows how all language practices are immersed in ideological power relations that users may not be aware of (Fairclough). Likewise, antiracist Black language pedagogy centers Black language and literacy practices on an equal footing with what Baker-Bell calls White Mainstream English as a move toward linguistically just practices for Black students (Baker Bell). By acknowledging and foregrounding the central role of racial and colonial ideologies in all language relations and unique historical experiences of the students, this framework paves the way for linguistically just writing practices that are inclusive, effective, and ethical.

Given the diverse institutional contexts and student demographics that we work with as writing teacher-scholars, it is important to note that promoting linguistically just writing practices requires a great deal of balancing. Since the ultimate goal of teaching writing is to help our students write across differences in an effective, inclusive, and ethical manner, I believe that the students we serve and their needs and roles in the learning process must be at the center of this linguistic justice framework. Therefore, I have proposed critical rhetorical agency as a concept and a tool to promote linguistically just writing practices in college writing classrooms. Since we cannot teach all possible genres of writing that students need, we approach each writing situation rhetorically. But in order to cultivate critical rhetorical agency, we go beyond the immediate rhetorical situation to take the larger socio-political exigency into account, help

students develop ability to make deliberate rhetorical choices and own each of the choices they make, see through the dominant ideologies and power relations that condition their rhetorical choices, and work with and though those ideologies to write in an effective, inclusive, and ethical manner. Built on Shapiro's concept of rhetorical agency and the inclusive and responsive linguistic justice framework developed in this dissertation, critical rhetorical agency offers both a conceptual roadmap and addresses the practical aspects of teaching writing in the way students play a decisive role in the learning process. In this sense, critical rhetorical agency serves as linguistic justice praxis in writing studies.

Second, I explored the ways in which embodied experiences of an International Graduate Associate Teaching (IGTA) of color teaching decolonize the West-centric notions of knowledge research in the field. In my critical autoethnography of an International Graduate Teaching Associate (IGTA), I have reflected on my positionality in an effort to understand it in a larger socio-cultural context and juxtapose the personal narrative of embodied experiences with the theories of language differences and (in)justice. I used the reflexive methodology of critical autoethnography to explore my positionality as a nondominant linguistic subject who learned English as a foreign language and is now studying and teaching writing as an international graduate student at a public research university in the U. S. I examined the historical context of my positionality as a student, teacher and researcher of writing focusing on my relationship with English language in general and the field of writing studies in particular with a hope to understand how my lived experiences inform my scholarship, teaching, and research about linguistically just writing practices that are inclusive, effective, and ethical. The ultimate goal of such critical self-reflexivity is to connect my lived experiences as a nondominant linguistic

subject with the changes that I believe are essential in the field of writing studies to make it more inclusive and responsive.

Third, I proposed an equity-based writing curriculum that doesn't allow English monolingual and monocultural ideologies to harm nondominant linguistic subjects–students whose first language isn't English and/or standardized English–and ensures that all students actively participate in and mutually enrich each other's learning experience as writers. A sequence of three assignments created an inquiry and invites students to recast writing beyond standardized language ideology and in doing so, they exemplified the core principles of linguistic justice pedagogy. I explored the ways personal narrative, intralingual translation, and critical language awareness contribute to the linguistically just writing practices. The proposed assignment sequence instantiated the major tenets of the linguistic justice framework. While language and literacy autobiography affirms diverse student voices and identities, the translation activity invites students to recast translation, writing, and paraphrase in a light in that they all are essentially the negotiation of differences—a complex and messy process. Unlike the monolingual and neoliberal utilitarian notion that views paraphrase as a mechanical process of substituting words while keeping the meaning intact, from a translingual perspective paraphrase is no different than translation in that it requires a complex process of comprehension, interpretation, and negotiation that connects it to the act of writing as well. The paraphrase and intralingual translation activities provide a textual space to grapple with the complexity of language relations and negotiation of language differences. The final assignment in the sequence invites students to research the history of standard language ideologies and understand their arbitrary and constructed nature. Drawing on the insights of critical language awareness, this assignment cultivates secondary research skills and critical rhetorical agency among students

who learn to make rhetorical choices, own those choices, and see through the dominant ideologies that already control those choices. Together, these three assignments demonstrate a few instantiations of promoting linguistically just writing practices.

This dissertation is one among numerous recent scholarly voices that call for the foregrounding the antiracist and decolonial edge of translingual approach to language differences. The implication of this project lies at the intersection of the urgency and complexity of the language justice work that simultaneously reveals the strength and constraints of such undertaking. In addition to answering the research questions, this dissertation, I believe, has contributed toward the following:

- Recentering the conversations on language differences by foregrounding the colonial and racial differences that often go unquestioned untouched.
- Revealing a complex relationship between language justice and social justice.
- Demonstrating why language differences/diversity is not exclusively an issue for minoritized students and scholars, but a "mainstream" topic of the field.
- Revealing the complexity of navigating language justice work as a writing teacher-scholar in the current socio-political climate—it is a balancing act.

Finally, this dissertation is but one take on the big question that the field of writing studies has been grappling with: How do we promote linguistically just writing practices that are inclusive, effective, and ethical? There are several recent publications in the field that have taken up this question and answered it. Unsurprisingly, some of them have similar emphasis on interrogating and expanding translingualism with a more explicit anticolonial and antiracist critique. For example, in their 2022 *College Composition and Communication* article "Translingual Praxis: From Theorizing Language to Antiracist and Decolonial Pedagogy,"

Rachael Shapiro and Missy Watson propose translingual praxis–translingualism with a focus on anticolonial and antiracist edges and caution writing teacher-scholars against indulging in language practices and processes while overlooking more substantial issues of language relations in the following words:

> If your pedagogies start and end with *practices* and *processes*–even when acknowledging the 'trans-' nature language and the inevitability and value of language difference–we risk losing sight of the most critical cause and consequence of such work: speakers, and their lived experiences, and (racialized) linguistic oppression" (297-98).

Since the question of promoting linguistically just writing practices is very complex and capacious with no single, perfect answer, I do not claim my dissertation has offered an entirely novel or complete answer. I present it as an individually and institutionally situated response to this momentous question of our field and I do not pose additional questions for future research. Instead, I invite different answers and approaches from different institutional contexts and subjective positionalities to advance the cause of language justice in writing studies that contributes to the larger goal of creating a more just and livable society.

APPENDIX A: SAMPLE EXCERPTS FOR INTRALINGUAL TRANSLATION ACTIVITY

Excerpt-1:

. . . Salute the '*Kismet*' *–All About H. Hatter*, pp. 225-34

DIGEST

Questions: Is there anything in this here '*Kismet*' notion? If Destiny should commit a feller to the wrong woman, can anything prevent it happening?

INSTRUCTION: The Sage of *Mogalsarai-Varanasi* smoothed his sparse, lammergeyer-like, mud-coloured, uncurled and unsheared beard. It served as a cloak to skin off his naked anatomy from the Globe's gaze.

'The ways of the wise male,' he said to the disciple, 'are eminently misunderstood. To all born females, whose lamp of intellectuality is *naturally* out, men's ways appear mystifying, know.'

'It is exceeding difficult to comprehend females as well, O naked majesty!'

'Thou art born a male,' said the male thereupon. 'Rejoice! Be merry! Yea, exult! Fall down on Mother Earth, this very instant! Be down on thy unworthy stomach, disciple, and thank thy Maker for thou art made male!'

'May my vitals grill for an eternity for interrupting thy discourse, but, for why?'

'For why, dog-like? I left my woman, unsupported, forsook, nigh Mungher, Bihar, because she appended "For why?" "For why?" to all my actions, statements, and submissions. I preferred to dress in ash and chose this dust-heap. Suffice to say all females are unwise,'

'Begging thy august mother's pardon, sir Sage . . .'

PRESUMPTION: 'Kismet', *i. e.,* fate–if at all anything, and

~225~

---

as potent as suspected for centuries–is a dam' baffling thing!

It fedies a feller's rational: his entire conception as to his soma, pneuma, and psyche!

Why did a feller like me commit matrimony with a femme fatale like Mrs H Hatterr (née
Rialto), the waxed Kiss-curl?
A personal query, but I don't mind answering . . .
If only I could!
All I know is that I wanted to raise a family: add to the world's vital statistics and legitimate: have a niche in the community, for my own kid, to hand out the wager till the end. And since

you can't achieve this without a wife–the neighbours wouldn't let you! the police wouldn't let you!--I equipped myself with the blarney-phrases, convinced this female that she was real jam, had me led to the middle aisle and gave the ready 'I do' to the amenwallah her brother had hired for the occasion.
This I did, knowing, hell, that between us was all the temperamental difference in the world! Till death us do part! This museum-piece and I! And that promise–what a stingo!--after a conflict dating back to donkey's Sundays!
*The female–contrast?--was poles apart: though, between the cur jenkins, me and the Duke Humphrey, it did seem once that she was going to win my regards for good, by delivering me an heir-presumptive–*my own *piccolo le fils–to survive me (and be added to the looney-bin). But despite days and days of biological observation and anticipation–the wasted reference to the obstetric table and pre-occupation with the signs of labour–it didn't come off. (backed the wrong filly, or, maybe, something the matter with me as create-or!)*
I would have loved and honoured this queer-card of a woman for keeps, had she but been the mother of my son. Bred me a young feller, whose achievements might have compensated me for my own delinquency, checkmates, and labours-in-vain. A scion who might have exalted me–been an emir, a coral, a boyar, a tsár-ut, an aga, a two-tail pasha, a maharaja's kumar, a khan or a Yankeedom freeman millionaire, an industrial mogul–and, maybe–I wouldn't have minded–

~226~

Wagered with me and hurt me and hurt me. But as to her own Kiss-curl self, 'Woman, go to hell, for heaven's sake!' would have been the wiser vow.

And, J'accuse! the church Sacrament of Confirmation, absolutely vetoed me trying my luck on any other fertile ground–but the Kiss-curl. The shepherds and round collar are dead against adultery, an opus most foul! Except with the wife–even a thousand times, if a feller enjoys consummating. The business with the wife, they hold, is 'holy mat'. 'Holy' is a lingo too high faultin' for what is 'holy' at all times for the sake of the kiddies of the world.

'Holy' or 'unholy', men need kids. It is a Dutch Duty imposed on 'em by Nature or what the hell. Damme, you can't blame fellers for wanting kids!
But the females, who might have given me a kid, only loved themselves: with truculence, with fuming, flaming bluster, swagger, and gall: themselves reflected in their liver-of-sulphur caps, raspberry scarves, kiss-curls and dam' all parafunerallia: themselves, over and over again, making a twosome a double merger!

Did I object to all this hell-come bolsheviki? Hell, no. I only said it was so ruddy monotonous! 'Pardon, madam, your slip is showing!'

(Legal note: Bill introduced into the British Parliament, 1770: ' *All women of whatever age, rank, profession or degree, whether virgins, maids or widows, that shall impose upon, seduce, and betray into matrimony any of his Majesty's subjects, by scents, paints, cosmetic*

washes, artificial teeth, false hair, Spanish wool, iron stays, high-heeled shoes, bolstered hips, shall suffer the penalties of witchcraft, the marriage standing null and void.')

(Intimate note: 'A woman is apt to feel,' says a *writer* feller, '*a peculiar attachment and dependence on a man to whom she has lost her virginity.*' I would confirm, ho, yurse! feeling a peculiar attachment and dependence on the Kiss-curl, to whom I had lost *my* virginity. Towards whom did *she* feel this pec. attach. & dep.? Didn't know the blighter else I'd have asked!)

(*Additional note: '. . . In fact, the lady is worth washing in*

~227~

---

asses' milk,' Banerrji. (See, autobiographical *I.*) O. K. *If* there are females who are lofty, and unselfish, and *suttees*, then I love 'em. And the gush applies to any lady–from Lilith down to the future-century petticoat.)

LIFE-ENCOUNTER: If ever a feller had a hell of a bother from a dog, I had same from my canine.

Yet, when I purchased him, I suffered from an incredible enthusiasm: acquire the chap at any cost!

I was dam' anxious: as if I were about to receive the Fellership of the Royal Microscopic Society, without microscoping for same!

The very able seaman jenkins, who sold me the pup, showed me the works: what it could do.

As a pup-standard, the canine Jenkins wouldn't touch any tiffin, but confectionary!

Except for an occasional bone-bonus to brush and sharpen his teeth with–any dog's hygiene–he absolutely rejected all natural animal–diet and went like hell for any delicatessen, provided it were a bonbon!

He'd O.H. M. S. *posthaste* swallow any candy, jelly babies, cookies, chocolate sundaes, rarebits, sweet lozenges, goodies with mottoes on 'em, and any species of ice-cream hokey-pokey.

It was dam' funny!

I had the pup, because, he was dam' funny!

You may apply the same table d'hôte argument to the waxed Kiss-curl. I married her, maybe–apart from the stated desire-for-kids Duty reason–because she was dam' funny!

Yet, hell, I used to be fond of that female once! Called her *Mouse!* and, before she finally took wing, and left me and our home, used to greet her annually–the domestic silly season–with the cordial, 'Bon anniversaire, ma bonne!'

Our East . . .

Once . . .

I chucked away a lucrative partnership with a Bengali chemist's apprentice, owing to an unfortunate exceeding of the maximum Pharmacopoæ-permitted dose of Digitalis on a wealthy woman patient. The feller used to carry on a success-

~228~

ful practice on the sly with the aid of a high-frequency shocking-coil, a jam-jar full of Gregory's powder, the bottle of castor, his bedside manner gift of the gab, and myself for his assistant. And, as far as I can remember, the shotgun matter this locumwallah gave me to deal out was:

'R,
Dig. gtt. lxii.
Aquæ puræ . . . viii
Misce. Signetur, 3ii., Quartis horis,
Syr. Gluc.
Oi!
hh!
½ d!'

In the circumstances, either the lady had a quartis horis (every four hours) dessertspoonful dose of an oi (one pint) of aquæ (pure water), or an oi f Digitalis, suspended in a gtt. Lxii. of pure water. If so, hell, I had certainly helped Dig. her gtt. lxii. grave! Besides, Zoondikers! There was in the RX, sheet, the Oi! hh! ½ d! Which might have been *Oi, you! H. H.!* my initials, or my partner's doodled, or, wham! ½ a hogshead (5½ Imperial gallons) of Syrupus Glucose, in addition to the Digitalis (Dig.) medication she had had.

A hell of an upset!

I went underground and was without employment for some time. But my pal came to the rescue and fixed up a journalistic job for me on a yellow to the core! Indian-owned weekly. (I wrote for 'em reader' obituary notices, sundry ads and manufactured testimonials for their regular advertisers' poison-plus-water patent medicines.)

I had been on the staff for seven weeks.

After that duration, one of the longest i ever held employment out in the Orient, the editor found the H. Hatterr personality *intolerable.*

The chap's name was Bankim Ali.

He was a temperamental feller, on a hell of an artistic side, and dam' emotional. (Took himself for a damme *writer!*)

I discovered him sitting on the editorial chair one day, the tassel of his fez sideways, and sobbing copiously.

I leaned against the communication door, and suggested to

~229~

the feller, 'Why are you weeping copiously, Bankim Ali, sir . . .'

I said this soothingly, in the deferential tones of a gentleman asking a lady for the honour of the next dance: and not at all like asking a question.

He remained on the chair, the tassel now static, and hid his face in his hands.

That very day, he penned a memo to the Sleeping Partner of the weekly: the capitalist small- fry who owned the works.

Therein, this feller, Bankim Ali, telling his employer on me! stated three alternatives as to his own immediate future.

Said Bankim Ali, to his wage-master, that he would be glad to affect a total self-effacement and be gathered to his fathers. This he would achieve by banging his head against the rocks till he should die. Secondly, if desired by the capitalist overlord, Bankim Ali would be too willing, fact's, too happy, to offer his body to pi-dogs as annual surprise meals and so depart: if, in the meantime, he postscript, the growling, cursing, advertisers didn't tear him apart. Now the only alternative-way of stopping him from taking these drastic and dramatised suicide steps–or being murdered, as editor responsible for my write-ups–was the *third*: *his* preference. It was that, ' . . .This H. Hatterr,' insisted Bankim Ali, definite-like, 'the in-charge of the obituary and advertisement department should resign *at once*!'

I resigned *at once*: being compelled to do so by the Sleeping Partner.

'Mr H. Hatterr,' said my pal, 'I am perversely affected! I am deeply grieved at the forfeiture of your bread and butter!'

'I won't disguise my anxiety at the loss of my job, Banerrji.'

'The incident is jolly-sight more painful than you fancy!
What troubles me most is the pro rata fact that you need *not* have resigned.'

'What pro rata? Man, the feller gave me no option!'

'Nevertheless, you are taking into account the prose of this deplorable incident and not the poetry of it. You have lost the career of being the prime obituary and testimonial king of India. Om Darja's surname translated in English is Rank. Now I quote you. ". . . Om Rank. Died young. He was a rank

~230~

---

beginner in *Life*. But, in *contrast*, he was a beginner of rank. R. I. P." The bull, outside the butcher's shop, shakes hands with the lady-customer. He says, I quote you, "Madam, pleased to meet you!" His cow, also standing outside the shop in the drawing, smiles and says to the lady-customer, "Meat to please you!" I loved your write-ups! I even say you could have become editor in Mr Bankim Ali's place instead of being fired by him!

Let's have this clear, Banerji. I wasn't fired by Bankim Ali.
For a couple of chips, I'd use the feller for a rag to mop up the floor of my lav with! I resigned!
'Be as it may, the fact remains that you are mercilessly fired.
As your per pro, I am deeply sorry.'
'Thanks.'

‘But the game isn’t up yet! Instead of the sombre, Put out the light, and then put out the light! rather, let’s say, Then come, kiss me, sweet and twenty! That’s the Bard. That’s hope. Did you know, Mr H. Hatterr, that the Sleeping Partner of weekly is a well-known supporter of Indian music? Here is your opportunity. You can, beyond bounds, win his love. The Sleeping Partner will embrace you as if you were his own flesh and blood.’
‘I have no desire to be his flesh and blood, Banerrji. But go on. What’s the motion?’
‘Please go and make known to the Sleeping Partner your deep attachment to Indian music. My heart bleeds for you! You are a cosmopolitan gentleman. You love the world. I also love the world.You love England. I also love England. And Englishmen, women and children. I often wish I could change my maiden name *Nath* to *Noel*. I have recently formed several English connexions myself and I like dogs too. If you require a proof of my sincerity, I am a member of the English Tail Waggers’, although I had the clear nationalist choice to join the kennel Club of India. It is like loving the Mediterranean Sea, Mr H. Hatterr, when having our own Indian Ocean! Nevertheless, here is my diploma. It has just arrived from dear England.’
Thereupon my pal handed me a certificate, stating, ‘This is to certify that Rufus and Roly-Poly are the true friends of

---

Nath C. Banerrji, Esqr., of India.’ It was signed per pro the twomember dogs by the human secretary of the Tail-waggers’ & Chums’ Club of England.
‘Why don't you get your canine enrolled, Mr H. Hatterr? As Mr Alexander Pope says, I am his highness’s dog at Kew! Pray tell me, sir, whose dog are you?As you are at present unemployed, I shall feel privileged to pay dear Jenkins’s biannual subscription. We shall be delighted to have him as a fellow-member.’
‘Thanks. I might have permitted it yesterday. I am thinking of getting rid of the dog.’
‘I feel certain it will break his heart!’

‘He is breaking mine, old feller! Last night I saw a dead mouse being thrown out of a trap by a surrealist neighbour. An Indian feller. Damme, it makes my blood boil to see mice being chucked about like that . . .’

‘The percentage of gentlemen in Indian society, particularly in your neighbourhood, excuse me., is very low. I apologize for same. This matter should be taken up editorially.’

‘Never mind that! I saw the mouse on the road. It was there this morning. It is outside my door now.’

‘Who did that?’

‘Jenkins! I saw him pick it up and he brought it to me to show off! Damme, Banerji, working the old army game on me! If I hadn’t witnessed the entire sordid incident, I might have believed that he had caught the mouse alive. I think I have had enough of the dog.’

‘I am very sorry to hear that I have a great love for our dumb friends.’

‘I don’t doubt that, old feller. I also believe you love the world.’

‘Why not, please, and good luck to me? We are all human-brothers. One for all and all for one. Excuse me. I do not belong to the backward India. Arise, Awake, advance! I already believe in the European sanitation and knives, which is better than eating with sweating fingers in this summer. A decent quantity of toilet tissue has already been ordered. You and your lady are welcome to use our lavatory if you wish to

~232~

Spend a penny and good luck to you both. Mr H. Hatterr, mankind is one. The culture of mankind is for all. India confirms same. Also, Mr Ben Jonson rightly says in his *The Devil Is An Ass . . .*’

Half a minute. You said something about my being a lover of Indian music. You know, Banerji, I don’t care a dam’ for it.’

‘Yes you do. You should say you do.’

‘I didn’t agree. All the same I inquired about it and about: if the means suggested had anything to do with showing Bankim Ali where he got off.

‘The proposal, in brief,’ explained my pal, ‘is this. I shall have recently been giving them many liberal write-ups, and inserting their poetry in my uncle’s fortnightly, without any underhand monetary payment whatever to me. I have, therefore, some influence with them.’

‘What have the pundits got to do with Bankim Ali?’

‘Mr. H. Hatterr, India owes you a heavy debt! I humbly say, it is overdue! You are spiritual. You speak the vernacular as any Indian servant. We love the spiritually inclined and the linguists from the bottom of our hearts. Excuse me, you are more than a sahib.’

‘Go on.’

“My plan is to get you recognition! Let me, please, exploit my position with the pundits. This has occurred to me for some time past. Now is the correct opportunity. I can get you a title from the pundits, showing to all whom these tokens may concern that India has recognized your love for her. You will be knighted by her. We shall make you a *Sangita Kala Sagara*!’

“What the hell does it mean?’

‘*Sangita Kala Sagara*’ means Ocean of Musical Art. You may think more of the O. B. E. But an O. B. E. is conferred by the government. A title like the *Sangita Kala Sagara*, on the other hand, excuse me, is from the people, and by the people, and for the people. You can, of course, assume a degree. Many people do. But, it is better conferred at a regular *abhisheka* ceremony, and by the common consent of at least five or six people. Once you are recognized by the pundits, you are

~233~

---

made! You can then, by all means, send a memo to the Sleeping Partner, appraising him of the event. He will at once embrace you! He would love to have you working for him again. He thinks so much of people with musical degrees.'

~234~

Excerpt-2:

"Sam and the Tiger" ~ Salman Rushdie, *Midnight's Children*, pp. 430-35.

SOMETIMES, MOUNTAINS must move before old comrades can be reunited. On December 15th, 1971, in the capital of the newly liberated state of Bangladesh, Tiger Niazi surrendered to his old chum Sam Manekshaw; while I, in my turn, surrendered to the embraces of a girl with eyes like saucers, a pony-tail like a long shiny black rope, and lips which had not at that time acquired what was to become their characteristic pout. These reunions were not achieved easily; and as a gesture of respect for all who made them possible, I shall pause briefly in my narrative to set out the whys and wherefores.

Let me, then, be perfectly explicit: if Yahya Khan and Z. A. Bhutto had not colluded in the matter of the coup of March 25th, I would not have been flown to Dacca in civilian dress; nor, in all likelihood, would General Tiger Niazi have been in the city that December. To continue: the Indian intervention in the Bangladesh dispute was also the result of the interaction of great forces. Perhaps, if ten millions had not walked across the frontiers into India, obliging the Delhi Government to spend $200,000,000 a month on refugee camps–the entire war of 1965, whose secret purpose had been the annihilation of my family, had cost them only $70,000,000!--Indian soldiers, led by General Sam, would never have crossed the frontiers in the opposite direction. But India came for other reasons, too: as I was to learn from the Communist magicians who lived in the shadow of the Delhi Friday

~430~

Mosque, the Delhi sarkar had been highly concerned by the declining influence of Mujob's Awami League, and the growing popularity of the revolutionary Mukti Bahini; Sam and the Tiger met in Dacca to prevent the Bahini from gaining power. So if it were not for the mukti Bahini, Parvati-the-witch might never have accompanied the Indian troops on their campaign of "liberation" . . . But even that is not a full explanation. A third reason for Indian intervention was the fear that the disturbances in Bangladesh would, if they were not quickly curtailed, spread across the frontiers into West bengal; so Sam and the Tiger, and also Parvati and I, owe our meeting at least in part to the more turbulent elements in West Bengali politics: the Tiger's defeat was only the beginning of a campaign against the left in Calcutta and its environs.

At any rate, India came; and for the speed of her coming–because in a mere three weeks Pakistan had lost half her navy, a third of her army, a quarter of her air force, and finally, after the Tiger surrendered, more than half her population–thanks must be given to the

Mukti Bahini once more; because, perhaps naïvely, failing to understand that the Indian advance was as much a tactical maneuver against them as a battle against the occupying West Wing forces, the Bahini advised General Manekshaw on Pakistani troop movements, on the Tiger's strengths and weaknesses; thanks, too, to Mr. Chou En-Lai, who refused (despite Bhutto's entreaties) to give Pakistan any material aid in the War. Denied Chinese arms, Pakistan fought with American guns, American tanks and aircraft; the President of the United States, alone in the entire world, was resolved to "tilt" towards Pakistan. While Henry A. Kissinger argued the cause of Yahya Khan, the same Yahya was secretly arranging the President's famous state visits to China . . .there were, therefore, grat forces working against my reunion with Parvati and Sam's with the Tiger; but despite the titling President, it was all over in three short weeks.

On the night of december 14th, Shaheed Dar and the buddha circled the fringes of the invested city of Dacca; but the buddha's nose (you will not have forgotten) was capable of sniffing out more than most. Following his nose, which could smell safety and danger, they found a way through the Indian lines, and entered the city under cover of night. While they moved stealthily through streets in which nobody except a few starving beggars could be seen, the Tiger was swearing to

~431~

---

fight to the last man; but the next day, he surrendered instead. What is not known: whether the last man was grateful to be spared or peeved at missing his chance of entering the camphor garden.

And so I returned to that city in which, in those last hours before reunions, Shaheed and I saw many things which were not true, which were not possible, because our boys would not could not have behaved so badly; we saw men in spectacles with heads like eggs being shot in side-streets, we saw the intelligentsia of the city being massacred by the hundred, but it was not true because it could not have been true the Tiger was a decent chap, after all, and our jawans were worth ten babus, we moved through the impossible hallucination of the night, hiding in doorways while fires blossomed like flowers, reminding me of the way the Brass Monkey used to set fire to shoes to attract a little attention, there were slit throats being buried in unmarked graves, and Shaheed began his, "No, buddha–-what a thing, Allah, you can't believe your eyes–no, not true, how can it – buddha, tell, what's got into my eyes?" And at last the buddha spoke, knowing Shaheed could not hear: "O, Shaheeda," he said, revealing the depths of his fastidiousness, "a person must sometimes choose what he will see and what he will not; look away, look away from there now." But Shaheed was staring staring at a maidan in which lady doctors were benign bayoneted before they were raped, and raped again before they were shot. Above them and behind them, the cool white minaret of a mosque stared blindly down upon the scene.

As though talking to himself, the buddha said, "It is time to think about saving our skins; God knows why we came back." the buddha entered the doorway of a deserted house, a broken,

peeling shell of an edifice which had once housed a tea-shop, a bicycle-repair shop, a whorehouse and a tiny landing on which a notary public must once have sat, because there was the low desk on which he had left behind a pair of half-rimmed spectacles, there were the abandoned seals and stamps which had once enabled him to be more than an old nobody–stamps and seals which had made him an arbiter of what was true and what was not. The notary public was absent, so I could not ask him to verify what was happening, I coil not give a deposition under oath; but lying on the mat behind his desk was a loose flowing garment like a djellabah, and without waiting any longer I removed my uniform, in-

~432~

---

cluding the she-dog badge of the CUTIA units, and became anonymous, a deserter, in a city whose language I could not speak.

Shaheed Dar, however, remained in the street; in the first light of morning he watched soldiers scurrying away from what-had-not-been-done; and then the grenade came. I, the buddha, was still inside the empty house; but Shaheed was unprotected by walls.

Who can say why how who; but the grenade was certainly thrown. In that last instant of his un-bisected life, Shaheed was suddenly seized by an irresistible urge to look up . . . afterwards, in the muezzin's roost, he told the buddha, "So strange, Allah–the pomegranate–in my head, just like that, bigger an' brighter than ever before–you know, buddha, like a light-bulb–Allah, what could I do, I looked!"--And yes, it was there, hanging above his head, the grenade of his dreams, hanging just above his head, falling falling, exploding at waist-level, blowing his legs away to some other part of the city.

When I reached him, Shaheed was conscious, despite bisection, and pointed up, "Take me up there, buddha, I want to I want," so I carried what was now only half a boy (and therefore reasonably light) up narrow spiral stairs to the heights of that cool white minaret, where Shaheed babbled of light-bulbs while red ants and black ants fought over a dead cockroach, battling away along the trowel-furrows in the crudely-laid concrete floor. Down below, amid charred houses, broken glass and smoke haze, ant-like people were emerging, preparing for peace; the ants, however, ignored the ant-like, and fought on. And the buddha: he stood still, gazing milkily down and around, having placed himself between the top half of Shaheed and the eyrie's one piece of furniture, a low table on which stood a gramophone connected to a loudspeaker. The buddha, protecting his halved companion from the disillusioning sight of this mechanized muezzin, whose call to prayer would always be scratched in the same places, extracted from the folds of his shapeless robe a glinting object: and turned his milky gaze upon the silver spittoon. Lost in contemplation,he was taken by surprise when the screams began; and looked up to see an abandoned cockroach. (Blood had been seeping along trowel-furrows; ants, following this dark viscous trail, had arrived at the source of the leakage, and Shaheed expressed his fury at becoming the victim of not one, but two wars.)

~4333~

Coming on the rescue, feet dancing on ants, the buddha bumped his elbow against a switch; the loudspeaker system was activated, and afterwards people would never forget how a mosque had screamed out the terrible agony of war.

After a few moments, silence. Shaheed's head slumped forward. And the buddha, fearing discovery, put away his spittoon and descended into the city as the Indian army arrived; leaving Shahed, who no longer minded, to assist at the peace-making banquet of the ants, I went into the early morning street to welcome General Sam.

In the minaret, I had gazed milkily at my spittoon; but the buddha's mind had not been empty. It contained three words, which Shaheed's top half had also kept repeating, until the ants: the same three which once, reeking of onions, had made me weep on the shoulder of Ayooba Baloch–until the bee, buzzing . . . "It's not fair," the buddha thought, and then, like a child, over and over, "It's not fair," and again, and again.

Shaheed, fulfilling his father's dearest wish, had finally earned his name; but the buddha could still not remember his own.

How the buddha regained his name: Once, long ago, on another independence day, the world had been saffron and green. This morning, the colors were green, red, and gold, And in the cities, cries of "Jai Bangla!" And voices of women singing "Our Golden Bengal," maddening their hearts with delight . . . in the center of the city, on the podium of his defeat, General tiger Niazi awaited General Manekshaw. (Biographical details: Sam was a Parsee. He came from Bombay. Bombayites were in for happy times that day.) And amid green and red and gold the buddha in his shapeless anonymous garment was jostled by crowds; and then India came. India, with Sam at her head.

Was it General Sam's idea? Or even indira's?--Eschewing these fruitless questions, I record only that the Indian advance into Dacca was much more than a mere military parade; as befits a triumph, it was garlanded with side-shows. A special I. A. F. troop transport had flown to Dacca, carrying a hundred and one of the finest entertainers and conjurers India could provide. From the famous magicians' ghetto in Delhi they came, many of them dressed for the occasion in the evocative uniforms of the Indian fauj, so that many Daccan got the idea

---

that the Indians' victory had been inevitable from the start because even their uniformed jawans were sorcerers of the highest order. The conjurers and other artistes marched beside the troops, entertaining the crowds; there were acrobats forming human pyramids on moving carts drawn by white bullocks; there were extraordinary female contortionists who could shallow their legs up to their knees; there were jugglers who operated outside the laws of gravity, so that they could draw oohs and aahs from the delighted crowded as they juggled with toy grenades, keeping four hundred and twenty in the air at a time; there were card-tricksters who could pull the queen of chiriyas (the monarch of birds, the empress of clubs) out of women's ears; there was the great dancer Anarkali, whose name meant "pomogranate-bud," doing leaps twists pirouettes on a donkey-cart while a giant piece of silver nose-jewelery jingled on her

right nostril; there was Master Vikram the sitarist, whose sitar was capable of responding to, and exaggerating, the faintest emotions in the hearts of his audience, so that once (it was said) he had played before an audience so bad-tempered, and had so greatly enhanced their foul humor, that if his tabla-player hadn't made him stop his raga in mid-stream the power of his music would have had them all knifing each other and smashing up the auditorium . . . today, Master Vikram's music raised the celebratory goodwill of the people to fever-pitch; it maddened, let us say, their hearts with delight.

~435~

Works Cited

Abu Hamdan, Lawrence. "Aural Contract: Forensic Listening and the Reorganization of the Speaking Subject." In *Forensis: The Architecture of Public Truth*, edited by Forensic Architecture, 65–82. Berlin: Sternberg and Forensic Architecture, 2014.

Ahmed, Sara. *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Duke UP, 2012.

Alim, H. Samy. "Critical Language Awareness in the United States: Revisiting Issues and Revising Pedagogies in a Resegregated Society." *Educational researcher*, vol. 34, no. 7, 2005, pp. 24-31. www.jstor.org/stable/3699797

Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. Monthly Review Press, 2001.

Alvarez, Sara P. "Multilingual Writers in College Contexts." *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, vol. 62, no. 3, 2018, pp. 342-45.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. 4th ed., Aunt Lute Books, 2012.

Baca, Damián. *Mestiz@ Scripts, Digital Migrations, and the Territories of Writing*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Baker-Bell, April. "'I Can Switch My Language, But I Can't Switch My Skin': What Teachers Must Understand About Linguistic Racism." *The Guide for White Women Who Teach Black Boys*, edited by Eddie Moore Jr., Ali Michael, and Marguerite W. Penick-Parks, CORWIN, 2017, pp. 97-107.

---. *Linguistic Justice: Black Language, Literacy, Identity, and Pedagogy*. Routledge, 2020.

Blommaert, Jan, and Ben Rampton. “Language and Superdiversity.” *Language and Superdiversity*, edited by Karel Arnaut, Jan Blommaert, Ben Rampton, and Massimiliano Soptti, Routledge, 2016.

Blommaert, Jan. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge UP, 2010.

Bloome, David, and Faythe Beauchemin. “ Languaging Everyday Life in Classrooms.” *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, vol. 65, 2016, pp. 152-65.

Boegeman, Margaret Byrd. “Lives and Literacy: Autobiography in Freshman Composition.” *College English*, vol. 41, no. 6, 1980, pp. 662-69. www.jstor.org/stable/375914.

Boylorn, Robin M., and Mark P. Orbe, editors. *Critical Autoethnography: Intersecting Cultural Identities in Everyday Life*, 2nd ed., Routledge, 2021.

Brown, Tessa. “What Else Do We Know? Translingualism and the History of SRTOL as Threshold Concepts in Our Field.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 71, no. 4, 2020, pp. 591-619.

Budhathoki, Thir B. “Cross-Cultural Perceptions of Literacies in Literacy Narratives.” *Literacy in Composition Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2022, pp. 47-71.

Calvet, Louise-Jean. *Towards an Ecology of World Languages*. Translated by Andrew Brown, Polity Press, 2006.

Canagarajah, Suresh. “Challenges in Decolonizing Linguistics: The Politics of Enregisterment and the Divergent Uptakes of Translingualism.” *Educational Linguistics*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2022, pp. 25-55. doi.org/10.1515/eduling-2021-0005

---. "Negotiating Translingual Literacy: An Enactment." *Research in the Teaching of English*, vol. 48, no. 1, 2013, pp. 40-67.

---. *Transnational Literacy Autobiographies as Translingual Writing*. Routledge, 2020.

---. *Transnational Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. Routledge, 2013.

Carpenter, William, and Bianca Falbo. "Literacy, Identity, and the "Successful" Student Writer." *Identity Papers: Literacy and Power in Higher Education*, edited by Bronwyn T. Williams, University Press of Colorado/ Utah State UP, 2006, pp. 92-108.

Cavanaugh, Jillian R. "Language Ideology Revisited." *International Journal of Sociolinguistics*, vol. 26, no. 3, 2020, pp. 51-57.

Cedillo, Christina V., and Phil Bratta. "Relating Our Experiences: The Practice of Positionality Stories in Student-Centered Pedagogy." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 71, no. 2, December 2019, pp. 215-40.

Chang, Heewon. *Autoethnography as Method*. Routledge, 2016.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. "Statement on Language, Power, and Action." November 2022. www.cccc.ncte.org/cccc/language-power-and-action.

---. "Students' Rights to Their Own Language." Special issue of *CCC*, vol. XXV, Fall 1974.

---. "This Ain't Another Statement! This is a DEMAND for Black Linguistic Justice." July 2020. www.cccc.ncte.org/cccc/demand-for-black-linguistic-justice.

Cordon, Frankie, and Vershawn Ashanti Young. Introduction. *Performing Antiracist Pedagogy in Rhetoric, Writing, and Communication*, edited by Condon and Young, The WAC Clearinghouse, 2017, pp. 3-16.

Corkery, Caleb. "Literacy Narratives and Confidence Building in the Writing Classroom." *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 24, no. 1, 2005, pp. 48-67.

Crudele, Leslie. "Graduate Student Employees or Employee Graduate Students: The National Labor Relations Board and the Unionization of Graduate Student Workers in Postsecondary Education." *William and Mary Business Law Review*, vol. 10, no. 3, April 2019, pp. 739-80.

Cushman, Ellen. "Foreword." *Rhetorics Elsewhere and Otherwise: Contested Modernities, Decolonial Options*, edited by Romeo García and Damián Baca, SWR/ NCTE/ CCCC, 2019, pp. Vii-viii.

---. "Translingual and Decolonial Approaches to Meaning Making." *College English*, vol. 78, no. 3, 2016, pp. 234-42. Denny, Harry C. *Facing the Center: Toward an Identity Politics of One-to-one Mentoring*. Utah State UP, 2010.

Daniel, James Rushing, Katie Malcolm, and Candice Rai. "Introduction: Centering Difference in Composition Studies." *Writing Across Difference: Theory and Intervention*, edited by Daniel, Malcolm, and Rai, University Press of Colorado, 2022, pp. 3-17.

Denzin, Norman K. *Interpretive Ethnography: Ethnographic Practices for the 21st Century*. SAGE, 1997.

Desani, G. V. *All About H. Hatter*. 1948. New York Review Books, 1970.

doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674731615.c18.

Dovchin, Sender, and Jerry Won Lee. "The Ordinariness of Translinguistics." *International Journal of Multilingualism*, vol. 16, no. 2, 2019, pp. 105-11.

Dovchin, Sender. *Language, Media and Globalization in the Periphery: The Linguascapes of Popular Music in Mongolia*. Routledge, 2018.

Downs, Douglas, 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. 552-84.

Eliss, Carolyn. "Preface: Carrying the Torch for Autoethnography." *Handbook of Autoethnography*, edited by Stacy Holman Jones et al., Routledge, 2013, pp. 9-12.

Fairclough, Norman. "Introduction." *Critical Language Awareness*, edited by Fairclough, Longman, 1992, pp. 1-29.

Flores, Nelson, and Jonathan Rosa. "Undoing Appropriateness: Raciolinguistic Ideologies and Language Diversity in Education." *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 85, no. 2, 2015, pp. 149-71.

---. *The Blog of Harvard Educational Publishing*, June 11, 2015, Harvard Education Publishing Group, https://www.hepg.org/blog/the-raciolinguistic-catch-22#:~:text=Presumptions%20about%20alleged%20problems%20with%20linguistic%20diversity%20hinge,of%20this%20meritocratic%20myth%20spans%20the%20political%20spectrum. Accessed 4 March 2023.

Fraser, Nancy. "On Justice: Lessons from Plato, Rawls and Ishiguro." *New Left Review*, vol. 74, 2012, pp. 41-51.

Frost, Alanna, et al., editors. *Translingual Dispositions: Globalized Approaches to the teaching of Writing*. WAC Clearinghouse, 2020.

García, Romeo, and Damián Baca. "Hopes and Visions: The Possibility of Decolonial Options." *Rhetorics Elsewhere and Otherwise: Contested Modernities, Decolonial Visions*, edited by Garcia and Baca, NCTE, 2019, pp. 1-48.

Gere, Anne Ruggles, et al. "Communal Justicing: Writing Assessment, Disciplinary Infrastructure, and the Case for Critical Language Awareness." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 72, no. 3, 2021, pp. 384-412.

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

Giroux, Henry A. "Border Pedagogy and the Politics of Postmodernism." *Social Text*, vol. 28, 1991, pp. 51-67.

---. *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2005.

Glissant, Édouard. *Poetics of Relation*. Translated by Besty Wing, The University of Michigan Press, 1997.

Guerra, Juan C. *Language, Culture, Identity and Citizenship in College Classrooms and Communities*. Routledge, 2015.

Hall, Anne-Marie, and Christopher Minnix. "Beyond the Bridge Metaphor: Rethinking the Place of the Literacy Narrative in the Basic Writing Curriculum." *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 31, no. 2, 2012, pp. 57-82.

Heewon, Chang. *Autoethnography as Method*. Routledge, 2008.

Horner, Bruce, and John Trimbur. “English Only and U. S. College Composition.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 53, no. 4, 2002, pp. 594-630.

Horner, Bruce, and Laura Tetreault. “Translation as (Global) Writing.” *Composition Studies*, vol. 44, no. 1, 2016, pp. 13-30.

Horner, Bruce, and Sara P. Alvarez. “Defining Translinguality.” *Literacy in Composition Studies*, vol. 7, no. 2, 2019, pp. 1-30.

Horner, Bruce, et al. “Opinion: Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach.” *College English*, vol. 73, no. 3, 2011, pp. 303-21.

Horner, Bruce. “Reflecting the Translingual Norm: Action-Reflection, ELF, Translation, and Transfer.” *A Rhetoric of Reflection*, edited by Kathleen Yancey, Utah State UP, 2016, pp. 105-24.

---. *Rewriting Composition: Terms of Exchange*. Southern Illinois UP, 2016.

Jakobson, Roman. “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation.” *On Translation*, edited by Reuben Arthur Brower, Harvard UP, 1959, pp. 232-39.

Jørgensen, Normann J. “Polylingual Languaging Around and Among Children and Adolescents.” *International Journal of Multilingualism*, vol. 5, no. 3, 2008, pp. 161-76. doi.org/10.1080/14790710802387562

Jørgensen, Normann J., and Janus Spindler Møller. “ Polylingualism and Languaging.” *The Routledge Companion to English Studies*, edited by Constant Leung and Brian V Street, Routledge, 2014, pp. 67-83.

Kumaravadivelu, B. “The Decolonial Option in English Teaching: Can the Subaltern Act?” *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 50, no. 1, 2016, pp. 66-85.

Lee, Eunjeong, and Sara P. Alvarez. “World Englishes, Translingualism, and Racialization in the US College Composition Classroom.” World Englishes and Translanguaging, special issue of *World Englishes: Journal of the International Association for World Englishes*, vol. 39, no. 2, 2020, pp. 263-74.

Lee, Eunjeong, Jennifer T. Johnson, and Brooke R. Schreiber. “Introduction: Why Linguistic Justice, and Why Now?” *Linguistic Justice on Campus: Pedagogy and Advocacy for Multilingual Students*, edited by Brooke R. Schreiber, Eunjeong Lee, Jennifer T. Johnson, and Norah Fahim, Multilingual Matters, 2021, pp. 1-16.

Lee, Jerry Won. “Beyond Translingual Writing.” *College English*, vol. 79, no. 2, 2016, pp. 174-95.

Leonard, Rebecca Lorimer. “The Role of Writing in Critical Language Awareness.” *College English*, vol. 84, no. 2, 2021, pp. 175-98.

Lippi-Green, Rosina. *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States*. Routledge, 2011.

Lu, Min-Zhan and Bruce Horner. “Introduction: Translingual Work.” *College English*, vol. 78, no, 3, 2016, pp. 207-18.

---. “Translingual Literacy and Matters of Agency.” *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms*, edited by A. Suresh Canagarajah, Routledge, 2013, pp. 26-38.

---. “Translingual Literacy, Language Difference, and Matter of Agency.” *College English*, vol. 75, no. 6, 2013, pp. 582-607.

Lu, Min-Zhan. “Living-English Work.” Cross-Language Relations in Composition Studies,edited by Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Kei Matsuda, Southern Illinois UP, 2010, pp. 42-56.

Madison, D. Soyini. *Critical Ethnography: Method, Ethics, and Performance*, 3rd ed., Sage., 2020.

“Managing (In)visibility and Hypervisibility in the Workplace.” Editorial. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol. 113, 2019, pp. 1-5.

Mapes, Aimee C. “Two Vowels Together: On the Wonderfully Insufferable Experiences of Literacy.” *CCC*, vol. 67, no. 4, 2016, pp. 686-92.

Martinez, Aja Y. *Counterstory: The Rhetoric and writing of Critical Race Theory*. CCCC/NCTE, 2020.

Matsuda, Paul Kei. “The Lure of Translingual Writing.” *PMLA*, vol.129, No. 3, 2014, pp. 479-83.

Mignolo, Walter D. “Coloniality is Far from Over, and So Must be Decoloniality.” *Afterall: A Journal of Art, Context, and Enquiry*, vol. 43, Spring/Summer 2017, pp. 39-45. www.doi.org/10.1086/692552.

---. “Delinking: The Rhetoric of Modernity, the Logic of Coloniality and the Grammar of Decoloniality.” *Cultural Studies*, vol. 21, no. 2-3, 2007, pp. 449-514.

---. “Geopolitics of Sensing and Knowing: On (De)Coloniality, Border Thinking and Epistemic Disobedience.” *Postcolonial Studies*, vol. 14, no. 3, 2011, pp. 273-83.

---. *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton UP, 2012.

---. *The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality, and Colonization*. 2nd ed., U of Michigan P, 2003.

---. *The Politics of Decolonial Investigations*. Duke UP, 2021.

Mihut, Ligia A. "Enacting Linguistic Justice: Transnational Scholars as Advocates for Pedagogical Change." *Translingual Dispositions: Globalized Approaches to the Teaching of Writing*, edited by Alanna Frost, Julia Kiernan, and Suzanne Blum Malley, The WAC Clearinghouse, 2020, pp. 269-94.

Milu, Esther. "Hip-Hop and the Decolonial Possibilities of Translingualism." *CCC*, vol. 73, no. 3, 2022, pp. 376-409.

Mufti, Aamir R. *Forget English! Orientalisms and World Literatures*. Harvard UP, 2016.

Otsuji, Emi, and Alastair Pennycook. *Metrolingualism: Language in the City*. Routledge, 2015.

Pennycook, Alastair. "English as a Language Always in Translation." *European Journal of English Studies*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2008, pp. 33-47.

---. *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. Routledge, 2017.

Perryman-Clark, Staci, David E. Kirkland, and Austin Jackson, editors. *Students' Rights to Their Own Language: A Critical Sourcebook*. Bedford/St. Martin's, 2015.

Piller, Ingrid. *Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice*. Oxford UP, 2016.

Quíjano, Anibal. “Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality.”*Cultural Studies*, vol. 21, no. 2-3, 2007, pp. 168-78. doi.org/10.1080/09502380601164353.

Rangan, Pooja, et al. “Introduction: Thinking with an Accent.” *Thinking with an Accent: Toward a New Object, Method, and Practice*, edited by Pooja Rangan, Akshya Saxena, Ragini Tharoor Srinivasan, and Pavitra Sundar, University of California Press, 2023, pp. 1-20. doi.org/10.1525/luminos.148.

Reeves, Carol A., and Maura Ross. “Writing Climate Change Assessments: Scientific Author Challenges and Rhetorical Negotiations.” *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, vol. 52, no. 2, 2021, pp. 1-31. doi.org/10.1177/0047281621989

Ro, Christine. “The Pervasive Problem of Linguistic Racism.” *BBC WORKLIFE*, June 3, 2021. www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20210528-the-pervasive-problem-of-linguistic-racism

Rosa, Jonathan Daniel. “Standardization, Racialization, Languagelessness: Raciolinguistic Ideologies across Communicative Contexts.” *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2016, pp. 162-83. doi.10.1111/jola.12116.

Rosa, Jonathan, and Nelson Flores. “Reimagining Race and Language: from Raciolinguistic Ideologies to Raciolinguistic Perspective.” *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Race*, edited by H. Samy Alim, Angela Reyes, and Paul V. Kroskrity, Oxford UP, 2020, pp. 90-107. doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190845995.013.3

---. “Unsettling Race and Language: Toward a Raciolinguistic Perspective.” *Language in Society*, vol. 46, 2017, pp. 621-47.

Rushdie, Salman. *Midnight’s Children.* 1981. Random House, 2006.

Schmertz, Johana. “Writing Our Academic Selves: The Literacy Autobiography as Performance.” *Pedagogy*, vol. 18, no. 2, 2018, pp. 279-93.

Seltzer, Kate. “‘My English is Its Own Rule’: Voicing a Translingual Sensibility through Poetry.” *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 297-311. doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2019.1656535.

Sen, Amartya. *The Idea of Justice*. The Belknap Press, 2009.

Shapiro, Rachael, and Missy Watson. “Translingual Praxis: From Theorizing Language to Antiracist and Decolonial Pedagogy.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 74, no. 2, 2022, pp. 292-321.

Shapiro, Shawna. *Cultivating Critical Language Awareness in the Writing Classroom*. Routledge, 2022.

Smitherman, Geneva. “CCCC’s Role in the Struggle for Language Rights.” *Students’ Rights to Their Own Language: A Critical Sourcebook*, edited by Staci Perryman-Clark, David E. Kirkland, and Austin Jackson, Bedford St. Martin, 2015, pp. 58-82.

---. “Raciolinguistics, ‘Mis-Education’, and Language Arts teaching in the 21st Century.” *Language Arts Journal of Michigan*, vol. 2, no. 32, 2017, pp. 4-12. doi.org/10.9707/2168-149X.2164.

Soliday, Mary. “Transferring Self and Difference through Literacy Narratives.” *College English*, vol. 56, no. 5, 1994, pp. 511-526.

Sultana, Shaila, et al. Transglossic Language Practices of Young Adults in Bangladesh and Mongolia.” *International Journal of Multilingualism*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2014, pp. 93–108.

Thu, Sumyat et. al. “Antiracist Translingual Praxis in Writing Ecologies.” *Writing Across Difference: Theory and Intervention*, edited by James Rushing Daniel, Katie Malcolm, and Candice Rai, University Press of Colorado, 2022, pp. 195-217.

Van Parijs, Philippe. *Linguistic Justice for Europe and for the World.* Oxford UP, 2011.

Vertovec, Steven. “Super-diversity and its Implications.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 30, no. 6, 2007, pp. 1024-54.

Wardle, Elizabeth, and Doug Downs. “Reflecting Back and Looking Forward: Revisiting ‘Teaching about Writing, Righting Misconceptions’ Five years On.” *Composition Forum*, vol. 27, Spring 2013. http://www.compositionforum.com/issue/27/reflecting-back.php.

Wei, Li. “Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language.” *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 39, no. 1, 2018, pp. 9-30. doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039

Wiley, Terance G. “Language Planning and Policy.” *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*, edited by Sandra Lee McKay and Nancy H. Hornberger, Cambridge UP, 1996, pp. 103-47.

Zhang-Wu, Qianqian. “(Re)Imagining Translingualism as a *Verb* to Tear Down the English-Only Wall: ‘Monolingual’ Students as Multilingual Writers.” *College English*, vol. 84, no. 1, 2021, pp. 121-37.

Zhang, Tao. “‘Your English is Accented!’: Surviving with Otherness While Approaching Positive Becoming.” *International Review of Qualitative Research*, vol. 13, no. 4, 2021, pp. 476-96.

Zheng, Yi, and Arthur G. Samuel. “Does Seeing an Asian Face Make Speech Sound More Accented?”*Atten Percept Psychophys*, vol. 79, 2017, pp. 1841-59.