



Farewell to Monolingualism, Hello to Translingual Orientation

NAOKO AKAI-DENNIS, PHD

Assistant Professor, English Department
Facilitator, One Book Program
Bunker Hill Community College

CONTENTS

Abstract

Dear Amy Tan

Relation to Language

Monolingualism

The Gaze and the Ear

Translingual Orientation
or Translanguaging

Relocalized Listening

Revisiting, Reflecting,
and Relocalizing

In Closing

Acknowledgement

References

Appendix

ABSTRACT

In 1974, the Conference on College Composition and Communication declared a resolution titled (and upholding) “Students’ Right to Their Own Language.” In 2019, forty-five years later, at an opening session of the conference of the same organization, Asao Inoue had to title his chair’s address “How Do We Language So People Stop Killing Each Other, or What Do We Do About White Language Supremacy?” Students’ rights to their own language are yet to be claimed. According to Inoue “The key to fighting White language supremacy is in changing the structures, cutting the steel bars, altering the ecology, in which our biases function in our classrooms and communities.” This article is part of this larger conversation.

This article analyzes detrimental effects of monolingualism and discusses features of ELLs written products as translanguaging. Further, the author of this article revisits, reflects on, and re-envision her feedback to one former student’s draft, applying the idea of “relocalized listening.” The author frames this article into one form of qualitative research, autobiography as inquiry, and therefore gives an account of her experiences as a language user.

DEAR AMY TAN

Dear Amy Tan,

I often have my students write an open letter to authors of texts we read. Asking questions, sharing their experiences, throwing out their thoughts, etc. without thinking about an organization helps them relate to the text, I think. Just practicing quoting and paraphrasing does not really get them engaged in a text. By the way, I am a teacher. I am a teacher of writing, but I’m not a teacher of English (see Akai-Dennis, 2021, p. 58).

So, now I feel like I want to write to you, knowing that you will not read this open letter, because I want to gather my thoughts about language, or mother tongue, which you delineated in “Mother-Tongue” (Tan, 1990). This work is loved by a lot of teachers of English, for some reason. They might love it because it is a “minority’s” story. They love “minority’s” stories, right?

I remember reading Joy Luck Club back in Japan when I was at a graduate school to study American literature. I was writing something really infantile about William Faulkner’s “Sanctuary”, about a young white female in the South. Why Faulkner? I related to this girl, Temple, a super-spoiled white girl. I was also a spoiled brat like her. I was full of myself. On the other hand, I was not able to relate to any of Asian women in that novel, honestly. It might sound ridiculous to some folks, but I didn’t see myself as an Asian at all when I was in Japan. But I do remember I wondered what it is like to live in the U.S. and speak English as an Asian, like your mother.

Now I am in the U.S. Since I came here, I obsessively ponder on some sort of relation between language and me, especially the language I did not grow up with, the language which did not shape the world around me, like color, smell, sound, taste, and touch. Other people’s language.

In the short story, you describe your mother's English. You say the mother-tongue is your "language of intimacy" (Tan, 2019, p. 7). Of course, it is. Isn't that why we have the expression, "mother tongue." Also, you said you were not happy that some of your friends described your mother's English as "broken" and "fractured" (Tan, p. 7). The language has shaped the ways we see the world. If the language is broken, then that means your world is broken. How should we take that? Or at other times, you explain how your mother's English nurtures your imagination, which can't be measured by those standardized tests. You seem to perceive your mother's English well. Of course, you do. You are a writer, and so a master of the language, English without the article "the" or possessive pronoun "my."

However, at one point, you called your mother's English "simple." That made me raise my eyebrows a little bit. Yes, you said it with much hesitation, but for me, that just implies that you see your mother's English from the dominant discourse of language which hierarchizes different versions of English. Sophisticated or civilized English, through so-so English, and down to simple, or primitive one. Maybe, maybe, you call it "simple," since the intimate relationship with your mother is simple. Yet, again, this portrayal as simple is trapped within binaries, like body and mind, nature and culture, primitive and civilized, and so on.

Any of your rendering of your mother's English does not even illustrate how SHE might feel about English. At one point, you write "My mother has long realized the limitation of her English as well" (Tan, p.7). That was wrong. That was your limited perception of her relation to the language. That seems to me to reveal your lack of imagination about any relation to language in general. Your relation to language might sabotage you from even imagining how one feels about a language which they were not born with/in.

Of course, I don't and can't speak for your mom. But I'd like to give you a little glimpse of how one, actually me, perceives a relation to English, in which they did not grow up.

Years, years ago, I wrote this piece "On the Shore" as a conference paper.

I am on the shore. Waves ebb and flow. I sometimes walk into the ocean with the receding waves or against the breaking waves. I sometimes go back to the shore, and the waves come after and with me, and pass me; but sometimes they recede further away from me. I can't tell if I am on the shore or in the ocean. When am I crossing a line? I am on the shore, without belonging, but longing for something (Akai, 2008).

This still sounds true to me in the sense that I don't know where I am in relation to the two languages. People say, "I write in English." I'd ask myself, "In English? Can I be IN English?" I'd rather say, "I write with English." But, I know, this does not make sense to you. But whose sense is that, anyways?

Revisiting this piece, I find myself having meandered and roamed as if I looked for a door to move from one place to another. But now I know there is no door between the two languages. Even if there is, -- actually there is; otherwise, why do the gatekeepers exist? --the door is so porous. Probably in those days, I might have felt I was more "in" Japanese and so struggled to get "out of" the language and immerse myself into English. Now, I still see myself on the shore, without belonging, without knowing where I am in relation to English. I am with/in both languages, which sometimes elude me.

Can you hear me? Can you feel this?

Sincerely

Naoko



If this open letter makes you feel confused or uneasy, I think I am successful in achieving one of my purposes of this article, inquiring into a translanguaging approach, which I am going to examine later. This open letter also gives a glimpse of what I mean by one's relation to language, which is the foundation of the discussion that I am going to unfold here in terms of engaging with English language learners through equity-mindedness.

Most professors of the English language come to realize that a deficit model in which ELLs are seen as lacking some linguistic knowledge has not benefited them. Instead, some of them employ an asset-based model which recognizes, values, and utilizes students' abundant capital or wealth, such as linguistic and cultural, thereby promoting their learning of English. That is wonderful.

And yet. As Watson and Shapiro (2018) contend, inviting and valuing linguistic differences as cultural wealth in the classroom and in writing is useful, but it is far from sufficient in order to combat the monolingual ideology, which has oppressed, marginalized, and even damaged not only ELLs but also the speakers who do not speak a certain version of English, or a legitimized English, if you like. The monolingual ideology permeates every single stage of the writing process and assessment as well. So, along with endeavoring to implement an asset-based pedagogy, we need to start a conversation about ways in which we teachers re-imagine our roles and involve ourselves as "readers" at some stages in the writing process, or in other words, ways in which we give feedback to students on their drafts in English, or in their Englishes. At those stages, we might be complicit in perpetuating the ideology of monolingualism with a "correcting gaze" (Watson & Shapiro, 2018, para. 56). Even if our curriculum values ELLs' cultural wealth, we might be complicit in perpetuating the ideology, not knowing that is what we do. That will never bring them equity.

Thus, this article focuses on multifaceted impacts that the dominant discourse of English, or English language education and products, have on us teachers, which dictates how we read, respond, and engage with ELL products. This conversation should foremost start with and even demand our understanding of the nature(s) of their writing and recognition that their Englishes do not interfere with meaning, but rather display their cultural wealth. The natures of writing

in their Englishes reflect a relation to language that they want to acquire and absorb in their "system," body and mind. Therefore, in order to start this conversation and examine the dominant discourse, the monolingual ideology, it is imperative to shed light on the relation between one and language, a visceral and corporeal relation, first.

As a matter of fact, you already got a partial glance of a relation to language in my open letter to Amy Tan. I say "partial" because the relation I describe is my story, my felt relation, and my experience, which are always incomplete as anyone's story is incomplete (Miller, 2004). Jhumpa Lahiri (2016) and Jacques Derrida's (1996) renditions of their relation to language give some in-depth insight into the relation to language I delineated in the opening missive.

Before I take you into Lahiri and Derrida's relations to language, though, I'll briefly explain how this article is theoretically framed. I am persuaded by Patti Lather's (2004) conceptualization of qualitative research as "a critical 'counter science' that troubles what we take for granted as the good in fostering understanding, reflection and action" (p. 765). The concept of science is reified by political apparatus that determines a particular form of science (Denzin 2009). For instance, the qualitative research methodology grounded in simplified neoliberalism as a doctrine of market and economics almost equates "scientific" research as "evidence-based" (Flick, 2019). Patti Lather (2014), Norman Denzin (2009), and Yvonne Lincoln (2018) question this kind of qualitative inquiry methodology that originated from the post-positivist trend, and instead argue for the need of qualitative research that hinges on different versions of data.

One strand within this concept of qualitative research, autobiography as a form of inquiry (Gourmet 1980; Pinar 1994; Miller 2004; Butler 2005), allows me to investigate my experiences and my feelings in terms of the issues of monolingualism, translanguaging, and translanguaging because these are also legitimate data, which could shed another light or another qualitative layer to the issues when discourses that construct my experiences and feelings are revealed and investigated. Although some mainstream qualitative researchers criticize autobiographical approach as a solipsistic monologue, I do not talk about my experiences with English to pity myself or gain some sympathy from the reader. Neither do I talk about my teaching

practices as a “success” story. Instead, I constantly interrogate my practices in the classroom since they might reflect my own internalization of the monolingual ideology to a certain extent. Additionally, the slogan of the second-wave feminist movement in the 1960’s, “The personal is political,” is still valid. The investigation of experiences and feelings illuminate injustice and inequality in the world we live in (Butler, 2005; Braidotti, 2013). In its logical extension, the interrogation of my experiences, feelings, and practices of operating myself in English, “other peoples’ language” (Young, 2014) will help me to decolonize myself and so critically look to the ways to combat the ideology more rigorously.

RELATION TO LANGUAGE

I start this article with the letter that ends with the “on the shore” piece. Being on the shore, my felt relation to English, is not peculiar to me. Jhumpa Lahiri (2016), an author who was born in Britain and grew up in the U.S. with heritage from West Bengali parents, writes about her feelings and perception of the Italian language in “In Other Words.” She delineates a relation to the language: “For twenty years I studied Italian as if I were swimming along the edge of that lake. Always next to my dominant language, English. Always hugging that shore” (p. 5). Unlike me, she believes that there is a border between her dominant language and Italian, a “foreign” language for her. The water in the lake sits still, and there is no wave touching and leaving her feet. She grounds herself in the land without any risk of drowning herself there. That is why later on she “finds [her]self inside the language” when she had a conversation with two Italians as if she went through an invisible door or climbed over a surmountable wall. In this literacy narrative, however, her perception of relation to the Italian language changes. In the chapter “Impossibility,” she states:

In that sense the metaphor of the small lake that I wanted to cross, with which I began this series of reflections, is wrong. Because in fact a language isn’t a small lake but an ocean. A tremendous, mysterious element, a force of nature that I have to bow before (p. 91)

She ends this chapter about the impossibility of writing in a foreign language with this strong statement: “If it were possible to bridge the distance between me and Italian, I would stop writing in that language” (p. 95). I echo her. If this distance were to disappear, why would I write in this language called English about writing in this “other people’s language,” hoping

Lastly, if I did not put forward my subjectivities, I might inadvertently create another danger for ELLs by universalizing or essentializing their needs, their writing, their relations to language, and the unknown. It is one of the responsibilities as researchers/writers to disclose where they speak, including their identities, subjectivities, education, beliefs, and so on. Concealing the position of the researcher, hindrance of “I,” does not make our writing objective, but rather makes it less trustworthy (Denzin, 2009).

that someday the people who monolingually orient themselves in English listen to me, really listen to me? And interestingly, I can’t express this thought in my mother-tongue. But that is another story to grapple with.

Can you hear me? Can you feel this?

The beloved and simultaneously hated French philosopher, Jacques Derrida (1996), also creates his literacy narrative in “Monolingualism of the Other,” intertwined with theoretical inquiries into this notion of our “own” language and the uncountability of languages. He unfolds his relationship with the French language as an Algerian Jew, which is the only language he speaks but is not his mother-tongue, because the French language was “interdicted” when he was given French citizenship in Algeria. He describes his relation to the French language as being “on the unplaceable line of its coast” (p. 2). Then, he poses a question if “one can love, enjoy oneself [jouir], pray, die from pain, or just die, plain and simple, in another language or without telling anyone about it, without even speaking at all” (p. 2) when they are neither in nor out of the language.

This description of his relation to the French language and the posed question show us two-folded aspects of the relation between self and language, whether it is native or foreign. One is that the relation is never stable, even if it can be stabilized. As Lahiri and I feel, we are in and simultaneously out of language. In Derrida’s astute delineation, the relation to the language is “inalienable alienation” (p. 57). The other aspect that Derrida’s rendition indicates is that the relation is visceral and corporeal. Language cannot be detached from the body. Doesn’t language make



it possible for us to love physically and emotionally? Doesn't language enable, and disable us to go through pains and sufferings? When I read students' essays, I hear their physical voices in my ears. When one talks about someone's linguistic ability, don't they say, "She can speak well." The level of mastering a language tends to be measured by this ability to "speak," which needs vocal cords. Remember how Amanda Gorman, the national Youth Poet Laureate, recited the inaugural poem in 2021 with hands, as if without them it is impossible to express herself?

Can you feel this? Can you hear me?

Your ear, which has "the edges, the inner walls, the passages" (Derrida, 1985, p. 11)

This relation to language inevitably reflects itself in writing produced by ELLs. The language that teachers, monolingual or multilingual, read and hear is not necessarily the English they have known. The words that we read and hear in student products might hold other invisible and inaudible layers that emanate from history, experiences, tears, suffering, bliss. (Ah, please don't add "and" before the word "bliss." I don't want

MONOLINGUALISM

By monolingual ideology, I am not just referring to the values around speaking one language at large, such as French or Napali, but also around speaking one of the different versions of a language. As Anzaldúa (1987) poignantly explicates, different versions of the Spanish language all over the world are hierarchized by "the purist and most Latinos" (p. 35) and some of them deemed "deficient" (p. 35). The French language also has been localized or nativized and so diversified in those nations colonized by France. It is impossible for those speakers of different kinds of language to share the same principle(s) about a language that happens to have simply only one designation. Indeed, nativized, hybridized, or localized versions of a language are categorized as "dialects" within one designation although linguistic differences among them cannot and should not be painted in such a broad brush. It seems to me that the categorization of "dialects" signifies deliberate differentiation from a standardized version of a language. Thus, by monolingualism, I am referring to an oppressive belief in the values of standardized English

Laying out the genealogy of the monolingual ideology, Canagarajah (2013a) discusses what the monolingual paradigm is and entails. The paradigm, called "The

it. The "and" excludes something unknown that can be included.) Anzaldúa (1987) rhetorically questions us, "what recourse is left to them (who don't speak either formal Spanish nor standard English) but to create their own language?" (p. 35).

"Their own" language that communicates their realities and values to themselves is understandably something foreign and even alien to teachers/readers who are ensnared into the monolingual ideology. This "their own" language is considered as interfering or unsuccessfully transferred (Leonard & Nowacek, 2016) and therefore as something that has to be eliminated or has to be "fixed." If these layers merged with some standardized forms of English are forcefully severed, that hurts. That hurts because the purging deprives their languages of their bodies, their feelings, and their identities.

Can you hear me? Can you feel this?

This approach to writing by ELLs for the purpose of making their English "pure" or "recognizable" is rooted in monolingual ideology.

Herderian triad" (Canagarajah, 2013a, p. 20), was formed by the triangular relations among language, community, and place. Language and community are thought to be rooted in one place. Thus, language has been considered to belong in a certain community within a place and to be owned by people in the community or the place. Simultaneously, this "Herderian triad" has, ironically, succeeded in detaching language from people and giving language an autonomous status without any context. So much so that language becomes a system or a science, which is guarded by the people in the linguistic community and yet can be "acquired" by anyone.

Thus, the "Herderian triad" has built up doors and drawn lines between languages, while in actuality we navigate in and out of languages. This is especially so in the transnational and global age because languages are not containable since they constantly travel via human beings and so encounter other languages or other codes of the same language. However, this triangular paradigm breeds and nurtures the orientation which normalizes and standardizes the use of a certain structure of language, presents it as the standard language, and determines what is 'right' or "wrong" to fortify the community and the place in the triad. Naturally,

1) <https://accelerationproject.org>

this orientation has become a “benchmark for language assessment and social stratification” (Canagarajah, 2013a, p. 11) and has constructed the monolingual ideology.

“Monolingualism is an ideology of many violences [sic] at the micro- and macro-levels,” state Watson and Shapiro (2018) when they call for actions to combat the harms of linguistic hierarchies and linguistic injustice. The monolingual ideology is “the project of racism” (Watson & Shapiro, 2018, para. 8). Establishing monolingualism as the standard language ideology legitimizes the only kind of English, the standardized English, and further downplays other kinds of English. Advocating for linguistic justice, Baker-Bell (2020) points out that a more subtle form of racism, valuing the standardized White English, is executed in education and excludes linguistically diverse groups whose languages are deemed as aberration. She cites Lippi-Green’s (2012) posit that “language and accent have become an acceptable excuse to publicly turn away, to refuse to recognize the other or acknowledge their rights” (as cited in Baker-Bell, 2020, p. 17). The ideology penalizes students who can’t speak nor write in the standardized English, and of course this penalization creates material consequences among race, because monolingualism eventually bestows paths to some forms of capital, such as education, on the speakers who have a command over the standardized English and deprive the speakers who have a command over a different English of that capital.

Monolingual ideology deters some students in community colleges from pursuing higher education due to their lack of exposure to the standardized English even though they hold developed literacy in their languages. Implementation of accelerating learning in community colleges, as has been demonstrated in the California Acceleration Project¹, for sure eliminates the daunting and economically burdensome ladder of remedial courses. Accelerating learning courses in community colleges especially help some students who struggle financially to pursue and expedite their education. Accelerating learning programs in community colleges also help students practice academic writing and reading instead of drilling decontextualized writing skills (Malcom, 2021). However, arguing for the need for a translin-

gual approach in writing courses at community colleges, Malcolm (2021) points out that this trend of accelerating programs could be just as detrimental as the eliminated “remedial” courses if these programs stay focused on eradication of linguistic differences that multilinguals produce as errors through teaching -- or “imposing” -- the standardized English. She also warns us that “the institutional history of these courses could contribute to a view of acceleration programs as vehicles to help students hide or eradicate language differences more efficiently” (p. 104). When accelerating learning programs have proved successful, it is time to look at if these programs are perceived as efficient vehicles to implement the monolingual ideology.

There is an argument that speakers of other Englishes and other languages should be able to switch language codes, so to speak, code-switching in certain rhetorical contexts. According to this argument, code-switching is a survival skill for the people who orient themselves in other kinds of English and other languages at every single aspect of their lives. Code-switching, a skill of shifting from one language code to another, is a big asset to survive and thrive in higher education, for sure. However, given what happened to Prof. Henry Louis Gates Jr., then director of the W.E.B. Du Bois Institute for African and African-American Research at Harvard University, the ability to do code-switching does not necessarily serve Black people justice. While Professor Gates attempted to open the door of his house since the door had been jammed while he was away, a white woman walking by called 911 for a possible burglary. He was arrested for “disorderly conduct” (Coates, 2010, para 7). Code-switching cannot dismantle this linguistic injustice, and what is worse, could not save Black people’s lives. Rather, code-switching only reinforces the linguistic hierarchy among different versions of English (Young & Martinez, 2011; Baker-Bell, 2020; Malcolm, 2021). McCluney et al. discuss the cost of code-switching and point out that people who code-switch face a professional and personal dilemma. Code-switching might make them “suppress their cultural identity” (McCluney et al., 2019, para. 23) while not code-switching might affect their careers.

Not only is monolingualism “the project of



racism”, but also as the standard language ideology and English-only policy, it suppresses other people’s ways of knowing. Bennett (2014) affirms that it is epistemicide when students are not allowed to use their languages. Epistemicide is the term coined by the Portuguese sociologist Boaventura de Sousa Santos in “Reinventing Social Emancipation”, to describe one of the pernicious effects of globalization on developing countries, that is, killing others’ ways of knowing. This effect, epistemicide, is happening within the so-called developed countries, too, by depriving students of their own languages in which they live, love, think, and cry.

Forcing a particular cultural formulation of knowledge, such as introduction, body paragraphs, topic sentences, and so on, on ELLs who are most likely to have learned other formulations of knowledge is also a form of epistemicide. My open letter to Amy Tan is a form of knowledge production, which is quite common in Japan. This is a spin-off of 書簡小説 and is similar to epistolary novels, but in my schooling in Japan, I was trained to write letters to produce knowledge. One of the reasons that I have been drawn to autobiography as a form of inquiry is that 私小説, a unique genre in Japan, is also a very familiar way for me. This genre is translated as “I-novel” in Britannica (2006), which describes it as a self-revealing novel. Autobiography as a form of inquiry is not unique to my “system,” while the particular organization of essays is foreign to that. This enforcement of the particular cultural formulation of knowledge production is not wholly ascribed to the monolingual ideology, but for sure is caused by the monocultural ideology.

Epistemicide can be also committed in another materialization of the monolingual ideology; linguistically homogeneous environments, when the classroom is isolated from the social spaces in which multilinguals and monolinguals can be in contact with one another

and influence one another. The linguistically diverse environment can be contained by monolingualism as the myth of linguistic homogeneity in the English classrooms. In 1989, Gunther Kress in “Linguistic Processes in Sociocultural Practice” already pointed out what the dominant discourse would bring to co-habitants in a community, using a metaphor of military power: an institution’s mission is to “occupy the adjacent territory,” and “as problems continue, more territory is occupied, then settled and colonized” (p. 7). The discourse of monolingualism categorizes other versions of English as “border skirmishes” and so contains and/or colonizes them. Some teachers might play the role of the border police, flushing out the unwanted ideology in the linguistic contact zone in the classroom, where killing other people’s ways of knowing is supposedly unacceptable.

There is yet another detrimental consequence; monolingualism affects and could even erase ELLs’ linguistic and cultural identities. Some ELLs need to sustain their sense of belonging to their respective cultures and primary or native languages when they feel muted and invisible in a linguistically homogeneous environment. Anzaldúa (1987) states that the language that linguistically minoritized people create is “a language which they can connect their identity to, one capable of communicating the realities and values true to themselves” (p. 35). This “their own language” represents their identity. When their Englishes are constantly gazed at and policed so that they are easy for teachers’ ears to catch, their linguistic and cultural identities are on the verge of erasure. Anzaldúa precisely and painstakingly describes this relation between language and identity, stating blatantly that “if you want to really hurt me, talk badly about my language. Ethnic identity is twin skin to linguistic identity - I am my language” (p. 39).

Can you hear her? Can you feel this?

THE GAZE AND THE EAR

Anzaldúa’s rendition of relation to language is also corporeal and visceral. We call a language “maternal.” We call a language “native” or “non-native.” Language relates to birth, mother, and blood. When one’s language is deprived, their body and mind bleed. On a more material level, as Derrida tells us, the moment I hear myself speaking, I am afraid of how it is taken on the other side. When talking about the goal as a writer in the film “The Piece I am” by Greenfield-Sanders (2019), Toni Morrison said:

I didn’t want to speak for black people. I wanted to speak to and to be among. It’s us. So, the first thing I have to do is to eliminate “white gaze.” I wanted to knock him [a little white man on the shoulder] off, and then you are free. Now you own the world. I can write about anything (12:28 - 12:58)

For me the first thing I wish I could do is to disregard the monolinguals’ ears, so that I am free and I can own the world and can speak freely.

When a language gets to others, the language travels through their bodies: their ears. However, just as eyes are filtered with experiences, belief systems, education, culture, and so forth, so are ears. As Derrida (1985) explicates in “Ear of the Other,” the ear is a labyrinth with “the edges, the inner walls, the passages” (p. 11). I think that “[T]he edges, the inner walls, the passages” allude to syntax, semantics, history, experiences, etc. In discussing autobiography in the book, Derrida states that “It is the ear of the other that signs. The ear of the other says me to me and constitutes the autos of my autobiography” (p. 51). And therefore he designates autobiography as “Otobiography.” The issue he brings up here is concerned about where the meaning resides. In Derrida’s conceptualization of autobiography, it is in the reader’s “oto,” ears.

This power that the ear of the other exerts over the written product is more contentious in education, as Derrida (1985) points out “The ear, then, is also at stake in teaching and in its new institutions” (p. 20). This is especially so in language courses since the teachers of languages are at the same time the readers of students’ production in their languages. Explaining how native-English speakers assess ELLs’ writing, Matsuda (1999) reveals how the former relies on their ears when they read and write. Quoting Tony Silva’s research, Matsuda writes that ELLs’ products “exhibit[ed] less ability to revise intuitively by ear” (p. 700). I do not think that Matsuda quotes this particular passage to draw attention to the power of “the ear of the other,” given his purpose in the article is to highlight the difference between the two disciplines, ESL and English. However, this shows native English speakers, whether or not they are ensnared into the ideology of monolingualism, read ELLs products by the ear of the monolingual.

TRANSLINGUAL ORIENTATION OR TRANSLANGUAGING

Although “Mother Tongue” (Tan, 1990) does not elucidate Tan’s mother’s fluid relation to languages, it highlights the nature of her English. Tan delineates that the mother’s English is “her internal language” (p. 3) and also a reflection of “her intent, her passion, her imagery, the rhythms of her speech, and the nature of her thoughts” (p. 4). The mother’s thoughts are at the same time constituted by her other language, Chinese. Challenging the monolingual writing instruction, McCall (2016) pinpoints the nature of ELLs’ writing by describing it as an “apple pie.” ELLs produce writing with both linguistic skills or knowledge that they are learning and their linguistic resources that they have already gained. Tan’s mother’s linguistic product in

In the brief history of the teaching of reading in K-12 in the U.S. after WWII, the approaches of reading have shifted and sometimes combined. It has started with close reading promulgated by the notorious New Criticism, and then shifted to transactional reading theorized by Rosenblatt. In addition to those two major approaches, depending on the teachers’ purposes, there are two notions of reading: reading for ideas and reading for rhetorical reading. For the past decades, Rosenblatt’s transactional reading has been embraced so much and we, teachers of writing, also encourage the students to read by relating to the text. However, interestingly, some teachers of writing read students’ products through the New Criticism lens, the premise of which is that the meaning is there in the text waiting to be found. This premise is deeply rooted in the ideology of monolingualism that “we” share the same syntax, the same semantics, etc. This assumption enables them to take a “correcting gaze” with the labyrinth of the ear. Implementation of accelerating programs and employment of culturally responsive pedagogies in community colleges have supported financially and culturally minoritized students to survive and pursue higher education. Yet, no matter how strongly the curriculum centers on or values students’ cultural wealth, the “correcting gaze” and “the labyrinth of the ear” that are grounded in this ideology of the monolingualism will not bring equity to linguistically minoritized students who are not allowed to bring in their rich linguistic wealths to the classroom. Saying GoodBye to monolingual ideology and Hello to translingual orientation is paramount to bring equity to linguistically minoritized students (Honer et al., 2011; Malcolm, 2021).

English is neither the English recognizable for native English speakers nor Chinese, but her own language.

ELLs’ language products, such as Tan’s mother’s, are products of translingual orientation (Canagarajah 2014; Pennycook, 2008) or translanguaging (Garcia & Wei, 2014). “Translingual orientation” here is different from “translingual writing.” “Translingual writing” is a pedagogical approach that invites language learners to employ their linguistic resources, including rhetorical styles (Horner et al. 2011; Canagarajah, 2013a, 2013b)². In this article, I focus on ELLs’ Englishes as a product of translingual orientation and a form of translanguaging. Garcia and Wei’s (2014)

concept of “translanguaging” helps us understand the natures of ELLs’ Englishes. Her concept of “linguaging” as a process of social interaction changes language’s ontological stability. In the same token, Canagarajah (2016), one of the prominent figures in the scholarship on translingual(ism) within applied linguistics and beyond, conceptualizes languages “as always in contact and generating new grammars and meanings out of their synergy” (p. 266). ELLs generate meanings through contact with English and meandering through English and their other dominant languages. Alastair Pennycook (2010), one of the leading sociolinguists, adds another layer to this perspective on languages. He contends that we do not use language as a “pre-given entity” (p. 2) but rather produce language in our “repeated local activities” (p. 46). Pennycook argues that we do linguaging; we do not use language as a “pre-given entity.” This concept of linguaging allows Garcia to propound “translanguaging” as “the act performed by bilinguals of accessing different linguistic features or various modes of what are described as autonomous languages” (Garcia, 2009, p 141). When language users orient themselves in multiple languages, they do “translanguaging.”

These concepts of language as always in contact and linguaging as social interaction defy the idea of literacy that has been so deeply taken for granted and naturalized, which Canagarajah (2019) calls “autonomous literacy” (p. 7) since it conceptualizes literacy as existing autonomously from time and location. The products through translanguaging of ELLs cannot and should not be decoded by the monolingual gaze and ear. We as teachers need to acquire a different literacy from this “autonomous literacy” to read translingually oriented written products (Canagarajah 2013a; Sohan 2009). As I have argued so far, and let me repeat here, it is not the ELLs who need to acquire the “dominant orientation to literacy” (Canagarajah, 2013a, p. 128) in order to orient themselves to the monolingual ideology. Canagarajah (2013a) points out that translingual literacy as opposed to “autonomous literacy” requires the willingness to “move out of self-centeredness in assuming only their norms as relevant” (p. 131) and instead to take linguistic and cultural differences as the norm. Further, Canagarajah (2013a) argues that translingual literacy involves the ability for “translingual negotiating strategies” that multilinguals employ in a certain form of

translingual writing (p. 145). It seems that these “translingual negotiating strategies” (Canagarajah, 2013b) will give us a key to acquire translingual literacy.

However, these “translingual negotiating strategies” that Canagarajah (2013b) explicate are mostly employed in the specific form of “translingual writing,” where the multilingual uses the visible linguistic and rhetorical resources available to them, as I demonstrate by starting this article with the open-letter to Amy Tan and inserting a couple of Japanese words. The translingual writing that Canagarajah (2013b) analyzes contains, for instance, Arabic letters or some emojis. However, as Matsuda (2014) and Lee (2016) warn, thus-narrowly defined “translingual writing” would end up with “linguistic tourism” (Matsuda, p. 483) and can be reduced to “a ‘consumable collage’ of linguistic plurality” (Lee, 2016, p. 10; also see Schreiber & Watson). Yes, glossdiversity (diversity of languages) is one of the ways that teachers can indicate that they value multilinguals’ linguistic wealth. Nonetheless, this mere inclusion might jeopardize the equity when we demand ELLs employ visible linguistic differences in their writing especially when they do want to learn the English, which gives them tickets to the social ladder in U.S. society. For sure, it is an inclusive gesture to have ELLs use their linguistic resources, but it is not necessarily equitable for them unless the inclusion leads to access to the capital they want. As Schreiber and Watson (2018) state, “the choice to code-mesh³ is a matter of agency” (p. 95). The translingual writing that Canagarajah promulgates should not be demanded of students, especially when that leads to loss of their agency over the language that they learn.

Thus, we teachers/readers do not need to familiarize ourselves with “translingual negotiation strategies” that Canagarajah finds in his students’ “translingual writing” with code-meshing that contains visible linguistic differences, although some of them might be useful. What we need, instead, is to look for ways in which we as teachers read and respond to ELLs’ written products generated through languages that are “always in contact” and “shamelessly hybridized” (Minh-Ha, 2010, p. 33), where English(es) used by multilinguals looks the same but are not quite the same as the English that we teachers have oriented ourselves in.

2) The open letter in this article and the Japanese alphabet I used on page 10 is an example of “translingual writing” (Horne) or “translingual practice” (Canagarajah). That is a calculated form of writing which purports to give multilinguals an agency by allowing them to employ their linguistic wealth. I do not have ample space to examine these terms such as translingual practice, translingual approach, translanguaging, etc. That said, I want to note that it is theoretically and practically irresponsible and misleading to use these terms interchangeably.

4) For a record, this positioning as “receiver” has never been passive. Rather, this position gives teachers the full-fledged power through panopticon that equips them with the “corrective lens.”

5) To call attention of those readers whose systems of hearing might not catch translingually produced writing, I needed to insert the brief intermission “Can you hear me?” which is a deliberate translingual practice in the sense that I intended to disrupt the linear seamless flow of writing that is valued in the monolingual ideology.

3) Translingual pedagogy and translingual orientation seem to be narrowly defined as “code-meshing,” which is also narrowly defined as either inclusion of nonstandard spoken language or inclusion of other languages into standardized English (Schreiber & Watson, 2018). However, although “code-meshing” can be considered part of translingual orientation, translingual orientation does not just refer to the “code-meshing,” but to meshing of other codes. For Pennycook, all languages are products of translanguaging.

“RELOCALIZED LISTENING”

In order to familiarize ourselves with/in translingually oriented texts, it is essential to undo the fixed binaries that are prevalent not just in the field of composition and rhetoric studies but also in education in the U.S. Translingual texts are produced through constant contact with other languages and other ways of using a language and therefore “generat[ing] new grammars and meanings out of their synergy” (Canagarajah, 2016, p. 266). The concept of “‘deviations’ from the standard” (Sohan, 2009, p. 270) or “error” as opposed to “correctness” has to be let go of at some points in the reader’s process of reading and in the language users’ processes of writing as well. This “let-go” logically leads to another undoing of another polarization of the teacher and the student in writing courses. When the norm is not the sameness but differences in meanings and forms, the binarized positions⁴ of teachers as “receivers” or “encoders” and students as “producers” become blurry (Sohan, 2009, p. 271). The “systems of hearing” that Royster (1996) called attention to in “When the First Voice You Hear Is Not Your Own” (as cited in Sohan, 2009, p. 274) decades ago has to be destabilized since the systems dictate our reading, writing, and thinking. As Sohan (2009) points out, “habituated ‘systems of hearing,’” or “the labyrinth of the ear” with “the edges, the inner walls, the passages” in Derrida’s words, are “designed to undercut ‘minority’ voices” (p. 274). These “systems of hearing” can be complicit in the prevalence of the monolingual ideology since the systems, devised to pick up the standardized English, can only catch what falls on their radars. So that which does not fall on the radar cannot be heard or, what’s worse, even be recognized.

It would be unimaginable to turn off the “systems of hearing” because the ears programmed for the systems are a part of the body. However, what could be imaginable is to attempt to listen to what “the labyrinth of the ear” can’t capture easily, or what makes the ears uncomfortable. Canagarajah (2013a) states that “it [translingual literacy] compels us to treat variation, unpredictability, and deviation as the norm” (p. 79). But then what would happen next? As Amy Tan describes in “Mother Tongue,” her mother’s English is not comprehensible for the staff at the hospital

or the person at the bank, both of whom did not respond to her mother’s requests. They recognized the mother’s English as “‘deviations’ from the standard” but did not know how to listen to them. As Sohan (2014) points out, while Canagarajah emphasizes the importance of treating differences as norm, which I do not contest, his theorization of translingual literacy lacks practical instructions about what to do with some features that can be easily recognized as irregularities or errors.

It is important to remind us here that linguistic features that are considered “deviations” do not necessarily derive from lack of language knowledge: Seen from translingually oriented views, deviations should not be polarized against a standard. Rather, some unconventional uses of language are manifestations of “the need of language users to relocalize established conventions in light of users’ spatiotemporal contexts” (Sohan, 2014, p. 193). Drawing heavily on Pennycook’s idea of language as a local practice, Sohan explains that “to relocalize established conventions” means to “employ[s] it [language] in context for which it has not been traditionally used” (p. 194). Language users relocalize the use of language by relocating their thoughts from its established conventions into other ways of using it and/or into another language. It is important to note that this employment of a certain usage of language is very different from the employment of a discourse that rhetorical situations determine. In the traditional idea of rhetorical ecology, the rhetorical situations dictate the ways of writing/speaking and even responding to texts. On the contrary, in order to understand texts at their hands, language users reshape their spatiotemporal contexts by relocalizing established conventions, which is also one form of translingual orientation (or translanguaging). The reshaping through relocalization, or translanguaging, takes place when their context of writing brings them to “question [their] own positionality and location in relation to” texts that they grapple with (Sohan, 2014, p. 202). This questioning could quake the linguistic grounding they stand on. This sense of being linguistically exiled could result in relocalization of language.



This sense of uprootedness from languages and this shaking positionality to texts and contexts of writing also come to me occasionally, for example, when I talk about my experiences that I had with/in Japanese languages or when I am entangled in complicated thoughts. What I think I do on those occasions is to drift through both languages, partly exiling myself from both languages. In this drifting exile, in order to make meaning from texts at hand, I “employ meshing, not just of codes, but of discourse, genre, convention, or style” (Sohan, 2014, p. 199), which is translanguaging in its broadest sense. However, this employment can be generated in two distinct ways. When I started this article with the open letter, I purposefully meshed the established convention of scholarly articles as genre with the localized convention that I was culturally and intellectually most familiar with. I relocalized established conventions. On the other hand, when I discussed my wobbly visceral relations to English and Japanese, I did not deliberately employ a meshing of any sort. However, at the same time, I was aware that I might indeliberately relocalize English, or from the monolingual perspective deviate from their standard, by relocating my thoughts on the relations to the two languages into Japanese when I grappled with this almost impossible task of describing my visceral and bodily relations to the languages only in English. Despite this awareness, I did not know for sure if and how my translingually produced text fell

on your “system of hearing.” I did not purposefully do translanguaging⁵. Deliberate translanguaging can be cued by the language users. On the other hand, indeliberate translanguaging is unnoticeable and even when recognizable, it is challenging.

What is needed to engage with this relocalization, or translanguaging, is “relocalized listening” (Sohan, 2014, p. 193). Discussing the notion of the literary imagination in the preface of her “Playing in the Darkness,” Toni Morrison (1992) wakes us that “writing and reading mean being aware of the writer’s notions of risk and safety, the serene achievement of, or sweaty fight for, meaning and response-ability” (p. xiii). When writers take a risk of leaving established convention as a safe space, either deliberately or not, readers accordingly should take a risk of re-tuning the “systems of hearing” in order to be responsible and response-able to the writer’s “sweaty fight” for meaning. As writers relocalize language, “relocalized listening” asks that teachers-readers be more attentive to not only diversity of form but also diversity of meaning within a text and of a word. When spatiotemporal contexts of writing and reading are reshaped by language users, language takes on new meanings because language is not a “pre-given entity” autonomous from time and space (Derrida, 2004; Min-ha, 2010 ; Pennycook, 2010; Canagarajah, 2019)

REVISITING, REFLECTING, AND RELOCALIZING

Keeping in my mind the idea that language users “relocalize established conventions in light of users’ spatiotemporal contexts,” I have revisited the feedback that I provided for one student’s draft. Since I started to draft this article, I mulled over whose drafts I was going to revisit to critique my feedback on them. I had three candidates from my 9-credit ELL and ENG accelerated learning community courses from the past four semesters in my mind (see Akai-Dennis, Grehan, Paul & Valdez, this issue, to learn more about the ELL-ENG learning community). All three students brought in their perspectives to the classes and applied their critical lens and angles through which they explored issues we discussed. At the same time, I recalled spending more time reading and commenting on drafts written by two of the three. I also recalled that I even felt frustrated with one of the two students’ drafts mostly because of their unique syntax. I’ve decided to revisit this student’s draft (See the appendix) and my feedback⁶ with this perspective on language users’ practices of relocalizing forms and meanings, or translanguaging.

Before I reflect on the feedback, let me explain the essay assignment (see Akai-Dennis, Grehan, Paul & Valdez, this issue, to learn more about this assignment). This assignment is an oral history project in which the students conduct an interview with a person whose experiences in terms of coming-of-age are interesting to them and then students must “place the individual’s experiences and/or perspective within a larger historical or social context” (The Writing Center UNC, 2020). This assignment is in one of the three units of a 9-credit cluster with a “coming-of-age” theme. They set up and carry out this oral history project after they read a scholarly article which discusses different aspects of coming-of-age and tell their stories about their coming-of-age experiences in Unit 1. This student was not able to conduct an interview with the person he originally planned to meet, so his classmate volunteered to be a participant of his project. This student asked his classmate about his experiences of coming-of-age in the country where he comes from.

This revisiting struck me. In my memory only in one-on-one conferences did I explain how

standardized grammar works to my students. So, I was surprised at the fact that I had commented on some grammatical errors and surprised at those comments as well. Revisiting the student’s draft, I find that there are three patterns of grammar mistakes that he made, which I am not quite sure if I was aware of at the time when I gave feedback. Neither am I sure if I consciously made different comments on them according to a pattern of those errors. One of the comments that I repeatedly made was “Delete this” without even telling him why. Students cannot be expected to learn any standardized grammatical rules⁷ unless the comment focuses on one recurrent error with explanations. I corrected another kind of grammar error, again, without any explanations. I also wrote “This does not make sense,” “Can you explain more?,” comments which I used to receive from some professors and honestly just recycled without giving so much thought about the possible effects of these comments.

The worst comment on the syntax is “This is just a series of words.” These are horrible comments to make as someone, like myself, who knows from experiences as a speaker of other languages that all the words, phrases, and sentences made sense to her. “The series of words” do not follow the set of rules that govern the structure of the standardized English but reflect the set of rules of the language(s) this student most comfortably orients himself with.

I made these comments because the student’s uses of words are cacophonous to my ears, my “systems of hearing.” And these are the three sentences from three different paragraphs that were cacophonous to my ears:

1. In my interview illustrates how education important for human being as making healthy and educated environment make person grow up and recognize his feelings, emotions, thoughts that come through approved experiences by human mind and what is benefits of boarding school.
2. Parent factor is important because before children are going deep lacking of knowledge the parents should to be friend during teen age years when teen agers just start to figure out

6) drive.google.com/file/d/1mHL7JUJLHwhAynbPLaZF8snMzRMDIzbW/view

7) That said, I do not argue that comments or feedback on grammatical errors should not be made. What I could have done better is the language.

themselves, their martial status, feelings, hesitations about bunch of matter such as most of the time judgement parents or teachers or siblings whoever involving in their life.

3. This is time that parents or professional maybe teachers or psychologist should attempt to explain for being teenagers assumed about life an then it is going be easy to avoid to charge brain onward wrong directed uncontrolled compelling thoughts such as to be lazy, to be part of gangs or to be enemy to other people.

My “system of hearing” can handle the first two thirds of each sentence but starts to have a problem with the rest of it (the underlined parts). My “system of hearing” made me stumble, going back and forth among these words. And so, I said “This is a series of words, and so doesn’t make sense.”

This language user once told me that he doesn’t know which language is his native language. He had already been translanguaging, and now does translanguaging with English quite organically. These underlined parts that my “system of hearing” couldn’t catch and I commented on as “a series of words” are an apple pie this translanguaging student baked with different apples (McCall, 2016), while I as a teacher looked for the apple that was most available to me and so tasted savory to my senses.

However, aligning these three passages side by side makes me realize that all of them refer to challenging times that the participant in the student’s oral history project shared with him as the participant’s coming-of-age experiences. This participant shared his experiences about how he brought his adolescent fight for independence, or freedom, too far, ended up in a boarding school, and appreciated the discipline the school provided him. Coming from one of the former Soviet Republics, this language user in his narrative essay vehemently talked about the meaning of freedom as one of the reasons he immigrated to the U.S. He also criticized the educational system in the country in terms of how harshly children are disciplined. The student’s reflection on his own teenage days in a very different milieu, and his cultural, familial, economic, and other background experiences might make it difficult for him to comprehend the participant’s experience that might be so foreign to him and his knowledge based on these experiences. Facing what is unfamiliar with the student, he might “question his [their] own positionality” (Sohan, 2014, p. 202) to the given topic, coming-of-age, and probably the knowledge that he gleaned from his experiences in his narrative essay.

As Sohan (2014) argues, when language users question their own positionality to texts and/or contexts, they might employ a meshing of some sort in order to understand texts and/or contexts. The readers with the monolingual mind and the system of hearing on will most likely consider the meshing “deviations from the standard.” But, these passages are a reflection of not just the shifting natures of multiple languages that this language user meandered but also this student’s shaking positionalities toward the participant’s experiences, the topic, coming-of-age, and his own experiences and thoughts on them. Although teachers/readers cannot know the nature of the students’ multiple languages, I think we could be attentive to the meshing of meanings by looking into the student’s shaking positionalities.

The language user’s ambivalent position to the presence of an authoritative figure in growing up can be seen in the phrase “recognize his feelings, emotions, thoughts that come through approved experiences by human mind.” Let me share the sentence again here:

1. In my interview illustrates how education important for human being as making healthy and educated environment make person grow up and recognize his feelings, emotions, thoughts that come through approved experiences by human mind and what is benefits of boarding school.

I, of course, understand what it is meant by “recognize his feelings,” but I stumbled upon the phrase “thoughts that come through approved experiences.” Knowing a little bit about this student’s cultural background and his experiences of totalitarianism, I wonder if he meant that there are some experiences that were “approved” and so were not approved by someone. If so, who or what does he think can legitimize or approve someone’s experiences? Another question of mine is that given his statement that “thoughts [that] come through experiences,” if he reckons experiences as a source of knowledge. What further complicates this question of mine is this adverb phrase “by human mind” that comes after “approved experiences.” This adverb phrase seems to answer the first question that I posited earlier. If this language user perceives the human mind as something universal beyond spatiotemporal contexts, then he might believe that some experiences can be sanctioned by the universalized mind of human beings. If not, as I questioned, who did he think can approve of someone else’s experiences? All those questions lead me to temporarily surmise that the writer might shuffle around his musing on some authority that might have approved or not approved of his experiences, his reshaping of the understanding of the theme, coming-of-age, and his understanding

8) Interestingly, this student continuously uses the pronoun “they,” instead of a singular pronoun to refer to the participant. It seems apparent to me that the student infuses his own experiences into the delineation of the participant’s experiences.

of the participant’s experiences and probably his experiences as well.

How do you listen to this? Is there any other way to read this? What makes you read that way?

This theme of authority in coming-of-age is recurrent in these passages. After the student discussed the importance of the role of education in coming-of-age and “thoughts that come through approved experiences by human mind,” he talked about the role of parents in sentence 2:

2. Parent factor is important because before children are going deep lacking of knowledge the parents should to be friend during teen age years when teen agers just start to figure out themselves, their martial status, feelings, hesitations about bunch of matter such as most of the time judgement parents or teachers or siblings whoever involving in their life.

What was cacophonous to me in this sentence was the phrase “hesitations about bunch of matter such as most of the time judgments.” However, this language user’s other diction such as “approve,” “recognize,” or “fastening chain” make me speculate that these “hesitations about judgments” address the feeling that teenagers can’t respect judgement from parents, teachers, or siblings. Or an alternative interpretation could be that the word “hesitation” might possibly refer to his participant’s⁸ rebellious actions or thinking, providing that the student also talked about the participant’s coming-of-age, which was rough in terms of ways to develop independence. For sure, hesitation is different from rebellion. However, I do understand, as someone who acquired this language, that this word “hesitation” could be registered as “rebellion” for the language user, because definitions of words are almost always shifted slightly when they are registered by translation. Here, the readers could have a moment of semiodiversity, since this word “hesitation” takes on new meanings. On the other hand, the writer argues that parents should be friends with their teenage children a little earlier. In this sentence, his two views of parents bump up against each other: parents as friends and parents as authority. As “hesitations” about judgements from parents could hold two meanings, so parents could hold ambivalent meanings for him.

How do you listen to this? Is there any other way to read this? What makes you read that way?

Sentence 2 also brings me back to the phrase “approved experiences by human mind” in sentence 1. Sentence 2 almost makes me settle on an interpretation of sentence 1 that the student had developed his thinking from his experiences, but his parents, teachers, or siblings did not approve of the thinking or the experiences.

Although sentence 3 that comes right after sentence 2 was the most cacophonous to my ears, the traffic of meanings that this language user attempted to make in sentences 1 and 2 helps me re-tune my “systems of hearing.” Let me share sentence 3 again here:

3. This is time that parents or professional maybe teachers or psychologist should attempt to explain for being teenagers assumed about life an then it is going be easy to avoid to charge brain onward wrong directed uncontrolled compelling thoughts such as to be lazy, to be part of gangs or to be enemy to other people.

In particular, the underlined part did not fall in the radar of my systems of hearing in terms of semantic nexus among words such as “wrong directed uncontrolled compelling thoughts.” However, this student’s equivocal positions about authoritative figures that I discern in sentences 1 and 2 prompt me to find connections among this series of words. The connection that I’ve found is that some attitudes and behaviors of youngsters such as being lazy or getting involved with gangs are improperly directed and uncontrolled but can be compelling for some of them. In turn, this possible connection could make clearer the student’s position toward parents or authority. If the student thinks, as I interpret, that those behaviors are improperly directed, it makes sense that he argues that parents or teachers need to direct youngsters and be friends. It seems that in sentence 3 this language user landed on a conclusion about parents as authority and youngsters’ rebellious behaviors.

This student’s narrative essay about his coming-of-age effectuates this relocalized listening. Now studying at BHCC and living in the U.S., where freedom is supposedly available to everyone, he was revisiting and trying to make sense of the idea of freedom in the narrative

essay. It seems to me that in this oral history project, he revisited the idea of freedom and discipline from this participant's perspective about disciplining as opposed to freedom. It seems to me that this language user needed to relocalize some language forms in the process of making the meaning of his experiences of gaining freedom juxtaposed with the participant's. The phrases that I simply described as "a series of words" parade his "sweaty fight for, meaning and response-ability" (Morrison, p. xiii) through relocalization of language and its concurrent diversification of meanings so that he could understand his participant's experiences and also reshape his positions about those and other concurrent themes such as freedom and discipline.

How do you listen to this? Is there any other way to read this? What makes you read that way?

My experiments of "relocalized listening" to the draft is never an ending, much less an exemplary feedback that "works," but rather a starting point of reading, responding to, and reenvisioning it. I also want to add that this relocalized listening to the student's use of language(s) is my apple pie, a product of making sense and meaning of this student's texts (Schwartz, 2020). My spatiotemporal context also might influ-

IN CLOSING

I end this article with the same spirit that I started this article with the open letter to Amy Tan, keenly aware that this move is already trapped in the dominant rhetorical form of the academic essay in which the conclusion is supposed to be tied back to the beginning. I do not conclude this article in the way the dominant discourse about an academic essay expects one to do, such as summarizing all points made and restating the thesis, etc. I do not follow this protocol because this is one way to demonstrate my resistance against being totally absorbed into the linguistic ideology of monolingualism especially when I attempt to dismantle the myth of monolingualism. I wish to close this article to open up a space where "misunderstandings, unfamiliarity, and unpredictability are the norm" (Sohan, 2014, p. 204).

Do I "buy" this "relocalized listening"?

Yes and no. Depending on how this listening is presented for students, this "strategy" could deprive them of agency over their written products. Sohan (2014) deems this relocalized listening as "dialogic pedag-

ogy," from which I have a critical distance. The idea of "relocalized listening" itself is not a pedagogy. And it should not be. It is a way to read and respond to translingually produced texts. It will become pedagogy when we think about how what we produce from the listening could possibly promote students' reflection and reenvisioning of their products. However, I feel the notion of "dialogic pedagogy" is important to explore especially when it comes down to translingually produced texts because "dialogic" reminds us of Bakhtin's other notions of polyphony and heteroglossia.

I'd start to explore what is unfamiliar or cacophonous to me in translingually produced texts by finding the meshing of meanings and multiple meanings of one word or phrase in them. I would bring to the language users my apple pie that I produce from their apple pies, not as feedback as a decoder. Sohan (2014) contends that we ask "which of these potential interpretations they are invested in" (p. 202). But this question will not allow the students to have agency over their products. Rather, I would share my readings as ways to open a discussion with the students.

Speaking of "pedagogy," the discussion of translingual orientation and translanguaging in this article is about translingually produced texts, but not about translanguaging pedagogy, and much less translanguaging -- I don't subscribe myself to any "ism" so much. "Ism" is so confining, except for feminisms. Anyways, as Schreiber and Watson (2018) point out, translingual pedagogy is not fully developed. I want to make it clear that this article is not about translingual pedagogy

Did I speak for ELLs?

I have been trained as a qualitative researcher to believe that we do not speak for anyone. But that is just bogus. I think some researchers especially in the humanities think about and write for a certain group of people. What has to be done about this is to recognize that and state where we/they speak from as a researcher/writer and as a person as well in order to avoid generalizing certain groups of people. So I think I spoke for ELLs in this article, knowing that my relations to languages do not apply to all ELLs. But simultaneously, I aspired to attain Morrison's position about her goal of writing that "I didn't want to speak for black people. I wanted to speak to and to be among. It's us (Greenfield-Sanders, 2019)." I am not quite sure what she meant by "us." But I think this article is also "us" - all the language users in this context. However, I don't think I spoke to ELLs. I feel that there is still a mile to go in order for me to "speak to." Well, I might have spoken to them in this piece of writing. Did I?

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I thank Professor Alison Ruch for reading my drafts and giving eye-opening responses as a partner/editor by "re-localized listening" :) I give a shout-out to Professor Jeff Ellenbird for helping me to grapple with the dilemma between keeping the nature of translingual writing in this article and keeping consistency with writing conventions across other articles in this edition. I thank my colleagues/friends, Professor Deborah Schwartz and Professor Tua Nefer, for conversations and discussions about curriculum, pedagogy, etc. in the midst of the pandemic, which nourished this article. I also thank my son, Lloyd-Sho Akai-Dennis, for putting up with my crabbiness while I write: you know my love-hate relationship with writing in English very well.

Do I advocate dismantling the monolingual ideology?

Hell Yes! If I were given a chance to read this article somewhere, I would definitely choose the section about "relation to language." I want you to "hear" the section.

What would I suggest to my cohorts who teach composition courses (not to ELLs) in terms of dismantling the monolingual ideology?

One way I would boldly suggest is to reimagine the role of teachers of composition. Language is not a pre-given entity and so constantly changing. How could something constantly changing possibly be taught? Students already have their "own" language through which they make sense of the world around them. What entitles us to deprive them of that? We do not teach language: we teach composition (Nefer 2020).



REFERENCES

- Akai, N. (2008, March 24-28). On the shore. *Interrogating colonized spaces and postcolonial identities: transnationalism(s), representation(s), and be(long)ing* [Conference presentation]. AERA 2008 Convention, New York, NY, United States.
- Akai-Dennis, N. (2021). Language, home, and transnational space. In W. Ordeman (Ed.), *Creating a transnational space: In the first-year writing classroom* (pp. 41-62). Vernon Press.
- Anzaldúa, G. E. (1987). *Borderlands/La frontera: The new mestiza*. Aunt Lute Foundation Books.
- Baker-Bell, A. (2020). *Linguistic justice: Black language, literacy, identity, and pedagogy*. Routledge.
- Bennett, K. (2007). Epistemicide! The tale of a predatory discourse. *Translator*, 13(2), 151-169. DOI: 10.1080/13556509.2007.10799236
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The posthuman*. Polity.
- Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia (2006, October 13). I novel. Encyclopædia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/art/I-novel>
- Butler, J. (2005). *Giving an account of oneself*. Fordham University Press.
- Canagarajah, S. (2013a). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.
- Canagarajah, S. (2013b). Negotiating translingual literacy: An enactment. *Research in The Teaching of English*, 48(1), 40-67. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24398646>
- Canagarajah, S. (2014). ESL composition as a literate art of the contact zone. In D. Teague & R. Lunsford (Eds.), *First-Year composition: From theory to practice* (pp. 27-48). Parlor Press.
- Canagarajah, S. (2016). Translingual writing and teacher development in composition. *College English*, 78(3), 265-273. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44075117>
- Canagarajah, S. (2019). Weaving the text: Changing literacy practices and orientations. *College English*, 82(1), 7-28.
- Coates, T. (2010, August 12). The arrest of Henry Gates jr. *The Atlantic*. <https://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2010/08/the-arrest-of-henry-louis-gates/61365/>
- Conference on College Composition and Communication (1974). Students' rights to their own language. Retrieved from <https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/srtolsummary>
- Derrida, J. (1985). *The ear of the other* (C. McDonald, Trans.) University of Nebraska Press,
- Derrida, J. (1998). *Monolingualism of the other or the prosthesis of origin* (P. Mensah, Trans.) Stanford University Press.
- Denzin, N. (2009). The elephant in the living room : Or extending the conversation about the politics of evidence. *Qualitative Research*, 9 (2), 139-160.
- Flick, U. (2019). The concepts of qualitative data: Challenges in neoliberal times for qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 25(8), 713-720.
- Garcia, O. & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. K. Mohanty & M. Panda (Eds.), *Social justice through multilingual education* (pp. 140–158). <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691910-011>
- Greenfield-Sanders, T. (Director). (2019). *Toni Morrison: The pieces I am* [Film]. Perfect Day Films.
- Grumet, M. (1980). Autobiography and reconceptualization. *JCT: Journal Of Curriculum Theorizing*, 2 (2), 155-158.
- Kress, G. (1989). *Linguistic processes in sociocultural practice*. Oxford University Press.
- Horner, B., Lu, M., Royster, J. & Trimbur, J. (2011a). Language difference in writing; toward a translingual approach. *Faculty Scholarship*, 67, 303-321. ir.library.louisville.edu/faculty/67
- Horner, B., NeCamp, S., & Donahue, C. (2011b). Toward a multilingual composition scholarship: From English only to a translingual norm. *College Composition and Communication*, 63(2), 269-300. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23131585>
- Inoue, A. (2019, March 14). *How do we language so people stop killing each other, or what do we do about White language supremacy?* [Chair's address]. CCCC 2019 Annual Convention, Pittsburg, PA, United States. Retrieved from https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1C2gGz2SEzt8fcb1WdsGPjWkQ98AC-80nTY-zeSX-5UPg/edit#slide=id.g3fd0a840bc_0_179
- Jhumpa, L. (2016). *In other words*. Translated from the Italian by Ann Goldstein. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Lather, P. (2004). Scientific research in education: a critical perspective. *British Educational Research Journal*, 30 (6), 759-772. DOI: 10.1080/0141192042000279486
- Lee, J. (2016). Beyond translingual writing. *College English*, 79 (2), 174-195.
- Leonard, R. L. & Nowacek, R. (2016). Transfer and translingualism. *College English*, 78 (3), 258-264
- Lincoln, Y. (2018). A dangerous accountability. In M. Spooner & J. McNinch (Eds.), *Dissident knowledge in higher education* (pp. 3-20). University of Regina Press.
- Malcom, K. (2021). Disrupting monolingual ideologies in a community college: A translingual studio approach. In B. Horner & L. Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing divides: Exploring translingual writing pedagogies and progress* (pp. 101-118). University Press of Colorado & Utah State University Press. DOI: 10.7330/9781607326205.c006
- Matsuda, P. K. (1999). Composition studies and ESL writing: A disciplinary division of labor. *College Composition and Communication*, 50 (4), 699-721. doi:10.2307/358488
- Matsuda, P. (2014). The lure of translingual writing. *PMLA/Publications Of The Modern Language Association Of America*, 129(3), 478-483. doi:10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.478
- McCall, M. (2016). Bridging the divide: Integrating composition and second language writing approach to transfer. *Double Helix*, 4, 1-14.
- McCluney, C.L., Robotham, K., Lee, S., Smith, R. Durkee, M. (2019). The cost of code-switching. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2019/11/the-costs-of-codeswitching>
- Miller, J. L. (2004). *Sounds of silence breaking: Women, autobiography, curriculum*. Peter Lang.
- Min-ha, T. T. (2010). *Elsewhere, within here: immigration, refugeeism and the boundary event*. Routledge.



- Morrison, T. (1992). *Playing in the dark: Whiteness and the literary imagination*. Picador.
- Nefer, T. (2020). Personal Communication.
- Pennycook, A. (2008). Translingual English. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31(3), 30.1-30.9.
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (2012). What might translingual education look like? *Babel*, 47 (1). Retrieved 8 Mar. 2020 from https://login.ezproxy.neu.edu/login?url=https://link.gale.com%2fapps%2fdoc%2fA308598678%2fA-ONE%3fu%3dmlin_b_northeast%26sid%3dAONE%26xid%3d54c90d22
- Pinar, W. (1994). *Autobiography, politics, and sexuality: Essays in curriculum theory 1972-1992*.
- Schreiber, B.R. & Watson, M. (2018). Translingualism ≠ code-meshing: A response to Gevers' "Translingualism revisited" *Journal of second language writing*, 42, 94-97. doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.10.007
- Schwartz, D. (2020). Personal Communication.
- Sohan, V. K. (2009). Working English(es) as rhetoric(s) of disruption. *JAC*, 29 (½), 270-27.
- Sohan, V. K. (2014). Relocalized listening: Responding to all students texts from a translingual starting point. In B. Honer and Kopelson, K. (Eds.), *Reworking English in rhetoric & composition: global interrogations, local interventions* (pp. 191-206). South Illinois University Press.
- Tan, A. (1990). Mother tongue. *The threepenny review*, 43, 7-8. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4383908>
- The Writing Center University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. (2020 February). Oral history. <https://writingcenter.unc.edu/tips-and-tools/oral-history/>
- Watson, M. & Shapiro, R. (2018). Clarifying the multiple dimensions of monolingualism: keeping our sights on language politics. *Composition Forum*, 38. <http://www.compositionforum.com/issue/38/monolingualism.php>
- Young, V.A. & Martinez, A. J. (2011). *Code-meshing as world English: Pedagogy, policy, performance*. NCTE.
- Young, V. A. (2014). Introduction: Are you a part of the conversation?" In V.A. Young., R. Barrette., Y. Young-Rivera., & K.B. Lovejoy (Eds.), *Other people's English: Code-meshing, code-switching, an African American literacy* (pp. 1-14). Teachers College Press.

APPENDIX A STUDENT DRAFT

Professor Naoko Akai Dennis
XYZ
Essay 2, draft 1

“Education is most powerful weapon that easily can use to change the world”.(Nelson Mandela). Most of our life spend in school or other educational places but important thing is how much human getting support to be shipped person by professionals who already done for students life. It is important having educational and psychological support on early age before jump to independent life which is school is best place for that. In my interview illustrates how education important for human being as making healthy and educated environment make person grow up and recognize his feelings, emotions, thoughts that come through approved experiences by human mind and what is benefits of boarding school .

Having Education is the way that make human to be avoid uneducated which means at least someone can read and write, and actually education give always steps should everybody follow them otherwise fastening chain can easily spoil . But while during teen old students having education there is also second important support that rely on support by professionals because then adolescences can easily focus on their life avoid stuck in age of hesitation. During my interview I have got records that my interviewer demonstrate “ while I was in high school I had have got dirty mind without recognizing to much and just got into relationships with gangs activities with to being part of local crimes that was affecting my life unexpected way through going often police office”.(interviewer). It is about time when he was teenager and could not recognize himself unless did not get support by his parents. Parent factor is important because before children are going deep lacking of knowledge the parents should to be friend during teen age years when teen agers just start to figure out themselves, their martial status, feelings, hesitations about bunch of matter such as most of the time judgement parents or teachers or siblings whoever involving in their life . This is time that parents or professional maybe teachers or psychologist should attempt to explain for being teenagers assumed about life an then it is going be easy to avoid to charge brain onward wrong directed uncontrolled compelling thoughts such as to be lazy, to be part of gangs or to be enemy to other people. Education and professional help is most important weapons for teenagers on early age to be successful who focused on his responsibilities such as education or daily life.



For being successful person in the future there is also another important tools that people who is on the way of being adolescences should follow these helpful steps. One of these is boarding school that is like military school which make person to be aware of himself , and focus on his mistakes that affect his time now and future. Boarding school is for adolescences who cannot be teaching by parents or has really heavy problems that affecting such as feel offending to control life which designate their thoughts by dirty minded backgrounds or friends poison them . This being un able control take offense come through the non disciplined life rely on self focus . It was suggest by my interviewer that was described “ My mother was tired by my mistakes what was running me always to police center , then she decide to send me boarding school as thinking it is going to be helpful to me and her, so I would like to say it was really helpful to attend in boarding school what made me person aware of himself after through the long term such as disciplined and self focused about my education and life that now I am in the company in my internship program and also I have focused on my college education for associated degree.”(interviewer). Some people who had have heavy problems back in his adolescences or teenager years that made them stay on one step behind of people who was on the same age here include maybe psychological problems or not enough support by patents changes and affects their life easily but help or intervention can easily change this situation.

Education is important for normal human being as long as someone can focus on his life otherwise it is not easy to support or help to people who already is on 30 years . Educational environment affects adolescences or teenagers life onward being successful person for futuristic plans. Emerging adulthood based on normal education and having life skills. These life skills are to live in disciplined, to help first him or herself with learning what make person helpful for others and to live normal educated life.