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Abstract

The author critically reviews the TESOL practice known as translanguaging which incorporates the student’s acquired language(s) within the syntax of the target language (TL) as a means to foster understanding. It is suggested that the learner’s entire linguistic repertoire better fosters the learner’s understanding of the material. Within the last 20 years, the practice has gained popularity, and proponents’ advocacy for incorporating home languages within the writing classroom has come to be understood as a necessity for student success. Leonard (2014) identifies students' drawing upon all of their linguistic resources as "rhetorical attunement" and argues that multilingual writers become better writers in the TL when they claim all of their voices. Like Leonard, the author recognizes the importance of home language representation within language classes because it is a major part of the learner’s identity to which their sense of self is tied. At the same time, the author argues that translanguaging may reduce the student’s access to the target language, resulting in potentially lower TL proficiency and ultimately fewer opportunities for professional opportunities within the United States. Triangulated data sources include: (1) the researcher’s experiences and research in language learning, (2) personal correspondence with a Russian-speaking ESL instructor, and (3) data gathered from the focus group, “Multilingual’s Information Processing.” The present study is an exploration of the role of translanguaging in the college composition classroom and the role of the instructor in that setting.
The first time I encountered postmodern philosophy was with the TESOL Program Director and my Thesis Chair, Dr. LaVona Reeves. As Dr. Reeves read through my paper for our Second Language Acquisition class during Fall quarter of 2017—my first quarter of the program, she stopped and asked: “Who are you referring to?” “Why are you saying this?” “Can you tell me more about this?” These questions came as a surprise to me as I thought I had perfected this paper. From this introduction to postmodernism and to dialogical review, I began to understand that clarity and detail were an essential part of our written thoughts and ones that through communicative engagement, instructors can help articulate. From this first account of instructor-led conferences, I learned how to fully incorporate the audience and the degree of relativity that is inherent in my perception and thoughts. This experience transformed my teaching instruction as I unknowingly began to incorporate it in my own teaching methodology. I realized this when I first gave similar feedback to my students after reading their argumentation papers, and I felt like they’d left out the real content of the story—the ‘who’, ‘why’, and the ‘how.’ Without this initial understanding of analysis and my consequent realization of knowledge’s transferability through exemplification, I would not have come to the same claims presented in this thesis.

My other departmental professor, Dr. Tracey McHenry, added further perspective to the research as she laid the foundation for my understanding of qualitative research and applied linguistics. It was in Dr. McHenry’s courses that I learned that linguistics is descriptive and not prescriptive—we aim to describe what we see, not apply a standard to it. I had not realized this trait of our discipline prior. This realization validated my feelings of language acquisition and my initial hesitation with translanguaging, which we will explore in the coming pages.
These foundations to the research were further developed by my rhetoric professors, Dr. Justin Young and Dr. Kate Crane. Within their classes I was prompted to think deeply about life and existence. In doing so, my perception of language aspects, such as its influence and articulation, were developed and changed. I realized the degree to which language and meaning is inherently tied to our backgrounds and surrounding environments. It is due to these classes and professors that I have decided to continue my research in composition in a doctoral program.

The academic progression that these professors and mentors provided me was the inspiration needed to undertake such a project, yet I would never have been at the place to start this project if it weren’t for the support of my family. My mother, Dorothy; father, James; brother, Robert; sister-in-law, Mandy; my nieces, Etta and Abbey, and my late grandmother, Audrey. Not only have I been fortunate to grow up with the most loving and supportive family, but I have been fortunate enough to grow up with a family that has expected the most from me, and who made sure that I was able to achieve what I was possible of. I dedicate this thesis to my grandmother, whose outstanding wit laid the foundation that prompted my confidence and self-assuredness. This understanding of myself was further developed by the never-ending encouragement from my family—for better or for worse.

Lastly, I must acknowledge the support of my fiancé, Lewis, and our dog, Rupert. Though they are a part of my family, they uphold a special place as they day-in and day-out put up with my tireless need for “quiet” and “space” in order to finish my work. Their love and presence made this thesis take shape in a way that I could have never executed without them.

Thank you to everyone who has helped me with this project. Elena Morgan, my Russian sister and colleague, who was always ready to answer my questions and who introduced me to my Russian family: Irena, Sergei, Katya and Vika. My Russian family helped me find my
Russian identity as they introduced me to Russian culture by ways of blini and family traditions. I also want to thank Ali Baghradi, my former supervisor from Tazarine, Morocco, who helped me adjust to life in l’Soud. And to both of my host families from Morocco—thank you. Their willingness to open their homes to me was pivotal for my survival in Morocco. I feel it was a culmination of my entire life that has created this work, but most specifically those that have been a part of it within the last two years. Thank you.
Preface

The foundation of this thesis is an effort to establish my ethos as a multilingual who has experienced language learning in diverse settings. Without this foundation, the conclusions and claims made in the present study, which challenge the sensitive topic of the reality of language boarders, could seem unjustly made. Therefore, I entitled the work with Adrienne Rich’s fitting words to establish the multifaceted perspectives present in the research. Without such an introduction, some of the conclusions drawn could evoke unintended perspectives, thus evading the purpose of the research; I am not advocating for English Only curriculums, rather advocating for immersive language instruction. In defining and locating translanguaging—the communicative act that incorporates a minimum of two languages into a single utterance—through theory, method, and practice, the thesis aims not to prescribe absolutes, but to inquire, provoke, and propose solutions. It is understood that TESOL is a field, which incorporates elements of a number of disciplines: linguistics (applied linguistics, neurolinguistics, anthropological linguistics, etc.), second language acquisition, English, and education. The extent of TESOL’s coverage entails the inclusion of many philosophies and ideologies. Consequently, the field is composed of diverse opinions on nearly all aspects of teaching. I aim to relinquish any bias or personal history that situates this research into any one canon, but rather relays sincere observations.

Having begun learning a second language, German, at age 8 with a private tutor in La Crosse, Wisconsin, my linguistic repertoire system, or competence, began to expand. The preparatory lessons were for our month-long stay in Austria, Germany. My German studies continued intermittently until twelfth grade as my life changed in many ways over those years.

Ninth grade began for me in a small, Russian town in Moscow-region called, Dubna. As
my mother worked for the local university under a Fulbright Fellowship, I attended a private Russian school, Rodnik, where the classes were taught in Russian. My Russian language preparation had started a year prior to our departure through a combination of private lessons and through the local university’s Russian 101 course. Therefore, I continued to develop my Russian acquisition during classes at Rodnik, while I also continued studying German as a foreign language. The German class was taught mostly in German, but with some instruction in Russian. In that class, I mainly focused my attention on German as I had studied it for nearly three years prior and felt comfortable in that language learning routine. Moreover, it was difficult to keep up with the instructor if I switched back and forth between Russian and German. I realized it took time to shift my understanding between the two languages.

Upon my return to the States, and after having visited France during our stay in Russia, I began studying French at the high school, where they also offered Russian 101 and 102. These classes were standard foreign language classes, where the instructor spoke as much of the foreign language as the class understood, while supplementing with English as necessary.

I stopped studying German and focused on Russian and French, until I moved to Washington in 2003. I took two more years of German in Washington, where I also continued my studies in French. In Washington my foreign language teachers held language-rich classrooms and I was expected to primarily speak in the target language. While I had not been able to study Russian during my secondary studies in Washington, my studies in Russian and French continued during my undergraduate work at the University of Washington, where I studied Russian language, literature, and culture with a French minor.

During my junior year from 2009-2010, I studied abroad at the same university that my mother had taught at in Dubna, Russia. I attended the linguistics courses in Russian, which
included a foreign language, or French for me. Again, this entailed undergoing foreign language instruction in my third language. The necessity for me to isolate my concentration to the French language became further apparent in this course as the instructor did not like my American-French accent and I needed to put further effort in my French. If I concentrated in Russian, my American-French accent would come through as soon as I caught up with the class in French. If I maintained my focus on the French, I was better able to replicate the sounds I was hearing from my instructor and classmates. Following my graduation, I worked in Russia and continued my Russian studies, concluding in nearly 10 years of Russian instruction, 5 years of French, and 6 years of German.

My most recent language acquisition comes from my Peace Corps service, where I was introduced to the Moroccan Arabic, Darija. This language learning experience was in an immersive setting, where not only did I undergo six-eight hours of language facilitation a day for the first three months, but I was placed with families that did not know English. The necessity of needing to ask someone for something and not knowing how, fueled my language acquisition. Therefore, I focused entirely on Darija, though I sometimes incorporated French as Morocco’s primary foreign language is French, and it influences Darija. Though my informal instruction stopped after those initial three months, I set-up language lessons with an on-site tutor and used the language daily. After 19 months in-service, I tested at the intermediate level in Darija.

These experiences are meant to establish that although I currently hold the profession of an English instructor, I am also a language learner. I am a language learner who has experienced the language learning process in multiple spheres. Moreover, I claim to be a multilingual as I am able to conduct my thoughts in four national languages. The claims made within this research are then from a researcher and language learner’s understanding. All of the material is examined
from an insider’s, or intrinsic, and outsider’s, extrinsic, perspective, thereby asking for a solution that is supportive of scholarly and personal research. The observations made are from nearly 20 years of reflection on language and language acquisition, either directly or indirectly. They are a compilation of life reflections on what language learning entails and how we, TESOL instructors, can best support it.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The days felt somewhat long in the small town of Tazarine, which was located on the southern Moroccan road heading from the infamous Ourzazette, where *The Mummy* was filmed, to Errachidia (Figure 1). *L’seHun*, the heat, in the summer months of 2015 crept in through the windows and raised the apartment’s temperature, while the *l’berd*, the cold, was constant in those winter months from lack of direct sunlight on the concrete buildings; weather was an influential element of the daily life in Morocco and did not allow for sleeping in. My morning routine went: wake-up, make coffee from the percolator on the gas stove-top, exercise—long runs across the desert or Fitness Blender YouTube videos in my apartment, shower, make *l’hozb*, (hearth-baked, local bread), an egg and *du fromage*—The Laughing Cow Cheese, for breakfast, and lastly, prepare for the day’s activities at the *dar chebab*, “home youth,” or youth center.

My *dar*, was located on the western side of town, approximately 15 minutes from the other side of town where the *dar chebab* was located. In the summer months, I would leave the apartment dressed in my most professional, conservative, lighter clothes—long, loose-fitting dresses and pants and long tops to respectfully cover the body. I’d walk along the sand pathways in the shadows across the town and up the hill where the *dar chebab* was situated. During the winter months, this walk was made in the direct sunlight to finally feel warm as the sunny rays beat down on my skin and clothes. Directly across from the *dar chebab* was the town high school, *Sidi Amro*, Mr. Amro, which featured a soccer field that looked out upon the entire Tazarine region. Tazarine’s town center, a long street with multiple electronics shops, cafes, groceries, bakeries, and specialty shops, was surrounded by many *duwars* or villages. It was from the very distant *duwars* that the Tamazight-speaking *chebab* came to the boarding school,
which was located across from Sidi Amro on the hill. The others walked the daily 20 minutes to school from the closer duwar dars, which were approximately 10 minutes from the town center.

Figure 1: Map of Morocco (Curtesy of www.nationsonline.org/maps/morocco-political-map.jpg)

Tamazight is one of the two dialects of the indigenous language of Morocco. Tamazight (figure 2) means “freeman” and represents the indigenous people of Morocco. Tashel’hiite, the second dialect, is more commonly used in the south-western and middle-south-eastern regions of
Morocco. The *chebab* from the *duwars* were very proud of their nationality and would portray the freeman symbol whenever we had a creative art lesson.

![Figure 2: Berber/ Tamazight Freeman Symbol (Photo courtesy of www.imgrumweb.com/hashtag/amazighsymbol)](image)

Once on top of the hill, attempting to wipe the sweat nonchalantly from my brow, I was greeted by many children who were playing around the couple of *dars* there. “*Bonjour!*” they would yell as their impression of white people was distinctly made by the colonization of the French. “*Salam wa-alya-kum!*” “Peace be on you!” I would yell back, attempting to demonstrate that I was not French, but a member of their community. Their understanding of language and identity was not linked to a nation-state identification, rather by the identification of a different appearance. Caucasians were presumed to be French, while all Asians were presumed to be Chinese for example. I found this uneducated perception to be fairly common and often led to derogatory remarks or gestures towards foreigners. Volunteers from the Japanese service organization, JICA (Japan International Cooperation Agency), described the frequented occurrence of the *chebab* placing their fingers to the outside of their eyes and pulling the skin outward to mimic the almond-shaped eye that is often associated with Asian ethnicity. This understanding of the world and people was due to the isolation of the *duwars* and lack of access
to exposure to different people. This understanding of the world was also part of the reason why volunteer groups like Peace Corps and JICA work in these areas.

After passing the houses and children, I’d walk in the shade of *dar chebab* fence for the remaining 5 minutes, in an attempt to cool down before entering the gated building. “*Allo, Nora! Kay dayra*?” “Hello, Nora! How are you?” my supervisor, Ali, would always say. Ali greeted me in Darija the Moroccan variety of Arabic that is a mixture of French, Spanish, Tamazight, and Arabic. Ali was a young local, who had been put in charge through his family’s connections and his education. A smart, motivated 29-year-old, Ali was not particularly interested in youth development, but rather in developing his professional skills. He was always awaiting my arrival because it seemed as if nothing would be happening at the center until I brought materials for that day. Due to this, Ali was always ready to support my ideas for programming.

“*Labas, lhumdillilah. U nta? Kay dayr*?” “Fine, thanks to God. And you? How are you?” I would formulaically reply in my lower-intermediate level of Darija. “*Lyum 3ndna chi-haja zwin dyal l’chebab*?” “Do we have anything nice for the children today?” Ali would ask to which I would reply in simplified Darija, “*Iyeh, l’yum, ana bghit n-dir chi-haja m3a l’peinture*.” “Yes, today I want to do something with paint.” Our communication, although basic, was always negotiated as Ali knew minimal English, and my Darija was limited. Therefore, I would apply the French I had studied for five years to support my lack of Darijan vocabulary. Hence, the inclusion of “*l’peinture*” in the phrase to supplement for my unfamiliarity of ‘paint’ in Darija.

“*Iyeh, l’yum, ana bghit n-dir chi-haja m3a l’peinture*” is an example of translangugaging, or the communicative practice that responds to a context through the use of all available linguistic repertoires or languages (Canagarjah, 2011; Li, 2018; Pennycook, 2017; Palmer, Martínez, Mateus, Henderson, 2014). What is it that evokes the autonomous inclusion of diverse,
linguistic structures into a single communicative act? Is it intentional? We feel that the setting invites these occurrences as I suggest that my inability to state ‘paint’ in Darija is simultaneously reconciled with the understanding that my audience, Ali, knows French as do I. The culmination of factors present in the setting of the speech act perhaps are unconsciously absorbed and, in that moment, are consciously addressed by the linguistic structure I provide.

Darija is a language that has been subject to multiple linguistic influences including French, Arabic, and Spanish, but is founded on Tamazight and Tashel’hiite. Moroccans grow up first learning either Darija or Tamazight or Tashel’hiite depending on the family’s heritage. Once they begin school, they learn Arabic and French, while English is introduced later but not highly emphasized. Therefore, French is the most commonly used foreign language in the country. The linguistic competence I had in French would surface when my Darija would fail. These instances were very common, but never created a communication barrier between Ali and me. In fact, we have stayed in contact and continue to negotiate our conveyances in whatever linguistic phrasings we have available to us that address the context.

During classes, which were drop-in programs so community members could come and go, the chebab would string utterances together that combined Darija, French, Arabic, and Tamazight. The language used among the children knew no linguistic boundaries as most had acquired these languages through communicative practices. The fluidity with which the children expressed themselves in multiple languages was the most fascinating linguistic phenomenon I had witnessed. Moreover, as I observed these linguistic occurrences among the youth, I began to be aware of my own linguistic flexibility when I spoke my Darijan-French combination. It became apparent that the focus was no longer on the language being used, but rather on effectively communicating my thoughts and understanding others.
Translanguaging in Spokane, Washington

The use of multiple languages or language varieties to delineate a message that is context-based, known as translanguaging. The practice has gained attention in academia the past 20 years as increased technological mobility has led to awareness of these occurrences, as well as served as a platform for more cultural intersections. Thus, leading to more instances of intersected linguistic structures, or translanguaging. Furthermore, increased migration has entailed increased diversity in local settings. An example of this increased cultural and linguistic intersectionality is in Spokane, Washington, where there is a large Slavic community. The resettlement of this community was a result of an influx in religious emigration in 1989 after Mikhail Gorbachev lifted the emigration barrier on the Soviet Union (Johnson, 1995). The Slavic community has grown since 1989 as relatives and friends continued to immigrate over the years (Cunningham, 2001). It was during one of these cultural intersections that an example of Spokane’s Russian-English translanguaged variety, or “Russlish,” occurred.

Over the 2018 summer, I was employed by AmeriCorps’ VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) summer program. The assignment was through the local libraries and was aimed at providing literacy programs to underprivileged youth through drop-in programs available to the local community. One of the locations of the programs was a park near a local, public swimming pool. Many families would come to the programming before going to the swimming lessons as we offered literacy activities, and a free lunch was provided through the park services. One of the families who attended fairly regularly, was a part of the local Slavic community. The mother, little boy, Maxim, and two daughters, Selena and Edith, would come with another Slavic family to check what the day’s activities were and to browse through the books we were donating. The first time I heard the family speak Russian my ears perked up since I had lived and studied in
Russia and consequently earned a B.A. in Russian language, literature, and culture. This love for the language and people spurred a relationship between the Russian family and me, as Maxim was so happy to hear someone from outside of the Slavic community share his language.

The families browsed through the books we were donating to ensure that no witchcraft or other evils were present in the content—the Slavic community in Spokane is very religious. The result of this religious affiliation is extreme isolation, whereby without a connection to the Russian language and/or one of the Russian Presbyterian churches, you are considered an outsider. Thus, the Slavic community’s preference to communicate in Russian and with those from within their community, creates a linguistic and social boundary between the Slavic community and outsiders. I had been granted access due to my Russian language skills and apparently kind manner as was demonstrated by one of the mothers offering me a pamphlet for salvation.

It is because of this isolation that I was particularly interested when Maxim’s mother, who was gathering the children to head to their swimming lessons, uttered a phrase similar to, “Нам нужно скоро пойти на swimming lessons,” or “For us it is necessary to go to swimming lessons soon.” As I remember, the mother was preparing the children to walk across the parking lot for swimming lessons. Therefore, this is a possible utterance, but my memory may not be 100% accurate as I did not record it. Observers may wonder why the mother so fluidly switched to use the English term, “swimming lessons” instead of the Russian equivalent, “уроки плавания” which directly translates to “lessons of swimming.” This experience prompted intrigue into the reasons for the incorporation of this English phrase and others that we may hear among multilingual Russian speakers in Spokane.
Background and Statement of the Problem

Washington state plans to instate a “K–12 dual language framework” (Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction [OSPI], 2018) by the year 2030. The efforts behind the legislation advocate for bilingualism and biliteracy in implementing dual language curriculums due to their promising skill development in children. These efforts are fully supported by a majority of language teachers who recognize the value of the language learning process. Yet the promotion of such frameworks inspires and encourages use of multilingual practices for the reason that they are in sheer opposition to ones used under the current “monolingualism [that] has shaped the historical formation of U.S. writing instruction and continues to influence its theory and practice” (Horner & Trimbur, 2002, p. 594). Hence, practices such as translanguaging become prioritized due to their inclusivity rather than due to their proven success. The present research situates translanguaging realistically rather than “romantic[ally]” (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 3) to examine potential outcomes.

Translanguaging is an example of a multilingual-oriented practice by way that it redirects the focus from the categorically explicit linguistic systems—Russian and English—used in denoting a context, to the context itself, thus encouraging multilingual utterances. Placing the focus on context rather than the language(s) used to express them “helps us… appreciate [multilinguals’] competence in their own terms” (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 3). This research recognizes the value of translanguaging’s support of multilingual competency, while critiques it for its inability to increase dynamic exposure to isolated language systems—an achievable objective proven to be of value for current English language learners (ELLS) further in Chapters 2, 4, 5, and 6. In locating translanguaging in the tertiary multilingual composition classroom, I hope to make transparent the practice’s possible outcomes as well as the underpinnings of
multilingual linguistic processing so that instructors use the practice in scaffolded ways. If translanguage is practiced near the end of the lesson rather than at the beginning, learners are asked to interpret the lesson through the lens of the TL, thereby providing dynamic exposure to SAE. In a time when some scholars are suggesting that native English teachers may no longer be necessary, not for the negative stigma attached to the term “native,” but due to the fact that SAE may not be necessary to learn for those outside of deemed English-speaking nations (He & Li, 2009; Kachru & Smith, 2009; Canagarajah, 2006; Li, 2018), this research seems highly relevant.

**Research Questions:**

1. What is translanguaging?
2. Where does translanguaging most effectively work in the tertiary, multilingual composition classroom?
3. Where does the TESOL instructor fit in this?

In first locating and identifying what translanguaging is conceptually, to how it works theoretically, this thesis hopes to answer if, why, and when the practice should be applied in the TESOL classroom. In order to answer these questions, we will first examine current research that relays why there is increased advocation for more multilingual practices such as translanguaging. This research includes published field research, personal correspondence with my friend and TESOL colleague, Elena Morgan, and collected personal experiences in language learning. The present study concludes with an analysis of the data from the focus group, “Insight to Multilinguals’ Information Processing” to help answer the if and when.

The collected data from the two focus group sessions that I conducted, help us to understand how “authentic,” or uninstructed translanguaging, can emerge. The conclusions drawn from this data suggest that translanguaging should be incorporated for: increasing
learner’s confidence in their understanding and exploration of material, while excluded due to it: limiting the learner’s exposure to the target language and exploration of their English self, minimizing the rate of frequency that the learner interacts with the target structure, and emphasizing a stimulated world, not reflective of the current, standard academic English (SAE) professional world of the United States.

The extent to which SAE pervades places of business, politics, and education in the United States is a reality—a reality that is further examined in Chapters 2, 4, 5 and 6. Yet this statement is made under hesitation as the politics and ideological reality which support the claim, are not popular within the TESOL community. Moreover, this statement dismisses the ontological reality of vast populations of multilingual speakers who function in this professional world with their English dialect and/or variety (Canagarajah, 2011, 2006; Li 2018; Cook, 2010). Hence, the thesis title’s appropriateness, “This is the oppressor’s language, yet I need it to speak with you,” which aims to establish my perception of the issue. Moreover, this advocation is addressed by focusing the present study on the collected examples of translanguaging and data collected from the focus group so to present an emic view. The voices of these multilinguals, who are members of and further understand the multilingual world we are attempting to surface, should be heard as they prompt concern for the practice of translanguaging. These voices prompt reflection and frame the research questions for the thesis.

**Research Methodology**

**Complex to Dynamic Systems Theory**

The examples above intend to demonstrate the possible outcomes of increased mobility and interconnectivity that we share globally. These examples become two *intricacies* within the global system that occupies the Earth—they become products from the intersections with other
systems under the complex system theory (CST). CST considers daily phenomena such as a business’s development, economic growth, upward social mobility, or human cognition to be both examples of complex systems and “fluxes” of complex systems (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2016, p. 152). Fluxes are the intricacies created by the system’s intersecting variables—they are the system’s progression and become systems themselves. The behavior, or consequent organization within the system due to these fluxes, is the primary element studied under CST.

From the above examples, we are looking at the intersection of the interlocuter and audience within a specific communicative act. These intersecting variables demonstrate complex systems of multilinguals, which led to the flux known as translanguaging. The following research, through analysis of performed utterances, research, and data gathered from a focus-group, attempts to locate translanguaging’s place in the Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) classroom. The purpose of this locating is to understand the effect of translanguaging in relation to language learners’ acquisition of a target language (TL), or SAE for our purposes. To locate translanguaging accurately, it appears that a comprehensive analysis such as dynamic systems theory (DST) would be the most effective.

DST correlates with CST, but with greater emphasis on the recursion of these intricacies overtime, equaling great dynamism, or greater flux—the same variable teachers have while meeting with their students multiple times over the quarter, year, or semester. Whereas, DST subjects second language acquisition (SLA) to external social interactions, the research includes O’Grady, Lee, & Hye-Young Kwak’s (2005) conclusions on processor-based emergentism to offer insight to multilingual’s internal, cognitive processing. In examining the extrinsic and intrinsic motivations for translanguage utterances, the research remains inducive to the system’s
variables. Moreover, the comprehensive analysis follows DST principles under which the observations have been drawn, modeling the application of DST. This dynamic phenomenon will be detailed in Chapter 2, further analyzed in Chapters 4 and 5, and present conclusions in Chapter 6.

**Triangulation through Narrative Inquiry and Phenomenological Theory as a Means for Ethnographic Research**

After locating translanguaging with DST, the present study analyzes the data with mixed-qualitative methods. Qualitative research principles “are inherently multimethod in focus” (Flick, 2002, as cited in Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p. 7). Through narrative inquiry and phenomenalological theory perspectives, translanguaging is examined in natural environments. The purpose in approaching the present study as such is to identify the basis of and the culminating variables that lead to translanguaged utterances.

Narrative inquiry brings to light the phenomenon of translanguaging, which under phenomenalological theory “embrac[es] a multicultural perspective because it accepts multiple realities. People act on their individual perceptions, and those actions have real consequences—thus the subjective reality each individual sees is no less real than an objectively defined and measured reality” (Fetterman, 2010, p. 5, as cited in Anderson, 2018, p. 30). The narratives, or stories, come from three sets of sources as a means to invoke triangulation. A triangulated account of translanguaging aims to offer “an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon in question” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p. 7). The first source is myself as my initial translanguage encounters were the foundation of the research. The second is my longtime friend and colleague, Elena Morgan, who I met in 2003 in preparation for my first move to Russia. Elena moved to Spokane in 2009 and became acquainted with the Spokane Slavic Community and the Russlish
that is presented in Chapters 2 and 3. My third source comes from the data collected from the focus group I conducted in September 2019, “Insight to Multilinguals’ Information Processing.”

My role in the present study invokes ethnographic research as I became a participant-observer and the other sources provide inside perspectives. “Participant observation entails becoming actively engaged in the life of the cultural group one is studying… It also entails simultaneously standing back, observing, systematically recording, and analyzing the cultural life one is experiencing” (Donmoyer, 2010, para. 7). The data, in including emic, or inside perspectives, illustrates “participant–attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, and practices [which uphold] the objective of ethnography … to come to a deeper understanding of how people in particular contexts experience their social and cultural worlds” (“Qualitative Research,” 2019). Though I do not intend to generalize these insider perspectives as a standard for the collective, I provide the data and analyses as a means for examining the translanguaging’s potential outcomes.

**Focus Group**

Focus groups are group interviews. A moderator guides the interview while a small group discusses the topics that the interviewer raises. What the participants in the group say during their discussions are the essential data in focus groups. Typically, there are six to eight participants who come from similar backgrounds, and the moderator is a well-trained professional who works from a predetermined set of discussion topics. Many other variations are possible, however. (Morgan, 1998, p. 1).

The discussions of “Insight to Multilingual Processing” were held through the reflections of the students during Sessions 1 and 2 and the relaying of my insight with them throughout the research process. In conducting the focus group as such we were able to gather the most authentic examples of translanguaging as possible, while also allowing for sincere responses from the participants. In doing this, the present study upheld the purpose of focus group methodology, “Focus groups create lines of communication [that lead to the] larger process of communication that connects the worlds of the research team and the participants” (Morgan,
Again, in an attempt to recognize the voices of the multilinguals that translanguaging advocates for, it is ever necessary to raise them and bring them to the forefront of contemporary research. The present study attempts to accomplish this objective.

**Grounded Method Theory**

We see then that the compiled research and data constructs an outline of translanguaging that is then reexamined at each stage of analysis: the preliminary analysis of the encountered translanguaging situations in daily life, the research, the focus group, and then the review of each of these multiple times over. Thus, the present study also follows grounded theory, which is a “method that uses a systematic set of procedures to develop an inductively derived grounded theory about a phenomenon” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, as cited in Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p. 15). The reiterative review of the analysis strives to realistically and appropriately review translanguaging.

**Assumptions Background**

Just as the data from the students provides insight to the situation, my language learner experiences relay my assumptions on the research. In my Arabic class we use translanguaging when stimulating dialogs and discussing new words in Arabic. It is important to note that I am a novice in my Arabic learning scenario, and translanguaging is often considered to be most effective in these situations as it can lead to fostering understanding. Hence when our ustad, teacher, taught *dunya*, world, we practiced translanguaging. In Arabic, *dunya* conveys a deep and emotional association in reference to heaven and Earth. At first *ustad* attempted to provide synonyms in Arabic, but then moved to discussing the connotations in English. The approach resulted in our first thorough account of *dunya* not in Arabic, which would have spurred deeper dynamism of the word in our Arabic competency, but rather in English. Had we attempted to
engage in the conceptual philosophy attached to *dunya* in Arabic first, then as my Arabic progressed, I may perhaps be privy to a more authentic understanding of *dunya*. *Ustad* was not familiar with the practice of translanguaging, therefore there are multiple reasons why I will continue to think of *dunya* as equivalent to ‘world’ and nothing greater. But due to the brain’s tendency to primarily recount first impressions, such as the argument that the home languages represent the initial identity of the person, I argue it would not. Conclusively, the assumptions that fueled this research, although partially constructed by the theoretical implications of SLA and rhetorical theory, originated from the translanguaging encounters stated above.

**Assumptions:**

1. Translanguaging asks ELL to engage in English academic materials across disciplines through the lens of their L1.
2. Translanguaging deconstructs the understanding that English language varieties are “mistakes” (Delpit, 1995, p. 170).
3. Language identities are developed during acquisition.
4. SAE fluency is achievable to some degree for every learner.
5. Acquisition of SAE is worth the effort.
6. Outcome-based curriculums are valuable for meeting the objectives in language acquisition.

**Overview of Thesis:**

**Preface:**

The preface situates the research within the author’s language learning background and intends to be a support for the claims made. Moreover, prefacing the work as such follows TESOL’s descriptive preference in analysis by relinquishing any and all biases.
Chapter 1:

The introductory chapter frames the thesis to let the audience understand the layout of the coming research. It begins with situations of translanguaging encountered by the researcher and means to establish the context. The statement of the problem included in the Chapter intends to make clear the relevancy and purpose of the research, while the assumptions and research methodology articulate the process of reviewing and analysis of the collected data and research.

Chapter 2:

Chapter 2 is a review of the history of pedagogies from fields that influenced and ultimately gave raise to TESOL. From this brief history, it is demonstrated why current TESOL research has begun to focus on multilingual competency, and how the research is applied within the TESOL classroom that currently operates under a monolingual tradition. The paradigmatic sway that has been demonstrated through the history situates translanguaging, while current subject theories critically review its potential outcomes.

Chapter 3:

Chapter 3 is an outline of the qualitatively grounded methodologies of this research and discloses the background information of the focus group participants and the Russian community member and ESL professional, Elena Pipenko-Morgan (herein after to be called Elena Morgan), before relaying the focus group procedure and data collection. Chapter 3 then exposes how the data was collected and analyzed so to make clear the discussion in Chapters 4 and 5.

Chapter 4:

Chapter 4 is the data collection of the three language details, Russian, English, and Russlish together with the post-language reflections from each detail. There is a discussion of each set posed after, which is then organized into a thematic chart. The data is organized so that
all of the participants’ language details are reviewed collectively, as well as their post-language reflections in-between.

**Chapter 5:**

Chapter 5 is the cumulative reflection from Session 1 and the data collected from Session 2. By placing the cumulative reflections from Session 1 and data from Session 2 in Chapter 5, we are able to identify the study’s findings and conclusions which are more closely examined in Chapter 6. Chapter 5 also includes the limitations of the study as they relay certain aspects of the conclusions provided in Chapter 6.

**Chapter 6:**

Chapter 6 is the conclusion of the present study with a review of the research questions and assumptions. Final conclusions drawn from the thesis lead to future research implications and recommendations, while finalizing the relevancy of the present study.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter 2 is a review of literature on Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theories and pedagogies that investigate multilingual competency and relevant applications that support multilinguals’ target language (TL) acquisition. This includes issues related to translanguaging. TESOL is a field, which incorporates elements of a number of disciplines: linguistics (applied linguistics, neurolinguistics, anthropological linguistics, etc.), second language acquisition, English, and education. In exploring established research, the purpose of this review is to 1) provide a brief history of TESOL pedagogy leading to the current emphasis placed on multilingual competency; 2) locate translanguaging as a product of comprehensive, interdisciplinary considerations; and 3) examine the variables of translanguaging practices and what these suggest for multilingual language processing. These areas are then the premise for the data analysis found in Chapters 4 and 5 and the conclusions presented in Chapter 6.

The basis of this thesis is grounded in the following research, which is a comprehensive account of the factors that have cultivated the push for abandoning monolingual practices. A number of scholars have claimed that acquiring a standard form is an ontological unreality (Canagarajah, 2011; Li, 2018; He & Li, 2009; Palmer, Martínez, Mateus, Henderson, 2014). The result of this claim has directed efforts in the ESL or multilingual classrooms to include a relaxed attitude towards structured language acquisition which is called “romanticization” by Canagarajah (2011, p. 3). Although these changes are not evidenced through-out TESOL, the heightened focus on equitable practices in regard to multilinguals in ESL classrooms, has led to greater acceptance of approaches such as translanguaging. While TL fluency is an instructional
goal, the present study not only advocates for accuracy, but also offers applicable, alternative practices that support multilinguals in composition classrooms.

**Brief history of TESOL pedagogy**

**TESOL’s Origin**

TESOL was founded in 1966 with the “mission to ensure excellence in English language teaching to speakers of other languages” (Noguerón, 2008). The establishment of the professional organization followed “the U.S. Congress set[ting] a minimum standard for the education of language minority students with Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which prohibits discrimination on the grounds of race, color, or national origin in programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance” (Wiese & Garcia, 1998, p. 3). Title VI then “establish [ed] the right of students to differential treatment based on their language minority status” (Wiese & Garcia, 1998, p. 3). TESOL responded to the growing concern and the non-compliance with the mandate that English language instruction had to support students of diverse backgrounds. At the same time TESOL became a center for practitioners to share research in the TESOL Quarterly and to establish their credentials as professionals (Noguerón, 2008).

As an association, TESOL incorporated bilingual and foreign language teaching methods that had been developed within the Modern Language Association, which had branched out to form new professional organizations—ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) and FLES (Foreign Languages in the Elementary School). TESOL methodology was directed at English language learners (ELLs) and was rooted in the growing, diversified needs of ELLs. The diversity brought to light the inconsistencies in learners’ success in acquiring the TL and emphasized the:
long-standing tension over whether equity in education is independent of cultural and linguistic attributes. One end of the debate over how to educate language minority students is a host of voices that insists that attending to the linguistic and cultural diversity in our schools thwarts efforts of social assimilation (Wiese & Garcia, 1998, p.3).

Thus, at the very heart of TESOL’s establishment was a practical component as it responded to the real needs of learners living in Anglophone countries (Cook, 2010). These students who were expected to assimilate for evaluative purposes, were losing their heritage. Moreover, the paradigm between traditional and contemporary language instruction was implicit with the onset of the organization; instructors noted that the traditional practices and understanding of language facilitation and acquisition was not applicable for specific student groups (Canagarajah, 2011, 2016; Cook, 2010). The realization then was that traditional foreign language teaching methods, modeled from modern language methods, often lacked real-life application and discounted the diversified background of the students. This realization in addition to an influx in immigration and global interconnectivity (Cook, 2010) resulted in new instruction methods.

**The Traditional Versus Modern Dualism**

TESOL’s development has been more recursive than linear, moving from “structuralist” (Canagarajah, 2016, p. 11) and “formalis[ts]” (Zhang-Leimbigler, 2014, p.1), who believe that language is best acquired through repetition of prescriptive rules, to the “progressivists” (Canagarajah, 2016, p.11) or “constructivists” (Zhang-Leimbigler, 2014, p.1), who perceive language acquisition as transforming thought into verbal representations. Much of the change has been due to interdisciplinary influence in that progressive or constructive philosophy is based on the epistemological influence from the “social turn initiated in SLA in the mid 1990s” (Ortega, 2013, p. 3). The influence is outsourced as the discipline acknowledged that aspects of the then-
current TESOL pedagogy were not effective for all. Moreover, the reactionary paradigmatic sway concludes today in an unsettled decision of the most appropriate TESOL curriculum and pedagogy (Canagarajah, 2016; Zhang-Leimbigler, 2014; Reynolds, Dolmage, Bizzell, & Herzberg, 2012). Though Hummel (2013) notes that the theoretical sway of a discipline may not necessarily have pedagogical implications, this review will suggest that the theories of second language acquisition (SLA), a primary domain of TESOL, has influenced pedagogical effects in both composition and TESOL.

As explained earlier in the Chapter, second or foreign language instruction is not new in academia (Canagarajah, 2016; García Mayo, Gutierrez Mangado, & Martínez Adrían, 2013; Reynolds, Dolmage, Bizzell, & Herzberg, 2012;). Since 1966, TESOL has evolved into a qualitative, holistic field as we reimagine communication as asserted by Canagarajah:

“Despite the modernist ideology of stable, homogeneous, and autonomous languages, people have always treated language as constituting semiotic resources that they appropriate from diverse communities for their purposes… The notion of resources adopts a functional orientation to communication in place of the normative and abstract. From this perspective, language purity is also challenged. All languages come through their histories of contact. This orientation also encourages us to look at how language resources are mobile, traveling with or without people to come into contact with other languages and communities, generating new grammars and meanings. (2016, p. 14).

It is suggested that the change to ethnographic focus was prompted by sociocultural implications (Freire, 1970; Huckin & Clary-Lemon, 2012; Lundsford & Glenn, 1990; Olson, 1999; Reynolds, Dolmage, Bizzell, & Herzberg, 2012) that many traditional TESOL methodologies such as audiolingual and grammar translation did not address in theory or practice (Ortega, 2013;
Canagarajah, 2016; Lantolf, 2007; Zhang-Leimbigler, 2014; Zhou, 2016). Although the literature describes this change as shifting from modern to postmodern (Canagarajah, 2016; Slattery, 2013; Ortega, 2013), it is perhaps indicative of a reactionary shift in the TESOL paradigm. (The term reactionary here is used to signify a response that is oppositional in orientation from the current one). The modern philosophy is more representative of formalist objectives and beliefs in static truths, while postmodernity opposes these former objectives (Canagarajah, 2016; Ortega, 2013; McKernan, 2008; Slattery, 2013), therein perpetuating the TESOL spectrum sway. The changes in philosophy are indicated in Figure 3.

![Figure 3: McKernan’s (2008) “Contrasting Characteristics of Outcomes-Based and Process-Inquiry Models for Curriculum” (Curtesy of McKernan, 2008, p. 85)](image)

As opposed to postmodern, the more traditional or modern pedagogies promoted repetitive instruction tactics such as drilling of vocabulary and focus on form (grammar) (García
Mayo, Gutierrez Mangado, & Martínez Adrián, 2013; Hummel, 2013; Zhang-Leimbigler, 2014). It is because these pedagogies regarded language and communication as “isolated practice[s]” (Zhang-Leimbigler, 2014, p. 2) that they taught foreign languages as such. Isolated practices disregard the relationship among the text, the author, and the audience, while they concentrate on direct interpretation from the language learner’s first language (L1) to the TL (Canagarajah, 2016; Hummel, 2013).

**Modern Methods and Practices**

“The Classic Method” (Hummel, 2013, p.108) focused solely on the instruction of reading and writing skills and piloted SLA pedagogies from the 1500s until the end of the 1800s (Hummel, 2013). From the Classic Method derived the Grammar Translation Method, which maintained isolated practices by consistent translating from the L1 to the TL (Hummel, 2013; Cook, 2010). Around 1890, Modern Languages transitioned from the Grammar Translation Method to the Direct Method (DM) (Hummel, 2013; Cook, 2010). The DM:

> “sought to immerse the learner in the same way as when a first language is learnt. All teaching is done in the target language, grammar is taught inductively, there is a focus on speaking and listening, and only useful ‘everyday' language is taught” (“Direct Method,” 2019).

With the DM, was a progression in the approach of language teaching, moving from isolated activities to immersive, but the practice assumed language learners acquire the TL the same as their L1—a conjecture that has come to be understood as not correct in many ways (Hummel, 2013; “Direct Method,” 2019).

One of the early pedagogical reactions in foreign language instruction, was the shift in focus from reading and writing to orality. This was emphasized in the 19th century language
classes when the previous attention on reading and writing skills came to seem “outdated”
compared to the progressive orientation, which aimed to emphasize the vernacular English.
Under the yet formalist, prescription-bound approach of the progressive redirection (Hummel,
2013), English came to dominate the American university. Horner and Trimbur (2002) traced the
history of the loss of Latin and Greek in the American University to the “vernacular” English.
They note:

> Writing instruction in the modern university, as many have noted, was institutionalized in
the late nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries as part of a larger modernizing initiative
to replace the classical curriculum of the old-time pietistic college with a secular
education in the vernacular. The question for the modernizers, as Theodore W. Hunt put
it in 1884, was, ‘Will the classics as taught in our colleges make any concessions of their
large amount of time to the modern languages?’ (121)”

(Horner & Trimbur, 2002, p. 595).

The shift proved largely successful in private schools, where student demographics were
consistent throughout and classes were facilitated by native speakers of the TL (Foss, Foss, &
Trapp, 1991; Hummel, 2013). This same redirection is evidenced in DM methodology, which
accounted for the value in acquiring aural and oral skills that former methods had not, but it had
not considered the realistic application of language. This is indicated by the method’s evaluation
of student success, which was assessed by their ability to repeat the prescribed, meaningful
utterances in the foreign language they were studying. Sometimes the students did not know
what they were saying (Hummel, 2013; Cook, 2010) as DM overlooked the abstractness and
generative nature of language being able to construct new sentences never heard before (Palmer,
2006).
In approximately 1940, the DM began to be replaced by the Audiolingual Method (ALM). ALM, shaped by Skinnerian methodology, argued that acquisition of the target language was attainable through habitual practices such as repetition drills (Canagarajah, 2016; Hummel, 2013; Zhang-Leimbigler, 2014). ALM methodology placed “emphasis [...] on learning grammatical and phonological structure, especially for speaking and listening” (“Audiolingualism,” 2019). As stated in Hummel (2013, p. 111) the “shortcomings” of the method, namely the lack of development in conversational fluency, provoked reflection from the field as to why ALM did not answer the modernist orientation for a “best method” (Prabhu, 1990, as cited in Canagarajah, 2016, p. 12). Thus, the paradigm yet again outsourced from fields such as psychology in order to find the best method (Canagarajah, 2016). For example, psychotherapist, Gregori Lazonov, claimed that language learners would acquire the TL more successfully in a “relaxed, non-threatening environment” (Hummel, 2013, p. 112). From this hypothesis Lozanov developed the method of Suggestopedia. Suggestopedia sparked the social influence that prompted an emerging awareness of environmental factors in regard to language acquisition. “Suggestopedia is a type of ‘affective-humanistic approach’ (Celce-Murcia in Larsen-Freeman 2000, p. 73) where students’ feelings are paramount” (Orosz, 2017, p. 10).

Lozanov (1978), the founding father of Suggestopedia, believed learning can take place at a much faster rate than is experienced by most learners and what gets in the way are “our psychological barriers to learning” (Orosz, 2017, p.10). Lozanov situated the foreign language classroom within the lives of the students, no longer keeping the language learning process isolated. The effect of this effort was coupled with the establishment of TESOL and monumental changes in addressing students’ personal lives within the curriculum.
Postmodern Methodology and Practices

Researchers began to move away from the perception that language learning was linear and static (Canagarajah, 2016; de Bot, Lowie, and Verspoor, p. 2007) to include the largely accepted view that language learning was an effort in “identity construction” (Canagarajah, 2016, p. 16). Under this orientation, cognitive linguistics emerged, which “relat[ed] language learning and use to social purpose, [whereby] learners would shape grammar according to their own needs and contexts, without a mechanical conformity to purported norms imposed by others” (Canagarajah, 2016, p. 16). TESOL’s cognitive linguistic advancement in the late 1970s further expanded the understanding of language learning and teaching. Most pointedly, TESOL witnessed the rise of “Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)” (Cook, 2010, p. 36), which has maintained its place in contemporary TESOL methods. CLT “is based on the idea that learning language successfully comes through having to communicate real meaning. When learners are involved in real communication, their natural strategies for language acquisition will be used, and this will allow them to learn to use the language” (“Communicative Approach,” 2019). CLT was a formalized step in understanding language as a negotiated practice rather than a static code to be transcribed by its learners. This understanding of English language teaching (ELT) is still heavily practiced today.

TESOL’s “autonomy” (Canagarajah, 2016, p. 7) from the Linguistic Society of America and the Modern Language Association exhibits its very trajectory, whereby its progression “c[a]me about partly in response to changing perceptions of ‘good’ language use, partly in response to developments in linguistics, and partly in response to changing political and demographic circumstances” (Cook, 2010, p. 39). The development of the discipline as noted by Cook (2010) came from the growing research brought about by both intrinsic and extrinsic
influence. No more were languages being taught and learned as a means to “br[ing] students into contact with the great national civilizations and their literatures” (Cook, 2010, p. 32). Languages were being taught as a means of necessity and practical survival. With increased interconnectivity due to technological advances (Canagarajah, 2011; Cook, 2010), voices emerged that demonstrated the inequalities this consideration of language and language teaching was creating, particularly as English grew to dominate global contexts. The emergence of once dismissed voices led to the understanding that language teaching and learning are complex and prompted the creation of TESOL.

**Language Learning as Identity Making**

**Sense of Self as Represented in Home Culture(s) and Language(s)**

The mere awareness of the traditional versus modern “dualism” (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2012, p. 5) became more formalized with the increase of communicative mobility, “globalization, language contact, and transnational interactions” (Canagarajah, 2016, p. 17). The passing of Title VI and establishment of TESOL further formalized the issues ELLs were experiencing. Yet prior to this hyper-connectivity, foundational scholars such as W.E.B. Du Bois, the prominent American sociologist, historian, and civil rights activist from 1868-1963, had voiced the injustices experienced by those who differed from the white-American standard. In *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903) Dubois exposes the internal struggled imposed on an individual when a particular culture, one that is different than the one of your heritage, is deemed to be the one to enculturate as it represents the societal “norm.”

The history of the American Negro is the history of this strife,—this longing to attain self-conscious manhood, to merge his double self into a better and truer self. In this merging he wishes neither of the older selves to be lost. He does not wish to Africanize America, for
America has too much to teach the world and Africa; he does not wish to bleach his Negro blood in a flood of white Americanism, for he believes—foolishly, perhaps, but fervently—that Negro blood has yet a message for the world. He simply wishes to make it possible for a man to be both a Negro and an American without being cursed and spit upon by his fellows, without losing the opportunity of self-development. (Du Bois & Chandler, 2014, pp. 68-69).

This sentiment, long ascribed, was less distributed not only because of the lack of technological access, but because of this being an “other” voice, a voice not representative of the standardized norm. In this respect, Dubois is one of the first to acknowledge the feeling of a double identity that is created when the culture you have always known is not represented in mainstream society. The effect of this “double-consciousness” as it’s come to be known, is its influence on one’s education and sense of value as will be seen in the present study.

Americanizing

Modernization, which could be marked by the education reform of the late 1800s (Wiese & Garcia, 1998) “emphasized an ‘Americanizing’ process for immigrants in order to educate them as responsible citizens” (Wiese & Garcia, 1998, p. 2).

At that time, the increasing numbers of ‘new immigrants’ from […] Southern and Eastern Europe raised nativist fears of separatism, and the only viable solution to the fear was their rapid assimilation into American culture. In this endeavor, language was seen as symbolic of overall integration into the larger society. The loss of the native language became an indicator of the abandonment of one’s culture of origin. (Malakoff & Hakuta, 1990 as cited in, Wiese & Garcia, 1998, p.2).
Thus, language teaching led to a “chain of reifications” or “the treatment of something, such as spoken and written language, that is always in process, located in and subject to ongoing and varying material practice, as a fixed, idealized entity removed from the vagaries of time, place and use” (Hohner & Trimbur, 2002, p. 596). The effect of modern practices and technology then, was the valorization of a standardized English—a language-variety that reflected the culture and etiquette of particular establishments such as at school, business, and government. In requiring the acquisition of the standard, stable form, the institutions “embodi[ed] a language policy that privileges English in relation to other languages” (Horner & Trimbur, 2002, p. 595). It was assumed that all students of the American school system would enculturate and take on the Indo-European identity that American Academic English is tied to, which may be connected to the emergence of translanguaging in some composition classrooms in the past two decades.

Du Bois accounted for ethnic variation, yet the premise holds true for linguistic variation and use as language and identity are inextricably tied (Cook, 2010; Canagarajah, 2016; de Bot, Lowie and Verspoor, 2007; Horner & Trimbur, 2002). Even following the consideration that language was a social construct, the persuasiveness of a standardized English in places of policy and importance, resulted in ELLs—even those who spoke a variety of English—to feel Du Bois’s double consciousness. The realization of the double consciousness on the part of the learner, is that their identity, which is first developed and cultivated at home, needs to be abandoned as the learner must enculturate to the linguistic and cultural norms of the institute.

While the United States Constitution does not state that English is the official language (Cunningham, 2002; Cook, 2010; Horner & Trimbur, 2002), “the dominance of English gives the language a certain power; it is the language of public discourse and government policy-making” (Cunningham, 2001, p. 5). Accordingly, the institute enforces the language of this
discourse perpetuating the perception that “one’s social identity is defined in terms of nationality, which itself is defined in terms of a single language” (Horner & Trimbur, 2002, p. 596). It is felt that any attrition to the language of the institute is less accepted as is the identity associated with it. As these identity issues arouse, the paradigmatic shift in composition studies gave rise to debates about the most appropriate English language curriculum and pedagogy (Canagarajah, 2016; Zhang-Leimbigler, 2014; Reynolds, Dolmage, Bizzell, & Herzberg, 2012). While some TESOL practitioners maintained that the “native speaker variety” (Canagarajah, 2016, p. 18) or standard dialect was transferable to all students by way of traditional practices, others began to look toward new language policies and practices.

**Students Right to their Own Language**

William Labov, a sociolinguist, furthered the movement for home languages to include recognition that students’ diverse languages (or dialects) were not deficient, but just that—diverse (Reynolds, Dolmage, Bizzell, & Herzberg, 2012) and representative of their cultural upbringings. This insight aided James Sled in creating the “Students’ Right to their Own Language” (SRTOL) resolution. SRTOL came from the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), which is a National Council for Teachers of English (NCTE) mandated conference that responded to the progressive movement in 1972 (Horner, 2001; Reynolds, Dolmage, Bizzell, & Herzberg, 2012; Students’ Right to their Own Language, 1974). The resolution claimed that if students were prompted to incorporate their “home language” (Reynolds, Dolmage, Bizzell, & Herzberg, 2012, p.9; Students’ Right to their Own Language, 1974) or “dialect” (Horner, 2001) of English in the classroom, they may have higher success in employing Standard Academic English (SAE) appropriately (Reynolds, Dolmage, Bizzell, & Herzberg, 2012, p. 9).
Around the same time, “Braj Kachru’s (1976) notion of World Englishes began to make inroads into [TESOL’s] professional discourse” (Canagarajah, 2016, p.18). Kachru, influenced by Labov, illustrated the expanse of English into other countries and how the countries had adapted English into local varieties for local purposes (Cook, 2010; Canagarajah, 2016). World Englishes provoked the argument as to who owns the language and which variety should be taught in-class: Standard Academic English, represented by Kachru’s termed inner circle (1982), which is composed of “the predominantly English-speaking countries” (Cook, 2010, p. 27), or local varieties that are represented by the outer (Kachru, 1982), or “former colonies where English is an official language” (Cook, 2010, p.27), and the expanding circles (Kachru, 1982), “where, although English is neither an office nor a former colonial language, it is increasingly part of many people’s daily lives” (Cook, 2010, p. 27). Kachru’s notion of World Englishes exposed the varieties of English being used around the world, further justifying STROL. These varieties were understood to be “rule governed with well-established norms and communication functions suitable for their new environment” (Canagarajah, 2006, p. 588). Thus, Kachru’s research forced the academic world to reconsider the English they were teaching in the classroom, initiating a paradigmatic sway that is still unsettled (Canagarajah, 2016; Kramsch, 2014).

**Methodological Implications**

The modern-postmodern sway is fueled by the TESOL enquiry, “what English should be taught?” Du Bois, SRTOL, and Kachru provoked this question as they initiated a reactionary shift from teaching the institute’s language to then attempting to incorporate students’ languages in the classroom. Therefore, another question is raised, “How should we include students’ languages into the classroom? Although revolutionary, SRTOL “treat[ed] languages and
language users as individually homogeneous, static, discrete, politically neutral yet tied indelibly to ethnicity” (Horner, 2001, p. 743). A responsive sway from traditional-modern philosophy, SRTOL was instituted to resolve misguided aspects of former methodologies; namely, that denying students their authentic voice in the classroom, was not effective for acquiring SAE. Therein enters critical discourse analysis (CDA) (Huckin & Clary-Lemon, 2012), rhetorical theory (Lundsford & Glenn, 1990), cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric (CCCR) (Zhou, 2016), and many other related, postmodern fields that seemed to provide further insight as to how to solve the issue of many tongues, one classroom. These composition-based traditions emphasize the interconnectivity of ideology and language, whereby rhetoric, the means of persuasion (or merely communication in the case of a language learner), is comprised of: the author’s values, the receiving individual’s values, “possible range of messages… and the nature of the university of reality” (Lundsford & Glenn, 1990, p. 452). Founded by the perception that language and rhetoric were a “form of social action,” (Huckin, Andrus & Clary-Lemon, 2012, p.108) it was suggested that CDA, rhetorical theory, and CCCR, can instigate change (Cunningham, 2001). This proposition is based in the orientation that language does not exist in a vacuum and is a product of thought and environment, or more explicitly, the sociocultural backgrounds of the student.

Expounding this orientation, CDA aims at unearthing “social inequality as it is expressed, constituted, and legitimized by language use” (Huckin, Andrus, & Clary-Lemon, 2012, p.108). These inequalities are further investigated under CCCR, which provides empirical evidence as the practice exhibits “how one’s first language influences his/her writing in a second language” (Zhou, 2016). CDA’s and CCCR’s insights are then processed in rhetorical theory, which provides a “conceptual framework that guides us in the dynamic process of making meaning”
(Lundsford & Glenn, 1990, p. 452). For at the very heart of the “what language to teach” issue is
the fact that language represents knowledge and meaning. Therefore, it is fitting that TESOL
incorporated a more holistic orientation in its methodology. These compositional-grounded fields
were part of the interdisciplinary influence that has advanced current TESOL research and left
the field questioning what to teach (Canagarajah, 2016; Kramsch, 2014) as they support the
understanding that language is not static.

With more focus on the multiplicity of factors present in the classroom, language
learning, and the students’ lives, the field of TESOL gained new considerations. In moving
towards a postmodern orientation, languages were no longer exclusive to nationalities, but came
to be considered an aspect of a cultural background (Canagarajah, 2011, Garcia & Li 2014,
Larsen-Freeman & Cameron 2012, Pavlenka 2003, Pennycook 2017). The postmodern thought
reconfigures language learning into a multidimensional process, whereby the diverse factors such
as the student, the student’s background, the student’s language resources, speaking styles, the
teacher, the teacher’s background, and classroom, etc., are variables that manipulate the
facilitation of curriculum material.

**Complex and Dynamic Systems Theory Locate Translanguaging**

The deconstructive intention (Slattery, 2013) of postmodernity fueled related fields that
led to TESOL’s reconsideration of language and English Language Teaching (ELT)
methodology (Canagarajah, 2016); out of this deconstruction arises translanguaging.
Translanguaging, although not a new practice (Canagarajah, 2011) has gained a place in TESOL
as it demonstrates the emergent behavior of occurrences when linguistic competencies, which
until the end of the 21st century were considered more exclusive, respond to a local situation
congruently. Li (2018) states that “whilst there has been significant progress in many parts of the
world where multilingualism, in the sense of having different languages coexisting alongside each other, is beginning to be acceptable, what remains hugely problematic is the mixing of languages” (p. 14). The argument arises more persuasively due to the rise in comprehensive and inclusive perspectives in neighboring fields such as:

…within cognitive science (Thelen & Smith, 1994; Port & van Gelder, 1995), developmental psychology (Van Geert, 1998), and language development (Elman, 1995). Since the late 1990s, the [dynamic systems] theory has also been applied to second language acquisition (SLA) (Larsen-Freeman, 1997; Herdina & Jessner, 2002; De Bot, Lowie, & Verspoor, 2007)” (Lowie, 2013, p. 1).

The application resulted in a dynamic and thorough perspective of language—that language is a construct of our immediate environment. Thus, altering the perception of language learning and language instruction methodology (Lowie, 2013; Li, 2018; Pennycook, 2017).

As the TESOL pedagogical paradigm drifted towards postmodernity, it examined language learning under dynamic, or complex system theories (Luenberger, 1979; Larson-Freeman & Cameron, 2016; de Bot, Lowie, & Verspoor, 2007; Cook, 2010). Not entirely synonymous concepts, both dynamic systems theory (DST) and complex systems theory (CST) examine the behavior of systems produced by the intersection of the system variables (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2012). The main difference between the two theories is that the focus of DST places greater emphasis on the recursion of these intricacies overtime, equaling great dynamism, or greater flux—an outcome developed over a certain period of time. “Essentially, DST is an application of mathematics, in which change of complex systems over time is expressed in dynamic equations that describe how these changes take place as a function of
time” (Lowie, 2013, p. 1). Therefore, DST would seem more appropriate for analysis of a complex system such as an ELL classroom that meets over a specified amount of time.

Luenberger (1979) suggests that DST “is nearly synonymous with time-evolution or pattern of change” (italics kept, p. 1), indicating that the analysis highlights the system’s flux. Furthermore, DST is applied to systems that are not reflective of their origins because they are expanding from the intersecting of the variables of the system (Luenberger, 1979). The inherent premise of DST then, is that the conditions of the initial system are not a primary focus as they would be under CST. Therefore, the application of DST under postmodern orientation is logical for TESOL, as language has come to “be seen as a complex dynamic system and that language development is a nonlinear, chaotic, and highly individual process that cannot adequately be described from a static point of view” (Lowie, 2013, p. 1). DST and CST’s prominence combined with the ever-progressing understanding that language learning entails multiple variables called for new ELT methodology.

**Dynamic English Language Teaching Methodology**

The postmodern consideration of language reflects the emerging phenomenon of multiple variables. When DST or CST is applied, the terminology of ‘complex’ and ‘dynamic’ denote more than simply diverse, abundant dynamisms, they entail the system’s flux or “behavior emerges from the interactions of its components” (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2016, p. 2). Language is then both represented within the intersecting variables of society and life, the local environment and personal thought, and the arising flux of these intersections. Larsen-Freeman & Cameron (2016) describe the way in which complex systems flux:

In the type of complex systems that we are concerned with, everything is dynamic: not only do the component elements and agents change with time, giving rise to changing states
of the system, but the ways in which components interact with each other also change with time. If components are themselves complex systems, then the dynamism goes ‘all the way down’ too, in that all subsystems nested inside the bigger system are in flux. (p.29)

In the present research, language is a complex system composed in part by the variables listed in Figure 4.

![Table 2.2 Examples of complex systems in applied linguistics](image)

*Figure 4: “Examples of complex systems in applied linguistics” (Curtesy of Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2016, p. 37).*

The delineation of these variables within the complex system of language is based on CST’s emphasis on the interconnectedness of all aspects of life including the “social, physical, and cognitive” (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2016, p. 34). Hence, TESOL’s advancement towards inclusive practices such as translanguaging is a result of comprehensive analyses.

The language system’s complexity is amplified when another system is introduced as Larsen-Freeman & Cameron (2016) note above. For the purposes of this research, which examines translanguaging, the other system becomes an additional linguistic system. Translanguaging can be understood as a demonstration of multilingual’s complex linguistic
system, where “the two systems [L1 and TL] are coupled, with the use of one affecting the use of the other” (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2016, p. 134). It is important to note that although it appears only two languages are appointed in the example, current thought is that even within one language, users are speaking multiple languages, due to the broad sense of language (Canagarajah, 2016; Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2016; Pennycook, 2017). Thus, contemporary research emulates a DST application to SLA as it follows the perspective that “the language system can be assumed to consist of embedded subsystems for all levels of language production and perception, such as conceptualization, semantics, syntax, lexicon, phonology, and phonetics” (Lowie, 2013, p. 2). Lowie’s conception of the complex system of language then develops TESOL’s orientation to bilingualism, or the interaction of two linguistic subsystems. “Additional languages are not stored in different anatomical localizations but may be considered as embedded functional subsystems in the dynamic sense, possibly nested within the phonological, morphosyntactic, and semantic subsystems” (Paradis, 2004, as cited in Lowie, 2013, p. 2). It is due to this notion that as TESOL practitioners began to question how to support multiple languages in the classroom, advocation for new, holistic practices were evidenced.

If languages are not bounded entities, then bilingualism must be more than simply the combination of two separate linguistic systems. García and Kleifgen (2010) propose a dynamic bilingualism, in which bilingualism is better understood as a repertoire of related language practices or ways of using language within particular sociocultural contexts. This reframing affords the exploration of everyday language practices such as translating or interpreting (Orellana, 2009; Orellana & Reynolds, 2008; Valdés, 2002), crossing (Rampton, 2005, 2009), language sharing (Paris, 2009), and hybrid language practices
(Gutiérrez, Bas quedano-López, & Tejeda, 1999) such as codeswitching or translanguaging (García & Sylvan, 2011)” (Palmer, et al., 2014, p. 159 [italics kept]).

The present study locates applied— instructed— translanguaging as an emergent behavior from the intersections of historical perspectives of language and foreign language methodology, and one that aims to answer, “what language to teach” and “how.”

**Dynamic Considerations of Language Learning**

Language learning is currently considered to occur in continuous time (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2016), therefore under DST it is “quantified in terms of the continuum of real numbers” (Luenberger, 1979, p. 2). This can be viewed in concrete terms as a differential equation, where the “derivatives of a dynamic variable” (Luenberger, 1979, p. 2) relate to the system as it is at any given point. These derivates are the conditions within a system or the “causal factors” (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2016 p. 2). The conditions of the complex system of translanguaging are the translanguaged practitioner’s social and linguistic background, local environment (complete with dominate language, social norms, settings, etc.), purpose for the communicative act (in response to another person, personal reflection, reaction, caution…), mood and character, and the context to which the communicative act is responding.

Context is suggested to be the: “tone of voice and facial expression; the relationship between speakers; their age, sex, and social status; the time and place; and the degree to which speakers do-or do not- share the same cultural background” (Cook, 2010, p. 49). But of course, context is malleable and dependent on the other situational variables. The context is the most influential variable in translanguaging as it is specifically practiced to impart focus on the context, rather than on the explicit, isolated linguistic structures that constitute language, such as grammar (Canagarajah, 2011, Wei, 2008, Pennycook, 2017). In refocusing language teaching as
such, TESOL can freely accommodate home languages in the classroom. This contextual focus is further supported by CST as complex systems “cannot be independent of [their] context since there is a flow of energy or matter between system and environment; the context is part of the system and its complexity” (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2016, p. 34). Thus again, the postmodern, comprehensive orientation as indicated in CST, is applied to language and communication and consequently becomes a necessary element of ELT methodology.

Larsen-Freeman and Cameron (2016) quote Thelen and Smith (1994, p. 329) to describe CST’s application to psychology, evidencing the ever-growing inclusivity of TESOL: “A dynamics systems approach to cognition and action provides a biological ground for cultural and contextual accounts of human cognition… mental life as emergent from the activities of everyday life” (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2012, p. 5; de Bot, Lowie, & Verspoor, 2007). The analysis becomes a beneficial platform for rectifying ELT methodology as language has come to include the “social and cognitive” (de Bot, Lowie, & Verspoor, 2007, p. 7), which is seen in translanguaging. The inclusion of these concepts in language learning suggested that language was responsive to its environment—a product of negotiation among the context of the local environment, the individual(s), and available linguistic competence(s) (Canagarajah, 2011, 2016; Li, 2018; Pennycook, 2017; Palmer, et al., 2014). With the new understanding of language, came the need for practices that support such philosophy. Thus, translanguaging, a practice that explores the use of multiple linguistic competencies respective to the context in a single utterance, seems to be particularly relevant.

**Translanguaging**

Translanguaging has received more attention within the last 20 years (Canagarajah, 2011; Li, 2018). A consequential result of 2019 roughly marking the 5th century of English as the
lingua franca (Crystal, 2003, p. 36) and of contemporary research criticizing English for being an imperialistic language as it has been used as a tool for “concerted efforts at ‘civilizing the savages’ in the diffusion of the language” (Kachru qtd. in Kachru & Smith, 2009, p. 2). The rooted perspective that prompted the coinage of English as “a global bully language” (Thurman, 2018, p. 50) is due to English’s excessive infiltration and domination of other cultures and countries in the outer and expanding circles and the “modernist ideology of ‘one language/one nation’ (Canagarajah, 2006, p. 587) present within the inner circle. In response to this, as well as an emerging awareness of multilingual competence, traditional, or modern SLA pedagogies, which recognize L1 and L2 systems exclusively, are no longer appropriate due to the complexity of linguistic systems (Palmer, et al. 2013; Canagarajah, 2011; Li, 2018). In an attempt to overcome the evidenced alienation and linguistic imperialism of monolingual curriculums, TESOL methodology has shifted to emphasize inclusive practices such as translanguaging.

**Translanguaging as an Act of Affirmative Action**

Suresh Canagarajah, a professor of applied linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania and a renowned scholar of composition and TESOL, called translanguaging an act of “affirmative action”:

In the context of a linguistics that theorizes competence and communication in terms of monolingual norms, it is appropriate that translanguaging is now being given a lot of attention in the academy. This is a matter of affirmative action. Many constructs arise from pitting one language against another treating multilinguals as non-native and, therefore, lacking ownership in some languages. (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 2).
Thus, the practice offers the learner a space to explore their understanding but does not necessarily support the learner’s acquisition of the target language (TL), which this thesis presents as a valuable and achievable outcome.

Translanguaging illustrates multilinguals’ linguistic competences in a highly complex way. The definition of a multilingual can be abstracted from the definition of a “multilingual classroom” which “is a class where the learners speak a variety of first languages. Multilingual classes can be compared to monolingual ones, where all the learners speak the same first language” (“Multilingual,” 2019). Hence, a multilingual is a speaker of “a variety of first languages.” It is necessary to again point out that even ‘first languages’ take on a dimension of multilingualism as current TESOL research follow’s Pennycook’s (2017) linguistic landscapes ideology. Under this, language is “to include ‘images, photos, sounds (soundscapes), movements, music, smells (smellscapes), graffiti, clothes, food, buildings, history, as well as people who are immersed and absorbed in spaces by interacting with [language learners] in different ways’” (Shohamy, 2015, pp. 153-154, as cited in Pennycook, 2017, p. 270). Under this orientation, the contemporary definition of linguistic competence—having acquired the grammatical form of a language—is no longer applicable because it is positioned as an isolated entity of our daily lives. As indicated by Canagarajah (2011), Li (2018), and Garcia & Li (2014), language competency has come to be understood as all linguistic thought.

**Language as a Contextual Flux**

The focus in TESOL methodology then has shifted from “prescript[ive]” to “descript[ive]” (Cook, 2010, p.15 ), from linear to nonlinear (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2016; Luenberger, 1979; De Bot, K., Lowie, & Verspoor, 2005; Palmer, et al. 2013; Canagarajah, 2016; Ortega, 2013), and most influential for this research—from mono-vocal to multivocal
In shifting from exclusive to inclusive analyses, thought is a relative perception of contextually-bound rhetorical situations. Language, then, is a flux within these complex situations that “emerges” (O’ Grady, 2005; 2008) in response to the situation. This emergence, or flux, is the language variation, or multilingualism, that every society member interacts in. From professionally relinquished thoughts to the texting language practiced by nearly anyone who owns a smart phone, it is suggested that modern, or rather postmodern society demands multilingual competency (Canagarajah, 2011).

The value that translanguaging has for context can best be understood through the analysis of examples. The analysis begins by establishing the background from which it arises, which is the Spokane’s Slavic community. A closed, homogeneous community, the Spokane Slavic local group, is geographically located in a different homogenous, or rather heterogenous community—the greater Spokane area. Thus, the Slavic community has had to engage with the inner-circle community, the predominately English-speaking Spokane, Washington, while to some degree upholding an expanding-circle status. When circumstances such as these arise, whereby one language community is reserved and/or closed in an attempt to keep the language and culture stable yet must interact with the dominant language of the surrounding local community, the interactions result in a linguistic flux. The understanding of the interaction as such is due to:

Recent models [of mental lexicon/ competence] are mostly based on connectionist models consisting of networks, in which each entry may be connected to one or many other entries, similar to what we know about neural networks. Almost all models today are based on this principle, combined with a reference to the activation metaphor. This metaphor entails that entries in the lexicon may vary in their degree of activation. Activation may increase as the
result of some event (for instance after coming across a certain word) and will decrease in
the course of time. (De Bot, K., Lowie, & Verspoor, 2005, p. 42).

The flux created by the interactions of two or more linguistic systems, where each language is a
standard condition for the represented system is translinguaging and is activated by the users’
focus on context.

**Applied Versus Authentic Translinguaging**

Instructed translinguaging is often the intersection of the L1 with the TL within the
classroom. Applied translinguaged utterances attempt to “deliberately break the artificial and
ideological divides between indigenous versus immigrant, majority versus minority, and target
versus mother tongue languages” (Li, 2018, p. 15). An example of applied translinguaging is
from Canagarajah’s (2011) case study. Canagarajah acknowledges the student’s use of Arabic
verses within her essay. The student responds:

> I did not see my essay as a one-way informative essay. It is a *negotiated essay* that seeks a
> better understanding from educators and futures teachers to the multilingual experience.

> By addressing my readers, I am welcoming them to the discussion, which, in my
> perspective, *is* ongoing (emphasis added; MC). (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 13 [italics kept]).

This contrasts with societal occurrences, where translinguaging perhaps transpires *unconsciously*
such as in the following example, where Russian is the L1 and the dominant language of the
situation, while English is the standard language of the greater environment. When the languages
intertwine, it appears that the English linguistic morphemes adhere to the grammar of the
dominant language of the situation—Russian. Hence, when Elena Morgan (2019), a member of
the Spokane Slavic community, who is now teaching ESL at the University of Oregon, and her
friends would congregate and speak predominantly in Russian, they would utter phrases such as,
“po-like-ала” (“po-like-ala”). no-like-ала follows Russian syntax as the prefix and suffix, which reflect Russian perfective verb structure, become a circumfix around the English root morpheme, “-like-.” The English root morpheme “-like-” then becomes an influx and is included in the interlingually constructed utterance. It seems that the nuance of the American English morpheme “like” better represents the intended meaning than the standard Russian root, “-нрав-” which denotes “a sense of pleasing.” Therefore, in authentic translanguaging it appears that the speaker incorporates the linguistic structure most familiar to the context.

The example of po-like-ала demonstrates a single translanguaged word, whereas in the example of the mother preparing her children to go to swimming lessons (Chapter 1), she incorporated the entire phrase, “swimming lessons,” into the Russian sentence. When analyzing the attractive state, or the state that the system feels harmonious in (Lowie, 2013; Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2016), of the phrase, it again appears to be contextually-bound. The reason for “swimming lessons” may be because “уроки плавания” is not reflective of, or as attracted to the context that ‘swimming lessons’ is referring to. Larsen-Freeman (1997) explores the inter-linguistic ability to transcend the societal, linguistic boundaries by identifying the “fields of attraction” that are demonstrated in DST (Larsen-Freeman, 1997, as cited in De Bot, Lowie, & Verspoor, 2005, pp. 29-30).

Fields of attraction are by nature gradient, unlike parametric choices, which are generally seen to be discrete. The strength each field exerts on a particular language differs thus allowing for inter-linguistic variation. For any given language, the fields of attraction will define the state that the system is attracted to, i.e. its most natural or unmarked state. Because of them, the changes a language undergoes leave its basic shape intact. Therefore, anything borrowed into the language will be adapted to conform to the permissible
phonological sequences and sometimes to the morphosyntactic constraints as well (e.g. 
*aisukuriimu* of Japanese and *Le Drugstore* of French, borrowed from English).

It is important to consider that the usage of “*no-like-ala*” occurs between members of the
Russian-American community when they engage predominately in Russian but are within an
American-English setting. Hence, the familiarity of “like” in the context of wanting to discuss
something that is appreciated, amusing, enjoyed, etc. is attractive and incorporated over the
Russian morpheme “-*нрав-*.” The reasoning for the attraction is perhaps due to the difference in
the cultures’ understanding of the phenomenon “to like” and the most natural state in the
American context is not -*нрав-* , but -*like-*.

A similar situation arises for the Russian phrase for swimming lessons, which directly
translated is, “*уроки плавания*” (lessons of swimming). Upon reflecting, Elena (2019) stated that
perhaps the use of the American English phrase, “swimming lessons,” was due to Russians’
preferred use of the verb “*плавать*” or “*to swim*,” over the unfamiliar participle “*плавания*” or
“swimming.” It was suggested to be “*odd sounding*” (Morgan, 2019). Moreover, the structure
and understanding of Russian swimming lessons is vastly different than ours, whereby water is
considered an aspect of nature and the swimming lessons mothers have with their children is
considered a lesson of nurturing, rather than a “*swim lesson*.” Thus, these examples follow
translanguaging’s purpose of “*coming-to-know-while-speaking*” (Swain & Lapkin, 2002, as
cited in Li, 2018, p. 16), which happens more readily in authentic translanguaging. The most
authentic understanding of the speech act’s situation is formed as the interlocuters speak. The
study of these occurrences has become more relevant by the recent change in focus in language
acquisition and teaching. However, as translanguaged utterances always follow this structure, it
prompts the question, how do the mutually exclusive morphemes settle as such?
**Self-Organization of Complex Systems**

DST and CST would concur that the variables’ intersections, by their very interaction, begin to organize themselves into the rhythm of the system; these complex, dynamic systems are always working to organize themselves to settle in a particular “state space” (Larson-Freeman & Cameron, 2016, p.20; de Bot, Lowie, Verspoor, 2007; Luenberger, 1979). The state space is outlined by the current system’s conditions and is representative of a particular behavior. While the systems appear to be chaotically disorganized, they are in fact self-organizing by ways of congruent consideration of all the variables and conditions present (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2016). Hence, the translanguageled utterance is comprehensible as the incorporation of diverse linguistic structures is self-organized until the state-space reflects the entity to be communicated—the authentic interpretation of the setting by the participant—and harmony is attained. The self-organization of complex systems is naturally occurring and seems sensical when discussing the natural reorganization within a flock of birds (the most notable example of complex systems’ self-organization). But the understanding of this organization in the complex system of language and language processing, is different as the major agent in this system is the brain—something that is still somewhat not understood (Ortega, 2013; de Bot, Lowie, & Verspoor, 2005; Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2016).

**Emergentism as Translanguaging**

A neologism, translanguaging denotes a linguistic utterance that is composed of a variety of linguistic structures within one utterance. It is of interest to examine the mental processing that occurs during these utterances, as the analysis of how the utterances transpire and are comprehended grounds the potential for insight as to how multilinguals process language.
Moreover, in understanding how these utterances occur, it becomes clearer how to practice this in the classroom.

In the case of how these utterances are comprehended, it seems more plausible that the phonemes, or smallest meaningful units, do not necessarily include a language specific indication (Palmer et al., 2013), rather that the complex processing system situated in the brain, is aided by emergentist principles. Emergentism can be understood as the flux of systems, or a “general approach to cognition that stresses the interaction between organism and environment and that denies the existence of pre-determined, domain- specific faculties or capacities” (Gregg, 2003, p. 95). The understanding of language or information processing as such is in part due to TESOL’s shift toward comprehensive orientations.

From Universal Grammar to Input Processor Emergentism

Traditionally the self-organization of languages was considered to follow Chomsky’s Universal Grammar (UG) or the thought that UG “forms the basis of competence in the particular language [that a] child goes on to speak” (Cook, 2010, p. 42). Recently Chomsky’s UG has been widely dismissed as it implies that the societal factors, which are currently understood to be influential, have little to no standing in the child’s linguistic acquisition. Instead, the concept of emergentism, which suggests that “the complexity of language must be understood in terms of the interaction of simpler and more basic non-linguistic factors” (O’Grady, Lee, Kwak, 2005, p. 1), provides insight as to how these utterances are organized.

Under “processor-based emergentism,” which differs from “input-based,” it is claimed that syntactic phenomena such as is exhibited in translanguaging, is a result of “a simple processor, committed to reducing the burden on working memory” (O’Grady, Lee, Kwak, 2005). The input-processor recognizes the grammatical structure, and resorts to the most appropriate
(most frequented) morpheme in that situation. Although, this explanation seems simplistic juxtaposed to the dynamic, comprehensive analysis, it is realistic as the brain aims for efficiency in terms of energy use. Moreover, it is proposed that the processor is able to help “bridge” the gap that language learners experience when introduced to information they have not come in contact with prior (O’Grady, Lee, Kwak, 2005, p. 7). Therefore, the input-processor accounts for the nearly immediate response and/or comprehension experienced in relation to language processing.

Traditional consideration of language processing is described in Levelt’s well-accepted “Speaking blueprint” (1983, 1989, as cited in, De Bot, Lowie, Verspoor, 2016, p. 39). The Speaking blueprint suggests that the brain of a monolingual includes a lexicon that is comprised of “two separate elements: the lemma, which contains conceptual, semantic, syntactic and pragmatic information, and the lexeme, which is the phonological form associated with the lemma” (De Bot, Lowie, Verspoor, 2016, p. 39). The lemma is an element that is decided upon after the idea is conceived, but prior to the association of the lexeme. Therefore, it seems that there is a disconnect between the phonological representation and the syntactic and semantic information. De Bot (2002) examines the blueprint under a multilingual lens and adds that there has to be “language-related information in the preverbal message” (De Bot, Lowie, Verspoor, 2016, p. 42). Alternatively, the more frequented phonetic representations of a context, could account for the selected lexeme, which is the articulated utterance. This would also indicate the relevancy of contextual focus that is indicated in translanguaging, as an unfamiliar morpheme can often be understood in terms of the present situation.
Efficiency Assumptions

The proposal for the operations of the processor are based on what O’Grady (2005) termed “efficiency assumptions” (O’Grady, Lee, & Kwak, 2005, p. 7). Under these assumptions, the processor “immediately assigns each NP [noun-phrase] an interpretation, based on available clues such as position, determiner type, case marker, context, and so forth” (O’Grady, Lee, & Kwak, 2005, p. 7). Within moments of engaging in the speech act, the processor assigns the NP. This calls for the processor to be adept at determining the NP’s location in the utterance, which entails former, dynamic exposure to the linguistic structure. After identifying the NP, the NP is “assigned an interpretation… based on its position and other local properties” (O’Grady, Lee, & Kwak, 2005, p. 7). The interpretation is reexamined as subsequent parts of the utterance are perceived and continue to denote meaning, but the process of reinterpretation is minimized as it calls for further energy (O’Grady, Lee, Kwak, 2005, p.8).

Applying O’Grady, Lee, & Kwak’s (2005) emergentism principles to the former example of, “Нам нужно скоро пойти на swimming lessons,” or “For us it is necessary to go to swimming lessons soon,” would suggest that the input processor of both the orator and audience first recognized “Нам” (“For us /We”); followed by “нужно” (“it is necessary/need”); then “сильно пойти” (“soon to go”); and lastly “на swimming lessons” (“to swimming lessons”). The mother, in speaking to her children, uttered the phrase in Russian until her input-processor incorporated the English phrase “swimming lessons,” which still included the Russian preposition – на- but incorporated the familiar utterance “swimming lessons.” It immediately substituted the phrases and simultaneously was comprehended by the children as their input processors processed the familiar phrase.
**Contextual Understanding of Realia**

The extent to which the contextual condition influences the language processing system, has given rise to the consideration that languages are not mutually exclusive, but rather constitute one linguistic repertoire (Canagarajah, 2011; Cook, 2010). The comprehensive repertoire attempts to match the individual’s mental interpretation of the context. In an attempt to understand how the interpreted meaning emerges, it is necessary to look inward at the neural processing of the brain.

Recently, in neurolinguistics, Spitsnya et al. conducted a study that professor David Poeppel further explored and contributed that it, “report[s] a network of four left-lateralized areas that are argued to mediate meaning independent of modality” (Poeppel, 2006, p. 930). This study relayed that the meaning engaged the left areas of the brain, regardless of what medium constituted the context, be it oral, visual, tangible, linguistic, etc. It would seem then, that language is not an entity of the context, as is demonstrated by translangugaging not distinguishing between the two. Yet the context as a variable of the complex system, is “relevant to whether a particular action or utterance is, to use Hymes’ term, appropriate” (Cook, 2010, p. 49). In this claim, Dell Hymes’ communicative competence is brought to light, which is an attempt at outlining the self-organization that occurs to produce the behavior of language. Hymes’ response to Chomsky’s understanding of communicative competence, which isolated language knowledge into structural entities such as UG, proposed that language competence comes from four conditions: possibility, feasibility, appropriateness, and attestedness (Cook, 2010). From this perspective, the input-processor must have encountered the swimming lesson situation enough that it understood the grammatical structure was possible, the sense created was feasible, it most
realistically (appropriately) reflected the situation, and lastly, that it would be received and understood. This last aspect, *attestedness*, in the situation of translanguaging, can only be upheld by the clarity of the context to all the participants of the speech act. Hence, yet again, it is found that context is the primary variable that influences translanguaging; in order for the utterance to be attested, all members of the speech act must be privy to the linguistic reference, or morpheme, of the context.

The change in language studies from isolated perspectives, which considered the text-base or graphemic representations of the language to account for the entire meaning, to fluxes of a system, has drastically altered how language is studied. In moving from examination of language structure and correctness to contextual, usage-based communication, TESOL finds itself looking at practices such as translanguaging. In examining such practices, there is a need to understand how these interactions occur, and thus requires both comprehensive and isolated analyses. By placing translanguaging as a behavior of the complex linguistic system of a multilingual, it allows access to examine the language processing which occurs during these utterances. The language processing can be viewed as the complex mental system of the multilingual organizing itself. This organization is aided by an apparatus such as the input-processor, which identifies the variables of the utterance within the conditions of the complex linguistic system. The apparatus, in an attempt to save energy, applies the more frequently associated structures of the context. Therefore, it appears that the context is the basis of communication and the linguistic structures associated are learned through dynamic exposure. Although the research and performed examples of translanguaging may support such hypotheses, in an attempt to address the attestedness of them, it must be stated that the reality is that the processing performed by multilinguals remains somewhat of an unknown.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Chapter 3 is an outline of the mixed methodologies used in this research and discloses the background information of the focus group participants and the Russian community member and ESL professional, Elena Morgan. Additionally, Chapter 3 provides the focus group procedure and data collection. Data analysis of the convenience sample is found in Chapters 4 and 5, while Chapter 6 presents the conclusions drawn from these analyses and future implications of them.

Triangulated, narrative inquiry are foundations for phenomenological and ethnographic perspectives, translanguaging is examined in natural environments as is initially discussed in Chapter 2. The purpose of analyzing authentic translanguaging utterances in Russlish is to identify the basis of and the culminating variables that lead to these utterances. Data collected from the focus group, “Insight to Multilinguals’ Information Processing,” illustrates the phenomenon through controlled settings and dialogical reflections. The basis of the conclusions drawn in Chapters 4 and 5 spring from the review of literature that was presented in Chapter 2 but are tentatively established in the focus group responses. These conclusions were then iteratively analyzed throughout the present study, thereby establishing the grounded theory perspective (GTM). A thematic analysis provided in charts, follows the analysis presented in Chapters 4 and 5. Providing a brief, descriptive analysis prior to the charted themes, aided in the iterative process used in reviewing the data.

**Grounded Theory Method**

GTM is defined by Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 24) as “a qualitative research method that uses a systematic set of procedures to develop an inductively derived grounded theory about a phenomenon.” The method was prompted by the demand for a methodology that “provide[s]
novice researchers with a flexible and open approach to research” (Bryant, 2017, p. 4). Therefore, GTM became “a set of flexible analytical guidelines that enable researchers to focus their data collection and to build inductive middle-range theories through successive levels of data analysis and conceptual development” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p. 204). The analyzed occurrences of translanguageing relayed aspects of language learning for multilinguals. This insight is then reflected upon in Chapter 6 as the present study provides future implications for TESOL methodology.

In examining translanguageing, multiple connections appeared among the various occurrences that were identified in the natural world and the research. The first observation from the natural world came from my own language learning experiences, which establish my role as participant-observer and the present study as ethnographic inquiry. The second, from everyday instances, most notably from the Russian family at the park and the personal correspondence with my colleague and longstanding friend, Elena. To further examine these authentic instances, translanguageing was reviewed in a controlled focus group. At each stage the research was analyzed and compared to former understandings of translanguageing, concluding in a projection for what the next analysis would reveal. In approaching the research as such, the thesis utilizes grounded method theory to make aware the act of translanguageing through narrative inquiry and phenomenological theory.

**Phenomenological Research through Narrative Inquiry**

“Phenomenology thematizes the phenomenon of consciousness, and, in its most comprehensive sense, it refers to the totality of lived experiences that belong to a single person” (Giorgi, 1997, para. 2). This research examines the phenomenon of translanguageing through the narratives from Elena, the focus group participants, and me, who offer illustrations of the
consciousness of the lived experiences. From this examination, themes are drawn that provide categorical analysis and further ways to understand the practice. Moreover, the very act of identifying translanguage gives it consciousness and intentionality, which are principles of phenomenology (Giorgi, 1997). These principles found “phenomenological reduction,” which “is a methodological device invented by Husserl in order to help make research findings more precise” (Giorgi, 1997, para. 9). Within the focus group we reduced our experience to just that—a lived experience, where no theories or truths were absolutes, and everything was attestable.

Edmund Husserl is the German philosopher who established the school of phenomenology. Husserl claimed that “one lives in the ‘natural attitude,’ wherein one takes things for granted, where the existence of things and events is not challenged unless they are somehow bizarre” (Giorgi, 1997, para. 9). Hence, phenomenological research aims to “(a) bracket past knowledge about a phenomenon, in order to encounter it freshly and describe it precisely as it is intuited (or experienced), and (b) to withhold the existential index, which means to consider what is given precisely as it is given, as presence, or phenomenon” (Giorgi, 1997, para. 11). Therefore, the present study disregarded all understanding of translanguage during the collection of the focus group data, where we prompted authentic translanguage utterances within a controlled environment. In doing so, the research was able to examine these utterances as they formed in their own way.

As introduced in Chapter 1 and will be further relayed in Chapters 4-5, the phenomena of translanguage has been witnessed and employed in multiple linguistically-diverse environments. Translanguage utterances also occur in apparent monolingual environments such as that, “welcome ya’ll!” which includes a formal introduction with a less formal referent, is a translanguage statement. The intersection of these two diverse linguistic registers is a form of
translanguaging that supersedes monolingual orientation as it is a means to highlight and reflect the context of the situation. In this example, the context could be a formal event, hence ‘welcome,’ for people who employ the word ‘ya’ll.’ Many times, these utterances are not noted by our input-processor as discussed in Chapter 2, as either they have been so ingrained in daily usage, or we are not privy to the linguistic competences needed to comprehend them. Hence, the phenomenon can go unobserved, but is more prominently noted when deemed ‘separate’ linguistic structures or languages are interwoven.

The narratives provided in the present study not only demonstrate translanguaging but also construct it. In this way, Elena, the six participants and I, through the phenomenon of translanguaging, engaged in the “narrative construction of self” (Bamberg, 2004). This constructivist view is interpreted as a methodology that uses small stories that “are situated in small talk and chit-chat, [and are] frequently constructed in interaction and traced in discourse” (Norton & Early, 2011, p. 421). Such small stories-in-interaction—Elena, the six participants, and the researcher—“do not necessarily create a coherent sense of self, but highlight diverse identity positions in everyday interactive practices, and are highly significant for identity work” (Norton & Early, 2013, p. 50, as cited in Anderson, 2018, p. 41). Translanguaging is a practice that is meant to reflect the practitioner’s entire identity as it allows for the incorporation of their complete linguistic repertoire. “When educators provide students a space in school where they can draw on their everyday language practices, we dignify who they are as multilingual beings and support bilingual identity construction (Reyes & Vallone, 2007, as cited in Palmer et al. 2014, p. 760). This compares to the formerly wide-held TESOL view of communication, which perceived linguistic repertories to be made up of isolated languages representative of nationally
defined environments and cultures. This is evidenced in Leonard (2014) as she examines narratives of multilingual writers and highlights one individual’s reflection:

…that language was available to her based on whichever political power felt inclined to grant that access, which in turn led her to believe that official or correct languages were related more to the whims of political change than to hard and fast rules. (p. 239).

The acknowledgement of this realization led to the understanding that language is not static, but in fact negotiated by the context, which is influenced by the political powers of the local environment, and the linguistic knowledge of the communicator. Thus, the 21st century is re-examining communication as “concepts such as native, foreign, indigenous, minority languages are […] also constantly assessed and challenged” (Li, 2018, p. 15). As we’ve come to understand this, we must recognize that for English language learner’s in the United States, one of the prevailing conditions is the usage of Standard Academic English. This condition is further evidenced in the instances of translinguaging provided in the present study as we see the intersection of Russian and English.

**Elena Morgan: Translanguaged Occurrences within the Spokane Community**

Although my Russian language background foregrounds my understanding of the Russlish utterances, my distance from the community has meant that I have not been included in these encounters. My experience in speaking Russian in Spokane has been fairly limited, as every time I have initiated a conversation with an apparent Slavic community member in Russian, I am responded to in English. Due to my response in Russia while speaking Russian, I recognize this to be an instance of the Spokane Slavic community showing their enculturation with the English community, while simultaneously preserving their Russian identity for members of the Slavic Community. These encounters have taken place in the taxi-service, Lyft, shoe-
repair shops, and with the mother of the Russian family from this summer. My linguistic “in” with the community came through Elena Morgan, who having lived in Russia for the first 20 years of her life, was swiftly granted access to the community.

Elena Morgan first came to the United States in the summer of 2003 as an exchange student from La Crosse, Wisconsin’s Russian sister-city, Dubna. From this initial interaction with America, Elena knew she wanted to be an American—a desire that has culturally come to be true as she is now living in Eugene, Oregon with her husband, teaching English at Oregon State University. In the trajectory to her current position, Elena studied at Eastern Washington University and earned her Master of Arts in English with a TESOL focus from 2006-2008. It was during this time that she encountered the local Russian-English, or Russlish, language variety that occurs from the intersection of the Slavic population with the greater Spokane community.

The occurrences of Russlish were most noted when Elena and her Russian friend group gathered. During these meetings, the language spoken was dominantly Russian as this was their first or home language (L1), and the commonality that implicitly brought them together. Yet due to English being the language spoken most frequently in their daily lives (a result of English’s dominant occupancy in school and work), English morphemes tended to intertwine with the Russian grammatical and linguistic structures. This is why the example of “po-like-ala” from Chapter 2, with the prefix, ‘po-,’ and suffix ‘-ala,’ which mimics the Russian perfective verb structure, include the English morpheme, “like.” Elena’s social groups were highly fluent in both Russian and English and were able to incorporate the most contextually-appropriate morphemes available to the situation. Though Elena’s group was using Russian, their cognitive familiarity of English became embedded in their speech at times when it seems that it suited the context more precisely.
An Overview of, “Insight to Multilinguals’ Information Processing: A Focus Group”

To develop the research that originated under narrative inquiry and phenomenological theory, translanguaging was examined in a focus group. Focus group methodology entails a “nondirective technique that results in the controlled production of a discussion of a group of people” (Flores & Alonso, 1995, p. 84). The controlled discussion was facilitated by me but stimulated by the prompts. In order to gain an accurate account of translanguaging, we could not have an open discussion of the prompts, but rather the students responded through compositions. These compositions were analyzed by me and the analyses were sent to the participants to allow for them to respond. All of the participants of the focus group agreed with the analyses I had drawn. Thus, the present study “gain[ed] powerful insights into the feelings of the people who will be most affected by these changes. [The present study] will thus help those who must implement these changes understand the perspectives of the clients they will be working with. If you do it right, the report[ing] will not be just a pile of facts but a rich source of insights into the human task of implementing change” (Morgan, 1998, p. 5). The use of the participant reflections allowed for an intrinsic review of translanguaging in order to relay its possible outcomes for the purpose of implementing change in the field of TESOL.

To elicit translanguaging, I structured a two-session focus group of six participants that took place at Eastern Washington University’s library in October 2018. The structure and lay-out of the focus group is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity (Time in Minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>10/19/18</td>
<td>1:00 PM- 2:30 PM</td>
<td>1. Reviewed consent slip (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Introduced structure of session (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Initial examination of object (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Russian language detail (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following IRB approval, I contacted several former students to invite them to both participate and invite other participants that matched the criteria as relayed in the consent form [Appendix A]. The group participants were members of the Slavic community who have retained Russian as an L1 for second and third generations due to the local Russian-Baptist church’s language classes and from immigrating from Russian-speaking countries. The selected participants examined a pictured, abstract object [Figure 6, p. 67; Appendix B] and were asked to independently evaluate it first in Russian, then English, then Russlish. To acquaint the students to the Russian-detail prompt, I spoke in Russian. The same procedure was done for the English-detail and the Russlish. In doing so, it was thought that the students would begin reflecting in the language-in-use and would engage in that language and subsequent behavior in their details and reflections. Following each language description, the students were asked to reflect on how precise their detail-evaluations were in respect to what they were seeing, in the post-language reflection [p. 72; Appendix J].
The pictured object (Figure 6) was designed rather than chosen from available objects, as it seemed pivotal to ask the students to reflect on an object they had not seen before to control for exposure. In asking them to do so, the study addressed whether the students would feel that their home language, Russian; target language, English; or authentic interlanguage, Russlish, better represented what they had seen in Session 1 and 2. In addressing this concept, the study sought to reveal how multilinguals process information. Moreover, we were able to examine whether participants, after having engaged with the object in all available linguistic repertoires, better understood the standard academic English (SAE) definition. Thus, the approach tested the effectiveness of translanguaging in situating the student in the academic discourse of the classroom.

Session 1 concluded with a cumulative reflection [p.100; Appendix G] on the experience. The concluding metacognitive compositions allowed for an external examination of the subconsciously (or perhaps unconsciously) engaged mental processing of multilinguals. Session 2 was facilitated like a standard tertiary multilingual composition lesson, where the students were shown the object again, but then informed of its name, “collamber,” and the fictional, SAE definition—“a rare collection of geometrical shapes and dimensions, this collamber is used to signify the disparity of time” [Appendix D]. The students were then asked to write a final reflection on which definition they would most likely consider the object in, in the future [p. 105, Appendix E]. These responses intended to demonstrate the potential roles of translanguaging within the multilingual writing classroom.

The controlled discussion of translanguaging was moderated by me but was facilitated through the instructions that the students were informed to read carefully and follow diligently. Translanguaging was never formally introduced to the participants so that I could gather data
about translanguaging in this select population. Following the final reflection of Session 2, students were informed that translanguaging “is [a practice] in English language classrooms where] we encourage the home language within the classroom. So, it’d be Russian within an English-speaking classroom.” The discussion following this information is reflected in the data analysis in Chapter 5.

Data Collection

As the focus group was a convenience sample of six participants, all post-language reflections, the cumulative reflection from Session 1, and final reflection from Session 2 were collected and reviewed. To control settings, I had scripted the outline of the focus group’s sessions [Appendix F], but in-between each language detail we had off-topic conversation, or an “intermission,” in an attempt to clear the participants’ minds. No information from the off-topic conversations, other than the declared majors of the participants and a participant’s response to translanguaging, is included in the research. The focus group sessions had been video recorded to allow for review and to witness any non-verbal behavior if any was included (none has been recorded).

Session 1 lasted approximately one hour and fifteen minutes. During this time, introductions were given, then each participant was handed the abstract object and asked to look at it for a minute. After the minute finished, the Russian language detail-prompt was distributed, and the students were given five minutes to respond. After the five minutes, I collected both the object and the detail. When the in-between de-compressing conversation about Russia, Russian food, classes… seemed to be concluding (approximately two minutes), I redistributed the pictured object, gave the participants a minute to recollect, and then gave the Russian language-detail prompt [p. 68; Appendix G] and 5 minutes to respond. All of the items were once again
collected, and the process was repeated for the English detail prompt [p. 77; Appendix H] and the Russlish detail prompt [p. 83; Appendix I]. After the Russlish detail, I collected all of the materials and distributed the Session 1 cumulative reflection prompt. The students were given five minutes to respond, before all of the reflections were collected.

Following Session 1, I read through the language details and typed my translations into English, trying to keep the same sentiment and style of the original Russian and Russlish details. The English details were typed verbatim as they were handwritten. Session 2 began with the students reviewing the translated details in reference to their original documents as a means to remember their feelings, associations, and thoughts from Session 1. Additionally, this controlled for interpretation and accuracy on my part. The participants were then given the same object to review for a minute before moving to a miniature, ten-minute lesson that reflected the structure of a standard ESL class. Following the lesson, the participants were given a final reflection prompt and five minutes to respond. All of the responses were gathered and after analyzing them, they were typed up and presented in Chapter 5.

I watched the session videos for the first time while I began analyzing the data presented in Chapters 4 and 5. The two session videos aided in my recollection of the data collection and the reactions of the participants to certain aspects of the focus group. Due to IRB policy, the videos were only meant to be a means for review and complete transcripts are not provided in the current study. Only the specific statements and actions pertinent to the conclusions have been included. Since the data has been analyzed and typed into this thesis, the participants have been sent a copy of their original work and the thesis. All of the present content has been approved by them for accuracy. None of the original details or reflections have been edited as they are provided below.
Participants

In order to appreciate the results of the focus group, it is necessary to understand the Slavic community that is present in Spokane. Currently it is estimated that out of the nearly 479,398 people living in Spokane County, 3,731 have reported Russian as their home language (Riffe, 2015). From that, it is suggested that 1,200 of those Russian speakers account for the “a highly educated, bilingual workforce” (“Diversity,” 2019). The community members that have immigrated for religious asylum are from the former Soviet Union, therefore not all identify as Russian. Yet due to having been born in the Soviet Union, the geographical diversity is unified by their Russian language in addition to their religious affiliation. The religious affiliation of the community is made evident by responses to events as presented in The Spokesman Review, “Russian refugees in Spokane, mostly evangelical Baptists and Pentecostals, see the deaths as a heavenly signal to stop fighting among themselves over religious differences” (Johnson, 1995). Although the Slavic community of Spokane and the Russians and former-Soviet immigrants I have met in Russia contrast greatly, their traditional values for family life are remnants of Soviet propaganda [Figure 5]. The image instructs observers: “Look at the illustration. What is incorrect here? Why do you think so? And how, in your opinion, must it be to be corrected?” Observers are provoked to state that the little girl should be playing with the teddy bear not on the stool, which is assumed the brother should play on, while the father should be reading as the mother takes up the ironing, leaving the grandma to the knitting.

These remnants of Soviet life are still present in modern Russian and former Soviet cultures as men are standardly the head of the household and women often primarily rear the children. To maintain this cultural background in Spokane, the church provides Russian language schools, preserving the culture through language—a language that is reserved for community
members only. Due to the community’s commitment to cultural and lingual preservation, the high-number of Russian learners on Eastern’s campus, and my Russian background, the Slavic community members made for the perfect focus-group candidates to explore translanguaging.

Гениальное решение детской задачки

*Figure 5: Soviet Children’s Workbook Depicting Gender Roles* (Curtesy of Belok.org).

The criteria for being a participant in the focus group were that all members must be a minimum of 18 years old, have Russian as their home language or the language first learned, and be a student of Eastern Washington University. The four former students that I had reached out to were interested, out of which two invited their siblings who also fit the criteria. All six students were undergraduates and had attended high school in America. Two students had moved here during middle school from Russia, and one had moved here from Belarus in elementary school, while the other three had been born in the United States. Although these three had been
born here, some had been homeschooled for their early education. Pseudonyms were used to protect the students’ privacy, as well as collect genuine, thorough responses. After all six participants had signed the IRB consent form that described the focus group’s purpose, we moved forward with Session 1.

List of Participants

Lena

Lena was born in the United States, but her family is from Ukraine. A quiet and hardworking student, Lena is majoring in Communications. A former student of mine, her writing demonstrated Russian syntactical structures as it included lengthy detail. The thoroughness was also due to Lena’s observant behavior and critical listening skills, which she often evidenced in free-writes. Lena had expressed that writing did not come easily for her, nor did researching, but that did not impede her ability to submit thorough work. In one of her pieces for class, Lena had identified that “Americans are individualist and focus on diversity.” This insight was not a criticism, rather an observation drawn and explored in her research—one that demonstrates her understanding of American culture.

Maxim

Maxim had been born in Russia and moved to the States when he was 10 years old. When he arrived, he knew little English, but he entered an American school and learned English in his classes. He is studying to become a nurse and has a light-hearted and caring personality that made him easily likeable. Maxim is also a former student of mine and the initial writing he submitted illustrated a need for further practice, but by the end of the quarter he submitted much more developed work. Maxim showed effort in lessons and came to be interested in the class as it progressed.
**Ksenia**

Ksenia came to the United States when she was 7 years old from Belarus and had not attended the Russian language school but was familiar with it. Interactions from in-class and the focus group suggested that she may have been the most enculturated of all the participants. Another former student of mine, Ksenia is studying to be a psychology major because she thinks “it is interesting.” She has vast knowledge of American popular culture, which became evident in her class research. Ksenia is a driven student and submitted detailed writing. She disclosed that in Belarus she had started studying English from the first grade.

**Egor**

Egor was born in the United States and had attended the Russian language school through the church. A former student of mine, Egor seemed to lack interest in English and opened his literacy narrative with, “I never liked reading books or writing and always thought that reading was for dumb kids.” A kind and motivated student, Egor described the struggles he had experienced throughout elementary and middle school as he was not interested in his literary classes, which impacted his performance. Although his writing included standard errors, he was one of the younger participants, showing potential to succeed when he applied himself. He has chosen health and sciences as his major.

**Viktor**

Viktor was also born in the United States and had also attended the Russian language school through the church. He was studying computer science and asked for clarification throughout the focus group as a means to provide the appropriate responses. Viktor was not a former student of mine, but he appeared serious and reflective during the focus group sessions.
**Boris**

Boris had come to the States when he was 12 and began learning English when he entered the American school system. He was studying to be a mechanical engineer and was very outgoing and confident. Boris also was not a former student, but he expressed himself freely throughout both sessions.
CHAPTER 4
SESSION 1 LANGUAGE DETAIL AND REFLECTION ANALYSIS

Chapter 4 is a detailed discussion of the collected data from the participants’ Russian, English, and Russlish language details and the associated post-language reflections for each detail. In this chapter, we review the collected artifacts from the focus group to understand the voices of the multilinguals that multilingual writing classrooms aim to support. The organization of said data is by prompt rather than individual provider so that under each prompt we see the entire collection of data. Presenting the data and post analysis as such attempts to provide the reader with a clearer understanding of how each language is used by and affects the participants. Ultimately than, this structure gives more voice to the participants as it examines the data collectively and brings to light the commonalities among the students. These commonalities are then analyzed by me, the researcher and participant, before being reviewed by the participants themselves. The result of the iterative process both follows focus group methodology and ensues grounded method theory.

The participants were not told the purpose of the focus group, rather they were informed through the consent form that:

This is an opportunity to explore how and why you process information as you do, while providing me insight for my master’s thesis. Please read this form prior to agreeing and ask any questions before signing.

Purpose and Benefits
In an attempt to improve English as a Second Language (ESL) classes it is important for teachers to understand multilingual students’ thought processes. This focus group will provide insight to the mental strategies used by multilingual speakers of Russian and English while being introduced to new information. In turn, the focus group will expose participants’ best learning strategies, ultimately helping them understand how, why, and under what conditions they learn best.
The purpose of not introducing or defining the concept of translanguage was to provide a forum in which students could use language structures as freely as individuals would in everyday interactions. Therefore, after a brief introduction to the study the abstract design in Figure 6 was provided for each member. I created the image on a digital illustrator and mirrored the image so the students would be able to see a more complete image. Authorities in translanguage suggest that the practice is meant to evoke multilinguals’ most authentic reflection of information they encounter (Canagarajah, 2011; Li, 2018; Pennycook, 2017). Therefore, the image was modeled after the infamous Rorschach inkblot test so as to encourage participants to deeply reflect on the image and describe in writing what they were viewing. After viewing the image on a handout for one minute, the participants were given the Russian reflection prompt in Russian only. The English translation provided here is for readers of the present study and was not provided on the handout.

Figure 6: The abstract object shown to focus group participants in Sessions 1 & 2 (Personal Data)
Data Collection Session 1: Russian Language Detail

Russian Language Detail Prompt:

Пожалуйста, опишите как можно более подробно и подробно, что вы видели и/или связали с изображением, которое вы только что видели на русском. Не стесняйтесь продолжать просмотр изображения.

“Please describe as specifically and detailed as possible, what you saw and/or associated with the image you have just looked at in Russian. Feel free to continue looking at the image.”

The prompt was written in colloquial Russian and I attempted to model informal, free-writing to encourage authentic responses. Thus, the participants understood not to focus on mechanical issues. The responses varied, yet all followed the instructions and described the image in detail as is evidenced in their uncorrected responses that follow. The italicized English translation of the students’ writing is included for the readers of the present study. While translating the Russian language details, I attempted to maintain the spirit and voice of the original. These translations have been reviewed by the participants since and agreed upon.

Participant Responses:

Lena

Этот обект сначала выглядит как будто дали первокласснику рисовать на планшете, а потом если, если разглядеть, можно увидеть знакомые объекте. Например, ближе к середине, рисование из самого светлого цвета и самой толстой линии, объект выглядит как моль. А объект с черными, толстыми линиями выглядит как крылья бабочки, но разнёсные. Этот весь объект также симетричный.

This object initially looked as if it was done by a first grader, drawn on the tablet, and then if, if you observe more closely, you can see familiar objects. For example, closer to the middle, drawn in the lightest shade/color and the fattest line, the object looks like a moth. And an object with black, fat lines looks like butterfly wings, but separated. The whole object is also symmetrical.

Maxim

Когда я смотрел на это изображения, я подумал о бабочке. С переди были толстые чёрные линии. Они выглядели как верх и середина крыла. За ними были серые полы токовоже размера. За этими полохами были маленки кружочки каторые выглядели
как нижняя часть крыла. Я чувствовал, что это не бабочка, но пачемиму не мог увидеть ничего другого в этом узоре.

When I looked at that image, I thought of a butterfly. From the front were thick, black, lines. They looked like the front and middle of a wing. Behind them there were gray lines of the same size. Behind these lines were little circles, which looked like the bottom part of the wing. I felt that this isn't a butterfly, but for some reason I can't see anything else in this pattern.

Ksenia

- Я вижу две бабочкины крылья, или одну бабочку только без тело.
- Я вижу музыкальные трубы, в которых дуют воздух и которые раздают звук.
- 2 разных цвета (черный и серый)
- Этот рисунок находится в квадрате
- рисунок в форме кругов.

- I see two butterfly wings, or one butterfly that’s without a body.
- I see musical instruments into which require blowing air and which create sound.
- 2 different colors (black and gray).
- This image is inside a box.
- The image is in forms of circle.

Egor

Шо я видел когда я побачел ет обжект то ано как звир крылям. Патом подумал што крыл как болез. Его обжект мает богато линье, что странные.

What I saw when I first looked at this object was that it was like animal wings. Later, I thought that the wings like diseases. This object has so many lines, that it’s weird.

Viktor

Я видел butterfly колье я видел черный линеё, потом я видел cicada колье я видел сыви линеё. после это я не чо увидел толко линеё.

I saw butterfly wings I saw black lines. Then/later I saw a cicada when I looked at the gray lines. After this I don’t see anything only lines.

Boris

Выглядете какбутно нарисовано на другой бумаге и потом от сканироват. или нарисовано на компонтере в paint.exe Сначала накалякано ручкой в стилые калирафии накалякам ручкой, потом радом с калякой разные черпачкы. Поверх каляк а левее нарисован треугольные типо highlighter, а поверх всего нарисован впорей треугольник все изображение дубрировано в зеркальном отражение.

It looks as if it was drawn on a different sheet and then scanned or was drawn on a computer in paint.exe. In the beginning, it was drawn by hand as though with a calligraphy
pen, then next to this is drawn a circle. Above the circles and to the left triangles are drawn in a type of highlighter. Yet, above everything there’s drawn a second triangle. The whole image was created by a mirrored reflection.

Data analysis of the Russian Language Detail

When the participants had read the instructions to the Russian prompt, there was hesitation. Maxim asked, “You want us to respond in Russian?” To which I replied, “Да,” “Yes” and then explained in Russian that if they needed to write in transcription instead of the Russian alphabet, that was also fine. The participants were really surprised, even shocked—a response which seemed in part due to their assumption that I was not literate in Russian and also due to their affiliation of their personal Russian literacy. Egor stated, “My Russian’s bad,” to which I replied again in Russian in an attempt to engage their Russian competency, “Not a problem, so is mine.” Therefore, the initial tone of the study group had been set with apprehension and relays an element of insight to the GM hypothesis at this stage regarding students use of their L1 in the classroom. It seemed though the participants’ home language had needed to be Russian, the study criteria had not accounted for the level of the participants’ Russian literacy. This is a possible reason as to why Lena’s, Maxim’s, Ksenia’s, and Boris’s details had more content, while Egor’s and Viktor’s did not, yet without a language assessment the reason as to why remains uncertain.

As a participant observer, I have noticed that in trying to include home languages in my own English composition classes, that students are very skeptical. It seems to come from an apprehension of the setting—the American tertiary classroom—their classmates, and from their preconceived understanding that English is the standard language in these classrooms. Had I been asked to use English in my Russian, French, or Darijan lessons, I think I would not hesitate to the same degree due to my lack of weariness in using English. The instructors and classmates I
have worked with are presumed to be accepting of my home culture and language, or else I
would not think them to be working in that profession. Perhaps this indicates that the participants
are hesitant to use their Russian with outsiders because they are weary of being judged.

What is most notable from all of the details is the style of each. It felt as if the
participants’ academic background, which is to some degree respective of their interests, applied
a layer of interpretation for the students. Lena, our communication major, described the
composition of the image with a flowing progression of detail. Maxim, our nursing major,
provided more of a narrative, letting us see into his understanding and how his perception
changed. Ksenia the psychologist’s detail seemed straightforward, as if she was coming to terms
with the object as she wrote. The bullet points were not originally an aspect of the reflection, but
it appeared she revised her work and added these later as a way to organize her thoughts. Egor,
the health and science major, detailed a very genuine first glance—reflective of what he perhaps
could say with his apparently limited vocabulary. Viktor’s response includes the English words
he could not recollect in Russian such as “cicada”; our computer science participant seemingly
felt it important to be specific with the term ‘cicada.’ Thus, to some it was more important to
inform the audience of what they saw regardless of the language boundary.

It seems as if Viktor’s reflection indicates his attempt at seeing real objects: “I saw
butterfly wings I saw black lines. Then/later I saw a cicada when I looked at the gray lines,”
which is reflective of Maxim’s detail when he states, “I felt that this isn’t a butterfly, but for
some reason I can’t see anything else in this pattern.” This is similar to Egor’s comment, “What I
saw when I first looked at this object was that it was like animal wings. Later, I thought that the
wings like diseases” and Lena’s, “This object initially looked as if it was done by a first grader,
drawn on the tablet, and then if, if you observe more closely, you can see familiar objects.” We
begin to wonder then if this detail, much like the apparent bullet-revision in Ksenia’s detail, is a coming-to-terms with the reality of the object as the participants acknowledge a sentiment of uncertainty. Again, though, this could be due to their association with their Russian literacy, the focus group structure, and/or a combination of all these aspects.

Boris’s response was the most technical with highly specified words and straightforward description, which appeared to match his discipline and demeanor. Though his detail feels more confident than the others, he indicates a degree of uncertainty with his introductory phrase, “It looks as if it was drawn on a different sheet…” It could be questioned whether this was a matter of syntax variety as these responses follow Russian sentence structure. Lena, Ksenia, Egor, and to some degree Boris followed Russian syntax to some degree, whereby the newest and most important information comes at the end of the sentence. Moreover, sentence combining is completed with subordinate conjunctions that then prompt a linguistic case to relay the relationship between the clauses without additional words. Maxim’s, Viktor’s, and Boris’s seem to mimic English syntax with Russian vocabulary. This may suggest that these students process information in terms of English thought rather than Russian. This process is the same because I have often constructed my sentences as I think in English and mentally translate in Russian. The answers to these questions begin to be identified in the post-language prompt reflections, which follow the thematic chart in Table 2.

In Table 2 we see a charted representation of these analyses. We review the thematic concepts that have arisen from the collected data on the left-column, while the individual who represented this is labeled above. This charted, thematic analysis provides the iterative revision necessary for grounded theory method and iterative analysis. For the Russian data set, only the
English translation has been provided, though concepts of the Russian language have been analyzed within the chart also.

Table 2
**Russian language reflection thematic analysis:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lena</th>
<th>Maxim</th>
<th>Ksenia</th>
<th>Egor</th>
<th>Viktor</th>
<th>Boris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Style</strong></td>
<td><strong>Descriptive composition:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Narrative:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bulleted List:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Initial Enquiry:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Explicit Description:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This object initially looked as if it was done by a first grader, drawn on the tablet, and then if, if you observe more closely, you can see familiar objects. For example, closer to the middle, drawn in the lightest shade/color and the fattest line, the object looks like a moth. And an object with black, fat lines looks like butterfly wings, but separated. The whole object is also symmetrical.</td>
<td>When I looked at that image, I thought of a butterfly. From the front were thick, black, lines. They looked like the front and middle of a wing. Behind them there were gray lines of the same size. Behind these lines were little circles, which looked like the bottom part of the wing. I felt that this isn’t a butterfly, but for some reason I can’t see anything else in this pattern.</td>
<td>• I see two butterfly wings, or one butterfly that’s without a body. • I see musical instrumen ts into which require blowing air and which create sound.</td>
<td>• What I saw when I first looked at this object was that it was like animal wings. Later, I thought that the wings like diseases. This object has so many lines, that it’s weird.</td>
<td>I saw butterfly wings I saw black lines. Then/later I saw a cicada when I looked at the gray lines. After this I don’t see anything only lines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following the Russian language details, the participants were given the post-language reflection prompt that was used between each language. The responses were written in English and have been provided below unedited.

**Post-Language Prompt:**

Please answer the following questions in English as thoroughly and detailed as possible. Feel free to write informally, but clarify any statements or claims made.

How do you feel your description represents the object? Do any specific words give certain imagery more than others? Why did you choose to describe it as you did?

**Russian Post-Language Reflection Responses:**

**Lena**

1. The way that I described this object represents it with the way I see it. Someone could look at it & describe it differently, or represent it in another way.
2. I think that some words do create more imagery than others. For example, when I explained what some of the certain objects looked like, it would have done a better job at creating a better imagery than when I spoke of the object broadly.
3. I chose the words that I did because those words described what I thought of or perhaps the way the object appeared to me.

**Maxim**

I feel like it was very hard to describe the object firstly because it’s abstract but secondly because the words I would’ve used in English didn’t come to me in Russian. I feel like associating the object with something that was easier to describe would paint a better picture in the head of the reader. I tried to chose words that had more meaning to me but I think they wouldn’t be as meaningful to others. I switched my answer to question one and oops [participant is assumedly referring to the order of the questions in the prompt].

**Ksenia**

I see a butterfly without a body or I see two butterfly wings. I also see two musical instruments, I believe they are called “horns?” They seem to face each other coming from
the right and left sides of the image. There are two different colors used; black and grey. This image is inside another square-looking form. The shape of the lines used are circular.

I used words such as “butterfly” and “horn” to help give a visual example of what I was seeing in the image provided. I also listed colors and shapes to also provide a better explanation of the piece. My description should be pretty good I think because it helps to image what I’m seeing better.

Egor

I feel like my description was very vague and didn’t represent the object very well. I believe that some of the words might give certain imagery more than others. I chose to describe the object the way I did because it was the easiest way for me to describe it and I mainly wrote down what came to my mind when I saw it.

Viktor

I have not written in Russian in many years so I had a tough time putting my thoughts down on the paper so I don’t think that I gave a good description of the object. In some cases yes but in this particular image I did not think much of it.

Boris

I feel like I was really limited by my speed of writing in Russian, like I chose to write in less detail because it took me so long. So my description is subpar. I used the word highlighter because its exactly what the object looks like it was drawn with I know there is a russian word for it ☺. I used the word калейда because that’s exactly what the circle looked like, so I guess I used the most descriptive word I could, unless I didn’t know it.

I chose words that would describe it well enough for someone else to reproduce the image however it kinda failed cause of the time constraint.

Data Analysis of the Russian Post-Language Reflection

Many of the participants felt the need to explain their language choices as if they were defending them. The prompt asked for the participant to state how they felt the reflection represented the object, yet the anticipated response was similar to Lena’s, “The way that I described this object represents it with the way I see it.” In asking the participants to reflect on whether their reflections accurately depicted the object, I had believed the responses would include comments such as, “It reflected the object as well as I knew how” or “It was difficult to describe the object as I didn’t know how.” I was surprised to see how harshly the students judged their own reflections. Maxim directly stated that it was hard to describe the object because of his
perceived distance from his Russian literacy. Ksenia decided to translate the detail either to help in the analysis or to ensure a particular understanding. She also used judgment words such as “pretty good,” which was another common theme from all of the responses. Additionally, Egor judged his work by stating that he felt the description “didn’t represent the object very well.” Viktor claims that his description is not good and begins with an explanation as to why, suggesting a self-consciousness in his Russian writing. Similarly, Boris described the difficulty he experienced from the time constraint—a complaint we will not see in the English post-language reflection.

The grappling that came from associating the object with something familiar, in addition to a lack of confidence in their Russian literacy, most likely led to the very self-aware reflections. Indicative of this claim are the references the participants made to their language choices in respect to their relative associations with the object. The reflection prompt asked for consideration of linguistic choices and representations, but the participants identified that the description depended on what they associated the object with, and that that association may not be reflective of others’ understandings. For example, Maxim notes, “I tried to chose words that had more meaning to me but I think they wouldn’t be as meaningful to others.” Additionally, Lena stated, “The way that I described this object represents it with the way I see it. Someone could look at it & describe it differently or represent it in another way.” The consideration of their audience may have come from the effect of the study and the participants’ understanding that these would be reviewed and analyzed for research purposes. Alternatively, these statements are made in defense of their language choices, further suggesting a self-awareness of their Russian literacy. The post-analysis is provided in a charted representation below (Table 3).
Table 3
Session 1 Russian Language Reflection Thematic Analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lena</th>
<th>Maxim</th>
<th>Ksenia</th>
<th>Egor</th>
<th>Viktor</th>
<th>Boris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>The way that I described this object represents it with the way I see it. Someone could look at it &amp; describe it differently, or represent it in another way.</td>
<td>I tried to chose words that had more meaning to me but I think they wouldn’t be as meaningful to others.</td>
<td>My description should be pretty good because it helps to image what I’m seeing better.</td>
<td>I feel like my description was very vague and didn’t represent the object very well.</td>
<td>… I don’t think that I gave a good descriptio n of the object.</td>
<td>… like I chose to write in less detail because it took me so long. So my description is subpar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt to associate with realia</td>
<td>I chose the words that I did because those words described what I thought of or perhaps the way the object appeared to me.</td>
<td>I feel like associating the object with something that was easier to describe would paint a better picture in the head of the reader.</td>
<td>I used words such as “butterfly” and “horn” to help give a visual example of what I was seeing in the image provided.</td>
<td>… was that it was like animal wings. Later, I thought that the wings like diseases.</td>
<td>“cicada” highlighter because its exactly what the objected looked like it was drawn with I know there is a russian word for it ☹️. I used the word kaļķa because thats exactly what the circle looked like, so I guess I used the most descriptive word I could, unless I didn’t know it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Collection Session 1: English Language Detail**

The responses below have been unedited and came after the students had been given the miniature break following the Russian language detail and reflection. Again, they were asked to follow the instructions of the prompt and to provide as much detail as possible. The conversation
around the distribution of the English prompt was entirely in English to help foster their linguistic engagement in English.

**English Language Detail Prompt:**

Please describe as specifically and detailed as possible, what you saw and/or associated with the image you have just looked at in English. Feel free to continue looking at the image.

**Participant Responses:**

**Lena**

At first glance, the object appears to be a lot of random scribbles, but if you take apart the picture, you can tell that some of the things resemble real objects. For example, the object closest to the center, (which is divided by a space) resemble a moth if you’re looking at it from the top. The top of the “moth” has two lines coming out that look like toilet uncloggers. The black object which slightly overlaps the grey object looks like cartoony butterfly wings, but separated & w/o a body.

**Maxim**

When look at the image I saw a butterfly at first. It was composed of three layers. The first lay was a dark squgle. It was in the center but also at the top of the wing. Behind it was a grey triangular shape. It wa right in the center. the bottom cornor had a circular pattern which was made of thinner black lines. After examaning the image close I decided that it might be the eyes of an alian buglike creature.

**Ksenia**

- Butterfly with no body
- two butterfly wings
- two musical horns pointed towards each other
- random lines/stripes in the background
- two colors used: black & grey
- image is inside of a square
- circular lines
- grey color shows shadows
- “wings” are overlapping the rest of the images in the back
- 3 different figures”
Egor

The first thing that I thought of when I first saw it is that it looked like a butterfly. After looking at it more it just confused me and the big sqigally lines looked like some kind of disease like ebola. After further observations it looked more like a heart that’s been tore apart with the black lines at the bottom sides being blood. When looking at it further there are 2 triangles, one black and one grey. Also a circle.

Viktor

When look at the bold black lines I see wings of a butterfly. When looking at the gray lines I see wings of a circada. The left side is symmetric to the right side. When turned upside down, The black and bold lines look like a heart.

Boris

This image was most likely made in Microsoft Paint 3D The image is mirrored vertically along the middle. At the bottom right corner there is a circle made from scribbles. The scribbles were made with a calligraphy pen tool. Then a highlighter was used to draw a triangle with its base close to the center and one corner on the circle. Than a larger triangle was drawn over the previous shapes. The whole image probably originally had color but was printed out in greyscale.

Data Analysis of the English Language Detail

The English language details were much more thorough and creative across the responses. This is perhaps due to both the students’ comfort in using English and them having reviewed and written on the object one time already. Moreover, the details appear to be progressions of the Russian detail—they are more developed pieces of the Russian details. This could suggest that as we compose we begin to acquaint ourselves more explicitly with our thoughts, or that the participants feel more readily able to describe the object.

Lena decided to remove the statement that a first-grader may have drawn the object but maintains that “it appears to be a lot of scribbles” before discussing how it becomes more dynamic with further review. This is very reflective of her original statement, but much more developed. The same progression is portrayed in Maxim’s detail as his original detail posed an introverted inquiry to which he answers in the English detail, “I decided that it might be the eyes of an alien buglike creature”. Egor maintained the association of a disease but identified it as “ebola.” As Lena, Maxim, and Egor progressed their language details, we see that Ksenia,
Viktor, and Boris maintained very similar details. This may suggest that these students have equal levels of literacy in Russian and English, or they simply drew no further understanding of the object. The basis for these progressions cannot be determined as it could be an indication of the writing process, comfort in English writing, and/or the further allotted time with the image.

The analyses are charted in Table 4.

Table 4
Session 1 English Language Detail Thematic Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lena</th>
<th>Maxim</th>
<th>Ksenia</th>
<th>Egor</th>
<th>Viktor</th>
<th>Boris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Similar</strong></td>
<td>At first glance, the object appears to be</td>
<td>When look at the image I saw a butterfly</td>
<td>The first thing that I thought of when I</td>
<td>When look at the bold black lines I see</td>
<td>This image was most likely</td>
<td>This image was most likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>a lot of random scribbles, but if you</td>
<td>at first. [...] It [squiggles] was in the</td>
<td>first saw it is that it looked like a</td>
<td>wings of a butterfly. When looking at the</td>
<td>made in Microsoft Paint 3D</td>
<td>made in Microsoft Paint 3D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>take apart the picture, you can tell</td>
<td>center but also at the top of the wing.</td>
<td>butterfly. After looking at it more it</td>
<td>looking at the gray lines I see wings of</td>
<td>image is mirrored vertically</td>
<td>image is mirrored vertically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that some of the things resemble real</td>
<td>Behind it was a grey triangular shape. It</td>
<td>just confused me and the big sqigally</td>
<td>a circada.</td>
<td>along the middle. At the</td>
<td>along the middle. At the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>objects. For example, the object closest</td>
<td>was right in the center. [...] was made</td>
<td>lines looked like some kind of disease</td>
<td></td>
<td>bottom right corner there</td>
<td>bottom right corner there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to the center, (which is divided by a</td>
<td>of thinner black lines. After examining</td>
<td>like ebola.</td>
<td></td>
<td>is a circle made from</td>
<td>is a circle made from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>space) resemble a moth if you’re looking</td>
<td>the image close…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>scribbles. … with a</td>
<td>scribbles. … with a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at it from the top. The top of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>calligraphy pen tool.</td>
<td>calligraphy pen tool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“moth” has two lines coming out […] The</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Then a highlighter was used</td>
<td>Then a highlighter was used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>object which slightly overlaps the grey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to draw a triangle with its</td>
<td>to draw a triangle with its</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>object looks like […] butterfly wings,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>base close to the center</td>
<td>base close to the center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>but separated &amp; w/o a body.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and one corner on the circle.</td>
<td>and one corner on the circle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More</strong></td>
<td>“random scribbles”;</td>
<td>“composed of three”</td>
<td>“‘wings’ are overlapping”</td>
<td>“confused”;</td>
<td>“wings of a”</td>
<td>“mirrored vertically and”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>specified</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“confused”;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word choice</th>
<th>“resemble”;</th>
<th>“toilet uncloggers”;</th>
<th>“cartoony butterfly wings”</th>
<th>“disease”;</th>
<th>“ebola”;</th>
<th>“symmetrical”;</th>
<th>“turned upside down”;</th>
<th>“heart”</th>
<th>“along the middle”; circle made of scribbles”; greyscale”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**English Post-Language Reflection Responses:**

**Lena**

1. I feel like my description individually represents the object. The way I see/describe it is only my opinion, so it ^my description [added for clarification by the participant] just only adds a little more meaning to it based on my observation.  
2. I think that the more descriptive words add more imagery, for example, those which I was comparing to tangible objects.  
3. I chose to describe my object based on the way it appeared to me when I looked at it.

**Maxim**

I felt I did a better job describing the object. This time my description was only limited by time and my imagination. I feel like I can describe a word by using other words instead of leaving it out. So words don’t hold a specific value. I described the image by stating the first thing I saw by looking at it because it was easier to relate things to each other.

**Ksenia**

I feel like I did a good job describing what I was seeing. I used shades of colors, distance, shape of lines, and look alike objects to describe the piece given to me. I described it as a did to help the audience imagine exactly what I was seeing and where it was located.

**Egor**

I feel that my description represents the object better but only when looking at it as a whole picture. I did not write a lot of detail, since I was looking at the picture as a whole. I think that specific words did give certain imagery more than others. I chose to describe it the way I did because when I look at something I first look at the thing as a whole before looking at the details.

**Viktor**

I think my description represented my view of the object better than in russia. I know basic Russian, but I have a broader vocabulary of the english language so I was able to think of more english words to describe the image.

**Boris**

Since I am lazy I will say that I tried to do the same thing as before however I could write more because I write faster in English. However I still didn’t say everything I wanted to. Again I used the word scribble because it best describes the circle.  
I chose to describe it in the same manner because when I describe something I think about it and put the thoughts to words, something this means translating some of the thoughts so that the whole thing is in one language.
Haha I was answering a different question than you asked. [Spacing and formatting intended to match participant’s.]

**Data Analysis of the English Post-Language Reflection**

All of the participants felt that their English language details were more descriptive, though some distinctively commented on how their word-choice is not necessarily the most meaningful unit. Both Lena and Maxim distinguished between the idea of stating words versus associations. Lena commented, “I think that the more descriptive words add more imagery, for example, those which I was comparing to tangible objects,” which is similar to Maxim’s—“I feel like I can describe a word by using other words instead of leaving it out. So words don’t hold a specific value.” Additionally, we see that though Boris’s reflections are nearly identical, he translated some of the words, “…when I describe something I think about it and put the thoughts to words, something this means translating some of the thoughts so that the whole thing is in one language.” Boris is perhaps suggesting that some of the words he associated with the object were originally in Russian and then he translated them into English, or vice-versa. These responses indicate that the participants were beginning to reflect on the study’s purpose and whether their use of language depicts their perception of the object better. Furthermore, these responses also suggest that the association of the object is independent of language for multilinguals as the content is perceivable without linguistic structures.

Often when I am in a situation that prompts me to think in a foreign languages such as when I speak with Ali, or Elena, I have to hyper-focus in that language to engage my entire repertoire. During these times, moments arise when I do not know a word such as was described in Chapter 1 with the word “paint.” In those moments, I refer to my entire linguistic competency and attempt to incorporate the necessary word, which was “le peinture” in the case of the unknown Darijan word for “paint.” What is understood though, is that I am either less familiar or
completely unaware of that linguistic structure when I need to resort to my entire linguistic competency. I do this out of necessity when I feel the need to “translate… some of the thoughts.” This is different from when I use translanguaging for rhetorical purposes, as perhaps the mother in the swimming pool situation demonstrated.

For the other participants—Ksenia, Egor, Viktor, and Boris—they seemed very critical of their word choice in relation to the accuracy of the image. Aside from Egor, the other three participants, although they remark their details were “better,” did not add that much more content to their description. Though they may have been more grammatically correct, the content stayed very similar. Thus, it could be suggested that students’ confidence in writing is defined by their ability to write grammatically correct. If this sentiment is true, it could be an outcome of the evaluation criteria that are currently used in TESOL classrooms, the focus paid towards grammar in society, and/or from the comfort people feel from conforming to a standard.

Table 5
*Session 1 English Language Reflection Thematic Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-awareness</th>
<th>Lena</th>
<th>Maxim</th>
<th>Ksenia</th>
<th>Egor</th>
<th>Viktor</th>
<th>Boris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel like my description individually represents the object. The way I see/describe it is only my opinion, so it just only adds a little more meaning to it</td>
<td>I felt I did a better job describing the object</td>
<td>I feel like I did a good job describing what I was seeing.</td>
<td>I feel that my description represents the object better but only when looking at it as a whole picture</td>
<td>I think my description represented my view of the object better than in Russia.</td>
<td>Since I am lazy…</td>
<td>Haha I was answering a different question than you asked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of the Relativity of words and audience’s perception</td>
<td>I chose to describe my object based on the way it appeared to me when I looked at it</td>
<td>So words don’t hold a specific value. I described the image by stating the first thing I saw by looking at it because it was easier to relate things to each other.</td>
<td>I described it as a did to help the audience imagine exactly what I was seeing and where it was located</td>
<td>I chose to describe it the way I did because when I look at something I first look at the thing as a whole before looking at the details.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>I chose to describe it in the same manner because when I describe something I think about it and put the thoughts to words, something this means translating some of the thoughts so that the whole thing is in one language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Collection Session 1: Russlish Language Detail**

**Russlish Language Detail Prompt:**

Пожалуйста сейчас давай записывать по RUSSLISH-- a комбинация o Russian and English! *1 Write in Cyrillic and/or the Roman alphabet—use both languages to describe EXACTLY what you see and feel from the image. Напишите как хотите! *2

*1 “Now please let’s write in RUSSLISH—a combination of Russian and English.”
*2 “Write how you want!”

**Participants’ Responses:**

The Russlish detail translations, which are provided below the response, were completed by the researcher as part of the data analysis. The bolded text represents what was originally written in English, while the normal sized font was written in Russian. These translations were checked by the participants during Session 2 and again after the data analysis to allow for the participants to verify that the translations and conclusions I’ve drawn, were supported by them also.
Lena

Картинку которую я вижу is semmetrical. Она вообще doesn't really look like anything in particular, но создает какое-то представление и связывает с другими объектами. Если смотреть на картинку с squinted eyes, то всё вместе выглядит как Monarch butterfly, а серая масса линий выглядит немножко как тень бабочки.

The picture that I see is symmetrical. Altogether, it doesn't really look like anything in particular, but creates some sort of a perspective and binds together with other objects. If the picture is looked at with squinted eyes, then everything together looks like a Monarch butterfly, a gray mass of lines looks a little like the shadow of a butterfly.

Maxim

This time I eyes not a butterfly. There were thick black lines at the front. Они выглядели как треугольники. Behind them were grey triangles that looked like the pupils of the eyes. Криги которые были за треугольышками выглядели как пятна. Как буто this was a feline with spots on its face.

This time I eyes not a butterfly. There were thick black lines at the front. They looked like triangles. Behind them were grey triangles that looked like the pupils of the eyes. The wings that were behind the triangles, look like spots. As if this was a feline with spots on its face.

Ksenia

Я вижу типа "рамку" вокруг этого рисунка, a frame around the image due to the noticable sides being cut off at the bottom (в низу) and on the right & left side (обо правая и левая сторона). Я доихпор вижу два разных цвета. The grey piece of this image (которой посередине) shows shadowing between the lines. Досихпор я вижу бабочку и два музыкальных инструмента (horn). In the background я вижу восьем линий, that are very random.

I see a type of “frame” around this drawing, a frame around the image due to the noticable sides being cut off at the bottom (at the bottom) and on the right and left side (both the right and left sides). I still see two different colors. The grey peice of this image (which is in the middle) shows shadowing between the lines. I still see a butterfly and two musical instruments (horn). In the background I see 8 lines, that are very random.

Egor

Когда я вдьу ето обжекта я Гачу один triangle with много линьы. Some of the lines look like the were repeatiadly drawn into a circle. The bold black lines look like there wer some letter written in it, like the letter R and L but were mixed together.

When I see this object I see one triangle with many lines. Some of the lines look like the were repeatiadly drawn into a circle. The bold black lines look like there wer some letter written in it, like the letter R and L but were mixed together.

Viktor
When I saw the линеё я saw a reflection. It looked like одна сторона бола reflecting the other side. потом я saw the big bold black lines; they looked like wings of a butterfly to me. The сывий lines looked like a cicada. The small circled lines looked like a ball of hair. Upside down, the black lines looked like a серце.

When I saw the lines I saw a reflection. It looked like one side was reflecting the other side. Later I saw the big bold black lines; they looked like wings of a butterfly to me. The lighter lines looked like a cicada. The small circled lines looked like a ball of hair. Upside down, the black lines looked like a heart.

Boris

Honestly I don't really have a language preference but here goes nothing. Start with a калюка which my cousin would call буйная пчелка. Then add an isosalese triangle on top of it however only one corner of the triangle is over the калюка. Now draw the outline of a 30-60-90 degree triangle on top of both the previous shapes. add random squiggles through the triangle. now mirror the image and put it on a gray background. The image should be mirrored in such a way that the bases of the equalateral triangles are parrallell and are about an inch apart. The 30 60 90 triangle has the second longest side parralell to the base of the isosalace triangle.

Honestly I don’t really have a language preference but here goes nothing.

Start with a scribble which my cousin would call drunk/rowdy bee. Then add an isosalese triangle on top of it however only one corner of the triangle is over the scribble. Now draw the outline of a 30-60-90 degree triangle on top of both the previous shapes. add random squiggles through the triangle. now mirror the image and put it on a gray background. The image should be mirrored in such a way that the bases of the equalateral triangles are parrallell and are about an inch apart. The 30 60 90 triangle has the second longest side parrallell to the base of the isosalace triangle.

Data Analysis of the Russlish Language Detail

It appears that the translangugaged details are both the most precise and the most developed. We see the precision due to the accuracy obtained by knowing two vocabularies—the participants’ linguistic repertoires—and from the participants being able to identify what they see with the language they most often associate with it. Lena concludes that the object is a “Monarch Butterfly,” which she had formerly identified as a “moth” in both the English and Russian details. Maxim identifies the object to be a set of eyes of a cat, and Boris relays that it’s not “scribbles” but a “буйная пчелка” or “drunk/rowdy bee.” The addition of these specific terms
could be attributed to Russlish being the students’ third time writing on the object, or it could be an outcome from the freedom they felt in being able to use both languages simultaneously. Therefore, they were able to incorporate the words they most often would associate with what they were seeing.

The instances where I have translanguaged have come from both necessity and from a rhetorical appeal. The instances of the former have been discussed in detail in Chapter 1, and are represented in the participants’ usage of specific words—words they most likely knew better and/or were familiar with in the language in use at the moment. Other times, I have translanguaged because it felt like the perfect way to relay the message I intended. This seems to mimic Boris’s inclusion of “буйная пчелка,” which we will see further analyzed in the Russlish post-language data analysis. His inclusion of this term is for rhetorical purposes as it describes the image perfectly.

A majority of the participants maintained their original thesis, or main claim as to what the object was, and only developed the syntax of the reflection, which would relay that the writing process was what prompted the inclusion of specified words, but this only holds true for Lena’s, Ksenia’s, Viktor’s, and Boris’s. Maxim and Egor continued to see new associations as Maxim identifies it as a “feline with spots on its face,” and Egor decides that they may be letters “like the letter R and L but […] mixed together.” Consequently, the data may conclude that some students comprehend what they see at their initial review, while perhaps others changed over time, and still others changed due to language use.

Ksenia’s reflection detail became more cohesive—an outcome that appears to be from the necessity of having to interweave the languages together but was also somewhat present in the original Russian detail. The Russian detail included simple but complete sentence structure,
whereas the English comprised of phrases. Though the weaving of the languages could have occurred through bullets, it may have been easier to allow the thoughts to flow freely in a sentence instead of as an organized list. Moreover, since we see evidence of fluency in the Russian detail, perhaps the cohesion present in the Russlish detail is simply due to Ksenia’s familiarity with Russian literacy as simple sentence structure. This contrasts perhaps with the English style of brainstorming, where we tend to mark down our thoughts, however incomplete as they may be. If the latter implication is correct, it could be understood that the foundational stages of literacy are the most prominent for our understanding of literacy in that language. The one objection to more developed Russlish details, would be Egor, who’s English detail seems to be the most developed—perhaps indicative of his Russian literacy. Alternatively, as this was the last detail and came after lunch, perhaps it was due to his lack of energy for the conciseness of his detail. Table 6 portrays all language details separated by individual for comparison. The data provided in the chart is only the English translation as a means for easy readability. The Russlish translation has bolded phrases of what was originally in English.

Table 6
Session 1 Russian, English, and Russlish Language Details Compiled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lena</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Russlish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lena</td>
<td>This object initially looked as if it was done by a first grader, drawn on the tablet, and then if, if you observe more closely, you can see familiar objects. For example, closer to the middle, drawn in the lightest shade/color and the fattest line, the object looks like a moth. And an object with black, fat lines looks like butterfly wings, but separated. The whole object is also symmetrical.</td>
<td>At first glance, the object appears to be a lot of random scribbles, but if you take apart the picture, you can tell that some of the things resemble real objects. For example, the object closest to the center, (which is divided by a space) resemble a moth if you’re looking at it from the top. The top of the “moth” has two lines coming out that look like toilet uncloggers. The black object which slightly overlaps the grey object looks like cartoon butterfly wings, but separated &amp; w/o a body.</td>
<td>The picture that I see is symmetrical. Altogether, it doesn’t really look like anything in particular, but creates some sort of a perspective and binds together with other objects. If the picture is looked at with squinted eyes, then everything together looks like a Monarch butterfly, a gray mass of lines looks a little like the shadow of a butterfly.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxim</td>
<td>When I looked at that image, I thought of a butterfly. From the front were thick, black, lines. They looked like the front and middle of a wing. Behind them there were gray lines of the same size. Behind these lines were little circles, which looked like the bottom part of the wing. I felt that this isn’t a butterfly, but for some reason I can’t see anything else in this pattern.</td>
<td>When look at the image I saw a butterfly at first. It was composed of three layers. The first lay was a dark sqigle. It was in the center but also at the top of the wing. Behind it was a grey triangular shape. It was right in the center. the bottom corner had a circular pattern which was made of thinner black lines. After examaning the image close I decided that it might be the eyes of an alien buglike creature.</td>
<td>This time I eyes not a butterfly. There were thick black lines at the front. They looked like triangles. Behind them were grey triangles that looked like the pupils of the eyes. The wings that were behind the triangles, look like spots. As if this was a feline with spots on its face.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ksenia| - I see two butterfly wings, or one butterfly that’s without a body.   
- I see musical instruments into which require blowing air and which create sound.  
- 2 different colors (black and gray).  
- This image is inside a box.  
- The image is in forms of circle. | - Butterfly with no body  
- two butterfly wings  
- two musical horns pointed towards each other  
- random lines/stripes in the background  
- two colors used: black & grey  
- image is inside of a square  
- circular lines  
- grey color shows shadows  
- “wings” are overlapping the rest of the images in the back  
- 3 different figures” | I see a type of “frame” around this drawing, a frame around the image due to the noticible sides being cut off at the bottom (at the bottom) and on the right and left side (both the right and left sides). I still see two different colors. The grey piece of this image (which is in the middle) shows shadowing between the lines. I still see a butterfly and two musical instruments (horn). In the background I see 8 lines, that are very random. |
| Egor  | What I saw when I first looked at this object was that it was like animal wings. Later, I thought that the wings like diseases. This object has so many lines, that it’s weird. | The first thing that I thought of when I first saw it is that it looked like a butterfly. After looking at it more it just confused me and the big sqigally lines looked like some kind of disease like ebola. After further observations it looked more like a heart that’s been tore apart with the black lines at the bottom sides being blood. When looking at it further there are 2 triangles, one black and one grey. Also a circle. | When I see this object I see one triangle with many lines. Some of the lines look like the were repeatiadly drawn into a circle. The bold black lines look like there were some letter written in it, like the letter R and L but were mixed together. |
| Viktor | I saw butterfly wings I saw black lines. Then/later I saw a cicada when I looked at the gray lines. After this I don’t see anything only lines. | When look at the bold black lines I see wings of a butterfly. When looking at the gray lines I see wings of a cicada. The left side is symmetric to the right side. When turned upside down, The black and bold lines look like a heart. | “When I saw the lines I saw a reflection. It looked like one side was reflecting the other side. Later I saw the big bold black lines; they looked like wings of a butterfly to me. The lighter lines looked like a cicada. The small circled lines looked like a ball of hair. Upside down, the black lines looked like a heart. |
| Boris | It looks as if it was drawn on a different sheet and then scanned or was drawn on a computer in paint.exe. In the beginning, it was drawn by hand as though with a calligraphy pen, then next to this is drawn a circle. Above the circles and to the left triangles are drawn in a type of highlighter. Yet, above everything there’s drawn a second triangle. The whole image was created by a mirrored reflection. | This image was most likely made in Microsoft Paint 3D The image is mirrored vertically along the middle. At the bottom right corner there is a circle made from scribbles. The scribbles were made with a calligraphy pen tool. Then a highlighter was used to draw a triangle with its base close to the center and one corner on the circle. Than a larger triangle was drawn over the previous shapes. The whole image probably originally had color but was printed out in greyscale. | Honestly I don’t really have a language preference but here goes nothing. |

The participants’ translanguage content indicates the knowledge building potential of the practice, yet it does not consider the syntactical relevance. Translanguaging forced Ksenia to articulate her understanding of the object in complete sentences. Due to her Russian sentences being more complete, this may be a reflection of how she composes in Russian. English free-
writes are meant to be more exploratory, whereas Russian writing is standardly more formal. Therefore, it could have been the familiar style that guided her cohesion. This conclusion could be supported by the very development of the students’ English aspects of the details. Maxim, Egor, Viktor, and Boris, who self-evaluated as being more proficient in English either due to familiarity, speed, or for an undisclosed reason during the English post-language reflection, appeared to include the most English in the Russlish. Therefore, the reflections may suggest that students write in the manner and style that they are familiar and comfortable in. This does not suggest a correlation with a specific language and confidence per se, rather a correlation between practice, instruction, and confidence. As students feel more fluidity in writing their thoughts, while also understanding that their writing is “correct” per classroom evaluation, they feel freer in composing.

Ksenia’s and Lena’s reflections illustrate the most interwoven syntax between the two languages. Although Ksenia’s detail repeats the sentiment in the other language in some places as if to clarify, “at the bottom (at the bottom),” altogether there appears to be complete harmony between the two languages and follows the grammar of English syntax. Lena’s reflection flows really smoothly but is heavier in Russian than English. This may suggest that they are the most literate in both languages, but still illustrates how the phrases that are the most familiar, regardless of language, come to mind first.

Maxim kept the languages isolated, alternating between the two sentence-by-sentence, until the very end when he includes the phrase, “как будто,” instead of the English equivalent, “as if.” Thus, perhaps it was a matter of training and/or practice for Maxim to become familiar with thinking freely in both languages. Alternatively, it could be because phrases such as, “как будто” are similar to the other succinct and pointed phrases that are often translanguaged. These are the
phrases that are used frequently in the home language and don’t necessarily have the same feeling in the target language. We see this with the verb “пое-ала,” which follows Russian perfective verb tense and is seen in other examples such as “пое-слід-іте” (по-слід-іте). “пое-слід-іте” is conjugated for the command form to direct at a deli-counter attendant if you’d like sliced meat. This is another example presented by Elena Morgan from the Spokane Slavic community. In these instances, it is unclear if it’s because of the context that calls for the inclusion of the phrase(s), or rather because that phrase is so prominent and readily available for us to use.

Egor, Viktor, and Boris wrote primarily in English, only inserting phrases that seemed more familiar or specific in Russian into their reflections. This is similar to Lena, except for her incorporating more Russian than English. Though the English and Russian linguistic structures are embedded perfectly within the opposite language’s syntax, these results may suggest that these participants feel more comfortable and/or familiar with the literacy they predominately wrote more in. It may be suggested that Egor, attempted to write in Russian and then concluded in English due to its ease in articulation for him.

Table 7
Session 1 Russlish Language Detail Thematic Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incorporated phrases within the syntax of the other language</th>
<th>Lena</th>
<th>Maxim</th>
<th>Ksenia</th>
<th>Egor</th>
<th>Viktor</th>
<th>Boris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The picture that I see is symmetric. Altogether, it doesn’t really look like anything in particular, but creates some sort of a</td>
<td>As if this was a feline with spots on its face.</td>
<td>I see a type of “frame” around this drawing, a frame around the image due to the noticeable sides being cut off at the bottom…</td>
<td>When I see this object I see one triangle with many lines…</td>
<td>When I saw the lines I saw a reflection. It looked like one side was reflecting the other side. Later I saw the big bold black lines; they looked like wings of a butterfly to me. The lighter lines looked like a cicada.</td>
<td>Start with a scribble which my cousin would call drunk/rowdy bee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The picture that I see is symmetrical. Altogether, it doesn’t really look like anything in particular, but creates some sort of a perspective and binds together with other objects. If the picture is looked at with squinted eyes, then everything together looks like a Monarch butterfly, a gray mass of lines looks a little like the shadow of a butterfly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lena</th>
<th>Maxim</th>
<th>Ksenia</th>
<th>Egor</th>
<th>Viktor</th>
<th>Boris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Dominant</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>This time I eyes not a butterfly. There were thick black lines at the front. They looked like triangles. <strong>Behind them were grey triangles that looked like the pupils of the eyes. The wings that were behind the triangles, look like spots. As if this was a feline with spots on its face.</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>When I saw this object I see one triangle with many lines. Some of the lines look like the were repeatedly drawn into a circle. The bold black lines look like there were some letter written in it, like the letter R and L but were mixed together.</td>
<td>Honestly I don’t really have a language preference but here goes nothing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Start with a scribble which my cousin would call drunk/rowdy bee. Then add an isosalese triangle on top of it however only one corner of the triangle is over the scribble. Now draw the outline of a 30-60-90 degree triangle on top of both the previous shapes. Add random squiggles through the triangle, now mirror the image and put it on a grey background. The image should be mirrored in such a way that the bases of the equalateral triangles are parrallell and are about an inch apart. The 30 60 90 triangle has the second longest side parrallell to the base of the isosalese triangle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lena, Maxim</th>
<th>Ksenia</th>
<th>Egor, Viktor, Boris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>I see a type of “frame” around this drawing, a frame around the image due to the noticable sides being cut off at the bottom (at the bottom) and on the right</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and left side (both the right and left sides). I still see two different colors. The grey peice of this image (which is in the middle) shows shadowing between the lines. I still see a butterfly and two musical instruments (horn). In the background I see 8 lines, that are very random.

**Russlish Post- Language Detail**

**Participant Responses:**

**Lena**
1. I feel like the last description best represents the object, because I was able to use words from both languages to describe what I saw.
2. I feel like the English words really create more visuals because they are somewhat more of the description version of the Russian words I couldn’t think of.
3. I chose to describe the way I did because it was more comfortable for me to express what I felt when I saw the object/the way that it appeared to me.

**Maxim**
My description represents the object not as well as the previous two. It was harder for me to decide how I wanted to describe it because I felt more freedom. Specific words helped me this time because I could switch languages. I chose to describe it this way because it was easier than sticking to one language.

**Ksenia**
I used pretty much the same words and techniques I used previously in my reflections. I don’t feel as anything new came from me using two diff. languages besides knowing some of the names for things (horns) and better words of descriptions due to me practicing one language more often than the other. Otherwise If I noticed something new it was because I have now looked at the image several more times.

**Egor**
I feel like my description represents the object as best as I can see it. I believe that there might be few words that give certain imagery more than others, such as saying that an object looks like the letter R. I chose to describe it the way I did because it was what I was able to see.

**Viktor**
I feel like my description did a good job of describing the object. One word that gave me more imagery than others was “heart” in russian as opposed to english. I chose to describe it based on how I thought of it in my head”.

**Boris**
I think I did better because It was like the 3rd draft of writing this.
When I was writing in Russian I forgot to say буйная пчелка so when I could use the Russian words again this time I used them, that was an addition to the description. To others it probably doesn’t mean much be to me it describes it perfectly.
I did not change anything in the way I tried to describe it because I don’t really know of a better way to do it yet I could critique the way others have described it. [Spacing and formatting intended to match participant’s.]

Both Boris and Ksenia commented on how they felt they owed the writing process to the accuracy of their details. Theirs also were the two that stayed nearly the exact same through-out, only more developed by more specified words — “бу́йная пчелка” or fluency as with Ksenia’s. Even though Ksenia stated that she “didn’t feel anything knew came” from the multiple reflections, her Russlish description illustrates the most developed syntactical cohesion of all three versions. There is still evidence of judgements on their details as if they were concerned that they may have been incorrect. For example, Viktor states, “I feel like my description did a good job of describing the object,” as did Egor, “I feel like my description represents the object as best as I can see it.” This was a new style for the participants and may have made them as self-aware as the Russian prompt, but they were most likely more comfortable with the focus group process and tired after having been in the Session for over an hour.

Most of the students remarked that they appreciated the freedom of being able to incorporate both languages, which is illustrated in their incorporation of specific words. Yet in the instance of Maxim, he felt constrained by the criteria of using both languages and reflects: “My description represents the object not as well as the previous two.” Although he states his initial discomfort, he also reflected that “specific words helped me this time because I could switch languages.” It appears then that the participants appreciated being able to access both languages to articulate their understanding of the object. When they were not familiar with a word in one linguistic repertoire, they incorporated it from the other. In being able to do so, they were all able to articulate, as they all state to some degree, what Viktor claimed, “how [they] thought of it in [their] head.” Thus, translanguaging may allow for students to articulate their
contextual impression of the stimuli they are observing, *but* if students haven’t been familiarized with the act or been made aware of this occurrence, it can create a discomfort. This was illustrated when the students, after reading the Russlish prompt, asked for further clarification. Ksenia depicted their reaction to the unorthodox practice by commenting, “That’s what we’ve been told not to do.” The perception of what’s “allowed” appears to have been instructed to the students and grounds their comfort level and usage of the language. We see these analyzes depicted in the Table 8 thematic analysis.

Because in the research design, I elicited written responses in the three languages, the unremovable element of the focus group setting is that it requires the students to translanguage. It seems that in asking the students to produce authentic translanguaging, perhaps I placed additional pressure on the students, altering the potential for authenticity. From my own experiences and those relayed by Elena, it appears that translanguaging is in response to a need. When it becomes a requirement, it takes away the very component needed for it to occur naturalistically. If I am asked to use both languages to describe an object, I can feel the pressure in needing to think of which word to use? This contrasts from the inherent feeling of wanting to denote something with a specific word to be as precise as possible. Therefore, the post-language reflections suggest the struggle of being instructed to think in both languages.

Table 8
*Session 1 Russlish Language Reflection Thematic Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freedom in using both languages</th>
<th>Lena</th>
<th>Maxim</th>
<th>Ksenia</th>
<th>Eg or</th>
<th>Viktor</th>
<th>Boris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel like the last description best represents the object, because I</td>
<td>It was harder for me to decide how I wanted to describe it because I felt more</td>
<td>I don’t feel as anything new came from me using two diff. languages besides knowing some of the names for things</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>…when I could use the Russian words again this time I used them, that was an addition to the description.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was able to use words from both languages to describe what I saw. freedom… I chose to describe it this way because it was easier than sticking to one language. (horns) and better words of descriptions…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accuracy due to writing process</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Otherwise If I noticed something new it was because I have now looked at the image several more times</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>I think I did better because It was like the 3rd draft of writing this.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy due to access of complete linguistic repertoire</td>
<td>I see is symmetric al… If the picture is looked at with squinted eyes,… looks like a Monarch butterfly</td>
<td>… that looked like the pupils of the eyes. As if this was a feline with spots on its face. Specific words helped me this time because I could switch languages</td>
<td>I see a type of “frame” around this drawing, a frame around the image due to the noticible sides being cut off at the bottom</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Upside down, the black lines looked like a heart.</td>
<td>Start with a scribble which my cousin would call drunk/rowdy bee. Then add an isosales triangle on top of it however only one corner of the triangle is over the scribble.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
SESSION 1 CUMULATIVE REFLECTION AND SESSION 2 FINAL REFLECTION
DATA ANALYSIS

Chapter 5 is an analysis of the Session 1 cumulative reflections and Session 2 final reflections. These analyses are drawn from an iterative review, whereby the data was examined repeatedly as a part of the research process. Srivastava & Hopewood (2009) cite Berkowitz’s (1997) depiction of qualitative research in stating that qualitative research is:

A loop-like pattern of multiple rounds of revisiting the data as additional questions emerge, new connections are unearthed, and more complex formulations develop along with a deepening understanding of the material. Qualitative analysis is fundamentally an iterative set of processes. (emphasis added). (77)

They then add that, “The role of iteration, not as a repetitive mechanical task but as a deeply reflexive process, is key to sparking insight and developing meaning” (Srivastava & Hopewood, 2009, p. 77). In order to recognize the implications and resulting conclusions from the data, it was necessary to continue to look at the data and realize what it meant at that time. I referenced the language details individually and then among themselves—this initial review is presented in Chapter 4. Chapter 4 analyses were then reviewed amongst the Session 1 cumulative reflections before being further examined against the Session 2 reflections. The analyses presented in Chapter 5 tentatively support the conclusions of Chapter 6. Thus, the present study has been an examination of the phenomenon of translanguaging through an ethnographic perspective and was conducted through the grounded method theory as it identifies themes and patterns that appeared during each stage of data analysis. The analyses then themes and patterns meant at that time in order to recognize the purpose(s) of the fluxes of these dynamic systems.
The conclusions of Chapter 5 are drawn from the focus group participants’ Session 1 cumulative reflections and Session 2 final reflections as understood by my experiences as a participant-observer. In presenting the conclusions through the students’ cumulative and final conclusions as well as my experiences, I hope that the reality of how multilinguals process information will surface. The participant responses serve as authentic yet elicited reflections of translanguaging practices, while the insight I bring to the discussion situates it in the TESOL classroom. It is for our students that we advocate, and it is through them that we will succeed in becoming the most effective and skilled teachers that we can be.

**Data Collection: Session 1 Cumulative Reflections**

After the students had completed all three language details (Russian, English, and Russlish) and the post-language reflections following each detail, we ended the session with a final reflection of Session 1. These are provided below unedited. I identified multiple themes from the reflections, which are discussed in brief following the reflections and are then illustrated in Table 5.

**Session 1 Cumulative Reflection Prompt:**

Please answer the following questions in English as thoroughly and detailed as possible. Feel free to write informally, but clarify any statements or claims made.

How did you feel using each language? Did your thought process seem to change? Did you see the imagine in a different way? Was any description seemingly more accurate in a specific language? How and why do you think this? How did the version compare?

**Participant Responses:**

**Lena**

1. I feel like w/ each language my description was a little different. Even though I stayed on the same track, I still managed to change my description as I went.
2. I think my thought process did change, because, as I thought in different languages, it caused me to see the same image mildly different each time.
3. As I mentioned above, I think it did. When I was writing strictly in Russian/ strictly in English, I saw the image almost the same, but when I wrote in Russlish, I saw the image even more different than before.
4. I think the description was more accurate because I was able to use both languages and mixing the two made it easier to express myself.

5. I think the reason for this is that because I use both languages, I have a broader vocabulary & sometimes I think differently between the two languages & I identify things differently.

6. The versions compared because I used basically the same theme throughout.

**Maxim**

I felt like it was harder to write in russian. I think my thought proces was opened when we switched to English. I saw the image differently the 3rd time. I think it was more accurate in English. I think the third time I couldn’t decide which language to use and that slowed down my thought process. I think my English description was the best. The russian/English was second best.

**Ksenia**

I liked using Russian only because I have not needed to use it in so long; but also I’ve always struggled with confusing certain Russian letters, like the “д”s” and the “б”s” (д, б, 6). I’ve struggled w/ this since I was first learning how to write and since I stopped practicing I never got in the habit of using the right letter. My thought process was way more broad in English due to me having a larger vocabulary. I noticed as I was writing in Russian I was focusing on spelling & grammar and on getting my thoughts out in the best way since my vocabulary is so much smaller. I saw the images in the same way. Descriptions were definitely more accurate in English since I practice it more.

**Egor**

I felt better using the English language because I know more vocab some im able to explain it better. I believe that when we had to write in Russian my thought process changed and I would try to see what that image would mean to me, or what does the image remind me of. I believe my description in English was more accurate because I was able to describe it better because I know more in English than I do Russian. All the version were not too different from eachother because when I see it one way I can’t forget what I see.

**Viktor**

I felt more comftorable writing in english because I do so way more often than russian and so I am alot better at it. My thought process changed because I know more english words that can be used to describe something than russian. I saw the image the same way. My english description was more accurate because I have a broader english vocabulary. Overall, I think my english description was alot better because of my better spelling and easier time writing.

**Boris**

I guess I let you down, I kinda answerd these questions before. I felt a little rusty in Russian. No my thought process seemed to stay the same. I think I saw everything I needed to the 1st time I saw it. I don’t think any one of the descriptions is more accurate, like I just got tired of writing the same thing over and over again. So I described it in slightly differing details each time. Maybe version 2 [English] is the most accurate? maybe not but 2 [English] and 3 [Russlish] are defenatly more accurate like I guess I didn’t formulate the description of the object all the way by the 1st [Russian] writing. Like I think the descriptions would be closer if I use a different order of languages.
Session 1 Cumulative Reflection Data Analysis

The students were tired by this point, having written six pieces already and having just finished the pizza that was ordered for their participation. Though this was an underlying condition of the participation, they all thoroughly answered the prompt. I had been very direct in relaying that the responses needed to be as thoroughly answered as possible and included multiple questions within the prompt to encourage this, but I believe this also reveals the students’ tendencies to follow instruction. All of the students were volunteers that participated in part due to the relationship we had developed in class and in part because participation entailed free pizza, yet their participation was beyond what could have been expected. These students appear to follow instructions well and perhaps even find solace in following instructions as it becomes a mark of completion. What this thoroughness provided, though, was a wide variation of feelings in regard to the procedure.

Lena, Maxim, Egor, and Viktor indicate how greatly their thought process changed due to the use of the different languages. For Lena, Maxim, and Egor, they comment specifically on how they saw the image differently each time, but they all maintained somewhat consistent in their depiction. Lena points out that she saw the images “mildly different” and that when the images were examined in the isolated languages, English and Russian, the details were almost the exact same—perhaps indicative of the brain translating from the explicit Russian repertoire to the English repertoire. Maxim hypothesizes that because of the constraint from his Russian literacy, he felt the details varied—again indicative of isolated, explicit repertoires. Moreover, since he feels more practiced and consequently more confident in his English, he perceives this detail to be the best. Egor’s sentiment is rather similar to Maxim’s, denoting the extra energy needed to articulate what the object was in what he suggests, limited Russian vocabulary. What
is even more interesting to note, is that he concludes his reflection with, “All the version were not too different from each other because when I see it one way I can’t forget what I see.” Hence, we can see that the object itself has not changed visually for the participant—an observation, again, made to some degree from all—it is just the feeling of being able to articulate what is seen that is changing Egor’s and others’ details. Therefore, the ability to articulate is implicitly changing the participant’s thoughts. This is nearly exactly restated in Viktor’s reflection, “My thought process changed because I know more English words that can be used to describe something than Russian. I saw the image the same way.” One of the primary elements that brought confidence to the students was their familiarity and knowledge of English.

The feeling of assuredness through Hyme’s “attestedness” (Cook, 2010, p. 42.), or knowledge of the appropriate use of a language, is a key take-away for Ksenia too: “I saw the images in the same way. Descriptions were definitely more accurate in English since I practice it more.” Ksenia identifies English to be her best reflection, but in her Russlish detail we see fluent, cohesive sentences that from a compositional perspective, would suggest being the best detail. Though, her perception differs, she relays the enjoyment she had in writing in Russian. It is known that student interest is crucial for student success (Kahu, Nelson, & Picton, 2017). For Ksenia, a student who aims to provide perfect work, the value of her work may be assessed by the level of correctness it has. This observation is supported by her statement, “I noticed as I was writing in Russian I was focusing on spelling & grammar and on getting my thoughts out in the best way since my vocabulary is so much smaller.” Again, the correlation between confidence and correctness is established—she did not feel as free as she was limited by her familiarity with Russian literacy. Translanguaging, would in fact, contain students to a bifurcated bilingualism, as they are not encouraged to practice the isolated English constructions. Though the practice aims
to help students become more familiar with their understanding of their environments, it would not help them practice the linguistic structure needed to articulate their understanding of their environments. Students practicing translanguaging, loose the opportunity to interact with the language in the dynamic situations that this structure can be used in. Therefore, students are left with the same sentiment denoted by these five participants—limited in their freedom to write and communicate in English, the language they will need for their professional endeavors.

The notion that “practice makes perfect” (or as stated by my driving instructor from 2004, “practice makes permanent”) is due to the practitioner engaging with whatever practice they are trying to “perfect” in as many different situations as possible. Whether they are in a good mood, bad mood, the weather is sunny or rainy, they are hungry, tired, got a bad grade… It is the acquisition of the practice overtime that develops the “mappings between a form and its meaning” (O’Grady, Lee, & Kwak, 2005, p. 3). The established mapping is more accessible and familiar to the input processor, hence will be more readily retrieved than other less familiar practices. Boris’s reflection identifies this very process:

I felt a little rusty in Russian. No my thought process seemed to stay the same. I think I saw everything I needed to the 1st time I saw it. I don’t think any one of the descriptions is more accurate, like I just got tired of writing the same thing over and over again. So I described it in slightly differing details each time. Maybe version 2 [English] is the most accurate? maybe not but 2 [English] and 3 [Russlish] are defenatly more accurate like I guess I didn’t formulate the description of the object all the way by the 1st [Russian] writing. Being “rusty” is from a lack of using Russian. The input processor, in trying to articulate what it was seeing, could not conjure the associated Russian structures to relay. Over time and through the other more readily available languages, Boris felt more accurate in his description.
Data Collection: Session 2 Final Reflection Data

Session 2 began with a quick review of the reflections and the translations I had written. I then asked the participants how long they had been in the United States and where they had studied Russian for further information for the present study. Following this recap of Session 1 and a quick lunch break, the session was conducted like a standard ESL lesson, where students after having been given the same drawing from Session 1, were asked to repeat after me, “collamber,” or the name of the abstract object. We repeated the word multiple times before they were provided the standard academic English (SAE) description orally, “a rare collection of geometrical shapes and dimensions, this collamber is used to signify the disparity of time.”

Students were given a handout with the definition on it for reference, while I then further explained that, “any collamber is a geometrical shape and dimension” and “will always be three-dimensional.” I then asked what was meant by ‘disparity’. Maxim replied that he thought it was related to “dispare” I replied, “Okay.” I then asked, “How do we feel about time itself?” to which I replied, “it’s moving…?” and Maxim stated, “it’s running away from us.” We concluded then that the collamber represents the sentiment of time moving away from us and can have a negative feeling if we perceive this idea as a sad or upsetting thing. This lesson provided the students with the knowledge they needed to perceive the object in its SAE definition. Following this the students were given the final reflection prompt.

Session 2 Final Reflection Prompt:

How do you consider yourself to receive new ideas? Are you openminded?

How do you feel the Standard Academic English description compare to how you had described it? Which description do you think you will be more opt to think of the object in? Why? Does this differ depending on who you would speak to about this? (Re: if you were to speak to your mother about the object, a professor, a friend?).
Participant Responses:

**Lena**

I feel like when it comes to accepting new ideas I am judgmental. I like to make sure the idea is valid so that I can accept it.

1. I feel like my description of the object is very different from the description in English. There was a lot more meaning behind it than I had anticipated.

2. I think all of my descriptions are off, but the closest description to the definition is probably the one in Russian. I feel like the description that I used is closest to the actual definition.

3. If I had spoken about this to someone else I might have changed my mind, especially if the person I spoke to is close to me. I highly value the opinion of my closest friends and family.

**Maxim**

I think I am accepting of new ideas and openminded.

I think the standard description of object is very different from what I thought about. I think that I will mostly think of it in the way I described it (especially the first russian description). Because thats how I thought about it for the first time so thats what stuck with me. It would most likely differ. If I were talking to a professor or educated person I would talk about its standard description but if I were speaking to my mother or friend I would talk about in the same way I wrote.

**Ksenia**

Very openminded.

I said nothing about time or anything that had to do with timelapses, so maybe that means I was way off. I’m more opt to think of this description in standard English definition due to that I think it’s most appropriate and I am most comfortable using this language. I would say this minorly differs depending on whom i’m speaking with: if it’s my prof. then it’s standard English, if it’s my mom or friend then just normal English, if it’s my dad or grandma then it’s Russian. (actually w/ both of my parents it might be Ru-english.)

**Egor**

I believe I receive new ideas nicely as long as I understand the idea. I like to be openminded but when I don’t understand something I most of the time try not to think more about it.

I believe the Standard Academic English had a more descriptive description while I had a more visual description. I think I will be more opt to think of the object in English because it has a better description and I’m able to visualize it more sometimes. This does differ depending on who I would speak to because I would try to explain it best as they would understand. If they don’t know too much English I would explain it in the most simpliest way.

**Viktor**

Yes, I am openminded and I am good at recieving new ideas.

I feel like the SAE description is very generic, or broad. It just sounds like something that you may think of when looking at the image vs what it actually is. I would use my Rusenglish description to think of the object instead of the other descriptions. The only time I would use the SAE description is when talking to a professor. I would use the
Russian description when talking to a native Russian speaker. I would use the Rusenglish description when talking to someone who can speak both languages fluently.

**Boris**

I am pretty open, I can listen to them but I’ll have to think about them on my own before forming a solid opinion (more at letter a) however if a new idea comes along I’ll try to understand where the Idea came from.

The definition matches up except the part about time the object is a collection of shapes/dimensions so it fits the definition. The english standard definition is not really specific to the object. It’s a broader definition. My definitions are better for picking out this particular “collamber” from other shapes that could be presented. I would use a different definition depending on what I was trying to say about the object and who I was talking to. When I look at the object I would not naturally get philosophical however if I was asked about it by a professor I’d start thinking about it in terms of the english standard definition.

*Session 2 Final Reflection Data Analysis*

The opening question of this prompt, “How do you consider yourself to receive new ideas? Are you openminded?” intended to make explicit whether the practice of translanguaging would be welcomed by the student or not. If the student was an individual who was fairly closeminded, I believe the practice of translanguaging would be a difficult task to practice as it is not a standard method for composition. Moreover, the students were aware that I was looking for something but unsure as to what exactly. This may have impeded their ability to authentically translanguage as they perhaps attempted to give results that they understood to be “correct.” The foundry understanding of correctness in language learning has most commonly been how fluent, or similar to the standard version, the articulated version is. This perception is evidenced in Lena’s and Ksenia’s reflections as organized in Table 9 as they compare their language details with the SAE definition of a collamber. Maxim, Egor, and Viktor felt the SAE description was not as accurate as theirs, while Boris felt his were similar to the SAE definition, but still that the SAE definition was “not really specific to the object”.

Without a doubt, learner’s foundational interactions with material and practices will mold what they believe to be correct and/or incorrect (Celce-Murcia, 2001). When I have been informed on how to construct a message intending to indicate “I like” in another language, that initial instruction becomes the basis for my understanding of “like” in that language. I am a person who is open to receiving new ideas but will most definitely analyze it against what I already know to be true. Hence, had the students relayed that they were not open to receiving new ideas, then it may have explained how they approached the Russlish prompt.

Lena, Egor, and Boris state that they are openminded, but are weary of new information until they have had time to consider it. Maxim, Ksenia, and Viktor either did not provide this information, or are individuals who accept new ideas willingly. These character-reflections may reveal why the Russlish responses from Lena, Viktor, and Boris tended to include one language as a basis, with only specific words from the other language included within the syntax. Alternatively, Maxim’s, Ksenia’s, and Egor’s Russlish details illustrate the two languages being more interwoven. Though this appears consistent in the present study, the data collected is too small of a sample to definitively conclude such a relationship.

<p>| Session 1 Cumulative Reflection &amp; Session 2 Final Reflection Thematic Data Analysis |
|----------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| <strong>Self-assessed Open-mindedness</strong>      | Lena      | Maxim     | Ksenia    | Egor      | Viktor    | Boris     |
|                                        | I feel like when it comes to accepting new ideas I am judgmental. I like to make sure the idea is valid so that I can accept it. | I think I am accepting new ideas and openminded. | Very openminded. | I believe I receive new ideas nicely as long as I understand the idea. I like to be openminded but when I don’t understand | Yes, I am openminded and I am good at receiving new ideas. | I am pretty open, I can listen to them but I’ll have to think about them on my own before forming a solid opinion (more at letter a) → a) continued… |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian Language Detail</th>
<th>Perceived Best</th>
<th>something I most of the time try not to think more about it.</th>
<th>new idea comes along I’ll try to understand where the Idea came from.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I feel like my description of the object is very different from the description in English. There was a lot more meaning behind it than I had anticipated.  
I think all of my descriptions are off, but the closest description to the definition is probably the one in Russian. I feel like the description that I used is closest to the actual definition. | I will mostly think of it in the way I described it (especially the first Russian description). Because that's how I thought about it for the first time so that's what stuck with me. | N/A | N/A |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Language Detail</th>
<th>Perceived Best</th>
<th>I'm more opt to think of this description in standard English definition due to that I think it’s most appropriate and I am most comfortable using this language.</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think I will be more opt to think of the object in English because it has a better description and I’m able to visualize it more sometimes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All of the students noted that they felt the standard American English definition was different from theirs, except for Boris, who conceded that only the time aspect of the SAE definition was different. Boris, Viktor, and Egor believed that the SAE description was broader and not reflective of the object, rather a statement about it. The feeling of detachment from the SAE description versus the participants’ is felt by all as they respond that their definitions were different than what it had been defined as. Additionally, all of the students provided a different reason for their choice in the definition of the object to use in the future. Lena based her choice on which one was the most similar to the SAE definition. Maxim chose the Russian detail “because thats how [he] thought about it for the first time so thats what stuck with [him]”. Ksenia and Egor state they would both use their English details as they both found these details apparently more fitting: “I think it’s most appropriate” (Ksenia, 2018); “I think I will be more opt to think of the object in English because it has a better description” (Egor, 2018), Ksenia stated that she is more comfortable using the English definition and Egor relayed that he was better able to “visualize” it sometimes.

Viktor liked his Russlish definition the most, which may be because he thought it defined and/or articulated it the best as he states that he felt that the SAE description was “like something that you may think of when looking at the image vs what it actually is.” This perception of the object’s definition suits his apparent tendency to follow the rules and appreciation for precision.
This is also reflected in his Session 1 cumulative reflection where he states that he felt his English detail was “more accurate because [he] had a broader english vocabulary. Overall, [he] think[s] [his] english description was alot better because of [his] better spelling and easier time writing.” This is somewhat similar to Boris’s reflection as he also felt that his details were more reflective of the object than the standard academic English definition.

The initial connection and association to an object is developed by the language used around it. In Darija, “l’seHun,” is the word for heat. I will now forever think of heat—that dry, all engulfing, suffocating heat—as “l’seHun,” as American English doesn’t quite have this connotation. Rather we say, “It’s so hot today!” It’s not that one necessarily relays the message more accurately, but that one becomes the term associated with that context. This acquired association can be recreated in the classroom by dynamic exposure to the target structure in context. The teacher can model these associations which may foster a more naturalistic setting for TL learning.

Table 10
Session 2 Final Reflection Thematic Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived distance/ dissatisfaction with SAE description</th>
<th>Lena</th>
<th>Maxim</th>
<th>Ksenia</th>
<th>Egor</th>
<th>Viktor</th>
<th>Boris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel like my description of the object is very different from the description in English. There was a lot more meaning behind it than I had anticipated.</td>
<td>I think the standard description of object is very different from what I thought about.</td>
<td>I said nothing about time or anything that had to do with timelapses, so maybe that means I was way off.</td>
<td>I believe the Standard Academic English had a more descriptive description while I had a more visual description.</td>
<td>I feel like the SAE description is very generic, or broad. It just sounds like something that you may think of when looking at the image vs what it actually is.</td>
<td>The english standard definition is not really specific to the object. It’s a broader definition. My definitions are better for picking out this particular “collamber” from other shapes that could be presented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>If I had spoken about this to someone else I might have changed my mind, especially if the person I spoke to is close to me. I highly value the opinion of my closest friends and family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I were talking to a professor or educated person I would talk about in its standard description but if I were speaking to my mother or friend I would talk about in the same way I wrote.</td>
<td>… this minorly differs depending on whom I’m speaking with: if it’s my prof. then it’s standard English, if it’s my mom or friend then just normal English, if it’s my dad or grandma then it’s Russian. (actually w/ both of my parents it might be Rus-English.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This does differ depending on who I would speak to because I would try to explain it best as they would understand. If they don’t know too much English I would explain it in the most simpliest way.</td>
<td>The only time I would use the SAE description is when talking to a professor. I would use the Russian description when talking to a native Russian speaker. I would use the Rusenglish description when talking to someone who can speak both languages fluently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would use a different definition depending on what I was trying to say about the object and who I was talking to. When I look at the object I would not naturally get philosophical however if I was asked about it by a professor I’d start thinking about it in terms of the english standard definition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Concluding Analyses

Translanguaging’s purpose in fostering student’s understanding of new information seems to be helpful; the students are able to orient themselves in relation to the object. But due to this personal locating, they are also distancing themselves from the SAE definition, making it seem more foreign than perhaps it would be if the students were first introduced to the object in the SAE definition. By first introducing the SAE definition, teachers are helping ground that association, confirming a unified understanding of the lesson objective – the one that will aid in the students’ ability to obtain professional careers and navigate the American composition classroom. This insight is gained by the participant responses and was explored in Chapter 1 as I relayed my experience with translanguaging in my standard Arabic, FusHa classes. My
understanding of certain Arabic words will not include the nuances known to native Arabic
speakers, but will include a translated understanding. Current literature equates a standardized
form of language as linguistic imperialism and unrealistic of the multilingual world:

[Phillipson’s] research and that of colleagues Skutnabb-Kangas, Kachru, Pattanayak, 
Fishman and others, […] builds the case that the export of English to formerly colonized
countries has not paved the way to modernity and prosperity, as was foreseen by at least
some planners in the post World War II era. In many cases, the study of English has
impeded literacy in mother tongue languages, has thwarted social and economic progress
for those who do not learn it, and has not generally been relevant to the needs of ordinary
people in their day-to-day or future lives. Far from being a neutral medium allowing for
international communication and access to the technology of developed countries,
English has served the political, cultural, and economic interests of the principal colonial
powers, Great Britain and the U.S., at the expense of local and national development in

Yet the students of this study indicate the reality of needing to know certain dialects to use with
specific groups of people. Fostered by the prompt’s question, “Does this differ depending on
who you would speak to about this? (Re: if you were to speak to your mother about the object, a
professor, a friend?),” the students commented on how their choice of definition-in-use is
dependent on their audience—an ontological reality for communication. It would seem then that
English language learners, in order to be afforded with the same opportunities as those deemed
“fluent” speakers of the language of the institute, would need to be familiarized and practiced in
SAE. The stigmas attached to language variations and dialects—an aspect of audience—is an
element of contemporary culture that is evidenced globally. This will be further discussed
through my own experience of language biases explained in Chapter 6. Though practices such as translanguaging attempt to underscore these perceptions, they do so at the cost of the learner’s potential to communicate in a wide variety of settings. Therein, translanguaging in all its efforts, limits the extent to which ELLs can relay their thoughts in different settings.

Current efforts in TESOL and composition are intended to provide the learner with the space they need to learn and to let them develop their own thoughts in relation to the material. These efforts are beneficial in minimizing the constraints students feel, but could leave them without a sense of direction, without a sense of accomplishment, therefore denying them the confidence they need to strive and succeed in their futures. Direct facilitation provides the students with what they need to know, while practice can promote confidence and familiarity. Translanguaging, which provides a sense of freedom that may feel like an equitable practice, in fact subjects students to an unrealistic perception of the world. A more profitable approach for the students would be a reexamination of assessment. Whereby, given the knowledge they need for the world, which we as teachers should be familiar with, and the space to practice and explore, perhaps students could be evaluated by means of genuine participation and effort, not standardized benchmarks.

**Limits of the Study**

**Students’ Preconceived Notions of Language**

One unremovable limit of the study was the students’ preconceived notion that languages are meant to be kept separate. On relaying the instructions for the Russlish prompt, Ksenia replied, “That’s what we’re not supposed to do.” This is further identified in the students’ post-language reflections where they state, “I did not know which language to use.” We cannot attest as to whether the participants would have felt otherwise had they been taught these languages
simultaneously or in an environment that had allowed for translanguageing. Moreover, we cannot account for how the details would have developed had they been instructed on how to translanguage, though this also would have defeated the purpose of the study. It is to be understood though, that the students’ perception of language is reflective of the main-stream world, where people learn the language(s) of their local community. That language has grammar, vocabulary, and syntax that is reflective of the culture of that community—it has a set of conditions that make it explicit from other languages.

We see that Lena would change her definition depending on the response of those close to her, therefore suggesting that approval of correctness is a determinant for her thought and therein, communication choice. Maxim acknowledges the pressure of needing to communicate in a more academic or professional manner with his professors and would use the SAE definition in these instances, but during his day-to-day interactions, would choose his details. Yet another participant, Ksenia expresses how the role of family (which is mentioned by Lena and Maxim) would figure in her choice of articulation about the object. Both Egor and Viktor consider the audience’s fluency levels, which was not commented on in the others’, though perhaps implicit in the claim that family reserves a specific definition, is the family’s level of language fluency.

Boris addresses the fact that the philosophical aspect of the definition, most likely the association with time, is why he would discuss the collar in terms of the SAE definition with his professor. His response is not indicative of the formal academic language that students are to some degree expected to engage in in-class, but that only in that space would he explore the deeper rhetoric of the object. The same thought is present in Lena’s reflection as she notes that in addition to the SAE description being different than hers, “There was a lot more meaning behind [the object] than I had anticipated.” These sentiments remind us that the classroom is meant to be
the place to explore deeper analyses of everyday phenomena. Perhaps the attribute of SAE within the institution should not reflect a pretentious communication style, but rather one that evokes the most contemplation. Instead of perceiving SAE as an outdated formal style that is unattainable to some, we should see it as the variable out of which critical, existential thought arises. This is not to suggest that SAE is the only means in obtaining these concepts, rather that it offers unified access to these concepts in the American tertiary, multilingual, composition classroom.

**Students’ Personal Language Learning History**

Upon concluding Session 2, I relayed the purpose of the focus group by telling the students that I was examining the practice of translanguaging, “which is a TESOL practice that allows for home languages to be used in the English language classroom.” Moreover, I stated that I had hypothesized that though I believe it fosters knowledge acquisition and understanding, I don’t believe it helps ELLs acquire the English language. In response to this, Boris replied, “I have to agree with you.” I asked him to provide more information as to why and he stated:

I had a friend who… like when we came over, we didn’t have anyone who would translate for us, so it was hecka hard, hecka hard, hecka hard, then we thought the language was easy, at least until seventh grade and then we had to do composition and stuff so then it was hard. But then we had a friend came over later. She was in seventh or eighth grade when she came over, and she had a Russian friend group in-class and she would only talk Russian in class and the teacher would say something, she would get it translated for her. And it took her like three- four years to learn the language. It was only after she had left school and her friend group that she finally started to learn the language.

Within the story, he also relayed that during the “hecka hard” time for him, he learned the language in about 3-4 months.

The research is available for us to gather what practices are more effective than others and as we are becoming more interconnected, we begin to see the outcomes of all of these practices. While immersion classrooms are extremely effective in language acquisition, we have
seen set-backs by students who begin to associate their home language or other language in a negative way. Yet perhaps the alternative is not to change the standard for the classroom, but rather the ways that we achieve and assess them. What if we are able to both ensure the student acquires the highest level of fluency, thereby preparing the students for their future, and support their home language and culture? Though I am not able to fully answer this question within this thesis, it will be addressed in Chapter 6.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

As the conclusion, the thesis wishes to reexamine the claims brought up in Chapter 1 as a way to ensure that the research has thoroughly reviewed the initial area of interest. To complete this thoroughness, we can begin with revisiting the research questions.

Research Questions

1. What is translanguaging?

2. Where does translanguaging most effectively work in the tertiary, multilingual composition classroom?

3. Where does the TESOL instructor fit in this?

When I wrote the research questions, they seemed to be entities that could be answered in isolated responses, but after the last 12 months of researching, I realized that they are not able to be answered as such. Instead I believe the replies to these questions have been addressed dynamically within the previous Chapters. We begin to understand translanguaging in Chapter 1, which is made clearer in Chapters 3-5, while the reasoning for translanguaging is made clear in Chapter 2. The answer to question two is drawn from the data analyses in Chapters 4 and 5, and to some extent, Chapter 6. The TESOL instructor’s role in this conversation is most adamantly addressed in Chapter 6 but is alluded to in Chapters 2 and 4-5. As the present study comes to conclusions regarding these questions, it is clear that these answers manifest in various contexts, making a direct answer inaccurate. What can be directly stated is that translanguaging, the communicative act that incorporates all available linguistic structures in response to the context for current purposes, does not help students acquire Standard Academic English (SAE) in the college classroom.
**Conclusions:**

At each moment of a language learner’s (LL) acquisition, the LL’s vocabulary established a specific “function” (Gelfand and Engelhart 2012), which changes overtime due to the addition of vocabulary, experiences, personal growth, etc. (numerous factors). “The same variables serve, in a sense, as both dependent and independent variables. Another way of saying this is that dynamical systems are, by definition, feedback models” (Gelfand and Engelhart, 2012, para. 4). Therefore, it is understood that the content provided for the LL is dependent on the learner’s future process: what they will be privy to now, will project their future fluency level. For an English language learner within the United States, they are bombarded by the English language within their daily lives, but without instruction, may be passive observers to what these foreign linguistic representations mean. Education gives direction as students are able to evaluate their experiences under guided facilitation—under the direction of someone who is responsible for their academic success.

For students embarking on the acquisition of English as they learn vocabulary, grammatical rules, and cultural nuances within the English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom, they are also shaping their identities, their *English* identities. The essence of this outcome represents a dynamic and complex system as these variables, from the student, teacher and the language, change over time and are “linked through time to other variables,” thus constituting the very “setting of the modern theory of dynamic systems” (Luenberger, 1979, p. 3). We saw this in Ksenia’s approach to sentence formation, Lena’s preferred use of Russian, Maxim’s Russian syntax, Egor’s and Viktor’s lowered sense of Russian literacy, and Boris’s approach to maintain a similar detail throughout, as these were elements that have stayed stagnant and have not been encouraged to grow.
A person born in a non-English speaking country grows to realize themselves in the context of their environment and is well influenced by the language used around them, but perhaps this isn’t their actual identity. As they begin incorporating English language structures within their lives, their linguistic competence grows, while their personal perception of self and identity begins to be questioned. This final application of the TESOL discipline, the realization of the learner’s English self, would perhaps not have become an objective had we not undergone our transformative past as a discipline. We begin to realize Mazlow’s Hierarchy of Needs, which depicts a foundation that meets basic humans needs for us to reach our full potentials. If we provide a comprehensive enough environment, whereby we serve the student’s economic needs by helping them become as fluent in English as possible, while also helping them realize the truest version of themselves—one they have identified in multiple contexts and languages, we have succeeded as TESOL instructors.

**Assumptions Revisited:**

1. **Translanguaging asks ELL to engage in English academic materials across disciplines through the lens of their L1.**

2. **Translanguaging deconstructs the understanding that English language varieties are “mistakes”** (Delpit, 1995, p. 170).

The structure of the focus group entailed that the students would be examining the material through their first language, Russian. This is reflective of how students engage with material in classes who practice translanguaging, whereby the ELLs are given a definition, picture, prompt, etc. and are asked to relay what they think about it in all available languages to them. This approach then implicitly asks for the students to examine it in their L1 and becomes the way the students will reflect on the prompt as was relayed by multiple participants. Hence, the purpose of
translanguaging—deconstructing the inherent prestige that SAE holds as the dialect of the American University—is not made explicit in the present study and was lost. Students contrasted their details with the SAE version and ultimately felt they did not match, nor that the SAE definition was as reflective of the object. Yet the participants acknowledge that this definition would be the one to use within the institute.

3. Language identities are developed during acquisition.

4. SAE fluency is achievable to some degree for every learner.

The power that comes from constructing your own understanding of an object, as the participants did in the focus group, is reflected in their appreciation of their own details versus the SAE detail. As none chose the SAE detail as the one to use with those close to them, rather only with professors, we begin to see how identity is tied with the language used. All of the participants reflected that they wrote the detail as they did because “it was how [they] saw it,” yet it was also from how they were able to articulate it. Some were not able to provide a full Russian detail due to a lack of familiarity with some terms. Thus, it appears that their complete language identity is dependent on the initial language state they are exposed to. Ksenia’s initial language state may be her third-grade literacy, complete with simple sentence structure, as she left Belarus at that time and was immersed in English. What is depicted in her Russian detail may be this initial language acquisition, therefore her Russian language identity. Moreover, it would be understood then, that none of the students feel themselves a part of the institute, which is an upsetting conclusion if accurate.

All of the participants expressed how much more familiar they were with English and establish that SAE is achievable for every learner. Moreover, most of their language identities appear to be dominated by their English acquisition as they articulate their thoughts most fully in
English. Lena and Ksenia would be the objection to this as Lena seemed more astute in her Russian identity and Ksenia seemed evenly acquired in both Russian and English. The result of this separation may be that Lena is more comfortable with her Russian identity and community that was developed here in the States, as opposed to Ksenia, who developed her Russian identity in Belarus before moving to the States and joining the larger Spokane community. Maxim, who came to the States nearly ten years ago, seems to have two separate identities—one that is representative of his Russian literacy and somewhat more formal and his more creative and playful English identity. This compares to Boris, who also arrived in the States nearly 10 years ago and appears to maintain the same identity with each language used. Egor and Viktor represent more of a mixed identity, one that is not fully Russian, nor English. An identity that perhaps was developed at home and then modified at school through their acquisition of English.

5. Acquisition of SAE is worth the effort.

6. Outcome-based curriculums are valuable for meeting the objectives in language acquisition.

With the current influx of intercultural and linguistic exchanges present in American universities, we see a change in curriculum and class objectives. It has come to be questioned whether this English identity and subsequent perspective that is developed under the acquisition of English, such as with Egor and Viktor, is necessary for the students. Is it necessary or perhaps realistic to ask them to conceptualize the world under the SAE perspective that currently dominates the tertiary American composition classroom? Again, as indicated by the focus group participants, the SAE dialect is the language of specific spheres. The participants allocated it to the language to be used with their professors, but American university professors comprise just
one demographic that are expected to speak SAE, while the corporate and political domains also require it.

College is a place that is meant to enlighten either by means of personal awakening or college readiness, or a combination of both. We see that the large Russian population that attends Eastern is primarily attending to earn a degree, while obtaining enlightening material along the way. If the primary goal is to become employed in America following their graduation, then SAE will help them achieve that goal. Particularly in Spokane, Washington where we see a fairly conservative legislation that favors traditional/ modern ideologies and values as is evidenced by the majority of funding to STEM. We see the stigmas attached to illiteracy as explored in efforts for adult literacy programs:

‘Social policy is that part of public policy specifically dedicated to improving some specific aspect of human or societal condition, typically though governmental programs’ (p. 69), it is also a form of social control for ‘regulating subordinate groups’ (p.70). Illiterates are not viewed as innocent victims (literacy soft), but as threats to society, whether through an alleged lack of desired middle-class social and moral values, or as a human resource drain, placing in danger the economic vitality of the United States to compete effectively in the post-industrial global economy. (Quigley, 1997, as cited in Demetrion, 1999, p. 164). Speakers of other English varieties or dialects are often considered part of the ‘literacy soft’ crowd as they are sometimes perceived to reflect the alternative of “desired middle-class social and moral values.” Therefore, it appears that learning the SAE dialect that is currently representative of these “middle-class social and moral values” is worth the effort, if only to disrupt the bias.
In the same way that SAE will help the students land more employment opportunities, so will meeting objectives. In response to the greater influx of intercultural and linguistic interactions at the American university, so too has there been an influx in advocation for alternatives to outcome-based curriculums that aim at providing learners with more equitable practices to achieve objectives. There are multiple reasons why education has reexamined curriculum development, but one of the leading reasons is that “objectives serve to reinforce the values and interests of groups interested in exercising hegemonic-political context” (McKernan, 2008, p. 77). Again, reminiscent of modern-orientation, objectives-based curriculums are thought to “dominate others” (McKernan, 2008, p. 77) due to the modern ideology of static truths. Yet a language has a condition state that could perhaps be considered the simplest grammatical structure of the language. The teaching and meeting of an objective that aims to establish this understanding of the language for the ELL is not dominating them, but in fact helping them towards their goal of achieving a job. Moreover, we see from the participants’ responses that there is an assuredness from articulating thoughts in a manner that is perceived as “correct” by the audience. It is a sense of accomplishment that reflects the communicator well.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Today, many people globally are learning English, not out of desire but out of necessity. Thus, the intrinsic motivation for wanting to learn English—to communicate with people from lands and cultures that speak English—is not necessarily there for all ELLs. Since English is the current lingua franca, learner’s motivation is most often extrinsic—they need to learn to survive in the current global economy—completely changing their language learning situation. Although elements of the language learning process are manipulated by such variables, does that also imply that the role of the TESOL instructor must change, or specifically, the material taught?
This thesis suggests that rather than adapting the role of the instructor or the materials, changing the assessment would provide the learners with the most opportunities, particularly if the learners have some control over what they are learning. American universities such as Purdue ask the learners to mark their initial objectives. These learner-defined objectives are then paired with the curriculum and assessment and become a means for intrinsic motivation. There is a need for more research surrounding dynamic assessment and for more research on populations such as international students or newly immigrated students. If the same study was conducted with these demographics, we may see a reverse in the results. That reversal, whereby the L1 detail would be the most thorough, the TL detail would be the least, and the interlingua detail would show more L1 than English, though is a conjecture, would help convey whether the conclusions drawn in present study are accurate.

**Future Implications**

The linguistic issue that translinguaging attempts to solve is how to teach English and reserve students’ home language in the multilingual classroom. This research specifically reviewed translinguaging’s place in the tertiary, composition classroom, which finds itself asking the same question. Representing students’ home languages entails representing their identities and cultures (Palmer, et al, 2013), therefore it is necessary to incorporate and support. The issue that arises is how to support these languages, while providing the target language rich environment needed for students to become as familiar and comfortable with the target language as their L1? Lisa Delpit, author of *Other People’s Children* and *Multiplication if for White People: Raising Expectations for Other People’s Children*, offers a profound perspective on the issue:
In any discussion of education and culture, it is important to remember that children are individuals and cannot be made to fit into any preconceived mold of how they are "supposed" to act. The question is not necessarily how to create the perfect "culturally matched" learning situation for each ethnic group, but rather how to recognize when there is a problem for a particular child and how to seek its cause in the most broadly conceived fashion. Knowledge about culture is, but one tool that educators may make use of when devising solutions for a school's difficulty in educating diverse children. (1995, p. 167).

What Delpit is suggesting is that though our progressive practices aim to support our perceived understanding of the diverse cultures represented in the classroom, they may not be the end-all solution we are looking for. This is further positioned in the text that follows this introduction:

When a significant difference exists between the students' culture and the school's culture, teachers can easily misread students' aptitudes, intent, or abilities as a result of the difference in styles of language use and interactional patterns. Secondly, when such cultural differences exist, teachers may utilize styles of instruction and/or discipline that are at odds with community norms. (1995, p. 167).

Delpit claims that the consequential issues that arise are in part due to the "discourse" (1995, p. 168) used by the different teacher groups: "the black teachers, none of whom are afraid of black kids; the white teachers, a few of whom are not afraid of black kids; and the largest group of white teachers, who are all afraid of black kids" (1995, pp. 167-168). While Delpit states that the discourse used by the black teachers is similar to the direct, explicit instruction of any responsible parent with their child, as compared to the "many middle-class European-American teachers [who] are likely to say something like, 'Would you like to sit down now and finish your paper?'" (1995, p. 168). Delpit attributes the indirectness from the 'middle-class European-
American teachers,’ to the ‘downplaying’ of power, which comes from the progressive conception that the classroom should be a space of shared power between the students and the teacher (Freire, P., Leonard, P., & McLaren, 1993). Yet in providing this type of instruction instructors are inherently disadvantaging their students, allowing them not to be challenged to submit work that meets a standard. And therein is the issue—whose standard should we be teaching? More research needs to be looked into this question.

The United States is currently in an extremely racially-tense moment of our history, as the President is closing our borders, and local educational funding for ESL, special education, and art courses is being cut. Practices such as translanguage are being forcefully advocated for (Canagarajah, 2011; Li, 2018; Pennycook, 2017; Palmer, et al., 2013) as a means to overcome the implied racism and injustices this country is seeing. It is a proposal to the issue of which English language variety is appropriate to teach in the multilingual classroom, but it could be disadvantaging students by essentializing their capabilities, or as stated by Delpit, “hammering them with their weaknesses” (2012, p. xxi). It is NOT that we believe home languages to be “weaknesses,” but that enforcing the learner to maintain a specific language level by suggesting that they continue to process the TL in their L1, makes it a weakness. This sentiment mimics Adrienne Rich’s (1993) quote and title of the thesis, “This is the oppressor’s language, yet I need it to speak with you,” where we understand the language may very well uphold specific values and cultural acknowledgements, but without access to it, we don’t have access to parts of society.

Multilingual culture currently can be promoted through multilinguals demonstration of fluency in both their home language(s) and the implicit language of the nation—academic English. Once multilinguals have fluid access to both of these linguistic repertories, we can see more multilinguals in positions of power, such as we are seeing with Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez.
To promote such access for all students it is recommended that TESOL instructors follow Lisa Delpit’s philosophy:

1. Recognize the importance of a teacher and good teaching, especially for the “school dependent” children of low-income communities.
2. Recognize the brilliance of poor, urban children and teach them more content, not less.
3. Whatever methodology or instructional program is used, demand critical thinking while at the same time assuring that all children gain access to “basic skills” — the conventions and strategies that are essential to success in American society.
4. Provide children with the emotional ego strength to challenge racist societal views of their own competence and worthiness and that of their families and communities.
5. Recognize and build on children’s strengths.
6. Use familiar metaphors and experiences from the children’s world to connect what students already know to school-taught knowledge.
7. Create a sense of family and caring in the classroom.
8. Monitor and assess students’ needs and then address them with a wealth of diverse strategies.
9. Honor and respect the children’s home cultures.
10. Foster a sense of children’s connection to community, to something greater than themselves.


Delpit’s teaching philosophy is similar to Geneva Gay’s culturally responsive teaching. Many of these suggestions are already in practice, but some of the methods of doing so may not be helpful in meeting the overall objective. For example, perhaps ‘good teaching’ as indicated in point one, is more student-dependent than merely the incorporation of a romanticized practice. Meaning, perhaps perceived progressive teaching methodologies are not good teaching for specific students. Yet as indicated in point two, we do not necessarily need to adapt the curriculum as not relaying to students what we have come to understand as essential, particularly with language courses, is underrecognizing the student. We can provide students with the ‘emotional ego strength’ called for in point four that’s needed to challenge racism by focusing on critical thinking skills (point three). Critical thinking skills means challenging students to ask, question, and think about what they’re learning, but to also identify the patterns. In language learning we can ask students to question the material content and even the grammatical structure of the
language, but in order for them to truly inquire about the language—they need to understand the current standard rule.

We can teach present-simple in the context of daily habits and routines, let the students practice the grammatical structure and then prompt them to think of how they would speak about this in their L1. Let them associate those instances so familiar in their L1 with the TL so that their English complex system begins to also associate those patterns with that speech. In doing so, we can help students identify metaphors (point six) and build a classroom that is safe and caring (point seven). We want to know what they already know; we are interested (point nine) and we also want the students to be familiar with the culture and language of origin that they are in to address point ten. Again, in presenting the aspects of American culture that we know, we can then recognize the strengths of the student as indicated in point five and foster the students’ strengths in the target language. Additionally, in raising this cross-cultural analysis, we can address point eight, where we assess the students’ needs and then offer a comprehensive environment filled with various alternatives for them to try.

As TESOL instructors we are facilitators of language and culture. We perhaps may only represent one (mono) version of the English language and culture, but it is our duty to facilitate our understanding of English composition in relation to what’s expected from the greater community. If we do not attend to this, we fail to ‘foster a sense of children’s connection to community, to something greater than themselves.’ That sense of connection to community relies on being able to articulate your thoughts accurately to members of that community. This is indicated in the students’ post-language reflections and their perception of the details being “good” due to accuracy. Meeting objectives does not need to be a constraint on the student, particularly if it is addressed by ‘address[ing] them with a wealth of diverse strategies.’ In
encouraging the learner to participate in a range of strategies, the instructor is asking the student to move towards a projected outcome that we both understand to be of value. In the TESOL classroom, this outcome is acquiring the standard academic English variety.

For better or for worse, the progressive movement needs to consider more inclusive curriculums and include objectives that help leaners of multilingual backgrounds acquire fluent accuracy of academic English. This is a matter of affirmative action, whereby without fluent accuracy—the capability to articulate thoughts in what is understood to be standard academic English—the multilingual will not be as privy to excessive professional opportunities in the States. This thesis may suggest than that as we “honor and respect the children’s home cultures,” that we also ask that translanguaging practices take place in concluding spaces. The concluding spaces that follow challenging the student to interact with the lesson material in the SAE definition that will be used by the influential powers of this nation. This thesis asks that we “foster a sense of children’s connection to community, to something greater than themselves” by challenging them to thoroughly apply themselves so that they have more access to their local environment. In doing so, this thesis “provide[s] children with the emotional ego strength to challenge racist societal views of their own competence and worthiness and that of their families and communities.” Without fluent access to the language of the oppressor, how can the student challenge the implicit, racist bias of one language/ one nation that translanguaging hopes to impede? TESOL instructors can acknowledge the beauty and power of home languages, while also requiring targeted outcomes for language acquisition. This would then suggest that translanguaging in fact caps the student’s linguistic competency, thereby perpetuating the cycle it hopes to break.
Final Reflection

I learned Darija during my Peace Corps service from 2015-2016. Darija is considered a dialect of Arabic, one that is distinguished by its North African origins. These origins are then perceived by other speakers of Arabic as a minority language, and it is attached to stigmas associated with Morocco. This conclusion was drawn after multiple attempts to speak Darija with other Arabic speakers and for them to only smile and reply, “Yes, that’s Moroccan” in English. When prompted for more information, it has been relayed that Moroccan is “funny” and “strange” with customs not considered Arab (a distinction the Moroccans are also supportive of). Therefore, it appears beneficial to learn the standard Arabic dialect—FusHa as it is perceived to be the most formalized version, granting it an elite and prestigious place among Arabic languages and dialects, and the most widespread variety throughout Muslim countries. My underlying purpose for learning Arabic has been to communicate with people from lands and cultures that speak Arabic—a key aspect for language learning. The distinction between language dialects has always been present and will continue to be present, but the reality of needing to enculturate out of necessity versus a personal desire changes the outcomes of this reality.

What does not change in this relationship is the potential to learn new aspects of yourself and life during the language learning process. From my initial foreign language of German, I believe I began to understand the complexity of the world as unconscious as it may have been. As I have grown older and continued to learn new languages, I have begun to understand people in a much more complex way. The motivations, desires, hopes, dreams… that we have are very much dependent on how we see the world, which is defined by our thoughts. These thoughts may or may not be dependent on our language repertoires, but the action we take in respect to these
thoughts is. The way we are able to articulate our respects to each other also is. Therefore, perhaps acquiring a variety of English, or English at all, seems absurd in this multicultural and interconnected world, but it is a current reality. That reality can be perceived as an unobtainable, modern objective, or it can be accepted as an opportunity to connect to various versions of ourselves and others. As I learn Arabic, though I reflect on those times in Morocco, I try not to think in Darija as the initial FusHa encounter becomes my understanding of that linguistic structure in the context the instructor is teaching it in. In that moment of time, I am not a speaker of standard Academic English, but a speaker of FusHa. My being is present, and I feel connected to the material and the language—I feel confident and assured in my sense of learning. These are the sentiments we want our students to feel and these are sentiments that we can help them feel by inclusive teaching methodology.
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Consent Form
Insight to Multilinguals’ Information Processing: A Focus Group

Nora Vralsted, MATESL Candidate, English Department, 509-413-9690, nvralsted@eagle.ewu.edu; Dr. LaVona Reeves, Thesis Chair, lreeves@ewu.edu

This is an opportunity to explore how and why you process information as you do, while providing me insight for my master’s thesis. Please read this form prior to agreeing and ask any questions before signing.

Purpose and Benefits
In an attempt to improve English as a Second Language (ESL) classes it is important for teachers to understand multilingual students’ thought processes. This focus group will provide insight to the mental strategies used by multilingual speakers of Russian and English while being introduced to new information. In turn, the focus group will expose participants’ best learning strategies, ultimately helping them understand how, why, and under what conditions they learn best.

Procedures
There will be two (2) approximately one (1) hour sessions that will meet in the library fall quarter 2018. During session one (1), participants will review and describe an abstract object. During session two (2), there will be a follow-up discussion of the object. Both sessions will involve brief, informal written reflections to be produced by the participants. The reflections will answer questions such as how and why participants chose to describe the object as they did and how they felt about their various descriptions. Participants are free to skip any question/s they find objectionable. The sessions will be video-recorded to allow for referencing by the investigator and adviser only. Answers and discussions will be confidential. No information that will identify participants will be released to the public or appear in the thesis. Tapes and records of the sessions will be destroyed within two years of thesis publication. Washington State law provides that private conversations may not be recorded, intercepted, or divulged without permission of the individual(s) involved.

Risk, Stress or Discomfort
Risks are minimal because the activities are similar to daily interactions multilinguals students have.

Other Information
All participants will remain anonymous. Only the thesis chair, Dr. Reeves, and I will know participants’ names. We will give each participant a pseudonym so the real names will not appear in the thesis. Participants are free to withdraw at any time without penalty. There will be pizza offered during each session and we will provide a safe environment for open discussion.
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Signature of Principle Investigator

Date

Subject's Statement
The study described above has been explained to me, and I voluntarily consent to participate in this research. I have had an opportunity to ask questions, and I give permission to record, intercept, and/or divulge conversations (as appropriate) in which I participate during this research. I understand that by signing this form I am not waiving my legal rights. I understand that I will receive a signed copy of this form.

Signature of Subject
Date

[as appropriate]
Signature of Parent/Legal Guardian
Date

[for adult who is unable to provide consent]
Signature of Subject Advocate
Date

If you have any concerns about your rights as a participant in this research or any complaints you wish to make, you may contact Ruth Galm, Human Protections Administrator, at (509) 359-7971
Appendix B
Abstract Object Handout

Insight to Multilinguals’ Information Processing: A Focus Group

Nora Vralsted, MATESL Candidate, English Department, 509-413-960, nvralsted@eagle.ewu.edu; Dr. LaVona Reeves, Thesis Chair, English Department, lreeves@ewu.edu
Appendix C
Session 1 Cumulative Reflection Prompt

Insight to Multilinguals’ Information Processing: A Focus Group

Nora Vralsted, MATESL Candidate, English Department, 509-413-960, nvralsted@eagle.ewu.edu; Dr. LaVona Reeves, Thesis Chair, English Department, lreeves@ewu.edu

Cumulative Reflection Questions:

Please answer the following questions in English as thoroughly and detailed as possible. Feel free to write informally, but clarify any statements or claims made.

How the students felt about using each language, whether they believe a description is more accurate in certain (any) language, and how they feel the versions differed.
Appendix D
SAE Definition of the Abstract Pictured Object

Insight to Multilinguals’ Information Processing: A Focus Group

Nora Vralsted, MATESL Candidate, English Department, 509-413-960, nvralsted@eagle.ewu.edu; Dr. LaVona Reeves

Image Definition:
A rare collection of geometrical shapes and dimensions, this collamber, is used to signify the disparity of time.
Appendix E
Session 2 Final Reflection Prompt

Insight to Multilinguals’ Information Processing: A Focus Group

Nora Vralsted, MATESL Candidate, English Department, 509-413-960, nvralsted@eagle.ewu.edu; Dr. LaVona Reeves, Thesis Chair, English Department, lreeves@ewu.edu

How do you consider yourself to receive new ideas? Are you openminded?

How do you feel the Standard Academic English description compare to how you had described it? Which description do you think you will be more opt to think of the object in? Why? Does this differ depending on who you would speak to about this? (Re: if you were to speak to your mother about the object, a professor, a friend?).
Appendix F
Focus Group Script

Insight to Multilinguals’ Information Processing: A Focus Group
Nora Vralsted, MATESL Candidate, English Department, 509-413-960,
nvralsted@eagle.ewu.edu; Dr. LaVona Reeves, Thesis Chair, English Department,
lreeves@ewu.edu

Investigator will collect consent forms.

“Welcome and thank you for participating in this focus group.”

“Спрауйте всем и спасибо за вашему время! Сегодня мы будем практиковаться
мышление за то, что на факультете Teaching-ово English-а как Вотором Языке есть
разговоры о multilinguals processing information differently. эта информация будет provide
insight as to how information processing transpires when students, such as yourselves, encounter
new information.”*

*[Hello everyone and thank you for your time! Today we will practice thinking as the
department of Teaching-ovo English-a in a Second language has talk of how multilinguals
process information differently. This information will provide insight as to how information
processing transpires when students, such as yourselves, encounter new information.]

“The purpose of this focus group is to uncover how Teaching English to Speakers of Other
Language (TESOL) instructors better serve students, such as yourselves. Specifically, we want to
understand how multilinguals perceive and retain new information and how the unearthed
processing can be better utilized in TESOL practices. We want to understand how your language
backgrounds configure your acquisition of knowledge. This in turn will relay to you how you
best learn, which can be incorporated in your academic and professional lives.

“We’d like to remind you that to protect the privacy of focus group members, all transcripts will
be coded with pseudonyms and we ask that you not discuss what is discussed in the focus group
with anyone else.”

“The focus group will last about an hour and we will videotape the discussion to make sure that
it is referenced accurately. We will have pizza available immediately following the conclusion of
today’s session.”

“Do you have any questions for us before we begin?”

“I will now hand you an image of something or a thing. I will give you a minute to look at the
image and ask yourself, “What is this?” “чё?” [what?]. After that minute you will begin
answering the sheet that is under your chair. There are instructions on that sheet. Please read
them and answer as completely and as detailed as possible. Do not rush your response. Take your
time to think and even re-read it once through. Consider all elements when responding: the
context, where are we, your senses... consider your deepest thoughts and write them down.”
Appendix F
Focus Group Script

“I will collect the responses. Please look at the blank sheet of paper I will give you as I pick up the responses.”

“Now, what are you studying at Eastern? Do you have a favorite class this quarter?”

“Alright, let’s try round-two.” Again, you will be given a minute to look at the image and think to yourself, “What do I see?” After this minute, you will begin answering the sheet that I have placed under your chair [during their reflection discussion about their quarter, I will replace the sheets with Attachment B-4]. Please re-read the directions as they are slightly different. Any questions?”

“I will collect the responses. Please look at the blank sheet of paper I will give you as I pick up the papers.”

“Who here loves pizza? What kinds? Ours should be delivered any time now… What are your favorite kinds of foods?”

“Alright, the final round. Again, you will be given a minute to look at the image and think to yourself, “What do I see? What do I feel when I look at this?” After this minute, you will begin answering the sheet that I have placed under your chair [during their reflection discussion about their quarter, I will replace the sheets with Attachment B-5]. Please re-read the directions as they are slightly different. Any questions?”

“Okay! Thank you! Ешё раз, спасибо всем за время и за помощь. [Again, thank you for your time and help]. I have one last element to today’s session. I will hand out a final sheet of paper and will ask you to read the directions and think about your response for 1 minute. I need these to be as detailed and as thorough as possible (re: “more is better”). Any questions?”

Session Two:

“Thank you for returning for the final session of our focus group. Today we will be reviewing the abstract object you detailed last time in Standard Academic English. We will compare how we feel this description compares to our previous and how you feel about reimagining and considering the object in this way. Are there any questions?”

“Here is the official description of the object. Will someone read this aloud? […] How do we feel about this definition?”

“Time for our last written response and last activity for this focus-group. Please read the reflection prompts on the sheet I will give you and again, answer as completely as possible. Feel free to use the details from the discussions we had today, but explain why you are including them. Вопрос есть? [Are there any questions?]”
Appendix G
Russian Language Detail Prompt

Nora Vralsted, MATESL Candidate, English Department, 509-413-960, nvralsted@eagle.ewu.edu; Dr. LaVona Reeves, Thesis Chair, English Department, lreeves@ewu.edu

Пожалуйста, опишите как можно более подробно и подробно, что вы видели и / или связали с изображением, которое вы только что видели на русском. Не стесняйтесь продолжать просмотр изображения.¹

¹ The following translation is provided for IRB purposes only and will not be included on the official document: “Please describe as specifically and detailed as possible, what you saw and/or associated with the image you have just looked at in Russian. Feel free to continue looking at the image.”
Appendix H
English Language Detail Prompt

Insight to Multilinguals’ Information Processing: A Focus Group

Nora Vralsted, MATESL Candidate, English Department, 509-413-960, nvralsted@eagle.ewu.edu; Dr. LaVona Reeves, Thesis Chair, English Department, lreeves@ewu.edu

Please describe as specifically and detailed as possible, what you saw and/or associated with the image you have just looked at in English. Feel free to continue looking at the image.
Appendix I
Russlish Language Detail Prompt

Insight to Multilinguals’ Information Processing: A Focus Group

Nora Vralsted, MATESL Candidate, English Department, 509-413-960, nvralsted@eagle.ewu.edu; Dr. LaVona Reeves, Thesis Chair, English Department, lreeves@ewu.edu

Пожалуйста сейчас давай записывать по RUSSLISH– а комбинация о Russian and English! Write in Cyrillic and/or the Roman alphabet—use both languages to describe EXACTLY what you see and feel from the image. Напишите как хотите! 

---

2 These translations are provided for IRB purposes and will not be included on the official document: “Now please let’s write in RUSSLISH—a combination of Russian and English.”

3 “Write how you want!”
Appendix J
Post-Language Reflection Prompt

Insight to Multilinguals’ Information Processing: A Focus Group

Nora Vralsted, MATESL Candidate, English Department, 509-413-960, nvralsted@eagle.ewu.edu; Dr. LaVona Reeves, Thesis Chair, English Department, lreeves@ewu.edu

Reflection post language-detail:

Please answer the following questions in English as thoroughly and detailed as possible. Feel free to write informally, but clarify any statements or claims made.

How do you feel your description represents the object? Do any specific words give certain imagery more than others? Why did you choose to describe it as you did?
Appendix K
Russian Language Details Data

Lena

Этот обект с начала выглядит как будто дали первокласснику рисовать на планшете, а потом если, если разглядел, можно увидеть знакомые объекте. Например, ближе к середине, рисование из самого светлого цвета и самой толстой линии, объект выглядит как моль. А объект с черными, толстыми линиями выглядит как крылья бабочки, но разведенённые. Этот весь объект также симметричный.

*This object initially looked as if it was done by a first grader, drawn on the tablet, and then if, if you observe more closely, you can see familiar objects. For example, closer to the middle, drawn in the lightest shade/color and the fattest line, the object looks like a moth. And an object with black, fat lines looks like butterfly wings, but separated. The whole object is also symmetrical.*

Maxim

Когда я смотрел на это изображения, я подумал о бабочке. С переди были толстые черные линии. Они выглядели как верх и середина крыла. За ними были серые полы токовоже размера. За этими полохами были маленки кружочки которыи выглядели как нижняя часть крыла. Я чувствовал что это не бабочка, но пачемиму не мог увидет нечего дригово в этом узоре.

*When I looked at that image, I thought of a butterfly. From the front were thick, black, lines. They looked like the front and middle of a wing. Behind them there were gray lines of the same size. Behind these lines were little circles, which looked like the bottom part of the wing. I felt that this isn’t a butterfly, but for some reason I can’t see anything else in this pattern.*

Ksenia

- Я вижу две бабочкины крылья, или одну бабочку только без тело.
- Я вижу музыкальные трубы, в которых дуют воздух и которые раздоят звук.
- 2 разных цвета (чорный и серий)
- Этот ресунок находится в квадрате
- ресунок в форме кругов.

- *I see two butterfly wings, or one butterfly that’s without a body.*
- *I see musical instruments into which require blowing air and which create sound.*
- *2 different colors (black and gray).*
- *This image is inside a box.*
- *The image is in forms of circle.*
Appendix K
Russian Language Details Data

Egor

What I saw when I first looked at this object was that it was like animal wings. Later, I thought that the wings like diseases. This object has so many lines, that it’s weird.

Viktor

I saw butterfly wings I saw black lines. Then/later I saw a cicada when I looked at the gray lines. After this I don’t see anything only lines.

Boris

It looks as if it was drawn on a different sheet and then scanned or was drawn on a computer in paint.exe. In the beginning, it was drawn by hand as though with a calligraphy pen, then next to this is drawn a circle. Above the circles and to the left triangles are drawn in a type of highlighter. Yet, above everything there’s drawn a second triangle. The whole image was created by a mirrored reflection.
Appendix L
Russian Post-Language Reflection Data

Lena

1. The way that I described this object represents it with the way I see it. Someone could look at it & describe it differently, or represent it in another way.
2. I think that some words do create more imagery than others. For example, when I explained what some of the certain objects looked like, it would have done a better job at creating a better imagery than when I spoke of the object broadly.
3. I chose the words that I did because those words described what I thought of or perhaps the way the object appeared to me.

Maxim

I feel like it was very hard to describe the object firstly because it’s abstract but secondly because the words I would’ve used in English didn’t come to me in Russian. I feel like associating the object with something that was easier to describe would paint a better picture in the head of the reader. I tried to chose words that had more meaning to me but I think they wouldn’t be as meaningful to others. I switched my answer to question one and oops [participant is assumedly referring to the order of the questions in the prompt].

Ksenia

I see a butterfly without a body or I see two butterfly wings. I also see two musical instruments, I believe they are called “horns?” They seem to face each other coming from the right and left sides of the image. There are two diff. colors used; black and grey. This image is inside another square looking form. The shape of the lines used are circular.

I used words such as “butterfly” and “horn” to help give a visual example of what I was seeing in the image provided. I also listed colors and shapes to also provide a better explanation of the piece. My description should be pretty good I think because it helps to image what I’m seeing better.

Egor

I feel like my description was very vague and didn’t represent the object very well. I believe that some of the words might give certain imagery more than others. I chose to describe the object the way I did because it was the easiest way for me to describe it and I mainly wrote down what came to my mind when I saw it.

Viktor

I have not written in Russian in many years so I had a tough time putting my thoughts down on the paper so I don’t think that I gave a good description of the object. In some cases yes but in this particular image I did not think much of it.

Boris

I feel like I was really limited by my speed of writing in Russian, like I chose to write in less detail because it took me so long. So my description is subpar.
Appendix L
Russian Post-Language Reflection Data

*Boris*

I used the word highlighter because its exactly what the objected looked like it was drawn with I know there is a russian word for it 😘. I used the word каллия because thats exactly what the circle looked like, so I guess I used the most descriptive word I could, unless I didn’t know it.

I chose words that would describe it well enough for some one else to reproduce the image however it kinda failed cause of the time constraint
Appendix M
English Language Details Data

Lena

At first glance, the object appears to be a lot of random scribbles, but if you take apart the picture, you can tell that some of the things resemble real objects. For example, the object closest to the center, (which is divided by a space) resemble a moth if you’re looking at it from the top. The top of the “moth” has two lines coming out that look like toilet uncloggers. The black object which slightly overlaps the grey object looks like cartoony butterfly wings, but separated & w/o a body.

Maxim

When look at the image I saw a butterfly at first. It was composed of three layers. The first lay was a dark sqgle. It was in the center but also at the top of the wing. Behind it was a grey triangular shape. It wa right in the center. the bottom corner had a circular pattern which was made of thinner black lines. After examaning the image close I decided that it might be the eyes of an alian buglike creature.

Ksenia

- Butterfly with no body
- two butterfly wings
- two musical horns pointed towards each other
- random lines/stripes in the background
- two colors used: black & grey
- image is inside of a square
- circular lines
- grey color shows shadows
- “wings” are overlapping the rest of the images in the back
- 3 different figures”

Egor

The first thing that I thought of when I first saw it is that it looked like a butterfly. After looking at it more it just confused me and the big sqigally lines looked like some kind of disease like ebola. After further observations it looked more like a heart that's been tore apart with the black lines at the bottom sides being blood. When looking at it further there are 2 triangles, one black and one grey. Also a circle.
Appendix M
English Language Details Data

**Viktor**

When look at the bold black lines I see wings of a butterfly. When looking at the gray lines I see wings of a circada. The left side is symmetric to the right side. When turned upside down, The black and bold lines look like a heart.

**Boris**

This image was most likely made in Microsoft Paint 3D The image is mirrored vertically along the middle. At the bottom right corner there is a circle made from scribbles. The scribbles were made with a calligraphy pen tool. Then a highlighter was used to draw a triangle with its base close to the center and one corner on the circle. Than a larger triangle was drawn over the previous shapes. The whole image probably originally had color but was printed out in greyscale.
Appendix N
English Post-Language Reflections Data

**Lena**

1. I feel like my description individually represents the object. The way I see/describe it is only my opinion, so it ^my description [added for clarification by the participant] just only adds a little more meaning to it based on my observation.
2. I think that the more descriptive words add more imagery, for example, those which I was comparing to tangible objects.
3. I chose to describe my object based on the way it appeared to me when I looked at it.

**Maxim**

I felt I did a better job describing the object. This time my description was only limited by time and my imagination. I feel like I can describe a word by using other words instead of leaving it out. So words don’t hold a specific value. I described the image by stating the first thing I saw by looking at it because it was easier to relate things to each other.

**Ksenia**

I feel like I did a good job describing what I was seeing. I used shades of colors, distance, shape of lines, and look alike objects to describe the piece given to me. I described it as a did to help the audience imagine exactly what I was seeing and where it was located.

**Egor**

I feel that my description represents the object better but only when looking at it as a whole picture. I did not write a lot of detail, since I was looking at the picture as a whole. I think that specific words did give certain imagery more than others. I chose to describe it the way I did because when I look at something I first look at the thing as a whole before looking at the details.

**Viktor**

I think my description represented my view of the object better than in Russia. I know basic Russian, but I have a broader vocabulary of the English language so I was able to think of more English words to describe the image.

**Boris**

Since I am lazy I will say that I tried to do the same thing as before however I could write more because I write faster in English. However I still didn’t say everything I wanted to. Again I used the word scribble because it best describes the circle.

I chose to describe it in the same manner because when I describe something I think about it and put the thoughts to words, something this means translating some of the thoughts so that the whole thing is in one language.
Haha I was answering a different question than you asked. [Spacing and formatting intended to match participant’s.]
Appendix O
Russlish Language Details Data

Lena

Картинку которую я вижу **is symmetrical**. Она вообще **doesn't really look like anything in particular**, но создает какое-то представление и связывает с другими объектами. Если смотреть на картинку с **squinted eyes**, то всё вместе выглядит как **Monarch butterfly**, а серая масса линий выглядит немножко как тень бабочки.

The picture that I see **is symmetrical**. Altogether, it **doesn't really look like anything in particular**, but creates some sort of a perspective and binds together with other objects. If the picture is looked at with **squinted eyes**, then everything together looks like a **Monarch butterfly**, a gray mass of lines looks a little like the shadow of a butterfly.

Maxim

**This time I eyes not a butterfly.** There were thick black lines at the front. Они выглядели как треугольники. **Behind them were grey triangles that looked like the pupils of the eyes.** Крыги которые были за триугольниками выглядели как пятна. Как буто **this was a feline with spots on its face**.

**This time I eyes not a butterfly.** There were thick black lines at the front. They looked like triangles. **Behind them were grey triangles that looked like the pupils of the eyes.** The wings that were behind the triangles, look like spots. As if **this was a feline with spots on its face**.

Ksenia

Я вижу типа "рамку" вокруг этого рисунка, a **frame around the image due to the noticable sides being cut off at the bottom** (в низу) and on the right & left side (обо правая и левая сторона). Я доихирор вижу два разных цвета. The **grey peice of this image** (который посередине) shows shadowing between the lines. Досихпор я вижу бабочку и два музыкальных инструмента (horn). In the **background** я вижу восьем линий, that are very random.

I see a type of “frame” around this drawing, a **frame around the image due to the noticable sides being cut off at the bottom** (at the bottom) and on the right and left side (both the right and left sides). I still see two different colors. The **grey peice of this image** (which is in the middle) shows shadowing between the lines. I still see a butterfly and two musical instruments (horn). In the **background** I see 8 lines, that are very random.

Egor

Когда я вижу это обхекта я Гачу один **triangle with** много линьы. Some of the lines look like the were repeatidly drawn into a circle. The bold black lines look like there wer some letter written in it, like the letter R and L but were mixed together.
Appendix O
Russlish Language Details Data

Egor

When I see this object I see one **triangle with** many lines. **Some of the lines look like the were repeatiadly drawn into a circle. The bold black lines look like there wer some letter written in it, like the letter R and L but were mixed together.**

Viktor

**When I saw the линеé я saw a reflection. It looked like одна сторона болa reflecting the other side. потом я saw the big bold black lines; they looked like wings of a butterfly to me. The жьвйй lines looked like a cicada. The small circled lines looked like a ball of hair. Upside down, the black lines looked like a серце.**

“**When I saw the lines I saw a reflection. It looked like one side was reflecting the other side. Later I saw the big bold black lines; they looked like wings of a butterfly to me. The lighter lines looked like a cicada. The small circled lines looked like a ball of hair. Upside down, the black lines looked like a heart.**

Boris

**Honestly I don't really have a language preference but here goes nothing. Start with a каляка which my cousin woul call буйная пчелка. Then add an isosalese triangle on top of it however only one corner of the triangle is over the каляка. Now draw the outline of a 30-60-90 degree triangle on top of both the previous shapes. add random squiggles through the triangle. now mirror the image and put it on a gray background. The image should be mirrored in such a way that the bases of the equalateral triangles are parrallell and are about an inch apart. The 30 60 90 triangle has the second longest side parrallell to the base of the isosalace triangle.**

**Honestly I don’t really have a language preference but here goes nothing.**

**Start with a scribble which my cousin would call drunk/rowdy bee. Then add an isosalese triangle on top of it however only one corner of the triangle is over the scribble. Now draw the outline of a 30-60-90 degree triangle on top of both the previous shapes. add random squiggles through the triangle. now mirror the image and put it on a gray background. The image should be mirrored in such a way that the bases of the equalateral triangles are parrallell and are about an inch apart. The 30 60 90 triangle has the second longest side parrallell to the base of the isosalace triangle.**
Appendix O
Russlish Post-Language Reflections Data

**Lena**

1. I feel like the last description best represents the object, because I was able to use words from both languages to describe what I saw.
2. I feel like the English words really create more visuals because they are somewhat more of the description version of the Russian words I couldn’t think of.
3. I chose to describe the way I did because it was more comfortable for me to express what I felt when I saw the object/the way that it appeared to me.

**Maxim**

My description represents the object not as well as the previous two. It was harder for me to decide how I wanted to describe it because I felt more freedom. Specific words helped me this time because I could switch languages. I chose to describe it this way because it was easier than sticking to one language.

**Ksenia**

I used pretty much the same words and techniques I used previously in my reflections. I don’t feel as anything new came from me using two diff. languages besides knowing some of the names for things (horns) and better words of descriptions due to me practicing one language more often than the other. Otherwise If I noticed something new it was because I have now looked at the image several more times.

**Egor**

I feel like my description represents the object as best as I can see it. I believe that there might be few words that give certain imagery more than others, such as saying that an object looks like the letter R. I chose to describe it the way I did because it was what I was able to see.

**Viktor**

I feel like my description did a good job of describing the object. One word that gave me more imagery than others was “heart” in russian as opposed to english. I chose to describe it based on how I thought of it in my head”.

**Boris**

I think I did better because It was like the 3rd draft of writing this.

When I was writing in Russian I forgot to say буйная пчелка so when I could use the Russian words again this time I used them, that was an addition to the description. To others it probably doesn’t mean much be to me it describes it perfectly.

I did not change anything in the way I tried to describe it because I don’t really know of a better way to do it yet I could critique the way others have described it. [Spacing and formatting intended to match participant’s.]
Appendix Q
Session 1 Cumulative Reflection Data

**Lena**
1. I feel like w/ each language my description was a little different. Even though I stayed on the same track, I still managed to change my description as I went.
2. I think my thought process did change, because, as I thought in different languages, it caused me to see the same image mildly different each time.
3. As I mentioned above, I think it did. When I was writing strictly in Russian/ strictly in English, I saw the image almost the same, but when I wrote in Russlish, I saw the image even more different than before.
4. I think the description was more accurate because I was able to use both languages and mixing the two made it easier to express myself.
5. I think the reason for this is that because I use both languages, I have a broader vocabulary & sometimes I think differently between the two languages & I identify things differently.
6. The versions compared because I used basically the same theme throughout.

**Maxim**
I felt like it was harder to write in Russian. I think my thought process was opened when we switched to English. I saw the image differently the 3rd time. I think it was more accurate in English. I think the third time I couldn’t decide which language to use and that slowed down my thought process. I think my English description was the best. The Russian/English was second best.

**Ksenia**
I liked using Russian only because I have not needed to use it in so long; but also I’ve always struggled with confusing certain Russian letters, like the “d’s” and the “b’s” (д, в). I’ve struggled w/ this since I was first learning how to write and since I stopped practicing I never got in the habit of using the right letter. My thought process was way more broad in English due to me having a larger vocabulary. I noticed as I was writing in Russian I was focusing on spelling & grammar and on getting my thoughts out in the best way since my vocabulary is so much smaller. I saw the images in the same way. Descriptions were definitely more accurate in English since I practice it more.

**Egor**
I felt better using the English language because I know more vocab some im able to explain it better. I believe that when we had to write in Russian my thought process changed and I would try to see what that image would mean to me, or what does the image remind me of. I believe my description in English was more accurate because I was able to describe it better because I know more in English than I do Russian. All the version were not too different from eachother because when I see it one way I can’t forget what I see.

**Viktor**
I felt more comfortable writing in english because I do so way more often than russian and so I am alot better at it. My thought process changed because I know more english words that can be used to describe something than russian. I saw the image the same way. My english description was more accurate because I have a broader english vocabulary. Overall, I think my english description was alot better because of my better spelling and easier time writing.
Appendix Q
Session 1 Cumulative Reflection Data

*Boris*
I guess I let you down, I kinda answerd these questions before. I felt a little rusty in Russian. No my thought process seemed to stay the same. I think I saw everything I needed to the 1st time I saw it. I don’t think any one of the descriptions is more accurate, like I just got tired of writing the same thing over and over again. So I described it in slightly differing details each time. Maybe version 2 [English] is the most accurate? maybe not but 2 [English] and 3 [Russlish] are defenatly more accurate like I guess I didn’t formulate the description of the object all the way by the 1st [Russian] writing. Like I think the descriptions would be closer if I use a different order of languages.
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**Lena**
I feel like when it comes to accepting new ideas I am judgmental. I like to make sure the idea is valid so that I can accept it.

1. I feel like my description of the object is very different from the description in English. There was a lot more meaning behind it than I had anticipated.
2. I think all of my descriptions are off, but the closest description to the definition is probably the one in Russian. I feel like the description that I used is closest to the actual definition.
3. If I had spoken about this to someone else I might have changed my mind, especially if the person I spoke to is close to me. I highly value the opinion of my closest friends and family.

**Maxim**
I think I am accepting of new ideas and openminded.
I think the standard description of object is very different from what I thought about. I think that I will mostly think of it in the way I described it (especially the first russian description). Because thats how I thought about it for the first time so thats what stuck with me. It would most likely differ. If I were talking to a professor or educated person I would talk about in its standard description but if I were speaking to my mother or friend I would talk about in the same way I wrote.

**Ksenia**
Very openminded.
I said nothing about time or anything that had to do with timelapses, so maybe that means I was way off. I’m more opt to think of this description in standard English definition due to that I think it’s most appropriate and I am most comfortable using this language. I would say this minorly differs depending on whom i’m speaking with: if it’s my prof. then it’s standard English, if it’s my mom or friend then just normal English, if it’s my dad or grandma then it’s Russian. (actually w/ both of my parents it might be Ru-english.)

**Egor**
I believe I receive new ideas nicely as long as I understand the idea. I like to be openminded but when I don’t understand something I most of the time try not to think more about it.

I believe the Standard Academic English had a more descriptive description while I had a more visual description. I think I will be more opt to think of the object in English because it has a better description and I’m able to visualize it more sometimes. This does differ depending on who I would speak to because I would try to explain it best as they would understand. If they don’t know too much English I would explain it in the most simpliest way.

**Viktor**
Yes, I am openminded and I am good at recieving new ideas.
I feel like the SAE description is very generic, or broad. It just sounds like something that you may think of when looking at the image vs what it actually is. I would use my Rusenglish description to think of the object instead of the other descriptions. The only
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Viktor

time I would use the SAE description is when talking to a professor. I would use the Russian description when talking to a native Russian speaker. I would use the Rusenglish description when talking to someone who can speak both languages fluently.

Boris

I am pretty open, I can listen to them but I’ll have to think about them on my own before forming a solid opinion (more at letter a) → a) continued… ) however if a new idea comes along I’ll try to understand where the Idea came from.

The definition matches up except the part about time the object is a collection of shapes/dimensions so it fits the definition. The english standard definition is not really specific to the object. It’s a broader definition. My definitions are better for picking out this particular “collamber” from other shapes that could be presented. I would use a different definition depending on what I was trying to say about the object and who I was talking to. When I look at the object I would not naturally get philosophical however if I was asked about it by a professor I’d start thinking about it in terms of the english standard definition.
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