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**A. Institutional Description:**

The context in which I work and am currently conducting research is a global campus of a private university in the United States. This particular transnational institution of higher education (TNHE) where English is the medium of instruction (EMI), is situated in Southeastern Europe and offers a Bachelor degree of Science in Applied Arts and Science (BSc) with numerous minors, e.g. English, and concentrations, e.g. Public Policy, and in Computing and Information Technology (CIT). A Master of Science degree in Professional Studies is also an option. These degrees are accredited in the US and in-country.

**B. Key Theorists:** Some of the key theorists, schools of thought, and frameworks of my research project center around the following:

* **Shapiro’s (2022) work on critical language awareness (CLA)**. Shapiro (2022, p. 12) points out

that CLA “focuses on the intersections of language, identity, power, and privilege, with the goal of promoting self-reflection, social justice, and rhetorical agency. A CLA approach … aims to promote a more just future, while also preparing students for the (often unjust) present. CLA … does not ignore the power of academic norms and other linguistic standards (i.e., the status quo), but aims to demystify, critique, and—at times—resist those norms and standards.” In other words, languagers need to be adequately informed regarding opting in or out of adherence to language norms so that they can make informed decisions given their situation.

* **Horner, Lu, Royster, & Trimbur’s** **(2011)** **translingual orientation, in particular regarding**

**translingual writing pedagogy**. Horner et al. (2011, p. 304-305) explain the notion of a translingual orientation: “In short, a translingual approach argues for (1) honoring the power of all language users to shape language to specific ends; (2) recognizing the linguistic heterogeneity of all users of language both within the United States and globally; and (3) directly confronting English monolingualist expectations by researching and teaching how writers can work with and against, not simply within, those expectations.” Many of the foundations of translingual writing and pedagogy are shared with translanguaging.

* **Li Wei’s** (e.g. 2017) and **Canagarajah’s** (e.g. 2011, 2016) **translanguaging framework, in particular**

**in the context of translingual writing.** As pointed out by Li (2017), the notion of translanguaging can be traced back to Baker’s (2001) English translation of a Welsh term, namely *trawsieithu*, that was employed to describe a pedagogical practice that was observed by Williams (1994) with regard to language revitalization efforts. Li (p. 15) writes: “[I]t is not conceived as an object or a linguistic structural phenomenon to describe and analyze but a practice and a process – a practice that involves dynamic and functionally integrated use of different languages and language varieties, but more importantly, a process of knowledge construction that goes beyond languages.” That is, translanguaging centers the meaning making of the languagers – rather than the rigidity of named (standard) languages.

* **Langer and Havinga’s** (2015) **linguistic invisibilization** (see also Joseph Rutten, & Vosters, 2020; and

also Gal and Irvine’s (1995) erasure). Joseph, Rutten, & Vosters (2020, p. 175) point out that “the gradual disappearance from writing of forms commonly used in the spoken language, often until the present day, has been termed *invisibilization* (Langer and Havinga 2015).” When a given linguistic construction or feature was not included in the officialized norm, despite usage practices, it is said to have been ‘de-selected’ or have undergone ‘non-selection’. Joseph et al. comment: “The term [invisiblization] reflects the more or less conscious removal of certain forms from the written tradition, limiting their use to (informal) spoken registers (cf. the concept of erasure, discussed by Irvine and Gal 2000)” (p. 175). Tsitsipis (2003a, p. 247) writes: “According to Gal and Irvine (1995: 974), erasure is a powerful ideological strategy in the process of which certain phenomena such as linguistic structures, cultural products, social groups, sociolinguistic varieties, etc. are rendered invisible… The processes that index this erasure are fragmentation, marginalization, sublimation, and repression.”

* **The research methodologies** **of, among others,** **Lee & Canagarajah (2019), Shapiro & Watson**

**(2022),** **and Lorimer Leonard (2021)**. These scholars present important perspectives on translingual writing processes that are relevant to the current investigation. These scholars approach translingual writing in a way that decenters monolingual ideologies and instead centers the languagers and their linguistic repertoires.

**C. Glossary:**

critical language analysis

translanguaging

translingual writing

linguistic invisiblization/erasure

**Working Draft**

**abstract**

In recent composition scholarship, translingualism has gained considerable pedagogical traction. Aimed, in part, at resisting and disrupting various assumptions of monolingual and standard language ideologies, many languagers continue to employ such dynamic linguistic repertoires, including in academic contexts. In transnational higher education (TNHE) settings where English is the medium of instruction (EMI), translingual writing, however, has been underexamined. Consequently, the current investigation attempts to address this gap. The study seeks to investigate: i.) whether or not translingualism surfaces in student writing in a first-year college writing course in an EMI-TNHE context in Kosovo; and ii.) when translingual assemblages do occur, what strategies are being employed by the student writer(s). Written assignments submitted by students during three academic years are the focus of this study. The methodology considers various grounded coding processes, ethnographic discussion regarding one student’s translingual practices, and translingual strategies and praxis. The preliminary findings suggest that additional discussions with students, faculty, and peer writing tutors, among other stakeholders, remain crucial, in particular concerning critical language awareness and the monolingual paradigm. Such critical conversations could also highlight how espousing such a translingual disposition could center culturally responsive pedagogy, social justice, and decolonial thinking. Various solutions concerning translingualism – including elements that have undergone linguistic invisiblization and silencing – are also considered.

---

**Shifting paradigms: Translingualism in transnational institutions**

In recent decades, numerous language experts have investigated the problematization of various dominant language ideologies. This critical examination of hegemonic standard language cultures provided an alternative narrative to repressive sociolinguistic dynamics (Joseph, Rutten, & Vosters, 2020). Whereas linguistic variation was often considered a hinderance that impeded the development of the nation-state, rigid standard languages were associated with modernization (Ricento, 2000). A shift towards criticality, however, endeavored to address and remedy various injustices linked with stringent and static language policies, including where languagers of vibrant linguistic repertoires were, and continue to be, perceived as having “language deficits – ‘errors’ to be eradicated” (Lu & Horner, 2013, p. 583; see also Milroy, 2001; Durst, 2014; Shapiro et al., 2016; Shapiro & MacDonald, 2017; Shapiro, 2022; Mendez Seijas & Spino 2023; Fox & Chang-Bacon, 2023).

Much of the discussion around criticality regarding language policies and practices is also captured in critical language awareness (CLA). CLA, as Shapiro (2022, p. 12) writes,

focuses on the intersections of language, identity, power, and privilege, with the goal of promoting self-reflection, social justice, and rhetorical agency. A CLA approach … aims to promote a more just future, while also preparing students for the (often unjust) present. CLA … does not ignore the power of academic norms and other linguistic standards (i.e., the status quo), but aims to demystify, critique, and—at times—resist those norms and standards.

Shapiro (2022, p. 59) explains that, particularly in educational contexts, this critical approach to language must also address rhetorical agency, meaning that “students not only need rhetorical opportunities—i.e., decisions to be made—but also the knowledge and skills to make those decisions confidently and carry them out successfully.” In other words, crucial is the languagers’ “ability to make informed decisions as language users, recognizing both opportunities *and* constraints” (Shapiro & Lorimer Leonard, 2023, p. 5) of the linguistic forms employed as meaning is being constructed. Languagers need to be adequately informed concerning opting in or out of adherence to language norms so that they can make informed decisions given their circumstances.

This pivot towards critical awareness also involves disquieting hegemonic language policies of a monolingualist mindset that views languages as fixed, static, and distinct – rather than dynamic, emergent, porous, and fluid. This monoglossic disposition is evident in the silo model of multilingualism, which emphasizes complete mastery of each named language: “The ‘true’ bilingual in this model is that rare linguistic hermaphrodite: someone who is essentially two monolinguals residing in one person” (Horner, NeCamp, & Donahue, 2011, p. 285). Such a perspective underscores the misconception that each language is a fortress unto itself and that linguistic hybridity signals a lack of competency; this monolingual bias equates “language mixing with contamination and lack of proficiency” (Lee, 2016, p. 177). Such deeply entrenched underpinnings of monolingualist ideology are thus problematized in this polyglossic turn.

The blending of linguistic codes, or translanguaging[[1]](#footnote-1), scrutinizes such monolingualist attitudes. The concept of translanguaging, rooted in Baker's English translation of the Welsh *trawsieithu*, was used to characterize pedagogical practices Williams observed regarding Welsh revitalization (Li, 2018). Canagarajah (2011, p. 401) defines translanguaging as “the ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system.” These languagers command multifaceted linguistic repertoires that are not restricted by inflexible, named standard languages and varieties (Kaufhold, 2018; García & Otheguy, 2020). In translanguaging, codemeshing[[2]](#footnote-2) is frequently employed, where diverse languages, varieties, registers, and amalgams are “part of a single unitary system” – unlike codeswitching, which views such elements as “switches between two different systems” (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 403). Codemeshing, not unlike translanguaging, involves “bringing the different codes within the same text rather than keeping them apart” (Canagarajah, 2013, pp. 112-3; Young, 2013). According to Ossa Parra and Proctor (2021, p. 769), these bi/multilingual and multidialectal language users “inhibit or select features from their linguistic repertoire based on the communicative context ... , but their full linguistic system is always active.” Rather than being a double monolingual with two distinct systems, these languagers call upon a unitary system containing lived linguistic experiences expressed through a vibrant linguistic repertoire (Turner & Lin, 2020). García and Kleifgen (2019, p. 556) write: “[T]ranslanguaging is a political act focused on reinterpreting language as a decolonizing process and liberating the language practices of bilingual ... populations.” Such corriente practices can entail transformative interactions that interrogate structural injustices, including dogmatic monolingual mindsets (Turner & Lin, 2020; Pontier & Deroo, 2023).

Translanguaging, including translingual writing, has been embraced as a pedagogical approach by numerous scholars (see Horner, Lu, Royster, & Trimbur, 2011; Horner, NeCamp, & Donahue, 2011; Canagarajah, 2011; 2016; Young; 2013; Donahue, 2016; Cushman, 2016; Kaufhold, 2018; Schreiber & Watson, 2018; Lee & Canagarajah, 2019; Seals & Olsen-Reeder, 2020; García & Otheguy, 2020; Özer, 2021; see also Matsuda, 2014; Gevers, 2018). Cushman (2016, p. 236) emphasizes that by including translanguaging in academic writing, marginalized languagers “could ideally see their home languages valued, taught, and practiced in reading and writing assignments and classroom discussions in ways that sustain one of many Englishes." These repertoires could be incorporated into academic discourse, such as written assignments, as opposed to being restricted to only certain domains (García & Otheguy, 2020; Flores & Rosa, 2015). Cushman (2016, pp. 235-6) suggests that by employing such a post-monolingual, decolonial strategy, "[h]eritage languages and scripts that were lost or being eroded and (re)learned alongside English could become a scholarly, curricular, and pedagogical focus.” That is, academic writing processes could incorporate the meshing of varieties that have experienced varied degrees of marginalization and attrition (Seals & Olsen-Reeder, 2020). Translingual pedagogy thus emphasizes “difference in language not as a barrier to overcome or as a problem to manage, but as a resource for producing meaning” (Horner, Lu, Royster, & Trimbur, 2011, p. 303). Shapiro (2022, p. 8) explains that translingual practices, including “using texts and assignments that mix codes and styles[,] is one of the many ways we can cultivate CLA in our writing classrooms[.]” In order to avoid undermining critical metalinguistic awareness and other aims of translanguaging and/or translingualism (see also Donahue, 2018; Britton & Lorimer Leonard, 2020; Arnold, 2020; Lorimer Leonard, 2021; Shapiro, 2022), linguistic tourism — a teacher’s or student's “fascination for ‘alien writing’” (Matsuda 2014, pp. 482-3; see also Atkinson et al., 2015; Shapiro, 2022) — and/or “uncritical celebration of diversity,” “difference” (Gevers, 2018, pp. 77-78), or linguistic hybridity would need to be addressed (Schreiber & Watson, 2018[[3]](#footnote-3)).

Also pertinent to translingual writing is critical discussion regarding linguistic erasure of non-standard forms. Irrespective of usage patterns and practices, when a prescribed norm has excluded a particular construction, it is said to have undergone ‘invisibilization’; when a particular amalgam does not possess the overt prestige associated with the standard, it is consequently confined to non-standard oral choices and stigmatized (Joseph, Rutten & Vosters, 2020, p. 175; see also Dovchin, 2020, p. 774 for linguistic invisibility, linguistic stereotyping, and accent bullying). Such structures may be rendered invisible, especially in materials (re)produced by prescriptivist proofreaders in relation to standard-gazing gatekeeping tendencies. Efforts to eradicate these configurations include their portrayal as non-resources ‘inappropriate’ and ‘unsuitable’ for effective communication (see Havinga, 2018; Flores & Rosa, 2015).

Drawing upon a large ethnographic study, Lee and Canagarajah (2019) present a case study of a student writer, Koky, who employs translingual writing practices in an academic writing course in the U.S. Their investigation includes examining student-generated textual artifacts, among other types of data (pp. 19-20). Their study focuses on various negotiation strategies made by Koky, including “translingual practices [that] involve reconfiguring contexts through critical and creative language use, rather than conforming to dominant meanings, conventions, contexts and social relationships that can be disempowering or silencing” (Lee & Canagarajah, 2019, p. 17). Their **ethnographic lens** on student translingual writing (p. 20) is of relevance for the current study.

Further, Shapiro and Watson (2022) discuss **translingual praxis,** including various **delinking**[[4]](#footnote-4) **strategies**, which consider language beyond colonialism. In particular such strategies can foster “‘un-learning in order to learn[,]’” where, for instance, “[s]tudents and teachers use language more explicitly to contest monolinguistic norms” (p. 308), while concomitantly “aiming to better contextualize and negotiate language difference and to explicitly challenge racist and colonizing paradigms” (p. 304). Such critical awareness could also be expressed in translingual practices, including “visible manifestations of code-meshing in their written assignments…[where] [c]ombatting monolingualistic norms through exercising linguistic agency may respond” (p. 308) to various colonialist legacies. Shapiro and Watson (2022) note that “linguistic resistance is an important decolonial strategy” as it contributes to cultivating a sense of “rhetorical sovereignty” (Scott Lyons as cited in Shapiro & Watson, 2022, p. 308) by confronting injustices head-on and thus “transforming academic discourse to make space for historically othered knowledges and voices” (pp. 308-309). Shapiro and Watson (2022), however, warn against uncritical approaches: “But contestations of linguistic norms may not be critically executed if they are not explicitly situated within a cultivated understanding of *ideologies* and *political historie*s of language” (p. 309). That is, critical awareness is central to the discussion.

Similarly, Lorimer Leonard (2021) discusses the notion of “resisting” and how interrogating the norms of monolingualism, among other linguistic hegemonies, can also be a form of writerly resistance. She explains: “[R]esisting is a moment of response to the language inequality, stratification, and domination” (p. 187); this type of “resistance [is] not…passive rejection but…agentive response based on family or community knowledge about language” (p. 187). Lorimer Leonard elaborates on this act, or strategy, of resisting:

to resist by providing the opportunity to describe unjust social consequences of language hierarchies, detail the stakes of language discrimination, testify to the impact of linguistic subordination on them and their families, and list how they can act to change these outcomes … ‘breaking,’ ‘pushing,’ and ‘amplifying,’… that include dedication to changing the negative impacts of discriminatory language values. Thus, resistance in and with writing can intentionally push writers beyond mere recognition of the power relations of language toward more intentional involvement in those relations (p. 187).

This “transformational resistance” can, from the student writers’ point of view, entail “[a] conviction to right the wrongs of language injustice from within[,] … to break these notions” in order guarantee that they are not actively engaged in perpetuating such inequities; in doing so, the student writers also “confront their own roles in that system … in order to resist it” (Lorimer Leonard, 2021, p. 188). This sort of resisting could also yield change at an institutional level (pp. 188-189).

These delinking and resisting strategies aim, in part, to offer a critical lens to various linguistic injustices, including the view that non-standard language usages and their languagers are linguistically deficient and inappropriate for various spheres. As Flores and Rosa (2015) point out: “We stand in solidarity with the view that subtractive approaches to language diversity are stigmatizing and contribute to the reproduction of education inequality. However, we question some of the underlying assumptions in many additive approaches–specifically the discourses of

‘appropriateness’ that lie at their core” (p. 150). Albeit Flores and Rosa join forces with scholars who seek to critique pedagogies that hinder linguist diversity, they are weary of various praxis that entail raciolinguistic ideologies, including the conflation of linguistic deviance with racialized bodies. They explain that “raciolinguistic ideologies produce racialized speaking subjects who are constructed as linguistically deviant even when engaging in linguistic practices positioned as normative or innovative when produced by privileged” languagers (p. 150). They seek to implicate appropriateness-based models, as they fail to recognize inherent biases unrelated to the actual language practices in question. Also, while additive approaches that acknowledge language diversity encourage code-switching in home dialects/languages, such pedagogies maintain that nonstandard forms are appropriate but primarily for informal settings out-of-school and that “standard conventions” are to be added to students’ repertoires for educational environments (p. 153). Such pedagogies, thus, discourage linguistic diversity, in particular in educational milieus (p. 153), given that the languagers often “engag[e] in dynamic linguistic practices that do not conform to monolingual norms” (p. 153). Flores and Rosa (2015, pp. 154-155) suggest that heteroglossic language ideologies coupled with critical language awareness and culturally sustaining pedagogies could replace uncritical approaches, including appropriateness-based discourses where English is the dominant language of instruction.

Not acknowledging the ideological positionings – simply focusing on the linguistic forms – risks intensifying the mindset that language mixing suggests deficiency, typical of appropriateness-based approaches (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 166). Such a line of thinking risks normalizing hegemonic hierarchies, thus contributing to their false sense of legitimacy (p. 166). Discourses of appropriateness, which permeate additive approaches, are complicit in the normalization of marginalizing the linguistic practices of languagers. Flores and Rosa explain a possible solution: “Therefore, the solution … cannot be to add objective linguistic practices to their repertoires … but instead to engage with, confront, and ultimately dismantle” the hierarchy, including monoglossic language ideologies of the listening subject. Instead of legitimizing the marginalization, it needs to be challenged by scrutinizing the listening subject – rather than stigmatizing marginalized languagers and the speaking subject, in particular by “challenging the ways that their linguistic practices are taken up and interpreted” (p. 167), so as to “shift from teaching students to follow rules of appropriateness to working with them as they struggle to imagine and enact alternative, more inclusive realities” (p. 168).

Further, transnational institutions of higher education (TNHE) where English is the medium of instruction (EMI) constitute an under-investigated context for translingual writing. As Sun (2023, p. 2) observes: “[T]ranslingual practices in academic writing in EMI-TNHE contexts are underexplored.”

As has been pointed out by numerous scholars, globalization has facilitated transnational movements of individuals and institutions (De Costa et al., 2021; 2022). In response, transnational universities, including international branch campuses, have emerged worldwide, aiming to foster global citizenship as well as transcultural competence, among other objectives (Fang & Baker, 2018; Wilkins, 2021; MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Language, 2007). Albeit many of these institutions commonly implement an EMI policy, concerns have been raised regarding the potential reinforcement of monolingual and native-speakerist ideologies, limitations on local language knowledge production, as well as issues involving diversity and inclusion, including linguistic and cultural heritage, among others (Bou Ayash, 2016; Kirkpatrick, 2014; De Costa, Park, & Wee, 2019; De Costa, 2020; De Costa et al. 2021; 2022; Shapiro et al., 2016). De Costa, Green-Eneix, and Li (2022, p. 84) point out that “in the TNHE context where multilingual practices are the norm, future research should explore the affordances that a TNHE learning environment can bring to students and teachers in order to develop their critical intercultural awareness, and subsequently disrupt a native-speakerist ideology (Piller, 2017).” In other words, the notion of native speaker in such settings needs to be re-examined in light of various injustices. As Kirkpatrick (2014, p. 9) explains: “The huge rise in the number of English-knowing multilinguals means that the ownership of English is now shared. English is no longer the exclusive possession of native speakers.” This shifting (read: sharing) of English’s ‘ownership’ beyond the ‘native speaker’ that considers the language practices of multilinguals should thus be reflected in various policies, in particular in TNHE contexts.

Thus, this current study aims to investigate an EMI-TNHE setting in Kosovo.

**The current study: The research questions**

The current study’s guiding research questions are twofold:

i.) Does translingualism, as a form of critical language awareness, surface in student writing in an EMI-TNHE setting in Kosovo?

ii) If (and when) it does, how is it manifested in terms of negotiation strategies and rhetorical agency?

**Methodology, subjects in context, (socio)linguistic landscape, and textual artifacts**

**Methodology**

The methodology of this ongoing multi-year qualitative study employs a mixed methods approach, following, in part, grounded theory processes (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). It draws upon Lee and Canagarajah’s (2019) ethnographic investigation of student-generated written artifacts; in the current study a similar approach is applied to the translingual writings of Shega, a student writer whose translingual practices are of focus. The critical frameworks of Canagarajah’s (2011) codemeshing strategies, Shapiro & Watson’s (2022) translingual praxis, as well as Lorimer Leonard’s (2021) orientation toward writerly resistance are also considered.

After the essay projects were collected and initially analyzed, open coding was used (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) for emerging themes and identifying different rhetorical moves and translingual strategies in the data that would assist in describing the choices made by the student writers (see e.g., Canagarajah, 2011; Shapiro et al., 2016; Shapiro & Watson, 2022; Lorimer Leonard, 2021; among others). For instance, in the coding and second and third rounds of analysis of the data of the current study, various negotiation strategies from Canagarajah’s (2011) case study were considered. Further, Shapiro & Watson’s (2022) “delinking” and Lorimer Leonard’s (2021) “resisting” categories also served as a guide in analyzing much of the data.

An informal reflective interview was also conducted with Shega by the author of this study after the essays were submitted so that the student writer’s insights into the decision-making processes would also be considered in this investigation.

**Context, subjects, (socio)linguistic landscape, and textual artifacts**

The institutional context of the present study is a transnational campus of a not-for-profit private US-affiliated university in the state of New York. The global campus in Kosovo has been in operation since fall 2003. It offers a Bachelor of Science in Applied Arts and Sciences and in Computing and Information Technologies as well as a Master of Sciences, all of which are accredited in the US and Kosovo (see https://www.rit.edu/kosovo/). The student body is comprised of students from around the world, many of whom have familial links to Southeastern Europe. The majority of the students, most of whom are multilingual, have Albanian, among other regional languages, as their L1. The focus of this investigation is a first-year credit-bearing EMI writing-intensive course that all undergraduate students are required to take.

For this study, the translingual writing practices of students (n=256) in a total of twelve sections during three semesters were assessed. Student-generated written materials from the fall semesters of 2020, 2021, and 2022 were considered. The students’ diverse linguistic heritages and cultural backgrounds allowed them to draw from a wide array of (named) languages and varieties, including Albanian, German, Romani, Slavic, and Turkish, among others. The author of the current study is the only instructor (n=1) involved in this investigation. Also, at the time of this study various COVID-19 mitigations (such as online, hybrid, and in-person learning) were in place.

Albeit data from all three years were analyzed, special emphasis in the current study is placed on one student, Shega[[5]](#footnote-5). Shega was born in Kosovo and has spent her entire life in the region. Her ancestors have resided in Southeastern Europe for centuries. Thus, her linguistic repertoire is highly influenced by the sociolinguistic landscape of this area. Her K-12 public education was primarily in Albanian, with English as a Second/Foreign Language classes offered beginning in her early education. Her first experience in an EMI-TNHE setting occurred during her first year of undergraduate studies at the institution of focus. Shega, unlike some of her peers, chose to employ translingualism in all three writing projects, and thus she and her essays are of special interest for this investigation.

When considering the sociolinguistic landscape of the region, light could also be shed on linguistic invisiblization, in particular when bearing in mind the language codification policies of the Geg and Tosk varieties of Albanian in Southeastern Europe[[6]](#footnote-6) during the previous century. In 1956 in the People's Socialist Republic of Albania the Geg variety went from being employed in numerous genres to being relegated to footnotes in Tirana's version of *The Orthography of the Albanian Language* – despite appearing in several textbooks in Kosovo and in a limited selection of literary works (such as those written by the Geg writer Migjeni) on both sides of the border (Vokshi, 1959; Ismajli, 2005, p. 277-307). In 1967, just over ten years later, Geg was all but forgotten as a legitimate linguistic code in academic, scientific, and other official publications through erasure and proscription by a group of linguistic experts working under the auspices of the University of Tirana (Ismajli, 2005, p. 357-520) – and then again in 1968 in the Autonomous Socialist Province of Kosovo by a team of linguists at the Albanological Institute in Prishtina (Ismajli 2005, p. 521). In 1972 Unified Literary Albanian (ULA), which is predominantly based on the southern Tosk dialect, became the official language of Albania and Kosovo (Ismajli, 2005, p. 523-630; Byron, 1976; 1978; 1985). That is to say, the language planning of the 1960s and 70s shaped the sociolinguistic landscape of language standardization in Albania and Kosovo. While Geg was stigmatized[[7]](#footnote-7) and hence marginalized, Tosk was elevated to overt prestige by being selected for the new standard. It could thus be argued that Geg languagers were “tethered linguistically to an institutionally discredited heritage,” as has also been observed with other disenfranchised language varieties and their users where “the arbitrariness of ‘correctness’” has also been at play (Gilyard, 2016, p. 285-6; see also Chang, 2022).

The artifacts under consideration include typed first and final drafts that were uploaded to the learning management system by students during the aforementioned semesters. The students were assigned three writing projects involving process writing. The first assignment was narration; the other two involved researched expository writing, some of which were completed in small groups (one to three students). For these assignments the students were encouraged to integrate translingual writing practices in relation to class discussions and readings centering critical language awareness. The students were informed orally and in writing, including through informed consent, that their student-generated texts could be used in research.

Each essay project considered for the study contained both a first and final draft. For this study 505 essay projects were taken into consideration. Each project, i.e. which consisted of the first and final drafts, was categorized into one of the following three groups:

**a.** those that contained overt translingualism (including codemeshing);

**b.** those that did not include explicit translingualism (e.g. codemeshing), but overtly attempted to address various CLA issues relevant to the student authors (e.g. dialect or accent shaming; standard language culture; linguistic profiling); and

**c.** other (the submissions that did not fall into the two aforementioned categories).

The project was coded as falling within the first category (a.) if either of the drafts contained overt translingualism/translanguaging. If none of the drafts contained translingualism/translanguaging, the project was coded as falling under either the second or third category (b. or c., respectively), depending on the substance (content) of the essay drafts.

**Results**

Occasional instances of translingualism emerged in the student-generated work. Only 21 (n=21; .042%) of the 505 essay projects included overt translingualism, in particular where the named languages of Albanian and German as well as various (south) Slavic varieties (and/or languages) were interwoven. Seven other projects (n=7; .014%) addressed CLA – but did not display overt translingualism (e.g. codemeshing). In total twenty-eight projects (n=28; .06%) exhibited translingualism and/or openly addressed CLA concerns.[[8]](#footnote-8)

Given that this research is still ongoing, future iterations of the course will also be considered in later investigations of student writing involving translingual practices at this institution.

**Discussion**

Albeit numerous studies have examined translingualism and translanguaging, this study extends the field’s understanding of translingual writing in TNHE-EMI settings, which is underexplored in the literature (see Sun, 2023, p. 2), in particular in Kosovo where invisiblized and marginalized varieties are involved in the translingual corriente.

**Figure 1: Extracts from student writing**

| 1. “Mos u sill si **katunar** se nuk tdon kerkush.” While waiting for the bus, I overheard a friend tell another friend something that has stuck with me all these years. |
| --- |
| 2. "**Hilfe! Bitte, Hilfe**!” Those distant screams for help from my uncle pulled me out of my agonizing thoughts, eliciting a small light of hope inside me. “**Zot, ndihmome**!” I pleaded in my head while struggling to catch my breath. |
| 3. When in Prishtina, Speak Like **Prishtinalis** Do! |

Figure 1 serves to illustrate the presence of translingual practices in the data that was considered for the current study; it includes excerpts from three different student-generated assignments (essay projects) from three different student groups. The first excerpt contains at least one (formerly) marginalized configuration from Geg Albanian (G), a regional vernacular – in contrast to Tosk Albanian (T) and Standard Albanian (SA) – namely *katunar* (***d*** has been dropped, cf. G *katun****d****ar* ‘villager’; T and SA *fshatar* ‘villager’), a ‘reduced’ construction with derogatory associations and stigma, depending on the particular context. In the second fragment, the trilingualism of the student is exhibited, where in German pleas of ‘Help! Please, help!’ and ‘God, help me!’ in Albanian (G, T, and SA) are integrated into the text. In the third extract, the title of the essay illustrates the fusion of multiple languages, i.e. Geg Albanian (cf. T, SA *Prishtinas*) and English for the plural marker. In these cases, the student writers’ linguistic heritage is being centered, where “articulating … [their] voice[s] is more important than merely conveying meaning. This priority enables … [them] to negotiate … [their] voice[s] with confidence” (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 407), which Canagarajah categorizes as **voice strategies**.

**Figure 2: Extracts from Shega’s essay projects**

|  |
| --- |
| 4. a.He would always ask, **“Kako si zemër? Çysh kalove n’shkollë, dobro?”**[[9]](#footnote-9) b. I could only mutter single syllables, knowing that if he found out that I couldn’t understand him, it would ruin him. Thus, I allowed our bonding to grow in a room infested with broken Albanian. Although, the stories my grandpa told me were anything but broken. They were overflowing with details of his life in **selo**[[10]](#footnote-10)**, the day he left for grad**[[11]](#footnote-11), **and the last time he saw njegova majka.**[[12]](#footnote-12) c. He would say sorrowfully, **“Dola sot n’pazar, çka me bo këtu pa ty? Ma kujtoi leton n’selo. Kur jom konë sa ti, n’këtë vakt dilsha me nanën mu bo gati për dimën. Sot shkova me i ble çizmet krejt vetë. S’ka gajle, me rëndsi m’hyjnë n’punë kur t’bohet sneg i madh… S’ka pasë me moja majka.”**[[13]](#footnote-13) |
| 5. As the song goes: “**Da zdravstvuyet Rossiya, svobodnaya strana! My volny i schastlivy, nam vsem gorit zarya!”**.[[14]](#footnote-14) |
| 6.This is greatly influenced by culture; growing up in an Albanian household the phrase **“Flokt e gata, ment e shkurta”**[[15]](#footnote-15) was the main dish on the dinner table. |

Figure 2 is of special emphasis in the current study, as it centers the translingual practices of Shega. In excerpt 4, she has employed south Slavic, Albanian (T, G, SA), as well as English; in fragment 5, another Slavic language, namely Russian, is integrated, but preceded by English; and in extract 6, English and Geg surface. Extract 4 is Shega’s narrative essay and extracts 5 and 6 are her research essays.

In 4a. Slavic and Albanian are employed. Elements of non-standard Albanian (vernacular forms) also surface here; the grapheme <Ç>[[16]](#footnote-16) (i.e. <çysh>, ‘how, what’, cf. <çka> ‘what’), reflecting the phonetic realization employed by many Geg languagers, is chosen instead of <Q> (i.e. <qysh>, ‘how, what’), the grapheme that appears in the standardized form of this lexical item. The <n’> (‘in’) also reflects a Geg nuance in the utterance, in particular when compared to the standard <në> (‘in’). The expression *Kako* *si* (‘How are you?’) and the lexical item *dobro* (‘good, well’)are Slavic, illustrating the multilingual landscape of the region where Shega’s grandfather was raised. Interestingly, however, these Slavic items appear in Latin script, as opposed to Cyrillic, which is used for Macedonian, as well as other Slavic languages in the region, e.g. Serbian and Bulgarian. As expressed during the reflective interview, Shega is attempting to accommodate her undergraduate peers (e.g. 17-25 year-olds) who might not be familiar and/or comfortable with a non-Latin script, in particular Cyrillic, given that many of them might not have had a Slavic language as a medium of instruction or as a second/additional language in their formal education; Shega’s peers, however, may have heard similar utterances in their linguistic journeys and heritages given the multilingual context of the region.

Shega’s choice to employ the Roman alphabet instead of Cyrillic for various Slavic elements is similar to Shapiro et al. (2016, p. 37), where a student employed the Roman alphabet of Pinyin in a dialogue in Cantonese, instead of opting for Chinese characters; such a decision was made by the student writer to make the text more accessible for an audience unfamiliar with Chinese characters. A related situation is explained in Canagarajah (2011, p. 404), where in draft 2 of a student paper, Buthainah, a graduate student writer, integrated a phrase in Arabic script and then changed it to English in the fourth draft: “‘Thank Allah’ and not ‘ma sha allah.’ Such careful experimentation shows that Buthainah is sensitive to the capabilities of her audience in negotiating her text. She also gradually builds the capacity of the audience to interpret her codes.” In draft six, however, Canagarajah (2011) explains that Buthainah opts to include an Arabic proverb with Arabic characters in her epigraph which she also chooses to translate into English for her readers; with this codemeshed choice of Arabic script, she elects to have the reader “move beyond passive reading and negotiate her codemeshing” (p. 405). Thus, Canagarajah’s (2011) **recontextualization strategy**, or “gauging the congeniality of the context for codemeshing and shaping ecology to favor one’s multilingual practices” (p. 404) could also be at play in the current study in some of these excerpts.

In terms of language choice when codemeshing, Shega during her reflective interview pointed out that Albanian is more central in her codemeshing than Slavic, such as in her narrative essay. Shega’s language choice could be a demonstration of **recontextualization strategy**, similar to various choices that were made by Buthainah, when electing to employ more Arabic than French:

Buthainah’s French mixings were more trivial compared to her Arabic mixings. French was less syntactically complex and it accomplished less compared to her Arabic verses. The latter had a powerful aesthetic and rhetorical implications for her text. Buthainah pointed out that the distinction between the languages was intended and had meaning. She wrote in her response: The reason that I did not include French poems or more French phrases is because French cannot be compared to my Arabic language. The value of the Arabic language is much greater than that of French simply because it is the language of the Quran and the language of my heritage. To treat French the same way, it would be simply strange … (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 413)

In the interview Shega noted that she prefers Geg Albanian over the Tosk or standard dialect, pointing out that Geg is the language of her home and community; she also explained that employing in her essay a non-standard, marginalized variety often regarded as ‘informal’ and ‘unprofessional’ was transformative, in particular regarding how its legitimate usage, or inclusion, in her writing empowered her – and thus indirectly her speech community as well. Like Buthainah,

Shega’s codemeshing is motivated by “rhetorical, social, and identity considerations” – rather than indiscriminate mechanical actions (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 413).

Moving on, the codemeshed excerpt in 4b. includes descriptive details of a nostalgic recollection of Shega’s grandfather, whose language practices outside the home were perhaps dominated by various Slavic influences of North Macedonia. In 4b., Slavic lexical items were woven into the text perhaps to create a sense of distance in time and also on an emotional level, to bring about feelings of pain and longing. Canagarajah (2011) describes Buthainah’s movements, where writing shapes her experience: “Although she fears she is ‘manipulating her experiences to suit her themes, she later says that they are still true to her life” (p. 411). Although Shega’s recollections may not be completely factual, they are representative of memories associated with a situated space and time. Similarly, Buthainah explains how “[w]riting this draft brings so many memories that seems to fade away. Learning languages is a big part of my life, and the idea that I began to forget some of the aspects of this important memory shocks me” and thus is appreciative of having an opportunity to center her “‘legacy’ of literacy” (as cited in Canagarajah, 2011, p. 412). Similarly, Shega recalls memories that are in the distant past and if not captured on paper and shared, they just might drift into the forgotten past. Shega, like Buthainah, has gained more agency throughout the process-oriented approach that involves criticality (p. 412), including by employing Canagarajah’s textualization strategy, as can be seen in Shega’s and Buthainah’s examples immediately above**,** where “orienting to the text as a multimodal social practice and adopting process-oriented composing strategies for effective text development” (p. 404) were at play. In 4c., a similar meshing of linguistic codes emerges, where Slavic *selo*, *sneg*, and *moja majka* are nestled in with a regionalized Geg Albanian. Here, too, Canagarajah’s **textualization strategy** can be seen in Shega’s writing, where nostalgia and memories are explicitly shared with the readers via the meshings of linguistic heritage from the region. When asked about these linguistic decisions, Shega commented that she aimed to generate relatable content, including by employing amalgams from the historical sociolinguistic landscape that for her readers invoked both the past in the present – while also transmitting the story of her family’s linguistic journey.

As seen in excerpt 5, Shega’s research essay includes Russian lyrics; these lyrics were used to underscore various elements of dictator syndrome in a well-known political figure in relation to a relatively recent invasion of Ukraine, which had been the focus of one of the paragraphs. This linguistic choice is somewhat similar to how Lee and Canagarajah’s (2019, pp. 20, 23) Koky, originally from Eastern Europe, codemeshed using Spanish. Whereas Koky codemeshed to create “a sense of humor in his text” (p. 23), Shega employed Russian to mark herself as an “Outsider,” the “Other,” as someone who might be perceived as being “otherized” – but who understood the intended message and could not be intimidated by such rhetorical devices. Shega is also employing **voice strategies** by visibly displaying her “own positionality” on the issue at hand (see Canagarajah, 2011, p. 404), thus establishing a “strong sense of self” (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 406). Such a strategy, according to Canagarajah:

enables her [(i.e. the student writer)] to appropriate dominant codes and experiment boldly with language … start[ing] from their own linguistic positionality and negotiate intelligibly through pragmatic strategies … This orientation additionally helps them [(i.e. student writers)] to approach the interaction from a position of strength and affirmation. Their relationship to the codes of others is based on appropriation according to one’s own values ... An attitude of deference to dominant codes or self-abnegation will lead to a shaky foundation for interlingual contact (p. 406).

During the interview Shega remarked that given, in part, the geographic distance to spaces where Russian is frequently employed, she felt somewhat distant to the codemeshings from Russian, in particular when compared to various regional Slavic languages, e.g. Macedonian or even Serbian. She was adamant that these lyrics be included in her essay, in particular given the paradox that was presented to the readers with their inclusion.

Also, Shega did not translate any codemeshed elements in any of her essays into English. This, in part, could be her employing an **interactional strategy**, i.e. “negotiating meaning on an equal footing with readers and helping them negotiate effectively” (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 404). Canagarajah explains how Buthainah admits that in some cases she had “enigmatic omission[s]”of translations from Arabic into English, to which she responded: “Translating this poem would take so much of its value and providing a two-sentence explanation will not do any justice for these few lines. ... Leaving it stand alone is more powerful” (p. 409). Canagarajah writes: “By refusing to translate, Buthainah is realigning the relationship between herself and the readers. She is shifting the dominant Western practice of putting the onus of intelligibility on the speaker/writer. She is pressuring readers to work harder for meaning” (p. 409). Buthainah comments: “If I translated everything, then the readers would simply go through it. But, if I did not translate, then I am encouraging the reader to question the relationship between the poem and the stories being told and promote critical thinking” (p. 410). Shega, while being interviewed about her linguistic choices, explained that the language varieties she included, e.g. Geg Albanian, “do not have to be accompanied by English as a dominant language, [in that] they can stand alone in an academic setting and contribute equally.” Also, she explained that translating her codemeshings into English would have tainted her intended meaning to such an extent that she would not have been satisfied with the resulting translated message.

These linguistic elements not only reflect a sense of authenticity in Shega’s texts given the sociolinguistic landscape and history of Southeastern Europe, but also demonstrate translingual praxis of delinking (see Shapiro & Watson, 2022), where unlearning of the rigidity of standard language culture and resisting monolingualist ideology are evident (see Lorimer Leonard, 2021). This strategy of resisting in Shega’s writing illustrates a pivot towards criticality. Her linguistic choices were not merely to celebrate and center her linguistic heritage, but rather to embark on a trajectory of resisting various long-standing impositions and status-quo alignments regarding notions of native-ness, ownership, and colonialism regarding various languages and varieties. Shega has made informed decisions concerning how she wants to communicate her heritage and memories – including by explicitly and strategically employing such deviations. Her resisting demonstrates how she refuses to be part of the problem by working from within the text and the curriculum as she proceeds forward. Shega pushes back against dominant language ideologies by **mobilizing** her fluid linguistic repertoire, confidently crossing over and beyond named language boundaries, thus showcasing her linguistic trespassing and deviance – as well as her rhetorical awareness and agency. She sidesteps appropriateness-based and additive pedagogies as well as privileged listening voices as she critically weaves her heteroglossic choices into her decolonialized text (see Flores & Rosa, 2015).

**Rhetorical awareness and agency**

In translingual writing rhetorical awareness and agency are crucial. Shapiro et al. (2016) explain that in order to center rhetorical awareness and agency, student writers “are asked to pay close attention to genre and register to ‘break out’ from the academic norms that shaped their papers …[,] noting choices the writers made to fit audience expectations” (p. 35-36). That is, students need to consider how their readers might interpret various linguistic choices, including deviations from and adherence to the prescribed norms in relation to register, genre, and hegemonic forces at play. In terms of the current study, Shega, along with her peers, grappled with such issues during the drafting and peer review processes as meaning making was negotiated on the page.

For the **narrative essay**, Shega critically grappled with the linguistic constructions that emerged during the various stages of her writing. As Bell points out: “A critical approach to narrative discourse … ‘requires going beyond the use of narrative as rhetorical structure, that is, simply telling stories, to an analytic examination of the underlying insights and assumptions that the story illustrates’ (p. 208[)]” (as cited in Shapiro & MacDonald, 2017, p. 81), including varied funds of knowledge that are often left in the shadows. Shega, while working on her narrative essay, applied a critical lens to her lived experiences – to go beyond the words on the page and to delve into the ideological complexities that underpin her reality. Shapiro et al. (2016, p. 37) shed light on this issue when they discuss colloquial meshings in student writing, in particular a text where the student opted to integrate a “colloquial mix of Malay and Malaysian English,” including linguistic forms of “Manglish” often associated with negative attitudes and thus stigmatized. Shapiro et al. (2016) explain that this student’s “goal was to highlight and challenge negative attitudes” associated with the stigmatized linguistic structures (p. 37-38). Similarly, for Shega the translingual process was transformative, reminiscent of a **counter-narrative** or **counterstory** (see Martinez, 2014). Shega’s texts illustrate pushing back against, challenging, interrupting, dismantling, and interrogating various false and misguided assumptions regarding language ideology, identity, and multilingual rhetorical awareness and agency, among others.

Many multilingual and multidialectal learners, however, chose not to embrace their polyglossic repertoires, as is shown from the low uptake of translanguaging in this study's findings. When describing translingual writing in Kazakhstan, Goodman and Tastanbek (2021, p. 38) note that “students may feel translanguaging is not a resource but a crutch unless the monoglossic ideology is interrogated and resisted.” The entrenchment of monoglossic ideology on the part of the state, educational institutions, and learners may still be so engrained that critically resisting it may require considerable resources (Goodman & Tastanbek 2021, p. 37-8), including in Kosovo. As Arnold (2020, p. 318, 337-8; see also Arnold, 2016, p. 79-81) points out in her research on translingual writing at a post-secondary institution in Lebanon, some learners may intentionally opt-out, depending on their academic goals, i.e. alignment with established norms, as could also be the case in the current study (see also Shapiro et al. 2016 p. 33-35; Guerra, 216, p. 229-232; Zhang-Wu et al., 2023, p. 3-4).

Similar to the multilingual pivot in composition, the decolonial turn also seeks to problematize various injustices, in particular by shedding a critical light on structures of power (Kubota, 2022). Kubota (2022, pp. 1-4) maintains that language education has increasingly recognized the legitimacy of diversity in linguistic forms and multilingual practices, including more recently translanguaging and translingualism, which can be explored through a decolonial lens. Such a decolonial stance encourages questioning and diversifying the understanding of notions such as of “second,” “language,” and “writing” (p. 3) and thus prompts the exploration of alternative naming, e.g. “multilingual writing,” and the recognition of such alternatives (see also Thonus, 2020). Kubota (2022) also highlights the importance of language in culture and its connection to decoloniality, such as the preservation and revitalization of the linguistic practices of marginalized multilingual communities. Lee (2023, p. 60-63), for instance, examines the lived linguistic experiences of a self-identified Latina bilingual student in a higher education institution in the US where applying “decolonial thinking” involving a “decolonial option” illustrates a path toward linguistic and social justice. Lee (2023, p. 60) also points out how

multilingual students’ writing has not been viewed as a site of social justice work. In the backdrop of the oppressive ideologies and rhetoric toward multilingual students’ ways of being, knowing, and doing language, we as scholar-educators must account for how multilingual students’ engagement ... works toward the goal of social justice and decoloniality.

A similar situation could also be the case for Shega in an EMI-TNHE setting in Kosovo.

**Concluding remarks**

The tentative findings of this ongoing, multi-year study suggest that additional discussions with students, faculty, and peer writing tutors, among other stakeholders, remain crucial, in particular concerning critical awareness and the monolingual paradigm, especially in relation to empowering students to leverage their vibrant linguistic resources in their writing (e.g. Lee & Jenks, 2016; Guerra, 2016; Gilyard, 2016; Shapiro et al., 2016; Shapiro, 2022; Michaud & Madsen Hardy, 2023; Fox & Chang-Bacon, 2023; di Gennaro et al. 2023; Pontier & Deroo, 2023). Such critical conversations could also highlight how espousing such a translingual disposition could center culturally responsive pedagogy, rhetorical agency, social justice, and decolonial thinking (Cushman, 2016; Shapiro et al., 2016; Guerra, 2016; Brown, 2020; Seals & Olsen-Reeder, 2020; Li & García, 2022; Kubota, 2022; Sun, 2023; Lee, 2023; Shapiro & Lorimer Leonard, 2023; Jordan, 2023; Zhang-Wu, 2023).

As for this study’s limitations, it did not involve spoken interactions, such as during essay consultations with the instructor, writing consultations in the writing center, or peers in various learning spaces, such as during the peer review process and in break out rooms. The study was also limited by the number of instructors and courses involved in the study. Future results of the author’s ongoing investigation of translingual writing may be revealing in understanding to what extent these constraints, among others, influenced the uptake of translingualism.

Additional avenues of research could incorporate supplemental interviews, surveys, and focus groups with various stakeholders and also include examining translingual practices during peer tutoring sessions at the institution’s writing center. As researchers reorient the lens concerning “what, in fact, constitutes failure” (Lorimer Leonard & Nowacek, 2016, p. 260), such lines of investigation could also assist students in leveraging their multifaceted linguistic repertoires, while also negotiating meaning-making that permits critically informed deviations and boundary crossing (pp. 260-1).
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1. The notion of translanguaging is sometimes conflated with translingualism, codemeshing, codeswitching, metrolingualism, and plurilingualism, among others. The current study uses translanguaging and translingual(ism) interchangeably, as both involve “*difference in labor*” (see Horner & Alvarez, 2019, p. 10). For further discussion, see Horner & Alvarez (2019) and Shapiro & Watson (2022). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Schreiber (2015, p. 85) explains: “Canagarajah (2006) originally defines codemeshing as the blending of non-dominant varieties of English into standard English texts, and later redefines codemeshing as a practice which ‘accommodates the possibility of mixing communicative modes and diverse symbol systems’ (2011, p. 403)” (see also Schreiber & Watson, 2018). Regarding the current study, codemeshing, a *visible* manifestation of (trans)languaging and translingual practices, entails the mixing, meshing, weaving, and fusing of dominant and non-dominant codes, including all (named) languages and varieties that exist in the languager’s linguistic and semiotic repertoire, including the sharing and preserving of intergenerational (cultural) knowledge (production), where an asset-oriented lens (cf. deficit orientation) and critical language awareness are involved (see also, e.g. Cushman, 2016; Shapiro & MacDonald, 2017; Donahue, 2018; Seals & Olsen-Reeder, 2020; Shapiro & Watson, 2022). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Schreiber and Watson (2018, p. 94-95) explain that a translingual approach extends beyond linguistic hybridity and codemeshing: “For us, defining translingual pedagogy narrowly as one specific type of languaging—code-meshing, or, more specifically, the use of nonstandard spoken dialects in writing—is what creates the false perception of a translingual approach as one which uncritically valorizes language difference. Instead, we see translingual pedagogy as much broader – as any pedagogy which works against the ‘pathologization of different Englishes that do not meet a narrowly defined set of standards dictated by...a privileged few’ (Lee, 2017, p.2). To accomplish this, teachers must to ‘go beyond simply inviting, encouraging...or curricularizing ‘difference’ (Lee, 2017, p.2). In other words, pedagogy is translingual not merely by exposing students to language diversity or by permitting students to use their full linguistic repertoires in their writing, but by asking students to investigate/consider how language standards emerge, how and by whom they are enforced, and to whose benefit, by bringing to light in the classroom how language standards sustain and are sustained by social inequity.” [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Shapiro and Watson (2022, p. 304) write: “Drawing from Mignolo’s concept of ‘delinking’ in concert with Rosa and Flores’s concept of a raciolinguistic perspective, here we demonstrate how teachers might translate antiracist and decolonial approaches into translingual praxis, aiming to better contextualize and negotiate language difference and to explicitly challenge racist and colonizing paradigms.” [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. So as ensure the anonymity of the student writer, this pseudonym has been used for this particular student. The name was chosen by the researcher and the student writer. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Whereas Geg has historically been employed by speakers north of the Skumbini River in Albania and Kosovo as well as in parts of Montenegro and North Macedonia, Tosk is spoken in southern Albania and parts of North Macedonia (Byron, 1976). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Skutnabb-Kangas (2015, p. 1) points out that “people whose mother tongue is not a ‘standard’ variety of language they use are often stigmatized” (as cited in Dovchin, 2020, p. 774). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. During in-person learning (2022), however, the number of instances of student incorporating translingualism and CLA were higher, in particular when compared to online and hybrid learning (2020 and 2021). That is, in 2022 there were 12 projects (n=12; .024%) that contained overt translingualism and four (n=4; .008%) that examined CLA (total of 16, or .032%), while in 2020 and 2021 (combined), only nine projects (n=9; .018%) contained explicit translingualism and three (n=3; .006%) addressed CLA issues (total of 12, or .024%). [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. “How are you, darling? How was your day at school, good?” Note that the English translations were provided by Shega during the informal interview. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. “village” [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. “city, town” [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. “his mother” [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. “I went to the market today, what else is there to do here without you? It reminded me of my life in the village. When I was your age, during this time I used to go out with my mother to get ready for the winter. Today, I went to buy my boots all by myself. It’s nothing (no worries), atleast they’ll come in handy when the big snow comes … There is no one like my mother.” [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. “Long live Russia, a free country! We are free and happy, we are all shining with a dawn!” [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. “Long hair, small (short) mind.” [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. For further discussion regarding these particular graphemes, their phonetic representations, and related developments, see Kolgjini (2004). Note that angular brackets, i.e. < >, are used to signify graphemes, i.e. the orthographic symbols of the written form of the language, including for a variety of (sub)dialects, in the student writing materials presented here. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)