

3

Multilingual Writing Teacher Identities and Institutional Ecologies: A Collaborative Narrative Inquiry

Su Yin Khor
COLLEGE OF THE ATLANTIC

Cristina Sánchez-Martín
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, SEATTLE

Lisya Seloni
ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

Md Mijanur Rahman
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES

Demet Yigitbilek
ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

With an increasing presence of linguistically and culturally diverse students and teachers in U.S. institutions of higher education, writing programs are transforming into transnational spaces. As a result, first-year writing (FYW) programs and pedagogies are being adapted to reflect the changing demographics by, for example, instilling in students the awareness of how writing is accomplished differently across communities and helping them recognize the diversity and legitimacy of non-mainstream languages and varieties. In response to these demographic changes, scholars in writing call for a “deep intercultural awareness” (Donahue, 2009, p. 236) and cross-linguistic experience within writing programs (Martins, 2015). Despite the growing number of multilingual instructors in all college courses (Kitalong, 2017) and the emergence of translanguaging as a decolonial approach to language difference (Horner et al., 2011), there is still a great need to understand the experiences of this population, as the teachers’ backgrounds, identities and life histories are not always considered an asset to the institutions (Zheng, 2017).

Indeed, the struggle to prove oneself as a legitimate English language teacher is well-documented in the nonnative English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) literature. A large body of work contests the native speaker fallacy in educational contexts and extensively discusses the difficulties that NNESTs face in college classrooms (Aneja, 2016; Kamhi-Stein, 2004; Park, 2017). For instance, the literature sheds light on the racial prejudices towards minoritized teachers (Rubin, 1992; Kubota et al., 2021) and job advertisements that regard native English-speaking teachers as the best candidates (Selvi, 2010; Ramjattan, 2015). Recently, more attention has been given to resources and assets that NNESTs bring into university contexts and the importance of institutional support, shifting from a deficit orientation (e.g., see the 2012 special issue of the *Journal of Excellence in College Teaching*). Although these studies contribute to our understanding of the overall NNESTs' experiences in the US, this topic remains underexplored and it was not until recently that their experiences in FYW classrooms have been investigated (e.g., Ruecker et al., 2018; Sánchez-Martín, 2018; Zheng, 2017).

This chapter contributes to the understanding of the role that transnational writing instructors play on college campuses, especially in writing programs. As we demonstrate, these instructors can have a critical role in helping student writers “practice a disposition of openness and inquiry . . . towards language and language difference” (Horner et al., 2011, p. 311) and invite students to develop attentiveness to language issues. With this in mind, we conducted a collaborative narrative inquiry of our stories as five multilingual instructors, primarily sharing our experiences as graduate teaching assistants (Su Yin, Cristina, Mijan, and Demet) teaching FYW at Illinois State University's (ISU) Writing Program and a faculty member (Lisya) who served as a graduate mentor during that time when this chapter came to fruition. Our goal with this chapter is to explore how transnational teachers of English can become instrumental in fostering a multi/translingual disposition among students and supporting their participation with linguistically diverse populations in global communities. We do this by sharing snapshots of our teaching experiences from our autobiographical narratives and classroom materials, particularly exploring how our identities inform our pedagogy, and discuss the role and importance of programmatic infrastructure in creating translingual spaces that meet the needs of all university students in the US. This is accomplished by drawing on an identities-as-pedagogy framework (Motha, Jain, & Teclé, 2012) to highlight multilingual instructors' identities as resources rather than deficiencies and how teaching writing deeply involves identity work, influenced by institutional ecologies and practices.

Identity-as-Pedagogy and Institutional Ecology

Pedagogical practices of NNESTs are highly embodied in their identities, as they bring their language experience to the classrooms. While some of these complex identities are situation-specific, conflicting, and learned over time, some are tacitly informed by life histories. In this context, many have argued that multilingual instructors strategically tap into their cultural resources and use their identities as pedagogical resources (e.g., de Oliveira & Lan, 2012; Morgan, 2004; Motha, Jain, & Teclé, 2012; Reis, 2012; Seloni, 2012). Viewing teacher identity as “potential pedagogical resources in the classroom,” Motha, Jain, and Teclé (2012) use the term “translinguistic identities” to argue for the embodied nature of teaching where language identities play important roles in understanding issues such as privilege, marginalization, and the political role of English in communities (p. 15). They explore their own teaching experiences, using anecdotes to illustrate the complex interplay between racial and linguistic identities embedded in their teaching practices.

Emphasizing the plurality of identities, Alvarez et al. (2017) discussed how transnational instructors’ diverse language resources index hybrid ethnicities and caution us to see ethnicity as a ludic identity marker in classroom interactions. They reject viewing identity and ethnicity as predefined constructs, and instead, urge us to recognize their complexities in order to resist perpetuating everyday discourses of language and identity homogenization. Performing one’s identity in the classroom is not always optional as the response can be undesired. Therefore, it is paramount to remember that “ethnicity is a complex semiotic achievement” (Alvarez et al., 2017, p. 44) where interlocutors are involved in co-constructing identities.

If the identity-as-pedagogy is one side of the coin of the embeddedness of teaching, the other side would be the institutional ecologies and spaces where these discourses take place. Other scholars (e.g., De Costa & Norton, 2017; Morgan, 2004) have emphasized the embeddedness of identity negotiations within specific sociocultural and institutional contexts, stating that identities “are seen as ‘constituted’ *within* institutional discourses” (Morgan, 2004, p. 178). In this sense, the notion of ecology, as discussed in writing program scholarship, allows us to understand how our identities are constructed in relation to the environments we inhabit and how our identities shape these environments in a bidirectional movement. For example, Sánchez-Martín and Walker (2021) explained this scenario with reference to their own writing program:

The philosophies and practices of the program created a space where these teachers could productively make practical and

everyday use of these complex identities, with an awareness that the program not only valued their work, in theory, but considered this complex and evolving work to understand their literate practice as fundamental to the core work of the program, to their work as teachers, and as part of the significant contribution they were making to the evolution of the program and its practices. (p. 187)

Moreover, an ecological perspective on writing has often focused on the individual writers, but it becomes important to highlight the writing programs themselves as ecologies that are characterized by “interconnectedness, fluctuation, complexity, and emergence” (Reiff et al., 2015, p. 5). For our chapter, we find the first two of these characteristics especially relevant to our context, as interconnection represents the program’s relationships and networks with multiple stakeholders and entities (e.g., our department, the writing program, and the TESOL/applied linguistics graduate program), and fluctuation as it points to ongoing transformation due to a variety of factors coming from both within and outside (e.g., new cohort of faculty, new students, and leadership changes). Along these lines, we acknowledge that our teaching of writing takes place in relation to these ecological contexts. The institutional ecologies could challenge, shift, and help re-envision teacher identities and provide spaces for teachers to reflectively and intentionally act on their identities. In more current orientations to language, identity, and interactions, spatiality is increasingly considered, highlighting the discursive-material ecologies in the agency of humans (e.g., Canagarajah, 2018). This move urges us to reexamine our interactions based on the “spatial repertoires,” defined as “link[ing] the repertoires formed through individual life trajectories to the particular places in which these linguistic resources are deployed” (Pennycook & Otsuji, 2015, p. 83). While some alternative spaces would be tolerant to the diverse language backgrounds and instructional practices used by transnational instructors, the same practices may not be admissible in spaces that are perceived to be more hegemonic.

As will be explained in the findings section, institutional ecologies are crucial to the types of pedagogies we were able to develop. Specifically, we discuss the importance of turning inclusive beliefs and ideas into concrete actionable steps and practices to create a constructive space for multilingual writing instructors and their writing students.

As illustrated in our collaborative narrative inquiry in this chapter, we embrace the idea that “language teaching is identity work” (De Costa & Norton, 2017, p. 8) and find significant implications of the embeddedness of our

NNESTs' identities for our writing classrooms, which are central to the explorations of our own ever-changing narratives. With this in mind, this chapter is guided by the following questions: (i) How do we, as NNESTs, create spaces for our multilingual identities within writing programs? and (ii) What can writing programs do to enable us to bring our evolving, contested, and fluid identities into the classroom as pedagogical resources?

Methodology

In order to answer our research questions, we apply a sociocultural and praxis-oriented framework (e.g., Lantolf, 2012) to illustrate the bidirectional relationship between theory and practice, from an understanding that our lived experiences are linked to our teaching and vice versa. To examine our experiences as multilingual writing teachers, we employed a collaborative narrative inquiry. Narratives are not simply stories and reflections, but they are “social and relational and gain their meaning from our collective social histories” and can't be “separated from their sociocultural and sociohistorical contexts from which they emerged” (Johnson & Golombek, 2002, p. 4). By jointly examining our narratives, we capture and describe our lived experiences, allowing us to “look *inward, outward, backward, and forward*” (Johnson & Golombek, 2002, p. 3). By examining our experiences through written narratives, we could collectively relate to and understand them through relevant scholarship on teacher identities.

We conducted recursive analyses of our individually written autobiographical narratives that were written in the fall of 2018 in response to the group-created prompt “Who am I in the classroom?” to reflect the focus of this edited collection and our research questions. In each narrative, we discussed what it means for us to be transnational writing teachers in U.S. higher education and how we reconcile and embrace our identities and language backgrounds. We supplemented our narratives with a variety of teaching materials, such as teaching philosophy statements, pedagogical articles we produced, our course plans that include our first-day syllabi, major assignments and handouts for in-class activities. These data allow us to examine our experiences as writing instructors at a predominantly white institution in the Midwest, drawing attention to the act of making our identities visible in pedagogically productive ways.

For our analysis, we utilized an inductive approach (Hatch, 2002), identifying patterns and relationships in the data by focusing on identity related phrases, words, and stories. For instance, expressions that were central to our narratives were native and nonnative, first language, identity, and multilingual.

Common stories concerned fears about being underprepared writing teachers because composition was new to us and our students' potentially disempowering perceptions of us. Each contributor read the other narratives, but was assigned one contributor's narrative, syllabi, and other materials to identify themes that emerge across these documents. We then met and discussed our preliminary themes and findings, identified commonalities and differences, and paid attention to how they related to teacher identity enactment within the ISU Writing Program and in the department in general. In the following section, we present findings from our analysis.

Findings

While multiple themes emerged from the exploration of our autobiographical narratives, we focus on two themes that answer the research questions we posed and are central to using our NNESTs identities as a resource: the first theme, identity-as-pedagogy and its interconnectedness with the second theme, the role of ecology.

Theme 1: Identity-as-Pedagogy

In this section, we share the findings for our first question: How do we, as NNESTs, create spaces for our multilingual identities within programs? As we illustrate below, our multilingual teacher identities translated into pedagogically productive ways after we participated in various professional development activities, completed coursework and other academic interactions. While we are currently at different stages of our academic careers in the US, we draw on our experiences during our time at ISU, our academic home, even though some of us have graduated and taken up positions at other institutions. Both in our current locations and at ISU, we frequently find ourselves not only teaching and developing writing courses in the FYW curriculum and intensive English programs, but also preparing fellow instructors to do the same. As multilingual instructors, we find the characterization of our multilingual selves as nonnatives to be reductive as our writing instructor identities intersect with other aspects of who we are and lived experiences. During different phases of our academic journeys, we all fought against the native speaker ideology that insisted that the ideal teacher is a native speaker. This native speaker fallacy not only impacts the egalitarian nature of interactions in our teaching spaces, it also reinforces asymmetrical power relationships.

For instance, Cristina acknowledges her conflicting identities across the privilege-marginalization spectrum in academia (Park, 2017). In the context

of her previous institution (rural U.S. Northeast), she was perceived and constructed as a Latina due to her accent, but she recognizes her white-skin privilege and origin (from Spain rather than Latin America, where European coloniality is particularly present). On the other hand, Demet always tries to be open about her identity as a Turkish woman who studied in an English-medium university and moved on to teach English first in Spain and then in Turkey. She has taught English mainly for academic purposes at colleges, working with many students with varying backgrounds and continues to do so in the US now with a different positionality. Mijan initially identified himself only as a nonnative Bangladeshi academic, who, after seven years of teaching English at a university in his home country, moved to the US to pursue a doctoral degree but now calls himself as a transnational educator of writing. For Su Yin, she is considered “a woman of Chinese descent” by default, but it is an observation that often fails to recognize that she was born and raised in Sweden to Chinese Malaysian parents, and that her subjectivity is multiple as she says: “I am a woman. I am an immigrant. I am a daughter. I have been minoritized. I have been racialized. I am an educator. I am a lifelong learner. I am a scholar. And I am also an activist and I want my work to reflect everything that I am, but also, reflect who my students are.” Similarly, Lisya, who has been working with prospective teachers for many years as a faculty member, addresses linguistic diversity, language ideologies, and socio-cultural and political influences on English language learning and teaching in her courses. As an ethnic minority (Turkish woman from a Jewish upbringing) both in her home country and in her adopted country (Turkish-American), she often discusses in her courses how her linguistic, ethnic and cultural practices are contextual and how they play out differently across different communities and geographical locations. She does this by bringing up stories and narratives both from the mainstream Turkish culture she sees herself affiliated with and from her minoritized language and community, Judeo-Spanish. In our chapter, we recognize that our identities are multiple and dynamic, and that they are shaped by sociocultural, historical, political, personal, and professional lives we live and discourses we navigate across (De Costa & Norton, 2017). We also want to underscore and acknowledge the emotional and professional labor required to translate our identities into pedagogical resources and that our chapter provides a glimpse into our journeys rather than a completed process.

Negotiating Inherited NNEST Identities and Discourses

Early on, our NNEST identity presented itself more as a constraint than a resource in our pedagogical enterprise. Most of us started teaching compo-

sition in the US, bringing, for instance, internalized discourses of English monolingualism, standard language ideology, and the notion that native speaking teachers are inherently better. This developed a sense of insecurity and concern for student resistance. Consequently, the FYW classroom and other content area courses loomed large as intimidating spaces where the legitimacy of our language and pedagogical expertise is contested and questioned. As Su Yin reflects,

Before my first day of teaching, I was worried about what my students would think of me. Would my “Asianness” and label as a “non-native” speaker become the big racialized elephant in the room? Would this perception of me as a foreigner negatively affect my teaching? Would they perceive some sort of “Asian” accent and complain about my language proficiency, and by extension, teaching skills?

Demet experienced a similar insecurity as she “was terrified before [her] first class” and contemplated some troubling questions: “What if they do not take me seriously because of my international identity? What if I cannot establish my writing instructor identity in the way that I usually do with my previous students in Turkey?” Mijan also reports a similar disposition, subordinating himself by internalizing the discourse of his accented English as “the native and non-native dichotomy left an indelible print on [his] English teacher psyche.” As a result, “the responsibility of teaching writing to the native English-speaking students appeared a very daunting and intimidating task” (Mijan). In the end, in Su Yin’s terms, “[We were] not brave enough to bring up social issues that intersected with language and writing” despite “[our] own burning desire to address linguistic inequalities” in composition classrooms as in some ways “[we] found [ourselves] perpetuating the Anglo-monolingual ideology in [our] classroom[s].”

NNEST Identity Transformation

As we took graduate courses in contemporary approaches to teaching composition, cross-cultural issues in TESOL, and language ideologies, our practices and perspectives began to transform. Emboldened by the scholarship on the plurality of English, the problematization of standard language ideology, and translanguaging, we progressively claimed ownership of our NNEST identity, accepting teaching as identity work. We navigated our ways through the initially-intimidating spaces, acknowledged the value of alternative rhetorical practices, and revised our course plans to reflect these developments.

As Demet explains in her narrative regarding the graduate courses she took,

the intense readings on translingualism, language variations, and identity issues in TESOL had added to my confidence immensely and I revisited my course plan to solidify the concepts I wanted to emphasize more and prepared assignments to address variety and diversity issues in linguistic resources we bring to the classroom both as teachers and students.

Mijan reflects on his experience after reading Henry Widdowson's (1994) article on the ownership of English that problematized the native-nonnative dichotomy, leading him "to feel better in academia." The graduate courses on "language ideology and sociolinguistics further clarified the issues of linguistic diversity, dialects, and accents, [prompting] [him] to take control of [his] writing classroom space." Moreover, as Mijan puts it, "the idea that academic literacy skills are not given to native users of a language and take a lot of time to master also helped [him] overcome [his] doubts about whether [he] could teach writing to the so-called native speakers of English." For Su Yin, she observes that completing coursework in TESOL and engaging in conversations with peers and professors built her confidence to incorporate lessons and units addressing language issues. Lisya, too, remembers that this was the case for her when she was a doctoral student. The courses taught by her mentor, Dr. Shelly Wong, were eye-opening: "Once you learn about the politics of language learning and teaching, you can never unlearn these issues, and you begin to see the field from a critical lens" she says, reflecting back her first exposure to critical applied linguistics during her doctoral program at the Ohio State University. These transformations, we think, are key moments for us as emerging scholars like we once were and still are. It is important to emphasize that while these transformations occurred in different times of our academic growth, the application of this transformation in new contexts is a more complex issue and involves multiple detours. For instance, after moving to new teaching contexts at different institutions, Cristina and Su Yin were, yet again, hesitant to draw on their transnational identities as writing teachers, concerned about how it would be received. These experiences demonstrate that this journey is recursive in nature with no fixed destination.

NNEST Identity Affordances

Our growth as writing instructors and new-found confidence are reflected in our attempts to raise our students' awareness about diverse linguistic practices and support their critical engagement with writing and language

issues. Our endeavor, in that sense, is best represented through the materials we include in our course plans and the goals and outcomes we set for our students in major assignments and in-class activities. Demet, for instance, references Gloria Anzaldúa's words "I am my language" (1987, p. 53) in her course to pinpoint the relationship between identity and language use, and urges her students to think about the complexities surrounding linguistic diversity. By using her "personal experiences to talk about writing and how languages and varieties of languages we speak shape the way we think, read, and write and how they show up in our interactions with different people in varying discourses," she asks her students "to think about the past experiences they have had related to languages and varieties they used or encountered" and then "have them relate their multiple aspects of identities to how they can play with the language in different genres." Similarly, Mijan developed a separate unit that takes a social justice perspective on linguistic diversity, making his students investigate how inter- and intralingual diversity prevents people from accessing societies' resources like education, employment and a safe civic life. His students complete a variety of readings on "language ideology, language change and variation, and the social justice issues arising from it" and compose multiple genres of writing (e.g., reading responses and narratives), critically examining their own language ideologies and those around them and reflecting on their own biases, the discriminations they faced, and the privileges they enjoyed while interacting with linguistically diverse people across settings. In a similar fashion, Su Yin redesigned her syllabus and developed "a unit that specifically addressed language diversity in society, and specifically focused on the local" to foreground the students' own language backgrounds in the class as she "wanted them to understand that they, too, despite being 'monolingual', find themselves in translanguaging spaces where diverse people, codes, and texts merge and interconnect." Cristina, too, defines her "classroom space as a meaning-making resource for [her] and [her] students" about "writing and language practices." Her multilingual self makes her students "curious about [her] language repertoire," triggering discussions about how the L1-L2 or native-non-native dichotomy is "limiting" in real world contexts. At her new institution, her international multilingual students (from Nigeria, for example) initiate questions about the complicated power dynamics in world Englishes that prevented them from being in the mainstream composition classes "even though they acquired English as a first language." Presenting herself as an embodiment of "the contradictions and tensions involved in writing across languages," she facilitates "conversations around writing, language and identity" fashioning a unique path for the course's trajectory.

Through these experiences, we try to foster discussions at the theoretical and practical level about language from a variety of (geographical) contexts. These materials and teaching practices are closely connected to our identities as teachers, informed by our backgrounds, unique experiences and how we understand the personal and the academic world. However, it should be noted that a crucial factor that created spaces for us to use our agency to engage critically with writing in our classrooms is the active support from our institution, which we discuss in the next section.

Theme 2: Ecology and the Importance of Programmatic Infrastructures

While we discussed the diverse ways that our multilingual identities inform our pedagogy, a key aspect that often gets overlooked is the role that writing programs and institutions play in creating the types of spaces where we, as NNEST teachers, can draw on our identities to enrich our pedagogical practices. In this section, then, we answer our second question: “What can writing programs do to enable us to bring our evolving, contested, and fluid identities into the classroom as pedagogical resources?” and examine the role that writing programs and institutions play, particularly addressing the impact of ecology and space.

Examining the enactment of teacher identities takes us beyond the classroom and intersects with institutional ecology and programmatic infrastructures. Thus, the space that we occupy becomes central to the discussion of how our identities are enacted in the classroom (Sánchez-Martín & Walker, 2021). The material and biological conditions of an ecology include the human involvement in the institution whose languages, lives, and identities transcend static and territorialized notions of language. Indeed, each of us has experienced tensions when it comes to our positionality and identity as writing instructors, and self-reflexivity was a way of learning how to navigate these tensions. For instance, our narratives show that Mijan was well-aware of his language identity being different from those of his students and how this fact informed his teaching; Cristina was cautious about transferring her writing pedagogies into a new educational context that had a more homogenous student population where language diversity was not a clear learning objective; Demet refers to experiencing apprehensions before her first class; and Su Yin begins her narrative asking “what do our identities allow or prevent us from doing?” and stating that, in her case, other aspects of our identities that are more visible than language, e.g., skin color, shape the initial assumptions students make about our abilities to teach writing in English.

The impact of ISU's Writing Program philosophies, which encourage instructors to see language use as a translingual practice, were significant in helping us grow as teachers and as emerging scholars specializing in TESOL and applied linguistics at an interdisciplinary English program. While many universities promote inclusivity and all sorts of diversity, we argue that the key factor is that these philosophies were transformed into daily practices, which could be observed at the micro-level, i.e., activities in our department, the writing program, and academic programs. In other words, the material conditions of the graduate programs that we were enrolled in involved actual opportunities to learn about language related issues through specific graduate level courses—some of them taught by Lisya—addressing a range of topics, such as language ideologies, second language writing, and cross-cultural issues in TESOL. These courses provide a site for graduate students to reflect on the ways in which their identities are taken up across multiple settings or about their own language histories. In turn, these instructors contribute by developing resources for all writing instructors and students to use in their classes. As these collaborations were inherently crucial to professionalizing writing instruction in the ISU Writing Program, our roles moved beyond individual attempts in bringing up issues of language diversity in our writing courses. We all contributed to the ISU Writing Program philosophy and collectively engaged with the scholarship on L2 writing and translingualism with other writing instructors. For instance, Su Yin, Cristina, and Mijan all wrote articles about language issues in writing for the program's undergraduate research journal, the key resource used across FYW courses. An archive of externally created resources (such as articles and videos) and internally produced resources (such as podcasts and presentations) about language diversity were—and still are—being compiled by the writing program for instructors and students. In addition to offering graduate courses in applied linguistics, Lisya provided workshops for incoming writing instructors and faculty across disciplines on various issues, such as language transfer, negotiation of grammar, and systemic functional linguistics. She engaged students in discussions around translingualism, discussed second language writing pedagogies in her graduate courses and served as a graduate mentor for students from different branches of English Studies.

All the resources available to us and other instructors, we believe, made an impact on our teaching—and that of other instructors in the program—and informed our dispositions in the class as we dealt with issues of language difference. In our data, there are multiple references by all of us to activities and resources about language and writing, such as Demet's whole unit on linguistic identities, which aimed to raise students' awareness on issues re-

garding language varieties and predominant perspectives and attitudes about language. Close attention to language takes a central role in our teaching of writing and it has shown to be of importance in the way we present ourselves in the classrooms.

At the same time, the available resources did not only change us and our teaching, but our presence also changed the space, as ecologies consist of interconnected relationships. In other words, we shape the physical environment that we exist in, highlighting multidirectional transformations between those who exist in this particular ecology. The philosophy of the ISU Writing Program and the interdisciplinary nature of the department were translated into concrete actions that created room for us to enact on our linguistic identities. Developing a philosophy that supports diverse instructors is only the first step. The fact that the institutional ecology of the program enabled the construction of spaces in our writing pedagogies for bringing in our linguistic identities as a site of learning was possible because of a practiced philosophy, which involved intense laboring of bringing translanguaging approaches to writing into daily practice. Therefore, an important, but often missing, second step is transforming philosophies into actions that create an environment for diverse instructors to draw on their identities that transcend the classroom space, such as the creation of program-wide learning outcomes that address language diversity in writing. Outside the classroom, instructors were encouraged to participate in professional development activities, such as recording podcasts about writing diversity, exchanging teaching strategies at the ISU Writing Program summit, and writing articles for the program's own journal. As such, the philosophy was inherently linked to the practices and activities of the writing program, encouraging the visibility of multilingual instructors.

This strong connection between theory and practice inside and outside the classroom, then, created room for transnational writing teachers' identities. Our knowledge was constantly drawn on to inform the pedagogy and philosophy of the writing program, reflected in the nine program-wide learning outcomes that all course plans were based on. Initially, translanguaging was part of the 8th learning outcome about differences in writing, within and across communities often associated with language in the US, but the active discussions of translanguaging prompted the creation of a 9th learning outcome about translanguaging and transnational literacies to account for the diverse practices of *all* student writers. This demonstrates the impact of our presence, as well as the purposeful inclusion of and critical engagement with language issues in this space, highlighting the synergy between us and the writing program and the fluctuating and emergent natures of writing program ecologies (Reiff et al., 2015). Ultimately, to fully support transnational writing instruc-

tors, we must intentionally create an open space for this type of support, as theory is meaningless without sustainable practice.

We believe that our diverse writing instructor identities and our agentic positions in our specific programs cannot be placed in the NNEST/NEST binary. Through our narratives on identity-as-pedagogy and institutional analysis, we see that multilingual writing instructors are aware of the sociohistorical connection between native speaker ideology and racialization. Through their pedagogical practices, they actively dismantle various monolingual ideologies by breaking linguistic hierarchies and perceiving identities from a multicompetent framework. As this chapter illustrates, recognizing and valuing writing pedagogies generated by multilingual instructors as productive sites of learning highly depends on the institution's language dispositions about legitimacy of language difference and literacy practices.

Recommendations and Conclusion

As our narratives illustrate, multilingual writing teachers can enrich and transform spaces that are commonly seen as homogenous. Our experiences highlight that “we must intentionally create contexts” (Donahue, 2018, p. 36) for effective writing instruction to account for language differences, diverse literate activities, and writing in the twenty-first century. Writing programs can be strengthened by these instructors' rich knowledge of non-English languages, expertise in writing/language studies, and a wide range of literacy practices, which have been overlooked for so long. Our strengths are also vital for broadening FYW students' understanding of what it means to participate in writing/literate activities in global communities and facilitating their developing understanding of literate practices across contexts and communities as *all* writers move in and out of different domains of writing. Although recognizing these assets is critical, we need to pay attention to the role of institutional structures and the ways NNESTs impact the curricula of writing-intensive courses.

In this context, we emphasize the need for writing programs and departments to critically engage with language ideologies to develop curricula that reflect our diverse ways of engaging with writing and literacy today. By extension, we underscore the importance of developing inclusive pedagogical practices, becoming more responsive to the needs of all student writers, creating opportunities for multilingual instructors to be involved in programmatic decisions, and validate their *identity-as-pedagogy* work. One possible venue for this is collaborative workshops offered by different units on campus to bring heightened awareness on various cross-cultural writing issues that emerge in classroom spaces. Inviting transnational writing instructors who specialize in TESOL

and applied linguistics to give workshops on issues such as language difference or genres across communities could help all FYW teachers to become better equipped to understand and facilitate students' translingual dispositions and value linguistic resources of student writers. While these workshops can help writing instructors and faculty become more aware of how language and culture influence students' reading and writing, some may continue to perceive language difference as a deviation from the norm rather than as an act to create space for agency and empowerment. To disrupt monolingual ideologies in our institutions and departments, we believe that these types of collaborations in the form of workshops or roundtable discussions should be part of the curriculum and offered as an ongoing professional opportunity for all instructors. Additionally, writing programs can work on making NNESTs' *identity-as-pedagogy work* visible and legitimate by having them overtly discuss cross-language issues they encounter in their courses with other writing instructors and administrators and by sharing course materials and assignments for incoming instructors as part of their socialization and training.

Moving forward, future studies could examine how instructors' pedagogical choices are shaped by their experiences as English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers, where high-stakes writing assessments, controlled composition, and large class sizes might have placed constraints on learning and teaching of L2 writing (Seloni & Henderson-Lee, 2020) and how knowledge about writing instruction evolves through time. Yet, as many of us have experienced, we constantly revise our pedagogies with the help of new institutional ecologies and the changing needs of students. Our languages, identities, and even educational backgrounds in writing programs are not fixed attributes, and thus, we cannot anticipate their trajectories. Therefore, we call for future research and praxis on writing programs, teacher education programs, and writing pedagogies to account for integrative approaches to language, writing, and identity as a dynamic, contextual, and co-constructed human activity.

References

- Alvarez, S. P., Canagarajah, S., Lee, E., Lee, J. W., & Rabbi, S. (2017). Translingual practice, ethnic identities, and voice in writing. In B. Horner & L. Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing divides: Exploring translingual writing pedagogies and programs* (pp. 31-48). Utah State University Press. <https://10.7330/9781607326205.c002>
- Aneja, G. A. (2016). Rethinking nativeness: Toward a dynamic paradigm of (non) native speaking. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 13(4), 351-379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2016.1185373>
- Anzaldúa, G. E. (1987). *Borderlands/ La frontera: The new mestiza*. Aunt Lute Books.

- Canagarajah, S. (2018). Translingual practice as spatial repertoires: Expanding the paradigm beyond structuralist orientations. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 31-54. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx041>
- De Costa, P., & Norton, B. (2017). Introduction: Identity, transdisciplinarity, and the good language teacher. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(Supplement 2017), 3-14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12368>
- de Oliveira, L. C., & Lan, S-W. (2012). Preparing nonnative English-speaking (NNES) graduate students for teaching in higher education: A mentoring case study. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 23(3), 59-76.
- Donahue, C. (2009). "Internationalization" and composition studies: Reorienting the discourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 61(2), 212-243. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40593441>
- Donahue, C. (2018). Rhetorical and linguistic flexibility: Valuing heterogeneity in academic writing education. In X. You (Ed.), *Transnational writing education: Theory, history, and practice* (pp. 21-40). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351205955-2>
- Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. State University of New York Press.
- Horner, B., Lu, M.-Z., Royster, J. J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Language difference in writing: Toward a translingual approach. *College English*, 73(3), 303-321.
- Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (Eds.). (2002). *Teacher's narrative inquiry as professional development*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kamhi-Stein, L. (2004). *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals*. University of Michigan Press. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.9648>
- Kitalong, K. S. (2017). "Yep, yep. Got it": Establishing common ground between international teaching assistants and first-year composition students. In N. DeJoy & B. Q. Smith (Eds.), *Collaborations & innovations: Supporting multilingual writers across campus units* (pp. 77-94). University of Michigan Press.
- Kubota, R., Corella, M., Lim, K., & Sah, P. K. (2021). "Your English is so good": Linguistic experiences of racialized students and instructors of a Canadian university. *Ethnicities*, 23(5), 758-778. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14687968211055808>
- Lantolf, J. P. (2012). Sociocultural theory: A dialectical approach to L2 research. In S. M. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 57-72). Routledge.
- Martins, D. S. (Ed.). (2015). *Transnational writing program administration*. Utah State University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7330/9780874219623>
- Morgan, B. (2004). Teacher identity as pedagogy: Towards a field-internal conceptualisation in bilingual and second language education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7, 172-188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050408667807>
- Motha, S., Jain, R., & Teclé, T. (2012). Translinguistic identity-as-pedagogy: Implications for language teacher education. *International Journal of Innovation in English Language Teaching*, 1(1), 13-28.

- Park, G. (2017). *Narratives of East Asian women teachers of English: Where privilege meets marginalization*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783098736>
- Pennycook, A., & Otsuji, E. (2015). *Metrolingualism: Language in the city*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315724225>
- Ramjattan, V. A. (2015). Lacking the right aesthetic: Everyday employment discrimination in Toronto private language schools. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 34(8), 692–704. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-03-2015-0018>
- Reiff, M. J., Bawarshi, A., Ballif, M., & Weisser, C. (Eds.). (2015). *Ecologies of writing programs: Program profiles in context*. Parlor Press.
- Reis, D. S. (2012). “Being underdog”: Supporting nonnative English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) in claiming and asserting professional legitimacy. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 23(3), 33–58.
- Rubin, D. L. (1992). Nonlanguage factors affecting undergraduates’ judgments of nonnative English-speaking teaching assistants. *Research in Higher Education*, 33(4), 511–531. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00973770>
- Ruecker, T., Frazier, S., & Tseptsura, M. (2018). “Language difference can be an asset”: Exploring the experiences of nonnative English speaking teachers of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 69(4), 612–641. <https://doi.org/10.58680/cc201829694>
- Sánchez-Martin, C. (2018). Teaching writing through transformation: Linguistically diverse writing teachers’ enactments of linguistic diversity [Doctoral dissertation, Illinois State University]. ProQuest Theses and Dissertations. <http://doi.org/10.30707/ETD2018.SanchezMartin.C>
- Sánchez-Martin, C., & Walker, J. R. (2021). Grassroots professional development: Engaging multilingual identities and expansive literacies through pedagogical-cultural historical activity theory (PCHAT) and translanguaging. In B. R. Schreiber, E. Lee, J. T. Johnson, & N. Fahim (Eds.), *Linguistic justice on campus: Pedagogy and advocacy for multilingual students* (pp. 180–197). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788929509-012>
- Seloni, L. (2012). Going beyond the native-nonnative English speaker divide in college courses: The role of nonnative English speaking educators in promoting critical multiculturalism. *Journal of Excellence in College Teaching*, 23(3), 120–155.
- Seloni, L., & Henderson-Lee, S. (2020). *Second language writing instruction in global contexts: English language teacher preparation and development*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788925877>
- Selvi, A. F. (2010). All teachers are equal, but some teachers are more equal than others: Trend analysis of job advertisements in English language teaching. *WATESOL NNEST Caucus Annual Review*, 1, 156–181.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 377–389. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587438>
- Zheng, X. (2017). Translingual identity as pedagogy: International teaching assistants of English in college composition classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(S1), 29–44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12373>