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The number of Second-Language and Multilingual writing and resource centers on North American college campuses continues to increase; however there is very little research that focuses on the writing and literacy practices multilingual learners employ in heterogeneous learning spaces. This study utilized one-on-one interviews to identify the wide variety of literacy practices international students who frequent the ESL Resource Center at California State University, Chico, engage in across discourse communities. Findings suggest although students engage in a wide variety of critical literacy practices outside of the Center, they tend to privilege conventional monolingual approaches to writing and tutoring while participating in the ESL Resource Center. Implications suggests second-language writing and resource centers adopt a translingual approach to writing and tutoring which acknowledges the different literacy practices students participate in across different linguistic, cultural, and academic discourses.
CHAPTER I

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Institutions of higher learning are admitting international students at higher rates than ever, but often fail to provide these students with the necessary support for them to successfully navigate North American academic discourse. As the international student population on North American college campuses continues to increase, so too does the demand for institutions to provide additional academic support services for multilingual writers. Academic writing and resource centers provide multilingual students safe spaces to participate in deep learning with peers and near peers across cultural, linguistic, and academic discourses. Despite the demand for additional learning resources, which serve multilingual students in higher education, very little second-language writing research has been conducted outside of traditional college classrooms. Lape (2013) highlights the lack of writing center scholarship specific to multilingual writers in the article (“Going Global, Becoming Translingual: The Development of a Multilingual Writing Center”) “with the internationalizing of academia, a growing number of foreign language writing centers have emerged in recent years. Although a review of the writing center literature yields few studies on the topic” (p. 1). Out of the limited number of studies available, few explore writing and reading as communicative literacy practices (Street, 2001, p. 430). Fewer still focus on how multilingual students use writing to participate in larger social and academic discourse communities. More
research surrounding the literacy practices of multilingual writers outside of traditional
classroom spaces is needed in order to more effectively serve this rapidly increasing
student population.

The English as a Second Language Resource Center (ESLRC) at California State University, Chico (CSUC) provides free tutoring services to international and
domestic students who speak English as a second, foreign, or other language. Multilingual students come to the Center to receive help with assignments in a variety of
courses including: introductory academic English language and writing classes, general
education classes across various disciplines, and advanced coursework from their
respective fields of study. This study identifies the different discourse communities
multilingual students navigate in order to better understand how members of the ESLRC
use language in a variety of contexts in order to serve different purposes.

This study is of importance to professionals and paraprofessionals who work
closely with multilingual learners in heterogeneous learning spaces, especially college
level instructors or tutors who are focused on the reading, writing, and literacy practices
of multilingual adults. This study appeals to instructors and tutors involved in tutor
training in writing and resource centers, particularly individuals interested in exploring a
translingual approach to writing. Finally, individuals who are focused on exploring
affinity spaces would also be interested in this study.

Significance of the Problem

Second-language writing and literacy studies researcher Shin-ying Huang
points out that although “critical literacy research is prevalent in a wide variety of
educational research, research that focuses on the critical literacy practices of students in English as a second-language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL) classrooms remains scarce” (2011, p. 145). The majority of research on second-language writing focuses on the conventional literacy practices of multilingual writers in traditional classroom spaces. Drawing on Lankshear (1994), Huang (2011) defines critical literacy as, “a way of problematizing texts.” Critical literacy approaches to second-language learning and literacy acknowledge that texts are multidimensional and serve multiple rhetorical and communicative purposes. Conversely, Huang warns that conventional literacy models largely ignore the communicative purposes associated with reading and writing academic texts, and assume texts are simple one-dimensional products. Huang uses the term critical literacy to describe a literacy model, which more fully addresses learning in social contexts, and conventional literacy to describe a pragmatic literacy model that views literacy as mastering an isolated set of writing and reading skills.

Similar to Huang, literacy studies researcher Brian Street also recognizes two conflicting literacy models present in writing and literacy studies research. Like Huang’s conventional literacy model, Street (2001) identifies an autonomous literacy model, which he states, “conceptualise(s) literacy in technical terms, treating it as independent of social context, an autonomous variable whose consequences for society and cognition can be derived from intrinsic character” (pp. 431-432). Street argues that an ideological model is a more comprehensive literacy model because it “recognize[s] the variety of cultural practices associated with reading and writing in different contexts” and views “literacy practices as inextricably linked to cultural and power structures in society” (p. 433). Street is also quick to point out that the ideological model, “does not attempt to
deny technical skill or the cognitive aspects of reading and writing, but rather understands them as they are encapsulated within cultural wholes and within structures of power” (p. 435). Street is highly critical of theorists who pit the autonomous literacy model against the ideological literacy model in order to create a “false polarity” (p. 435). Street argues that the ideological model, in fact, avoids the polarization introduced by any attempt to separate out the ‘technical’ and ‘cultural’ aspects of literacy, and therefore also encompasses the autonomous model” (p. 435).

Similarly, Huang’s (2011) research suggests that critical literacy and conventional literacy should simultaneously be promoted in second-language reading and writing courses (p. 145). Although Street and Huang use different terms to describe the two conflicting literacy models identified in the research across disciplines, the terms autonomous literacy model (Street, 2001) and conventional literacy (Huang, 2011) both essentially refer to the same concept, and could be used interchangeably. Similarly, the terms ideological literacy model (Street, 2001) and critical literacy (Huang, 2011) are also similar enough to also be used interchangeably. The terms conventional literacy and critical literacy will be used throughout this study to refer to the two conflicting literacy models named in the research to avoid confusion.

The conflicting literacy constructs identified by Huang (2011; Street, 2001) manifest in the types of literacy and writing practices researchers choose to focus on in their given field. Street reports that the ideological or critical literacy model has been widely accepted by literacy studies researchers (p. 434). Conversely, the conventional literacy model is traditionally more widely accepted by second-language researchers. Second-language writing research tends to focus strictly on conventional literacy
practices and often fails to acknowledge the wide range of literacy and writing practices that all students, including multilingual students, struggle with throughout the entire research and composition process.

Although social linguists and second-language researchers have been exploring the cultural and social implications of differences in languages for decades (Matsuda, 2014, p. 749), second-language research still tends to focus on form rather than the “linguistic practices of multilingual students” (De Costa, 2015, p. 182). A disproportionate amount of second-language research focuses exclusively on the form of a written product, which only addresses the conventional literacy practices of multilingual students in language learning spaces, including writing and resource centers. This conventional approach to second-language writing research fails to explore the broader sociocultural implications of multilingual writing. Sociolinguists and translationalists aim to expand the unit of analysis from focusing exclusively on the conventional literacy practices of multilingual writers in formal classroom spaces, to include the critical literacy and writing practices of multilingual students in informal learning spaces, such as writing and resource centers.

More research which focus on the critical literacy practices of multilingual students in heterogenous learning spaces is need in order to offer a more complete picture of the diverse literacy and writing practices that multilingual writers utilize to participate in broader discourse communities. Data collected and analyzed throughout this study draw on established research surrounding social constructivist learning theories across the fields of composition studies, literacy studies, and second-language writing, and translationalism in order to more accurately represent the wide range of literacy and
writing practices that members of multilingual, heterogeneous, writing and resource centers take up.

Social constructivist theories of learning hold that learning is a highly contextualized, situated, activity that occurs through the complex process of making meaning with others (Knobel & Lankshear, 2007, p. 2; Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 31). Exploring “literacies from a sociocultural perspective means that reading and writing can only be understood in the context of social, cultural, political, economic, historical practices to which they are integral, of which they are part of (Lankshear & Knobel, 2007, p. 1).

James Gee, renowned sociolinguist and literacy studies researcher, is highly critical of traditional understandings of language and literacy that fail to acknowledge learning as social action. Gee asserts that the focus of literacy studies and applied linguistics “should not be language, or literacy, but social practice” (2001b, p. 524). Gee, even challenges the traditional definition of language. “The term ‘language’ itself suggests mastering specific linguistic features, or grammar rather the communicative practices of saying, doing, being, valuing, and believing” (Gee, 2001b, pp. 525-526). In other words, Gee believes language should refer to the social practices that help individuals understand themselves and the world around them, rather than the popular belief that language means identifying and mastering specific linguistic features. Gee’s definition of language is widely accepted by professionals in the fields of literacy and composition studies. However, most second-language professionals have a more pragmatic approach to language learning, which rarely focuses on how multilingual
students engage in the social practices of “saying, doing, being, valuing, and believing” (Gee, 2001b, pp. 525-526).

Translingual Writing

A review of available research surrounding the writing and literacy practices of multilingual students across disciplines reveals the theoretical gap that exists between the fields of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) and literacy and composition studies. Comparing current research across disciplines highlights underlying assumptions, and conflicting literacy constructs, that greatly influenced how researchers approach multilingual writing research. Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, Jacqueline Jones-Royster, John Trimbur, and other multilingual literacy researchers address the ideological and pedagogical gap that currently exists between second-language researchers and literacy studies researchers by proposing a new approach to second-language writing, a translingual approach. According to Horner et al. (2011), “A translingual approach directly addresses the gap between actual language practices and myths about language . . . in order to combat the political realities those myths perpetuate” (p. 305). This study attempts to identify the actual practices multilingual writers engage in while simultaneously challenging the myths associated with second-language tutoring in the ESLRC.

The primary purpose of this project is to explore how dominant literacy constructs contribute to the lack of research surrounding the actual literacy practices of multilingual writers in second-language writing and resources centers, particularly how they function as affinity spaces (Lankshear & Knobel, 2011, pp. 68, 78). This study seeks
to address the gap that currently exists in multilingual literacy research by expanding the scope of analysis beyond “specific linguistic features, or grammar” (Gee, 2001b, pp. 525-526) in order to more accurately reflect how members of the ESLRC participate in a wide variety of discourse communities. A secondary goal of this study is to identify the conventional and critical literacy practices that multilingual students and tutors engage in across cultural, linguistic, and academic discourse communities in order to provide a more accurate representation of the types of literacy practices that multilingual students struggle with throughout the writing process. Finally, this study proposes the ESLRC adopt a translingual approach to writing and tutoring in order to challenge traditional approaches to language learning and writing instruction that privilege English monolingualist expectations in heterogenous learning spaces. Adopting a translingual approach to tutoring in the ESLRC will more fully address the different purposes, conventions, and expectations of student writing across discourses (Horner et al., 2011, p. 303).

This project was designed to serve multiple purposes: 1) scrutinize second-language writing research that fails to acknowledge the sociocultural implications of language use; 2) explore the underlying literacy constructs that drive ideological and pedagogical approaches to second-language tutoring; 3) identify the linguistic, cultural, and academic discourse communities that members of the ESLRC participate in; 4) analyze the wide range of literacy practices that students engage in throughout the writing process; and 5) provide some heuristic strategies and tools that encourage instructors, tutors, and students to adopt a translingual approach to writing which cultivates both critical literacy practices, and conventional literacy practices in the ESLRC.
Overview of the Project

This project acknowledges the ideological and pedagogical divide that currently exists in composition studies and TESOL research and recognizes that a translingual writing approach offers a more accurate representation of the complex literacy practices multilingual students in heterogeneous learning spaces actually engage in. This study attempts to provide a more accurate representation of the complex literacy practices multilingual students in the ESLRC at CSUC actually engage in.

Chapter II explores theories of learning across multiple disciplines including composition studies, literacy studies, second-language writing, TESOL, and translingualism. This interdisciplinary review of the literature challenges traditional approaches to second-language writing and reading research. A brief analysis of current trends in TESOL and composition studies research reveals the ideological and pedagogical divide that exists between the two fields, and calls for a more integrated approach to second-language writing instruction. Key terms relevant to literacy and writing theory are also identified throughout the chapter.

Chapter III responds to appeals from translingual researchers to focus new research on the literacy practices of multilingual writers beyond traditional classroom spaces. This chapter explains the methods of data collection used to complete this qualitative research study and focuses on how the study was designed to more accurately identify and analyze the wide range of literacy and writing practices that multilingual students engage in across discourses.

Chapter IV investigates how data collected from multilingual student interviews emerged into key findings. This chapter also explores how myths surrounding
the nature of language and conflicting literacy constructs identified throughout established literature influence how students participate in the Center. Further discussion and analysis key findings support established research that suggests adopting a translingual writing approach to tutoring in the ESLRC.

Chapter V demonstrates how emergent findings from this study underpin established research that urges second-language professionals and paraprofessionals in heterogenous learning spaces, like the ESLRC, to adopt a more inclusive critical literacy framework that challenges traditional instructional and tutoring practices. The project concludes by presenting the implications of key findings to students, tutors, and instructors in the form of an infographic. This translingual “toolkit” identifies specific points of intervention where the ESLRC can help students negotiate the choices and resources available to them throughout the writing process.

Limitations of the Project

Several factors beyond the researcher’s control limited the effectiveness of this study. The primary limitation was the small sample size. Since this study only focuses on a small sample of multilingual students at a single institution, findings from this study are not necessarily representative of all students who frequent the ESLRC at CSUC and may not be an accurate representation of other multilingual writing centers. The small sample size is particularly problematic with heterogeneous language and cultural populations because one individual’s opinion or practice does necessarily reflect the opinions or practices of all members of a particular discourse community. Since
participation in the study was voluntary, it was impossible to include students from all major international and domestic language and cultural groups that frequent the Center.

Although a small number of domestic students whose primary language is not English also utilize the Center, the sample did not actually include any domestic students. Also, only interviewing students one time does not allow students to reflect on their experiences over time. It should also be noted that the researcher maintained dual roles while conducting research for this study and, thus, could not be considered entirely objective. Working closely with students as a tutor, and also as an instructor, may have inadvertently influenced student responses during the interviews.

Originally, this study sought to also include a small sample of tutors in order to offer a more complete picture of the literacy practices of all members of the ESLRC participate in. After conducting, transcribing, and coding the six tutors’ interviews, time constraints prevented the researcher from conducting a complete analysis of tutor interview data in this study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

As the number of international students on North American campuses continues to increase, so does the need to better support this rapidly increasing student population. This review of current multilingual literacy and writing research explores the theoretical frameworks that inform pedagogical approaches to tutoring in multilingual learning spaces. The majority of writing center research on college campuses focuses on “mainstream” writing centers that serve primarily monolingual, native-English speaker writers from homogeneous cultural backgrounds. Although there is ample research that focuses on the social learning and literacy practices of monolingual English speaking writers in writing spaces, very little research in the field of literacy studies focuses specifically on the literacy practices of multilingual writer populations in mixed language writing spaces.

This chapter seeks to move beyond a surface level analysis of previously established literature surrounding second-language writing and literacy in order to more deeply understand how second-language writing research is a function of broader social systems and literacy constructs. Writing, like all social practice, needs to be examined on multiple levels in order to understand how it functions within larger social and cultural systems. Traditional approaches to second-language research tend to focus on narrow
units of linguistic analysis, rather than broader conceptualizations of language as social 
practice. Traditional approaches to second-language writing research focus almost 
exclusively on the conventional literacy practices of multilingual writers, therefore 
offering an incomplete picture of multilingual literacy across discourses. Although 
sociocultural approaches to second-language learning have slowly permeated second-
language writing research, most research still does not explore the broad range of 
conventional and critical literacy practices multilingual writers engage in throughout the 
composition process. Since second-language research fails to offer a more complete 
picture of the complex learning process associated with second-language writing, second-
language professionals and paraprofessionals often adopt pedagogical practices based on 
popular assumptions about language learning. These unsubstantiated, tacit theories of 
learning are based on “generalizations that people have not overtly considered and 
explicitly spelled out to themselves and others” (Gee, 2012, p. 13). Tacit theories tend to 
reinforce dominant cultural values and preexisting power dynamics, and fail to 
acknowledge issues of access and equity in academic learning spaces (Gee, 2012, p. 13). 
Academic research which fails to acknowledge the broader social and cultural 
implications of language and learning can not overtly challenge these myths and 
assumptions and, therefore, reifies dominant literacy constructs (Gee, 2012, p. 13).

This literature review begins by exploring how perceptions of literacy and 
learning influence how educational researchers identify and frame problems related to 
language and learning across disciplines. Implicit assumptions toward language and 
learning determine whether literature in a particular field focuses on small-scale, discrete 
features of language, or larger, sociocultural aspects of literacy and learning. After
exploring how large scale educational and literacy paradigms shape the available literature, the chapter provides a review of established research that explores writing and resource centers through a sociocultural lense. Next, the review identifies and analyzes a series of conflicting literary constructs present in current literature surrounding writing and reading research across disciplines. Finally, the chapter concludes by scrutinizing traditional theories of learning by exploring the sociocultural implications of perpetuating myths about the nature of language and learning in multilingual learning spaces.

**Literacy and Learning Paradigms**

Social constructivist theories of learning challenge *conventional literacy* constructs and traditional learning paradigms, which assume that learning is an internal process that happens “inside” the learner’s mind, rather than situationally, through interaction with the outside world (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 47). Preeminent social learning theorists Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger (1991) oppose, “conventional explanations [which] view learning as a process by which a learner internalizes knowledge” (p. 47). Assuming that learning is simply a process of internalization “establishes a sharp dichotomy between inside and outside, [and] suggests that knowledge is largely cerebral, and takes the individual as the non problematic unit of analysis” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 47). One of the “far-reaching assumptions” surrounding learning and literacy that Lave and Wenger address in their research is the tendency of researchers to reduce complex social processes into “non problematic unit[s] of analysis” (p. 47). The majority of second-language research has adopted this “non
problematic” unit of analysis which focuses primarily on surface level features of language, and fails acknowledge the complex sociocultural aspects of language.

Lave and Wenger (1991) claim, “Learning must be understood with respect to a practice as a whole, with its multiplicity of relations—both within the community and with the world at large” (p. 114). Language instruction which fails to explore language as social practice with its “multiplicity of relations” (p. 114) offers a narrow view of literacy and learning. Gee draws on linguist Stephen Krashen’s *learning acquisition distinction* (2001b, p. 540) to highlight the difference between inauthentic learning, which is the result of overt instruction, and acquiring literacies naturally by engaging in communicative practices with others. Lave and Wenger (1991), Krashen (1982), Street (2001) and Gee (2001b) all caution educators against viewing language and learning as teachable skills, rather than social practices acquired through making meaning with others. Gee (2001b) draws on the work of Lev Vygotsky (1978), Krashen (1982), and Lave and Wenger (1991), when he asserts that languages, like discourses, cannot be mastered by overt instruction. Instead, individuals acquire languages and discourses through a complex process of enculturation or apprenticeship through meaningful social interaction (Gee, 2001b, p. 527; 2012, p. 168). An individual acquires secondary discourses, or identities that differ from their primary, home-based discourse, by acquiring multiple “ways of being” (Gee, 2001b, p. 526). According to Gee, “A discourse is a sort of ‘identity-kit’ which comes complete with the appropriate costume and instructions on how to act, talk, and often write, so as to take on a particular role that others will recognize” (2001b, p. 526). Literacy, according to Gee, is the result of

Sociolinguists, like Gee (2001b, 2012), argue since reading and writing are social practices, they should be explored through larger sociocultural lenses that situate the practices of reading and writing within larger discourse communities.

Communities of Practice

Lave and Wenger define a community of practice as an activity system where “participants share understandings concerning what they are doing, and what that means for their communities” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 98). This definition of a community of practice is problematic in regards to writing and resource centers because students and tutors participate in very different communities, for different purposes, and do not necessarily “share understandings” of the practices they engage in both inside and outside the physical space of the writing center. Lave and Wenger (1991) later expand their definition of community of practice to include “a set of relations among persons, activity, and world over time and in relation with other tangential and overlapping communities of practice” (p. 98). This definition of community of practice seems to align more closely with writing and resource centers since they are physical spaces where student writers who participate in a variety of “tangential and overlapping” discourse communities come together. However, the term community of practice does not fully encompass the wide variety of purposes and identities that multilingual writers and tutors engage in while participating in multilingual writing and resources centers, such as the ESLRC. Student writers and tutees who participate in writing and resource centers on college campuses are not necessarily doing so with the express purpose of becoming full participants in a
writing center community of practice; instead, they are participating in the community to complete a task that will help them assume an academic and professional identity outside of the writing center community.

Affinity Spaces

Gee offers an alternative social learning model to Lave and Wenger’s CoP model (as cited in Lankshear & Knobel, 2011, pp. 68, 78). Gee’s *affinity spaces* model emphasizes the spaces and contexts where social learning actually occurs, rather than a particular identity participants themselves are in the process of acquiring (Lankshear & Knobel, 2011, p. 68). According to Lankshear and Knobel (2011), “Gee describes affinity spaces as: specifically designed spaces (physical and virtual) constructed to resource people [who are] tied together . . . by a shared interest or endeavor” (p. 68). An *affinity spaces* model of social learning is applicable to writing and resource centers because the “primary motivation of most participants in writing and resource centers is to participate in the community in order to create some sort of written artifact,” or assigned task (Lankshear & Knobel, 2011, p. 82). Students and tutors participating in writing and resource centers take on multiple identities by engaging in the literacy and writing practices of multiple academic discourses to complete different tasks. Lankshear and Knobel recognize that what motivates individuals to participate in affinity spaces is very different than what motivates individuals to participate in a community of practice:

People participating in affinity spaces are doing so under the primary motivation of creating some kind of artifact to meet a personal (or joint) purpose, rather than from motivation of further enhancing an affinity, [or] community of practice. (p. 78)
Following Gee’s discourse model, affinity spaces act as hubs of social learning where participants participate in the space or discourse community without the express goal for becoming more full participants in a single discourse community. Lankshear and Knobel (2011, p. 78) suggests learning institutions include affinity spaces where participants are able to engage in deep learning, which operate within greater activity systems and discourse communities. Gee is quick to point out, however, that these spaces often take place outside of the physical walls of the brick and mortar classroom (as cited in Lankshear & Knobel, 2011, pp. 67-68). Since authentic learning most often occurs outside of formal classroom spaces, more second-language research needs to focus on CoP and affinity spaces on college campuses, such as multilingual writing and resources centers.

Writing and resource centers are spaces where students are acquiring North American academic discourse by engaging in the practices of “acting, talking, and writing” with tutors (Gee, 2001b, p. 526). Unfortunately, most research surrounding second-language writing and resource centers fails to analyze how second-language writing functions within larger academic and social discourse communities. Experts in writing center scholarship, Geller, Eodice, Condon, Carroll, and Boquet (2007) emphasize how important it is for student writers and tutors to “operate in the betwixt-and-between state in which so much of our [writing center] work must be done” (p. 8). Although Geller et al. (p. 8) and others encourage writing professionals and paraprofessional to view writing and tutoring as complex process, the overwhelming majority of second-language research largely ignores the wide range of literacy practices that writers and tutors engage in throughout the composition process. Most second-
language writing research focuses almost exclusively on the final written product, largely ignoring the bulk of the work associated with the “betwixt-and-between” state of writing and tutoring that Geller et al. (p. 8) mention. In order for second-language writing literature to provide a more complete picture of the literacy practices multilingual students engage in throughout the composition process, more research needs to be conducted that focuses on the “work associated with the ‘betwixt-and-between’ nature of second-language writers in writing communities” (Geller et al., 2007, p. 8).

Although ample research has been conducted in literacy and composition research that explores writing and research centers through a sociocultural lens, research in second-language writing rarely includes the literacy and writing practices of multilingual learners throughout the composition process. The studies that do explore writing and resource centers as affinity spaces (McCarthy & Nahas, 2011, pp. 153-164) are not specific to sheltered ESL classrooms or learning spaces, so second-language professionals and paraprofessionals rarely access it. This hyper-specific attitude towards literature surrounding language and learning creates large gaps in literacy and writing research specific to sheltered second-language learning spaces and reaffirms dominant literacy constructs in the field of second-language writing.

Conflicting Literacy and Writing Constructs

Second-Language Writing

The lack of evidence-based scholarly research that explores reading and writing as social practice in sheltered ESL learning spaces leads second-language professionals to adopt pedagogical approaches to language instruction which fail to
explore the significance of reading and writing in broader sociocultural contexts (Matsuda, Cox, Jordan, & Orteier-Hoppe, 2011). In the early 1990s, preeminent second-language writing researchers Paul Kei Matsuda, Toni Silva, and others recognized that the needs of multilingual student writers on college campuses were not necessarily being met in mainstream composition classrooms or in sheltered ESL classroom spaces (Matsuda et al., 2011, p. 7). The interdisciplinary field of second-language writing emerged as a response to the lack of research surrounding the literacy and writing practices of second-language writers in TESOL and composition studies research. Second-language writing research integrates theories of social learning from sociolinguistics, composition studies, and TESOL into second-language writing spaces (Matsuda et al., 2011, p. 20). Similar to second-language writing, literacy studies is an interdisciplinary field that emerged in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Literacy studies approaches literacy and learning from a critical or sociocultural perspective, drawing on the fields of sociology, social psychology, sociolinguistics, and anthropology to explore learning as social action (Knobel & Lankshear, 2007, p. 2). The field of literacy studies focuses on the practices associated with literacy and learning in a broad range of contexts, including reading and writing in academic contexts. Literacy studies and composition studies professionals tend to reject conventional literacy models that perpetuate prescriptive approaches to language and learning which privilege direct instruction of reading, writing, speaking, and listening as isolated “skills.” Instead, literacy and composition professional tend to adopt a critical literacy framework, which emphasize pedagogical approaches that focus on learning as social action.
Sociolinguistic approaches to multilingual writing and literacy research are in direct conflict with traditional teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) research, which tend to focus on analyzing individual units of language outside of social contexts. Although TESOL professionals have slowly begun to embrace research practices that align more closely with social theories of learning, there is still a lack of TESOL research that views writing as social practice in multilingual writing spaces where social learning is occurring across classrooms, languages, cultures, genres, and fields of study (Matsuda et al., 2011, p. 15). Emergent research in literacy studies and second-language writing which more fully integrates social theories of learning into second-language writing and tutoring spaces has prompted a paradigm shift in second-language instruction (Matsuda et al., 2011, p. 20). This shift towards a more integrated instructional framework is in direct conflict with traditional literacy and writing constructs that have traditionally dominated TESOL research and instructional practices. TESOL research overwhelmingly adopts a conventional literacy model that perpetuates prescriptive approaches to literacy and writing instruction in second language learning spaces. This preference has been a huge source of contention within the fields of literacy and composition studies, and TESOL.

analysis of the current trends in literacy and writing research across composition and TESOL research by analyzing a years worth of articles published in the *TESOL Quarterly Journal* (TQ), and *Research in the Teaching of English* (RTE) journal. After analyzing articles in both journals, the authors identify the following five conflicting literacy constructs present in TESOL and composition studies literature: 1) writing to learn versus learning to write, 2) knowledge telling versus knowledge transforming, 3) adopting a deficit approach to writing instruction versus an anti-deficit approach to writing instruction, 4) viewing writing as process, and 5) views surrounding explicit instruction. Each of the aforementioned five conflicting literacy constructs will be discussed in greater detail in subsequent sections. All five of the conflicting literacy constructs identified in Jeffery et al.’s (2012) article illustrate the tendency of TQ researchers and practitioners to privilege traditional expert-centered pedagogical approaches which privilege *conventional literacy practices*, and the tendency of composition researchers to privilege *critical literacy practices* and student-centered pedagogical approaches to second-language writing.

1. **Writing to learn versus learning to write.**

The first of the five conflicting literacy constructs identified by Jeffery et al.’s (2012), is the idea that students in second-language classrooms are typically *learning to write* rather than *writing to learn*. TESOL research tends to “emphasize writing competence as an ultimate goal” and views writing as “a means of learning a language” (section, 3.0). Consequently, researchers in second-language writing tend to see writing as a tool for language development, rather than as a communicative tool for increasing
student understanding. Whereas the emphasis on writing to learn in highly situated contexts is more typically found in RTE research.

2. **Knowledge telling versus knowledge transforming.**

The second conflicting literacy constructs Jeffery et al. (2012) identity is *knowledge telling* versus *knowledge transforming*. According to the authors, *knowledge transforming* requires students to critically analyze previous authors’ work in order to compose original research-driven claims. TQ “articles that focused on writing as knowledge telling tended to present writing as a measure of language ability and often presented successful writing as clear communication or native-like language output” (section, 3.3). This idea contrasts sharply with RTE research which most often focuses on “the challenges of transforming academic knowledge through writing” (section, 3.3). One way that students transform knowledge is by “composing critiques and interpretations” (section, 3.3) of academic source materials.

3. **Deficit-approach versus an anti-deficit approach.**

The third conflicting literacy construct Jeffery et al. (2012) analyze is the anti-deficit model of writing versus a deficit model of writing. A deficit approach to second-language writing research is the tendency for TQ studies to “quantify patterns of error in texts produced by L2 (second language) learners” (Jeffery et al., 2012, section 3.5). Deficit-approaches to writing focus exclusively on producing error-free texts with native-like production. Privileging accuracy over other critical literacy practices deters students from engaging in more cognitively demanding practices (Jeffery et al., 2012, section, 3.5). Knowledge transforming requires students to further complicate arguments established by previous authors by contributing new ideas, rather than focusing
exclusively on restating other authors arguments with linguistic accuracy. The preference for focusing on knowledge-telling over knowledge transforming in TQ research suggests that multilingual writers are often encouraged to simply parrot the ideas of native English writers accurately, rather than express their own ideas at the expense of committing possible errors (Jeffery et al., 2012, section, 3.4). RTE research has historically rejected this deficit-model of writing which tends to focus on summarizing and reproducing expert driven texts accurately over an anti-deficit model that privileges the writer’s ability to compose original, claim driven arguments and engage in critical literacy practices (Jeffery et al., 2012, section, 3.5).

4. Writing as process-sentence level revision versus above sentence level revision.

The fourth area of conflict Jeffery et al. (2012) identify is viewing writing as process. They point out that composition researchers overwhelmingly view writing as a recursive process “in which authors shift among reading, planning, composing, and revising activities, attending to different aspects of discourse throughout (section 3.4).” On the other hand, TQ researcher views recursive writing as a tool for identifying below sentence level and sentence level errors in order to maintain native-like accuracy. Jeffery et al. (2012) found that composition research tends to focus almost exclusively on above sentence level revision such as organization, argumentation, and feedback practices, while the majority of TQ research focused on below sentence level revision. In fact, no composition research in the selected journal focused on sentence level errors of any kind. Whereas TQ researchers were more likely to identify issues with specific linguistic features. Although TQ research “often reflected the view that such attention should be
situated in an understanding of ‘the value of discourse knowledge’” (Suzuki, 2008, p. 226, as cited in Jeffery et al., 2012, section 3.5), the preference for identifying and analyzing errors was the driving factor in the recursive process in TQ research (Jeffery et al., 2012, section 3.5). TQ researchers’ preference for identifying errors throughout the revision process also justifies the need for explicit instruction of sentence level or below sentence level errors.

**Explicit Instruction of Grammar vs. Explicit Instruction of Rhetoric and Genre**

The final conflicting literacy construct addressed in Jeffery et al.’s (2012) article is the definition of the term explicit instruction. TQ research tends to utilize the term *explicit instruction* when describing instruction of sentence level or below sentence level features of language, while RTE research tends to utilize the term *explicit instruction* when referring to strategies for developing rhetorical and genre awareness in order to increase metacognitive awareness (Jeffery et al., 2012, section 3.6). Once again, the study confirmed RTE research tends to focus on writing as a tool for analyzing and interpreting texts, which focuses on developing higher order concerns, and encourages knowledge construction and transformation (Jeffery et al., 2012, section 3.6). Conversely, TQ research tends to focus on writing as a tool for summarizing texts produced by “expert” native English speaker writers with a focus on explicit instruction on lower order concerns and sentence level features of language in order to maintain native-like accuracy.
Conflicting Literacy and Reading Constructs

Although Jeffery et al.’s 2012 study focused exclusively on writing, many of the conflicting literacy constructs identified in writing research also applies reading research across academic disciplines. Not surprisingly, second-language reading research, much like second-language writing research, tends to approach reading as an isolated skill that can be mastered through overt instruction rather than as a natural, communicative practice that individuals engage in order to participate in a particular discourse community.

Reading to Learn Versus Learning to Read

Like writing, much of the literature surrounding second-language reading research is based on pragmatic approaches to reading instruction which emphasizes learning to read rather than reading to learn. Second-language reading literature tends to view learning to read as the process of accurately decoding texts (Smith, 2012, p. 6). Whereas reading to learn is focused on purposeful reading which “always involves feelings as well as knowledge and experience” (Smith, 2012, p. 178). Reading to learn, or top-down approaches to reading tend focus on exploring the rhetorical and communicative function of texts in relation to broader discourse communities. According to Gee, reading “at the very least is the ability to interpret print . . . but an assertion of print is just a viewpoint on a set of symbols, and viewpoints are always embedded in a discourse (2001b, p. 540). Gee claims that the best way for all learners, including second-language learners, to acquire reading skills is to expose them to reading within the context of a discourse (2001b, p. 540).
Natural (Anti-Deficit) Approach Versus Deficit Approach (Direct Instruction) to Reading Instruction

Krashen (2004, 2009a, 2009b) and Smith (2012) are both critical of direct instruction of reading strategies, which they argue results in overt instruction of innate processes that students would naturally acquire on their own through practice (Krashen, 2009a, p. 24). Krashen (2009a) claims, “Only one method of improving reading ability really works: engaging in a great deal of interesting (better yet compelling), comprehensible reading. Massive evidence supports this view, both in first and second-language research” (p. 20). According to Krashen (2004), individuals from all language backgrounds “who read more: read and write better, spell better, have larger vocabularies, and have better control of complex grammatical constructions” (p. 20).

Krashen (2009a, p. 25) offers two instructional strategies for making text more comprehensible for both first and second-language learners. The first is “narrow reading” that is, reading one genre, or one author, or texts about a single topic, or reading series books (Krashen, 2009a, p. 5; also see Cho, Ahn, & Krashen, 2005) This instructional strategy allows learners to build on highly contextualized knowledge they have gained from similar texts they have previously read. The second strategy Krashen (2009a) offers is to allow students to select “much of what they read themselves” (p. 25). Krashen (2009a, p. 20) claims that current research in second-language reading overwhelmingly supports self-selective reading as an effective instructional practice in the L2 classroom (see Krashen, 2009a, page 20, for a comprehensive list of self-selected reading research studies in L2 classroom contexts). According to Krashen (2009a), “self-selected, voluntary reading result[s] in unmistakable improvement in reading and other aspects of
literacy” (p. 20). Krashen argues that most instructors are hesitant to allow self-selection of reading materials because they believe that students will simply not read the materials they select independently, but research actually suggests the opposite. If students have access to interesting comprehensible reading materials, are given the opportunity to self-select reading materials, and have time to read in class, research suggests that reading comprehension will improve (Krashen, 2009a, p. 21). Krashen is also quick to point out the negative correlation between the time instructors dedicate to direct reading instruction and students reading test scores (2009a, p. 21; 2009b, p. 73). Notably, the more time instructors dedicate to overt instruction of phonics, the worse the students performed overall (Krashen, 2009b, p. 73).

**Reading as Process**

Composition and literacy studies research tends to recognize the interconnectedness of reading and writing throughout the learning process, whereas pragmatic approaches to reading, often called bottom-up approaches, often ignore the interconnectedness of reading and writing (Smith, 2012, p. 178). TESOL research tends to isolate reading and writing as separate skills that can be taught in isolation from one another. Smith claims thinking is a natural human capacity and suggests “reading also can never be separated from writing or thinking,” and thus can not be broken down into sets of skills (Smith, 2012, p. 178). The complex relationship between the critical reading practices and academic writing practices of multilingual writers also needs to be explored further in multilingual learning spaces. Leading literacy and reading specialists, James Gee (2001b, p. 540), Frank Smith (2012), and Stephen Krashen (2004, 2009a) argue that reading and writing are not “skills” that can be separated. Despite the ample research,
which supports this view, the majority of second-language research tends to focus on reading and writing as isolated skills, and usually focuses on one demonstrable “skill.” A skills-based approach to second-language writing and reading instruction assumes that reading and writing can be separated from one another, and taught in isolation in an academic contexts.

Integrating reading and writing along with other communicative actions is a foundational principle translingualism. Lu and Horner identity integrating reading as a tenet of translingualism, “reading-writing as integrally related acts of translation-transformation (2012, p. 3). A translingual approach to language defines all acts of reading and writing, speaking, and listening as related acts of translation and transformation as well as negotiation (Lu & Horner, 2012, p. 4).

**Views Surrounding Explicit Instruction of Reading**

The problem with reading classes, according to Gee, “is that a “reading class” stresses learning and not acquisition” (Gee, 2001b, p. 540). Smith (2012) and Krashen (2009a) assert that prediction, or the process of asking questions and making inferences as you read, is a natural phenomenon, and thus question the benefits of overt instruction of prediction practices in the classroom. Krashen (2009a) cautions teachers against adopting methods that encourage “reading-like-behavior, such as intensive phonics instruction, or advice that teaches students to use strategies that are innate such as prediction, that they will acquire anyway as they read” (p. 19). Krashen states (2009a), “The only time readers are unable to make reasonable predictions is when texts are incomprehensible or very boring!” (p. 24). The cure for this is not to “teach prediction”
or ask questions for students, but rather to make sure comprehensible and interesting reading materials are easily available to them (Krashen, 2009a, p. 24).

Tacit Theories of Learning

Many widespread assumptions surrounding writing and literacy are based on popular theories that have not been supported through empirical research. These unsubstantiated, or tacit, theories are based on “generalizations that people have not overtly considered and explicitly spelled out to themselves and others” (Gee, 2012, p. 13). Although tacit theories of learning are easily discounted by overt learning theories that have been substantiated through research, collective cultural understandings of language and learning are so pervasive that they often, overshadow academic scholarship. Since dominant cultural assumptions regarding the nature of language and learning are inextricably linked to accessing cultural and linguistic capital, individuals from dominant cultural discourses have a vested interest in maintaining assumptions that allow them to retain dominant cultural power and the unearned privilege associated with that power. It is important for second-language professionals and paraprofessional to understand how tacit learning theories help to maintain systems of social and cultural stratification, and reify conventional literacy constructs that serve to disempower learners from non-dominant cultural discourses.

The Native Speaker Fallacy

Since a discourse cannot simply be taught, or acquired through overt instruction, social learning theorists are highly critical of popular assumptions that assume native English speaking instructors, or tutors, can simply impart their knowledge
of English by “teaching” multilingual students discrete skills. Lave and Wenger (1991) describe teaching curricula as “Didactic instruction of newcomers by mediating newcomers learning through an expert” (p. 97). Conventional skills-based approaches to tutoring and language instruction which call for explicit instruction of below sentence level errors mediated through a native-speaker “expert” is an example of didactic instruction. This didactic, expert mediated-approach, to language learning is particularly problematic in heterogeneous learning spaces because it reinforces monolingualism.

Phillipson (1992, p. 182, as cited in Selvi, 2011, p. 187) describes the preference for native-English speaker teachers from standard dialects over qualified non-native speaker teachers as the “native speaker fallacy.” The native speaker as expert fallacy is a phenomenon which privileges the collective cultural knowledge and conventional literacy practices of expert from dominant cultural discourses regardless of their professional qualifications, training or professional development (Selvi, 2011). The preference for native-English speaker instructors and language professionals from dominant cultural backgrounds and standard English dialects has been widely documented (Ellis, 2004; Phillipson, 1992; Selvi, 2011).

The preference for native-English speaker teachers (NESTs) also applies to tutors. Expert-driven approaches to second-language tutoring center on the belief that native-English speaker tutors from dominant cultural backgrounds can “fix” multilingual student writing by simply eradicating sentence-level errors that would otherwise reveal a writer’s primary language or cultural discourse is not standard English. This approach privileges the collective cultural knowledge of the native English speaker, regardless of the tutor’s knowledge of composition theory, previous tutoring experience, mastery of
field-specific genre conventions, or knowledge of the content area. This assumption also translates to the belief that native-English speaker writers are more capable “expert” writers and tutors than their multilingual counterparts.

Multiple studies (Ellis, 2004; Phillipson, 1992; Selvi, 2011) explore the implications of multilingual expert teachers and tutors in language learning contexts. Ellis (2004) asserts that the native versus non-native English speaker teacher debate that has dominated TESOL literature detracts from a much more relevant discussion of instructors’ language backgrounds. Ellis (2004) claims that discussions of instructors’ language backgrounds for native-English speakers are “all but invisible in teacher education, employment, and professional development” (p. 90). Ellis (2004) argues that an instructor’s professional development, and experience learning or attempting to learn a second-language (i.e., mastering a secondary discourse) is a far better indicator of their effectiveness than whether or not that instructor is a native speaker.

Ellis (2004) claims that multilingual teachers, or teachers that have mastered a secondary discourse, have a more complete understanding of the systematic nature of language. As a consequence, multilingual teachers have a meta-knowledge to draw from that native speakers from dominant primary discourses are lacking (Ellis, 2004, pp. 97-99, 103). Multilingual instructors are able to draw on variety of successful language learning strategies to inform their teaching regardless of their first language. Although non-native English Speaker teachers (NNESTs) may speak accented English, or maintain some linguistic features of primary language, they have the ability to draw on their own experiences learning a second-language and the meta-knowledge that goes along with that (Ellis, 2004, pp. 97-99). Ellis encourages embracing the strengths and weaknesses of
native and non-native speaker teachers, and encourages instructors to focus on student-centered collaborative learning practices regardless of the instructors’ language background.

Ellis (2004) reports, “If a teacher has never learned another language, he or she can only present as articles of faith what might or might not work” (p. 103). Since a monolingual speaker has not tested language learning theories themselves, through experiential learning, their own theories are not necessarily overt theories language. (Ellis, 2004, p. 103). Following Ellis’ argument (2004, p. 103), monolingual tutors, who have never been forced to test their own theories or assumptions about second-language acquisition, are more likely to adopt tacit theories of learning. Native English speaker as expert-centered tutoring practices may perpetuate tacit assumptions about the nature of language, which reinforce traditional institutional pedagogical practices and dominant literacy constructs.

Ellis points out, if the content of a language classroom focuses exclusively on superficial linguistic features of English, such as mastering native-like production, the monolingual native English speaker teacher will maintain their power as the sole authority on the target language in the learning space. Gee (2001b) is highly critical of pedagogical practices, which reinforce the social stratification of native and non-native speakers:

Very often dominant groups in a society apply rather constant ‘tests’ of the fluency of the dominant Discourse in which their power is symbolized. These tests take on two different functions: they are tests of “natives” or at least, ‘fluent users’ of the Discourse, and they are gates to exclude ‘non-natives.’ (p. 528)
Maintaining native speaker as expert centered pedagogical practices reinforces these gatekeeping mechanisms in higher education.

Although many studies (Ellis, 2004; Selvi, 2011) have concluded that bilingual and multilingual instructors have a better understanding of the literacy practices necessary to acquire a second or other language regardless of their first language, and have often received more teacher training, the preference for native English speaker instructors persists.

“Bad English” Ideology

In addition to the native-English speaker fallacy, the “bad English” instructional model is another tacit learning theory that impacts second-language writing research. The “bad English” model follows the popular belief that native speakers of English who speak non-dominant dialects simply speak “bad English.” Gee (2012) identifies four generalizations of the bad English theory that also influence literacy constructs in second-language learning spaces:

1. People learn to speak their language by exposure to “intelligent” (“successful”) and well-educated people, either at home or at school, or both and to the writing of such people.
2. The speaking and writing of “intelligent” and well-educated people is what counts as “correct” language.
3. This exposure leads to “correct” language, provided the person has enough exposure and that exposure is not mitigated by a “bad” home environment that undermines the good model supplied to the child at school or in books, and if the child is well enough motivated and mentally equipped to learn the “correct” language.
4. Some people speak and use their language better than other people, either because of the degree of their exposure to the correct models or because of their native abilities. (p. 14)

Gee challenges these four tacit assumptions by pointing out that linguists have actually already discounted most of the “bad English” theory years ago through primary
research in the field of linguistics, thus making the linguistic theory an overt theory (Gee, 2012, pp. 19-20).

Linguists do not actually classify languages, dialects, or individual speakers as “good” or “bad.” Overt linguistic theories assert that all language is correct if it serves a communicative function, including speakers of nonstandard dialects of English and second-language learners who speak accented English, or maintain linguistic features of their primary language while communicating in English. Linguists acknowledge that everyone learns to speak by participating in meaningful communication with others regardless of the dialect they speak. Therefore, children learn to speak because they are spoken to, not because they are taught to speak “correctly.” Similarly, children or students acquire the dialect of their surround. Following this assumption, a speaker’s dialect, has absolutely no bearing on their intelligence or writing ability. Unfortunately, all four of the assumptions that Gee identifies in the bad English theory are widely accepted by teaching ESL writing instructors, and have been reified following the native speaker as expert instructional model. Gee (2012) argues the “bad English” ideology serves to maintain the established power dynamic in learning spaces by privileging the linguistic features of those in power. “What people in power believe is simply an expression or reflection of their desire, whether conscious or not, to retain and enhance their power” (Gee, 2012, p. 7). The “bad English” theory reinforces the established power dynamic in the second-language learning spaces by ensuring that the instructor will be the only individual with the cultural capital that accompanies mastering the most superficial aspects of languages, like spelling and pronunciation. The belief that standard native-English speaker tutors, are “better” tutors, teachers, or writers, simply because
their home based or primary discourse is the dominant discourse of the target language, is just one example of the “bad English” theory.

Tacit theories often oversimplify the complex process of second-language acquisition into easily definable master and apprentice roles which essentially creates a false dichotomy, limiting the types of instructional practices and literacy practices that individuals engage in academic contexts. Maintaining traditional “expert” and “new comer” roles during tutoring sessions also prevents students and tutors from engaging in an authentic two-way dialogue that prompts complex rhetorical and cross-cultural analysis, increases student and tutor metacognitive awareness, and knowledge of writing across discourse communities. Although tacit theories of learning are constantly challenged and discounted through educational research, popular assumptions surrounding the nature of language and learning continue to shape educational paradigms and traditional approaches to second-language learning. The “native speaker fallacy” (Phillipson, 1992, p. 185) and the “bad English” theory (Gee, 2012, p. 14) both serve as gatekeeping mechanisms in multilingual learning spaces where students are from non dominant primary discourses and instructors are from dominant cultural discourses. These tacit theories ensure the native speaker teacher retains social “goods” and power in the classroom. Learning spaces that privilege dominant linguistic and cultural discourse, over non dominant discourses reinforce a deficit approach to language instruction

Translingual Approaches

Translingualism rejects tacit learning theories of learning privileged by monolingualism, while simultaneously challenging dominant cultural assumptions about language and power. Translingualism demands the focus of writing instruction shifts
from an expert-mediated, deficit-centered approach that ensures students produce error
free texts with native like production, to an anti-deficit approach that supports students as
they identify and negotiate the various rhetorical choices available to them throughout the
writing process.

Matsuda (2014) alluding to the work of translingualist scholars Horner et al.
(2011), Lu and Horner (2012), and others identifies the following four assumptions
prevalent in translingual scholarship:

1) Monolingualism is prevalent and problematic, 2) the presence of language
differences is normal and desirable, 3) languages are neither discrete or stable; they
are dynamic and negotiated, 4) practicing translingual writing involves the
negotiation of language differences. (p. 476)

The four assumptions Matsuda (2014, p. 476) identifies as underlying foundational
principles of translingualism seem to fill the ideological and pedagogical gaps that Jeffery
et al. (2012) previously noted as lacking in ESL writing research. All four of these
assumptions are further analyzed and discussed in subsequent sections.

Monolingualism is Prevalent and Problematic

Translingualists would argue that promoting tacit theories of learning such as
the “native speaker fallacy” or the “bad English” theory in language learning spaces is
adopting a monolingual approach to instruction. One reason Gee (2012) is so critical of
the “bad English” theory is because it equates any deviation from the standard form of
English as indicative of a deficit or lack of intelligence. Lu and Horner (2012) further
explore the socio cultural implications of monolingualism:

Monolingualist approaches interpret apparent deviations from what is thought to be
Standard Written English in students’ writing as evidence of the students cognitive
immaturity, ignorance, laziness, or vulnerability to interference from non
mainstream languages and dialects (which are themselves often viewed as defective). (p. 8)

The idea that all individuals whose primary linguistic and cultural discourses differ from dominant English discourse, are at a deficit, is a cornerstone of monolingualism.

The Presence of Language Differences is Normal and Desirable

Lu and Horner (2012) and Horner et al. (2011) are highly critical of traditional approaches to second-language instruction that, “aim to reduce ‘inference,’ excising what appears to show difference” (Horner et al., 2011, p. 303). Horner et al. (2011) claim:

Monolingualism teaches language users to assume and demand that others accept as correct and conform to a single set of practices with language and, in multilingual situations, to assume and demand that others accept as correct and conform to multiple discrete sets of practices with language. (p. 303)

Adopting a “single set of practices . . . in multilingual situations” (Horner et al. 2011, p. 303) denies students from dominant and non-dominant discourses the opportunity to identify and discuss differences, let alone challenge dominant social constructs.

Unlike monolingualism, which views language difference as inherently bad, or deviant, translingualism embraces linguistic differences. Translingualism focuses on analyzing difference in language in order to better understand the multiplicity of language. Horner et al. (2011) call for a new instructional paradigm: “A translingual approach. This approach sees difference in language not as a barrier to overcome or as a problem to manage, but as a resource for producing meaning in writing, speaking, reading, and listening” (p. 303). Translingualism assumes an anti-deficit approach to language difference. This anti-deficit approach to multilingual writing encourages multilingual students to explore texts as multidimensional products that serve different
purposes. Rather than simply classifying texts as being “good” (i.e., error-free with native-like production) or “bad” (i.e., identifiable as non-standard or “accented” texts), translingualism recognizes the dynamic nature of language.

Languages are Neither Discrete or Stable; They are Dynamic and Negotiated

Lu and Horner (2012) assert that translingualism views “language is a dynamic process of structuration” (p. 3). This approach encourages students to critically analyze texts by exploring their communicative purposes. Emphasizing the rhetorical choices writers make throughout the composition process over accuracy of the product, encourages multilingual writers to critically evaluate the rhetorical purposes of language, and understand that language serves multiple purposes.

Practicing Translingual Writing Involves the Negotiation of Language Differences

Translingualism privileges the practices and process of negotiating differences over composing an error final product with native like accuracy. According to Matsuda (2014), “in translingual writing the process of negotiating assumptions about language is more important than the product” (p. 481). Canagarajah (as cited by De Costa, 2015, p. 182) also emphasizes the “importance of focusing on linguistic practices instead of form” in translingual writing. Translingualism encourages writing to learn and knowledge transformation over learning to write and knowledge telling (Jeffery et al., 2012). Writing to learn has emerged as a foundational principle of translingual writing. Horner et al. (2011) acknowledge that:

Scholars of basic writing have long since exploded the notion that adult writing students improve their writing by first attempting to master the so-called mechanics
of writing before working on what are deemed to be higher-order features of writing. (p. 312)

Since much research across fields has discounted the *learning to write* approach, Horner et al. (2011) offer alternative pedagogical strategies to focusing exclusively on the mechanics of writing. Horner et al. propose: “Students can investigate . . . difference in all features of written language, including syntax, punctuation, formatting, media, organization, media, organization, and genre, addressing these in terms of their interrelatedness” (p. 312). A translingual approach to writing “insists on viewing language differences and fluidities as resources to be preserved, developed, and utilized . . . it sees them as resources” (Lu & Horner, 2012, p. 304). Adopting a theoretical and pedagogical approach to second or multilingual writing that views language difference as a resource, rather than as a disadvantage, has widespread implications for existing power structures in multilingual learning spaces.

**Critical Literacy**

Academic programs, instructors, and tutors that maintain traditional monolingual paradigms and literacy constructs which focus exclusively on deficit-centered *conventional literacy* practices mediated through “expert” native-English speakers reinforce tacit theories of learning, and discourages multilingual students from utilizing all of the cultural and linguistic resource at their disposal. Many times, writing centers are the only places where tutors and students have the opportunity to challenge monolingual approaches to language and writing while engaging in *conventional* and *critical literacy* practices with peers and near peers from a variety of language and cultural backgrounds. Encouraging students and tutors to engage in critical analysis of
texts across discourse communities also provides participants opportunities to engage in discussions of the structural and stylistic differences of writing in a variety of contexts, across cultures, and genres. Writing and resource centers are the perfect spaces for tutors and students to adopt translilingual approaches to writing which encourage both students and tutors to develop a critical framework for reflecting and analyze dominant literacy constructs and implied preferences for literacy and instructional practices in their primary linguistic and cultural discourses:

Classroom instruction (in language, composition, study-skills, writing, critical thinking, content-based literacy or whatever) can lead to meta-knowledge, to see how the Discourses you have already got relate to those you are attempting to acquire, and how the ones you are trying to acquire relate to self and society (Gee, 2001b, p. 532).

Gee (2001b) argues that good teaching and good learning encourages students and tutors in heterogeneous learning spaces to develop this critical framework (p. 543). Too often, the educational system codifies misguided ideologies surrounding language and writing, that discourages individuals from critically analyzing and challenging dominant literacy constructs and established literacy practices.

**Critical Pedagogy**

Krashen (1982), Street (2001), Ellis (2004) Huang (2011), Matsuda et al., (2011) and Gee (2011, 2012) are all highly critical of educational research paradigms that reify traditional expert-centered research and pedagogical approaches to language instruction. Expert-centered approaches to language instruction privilege conventional literacy practices that reinforce dominant cultural norms. Gee (2012) argues that it is the responsibility of an instructor or any individual who retains institutional power to
critically analyze their own assumptions about language and learning in order to avoid perpetuating tacit theories. Gee (2012) states:

If I have a good reason to believe, or others argue convincingly that I ought to have a good reason to believe, that a theory I hold gives me or people like me (however this is defined) an advantage over other people or other groups of people, then my continuing to hold this theory in a tacit and non-primary way is unethical. I have an ethical obligation to explicate my theory, make it overt, and to engage in the sort of thought, discussion, debate and research that would render it a primary theory for me. (pp. 19-20)

Gee urges educators to acknowledge the social and cultural capital that continues to perpetuate tacit theories of learning, in order to challenge tacit assumptions about language and learning. According to Gee, “The liberal classroom that avoids overt talk of form and superficialities, of how things work, as well as of their socio-cultural-political bias, is no help” (2001b, p. 532). In other words learning spaces that focus exclusively on mastering conventional literacy “skills” without also reflecting on the wider cultural and social implications of these skills, prevents members of heterogeneous language and cultural communities from understanding how language is a function of larger social systems. Gee argues that participating in learning spaces that encourage participants to engage in critical analysis of dominant cultural discourses can be liberating, according to Gee (2001b), these “liberating literacies can reconstitute and re-situate us” (p. 529). Although Lave and Wenger (1991), Gee (2011b, 2012), and others assert that one cannot overtly teach students to master a specific set of dominant cultural practices or “skills,” Gee (2012) points out that engaging in critiquing these culturally significant practices and “skills” with students from non-dominant discourses can be liberating. Gee (2001b) further explores the paradox of “teaching” literacy:
People who have been allotted the job of teaching Discourses, for example, English teachers, language teachers, composition teachers, TESOL teachers, study-skills teachers . . . can remark on the paradox that even though discourses cannot be overtly taught, and cannot be mastered late in the game, the University wants teachers to overtly teach and wants students to demonstrate mastery. (p. 531)

It is important to acknowledge that although second-language resource and writing centers, like all academic spaces, are not necessarily the perfect place for students to acquire a second-language, they can and should be effective collaborative learning spaces where students can engage in co-construction of meaning, increase intercultural competence, and develop metacognitive awareness.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Design of Study

According to Matsuda (2014), when adopting a translingual approach to writing, “the first step [is] to learn more about language-its nature, structure, and function as well as users and use-as it pertains to the study and teaching of writing, especially translingual writing (p 483). This study was designed to specifically identify how multilingual students that utilize the ESLRC (users) use language in order to inform future tutoring practice.

This study utilizes one-on-one interviews from a small sample of members of the ESLRC learning community to investigate the wide range of literacy practices members of the ESLRC learning community engage in inside and outside of the Center. The theoretical framework for analysis utilizes social learning theories of learning such as: situated learning, literacy constructs, communities of practice, and discourse analysis to provide a more complete picture of multilingual literacy in heterogeneous writing and resource centers. This qualitative study utilizes first hand accounts from students and tutors who frequently participate in the ESLRC to identify the literacy practices members engage in while participating in discourse communities outside of the ESLRC and within the brick and mortar Center. Interview data reveal the diverse discourse communities
multilingual students participate in, and identifies the *conventional literacy* and *critical literacy* practices students and tutors exercise while participating in the Center.

Second-language writing research focuses disproportionally on the *conventional literacy* practices of multilingual learners in traditional classroom spaces. Very few studies focus on the *critical literacy* practices of multilingual writers. Very few studies focus on the *critical literacy* practices of multilingual learners; therefore, second-language writing research fails to offer a comprehensive view of multilingual literacy in informal collaborative learning spaces like the ESLRC. Interviewing a small but diverse sample of ESLRC members allowed select individuals to offer detailed, first hand, accounts of their literacy and writing practices in order to offer a more complete picture of multilingual literacy.

Noted ethnographic researcher John F. Szwed (1981) acknowledges that “it is not enough to know what a language looks like and to be able to describe and measure it, but one must also know what it means to its users how it is used by them” (p. 422).

Although Szwed’s appeals for language research that expands the units of analysis to include the sociocultural implications of language have been widely documented for over thirty years, the majority of TESOL writing research still relies on research methods that focus primarily on measuring linguistic accuracy, rather than exploring the communicative purposes behind a written sample, or utterance. Research methods that fail to investigate what language means to a participant in a particular context, or fails to acknowledge how a particular sample of language is being used, are focusing exclusively on surface level features of language without exploring how these features are a function of larger social systems. In order to avoid focusing solely on surface level...
decontextualized features of language, Szwed suggests researchers “directly observe literacy in operation with a limited setting” by using ethnographic research methods to better understand how individuals use language. One data collection method Szwed (1981) proposes is to “obtain ‘reading’ and ‘writing autobiographies’—that is, tape recorded personal statements of the use and meaning of specific activities and genres of reading and writing to individuals at various points in their lives” to (p. 429).

Interviewing students, while they reflect on their unique experiences reading or writing, allows students to articulate to the researcher how they use language in highly contextualized ways.

Street (2001) defines “‘literacy practices’ as a broader concept, pitched at a higher level of abstraction and referring to both behavior and conceptualizations related to the use of reading and or writing” (p. 438). An affordance of collecting ethnographic autobiographies is that subjects can describe for the researcher in their own words how they use language in particular settings, for specific purposes. Interviews were the best research method for identifying the “reading and writing practices” of individual members of the ESLRC, including the behaviors and conceptualizations associated with the literacy practices subjects identified.

Interviews also allow both researchers and interview subjects to ask additional follow-up questions “in order to obtain the fullest possible response from an individual” (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2010, p. 134). Interviews provide participants with the opportunity to engage in two-way dialogue with the researcher, so they “elicit data of greater depth than is possible with other measurement techniques” (Gall et al., 2010, p. 134). Interviews seemed the most appropriate method for data collection since the sample
population included individuals from a wide range of language proficiency levels. Interviews gave subjects the opportunity to ask follow up questions about specific terms or concepts they were unfamiliar with during the interview. This dialogic approach to data collection allowed the researcher to reframe interview questions and restate responses for clarification. In-depth semi structured face-to-face interviews were conducted following two interview protocols (Appendix B). Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed for later analysis.

Sample Population

In order for the sample population of this study to accurately represent the diverse membership of the ESLRC learning community, interview data were collected from six students who belonged to diverse linguistic, cultural, and academic discourse communities, and also participated in the Center. In order for the data to accurately reflect the experiences, attitudes, and habits of the established learning community, only students who participated in the ESLRC frequently were included in the sample population.

Student participation in the study was voluntary; the only criteria used for the student selection was that student utilized the Center frequently. Daily student sign-in logs were used to determine a student’s frequent use of the Center. Students who signed the sign-in log multiple times throughout the semester were contacted via email and asked to participate in the study. After being contacted via email and in person, six student participants volunteered to be a part of the study. Since frequenting the Center regularly was the only criterion for student selection, the sample population was a more
accurate representation of international students who attend the Center regularly, then the overall international student demographic at CSUC. This selection process resulted in a diverse sample that included students from a wide range of language and cultural backgrounds, and fields of study. Table 1 shows student participants’ pseudonyms, genders, native country's, primary language and culture, and academic focus. Student participants signed an informed consent before they were interviewed.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamiko</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although international students that utilize the Center have disparate linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds before they arrive on campus, after arriving, institutional language requirements dictate students follow similar academic pathways. According to the California State University, Chico International Student Services website, in order for undergraduate international students to be admitted to the CSUC or directly transfer from their home university to CSUC they must have proof of English Language proficiency. CSUC accepts satisfactory scores on several standardized
tests (TOFL, IELTS, Pearson PTE academic) as proof of English proficiency. If students are not able to provide proof that they meet minimum language proficiency requirements by earning satisfactory standardized test scores, they have several alternatives.

International students also meet the minimal language proficiency requirement if they have previously completed a degree at a secondary or postsecondary school in Australia, Great Britain, Anglophone Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, or the United States or if they complete a general education area A2 written communication course at an accredited U.S. college or university with a grade of C- or better (International Student Services). International students who have not met the minimum language requirement by testing out, or by meeting the A2 requirement at another university, are required to complete an intensive English language program through an acceptable partner institution. The international services website lists the American Language and Culture Institute (ALCI), Kaplan English Programs, ELS English Language Instruction Centers, and The New England School of English as approved partner English language institutions.

International students who choose to attend an intensive English language institution are admitted as conditionally classified students. Upon completion of advanced level coursework at an approved partner institute, students are eligible to officially transfer to the university. According to the international student services website it “is a very popular option” for multilingual international students at CSUC to attend the American Language and Culture Institute (ALCI), the intensive English language institute on campus.

After meeting the minimum English requirements for admission to the university, many international students are also required to take a remedial English as a
foreign language course, EFLN 170, which according to the 2015 course catalogue focuses on, “intensive practice and analytical study in reading, writing, speaking, and listening” with a focus on American culture. Finally, international students, like all undergraduate students, enroll in a section of English 130 (specifically, ENGL 130E), a sheltered academic writing course which satisfies the A1 written communication requirement. Since most multilingual international students at CSUC complete intensive English language program, such as the ALCI, then EFLN 170, and finally English 130E, students and tutors who participate in the ESLRC are very familiar with the literacy constructs, assignment sequences, and course content of these English language courses. Students and tutors refer to these courses and assignments from these courses often during interviews.

The ESLRC provides free tutoring services to domestic and international students who speak English as second or other language, including conditionally classified students, who attend the ALCI; undergraduate students, most of whom are enrolled in writing intensive courses such as English 130E; and graduate level students who are completing coursework in a variety of fields. According to the university website, The ESL Resource Center provides free tutoring services to domestic students and international students who are “non-native speakers of English.” Although the Center is available to domestic students and international students, the majority of students who utilize the Center are international students. All student participants included in the study were international CSUC students who had previously met the minimum language requirements for admission.
Of the six student participants included in this study, two students, May and Ren, attended the ALCI to meet the English language requirement for admission. Similarly, Samir meet the minimum English requirement by attending Kaplan, an approved partner intensive English language institute before attending CSUC. Like Smair, Tamiko attended an approved partner intensive English language institute in Japan before arriving at Chico State. Salma, the most proficient speaker interviewed, satisfied the English proficiency requirement with a satisfactory IELTS score in her home country of Saudi Arabia before transferring to CSUC. Keiko was not required to take a test, or complete an intensive language program due to her special circumstances as a direct exchange student. According to the University’s International Exchange website, direct exchange international students, like Keiko, meet a unique set of requirements previously agreed upon by her home university in Japan, and CSUC (Study Abroad and International Exchange website). In Keiko's case, she was not required to enroll in any remedial English courses before enrolling in English 130E. Four of the six students interviewed also took EFLN 170: Selma, Tomiko, May and Samir. Samir actually took EFLN 170 twice since he did not pass the course on his first attempt. Since Ren stated that since had previously completed an undergraduate degree at another university, and completed an A1 requirement after completing the intensive English language program at the ALCI, he was not required to take EFLN 170 or English 130E. May and Tamiko had previously completed English 130E at the time of the interview, and Keiko, Samir and Selma were enrolled in English 130E at the time of the interview.
Procedure

The researcher was flexible during interviews often re-framing or restating interview questions to accommodate the wide range of language proficiency levels of the sample population, and each participant's knowledge of writing and literacy terminology. During the interview, the researcher asked follow-up questions to encourage participants to elaborate on some of their responses and maintain a conversational dialogue (Gall et al., 2010, p. 134). This dialogic approach resulted in some interviews lasting much longer than others. Interviews ranged from 15 to 45 minutes, depending on how much additional information each subject desired to contribute. All face-to-face interviews were conducted and audio recorded at the ESL Resource Center at Chico State. Audio recordings were used to transcribe interview data at a later time. After conducting one-on-one interviews with students, data were coded and grouped into themes that were then analyzed. Key terms and concepts emerged across interviews that determined the findings and implications of the study.

To ensure the same questions were asked to all participants, an interview protocol was created. See appendices for student interview protocol. Interview subjects were asked questions regarding the communities of practices and academic discourse communities they participate in, as well as the literacy and writing practices students and tutors engage in both inside and outside of the Center.

Data Analysis Procedures

Sociolinguistics believe that data analysis methods should include both small scale analyses of linguistic units, as well as larger scale analyses that include the
sociocultural implications of a particular sample (Street, 2001, p. 438; Gee, 2001a, p. 80).

The term discourse analysis refers to “the communicative purpose or meaning of larger units of language than individual words or sentences” in order to analyze interview data” (Street, 2001, p. 438). Discourse analysis is used to relate transcribed words and phrases to situated meanings and cultural models (Gee, 2001a, p. 80). Gee (2012) describes discourse analysis as identifying “stretches of language which ‘hang together’ so as to make sense to some community of people, such as a contribution to a conversation or a story” (, p. 112). Szwed (1981) claims that discourse analysis methods allow sociolinguists and ethnographic researchers to provide “a description of the social contexts within which the various uses are activated and found appropriate” in addition to “close descriptions of language codes themselves” (p, 428). This study utilized discourse analysis methods to identify the wide range of literacy and writing practices that students and tutors engage in at the ESLRC as well as the underlying behaviors and conceptualizations associated with the literacy practices identified by interview subjects.

Limitations

Translingual scholars, Rebecca Lorimer (2014) and Matsuda (2014, p. 483) recognize the need for new research to focus on the users and uses of language in order to more understand the literacy practices of multilingual writers. Lorimer suggests: “researchers and teachers focus on what writers do and not what they know” by adopting a practice-based framework (as cited in De Costa, 2015, pp. 183-184). Lu and Horner (2012) also encourage researchers to consider how users deploy a variety of rhetorical strategies, such as asking “how, when, where and why specific language strategies are
deployed” (p. 2), as well as centering attention on “how we do language and why (p. 4). Following the call to action posed by translingual researchers, this study attempted to provide some insight as to how multilingual students use language in the ESLRC and across discourse communities.
CHAPTER IV

STUDENT FINDINGS

Results

This study utilized autobiographical data collected from student and tutor interviews to investigate how multilingual students use writing and language to complete a wide variety of tasks and artifacts within the brick and mortar Center, and other discourse communities. The study set out to answer the following questions: First, what are the primary and secondary discourse communities members of the ESLRC participate in? Second, what are the literacy practices members of the ESLRC engage in? Data collected from student and tutor interviews are used to address and discuss these questions throughout the chapter.

After reviewing current trends in the literature surrounding literacy and social learning theory, student and tutor interview data were interpreted and analyzed following a translingual approach to writing. Emergent data from this study also reinforce established literature that supports analyzing diverse communities of learners through a social constructivist lens. Results from student interviews are discussed throughout this chapter.

Interview data confirm that the ESLRC is truly an affinity space on campus where members from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds come together to participate in co-collaboration of texts across discourse communities. Student interview
data uncover the different linguistic, cultural, and academic discourse communities multilingual students participate in including: dominate North American cultural discourse, academic English discourse, and field specific writing discourses. Interview data affirm the ESLRC is a space where multilingual students constantly engage in the process of identity negotiation in order to participate in multiple “tangential and overlapping” discourses (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 98). In the Center, multilingual students embody the writing and literacy practices of separate and conflicting discourse communities in order to produce a wide variety of academic artifacts. Students provided first hand accounts of the writing and literacy practices they engage in across discourse communities in order to offer a more complete picture of the conventional and critical literacy practices members of heterogeneous spaces employ throughout the writing process. Student and tutor interview data also offer valuable insight as to why particular literacy practices are privileged in heterogeneous learning spaces, like the ESLRC.

Linguistic, Cultural, and Academic Discourse Communities Students Participate In

Conflicting Cultural Discourse Communities

Multilingual students successfully navigate multiple, often conflicting cultural and linguistic discourse communities while simultaneously participating in Center. Interview responses indicated that multilingual students participate in an astonishing number of communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), affinity spaces (Gee, 2004; Lankshear & Knobel, 2011), and secondary discourse communities (Gee, 2011b) across multiple cultures and disciplines of study. Student writers are in the process of mastering a wide variety of literacy practices that shape their identities as multilingual academic
writers and as experts in a particular field of study. Like all students in higher education, students from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds are in the process of mastering a number of complex language and literacy practices, in order to more fully participate in their respective fields of study and North American academic and cultural discourse.

For example, international students who are not used to communicating in North American academic discourse often struggle with negotiating implied cultural preferences for a direct rhetorical style. Ren, a mechanical engineering student whose primary language is Japanese, explains how he navigates conflicting cultural communication styles across discourses:

My language is Japanese, so in my opinion it’s a lot different from English. Like the grammar is different. Like we can move verb and subject around, and sometimes it’s really confusing, but English to me is more straightforward. I mean like if I follow the grammar I can make really clear sentence. So yeah, so in Japanese culture we are really indirectly, indirect. So, whenever we try to say, we struggle with how to hidden our real opinion, but in America, American culture is really direct. Direct, but more open about your opinion, so like it sounds really direct, and like you know a beginner speaking English in like Japanese, they always try to be indirectly, but like they don’t know a lot of phrase or whatever, so they can’t really say indirectly, so it sounds really direct, to the other, or whatever, so just like culture difference. We’re not really honest.

Ren is in the process of mastering the “direct” communication style of North American cultural discourse while simultaneously participating in North American academic discourse. Selma, an International Relations student who speaks Arabic as her first language, also communicated the difficulty she experiences navigating North American academic writing discourse, despite her ability to effectively communicate verbally in professional and academic contexts:

How we write in Arabic, the structure is affecting our structure in English writing. And it’s total difference, but we can’t understand that difference. I’m not sure how to switch, and I use to just write in English when I was working, and it was actually
like academic paper, and so like a lot of times they would ask me, structure is kind of different, but not how you do it . . . I don’t know what the difference is, but I know the shift to English I forgot all about the Arabic style. Like now, actually, since I haven’t been writing in Arabic at all, and I just start all over when I write a paper.

Selma continues to compare the stylistic and structural differences of North American English academic discourse to the text she composed in Arabic while studying and working in her home country, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia:

I just like copy the style, the structure, . . .. Like how they [North Americans] start the introduction, like how they [North Americans] make the conclusion, because conclusion in Arabic doesn’t have that much focus . . . In Arabic, we don’t put that emphasis on conclusion. What we care most about is the subject itself and the introduction. Conclusion not so much. But here obviously, conclusion is like equally important to the paper.

After comparing how conclusions are approached differently in academic English writing and academic Arabic writing, Selma continues on to further analyzing the cultural significance of introductions across academic discourses:

In Arabic, we don’t have to give that long introduction, we just give like two lines, that’s it, but I see here I have to give . . . at least one paragraph for the subject. It’s so direct.

Like Ren, Selma struggled to master the “direct” tone and rhetorical strategies characteristic of North American academic writing. Most notably Selma struggled with the implied cultural assumption that it is the writer’s responsibility to provide evidence and context for the reader throughout the entire body of a paper, as well as in the introduction and conclusion. Selma mentioned how assuming responsibility for providing her audience with more comprehensive background information in addition to composing a detailed introduction was new to her.
Selma continues to compare how writer and reader responsibility differs across languages by comparing the instructor feedback she receives in her English and her Arabic coursework: “The other comment I always give [receive] in my Academic English course] is like why do you always assume the other person [reader] knows what you are talking about?” Selma questions whether or not instructor feedback practices are a direct reflection of rhetorical preferences across languages and cultures or are a matter of individual instructor expertise and personal preference:

And they [Arabic instructors] didn’t give me those comments when I was writing in Arabic, so I’m not sure if it was their [Arabic instructors] fault they didn’t tell me, or Arabic style didn’t want that much of background information.

Receiving instructor feedback seems to have made this implied cultural assumption more explicit to Selma. Selma continues to describe how the assignment sequence in the English Academic Writing course she was taking at the time of the interview was helping her further acquire the direct tone of North American Academic discourse.

Selma stated that breaking a large research paper up into smaller units allowed her to reflect on the rhetorical purposes of an introduction and conclusion in an argumentative research paper in Academic English:

It’s actually giving us more understanding of how to structure the introduction by itself, and how to structure the background, because I never wrote the background section [in] any of my papers. I just wrote the introduction, and go ahead with the body, so I think I’m not sure with other languages, but for Arabic speaking students, they will learn how to actually style the English writing instead of the Arabic [style] because they will give me like direct instructions. This is how you style the introduction, this is how you style the background, this is how to style the conclusion . . . so I wish that this class was the first class that we had to take in English because it actually build my writing. Like the base of the writing.
Ren and Selma are both in the process of negotiating conflicting cultural assumptions in their primary languages and cultures and North American academic writing discourse surrounding direct and indirect tone, and writer and reader responsibility. Selma also reflected how receiving feedback from her instructor made the implicit cultural assumptions regarding directness and reader responsibility in North American academic writing more clear to her. Ren and Selma are navigating these conflicting cultural discourses and rhetorical communication strategies while simultaneously participating in academic English writing discourse.

Writing Constraints Across Academic Disciplines

In addition to navigating conflicting cultural discourses and rhetorical strategies, multilingual students are also learning how to identify field-specific writing constraints across disciplines in order to successfully embody the writing practices of North American academic writers in their respective disciplines. North American writing discourse varies significantly depending on the fields of study students are composing in.

May, a business major, whose first language is Korean, points out that the academic writing she produces varies significantly across academic disciplines:

In English [courses] I think they are more focus on the elaborate, and talk about more detail, but business writing they are focusing more on concise and clear. Instead of writing a lot, we more focusing on more short and clarify . . . . Yeah, so we don’t want to use more sentences that I don’t need.

May continues to discuss how academic writing conventions vary across fields of study when she compares the types of texts and assignments she produces in her business courses to other academic writing she has produced:
So in my [business] class we don't have a lot of class like writing assignments. We have more presentations, and even though we do have homework, like writing assignment, we do more focus on what we have done as a class project. More business planning more using a lot of terms in the field, the business field.

May recognizes that the writing she produced in her introductory academic writing course did not resemble the writing she later produced as a Business major, which was a source of conflict for her. Since the tasks May was completing in her business classes focused primarily on group presentations, and collaborative projects, she struggled to see the value the writing she produced in her introductory academic writing course:

I don’t even remember what I wrote for that class [English]. The thing is I don’t use a lot of what I learn from that class. It was good class to know like the basics writing requirements are, but the thing that I am in [business] is a little bit different from what I have done in that class. For me not good starting point to see what American classes looks like, but I don’t think they look like that a whole lot.

Since the writing assignments May produced in her introductory English academic writing courses were not the same types of texts she produced in her business courses, she felt that they were not an accurate reflection of North American academic writing discourse. After completing their general education requirements, many other international students, like May, do not continue writing in the humanities. After completing a series of remedial English courses at language institutes, and then at the university level that emphasize learning to writing over writing to learn in it is not surprising that May does not find the writing “skills” she learned in these remedial language courses transferable to the highly contextualized writing she is now producing in her field.
Like May, Samir, an electrical engineering student, who speaks Arabic as his primary language, produces very different types of text in his electrical engineering coursework than he produces in his academic writing course work. Samir describes the technical writing he produces in his engineering courses:

It [writing in electrical engineering] need to explain how . . . the machine . . . works, or . . . the work that you did. It’s not just doing the work and leave it. So you have to explain what’s going on, and how the power goes from the kit, and how the power goes to another charge you know.

Samir explains how he struggles to integrate highly specialized academic vocabulary into hyper-contextualized procedural writing assignments, “It [writing in electrical engineering] focusing about writing and programming, but maybe the problem that I do have is understanding some like new words or new context.” Like May, the writing Samir produces in his electrical engineering is very different than the writing he produced in previous writing courses. The academic language and content of the texts Samir was exposed to in his remedial English courses, is very different than the academic language and course content he is now focusing on in his major coursework Samir is now struggling to master the field specific academic vocabulary he is now using in his electrical engineering classes.

Ren, who like Samir, is studying engineering, also explained how the writing he composes for his mechanical engineering courses differs from “normal essays” he has written in previous courses. “I start like what is my concept start, it’s kind of different from like normal essays it’s like more conceptual.” The research driven writing Ren composes in his mechanical engineering coursework is highly contextualized. Ren offers additional insight into research driven essays in mechanical engineering courses differ
from other research driven essays he completed that necessitated he utilize secondary sources:

Writing style [in mechanical engineering] was a little bit different from normal essays . . . I don’t really have to . . . research for it because I already have result from my own experiments, like building stuff or making stuff. So I need to put those information in the paper with like pictures . . . I don’t have to [conduct more research], I already have proof, like a reference, so I don’t have to looking online.

The academic language and writing that May, Samir, and Ren all describe composing in their major coursework is highly contextualized and situated within larger academic discourse communities. Since, the writing May, Samir and Ren describe completing in their major coursework is all project or task-based, it is not surprising that it looks a lot different from the types of writing they were producing in remedial English courses that were more focused on learning to read and writing than writing and reading to learn.

Interview data also affirm that like learning paradigms, instructor expectations also differ across academic disciplines. Tomiko, a communications major, whose primary language is Japanese, reflects on how “high” instructor expectations in her communications classes differ from instructor expectations in her entry-level English writing courses:

But English . . . is like professors expectation is not high, it’s like we write paper and bring to here to edit, and then just hand [it in, and] . . . I got ‘A’, so that’s the difference I think.

The multiple and conflicting literacy constructs and instructional paradigms May, Samir, Ren and Tomiko identify across academic writing discourses illustrates the multiple identities multilingual writers participate in while simultaneously participating in the ESLRC.
Multilingual Student Participation in the Center

Interview data also revealed that student writers who frequent the Center are in the process of transitioning from limited English speakers to more fluent academic writers in their respective fields of study. Although the boundaries between novice student writers and expert student writers within the ESLRC are hard to identify and define, Ren explains how his English language learning goals changed and evolved as he became a more active participant in his academic discourse community:

The goal is, I don’t know, improve my English as a tool to learn my subject, or my major. So, my focus is not learning English. It’s like learning English is going to be the first stuff to learning other stuff, not more important, but like interesting . . . or like any class I am taking, because if I do not know English enough I can’t understand what they are saying. So like yeah, I like to think that way the first time I come here [The ESLRC] the purpose was just learning English, because I don’t know what to do besides learn English, but now it’s changing because I understand enough to, I can learn from the content.

Ren expressed how his goals for learning English changed when he began to participate in an academic English discourse that was specific to his field, engineering. When Ren started engaging in literacy practices that centered around “interesting” engineering course content, he began to see English as a “tool” to help him meet his academic goals. After Ren completed his entry-level English language intensive coursework, his focus shifted from simply learning English, to using English to learn how to be an engineer. Using English for a specific purpose helped Ren to identify as an engineering student and participate in the greater English speaking, engineering discourse community at CSUC. Ren also explained how he used the Center for different purposes throughout this process of identity negotiation. As the focus of Ren’s courses shifted from learning to write to writing to learn Ren’s expectations for the Center also changed.
Ren recalls how a writing to learn approach to English prompted him to focus on the “content” of his writing during tutoring sessions. Viewing English as a “tool” for learning course content, prompted Ren to engage in conventional and critical literacy practices with tutors during sessions in the Center.

Literacy Practices Multilingual Writers Engage In

During interviews, multilingual students easily identified the wide array of conventional and critical literacy practices they employ both inside and outside of the brick and mortar Center in order to complete a variety of academic tasks. Multilingual students report engaging in a wide variety of literacy and writing practices in Center, as well as in their English language, general education, and major classes. However, further analysis revealed that students primarily engage in the critical literacy practices of problematizing texts, engaging in analytical discussions of course content, and participating in peer review outside of Center. Data also suggest that although students do report engaging in critical literacy practices in the Center, overall students primarily view the Center primarily as a place to edit final drafts of formal writing assignments, identify and correct errors, and receive explicit instruction of English grammar.

Conventional Literacy Practices Inside the Center

When students were asked to describe in their own words what the primary goals and purposes of the Center where, those who described the Center as a place to engage in a narrow set of conventional literacy practices such as identifying and
correcting errors, tended to report participating in more conventional literacy practices, and fewer critical literacy practices within the brick and mortar Center.

Samir, communicates his interpretation of the goals of the ESLRC during the interview, “I think the right goals. . . [for] this place [referring to the ESLRC], is fixing our, correcting our mistakes with writing for international student.” This narrow view of the goals and purposes of the Center is also echoed by Ren and Tomiko. Ren states, “I use it [ESLRC] for writing mostly, because my writing is terrible, so I need somebody to check my paper.” Tomiko, states the primary purpose of the Center is to, “help international students to edit paper, and improve their English.” Even Selma who later revealed that she regularly engages in a wide variety of critical literacy practices throughout the composition process, states that she only brings in final drafts to the Center to be edited for “final touches”:

Okay it’s always a finished paper, no a draft . . . for example when I edit my sisters papers, I always find a lot of mistakes, and when I see my paper, I don’t see that mistake even if it’s the exact same mistake. So um, I don’t bring the first draft [into the Center], I bring, like kind of final draft, for final touches. What is a word to add? What sentence should I remove? How to structure paragraphs? Yeah, that’s it.

Most of the students interviewed stated that they see the ESLRC primarily as space where an expert mediator (e.g., tutor) can fix “terrible” drafts or address surface level errors. This narrow description of the primary goals and purposes of the Center reflects a strong version of the conventional literacy model (Huang, 2011; Street, 2001, p. 430) that focuses on discrete elements of reading and writing. One student, Samir, had such a narrow view of purposes and goals of the Center that he actually revealed during the interview that he was completely unaware that he could bring in any text or communicative task into the Center at any stage of the composition process.
Although Samir stated throughout the interview that he was struggling with all aspects of his electrical engineering classes, as well as his entry-level English language courses, he maintained that he never received help from tutors in the ESLRC with anything besides completed drafts of formal English papers:

[I] only kind of come here [ESLRC] to get corrections. Get corrections and actually, to be honest, in 170, I only wanted to attended here just to show . . . that I was coming here. I try my best, I just kinda don’t want to fail the class again. I was trying to do anything just to pass it.

Despite the fact that he had already failed a remedial writing course, and was concerned with passing other writing intensive courses, Samir maintained that he only comes to the Center to “get corrections” on final drafts of English papers. The emphasis Samir places on “getting corrections” reflects a deficit-centered, product-oriented approach to formal writing. During the interview Samir disclosed that he struggled with the writing in his major courses, as well as his English language courses; however, he expressed some reticence to work with tutors in the ESLRC who were not electrical engineers:

I was thinking I don’t know, but if they're gonna be helpful . . . because like what you say, you don’t have like any idea of electrical engineering. I think that’s gonna be like little bit of issue . . . maybe the mentor, or the tutor doesn’t know about it . . . It’s kind of really hard so, that’s when I say, it kinda won’t be helpful for me to bring that work. For me, I need to understand myself.

Samir’s concern that tutors cannot engage in discussions of electrical engineering course content with him seems valid, since most tutors do not have any knowledge of electrical engineering. However, since Samir had previously communicated that he only comes to the Center “to get corrections” from tutors, it is unclear why he would value the tutors’ corrections of his English papers and not on his
electrical engineering papers. Since English tutors are considered experts in English composition, and not engineering, it’s possible that Samir would not value feedback on an engineering paper from a tutor who was not also an engineer because then the tutor would not be the expert. In addition to maintaining a final product driven approach to writing and an expert-centered approach to tutoring, that prevent Samir from utilizing all of the resources available at the Center, Samir also reveals that was unaware that he could receive help reading and interpreting texts in the Center.

During the interview, Samir claimed that many international students, like himself, struggle with reading and interpreting dense academic texts. He also stated that other international students, like himself, were unaware that they could receive help analyzing and interpreting texts from tutors in the Center:

I think most of the people [other international students] too also kind of have difficulty with the reading too, for understanding for pronouncing a lot of words kind of make it difficult for student from Saudi Arabia and from other countries. I don’t know if ESL is for improving reading or not?

During the interview, Samir questions whether the ESLRC is a space “for improving” or not. Samir revealed that he never considered coming into the Center to receive help reading difficult academic texts because “I was only thinking that it [the ESLRC] was just for writing. Most instructor told about us go there they’re gonna help with writing, that’s it.” Samir’s understanding of reading and writing as two separate skills also reflects a strong version of the conventional literacy model which fails to acknowledge reading and writing as practices that cannot be separated. It is impossible to determine whether Samir’s limited understanding of the tutoring services available to him at the Center were in fact the result of an instructor stating that he could only receive help
from tutors on writing, and not reading, or if he just assumed that he would have to work independently throughout the early stages of the research and writing process, and then have the final draft of his papers edited by tutors when he brought in a full draft of an English essay.

During the interview Tomiko also mentions how instructor expectations in her upper division Communications classes dictate the conventional literacy practices she asks tutors to focus on during tutoring sessions:

I also brought memos in for communication studies. That you know was a little different that like really, really, care about my grammar and spelling, right, so like when I come to here to bring my memos, they [tutors] checked my accuracy and grammar.

Like Tomiko, Ren also mentions that his non-native speaker voice, grammatical errors are a problem when his mechanical engineering projects are being evaluated:

Yeah, I make . . . report paper . . . so it’s like a document making for teachers what I’ve done for this project, so here were gonna evaluate my work . . . like your paper is terrible, or my project was not good, and some grammar too. If like I write terrible grammar . . . they don’t know what I’ve done. So like actually [for] all of my papers [instructors] say like you need someone who speak English, like native-speaker [to] check your paper because some of your grammar . . . doesn’t make any sense. It’s like I’m sorry I should have come to ESL to get checked).

Samir, Tomiko, and Ren describe receiving instructor feedback in their major coursework, which seems to contribute to them privileging conventional literacy practices over critical literacy practices during tutoring sessions. One possible reason students may have a limited view of the services available to them at the Center is because students are often referred to the ESL Resource Center by their instructors after failing to meet instructor expectations in writing intensive classes, as in Ren’s case.
When instructors only refer struggling students to the Center to “fix” and “edit” finished products, it limits students’ perceptions of the services available at the Center. If instructors encouraged struggling students to receive support from tutors throughout the research and pre-writing phases of their papers, it is possible that students would engage in more pre-writing tasks with tutors. Following Jeffery et al. (2012), evaluative criteria that emphasizes multilingual writers produce error free texts reinforces a deficit-model of writing. Deficit approaches to writing focus on knowledge-telling or summarizing sources with native like accuracy over knowledge-transforming or utilizing sources to develop research driven claims. Deficit-centered evaluative criteria drives traditional native-speaker as expert tutoring practices. This deficit-centered approach to writing instruction necessitates multilingual students adopt an expert-mediated approach to tutoring so that they can produce error-free final products in order to receive full credit for formal writing assignments. Unfortunately, this approach to second-language writing instruction fails to acknowledge that writing is a process, and largely ignores the complex prewriting tasks that students struggle with throughout the research and drafting process. Students, like Samir, who actively participate in the Center, yet have never been introduced to the concept of process writing during tutoring sessions, are often unaware that they can even receive support reading academic texts from tutors, or receive support throughout the early stages of the writing process, in addition to receiving help editing their final drafts.

Identifying the Critical Literacy Practices of Multilingual Writers Inside the Center

When students were asked to describe in their own words what the goals and purposes of the Center where, those who described the Center as having flexible goals
and multiple purposes tended to report participating in a wider variety of conventional and critical literacy practices with tutors throughout the research and writing process.

Interviewees who view the Center primarily as a safe place to receive support while completing a variety of informal and formal communicative tasks reported engaging in a wider variety of critical literacy practices with tutors inside the brick and mortar Center.

According to May, the “goal is to help ESL students do well, and at the same time improve their English.” Keiko states the purpose of the Center is “to make international students feel a little more comfortable with their language skills, yeah . . . by helping.” For both May and Keiko the primary purpose of the Center is to act as a network of support by “helping” students “do well” and “feel comfortable” so that they can be successful. Like May and Keiko, Selma described the Center as having the multiple goals and purposes:

I think it's definitely to improve the English in general, whether it’s conversation, or writing, whatever; to give confidence, especially first semester, because I have paper and I’m not sure if I did it right . . . so I feel more confident actually submitting that paper [more so than] . . . if I was like just give it by myself. So, again, confidence, I really had to come in even with all of my friends to practice language kind of, because most of the time I’m just communicating with a tutor or, when they come to conversation hour just practicing language. Asking questions that I can’t ask in class. Um maybe because just simple question, or because I’m shy, or whatever it is. I think it just give a chance to actually ask all of the questions without being like oh that’s a stupid question, that's so silly.

May, Keiko and Selma’s responses all indicated that they see the Center as serving multiple student-centered purposes. They see the Center as functioning primarily as a space where students feel “comfortable” and supported while completing a variety of tasks. Selma mentions using the Center as a safe place to build “confidence” while “practicing language” and “asking questions” by interacting with peers and tutors. Selma
mentions that she engages in literacy practices in the Center, like “asking questions” that she might otherwise avoid in formal classroom environments. Ren describes the Center as a space where students can participate in active learning with tutors in order to gain “confidence”:

ESL goal is like, student came here to get help because you guys know a lot about English, then goal is make student to get interested in English and the other subject they are learning . . .. Because you know if tutor just say you’re wrong here wrong here and wrong here, student lose their confidence. You know you guys do like your wrong here, but you make good point. So they will be like I’m doing well, so like they can have more confidence. The point is like whatever you guys do is give student have more confident about their English so they can learn more than having less confidence.

Selma and Ren both mention that the main purposes of the ESLRC is to provide students with a safe environment to receive critical feedback and engage in critical discussions about writing. Once again, Ren emphasizes how language is used to help students gain a deeper understanding of their academic subject area.

Students mentioned engaging in a wide array of critical literacy practices with tutors inside the Center, including engaging in conversation and informal discussion about assignments, planning and practicing presentations, and even career planning.

May lists the wide variety of tasks and assignments she discusses with tutors: “lectures . . . any kind of work if it is related to the English . . ..” May states that she brings, “a lot of different [assignments], even like some phone interview practice, interview practice, report, lot of writing assignments . . . presentation, memos . . . letters, business letters.” May’s willingness to discuss any assignment or question related to English language or culture with tutors in the Center reflects her writing and reading to learn approach to language learning.
Presentations

Like May, Tomiko utilizes the Center while completing a variety of formal writing assignments from her major courses, as well as informal writing from general education courses; for example, “When I got homework that’s science, I bring [it] . . . here [The ESLRC].” Tomiko also mentions utilizing the Center to practice oral presentations in her Science courses, “I’m talking science class, and they want me to do the presentation. When [I] got presentations and scripts and papers [I bring them to the ESLRC].” In addition to receiving help with Science presentations and “scripts,” Tomiko utilizes the Center to practice presentations in her communications classes:

I came here to practice my presentation . . .. I'm taking communication studies [classes and] they want me to do a lot of presentation, so you know I practice to present to tutors, and then tutors give me the feedback.

Although Ren states that he “basically” just brings papers into the Center, he also mentions occasionally practicing presentations with tutors in the ESLRC:

Presentation, because you know [since] presentation is different from writing papers . . .. It’s grammar, and like speaking too, so like how fluent I can speak, or how confident I can have . . .. If I practice here you know the tutors can . . . help me . . . emphasize different points, so you should do this.

May, Tomiko, and Ren all mentioned practicing oral presentations with tutors in addition to utilizing the ESLRC to receive help with formal writing assignments.

Reading Practices in the Center

Keiko was the only student interviewed who stated that she comes to the Center specifically to discuss complex concepts from assigned readings with tutors, “I have like trouble with reading text books, so I bring like communication studies textbook
and interpersonal communication textbook here, and I got help for that.” Keiko continues by describing the reading strategies she employs with tutors at the Center:

For interpersonal communication class I brought like just what I don't understand [from the assigned reading] for make more sense for me. But for interpersonal communication class I have quiz every week, I want to kind of go over the content of the [weekly]. I got help kind of reading first sentence and last sentence of each paragraph, we go over the content of the reading.

Although Keiko describes the reading tutoring she received in the Center as helpful, she also expresses a desire to “learn a little more about like skills to read, or maybe have time to practice more, a little more.” Instead of engaging in a discussion of content of the reading, Keiko’s tutor summarized the assigned weekly reading for her paragraph by paragraph. This particular strategy did not allow Keiko and her tutor to completely review the assigned reading in the time available:

She [a tutor] explain it to me [summarizes a text] and when I don’t understand, I ask a question. Try to make sure I know what the point is . . . It’s helpful, but she did short amount, and I just wish I could have more time . . . because there were more people waiting. Yeah, so that’s hard, I just had like 30 minutes, so I wish it would have been longer.

Keiko also expressed how the 30-minute time limit that is occasionally imposed when the Center is busy restricts interactions between students and tutors and makes fully analyzing texts difficult. Consequently, this time restriction might also deter other students from discussing complex readings with tutors.

**Discussions of Course Content**

Selma and Ren both described informal discussions of the content of their papers as helpful. Selma described engaging in complex philosophical discussions with tutors about course content she was struggling with while creating multiple drafts of several religious studies research papers:
It was my first semester here, and it was my first class of religion, so it was so hard for me. I didn’t get that much information to base on my paper . . . I actually came in [to the Center and] they [tutors] did help me with that because obviously they have more like perspective on world religion.

Selma later reflected on how speaking with tutors multiple times throughout the drafting process helped her remain unbiased while composing her religious studies papers.

Ren commented on how he finds it helpful that every time he brings a piece of writing into the Center, and sits down with a tutor, he is asked to articulate his rhetorical purposes to the tutor in a low stakes environment. Ren notes how these conversations often take on a friendly conversational tone:

Besides writing, I think having conversation help me a lot because even if I came here to correct my essay I still need to talk to them [tutors] and they will ask me questions . . . What are you writing about? Straightforward enough to be clear. It helps me out . . . Yeah, and sometime, you know have some tiny chat . . . chatting with tutor.

Ren points out here that although he might not come to the Center with the express purpose of engaging in discussions of rhetorical choices and comparative discourse analysis with tutors, often the tutoring process lends itself to such discussions.

May also expresses a desire to engage in more critical discussions with tutors throughout the interview:

I still want to improve my English. . . I’m looking for long-term improvement with my English, not short-term improvement . . . I want more explanation. . . I understand that sometimes it’s hard, but I want to know why!

May wants to gain a deeper understanding of English by asking tutors complex questions about linguistic features of English. May does not want a tutor to simply correct her
work, so that she turn in error free drafts; she wants tutors to be able to articulate the more critical discussions of language with tutors.

Like May, Selma expresses a desire to engage in rhetorical and philosophical discussion with tutors that help her more deeply reflect on the cultural and rhetorical purposes of her writing. While May desires more detailed answers from tutors, Selma states that she wishes tutors asked her more questions:

I want them to actually ask us why did you write this? Because a lot of times they say okay, that is great, okay that is good, and that’s it. But I don’t want you to tell [me] that [it’s] good, like starting off. That [is] not why I come here. I want real feedback, like something where I can actually fix something. like more comments, more questions. Why did you do that? What do you actually want to say? Maybe they can give it to me in a different way, or some simple way, or in academic way.

Selma would prefer tutors initiated more critical discussions in the Center. She wants tutors to ask questions about the rhetorical choices she makes so that she can also reflect on those choices throughout the composition process.

May, Keiko, Tomiko, Selma, and Ren all reported engaging in a wide variety of student-centered critical literacy practices with tutors within the physical constraints of the Center. Ren, May and Selma all communicated during the interview that engaging in critical discussions with tutors in the ESLRC helps them navigate North American academic writing discourse.

Identifying the Critical Literacy Practices of Multilingual Writers Outside the Center

During the interviews, multilingual students describe the conventional and critical literacy practices they engage in at the Center, as well as the critical literacy practices they actively engage in with classmates, friends, family members, and experts
outside of the Center. Students mentioned participating in the following critical literacy practices outside of the Center: locating, evaluating, and synthesizing sources; collaborating with peers and near peers, participating in informal and formal peer review practices; meeting with professors and experts; utilizing online and institutional resources; and finally participating in a number of virtual and offline clubs and learning communities.

**Locating, Evaluating, and Synthesizing Sources**

During interviews, students often reported struggling to locate, evaluate, summarize, and synthesize sources while completing formal research papers. Although students frequently reported working closely with tutors to revise and edit final drafts of these complex writing assignments, further analysis revealed that students often struggled to locate and evaluate appropriate sources independently during the early stages of the writing process, and then came into the Center to edit final drafts of these research papers. Selma explained how she struggled to locate appropriate sources until she developed a critical framework for evaluating sources in her academic writing course:

> In 130, I thought it was really good because the way, how we actually saw stuff, like before I didn’t mind how to actually take information from like just an article, just any website, but now I have to be so critical, so um like the source, I need to know which one, what is the source exactly, and [not] just take it.

Selma mentions how in previous courses, instructors told her that certain sources were credible, and other were not, but she was not given any criteria for evaluating sources, so did not actually understand why different sources were more appropriate for different contexts:
[Instructors] told us that it [academic sources] had to be from the library database, and that’s it. [Instructors] . . . make certain comments about some websites like . . . these are not so good websites for a paper, but we didn't actually talk further. Like I wasn’t 100 percent sure why she didn’t want us to use the website . . . [Instructors] say these websites are bad, and these websites are good.

Selma reflects on how locating sources on her own in other writing courses helped her develop a critical framework for evaluating sources, “I think . . . we see that some websites or articles might not be credible or might be biased, so we have to actually look around and search.”

Keiko explained how she struggled to locate four relevant sources with recent publication dates while composing a research paper, “I got like a research paper that I was working on that I choose four articles, but they have like date limit. It should be recent and that kind of thing, so it was much harder.” Keiko did not mention asking or receiving help from tutors while locating appropriate sources.

Summarizing and Synthesizing Sources

Keiko described how difficult it was for her to summarize and synthesize three academic articles while composing an annotated bibliography for an interpersonal communication class:

It was difficult to like shorten, I mean summarize, the content in such a short paragraph . . . for like annotated bibliography teacher want me to write like shorter sentence, so like it was difficult to put the idea in the such short paragraph.

Keiko recalled how it was also difficult to develop her own ideas and engage in knowledge-transforming while simultaneously summarizing and integrating quotations using a limited number of sources:

It was hard for me to like expand idea with just four articles, while we in English 130 we have 10 sources and we have like a lot more sources, but yeah, it was just four articles, so it was difficult to choose just what four articles to use for quote?
Like Keiko, Selma also struggled to synthesize sources for a research paper. Unlike Keiko, Selma integrated both print-based sources, and non-print based sources into her research. Since, Selma collected primary research, in addition to summarizing source content, she had to synthesize conflicting points of view:

This semester I am taking the international relations class. It is writing intensive, so we write about book review, we review . . . cultural identity, so just compare between two cultures. I had to interview two people[ from each culture], so that was so different, because . . . I interviewed [two] Chinese and [two] Americans, and the Chinese gave me the first feedback of the culture, and the Americans gave me different feedback, so when I was writing the paper, there was a lot of like he said that, but then the other girl from the same country say something else. I wish that he gave us like just one interview from this culture, one from the other, but that would have not been accurate so much.

Although Keiko and Selma both offered insight into the difficulties they experienced working with sources throughout the composition process, neither student recalled tutors supporting them throughout this difficult process. This finding is significant because it highlights how the final product-focus of the Center prevents students from collaborating with tutors throughout the research and pre-writing portions of the writing process. It’s possible that multilingual students also privilege monolingual approaches to tutoring which emphasize expert-centered conventional literacy practices while in the presence of native English speaker tutors. Multilingual students who adopt these monolingual approaches to writing instruction might adopt the “bad English” approach to language instruction and the “native speaker fallacy” in the presence of native speaker experts because they have never been offered an alternative tutoring model.
Critical Literacy Practices Students Engage in Outside of the Center

Interview data suggest that students tend to engage in more critical literacy practices that focus on co-construction of texts and knowledge construction with peers, near peers, and experts outside of the Center, rather than with tutors inside of the Center. Students report engaging in informal and formal collaboration with peer and instructor feedback outside of the Center. In addition to collaborating with peers and near peers, students identified a number of on-demand institutional and digital resources that they utilize throughout the composition process, especially in the early stages of the writing process. Students mentioned utilizing: internet search engines online sources and databases, language translators, dictionaries, library resources, formatting and style guides, YouTube videos, and social media networks to help them negotiate meaning and make rhetorical choices throughout the writing process.

Collaborating with Peers

Keiko and Samir stated they both found it helpful to collaborate with peers from their classes who also speak their primary languages. Keiko explains how she works with a friend to understand key concepts from her communications coursework:

Actually I have a friend in my interpersonal communication class who is Japanese, and if I get stuck we call each other and to make sure the points. When I don’t understand, I ask her and she explain to me, sometimes in Japanese, and when she doesn’t understand, sometime I explain to her instead. Just like try to [Explain] and then, at that time, it has made more sense to me when I could explain to her. . . and when I am kind of like am at home, I . . . just mark it and try to ask later somebody.

Samir explains how he works closely with friends who are native Arabic speakers, as well as native English speakers to complete his coursework:
Was it [It was] kind of helpful because being with an American partner they can explain for me more, make it easier for me. And also, I mean I help with like my friend from my own language to explain more. Even if I understood, maybe I couldn't understand the subject, but someone like from my own language explain it to me, it’s going to be easy to get it.

Keiko and Samir both find it helpful to engage in deep discussions of course content with classmates and peers who belong to similar academic discourses and language backgrounds.

Similarly, Ren stated that he often engages in discusses of writing and language with his wife, other native-English speaking friends, and Japanese speaking friends:

My wife is American, so like I usually ask her to rephrase what I’m saying, and that help me a lot . . . . I ask my American friends what they think about my opinion. Yeah . . . or sometimes Japanese friend because they know a lot of grammar things. So like they will teach me or let me know if my thing is wrong.

It’s possible that students find it easier to engage in complex discussions with peers and near peers who are more familiar with the course content, or have a deeper understanding of their primary language than with tutors, who might not be knowledgeable of the content area, or the multilingual students primary language.

Peer Review

Like Keiko, Samir, and Ren, Selma, also engages in peer collaboration outside of the Center. However, unlike Keiko and Samir, Selma engages in formal peer review practices throughout the drafting process. Selma explains how she and her friends utilize the formal peer review process she became familiar with in an academic writing course outside of the formal learning spaces:

[In English 130E] It was so nice, because I saw different people papers, and how they actually write it. I used to see the papers, but I actually didn’t put comments like we did in peer review, so I didn’t care that much, but now I’m actually seeing
how they write the structure, and I’m taking some like okay, I should do this the same. That was so great because I really need to see like other writing styles.

Selma further explained how she utilized the peer review process she learned in class to provide her friends and family with peer feedback on writing at home. Selma stated that her and her friends now engage in the peer review process for nearly every paper they write:

My sister and her friends they actually send me every paper just to see, like not just the grammar, the vocabulary, and the structure, I’m not that good, but I just review and then they can just come here, or they can do it by themselves. I actually did the same what we did in class, I said just do it in Google Doc, I’ll give you some comments.

Selma explains how providing her sister and her friends with feedback on their academic writing helps her to reflect on her own writing:

Actually while I’m editing their papers, it helps me to see again their prioritizing or again I’ll be like I’m not sure of this sentence. I do it all the time. I do the same mistake, but when I see it in someone else's paper I’ll see it. It’s not just helping them, but I’m helping myself.

Again, multilingual students seem to engage in informal and formal collaborative learning practices with classmates, friends, and family throughout the composition process, however these findings are significant, because they rarely reported engaging in critical literacy practices with tutors during tutoring sessions.

Meeting with Professors and Experts

In addition to collaborating with classmates, friends, and family members multilingual students stated that they also often meet with professors and experts in their academic disciplines to receive guidance and feedback on their writing.

Keiko, Tomiko, and Ren all mentioned consulting instructors during office hours, in order to more fully comprehend complex course material, clarify instructor
expectations for assignments, and to receive informal feedback, “I often go to teachers office hours. Yeah, as much as I can” (Kieko). Tomiko also reported visiting her professors during office hours, “I often go to my professors office hours. Helps me out . . .. Yeah, for like content, to see if the content is good.” Tomiko stated she visited her professors to discuss content, and visited tutors at the ESLRC for editing. Like Keiko and Tomiko, Ren also mentioned he visited his professors during office hours.

During the interview, Selma mentioned that she often to interview “experts” to help her understand key concepts about the content of her research papers:

I thought that interview someone from that field who I can actually communicate with, who will give me some direct feedback, and answers, which will make my paper more interesting, or like clear for the reader, so I did that, and I did that in my paper for sexual child abuse. Yeah, it made me understand it even more, because I had like different point of view, but now I’m seeing the right way, so I think this is great resource. Not just to rely on the website . . .. There’s information, but it doesn’t give you a chance to actually question and have answers.

Although Selma communicated the importance of “having someone who will give me direct feedback, and answers which will make my paper more interesting, or like clear for the reader” she obviously does not see a tutor as someone who can fulfill these roles. It is possible that since the tutor is not an expert in the target discipline, Selma does not see the value of engaging in discussions of content with them.

In addition to utilizing peers, near peers, and experts in the field as resources throughout the prewriting and drafting phase of the writing process, students also reported utilizing a variety of on-demand digital resources and social networks to help them clarify complex ideas, and refer to examples and models.
During the interview, Selma and Samir both mentioned utilizing YouTube as a learning resource. Samir explained how the YouTube community helps him with his math assignments:

Sometimes [I use YouTube] with the classes . . . for . . . math . . . looking up how to solve it. And [I] go to some website to it give me a lot of videos that make it easier than the instructor says. Like maybe when the instructor was talking, I’m not getting [it] all the time, so when I just go back home go to YouTube about the topic I just get it, so it make it also make it easier than the instructors.

Selma states that she uses YouTube videos to find language models:

Yeah, I use YouTube a lot and watch videos, because they will give me like how to structure the words. Or how to say it like have like an idea in my mind how to actually make a sentence so I have kind of problem with that it takes a lot of time. So when I see YouTube video they give me how to phrase that idea, what you have in mind, yeah.

Selma also explained how she introduced her sister to using YouTube as a learning tool:

I just type whatever. I actually told my sister to do the same, and she was like it’s pointless, but I was like just see how they present the words, and it will help you a lot . . .. She actually did it, and was like yeah that’s great, because you see to present the idea.

Selma also reported that YouTube videos help her master the direct tone of academic writing discourse:

How to say it, because I already have the idea, just how to say it in a very direct way, because I always write my idea in like three lines, and I don’t need it. I need to say like one sentence. So yeah, YouTube videos actually help me a lot.

In addition to participating in the YouTube community, all students mentioned participating in a wide variety of social networks and online learning spaces, in English, as well as in their languages. Selma explained how using Facebook in English helped her master North American informal writing style:
Facebook anymore is for my American friends, so I find so good because, I’m not just practicing my writing but different writing style like slang. Um so yeah that really helped again not with my academic writing, but in general to understand because a lot of times like in the movies, I hear the word, like slang, I try to look it up, I don’t even know how to spell it. But like in Facebook I can just see what this actually means. Does that actually help, definitely, but not in an academic way.

Like Selma, Samir reflected on how frequent informal communication on social media and text messages has helped his interpersonal communication fluency:

Social media I use that, but just for communicating with friends. Also I mean it’s kind of helped me with typing, but it’s not fixing the problem for me . . . . Also, texting too, it’s the same thing. I do have a correction [spell check] in my cell phone. Right, but you know sometimes it was helpful to me, because when I was writing the word it even give me like an error. See like the right word, then I try to see the letters and delete and write again, sometimes that’s gonna help me.

Since students reported engaging in a wider range of critical literacy practices outside of the Center, it is important to identify the formal academic learning communities they engage in on campus, as well as the informal social networks and discourse communities they navigate in online spaces. Students also reported using social media to connect with clubs, academic, and cultural communities on and off campus. These findings are significant because students report engaging in critical literacy practices with peers, near peers, and experts, from these tangential discourse communities, than they are with tutors in the ESLRC. One possible reason students tend to collaborate more with peers outside of the Center than they do with tutors inside of the Center might be the on-demand access to peers available through online resources and social media.

**Physical and Temporal Constraints**

During interviews, students revealed that the physical and temporal constraints of the brick and mortar ESL Resource Center are negatively affecting student
satisfaction with the services offered at the Center. In fact, when students asked how the Center could be improved every single student suggested reducing the time students have to wait to receive tutoring services. In response to this problem, students suggested implementing a reservation or appointment system, expanding the hours of operations to include evenings and weekends, hiring more tutors, offering online tutoring, as well as finding a new larger location. Keiko, Samir, and May all suggested the Center make more tutors available to students. Samir notes:

I think the problem which they had last semester was kinda like that had a few tutors for student, and sometimes it’s gonna be really busy, and it’s gonna take a long time, it’s gonna take and hour to have everyone's waiting for the one tutor.

Keiko reported often having to wait longer to see a tutor, than actually receiving services, especially on Fridays:

I'm not sure actually, but there are too many lines . . . sometimes I only need help for thirty minutes, or ten minutes, but I wait for like one hour. For example, on Fridays it’s always crowded and I have to wait 30 minutes, but I have to leave here like 30 minutes after I got help, so sometimes it can be even longer where I wait. Sometimes the time where I wait can be longer than like my tutoring, actually.

Samir also experienced long wait times when a large writing assignment was due:

I remember once when I came here there were a lot of people because we had to come here Our instructor, she give up a deadline with time for the deadline, because she knew that a lot of people they didn’t have time to come here. So having a lot of tutors can be more helpful.

Tomiko and Ren both suggested implementing a reservation system and appointment system to reduce the time student wait to be tutored. Tomiko said, “I want you guys to have reservation system. Yeah, because this not useful. This is not useful for
me because, yeah, like make appt system would be good for me.” Ren also suggested that students should be able to request appointments with specific tutors:

I don't know sometimes when I come in where is too much student. I feel like I can’t get help, so I feel like I should come in different time, but if there is sometime have appointment for certain tutor, if I want to get help then that would be great.

Students also complained that the hours of operation was too limited. Students reported that it is difficult for them to visit tutoring during the day in between classes. Tomiko, Keiko, and Samir all suggested that the Center expand their hours of operation to include evenings and weekends. Tomiko suggest the Center stay open late a few days a week:

Okay so the ESL center is open 10:00-4:00, right. It’s too short . . . like sometimes like 10:00-6:00, or like 10:00-9:00, international students are busy too, so I think 10:00-4:00 is too limited. I think extend hours sometimes, like once or twice a week.

Keiko states that her class schedule makes it difficult for her to come to the Center in the early afternoon, so she suggests the Center open earlier in the morning and stay open during the evenings:

Maybe like time because we also have additional classes during mid-day daytime, so like when I have class during like around lunch time like for example 10-11 and 1-3, I really can't have more time to like come here. I mean it’s difficult to find time to come here, so I just wish a little earlier, or a little later, like after 4 or something.

In addition to expanding the hours during the week, Samir suggests opening the Center on the weekend:

It might be hard as a tutor also because you have a class, but maybe open one day, just Sunday, maybe . . . . Even on the weekend, it’s not supposed to be only on the week day. I mean at least one day [during the weekend] because I mean some people, they came here and they don't the chance to correct their work.
Samir also suggested implementing an online tutoring program:

A lot of people told me about what might be interesting, which is online. It might be really helpful. You’re not going to be worried about coming, or maybe you’re going to be late.

Samir also suggested the ESLRC change locations, “It’s not supposed to be here [referring to the physical building], maybe like in the library or anywhere with time.” Since the library is open very late, Samir suggests tutors be made available at the library.

During the interview, Samir offered some great suggestions for improving student access to tutoring services. Interview data suggest that students desire to engage in more critical discussion with tutors during sessions; however, the period of time students have to engage in rich discussion with a tutor is dependent on the physical and space constraints of the Center. If students have to wait long periods of time to see a tutor, and they know that other students are also waiting for tutors, they might not think that they have time to engage in time consuming discussions of content or other critical literacy practices with tutors. Time constraints not only limit students’ perceptions of the services offered, but also reify product driven approaches to tutoring. It is a lot less time consuming for students to sit quietly while tutors correct their work, than for students and tutors to negotiate the rhetorical choices students made while composing. Time and space constraints limit students abilities to engage in individual or group interactions as well as one-on-one tutoring.

Key Findings

Although students who frequent the ESL Resource Center engage in a wide variety of literacy and writing practices across linguistic, cultural, and academic courses,
they tend to only utilize the Center as a space to receive corrective feedback that focuses on identifying sentence level errors on final drafts of formal essays, or other written products. Even students that frequent the English as a Second Language Resource Center regularly are often not aware of all of the services available to them throughout the writing process. Multilingual students are acutely aware of the complexity of the writing process, however most multilingual students have a very narrow perception of the literacy and writing practices they can and should engage in with tutors at the ESLRC. The literacy practices that students reported engaging in with tutors largely reflected a monolingual product-oriented approach to tutoring.

Findings suggest that although students struggle throughout the composition process, especially in the early stages of the pre-task planning and research phases, students do not report utilizing the Center to collaborate with tutors during the early stages of the writing process. Students reported struggling to locate, synthesize, and evaluate appropriate sources, however only Keiko reported actively seeking help with reading during tutoring sessions. Keiko also reported that much of the reading tutoring focused on summarizing content rather than employing critical reading strategies. Samir even reported that he was unaware he could in fact receive support with reading, listening and speaking as well as writing in the ESLRC.

Students also reported engaging in co-collaboration and deep discussions of complex ideas and course content, outside of the Center with peers and near peers and experts from similar linguistic and academic backgrounds, rather than with tutors in the Center. Similarly, students reported frequently engaging in informal and formal feedback
practices with classmates, friends, and family members throughout the drafting process, rather than with tutors in the ESLRC.

Overall, students reported that they mostly engage in a limited number of final-product oriented conventional literacy practices with tutors, after they completing most of the pre-task planning and organizing independently, or with co-collaborators outside of the Center. One possible reason for this might be increased access to peers, digital resources, and other networks of support that can provide students with on-demand resources across discourse communities.

Students revealed a desire to engage in deeper discussions of critical and conventional literacy practices with tutors during tutoring sessions. Specifically, Selma suggested tutors ask more questions in order to determine the rhetorical choices students make and understand the purposes of the assignment.

Student Perceptions of the Services Available at the ESLRC

Students’ perceptions of the goals and purposes of the Center dictate the practices students and tutors engage in during tutoring sessions, and shape the overall culture of practice in the Center. If students reported engaging in a wide range of critical and conventional literacy practices with tutors, they saw the Center as serving multiple purposes, and therefore utilized the Center to help them navigate multiple plural identities. On the other hand, if students reported engaging in only a limited number of conventional literacy practices with tutors, they tended to view the Center as a place to engage in expert-mediated conventional practices, and therefore only utilized the Center to serve one purpose and reinforce their identity as a limited speaker or writer.
Data also revealed that the literacy practices students come to value in the Center are reflection of the literacy practices they see emphasized in their course work. Students might not have such a narrow perception of the services available to them at the ESLRC if instructors encouraged students to engage in pre-writing and research practices with tutors in the ESLRC as they do with final editing. Students may have a limited view of the services available to them at the Center is because students are often referred to the ESL Resource Center by instructors after identifying the student as a “struggling writer” in their writing intensive courses. Many instructors require students to visit the Center before they submit their final drafts, or after they have submitted a paper that an instructor deems unacceptable.

Findings also suggest that instructors are not always aware of all of the diverse services available to students at the ESLRC. Student responses indicated instructors do not necessarily encourage students to visit the Center throughout the writing process to further develop their ideas; instead, they refer students to the Center as a place to go to “edit” their final papers. In other words, instructors that privilege correct grammar and accuracy over other aspects of writing shape student perceptions and values of what “good” writing is. If instructors only encourage students to identify errors with tutors in order to “fix” their papers, students come to see this as the only service of value available to them at the Center.

The literacy practices that an instructor values are reflected in an instructor's grading criteria. An instructor's grading criteria directly influences the values students attach to a particular set of literacy practices. An instructor's implied preference for a particular set of literacy practices manifests in the types of literacy and writing practices
that instructor asks students to repeatedly engage in throughout a course. This process eventually results in the reification of conventional literacy practices across cultures, academic disciplines, and institutions. Instructional preferences and field-specific literacy constructs also dictate the literacy and writing practices that students and tutors tend to focus on during tutoring sessions.

One way tutors can challenge this product-based approach to ESL writing is to increase instructor and tutors awareness of the comprehensive tutoring services available at the ESLRC, and encourage students to engage in discussions of critical literacy with students during sessions.

Although tutors maintain some institutional power during tutoring sessions, they do not actually have the power to change an instructor's assignment or the grading criteria attached to an assignment. A tutor cannot simply dismiss an instructor's assignment or grading criteria that reinforces a skills-based approach to writing, which conflicts with their own philosophical or pedagogical approaches to learning. Tutors, like students, must adhere to the constraints of an instructor's assignment in order for the student to earn an acceptable grade. Although a tutor can encourage students to critically evaluate the assignments they are assigned and identify and challenge parts of individual assignments that reinforce conventional literacy practices, they have no power or influence over how instructors evaluate student work or the literacy constructs that are an instructor's privilege.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

The project culminates with a review of the overall project, and further explores the implication of key finding on the ESLRC. This chapter begins with a brief summary of the overall study. Next, key findings from student interviews are further explained, and provide evidence to support adopting a translingual approach to tutoring in the ESLRC. After explaining how key finding support adopting a translingual approach to writing in the Center, a series of recommendations are made for tutors. Finally, a “toolkit” that illustrates how adopting a translingual approach to writing will help multilingual students utilize the wide range of resources available to them at ESLRC throughout the writing process is provided.

Summary

This study attempted to more fully address the ideological and pedagogical “gap” identified in ESL and composition studies literature by conducting primary research that focused on the wide variety of literacy practices members of the ESLRC engage in across social, cultural, and academic discourse communities. Research that addressed this theoretical “gap” that currently exists across the disciplines of second-language and literacy and composition studies was identified and synthesized in the
literature review. This brief review of the literature explained how ideological divisions have lead to conflicting literacy constructs across academic disciplines, and have contributed to second-language professionals adopting traditional monolingual approaches to language learning. However, current trends in second-language writing research suggest a paradigm shift is occurring in language instruction towards a translingual approach. This shift more fully integrating social theories of learning into multilingual learning spaces, and challenges conventional, monolingual literacy constructs and underlying assumptions which have come to dominate second-language writing.

This study utilized ethnographic research methods to collect primary data from multilingual students who frequent the ESLRC at CSUC. One-on-one interviews allowed students the opportunity to provide first-hand autobiographical accounts of the various discourse communities they participate in as well as the literacy and writing practices students engage in beyond the brick and mortar Center.

Interview data provided valuable insight into the beliefs and values that shape the literacy practices multilingual students engage in at the Center. Student interview data revealed that popular beliefs surrounding the nature of language learning dictate institutional expectations, and shape the overall culture of practice in the ESLRC. Students reported engaging in a wider array of critical literacy practices with peers and near peers throughout the writing process, however, further analysis brought to light that students have a limited view of the literacy practices they perceive as appropriate to engage in during tutoring sessions at the Center.
Findings from this study reinforced previously established research that supports adopting a translingual approach to language learning. Emergent trends in language and literacy scholarship across disciplines has recommended language professionals and paraprofessionals, adopt a translingual approach to writing. Key findings suggest students have a narrow perception of the resources available to them in the Center. This limited view of the literacy practices students can and should engage in with tutors is also reflection of tutor and instructor expectations across academic discourse communities.

The final section of this chapter explores how key findings from this study will inform future tutoring practices in the ESLRC. Adopting a translingual approach to tutoring in the Center will provide multilingual students with the resources and support to successfully negotiate the rhetorical choices available to them throughout the composition process.

Conclusion

Monolingualist approaches to language learning continue to dominate multilingual learning spaces despite researchers across disciplines calling for an alternate language-learning model that offers a more complete picture of multilingual literacy. Translingualism offers and alternative ideological and pedagogical approach to writing which more fully integrates social theories of learning and critical literacy into multilingual writing spaces. Interview data and established research both support the ESLRC adopting a translingual approach to tutoring.
Student interview data suggest students, tutors, and instructors tend to privilege monolingual approaches to multilingual tutoring. Interview data revealed that although multilingual students participate in a wide range of critical literacy practices outside of the brick and mortar Center with peers, near peers, and experts, they tend to engage in conventional literacy practices with tutors during the final stages of the writing process during tutoring sessions at the Center. These findings are significant for two reasons. First, they imply that students privilege expert-mediated, final-product focused, conventional literacy practices in the Center, which reflect monolingual approaches to writing. Second, findings reveal that although students struggle throughout the pre-task planning, and drafting phase of the writing process, they are not collaborating with tutors throughout the early stages of the writing process.

Adopting a translingual approach to writing in the ESLRC will provide students with a safe space for students and tutors to “develop alternatives to conventional treatments of language difference” (Horner et al., 2011, p. 304). In addition to discussing linguistic features of English, students and tutors can engage in discussions of linguistic, cultural, and rhetorical differences across discourses. If the focus of tutoring sessions shifts from expert-centered discussions of sentence level features of English, to more student-centered discussions, of the rhetorical and cultural significance of specific assignments, students and tutors will be much more likely to develop a critical framework.

Most importantly, adopting a translingual approach to language “defines all acts of reading and writing, speaking and listening as related acts of translation and transformation as well as negotiation” (Lu & Horner, 2012, p. 4). Tutors can more
effectively support students throughout the composition and writing process by expanding their definition of “writing” to include reading critically, engaging in textual analysis, and synthesizing and evaluating sources in order to compose research driven claims. Acknowledging the interconnectedness of all aspects of communication and language would help students and tutors analyze rhetorical features of texts, across genres and discourse communities throughout the research and writing process.

Findings also suggested that students want to engage in complex discussions of language and writing with tutors, not just have expert tutors identify and correct errors. A translingual approach would encourage both students and tutors to adopt an “attitude of deliberative inquiry” (Horner et al., 2011, p. 304). Instead of maintaining rigid novice-student, expert-tutor roles in the Center students and tutors would both focus on asking difficult questions about the nature of language, problematizing texts, and engage in reading to learn and writing to learning.

Finally, if students and tutors begin to view language differences as resources, instead of deficits, the ESLRC would provide a space where tutors help multilingual writers “deploy a broad and diverse repertoire of language resources and responsiveness to the diverse range of readers social positions and ideological perspectives” (Horner et al., 2011, pp. 312-313). Engaging in critical rhetorical, social, and textual analysis across academic disciplines, languages, and cultures encourages student writers and tutors to develop a critical literacy framework that would increase student and tutor metacognitive awareness, and intercultural competence.

Shifting the ideological and pedagogical focus of the Center from a monolingual approach to a translingual approach will encourage students and tutors to
embrace differences across discourse communities and encourage students and tutors to develop a critical framework for engaging in linguistic, cultural, and rhetorical analysis across discourse communities. Adopting a translingual approach views all communicative practices as negotiations, and as such will more fully integrate reading and writing practices into tutoring sessions at the Center. Translingualism also embraces inquiry, encouraging students and tutors to both take on the role of investigator and or expert. Finally, adopting a translingual approach to tutoring will elevate the Center from a safe place to interact across languages and discourse communities in order to meet an academic goal, to a space where students and tutors can explore and analyze difference across languages, cultures, academic disciplines, and genres. Adopting a translingual approach to writing and tutoring in the ESLRC would have far-reaching implications campus wide. A resource was created for students, tutors, and instructors that facilitates an ideological and pedagogical shift towards adopting a translingual approach to writing in the ESLRC.

Implications

Since findings suggest that students are largely unaware of the wide variety of resources and services available to them at the ESLRC, a research driven “toolkit” was designed to present the implications of this study to a wider audience. This “toolkit” was designed to identify the wide array of critical literacy practices students can engage in with tutors during tutoring sessions, and encourage students, tutors, and instructors to recognize that the ESLRC is a space where students can engage in on demand learning throughout the writing process. This “toolkit” will act as a resource for students, tutors,
and instructors by identifying specific points of intervention where tutors can help students develop a critical framework for engaging in textual and rhetorical analysis throughout the pre-task planning, drafting, and editing phase of the writing process. The “toolkit” was designed to reconceptualize traditional monolingual approaches to tutoring by shifting the focus of the Center an expert-mediated, deficit-approach to tutoring that privileges conventional literacy to a translingual student-centered anti-deficit approach which focuses on the critical literacy practices of multilingual students.
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APPENDIX A
How can the ESL Resource Center help students, tutors, and instructors adopt a translingual approach to writing?

1. Increasing Awareness of Services Offered at the Center
2. Addressing Physical and Temporal Constraints
3. Creating a Website to Increase Access to On-Demand Services

In the ESLRC Students Receive Support:

Writing  Reading
Speaking  Listening

Throughout the Research & Writing Process
Drafting

Planning and Organizing
Students and Tutors Negotiate Rhetorical Choices while Drafting

- Identifying Purpose of Assignment
- Identifying Audience
- Formulating Research Driven Claims
- Composing First Draft
- Identifying Genre Conventions
Students and Tutors Identify and Negotiate the Cultural Significance of Errors and Differences Across Discourses

Final Draft

Physical & Temporal Constraints

A Monolingual Tutoring Model Dictates Students Wait Long Periods of Time to Work One-On-One with Tutors During the Final Stages of the Writing Process

A Translingual Approach Shifts the Focus of the Center From Expert-Centered to Student-Centered.
While Students Wait to Work One-on-One With Tutors, They Can Utilize Designated Spaces to Work Individually, or Collaborate in Small Groups.

**Individual Work Space**
- Connect to Other Resources
- Write and Draft
- Locate and Read Sources
- Outline and Map Assignments

**Group Work Space**
- Practice Oral Presentations with an Audience of Peers
- Plan, Draft & Compose Group Projects
- Read and Interpret Other Students' Work
- Receive and Provide Peer Feedback
Online Resources

An ESLRC Website Would Increase Student, Tutor, and Instructor Access to Resources Beyond the Temporal and Physical Constraints of the Brick and Mortar ESL Resource Center
A Website Would Provide Students, Tutors and Instructors With On-Demand Resources Throughout the Drafting Process

Students Can Utilize On-Demand Resources While Composing

Tutors Can Utilize Online Tools & Models of Student Work to Analyze Differences in Language, Culture, and Field Specific Genre Conventions with Students

Instructors Can Utilize Online Tools to Familiarize Themselves with Translingual Approaches to Writing

Students:
- Compare Rhetorical Strategies Across Cultures
- Access Links to Online Resources
- Compare & Analyze Models Across Courses
- Engage in Critical Feedback Practices

Tutors:
- Compare Writing Across Discourses
- Engage in Critical Feedback Practices
- Identify Genre Conventions Across Fields
- Identify Rhetorical Purposes & Strategies

Instructors:
- Provide Models of Student Work
- Encourage Students to Compose Multiple Drafts
- Become Familiar with Available Resources
- Encourage Peer & Tutor Feedback Practices
APPENDIX B
INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

Integrating Social Learning and New Literacy Practices into Multi Language Writing Spaces: Creating an Online Resource for Multilingual Writers and Tutors

Student Interview Protocol
(20 minutes)
One goal of this study is to identify the academic discourse communities students and tutors participate in outside of the English as a Second Language Resource Center. A secondary goal of this project is to create an online resource that will allow students and tutors to connect with these academic discourse communities using an online resource.

I would like to spend about 20 minutes talking with you about your experiences related to writing in your field and in the ESL Resource Center. I am particularly interested in the resources you are currently utilizing in order to connect with other writers in the ESL Resource Center, and in your field. If you choose to participate in this study, you will be anonymized in order to protect your identity. Your name will be replaced with a pseudonym in all written work. All written and video recording of interview data will be destroyed upon the completion of the study.

Background:

1. Talk to me a little about your language and cultural background. When did you start using the ESL Resource Center?

2. What kinds of work have you brought into the ESLRC for help?

3. What genres (types) of writing have you worked with in your major? In other classes outside of your major?

4. Other than writing assignments, what type of work have you brought to the ESLRC? Besides writing, what other aspects of language would you like help with in the ESLRC?

5. What resources do you utilize to help you with your coursework and academic English in addition to the ESLRC?

6. What kinds of online communities do you participate in, in your native language, and in English?

7. What do you think the goals or purposes of the ESLRC are? What do you think they should be?

8. How do you think the ESLRC could better serve the students that utilize its services?