DOI: 10.1111/weng.12459

Check for updates

PAPER

WORLD ENGLISHES WILEY

World Englishes, translingualism, and racialization in the US college composition classroom

Eunjeong Lee | Sara P. Alvarez

Department of English, Queens College, City University of New York, USA

Correspondence
Eunjeong Lee, Department of English, Queens College, City University of New York, NY, USA.
Email: eunjeong.lee@qc.cuny.edu

Abstract

This paper examines the connection between language ownership and racialization as discussed in world Englishes (WE) and translingualism. WE and translingualism have expanded both epistemological and ontological spectrums in understanding how Englishes have been used, understood, and transformed in different global contexts, challenging a monolingual orientation to language and literacy. Yet, less questioned is how the very approach to various ways of 'owning' Englishes contributes to WE and translingualism's work of linguistic justice. In this regard, we argue that the issue of racialization needs to be foregrounded in these two bodies of scholarship to better account for racialized students' language practices and ownership. Situating this examination in the US college composition classroom, we discuss how the conceptualization of language ownership can extend monolingual and racializing ideologies. We conclude by calling for a more linguistically just view of language ownership as a way to undo the racial-linguistic stratification in educational contexts such as the writing classroom.

1 | INTRODUCTION

Jamila Lyiscott's (2014) TED spoken word poem '3 ways to speak English' has garnered over four million views. But the importance of Lyiscott's work lies beyond its virality. Lyiscott's poetic and critical take on being called 'articulate' delves into the racial and linguistic undertones of what it means to participate in a multilingual society as a Black Trinidadian and Tobagonian American scholar raised in New York City (Raz, 2014). In her performance, Lyiscott explains how she navigates three social domains in her life – home, friends, and school – and how being considered 'articulate' in each of these intersecting locales requires negotiating different and nuanced linguistic performances, thereby declaring herself 'trilingual.' To this extent, Lyiscott brings to light how her language use is pluralistic and always undergoing transformation, under different power relations, including racialization. Yet Lyiscott does not merely foreground race and the racialized aspects of her voice, but also uses them as contending points for reconceptualizing 'articulateness,' and language practice. Reflecting on her language use in school, Lyiscott meditates on how being recognized as

 © 2020 John Wiley & Sons Ltd

'articulate' is a relational, and therefore political, matter intertwined with the power structure and its conception of knowledge and race. Lyiscott agentively performs and contests the languaging of articulateness, as she exclaims on the control of language, as in the extract below.

Extract (1)
And sometimes in class
I might pause the intellectual sounding flow to ask
'Yo! Why dese books neva be about my peoples'
Yes, I have decided to treat all three of my languages as equals
Because I'm 'articulate'
But who controls articulation?
Because the English language is a multifaceted oration
Subject to indefinite transformation

Lyiscott's work moves between her translingual practice and her sense of ownership over the Englishes she has grown up with and learned to navigate. She importantly questions how educators participate in the sociopolitical decision making of deeming who is articulate and how. More so, Lyiscott calls attention to how this subjective view of 'articulation' works as an exclusionary practice, by which her community's ways of knowing and historicizing have been neglected. The attention placed on this exclusionary practice is a particularly crucial matter in US schooling contexts, as work on raciolinguistics (Alim, 2016; Flores & Rosa, 2015; Rosa & Flores, 2017) shows how racialization complicates one's experiences with language in such spaces and considerations of who is considered 'articulate.' More broadly, matters of who and what 'sounds' and 'reads' as articulate are concerned with language ideology and reified conceptualizations of who owns, and therefore is attributed to the production of, language, literacies, and knowledge (Mignolo, 2000; Rosa, 2019; Sánchez, 2016). From this perspective, then, the notions of 'articulateness' and language ownership function as a manifestation of a monocultural and monolingual ideology that calls for speaking 'white,' or within the perception of whiteness (Inoue, 2015). This, of course, presents tremendous detriment to the schooling and writing experiences of racialized students, as they are presented with a double-edged sword, by which manifestations of articulation are read as dissociated from their own community and culturally rooted communicative practices, stripping off their language ownership. Here, we want to clarify that such harm is not just done through dominant language ideologies that focus on language standardization and diction in the classroom, but also through pedagogies that view multilingual communicative practices through a racializing lens that cannot recognize their performative potential.

Influential in the pluralization of English languages and the dynamic and cultural characters of literacy practices, world Englishes (WE) and translingualism offer useful ways for exploring answers to this matter further, as these two lines of scholarship importantly highlight how different Englishes and other potential communicative resources are drawn upon to make meaning (Canagarajah, 2013; Higgins, 2009; Kirkland, 2010). In this regard, we pose that WE and translingualism offer us – as scholars and educators at the intersections of language research and practice – opportunities for working against the monolingual-oriented racial-linguistic hierarchy in our classrooms. In making this case, this paper foregrounds questions of language ownership and racialization in the discussion of WE and translingualism as implicated in the US postsecondary writing classroom. In our exploration of language ownership and racialization, we discuss the contextual ramifications of how language ideology shapes (and can hinder) knowledge production in writing education, where communicative practice and performativity are crucial to the language and literacy growth of all students (Flores, 2018; Kinloch, 2017; Kynard, 2008, 2011). Central to our examination is the potential we advocate for in these literacy sites for both students and teachers to actively resist and undo harmful racializing forces of monolingualized language ideology and reimagine students' language ownership more critically. The US postsecondary writing classroom is an important site with material consequences of this discussion. This is particularly so given the dominant monolingual ideology that shapes the administrative and pedagogical practices, on one hand, and its increasingly multilingual and multicultural linguistic landscape on the other with the changing transnational migration patterns and policies that have significantly impacted our work for the last three decades or so.

Our work is then prompted by the following question: How does the US writing classroom, together with the current conceptualization of language ownership, participate in the racialization of students? How we see and rethink language ownership amidst these racial/economic/transnational relations and educational inequalities based on the insights from WE and translingualism can grant us opportunities for change. Specifically, working at the juncture of these two lines of scholarship can help us positively shift power dynamics for those students who have been marginalized and racialized in the writing classroom, to the extent that they can feel a sense of ownership of and confidence in their own writing practice.

Below, we begin with a brief discussion on how monolingual norms have historically impacted the US college writing classroom and worked to reinforce student racialization. We focus on how the teaching of writing was established on the premise of remedying language difference as in 'fixing' and responding to surface mechanical issues. Then, we discuss how WE and translingualism have contributed to problematizing English monolingualism, and how discussions on race and racialization bridge these two bodies of scholarship. In particular, we emphasize how our conceptualization of language ownership also operates at the intersection of monolingual and racializing ideologies. Finally, we argue that WE and translingualism–in their attention to language ideology and writing practice–both carefully approach the conceptualization of language ownership away from monolingual and racializing ideologies. In doing so, we revisit calls for problematizing how articulation and language appropriateness are understood in the context of so-called academic writing.

2 | THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE IN THE US WRITING CLASSROOM

Historically, the US postsecondary writing classroom has long reinforced the idea of English as a rigid, monolithic entity (Strickland, 2011; Trimbur, 1999). In fact, to a great extent it has worked as the very deterrent force in the expansion of language pluralism in writing education (Hall, 2014; Horner & Trimbur, 2002). Exclusively focused on the young white men for whom US universities were designed and imagined for (Wilder, 2013), writing classrooms in the late-19th century, set the tone for how the culture of writing education could participate in the extension of exclusion, segregation, and monoculturalism. However, it was not just in the mere design of universities that postsecondary writing classrooms participated in monolingual and racialized ideologies.

The debates during the late 1800s over what was to be taught in the college writing classroom, as well as the conceptualization of writing classrooms as remedial forms of education also set the tone for the existing US writing culture. As Strickland (2011) has demonstrated in her study of how writing programs became 'managerial,' the debates reinforced structuralist views of language, by which the teaching of writing (as a literacy practice) was limited to instruction on syntax and mechanics. In the late 19th century, administrators at Harvard University introduced admissions and curricular requirements based on students' writing abilities in English, conflating knowledge and literacy with writing mechanics (Brereton, 1995, p. 89). And it was this controversial decision that, to a great extent, led to the centrality of writing instruction and the creation of the first English Department in the US (Berlin, 1987, pp. 34–35).

As a matter of fact, much of the continued discourse over these language and literacy debates has largely ignored the structural inequities and contributions that historically marginalized students have faced and played in transforming the US writing classroom. For example, in the case of the City University of New York (CUNY), the largest urban university system in the US context, it was the Black and Puerto Rican Student Community (BPRSC) who actively worked for and demanded open admissions at the university in the 1960s (CDHA, 2019). These student protests – along with the country's history on 'desegregation and convergence' – led to what has been understood as the most important language and cultural shift for CUNY, and the development and launch of basic writing (Kynard, 2013, p. 151). As a teaching approach and form of study, basic writing has also inadvertently participated in the conceptualization of writing instruction as a remedial task, which has often targeted students presumed as multilingual and 'in-need' of a mythologized form of so-called 'Standard Written English (SWE)' (Otte & Mlynarczyk, 2010). This racialization

of specific bodies of students (in their majority students of color) in the writing classroom as in-need of SWE or 'basic writing' has long been amplified through monolingualist ideologies (Alvarez, 2018). And while the US college writing culture has certainly moved past the limited perspective of equating literacy with writing mechanics, the monolingualist ideology of 'a' SWE still stands for English and writing. More broadly, in the teaching of writing, academic discourses of language appropriateness and articulation have been imagined (and rewarded) within and from the privileged position of whiteness. As Kynard (2013) has importantly shown, the politics of writing in academia have always been about how historically racialized students are going to be viewed (and by consequence treated) by white gazed ideologies of language and culture.

The white gaze against racialized students is also present even in the best attempts to serve these students, away from the othering gaze. Centralizing the importance of race and embodied language practice in this discussion, Green (2016a) has shown how students at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), postsecondary institutions long-invested in their cultural and linguistic growth, dynamically navigate the 'push-pull' forces of the writing classroom. As Green (2016a, p. 154) writes, '[e]ven at HBCUs where Black English traditions flow through ceremonies, social events, and sports culture (see any HBCU homecoming), classroom discourse focuses on normative standards for writing. In other words, HBCUs push students toward social justice goals within the institutional context while also pulling them toward certain dominant, white language norms within classrooms.' Therefore, while the writing classroom offers a space to explore the dynamic character of language practice and performativity, the monolingualist ideology can still operate as a restrictive force. This is of particular concern in the study and teaching of writing, where Black cultures and languages, for example, have been treated as singular, informal, and monolithic 'under white supremacy' (Kynard, 2013, p. 79; Baker-Bell, 2017). Challenging 'the privileging of purely Eurocentric modes and decades-old ways of thinking on language education [and practice]' (Green, 2016b, p. 162), Kynard (2013) argues for an understanding of Black English – in its many variations, pluralisms, and community perspectives – as 'invigorated' by Black Power. Through this view, 'the language of the masses of black folks [is situated] as a critical source of its own knowledges,' and not 'reduced to a "coping mechanism" or "oppositional response" to oppression' (Kynard, 2013, pp. 78–79). In this manner, Kynard explicitly locates Black Englishes as both rhetorical traditions and community practices that belongs to the people furthering this knowledge. More so, Kynard importantly calls into question how languages, as meaning-making practices, are inadequately valorized and conceptualized through monolingual and racialized ideologies.

The monolithic construction of English and writing construed as the speaking position and entextualization of whiteness also reflects how composition classes function as a site where both students and their languages become stratified. Canagarajah (2006) points out the segregationist tendency to different Englishes in composition classrooms – namely that WE belongs to students' home, local communities, and informal places, and therefore can be allowed in class discussions (that is, speaking), but not in writing for the purpose of a 'formal' and 'serious' text production. The view that WE (as well as other languages) cannot participate in the production of institutionally valued communicative exchanges, such as writing, also reflects how these different Englishes are viewed from the white gaze. This very orientation disregards the racialized dynamics of our society, as specifically manifested in the writing classroom (Baker-Bell, 2017).

3 | WORLD ENGLISHES AND TRANSLINGUALISM

The controversy generated by US college composition simultaneously makes it a space of imperative significance and potential for change. To this end, scholarly discussions in WE and translingualism on different Englishes and language plurality has helped to draw needed attention to the increasing heterogeneity and complexity of linguistic backgrounds of US students. Particularly, the insights from WE and translingualism have helped to challenge the English-only monolingual ideology in the teaching and study of composition. Language and literacy scholars have long argued that schools need to promote better awareness and engagement with different Englishes and languages both within and beyond

the US. Focusing on the crucial role that the use of Englishes plays in the lives of minoritized youths in urban contexts, Kirkland (2010, p. 296) has called attention to how English education (which is directly aligned with the US teaching of writing) must work to better address the ways in which minoritized youths embody, experience, navigate, and contribute to the dynamic character of Englishes, which with them carry their own histories of 'survival and oppression.' Specifically, Kirkland (2010) aligns his scholarship with WE and language and literacy scholars who look to answer today's pressing sociopolitical contexts of racial and cultural injustice in educational environments (Alim, Rickford, & Ball, 2016; Kinloch, 2017). In a similar fashion, Kubota (2001, pp. 49, 47) has suggested that schools should be able to 'develop awareness and attitudes necessary for functioning in a culturally and linguistically diverse society' as students likely communicate more and more with 'various WE speakers on campuses and at workplaces.' Attuned to these language and literacies expectations, many writing instructors have purposefully incorporated WE texts in their teaching and sought to foster opportunities for students to examine different Englishes and variability of norms (Lee, 2014; Wetzl, 2013). While not conclusive, these studies often report students' enhanced awareness of the pluralism of English formations, WE, and positive perceptions towards texts that work within and across these different Englishes. And in this sense, as a concrete representation of different varieties, WE serves an entry point in which students can discuss language difference and pluralism as a natural linguistic happening.

Rooted in the study of writing, translingual-oriented pedagogy has mainly worked to understand how meaning-making practices can be brought to the attention of writers, so that they gain awareness and sensitivity to language difference and heterogeneity. US composition scholars Horner, Lu, Royster, and Trimbur (2011) and Lu and Horner (2013) have posed that language difference in writing should be seen as an opportunity to interrogate and problematize monolingual ideologies that look to discount plural ways of knowing. In line with this argument, You (2016, p. 85) has demonstrated that academic Englishes get negotiated and transformed in the interest of communication, and specifically amidst the context of writing. In fact, in arguing for a more pluralistic view of language practice, You has forwarded a cosmopolitan view of English, by which 'taking a cosmopolitan perspective will enable us in writing studies to further appreciate the creativity that English, along with other languages, affords multilingual writers.' Enacting such orientations in an actual educational context, however, requires mobilizing both material and dispositional work in sustainable ways. Oriented to this language and literacy perspective in the writing classroom, Mihut (2019, p. 81) has importantly shown the need for the adoption of a translingual pedagogy to be directly concerned and invested in the work of language rights and social justice. As she has argued, '[t]olerating pluralism is one type of value. Advocating and working for language rights and global perspective in composition involves a completely different set of practices and values. It shows commitment to engage with and dismantle privilege and power discourses with students, with teachers, and with local communities.' As we, too, have argued the approach toward language pluralism – via our adoption of a translingual orientation – involves extraordinary labor because of its sociopolitical literacy context, by which the democratic project of schooling is still a longing for racialized bi/multilingual students (Alvarez & Lee, 2019).

While the philosophical orientation from WE and translingualism is liberating and a reflection of our student reality, this work also requires careful attention to how students' social contexts and embodied lived experiences differ, and how structural inequities and matters of historical exclusion affect them in their everyday learning. Gilyard (2016), for instance, has keenly critiqued how the discourse of translingualism can extend and produce an erasure of inequity and structural difference by treating all language difference as if it were the same form of difference or could receive the same form of assessment. Such critique in scholarly discussions of language difference and experiences of racialized students, specifically in the case of Englishes, reminds us that differences emerging from racialized subjectivities should be more carefully foregrounded in the discussions of WE and translingualism. WE and translingualism share the common goal of working toward linguistic pluralism and justice. Yet, this goal also justly calls for sensitivity to different differences (Alvarez & Lee, 2019). This inquiry is the question of how we understand students' language experiences, histories, and practices, including how their language practices are implicated in the practices and discourses of difference, and specifically, race and racialization. And, as we have noted before, these discourses of racialization and structural exclusion are also the byproduct of how the writing classroom views, both who owns language and what it means to have a sense of language ownership.

4 | LANGUAGE OWNERSHIP IN THE WRITING CLASSROOM

Who can own language, and even whether language can be owned, has been a site for contentious scholarly debates (Hutton, 2010; Norton, 1997; Pennycook, 1997; Widdowson, 1994). This discussion has moved from going beyond the 'birth-right' (Rampton, 1990) or ethnolinguistic membership-oriented view (Bonfiglio, 2013) that entails a focus on one's 'native' or 'nonnative' speaker status, to speakerhood and language identity that emphasizes experiences and practices. As widely documented, debates on native speakerism and 'native speaker' (NS) and 'non-native speaker' (NNS) categories have drawn a great deal of attention from scholars in applied linguistics and TESOL (Bonfiglio, 2013; Geeta, 2016; Holliday, 2006; Rudolph, Selvi, & Yazan, 2015). As noted by Widdowson (1994, pp. 384, 385), language ownership is concerned with the way people make meaning 'which [they] can call [their] own' rather than 'a possession that they [the native speakers] lease out to others, while still retaining the freehold.' Widdowson's (1994) discussion of language ownership also importantly hints that language ownership is an issue of a racial hierarchy in a sense that 'who' is inventing a new meaning matters in calling the new language as innovative or just nonconforming. Examining the practice of lexical innovations, Widdowson takes an example of two words, 'depone' and 'prepone,' the former a respectable technical legal term, and the latter an Indian English word that contrasts with the word, 'postpone.' Pointing out how these two words receive a different status (as in legitimate vs. othered English) despite a similar process of invention, Widdowson poses that the double standards are at play in evaluating the legitimacy of these two terms. While Widdowson himself did not explicitly make this legitimacy as a racial matter, it is the racializing ideology that is at play in this kind of evaluation. What matters in legitimacy of English is who invented the term and where the term is used, including who stands on the other side of the lexical invention and the ideology that governs the decision of whether a new linguistic invention is acceptable or not. Given that language use is always about making meaning, this decision is also about which meaning is acceptable and worthy of a space within a sociosemiotic field. Altogether, accepting a new term as a legitimate expression is a sociopolitical act, a work of recognizing which body belongs to the given sociosemiotic field as a legitimate member with a capacity to expand conventions that can either preserve or transform a racial-linguistic power structure. This discussion ultimately points to the racializing potential in recognizing and evaluating whose words are 'legitimate.'

In this regard, both WE and translingualism have critiqued and challenged the dominant monolingual ideologies and the implicating understanding of who can own language, albeit differently. The core of WE's theoretical tenet resembles Widdowson's position, namely that English belongs to everyone, not one particular group of speakers – those who are conceived as 'native speakers' of English who are also white in the monolingual and monocultural conceptualization of language ownership. Yet, WE's approach to language ownership has also inadvertently reinforced the conceptualization of language norms by connecting speakers' legitimacy to understanding the norms of each variety of English (Bokhorst-Heng, Alsagoff, McKay, & Rubdy, 2007; Higgins, 2003; Rubdy, McKay, Alsagoff, & Bokhorst-Heng, 2008). This focus on language norms leaves out how students have different embodied experiences and practices in and across different languages and literacies. Just like the way the 'spot the difference' approach (Saraceni, 2015) is grounded in the deficient view towards peripheralized Englishes, highlighting 'a' norm in the way students 'own' language inadvertently extends racializing ideology. Despite the contributions made by WE in expanding the spectrum of different English, WE's focus on the norm does not address the fact that racialization and the racializing white gaze continue to (over)determine the legitimacy and belonging of all student voices in writing classrooms. This particularly impacts students of color whose lived experiences are not only marked by racialization in the US writing classroom, but in their everyday societal participation (Baker-Bell, 2017). The conceptualization of language ownership that takes language norms as a measure of legitimacy by default renders language minoritized students as not able to hold any legitimacy in any language – what Rosa (2016) has called the 'ideology of languagelessness,' by which language-minoritized students (racialized bi/multilinguals) are consistently conceptualized as having neither 'a' language nor another. Therefore, the conceptualization of language ownership itself can operate as an extension of the monolingual and racializing ideology, operating within the colonial paradigm of language and race.

While translingualism has not addressed the matter of language ownership forefront, the scholarship has complicated the notion of language ownership and challenged the monolingual orientation further, by situating itself as moving beyond the native and nonnative binary and toward experiences and socialization as the core of a person's language identity (Canagarajah, 2013). Beyond the focus on forms of language (for example, the norms within each institutionalized variety of English), as shown in some WE research on language ownership mentioned above, translingualism's focus on language practices and processes provides a new lens through which to understand language ownership, specifically for students who consistently face racialization. As translingualism sees multilingualism, rather than monolingualism, as the norm, it presents a possibility of reenvisioning what it means to experience a sense of language 'ownership' from a multilingual perspective. This shift in understanding language ownership differently, focusing its attention on language and literacy practices as an emergent form of language ownership, moves away from the white gaze that finds evidence of language ownership only in the knowledge of so-called SWE.

Indeed, translingualism emphasizes that the reconceptualization of language ownership too requires a shift in one's dispositions. Recently, scholars in translingualism have taken up a task of examining the values and dispositions that are entrenched in the US educational institutions and discussed the role of dispositions in both multilingual communicative practices and pedagogical approaches that can help sustain students' multilingual practices (Alvarez & Lee, 2019; Lee & Canagarajah, 2019; Lee & Jenks, 2016). The attention on translingual disposition is promising in that it helps to question the monolingual and monocultural orientation in language and literacy practices promoted as 'articulate' in institutional settings. In other words, the focus on translingual dispositions can help us turn to what goes into reading racialized students' language use as 'inarticulate.' And also, importantly, attention to dispositions, as an orientation to and an ideology towards language and literacy that undergirds considering who and what sounds 'articulate,' enables us to see clearly how matters of language ownership and articulateness are beyond language itself, but more about bodies.

The critiques and discussions of monolingualism complicate and highlight how racialization as students experience in their historicities, community practices, and culturally rooted rhetorical traditions come to the forefront and point to the ways in which students experience language and literacy practice differently. And such perspective points to the colonial power structure that organized and naturalized the link between race and language that continues to exert its conceptual influence on the historical and contemporary monolingual ideology (Rosa & Flores, 2017). It points to how through this settler perspective, racialized and minoritized communities' language and literacy practices receive acknowledgement only in the 'service of' white-gazed perspectives of performativity, as opposed to as part of our own ways of knowing. At the core of understanding the naturalization of the race-language link and structural issues of power, then, is who 'can' claim ownership over language and how this claim is extended to language practice and teaching of writing. To summarize, language ownership as a concept conceived through the white colonial gaze can maintain the racial-linguistic stratification in the writing classroom, instead of dismantling it. The monolingual ideology and the corollary racialization of students has also been also (re)produced through the limited conceptualization of language ownership – more specifically, the ownership over English, along with the question of who the writing classroom sees as the owner of English and how. The concept of language ownership where understanding of legitimacy or authority over language norms dominate the conversation will not do due linguistic and racial justice to speakers from marginalized groups, despite its original goal of discussing language and the speakers in a decolonial and democratic manner (Bhatt, 2001).

5 | ARTICULATENESS AND OWNERSHIP IN THE WRITING CLASSROOM

Monolingualism and racism continue to orient our multilingual landscapes. In writing classrooms specifically, these ideological and impactful forces get amplified via our current conceptualizations of language ownership and articulateness. Reimagining language ownership and articulateness is then a crucial goal for sustaining WE and multilingualism in writing classrooms. Such reimagination, however, must go beyond the nationalist and colonial model of speakerhood

and highlight the power and ideology in a person's language practice. It is then imperative for those of us – scholars at the crux of writing and language education – to ask: How can we study and teach writing to do more linguistic justice given what we know about language and identity from research on WE and translingualism? One obvious way to begin this discussion would be to understand language ownership and articulateness from a multilingual perspective. That means this new approach to ownership should give way to the production and sustainability of languages beyond English towards a multilingual and multimodal communication model. Despite the plethora of research that highlights the complex and creative language practices that multilinguals engage in as part of navigating multilingual realities, the current ownership discourses have not centered these practices in studying language ownership. We can foreground the practices that people claim ownership of and the embodied experiences from those practices, not one's knowledge towards language norms alone. What if the scholarship examines the linguistic and rhetorical practices labored from the racialized speaking and listening positions as part of the language ownership (Kinloch, 2017)? Particularly considering the emergent, embodied, and dynamic view of language beyond the visible form of what is traditionally understood as a single named language, a multilingually oriented conceptualization of language ownership and articulateness needs to also reflect these insights.

In addition, considering translingualism's critique on the untenability of the relationship between one's geographical location and linguistic proficiency as well as the complexity and dynamicity of language experiences among transnational, translocal spaces, the notion of ownership can incorporate more situated, historicized accounts of one's use of language (Alvarez, 2018). Taking a temporal-spatial framework enables one to take such an approach. Calling for a translingual approach to agency, Lu and Horner (2013, p. 584) explain that taking a spatial approach to writing alone does not allow us to understand what difference a writer's textual decisions and construction of discourse contributes to and how; rather, they warn, paying attention to the monolingually understood language difference – those 'rendered recognizable' – alone does not help one to understand the significance of one's writing, and more broadly, language use, as a sedimented and situated practice. Asking the same questions allows us to investigate how individuals' language use is meaningful given the speaker's identity, as utterance situated in a particular historical and geopolitical moment, rather than against the monolingual norms. In the practice-based and multilingual-oriented view of language ownership and articulateness, some may question how claiming 'a' language stands in relation to achieving linguistic justice. Based on the discussion so far, claiming 'a' language may not look like a tenable idea in the practice-based and decolonial approach to studying matters of language ownership and articulateness – after all, the idea of 'ownership' itself presumes that language is a property that is ownable, which follows the colonial logic. Here, we would like to take a cautionary note that we are not arguing that claiming a sense of ownership over a named language itself is wrong. As the work on language rights and revitalization has shown (May, 2012; Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1996), claiming 'a' language itself can be an important act in moving towards linguistic justice. Yet, we pose that in moving forward with a pluralistic and more just view towards multilingual students' language practices, we need to be careful not to be caught in the monolingual and colonial conceptualization of language ownership and articulateness.

At the same time, reconceptualizing language ownership away from the white gaze also demands that we work more carefully to valorize the listeners' practice to read and listen to the different differences, and foreground such practice as a way to conceive language ownership differently. As research has shown, multilingual students bring rhetorical savviness and sensitivity to discern difference and dynamically draw on language difference (Lorimer Leonard, 2014; Young, 2004; Zentella, 1997). While such ability has been theorized as competence from a translingual perspective (Canagarajah, 2013), many are still concerned about the necessity for students to learn SWE for their academic success and beyond. However, such concern is based on a limited view of what counts as 'success' in students' writing and an assumption that exclusively working in SWE will contribute to students' 'success,' reinforcing the myth that academic writing can only be engaged through SWE and that using SWE will stop racializing our students. Monolingual and racializing ideologies work against our students' rich linguistic and literacy practices. And when we make a decision to see students' writing through the white gaze, we make the decision to maintain and extend the white language supremacy, not dismantle it. Therefore, we need to take seriously what harm white-gazed conceptualization of language ownership does to students. And ultimately, we have to reflect the practice-based and multilingual-oriented view towards

language ownership and articulateness in our work with students in classrooms. In order to take an activist stance (Mihut, 2019), we need to make conscious efforts to learn to see and hear different differences along with our students in our classroom. What would happen if language ownership is understood as a range of embodied experiences and practices, and the writing classroom is a place to help expand this range for students? We imagine that such pedagogy can achieve at least three goals: raising awareness in different ways to make meaning across language varieties from their positionality, critically questioning the role of ideology in perceptions towards the language difference, and finally creating opportunities for students to perform different practices that are part of their multilingual historicity. In this work, it is crucial to reflect on how our current classroom practices are limiting what are legitimate ways to make meaning and how we are (not) listening to students' own articulation.

6 | CONCLUSION

WE and translingualism provide crucial perspectives about how language ownership and articulateness function in multilingual landscapes. WE extends the ontological spectrum of different Englishes and how these Englishes operate in its speakers' lives, while translingualism asks that we interrogate the dynamic character of these languages, often veiled behind the focus on each language variety. Together, WE and translingualism provide useful epistemological apparatus for researchers to continue to understand what people do with different languages, including Englishes, and how they are differently implicated in language practices as a result. Examining how current monolingualist discourses on and around language ownership contribute to the racialization and restriction of student voices advances our understanding on how WE and translingualism can better address the goal of linguistic justice. WE provides a platform upon which our students can name and historicize their language practices. WE, as a linguistic approach, works to valorize and legitimize language varieties, as opposed to ascribing them as 'broken' or 'nameless' language. WE fosters a pathway for these speakers to understand their language practices as part of historical and dynamic processes that constitute language ecologies. Yet, at the same time, we should also be concerned about the extent to which our research critically attends to the meaning of each difference against the risk of erasing multiple differences. It is towards this end that both WE and translingualism can work alongside one another in order to undo the racial-linguistic stratification in the writing classroom. In this sense, this new imagination asks us to pay attention to the intersection between WE and translingualism all the more carefully around race and racialization. While WE has provided a framework for students to be able to claim ownership over these 'different' languages and plural practices, it needs to also carefully consider how the varied ownership experiences around these languages may be organized based on the racializing ideologies. Similarly, in translingualism's focus on language as meaning making practices, how such meaning making practices may be racialized needs equally important attention. In the midst of this intersection, we also need to pay attention to how different actors in the writing classroom and programs do such work to undo the harmful monolingual and racializing ideological consequences.

In a similar sense, in reimagining 'articulateness' and ownership of language from a multilingual perspective, examining the juncture of WE and translingualism also reminds us of the importance of interrogating our own knowledge making practices and who gets excluded in the discussion. As Lyiscott (2014) importantly highlights in her work, what she is bringing to the forefront is a (re)conceptualization of how articulation, as a form of language and meaning-making practice, is tied to an equal treatment of the rich voicing and voices that belong in her everyday life, as in this final extract.

Extract (2)
'Yo! Why dese books neva be about my peoples'
Yes, I have decided to treat all three of my languages as equals
Because I'm 'articulate'

While WE and translingualism have initiated the work of changing discourses around the issue of language ownership and articulateness, we need more careful attention to different 'bodies' as people and communities who are implicated in the discussion, as the work of raciolinguistics has emphasized (Alim et al., 2016). Our work is most impactful when it grounds itself in the struggle and recognizies the forms of racio-linguistic stratification that our students and their communities face on an everyday basis, especially when they enter our writing classroom.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We sincerely appreciate Jerry W. Lee and Christopher Jenks for their patience and guidance on this manuscript. We'd also like to extend our gratitude to Steven Alvarez for his valuable feedback.

REFERENCES

Alim, H. S. (2016). Introducing raciolinguistics: Racing language and languaging race in hyperracial times. In H. S. Alim, J. Rickford, & A. Ball (Eds.), *Raciolinguistics: How language shapes our ideas about race* (pp. 1–30). New York: Oxford University Press.

Alim, H. S., Rickford, J. R., & Ball, A. F. (Eds.). (2016). *Raciolinguistics: How language shapes our ideas about race*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Alvarez, S. P. (2018). Multilingual writers in college contexts. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *62*, 342–345.

Alvarez, S. P., & Lee, E. (2019). Ordinary difference, extraordinary dispositions: Sustaining multilingualism in the writing classroom. In J. W. Lee & S. Dovchin (Eds.), *Translinguistics: Negotiating innovation & ordinariness* (pp. 61–71). New York: Routledge.

Baker-Bell, A. (2017). 'I can switch my language, but I cannot switch my skin': What teachers must understand about the relationship between black language and race. In E. Moore Jr., A. Michael, & M. W. Penick-Parks (Eds.), *The guide for white women who teach blackboys* (pp. 97–107). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Berlin, J. A. (1987). *Rhetoric and reality: Writing instruction in American colleges, 1900–1985*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Bhatt, R. M. (2001). World Englishes. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *30*(1), 527–550.

Bokhorst-Heng, W. D., Alsagoff, L., McKay, S. L., & Rubdy, R. (2007). English language ownership among Singaporean Malays: Going beyond the NS/NNS dichotomy. *World Englishes*, *26*, 424–445.

Bonfiglio, T. P. (2013). Inventing the native speaker. *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, *1*, 29–58.

Brereton, J. C. (Ed.). (1995). *The origins of composition studies in the American college, 1875–1925*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). The place of world Englishes in composition: The pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication*, *57*, 586–619.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. New York: Routledge.

CUNY Digital History Archive (CDHA). (2019). Press release from Black and Puerto Rican Student Community. Retrieved from http://cdha.cuny.edu/items/show/6932

Flores, T. T. (2018). Breaking silence and amplifying voices: Youths writing and performing their worlds. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *61*, 653–661.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, *85*, 149–171.

Geeta, A. (2016). Rethinking nativeness: Toward a dynamic paradigm of (non)native speakering. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *13*, 351–379.

Gilyard, K. (2016). The rhetoric of translingualism. *College English*, *78*, 284–289.

Green, D. (2016a). Expanding the dialogue on writing assessment at HBCUs: Foundational assessment concepts and legacies of historically Black colleges and universities. *College English*, *79*, 152–173.

Green, D. (2016b). Race, language, policy, and silence in composition studies [Review Essay of the books, *Vernacular insurrections: Race, black protest, and the new century in composition studies*, by C. Kynard; *Shaping language policy in the U.S.: The role of composition studies*, by S. Wible; *A search past silence: The literacy of young men*, by D. E. Kirkland]. *Composition Studies*, *44*, 160–168.

Hall, J. (2014). Multilinguality is the mainstream. In B. Horner & K. Kopelson (Eds.), *Reworking English in rhetoric and composition* (pp. 31–48). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University.

Higgins, C. (2003). 'Ownership' of English in the Outer Circle: An alternative to the NS-NNS dichotomy. *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*, 615–644.

Higgins, C. (2009). *English as a local language: Post-colonial identities and multilingual practices.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal*, *60*, 385–387.

Horner, B., Lu, M., Royster, J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Language differences in writing : Toward a translingual approach. *College English*, *73*, 299–317.

Horner, B., & Trimbur, J. (2002). English only and U.S. college composition. *College Composition and Communication (CCC)*, *53*, 594–630.

Hutton, C. (2010). Who owns language? Mother tongues as intellectual property and the conceptualization of human linguistic diversity. *Language Sciences*, *32*, 638–647.

Inoue, A. (2015). *Antiracist writing assessment ecologies: An approach to teaching and assessing Writing for a socially just future*. Fort Collins, CO/Andersen, SC: The WAC Clearinghouse/Parlor Press.

Kinloch, V. (2017). 'You ain't making me write': Culturally sustaining pedagogies and Black youth's performances of resistance. In D. Paris & H. S. Alim (Eds.), *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world* (pp. 25–42). New York: Teachers College Press.

Kirkland, D. E. (2010). English(es) in urban contexts: Politics, pluralism, and possibilities. *English Education*, *42*, 293–306.

Kubota, R. (2001). Teaching world Englishes to native speakers in the United States. *World Englishes*, *20*, 47–64.

Kynard, C. (2008). Writing while Black: The colour line, Black discourses, and assessment in the institutionalization of writing instruction. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *7*, 4–34.

Kynard, C. (2011). 'This the Conscience Rebel': Class solidarity, congregational capital, and discourse as activism in the writing of Black female college students. *Teaching Education*, *22*, 217–238.

Kynard, C. (2013). *Vernacular insurrections: Race, black protest, and the new century in composition-literacies studies*. New York: SUNY Press.

Lee, E., & Canagarajah, A. S. (2019). The connection between transcultural dispositions and translingual practices in academic writing. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *14*, 14–28.

Lee, J. W., & Jenks, C. (2016). Doing translingual dispositions: Considerations from a US–Hong Kong partnership. *College Composition and Communication*, *68*, 317–344.

Lee, M. E. (2014). Shifting to the world Englishes paradigm by way of the translingual approach: Code-meshing as a necessary means of transforming composition pedagogy. *TESOL Journal*, *5*, 312–329.

Lorimer Leonard, R. (2014). Multilingual writing as rhetorical attunement. *College English*, *76*, 227–247.

Lu, M., & Horner, B. (2013). Translingual literacy, language difference, and matters of agency. *College English*, *75*, 582–607.

Lyiscott, J. (2014). 3 ways to speak English. *TED talk: Ideas worth spreading*. Retrieved from https://www.ted.com/talks/jamila_lyiscott_3_ways_to_speak_english?language=en#t-251692

May, S. (2012). *Language and minority rights*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Mignolo, W. D. (2000). *Local histories/global designs: Coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mihut, L. (2019). Linguistic pluralism: A statement and a call to advocacy. *Reflections*, *18*, 66–86.

Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*, 409–429.

Otte, G., & Mlynarczyk, R. W. (2010). The future of basic writing. *Journal of Basic Writing*, *29*, 5–32.

Pennycook, A. (1997). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. London: Routledge.

Rampton, B. (1990). Displacing the 'native speaker': Expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. *ELT Journal*, *44*, 97–101.

Raz, G. (2014). What does it mean to be 'articulate.' *NPR TED Radio Hour*. [Podcast] Retrieved from https://www.npr.org/templates/transcript/transcript.php?storyId=362372282

Rosa, J. (2016). Standardization, racialization, languagelessness: Raciolinguistic ideologies across communicative contexts. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *26*, 162–183.

Rosa, J. (2019). *Looking like a language, sounding like a race: Raciolinguistic ideologies and the learning of latinidad*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society*, *46*, 1–27.

Rubdy, R., McKay, S. L., Alsagoff, L., & Bokhorst-Heng, W. D. (2008). Enacting English language ownership in the Outer Circle: A study of Singaporean Indians' orientations to English norms. *World Englishes*, *27*, 40–67.

Rudolph, N., Selvi, A. F., & Yazan, B. (2015). Conceptualizing and confronting inequality: Approaches within and new directions for the 'NNEST Movement.' *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *12*, 27–50.

Sánchez, R. (2016). Writing. In I. Ruiz & R. Sánchez (Eds.), *Decolonizing rhetoric and composition studies: New Latinx keywords for theory and pedagogy* (pp. 77–89). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Saraceni, M. (2015). *World Englishes: A critical analysis*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Phillipson, R. (1996). Linguicide and Linguicism. In H. Goebl, P. H. Nelde, Z. Starý, & W. Wölck (Eds.), *Contact linguistics: An international handbook of contemporary research* (Vol. 1, pp. 667–675). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Strickland, D. (2011). *The managerial unconscious: In the history of composition studies*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University.

Trimbur, J. (1999). The problem of freshman English (only): Toward programs of study in *writing*. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, *22*, 9–30.

Wetzl, A. M. (2013). World Englishes in the mainstream composition course: Undergraduate students respond to WE writing. *Research in the Teaching of Writing*, *48*, 204–227.
Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*, 377–389.
Wilder, C. S. (2013). *Ebony and ivy: Race, slavery, and the troubled history of America's universities*. New York: Bloomsbury Press.
You, X. (2016). *Cosmopolitan English and transliteracy*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
Young, V. A. (2004). Your average nigga. *College Composition and Communication*, *55*, 693–715.
Zentella, A. (1997). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. London: Blackwell.

How to cite this article: Lee E, Alvarez SP. World Englishes, translingualism, and racialization in the US college composition classroom. *World Englishes*. 2020;39:263–274. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12459