Advancing a Transnational, Transdisciplinary and Translingual Professional Development Framework for Teaching Assistants in Writing and Spanish Programs: An Update

Alyssa G. Cavazos
University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

Marcela Hebbard
University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

José E. Hernández
University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

Crystal Rodriguez
South Texas College

Geoffrey Schwarz
University of Texas Rio Grande Valley[1]

In 2018, we published a translingual and transdisciplinary collaborative piece that sought to respond to the call for writing and language programs to develop professional development opportunities central to multilingual writers' needs as language learners and writers and their sophisticated and diverse language and writing abilities (Guerra, 2008; Horner et al., 2011; Kells, 2007; Tardy, 2017). We described the design, implementation, and implications of a multilingual

pedagogy professional development series for teaching assistants in a transnational and multilingual context (Cavazos, et al., 2018). In this chapter, we provide an update on what has transpired since the series ended. We arrange the chapter as follows: first, we give a brief description of the institutional context where the workshops took place. Then we briefly describe the professional development series for readers unfamiliar with our first piece. After that, we provide an update on what happened after the series ended that emphasizes the impact, affordances, and challenges of implementing this type of workshop and how the authors continue to enact the core components of the proposed workshop in their disciplinary contexts and teaching practices.

Local Context: What Does It Mean to Teach Bilingually?

According to Barry Thatcher et al. (2015), the Mexico/U.S. border is "a dynamic rhetorical space with multiple language varieties (Spanish, English, and Spanglish), and at least four complexly-related cultural and rhetorical traditions" (p. 170). This rhetorical dynamic complicates and challenges U.S. mainstream writing programs because multilingual and multicultural writing in border regions is a constant occurrence in academic environments. Isabel Baca et al. (2019) assert that academic institutions located on the Mexico/U.S. border tend to have a large percentage of students who are bilingual/translingual, and many are Mexican nationals who cross the border frequently. Established in 2015 as a result of a consolidation between two legacy institutions and aware of the region's sociocultural and linguistic context, our institution, the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (UTRGV) devised a vision of becoming a "highly engaged bilingual university." This vision has led faculty at all levels, from full professors to teaching assistants, to ask: "What does it mean to be a bilingual university?" "What does it mean to teach bilingually?" In the Writing and Language Studies Department, faculty from the units of Linguistics, Rhetoric & Composition, Spanish, Asian Studies, English as a Second Language, and French, among others, have asked critical questions regarding the teaching of writing and language acquisition. Colleagues teaching rhetoric and composition asked: "How should I adapt my pedagogy to help students develop bilingual writing abilities?" Faculty teaching Spanish as a heritage language inquired: "How can we respond to students' diverse levels of language fluency in Spanish heritage?" Faculty teaching modern languages asked: "If I am not bilingual in English and Spanish, how can I effectively contribute to fulfilling UTRGV's vision?" These questions fueled our desire to explore building linguistically inclusive educational environments in writing and language coursework.

In 2016, the Graduate College awarded our newly created department with a grant to develop a Multilingual Pedagogy Professional Development (MPPD)

series for teaching assistants (TAs). The rationale behind this initiative was that an MPPD centered on TAs could enhance the quality of writing instruction in undergraduate courses and encourage TAs to build cross-linguistic awareness. Supporting TAs' pedagogical development is of vital importance since graduate students (and non-tenured faculty alike) are usually hired to teach undergraduate courses (Smith, 2018). As a result, TAs serve as primary points of contact for undergraduate students across disciplines (Gallardo-Williams & Petrovich, 2017).[2]

To design and implement this professional development opportunity for TAs, a transdisciplinary, multilingual research team was formed consisting of graduate students and instructors in rhetoric and composition, Spanish, English as a second language, and anthropology. As Shuck (this volume) argues, "dialogue between faculty within and across disciplines is a critical first step toward a more inclusive view of language in the classroom"; we aimed to build a cross-disciplinary dialogue among the research team. The makeup of our team exemplifies the linguistic richness of our border region. Four of us were born in Mexico and moved to the United States of America at different ages. All five of us speak and possess different levels of literacy competence in Spanish. While each one of us joined the project for different reasons, all five of us were committed to exploring what it means to teach writing and language bilingually. (Please see Gentil, this volume, for a similar attempt to bridge multidisciplinary and translingual approaches to writing in a case study set in the Canadian Francophone-Anglophone context.) Although we (and our institution) are still trying to answer that question, by the end of the project back in 2016, we arrived at a point of convergence, which sees the diverse linguistic and rhetorical realities in our region as a site where writing and language fluidity, hybridity and blurring of boundaries is the norm (Brunk-Chavez et al., 2015; Christoffersen, 2019). Furthermore, this convergence treats students and teachers as experts in languaging (Robinson et al., 2020). In the next section, we briefly describe the four components of the MPPD series for readers unfamiliar with our first piece.[3]

---

2   The following is, in part, the original grant proposal Dr. Colin Charlton submitted to the Graduate College: "[The Department of Writing and Language Studies should] explore transdisciplinary TA training with the idea that language acquisition (technical, cultural, or professional) is a concern of all learning situations. WLS is primed to begin integrating a multilingual group of graduate students and leveraging their backgrounds for the development of multilingual lessons and community literacy interventions. For the spring and possibly summer, a small group of graduate faculty and advanced graduate students could study existing graduate training programs, design a multilingual one within the existing UTRGV channels and degrees, and prepare it for launch in fall 2016."

3   We presented our work in March 2017 at the Conference on College Composition and Communication in Portland, Oregon under the title, "A Translingual Approach to Professional Development for First-Year Spanish and Writing Instructors."

Brief Description of the Design and Components of the Multilingual Pedagogy Professional Development

As explained elsewhere (Cavazos, et al., 2018), due to our diverse disciplinary backgrounds, we knew as we began our collaboration that we faced challenges based on disciplinary and personal perceptions of English and Spanish and variations of these languages in the teaching of writing and language. To minimize the risk of advocating for a single perspective, a common problem that those in charge of designing professional development opportunities face, we engaged in cross-disciplinary research and pedagogical conversations. We met biweekly during the spring 2016 semester to discuss our disciplinary perspectives and assigned research areas that included multilingual pedagogy, curriculum design, professional development in writing and Spanish programs, and assessment of professional development effectiveness. We recruited graduate students interested in "language learning and teaching, multilingualism/language diversity, writing studies, feedback on student writing, professional development, curriculum design, and/or assessment." At the end, ten graduate students responded to the call and six consistently attended the sessions. The series consisted of four sessions.

First Session: Self Reflection

The first session focused on providing background knowledge of the series and participants' self- reflection on their linguistic background as learners, writers, and teachers, as Anne Ellen Geller (2011) recommended. As Joyce Meier et al. (this volume) explore the need to foster critical awareness of linguistic differences among multilingual and international students through their transdisciplinary collaboration model, we intended to build a sense of critical self-awareness of linguistic differences among the participants in the series through the following questions:

1. What languages/dialects do you know/use? In what contexts do you use them?
2. To what extent have you used all your language resources in your education/academic work?

The interactions revealed that some TAs and instructors who participated in the professional development series learned English as a second language, others learned Spanish as second language, and yet others learned English and Spanish simultaneously. Subsequently, we asked participants to engage in an interdisciplinary exchange of ideas by reflecting on and discussing the following questions in small cross-disciplinary groups:

3. What do you think is the role of language diversity in the classes you teach and why?

4. What languages/dialects do your students know/use? To what extent do your students use or draw on their language resources in the work they do in your class?

5. Identify two to three questions you have about the presence of language diversity in the classes you teach.

The interdisciplinary exchange of ideas during the first session provided us with opportunities to learn and better understand our disciplinary backgrounds and perceptions of language. As a result, we collectively identified the following questions:

1. What is the role of language difference or extent of language difference within different academic units (e.g., writing program, writing center, language learning programs, institution)?

2. How does a grammar-focused and/or a prescriptive approach to teaching writing and language influence/impact native/non-native speakers/writers?

3. How do we reconcile different expectations (e.g., course, program, department, institution) while valuing different languages while adhering to expectations?

4. How does the presence of language diversity impact assessment practices?

The first session aimed to build a sense of community as we prepared to explore these questions in subsequent sessions.

Second Session: Translingual Assignments

The second session focused on brainstorming potential translingual assignments from a Spanish and writing instructional perspective. For this session, we asked TAs to read "Cultivating a Rhetorical Sensibility in the Translingual Writing Classroom," by Juan Guerra (2016). We worked in small groups to respond to questions on the meaning of "rhetorical sensibility" from a language learning and writing instruction perspective (see Appendix).

TAs and instructors explored what is often valued in writing and language learning courses; particularly, they explored the differences between applying a translingual approach in Spanish for heritage language learners and Spanish for non-native speakers. Spanish TAs explored how a translingual pedagogy might work best in a heritage language class or an upper-level Spanish course rather than in an introductory non-native Spanish language learning course.

In this session, we designed an activity that would convey to all TAs that they possess knowledge based on their personal, scholarly, and teaching experiences, which creates an environment centered on their meaning-making rather than on a prescribed set of pedagogical tips to implement. We asked a former teaching assistant to

develop a handout describing linguistically inclusive writing assignments informed by her thesis work. Afterwards, TAs reflected on how they could use or revise the examples provided. As a result of our conversations, TAs and instructors discussed potential linguistically inclusive writing assignments in partners or small collaborative groups. This type of activity aligns with the goals of a translingual approach, which includes encouraging instructors to develop their translingual pedagogy (Canagarajah, 2016) and ensuring graduate students facilitate the conversations (Hall & Navarro, this volume; Worden et al., 2015). Some of the assignments we discussed as a group that might apply both to language learning and writing courses included literacy or language autobiographies, language ethnographies within different discourse communities, and reflective writing activities on language and grammatical choices.

Out of the four sessions, most participants found this one to be the most challenging and transformative as we engaged in conversations not only across different languages and disciplines but also pedagogical values. For most of us, it was the first time we learned about translingualism, and for those outside the discipline of composition, it was the first time they were exposed to the term "translingual writing." As a result of this session, several transdisciplinary and translingual collaborations emerged. Later in the chapter we share the lessons learned from one of the authors as she collaborated with a Spanish-as-a-Heritage Language (SHL) instructor during and after the series ended.

Third Session: Linguistically Inclusive Assessment Practices

The third session addressed how we might design assessment practices that are fair and equitable using a linguistically inclusive approach. We read Paul Kei Matsuda's (2012), "Let's Face It: Language Issues and the Writing Program Administrator." The session was designed in two parts:

1. exploring Matsuda's article and
2. brainstorming the design of linguistically inclusive writing assignments (Appendix).

The purpose of the discussion questions about Matsuda's article was to learn about the participants' existing assessment approaches and their values toward responding to and assessing student writing. We discussed the following questions as a group:

1. What assessment tools do you use in your writing and language class to assess student learning?
2. What specific tools/methods do you use to assess specific student learning outcomes for the course, program, department, and/or university?

3. How does Matsuda's discussion of instructional alignment, formative assessment practices, and metalinguistic commentary/awareness align with and/or offer a new perspective on your assessment methods in your language and writing classes?
4. How do we respond to the growing linguistic diversity in our classrooms through assessment tools and the design of writing and language assignments?

These questions helped us understand assessment practices from a language learning and writing studies perspective as well as how instructors who teach writing and language responded to Matsuda's arguments about writing assessment.

Fourth Session: Reflection and Next Steps

The final session was a reflection session intended for participants to share their writing assignments and offer suggestions for the future of the series. Reflection is critical to professional growth and development of innovative pedagogies, as Manel Lacorte (2016) argues: "Reflective practices should be an essential component of language teacher courses and programs in L2 or general education units for TAs . . . reflective practices may be the foundation for a research component in teacher preparation programs . . ." (p. 111). When we are open and willing to engage in rhetorical dialogue with colleagues from diverse linguistic backgrounds and disciplinary expertise, we create the necessary "contact zone [conditions] valuable for reflection and negotiations of translinguality" (Canagarajah, 2016, p. 268). For this reason, the final session was intended to engage in a reflective and collaborative experience, which enriched our respective pedagogical approaches and enhanced collaborative opportunities within our department. During this final reflection session, participants finalized the collaboration objectives they had started during the second session.

By briefly describing the content and purpose of each of the four sessions above, it is our goal that the reader gain an appreciation of the time and effort it takes to develop cross-disciplinary and cross-linguistic collaborations that encourage and equip TAs and faculty alike to become aware of their language choices and resources as they make sense of their language learning and writing process. In the next section we describe what happened after the series ended.

Looking Back Forward: Lessons Learned from the MPPD

In this section we would have liked to highlight and include reflections from the TAs who participated in this project. Unfortunately, we are not able to do that for two reasons. First, the MPPD series was a pilot and we did not seek IRB approval.

By the time the series ended, and we considered applying to the IRB office, many of the participants had graduated and moved away. Second, not having funding to continue impacted our ability to offer another series where we could gather data. We discuss more about the difficulty and need to implement and sustain such initiatives in the implication for teaching section.

Despite these circumstances, when we developed the series back in 2016, we saw our task as an opportunity to engage in conversations on how the transdisciplinary realities of not only our team, but also our region, influence the teaching of writing and languages. As we designed a four-session series, we recognized that the meaning of translingual practices emerged from our lived personal and pedagogical experiences and our context (Garcia & Kleyn, 2016). We also intended to empower TAs as teachers and scholars with a wealth of knowledge and experience related to language difference. Scholars have argued that while TAs might be new to teaching, they possess knowledge we want to recognize (Canagarajah, 2016), especially their experiences with language difference pertinent to their developing identities as educators. We acknowledged from the beginning that TAs play different roles simultaneously—they are both students and emerging educators. We learned that when we value others' teaching and language approaches and their multifaceted linguistic identities, we create room for reflection, rethinking, and redesign of pedagogical practices that can lead to linguistic inclusivity and equity. Thus, in the next section, we provide an update that emphasizes the impact, affordances, and challenges that implementing this type of workshop has on the research team. Our goal is to show that participating in the creation and implementation of a translingual initiative series transformed us. All of us continue to navigate, enact, and explore the core components of the proposed workshop in our disciplinary contexts and pedagogies.

Lessons from First Session: Self-reflection

Geoffrey's reflection on his participation in the series focused on two overlapping lines of inquiry—first, on the emancipatory potential of translingual pedagogy to disrupt hegemonic notions of language, race, and belonging and, secondly, on the methodological challenges of integrating translingual methods into qualitative research practice. For Geoffrey, the power of translingual pedagogy lies in its emphasis on the colonial ideologies that govern language use in the classroom. Understanding named languages as social constructs that operate in the context of European colonialism was particularly salient for Geoffrey, given the legacy of discrimination and delegitimization of racialized bilingual communities in Valley classrooms.

Geoffrey views translingual pedagogy as a framework to subvert the assimilationist and anti-Latinx narratives embedded in the English-only education that have marginalized the language practices of poor and immigrant communities in the Rio Grande Valley for decades. Similarly, transnational and transdisciplinary pedagogies

have the potential to empower students to recognize and challenge the political-ideological borders between nation-states and academic disciplines that reproduce systematic inequality in and out of the classroom. In this way, the professional development series was a much-needed point of entry for students to engage, deconstruct, and blur the boundaries and divisions that separate languages, disciplines, and countries.

After the series, Geoffrey integrated translingual techniques into his qualitative and evaluation research practice (e.g., participatory focus groups, translation, and storytelling activities). Although many researchers have incorporated a translingual approach into their data collection and analyses, Geoffrey noted a gap in the literature on translingual research methodology, particularly in the context of multilingual focus groups. A translingual focus group approach encourages research participants to engage with important issues by using language practice relevant to their experiences and identities. In this way, translingual focus groups can produce data that are more meaningful to the interests of participants and can help them recognize their needs within the context of their own language practice and empower them to mobilize accordingly.

Crystal Even though Crystal was born in the Valley and learned both English and Spanish as a small child, soon after she started school, English became the primary focus until Spanish was revisited as a language elective in junior high. She remembers that during the initial pilot session—in which most students spoke in Spanish—she refrained from speaking Spanish for fear of "messing up" questions or comments in front of native Spanish speakers. However, seeing writing and Spanish graduate students in the pilot sessions question the pragmatics of language difference in writing and language-learning courses helped her realize there is a continued need to discuss language issues openly to not only gain awareness but also identify ways that assist in recognizing language difference in the teaching of writing and languages.

A few months after the workshop, Crystal began teaching at a junior college also located in the Rio Grande Valley. Most of the college's students tend to transfer to UTRGV after they have completed either an associate degree or equivalent hours. The population at the junior college is made up of a large percentage of traditional (those who attend college after high school graduation) and non-traditional (students who begin college after taking time off after high school) Latinx students. From the start, Crystal knew she wanted to teach students about translanguaging so that they could understand the importance of its application. As a lecturer at the college, she started each First-Year Composition course by sharing a brief lesson on language difference and then asking students to write about their language narratives. The lesson involves short videos on regional language differences throughout America, discussion, and reflection. She believes that starting the semester in this manner helps students see how their attitudes shape their understanding of their and others' language use. For example, Crystal incorporates peer-review sessions where students learn how to critique each other's work, and while this practice can be challenging for all students, it is especially challenging

for those who are not English dominant speakers. Without the introductory lesson, she believes some students may not understand how their language attitudes (especially negative ones) can greatly affect the confidence and willingness of non-English dominant students to share their work with others. Furthermore, she hopes the language diversity lesson will help English dominant speakers appreciate and value the linguistic abilities of translingual students. Apart from affecting peer-to-peer relationships, the lesson is Crystal's way of approaching students who are grappling with academic requirements due to varying language proficiencies and serves to welcome those who have felt pressured by prescriptivism.

Esteban During the first session back in 2016, Esteban recalls questioning how this collaboration would help his teaching as he believed that, as a sociolinguist, he was familiar with the ideas discussed. To make sense of the experience, he identified terminology used during the workshop and connected them to concepts he knew within his own field of expertise. Specifically, he remembers being surprised to see instructors of English writing courses accepting translingual approaches; in his mind and personal experience, English writing courses are sites where standard English exerted full hegemony. When asked to think about the extent to which he uses his language resources in the classroom, Esteban is sensitive about promoting language variation present in the local community, often missing in textbooks, because students often resort to their whole linguistic repertoires in real linguistic encounters, including their first or second language or a mixture of the two. For this reason, it is critical to introduce students to different registers, styles, and varieties in heritage language courses, alongside more academic registers. Because students often bring to class forms and varieties that are highly stigmatized at the social level, a standard language ideology serves to reinforce insecurities students have about ways of talking in their community, and standard language ideologies have negative effects on students, such as the invalidation of home varieties and other linguistic modalities and potentially erodes pride in their heritage language and bilingual repertoires.

After the series ended, Esteban has continued to seek ways to promote the teaching of language variation in the language classroom with a particular emphasis on the validation of the local bilingual speech. Through a critical analysis of ideologies of language and attitudes, he fosters a language awareness perspective where students can begin to understand the relationship between language and the power structures that (re)produce social inequalities.

Lessons from Second Session: Translingual Assignments

Marcela Back in the fall 2016, Marcela found this session to be the most challenging and transformative when the group engaged in conversations not only across

different languages and disciplines but also pedagogical values. When Marcela paired up to collaborate with a Spanish-as-a-Heritage Language (SHL) instructor, disciplinary differences became visible immediately. To negotiate this situation, Marcela suggested to her SHL collaborator to draw on writing across the curriculum scholarship. They read Justin Rademaeker's 2015 piece titled *Is WAC/WID ready for the transdisciplinary research university?* which talks about the importance of engaging in rhetorical dialogue when conducting transdisciplinary collaborations. Their candid exchange afforded them a basic, yet valuable understanding of their respective disciplinary knowledge and conventions, which they drew on to design a collaborative transdisciplinary and translingual writing activity intended to help students develop linguistic agency.

While the implementation of the activity was not a requirement of the series, Marcela and her SHL collaborator decided to pilot their activity in the spring 2017 semester. Marcela and the SHL instructor revised and implemented collaborative transdisciplinary and translingual student activities over the next three consecutive semesters. In addition, they also presented their work in three academic peer-reviewed national and international conferences and published one chapter in an edited collection where they described in detail their collaborative transdisciplinary and translingual journey and student activity (Hebbard & Hernández, 2020). They framed their collaboration around the concept of *Transfronterizo* because of its applicability to students as well as instructors' linguistic practices and experiences. The purpose of listing these academic activities is to show the impact of the series on teachers' pedagogical intentions. Below, Marcela offers a brief account of her collaboration and examples of students' written responses.

After implementing the pilot activity and reading student reflections in spring 2017, the SHL instructor and Marcela learned they needed to revise their activity and ensure their students engaged in face-to-face rhetorical dialogues to increase opportunities for them to verbally articulate issues of language and identity through translingual and transdisciplinary perspectives. They also applied and obtained IRB approval. When they carried out the revised activity, a total of 53 students (25 = FYW, 27 = SHL) participated in the activity. Students were given the freedom to complete the activities, which included a summary/response to a common reading, written reflections, response to peer's reflection, and a short video describing what they learned from this activity in their preferred language; that is, either English or Spanish (for a description of the activity components see Hebbard & Hernández, 2020).

The following are the written responses that two FYW students made to their SHL peers' reflections. Our purpose is to illustrate students' views of language and language practices from two disciplinary perspectives as well as their translingual/transfronterizo identities. Two of the five guiding questions students had to answer were: What do you find interesting or surprising in your peer's reflection? And, if

you could ask your peer anything about his/her reflection, what would you ask? In her reflection, a female SHL student wrote,

> Personalmente yo creo que debemos de expresarnos como uno piensa y no forzar a alguien a escribir en forma estándar porque eso lleva al individuo a tener un límite en su manera de pensar y creer que la manera correcta para expresarse debe ser formal con palabras profesionales y no debe ser así. Por ello, el método translingual puede ser útil.

A female FYW student responded to her peer in English,

> Even though my peer has a good point when she states that standard writing shouldn't be forced on students since each individual writes differently, one thing I'd like to ask is: Why do you think standardized writing can hinder the way you express yourself? Standard writing can help you express yourself in a formal way; it doesn't stop you from saying what you want to say.

Our second example is from a male SHL student. He wrote in English,

> A translingual approach can be very comfortable for many students because many students, including myself, are used in doing assignments in English and then when we switch to Spanish we can struggle. That's why I believe heritage language courses should value language difference.

A female FYW student responded to him in Spanish,

> Las experiencias de mi compañero son similares pero a la vez varían ya que cuando me vine a estudiar al Valle de Texas, yo estaba acostumbrada a escribir en español y en la universidad tuve que cambiar al inglés. Si le pudiera preguntar a mi compañero algo sería ¿cuales son los beneficios que se pueden encontrar en una comunidad translingual?

While the analysis of these interactions is not the focus of this chapter, it is interesting to note that both FYW students raised questions about the prompt acceptance of translingualism the SHL students' reflections imply. From a pedagogical perspective, these written reflections and interactions are an example of translingual/transfronterizo identities in that these students had to traverse language (e.g., had to read SHL peers' reflection in Spanish or English) and engage in complex cognitive processes to draw and (re)construct meaning as they formulated their written responses (Motha et al., 2012). Furthermore, they also considered their peers' and their own disciplinary and linguistic ideologies, if only briefly, which

serves as a glimpse into their expertise in languaging (Robinson et al., 2020).

Regarding assessment, the pilot and revised student-centered translingual activities Marcela and the SHL instructor designed were low-stakes for two reasons: 1) they did not want students to stress over a grade, and 2) they are still considering how to best assess translingual writing in a way that is fair and promotes linguistic social justice (Lee, 2016). How to assess students' writing and language learning was (and continues to be) one of the questions among writing and language instructors.

Lessons from Fourth Session: Reflection and Next Steps

Alyssa For Alyssa, the last session revealed the challenges inherent in advocating for translingual approaches to language and writing instruction, especially within transdisciplinary conversations. As early as the first session, instructors voiced concern on how we should assess writing and language learning within a pedagogy that welcomes and accepts language differences. Particularly, participants were concerned about language and writing standards and the message our pedagogy would send students about language "correctness." However, if our assessment practices privilege a standard variety of either Spanish or English, we continue to send a message that dismisses the linguistic realities that exist within a transborder space. For this reason, assessment practices in writing and language learning coursework should be responsive to students' experiences, knowledge, and beliefs about language difference. In other words, our assessment practices should be rooted from within the transborder student experience rather than imposed by an academic standard, existing outside of or in opposition to those realities.

After the series ended, Alyssa continued to explore assessment practices in relation to language difference in the teaching of writing. She developed a translingual disposition questionnaire as a self-assessment tool for students enrolled in her first-year writing, sophomore writing, and upper-level English courses. The questionnaire can help instructors further understand student learning and meaning-making about writing instruction and language learning. Translingual dispositions refers to both the openness to language difference and enactment of language difference as defined by Lee and Jenks (2016). The questionnaire has been validated as measuring translingual dispositions related to language negotiations, resistance to standard language practices, and questioning language expectations (Cavazos & Karaman, 2021).

Alyssa has used the questionnaire as a pedagogical tool to learn about and better understand students' linguistic experiences. Recently, Alyssa collaborated with a bilingual and literacy studies professor on a project where they assigned the translingual disposition questionnaire to their students in bilingual and English language arts teacher preparation courses. The students took the questionnaire at the beginning and end of the semester and provided a written reflection

exploring shifts, nuances, and complexities in their responses. As a result, writing and language instructors can draw on the questionnaire as a self-assessment tool that validates transborder students' linguistic realities and places those realities at the forefront of writing instruction and language learning. Sandra Musanti et al. (2020) claim that "preparing preservice teachers to serve an increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse student population requires considering the criticality of fostering translingual dispositions as content in teacher preparation programs" (p. 84). This implication is crucial as our students, regardless of academic path, will work in increasingly diverse local and global contexts. Therefore, creating opportunities across academic disciplines that encourage reflection and assessment of their and others' translingual dispositions ultimately places the linguistic realities of our transborder context as central to learning and meaning-making, rather than something "foreign" or "different" that opposes often-privileged academic language expectations.

Implications for Teaching

In our first article we wrote that as a result of the multilingual pedagogy professional development series, we learned that engaging in transdisciplinary conversations with our colleagues is critical in responding to the linguistic needs and assets of our students and that in order for such collaboration to be meaningful for all, a professional development series like this needs to be institutionalized at the program, departmental, and university levels. While we believe the updates we incorporated throughout the chapter attest to our commitment to the former statement, institutionalizing or even sustaining a professional series for TAs is a complex process beyond our immediate control that involves multiple divisions, disciplines, priorities, and financial support. A sense of privilege of "standard" languages or "correctness" continues to exist across disciplines despite the university's support to develop linguistically inclusive pedagogies to become a "bilingual" institution. In order to challenge monolingualism as the norm in higher education, Geller (2011) argues for the "need to know about multilingual faculty members' experiences as learners, writers and teachers" (p. 4), including TAs. Furthermore, after the grant ended, TA training that includes topics about language difference only takes place in the graduate practicum course offered in the rhetoric and composition program. TAs in the Spanish program do not take a graduate practicum course; however, they attend a pre-semester training and monthly meetings. If a practicum course existed for Spanish TAs like the graduate course for writing TAs, there would be opportunities for faculty teaching practicum to engage in cross-disciplinary collaboration, particularly with a focus on how writing can also be used in language learning contexts. This collaboration among the TAs can enhance linguistically

inclusive practices in their respective courses and build long-lasting cross- disciplinary, cross-linguistic relationships.

We hope that in the future, we can once again offer professional development sessions that facilitate conversation surrounding many of the questions, concerns, and issues raised by the TAs and other instructors during the series. For instance, TAs expressed concern regarding how to design translingual assignments, and although some scholars in rhetoric and composition have discussed implementing pedagogies that embrace translingualism (Guerra, 2016b), they tend to focus on assignments that mostly involve reading about translingualism. Therefore, instructors are left wondering about what a translingual approach might look like in practice. Because a translingual approach involves more of an awareness that students use and draw on all of their language resources while reading, drafting, and researching, course activities should facilitate this awareness of language use for both educators and students. Through our transdisciplinary professional development workshop, TAs had the opportunity to collaboratively brainstorm potential assignments that implemented a translingual approach. Through this collaborative work, they not only identified challenges that come from creating such assignments, but they also recognized how these assignments can enhance writing instruction and language learning. As A. Suresh Canagarajah (2016) explains, "Teacher preparation for translingual writing would focus on encouraging teachers to construct their pedagogies with sensitivity to student, writing, and course diversity, thus continuing to develop their pedagogical knowledge and practice for changing contexts of writing" (p. 266). The multidisciplinary workshop introduces participants to these sensitivities by first creating an awareness of the rhetorical abilities multilingual writers already possess, and by encouraging participants to reflect on their personal attitudes towards translingualism in order to better understand their own views toward a progressive approach to writing and language instruction.

In order to sustain a multidisciplinary translingual approach, the practice of reflection for both educators and students is essential. Even devoted advocates of language difference have grappled with fully embracing the practice because as language users, we are constantly reminded of linguistic hegemony, especially in academia. Therefore, through reflection, we can focus on why translingualism is important for current and future language instruction, since its aim is not just to include the languages and dialects of others, but to change the way we think about language and language use—a constant struggle for many. Bruce Horner (2016) argues that ". . . [W]e can recognize, and help our students learn to recognize and engage in, writing as the occasion for just such action-reflection, posing anew the ongoing challenge of what kind of difference to attempt to make through writing, how, and why" (p. 120). Additionally, as a result of rereading and providing updates on this collaborative work, we also advocate for the importance of continuing to share and reflect on teaching practice and research on translingual practices to further expand conversations and

work through challenges across and within disciplinary borders. Through the practice of action-reflection, a translingual approach to writing and language instruction will likely be sustainable because the focus remains on awareness of language negotiations for both educators and students.

Implications for Research

Through our collaboration, we realized that the heterogeneous linguistic nature of multilingual, transborder students is a valuable resource that we should integrate into the writing and language studies curriculum. Multilingual students' differences in their linguistic repertoires can be used to "increase students' fluency" in written and oral communication in their first, second, and heritage language (Horner, Lu et al., 2011, p. 307).

The transdisciplinary aspect of the project helped us identify our different linguistic needs and approaches to achieve more inclusive pedagogical practices grounded on a translingual view of writing and language teaching. Geller (2011) calls for research to "push against the institutionalized and standardized English monolingual norms" by designing WAC programs and support services that "encourage faculty to learn about and reflect deeply on language experiences and language biases." Future research should focus on collecting data on the impact of a multilingual pedagogy professional development by collecting evaluations, conducting interviews and class observations, and analyzing primary documents, such as syllabi and course assignments. Data collection will help us apply a systematic approach to evaluating how our pedagogy is enriched by professional development focused on a translingual view to teaching writing in our disciplines. Empirical data would also allow comparisons within our disciplines to see whether our focus on a translingual approach to teaching writing and language studies has the same or a different impact on our pedagogies and students' language practices, and it could show the particular language practices that influence writing and language acquisition in each discipline, informing future studies and pedagogical practices. We also suggest research that investigates how writing-to-learn or learning-to-write approaches (Manchón, 2011) and service learning (Parra, 2016) can be implemented alongside translingual writing in writing and language learning contexts. While, as a collaborative team, we have not addressed these suggestions for future research as it pertains to the professional development of TAs in writing studies and Spanish, we have engaged in research about our translanguaging pedagogical practices in diverse contexts (Cavazos & Karaman, 2021; Hebbard & Hernández, 2020; Musanti & Cavazos, 2018; Musanti et al., 2020; Sánchez et al., 2019) and Alyssa has also engaged in the design, implementation, and research on the impact that professional development on translingual teaching practices has on instructors' beliefs about teaching across academic disciplines (Cavazos & Musanti, 2021).

Finally, we are interested in engaging in cross-institutional collaboration to explore how different factors, such as institutional context and faculty and student populations, impact how translingual approaches to teaching writing and languages are explored through professional development. In order to advance transdisciplinary and translingual approaches as a new normal in composition studies (Horner, NeCamp, & Donahue, 2011; Tardy, 2017), we hope to provide a professional development framework that adapts to the linguistic realities of different institutional contexts and students' lived language experiences. Our respective language backgrounds, language perceptions, and linguistically inclusive pedagogies can impact our students' linguistic agency, academic success, and sense of belonging in higher education; therefore, it is critical to explore how multilingual students perceive the presence of language difference in the classroom and create opportunities where they can use all their language resources as they navigate through changing academic and community contexts.

References

Baca, Isabel, Hinojosa, Yndalecio Isaac, & Murphy, Susan Wolff. (Eds.). (2019). *Bordered writers: Latinx identities and literacy practices at Hispanic-serving institutions*. SUNY Press.

Brunk-Chavez, Beth, Mangelsdorf, Kate, Wojahn, Patricia, Urzua-Beltran, Alfredo, Montoya, Omar, Thatcher, Barry, & Valentine, Kathryn. (2015). Exploring the contexts of U.S.-Mexican border writing programs. In David S. Martins, (Ed.), *Transnational writing program administration* (pp. 138-160). Utah State University Press.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. (2016). Translingual writing and teacher development in composition. *College English*, *78*(3), 265-273.

Cavazos, Alyssa G., Hebbard, Marcela, Hernández, Jose Esteban, Rodriguez, Crystal, & Schwarz, Geoffrey. (2018). Advancing a transnational, transdisciplinary and translingual framework: A professional development series for teaching assistants in writing and Spanish programs. *Across the Disciplines*. *15*(3), 11-27. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2018.15.3.09

Cavazos, Alyssa G., & Karaman, Mehmet. A. (2021). A preliminary development and validation of the Translingual Disposition Questionnaire with Latinx students. *Language Awareness*, 1-16.

Cavazos, Alyssa G., & Musanti, Sandra I. (2021). Insights from a faculty learning community on translingual community-engaged pedagogy at a Hispanic serving institution. *Language and Education*, 1-15.

Christoffersen, Katherine. (2019). Linguistic terrorism in the Borderlands: Language ideologies in the narratives of young adults in the Rio Grande Valley. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *13*(3), 137-151.

Gallardo-Williams, Maria Teresa & Petrovich Lori Marie. (2017). An integrated approach to training graduate teaching assistants. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, *47*(1), 43-47.

García, Ofelia, & Kleyn, Tatyana. (Eds.). (2016). *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments*. Routledge.

Geller, Anne Ellen. (2011). Teaching and learning with multilingual faculty. *Across the Disciplines*, *8*(4), 11-19. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2011.8.4.06

Guerra, Juan C. (2008). Cultivating transcultural citizenship: A writing across communities model. *Language Arts*, *85*(4), 296-304.

Guerra, Juan C. (2015). *Language, culture, identity and citizenship in college classrooms and communities*. Routledge.

Guerra, Juan C. (2016). Cultivating a rhetorical sensibility in the translingual writing classroom. *College English*, *78*(3), 228-233.

Hebbard, Marcela, & Hernández, Yanina. (2020). Becoming transfronterizo collaborators: A transdisciplinary framework for developing translingual pedagogies. In Lesley Erin Bartlett, Sandra L. Tarabochia, Andrea R. Olinger, & Margaret J. Marshall (Eds.), *Diverse approaches to teaching, learning, and writing across the curriculum: IWAC at 25* (pp. 251-273). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2020.0360.2.14

Horner, Bruce. (2016). Reflecting the translingual norm: Action-reflection, ELF, translation, and transfer. In Kathleen Blake Yancey (Ed.), *A Rhetoric of reflection* (pp. 105-124). Utah State University Press.

Horner, Bruce, Lu, Min-Zhan, Royster, Jacqueline Jones, & Trimbur, John. (2011). Language difference in writing: Toward a translingual approach. *College English*, *73*(3), 303-321.

Horner, Bruce, NeCamp, Samantha, & Donahue, Christiane. (2011). Toward a multilingual composition scholarship: From English only to a translingual norm. *College Composition and Communication*, *63*(2), 269-300.

Kells, Michelle Hall. (2007). Writing across communities: Deliberation and the discursive possibilities of WAC. *Reflections*, *6*(1), 87-108.

Lacorte, Manel. (2016). Teacher development in heritage language instruction. In Marta Fairclough, & Sara M. Beaudrie (Eds.), *Innovative strategies for heritage language teaching: A practical guide for the classroom* (Reprint ed., pp. 99-119). Georgetown University Press.

Lee, Jerry Won. (2016). Beyond translingual writing. *College English*, *79*(2), 174-195.

Lee, Jerry Won & Jenks, Christopher. (2016). Doing translingual dispositions. *College Composition and Communication*, *68*(2), 317-344.

Manchón, Rosa M. (Ed.). (2011). *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language* (Vol. 31). John Benjamins Publishing.

Matsuda, Paul Kei. (2012). Let's face it: Language issues and the writing program administrator. *Writing Program Administration*, *36*(1), 141-164.

Motha, Suhanthie, Jain, Rashi, & Tecle, Tsegga. (2012). Translinguistic identity-as-pedagogy: Implications for language teacher education. *International Journal of Innovation in English Language Teaching*, *1*(1), 13-28.

Musanti, Sandra, Cavazos, Alyssa G., & Rodriguez, Alma D. (2020). Embracing a translanguaging stance and redefining teacher preparation practices in a Hispanic Serving Institution. In Janine M. Schall, Patricia Alvarez McHatton, & Eugenio Longoria Sáenz (Eds.), *Teacher education at Hispanic-serving institutions: Exploring identity, practice, and culture* (Routledge Research in Higher Education) (1st ed., pp. 69-87). Routledge.

Parra, Maria Luisa. (2016). Critical approaches to heritage language instruction: How to

foster students' critical consciousness. In Marta Fairclough, Sara M. Beaudrie (Eds.), *Innovative strategies for heritage language teaching: A practical guide for the classroom* (Reprint ed., pp. 166–190). Georgetown University Press.

Rademaekers, Justin K. (2015). Is WAC/WID ready for the transdisciplinary research university? *Across the Disciplines*, *12*(2), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2015.12.2.02

Robinson, Heather, Hall, Jonathan, & Navarro, Nela. (2020). *Translingual identities and transnational realities in the U.S. college classroom*. Routledge.

Sánchez, Yemin, Nicholson, Nicole, & Hebbard, Marcela. (2019). Familismo teaching. In Isabel Baca, Yndlencio Hinojosa, & Murphy, Susan Wolff (Eds.), *Bordered writers: Latinx identities and literacy practices at Hispanic-serving institutions* (pp. 105-124). SUNY Press.

Smith, Christian. (2018, January 9). Higher education is drowning in BS: And it's mortally corrosive to society. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. https://www.chronicle.com/article/higher-education-is-drowning-in-bs/

Tardy, Christine M. (2017). Crossing or creating divides? A plea for transdisciplinary scholarship. In Bruce Horner & Elliot Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing divides: Exploring translingual writing pedagogies and programs* (pp. 181-189). Utah State University Press.

Thatcher, Barry, Montoya, Omar, & Medina-López, Kelly. (2015). Global writing and application on the U.S.-Mexico border. In David S. Martins (Ed.), *Transnational writing program administration* (pp. 163-201). Utah State University Press.

Appendix

Session Two: Discussion Points

Activity T-Chart: Language Learning Class and Writing Class

- What does Guerra (2016) mean by developing "rhetorical sensibility that reflects critical awareness of language as a contingent and emergent" (p. 228)? What does this look like in language learning class and in a writing class? How might we already be doing this with our students?

- Guerra (2016) provides several examples of the type of writing activities he asks his students to work on in class and he also acknowledges the mistakes he made (p. 231). To what extent do you find those examples useful and/or valuable in building rhetorical sensibility? How would those assignments (or revised versions of them) look like in your own courses (Spanish/writing)? What changes would you make and why?

- How does the former TA's document help us think about language difference in language learning and writing courses? What are your thoughts? What kind of assignments can facilitate critical awareness and rhetorical sensibility that accomplish course, department, and university learning outcomes? What are the student learning outcomes for your course?

- Discussion question: Guerra (2016) claims that each one of the approaches to language (monolingual, multilingual, translingual) is informed by specific beliefs, values, and practices and he also provides an example of a teacher who asks students to respond to these approaches based on their lived experiences. What are the beliefs, values, practices of each of the approaches based on your own experiences as scholars and teachers but also as you interact in non-academic contexts?

Session Three: Writing Assignment Design Brainstorming (Part 2)

- What is an ideal writing assignment you would like to assign students in your language/writing class?
  - Why would you like to teach this writing assignment?
- How do you think this writing assignment can be linguistically inclusive by considering all our students' language resources and abilities?
- How does the writing assignment fit with the objectives of the course, program, department, and/or university?
- What is the objective and purpose of the writing assignment? How does the writing assignment connect with course readings and beyond the classroom?
  - What do you want the students to learn or experience from this writing assignment?
  - Should this assignment be an individual or a collaborative effort? Why?
- What do you want students to show you in this assignment? To demonstrate mastery of concepts or texts? To demonstrate logical and critical thinking? To develop an original idea? To learn and demonstrate the procedures, practices, and tools of your field of study? Explain in detail.
  - How will you assess student learning? What makes the assignment effective? How will you evaluate it?