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***A. Institutional Description*:**

The context in which I work and am currently conducting research, is a global campus of a private university in the United States. The global campus in Southeastern Europe offers an Associate degree of Applied Science (AAS) and Bachelor degree of Science in Applied Arts and Science (BSc), with numerous minors, e.g. English, and concentrations, e.g. Public Policy and Computing and Information. A Master of Science degree in Professional Studies is also an option. All of these degrees are accredited in the US and in-country.

Some of the factors that influence my current research project include the following. First, as is likely the case for many of the workshop participants, COVID-19 has impacted the project. For instance, it has meant that various in-person components (among others) of this research project have not yet been implemented. Also, a combination of online, hybrid, and in-person modes of delivery of instruction and learning (esp. with regard to the epidemiological situation, including governmental guidelines in the country, the region, and abroad) has meant that meaningful interactions with and among the students in the targeted courses have been impacted (including regarding mental health issues). Second, the students in the courses that have been considered for this study are mainly from the region (Southeastern Europe) as well as from a diverse range of regions, countries, and continents, as is usually the case. Regardless of the region of origin, each student brings their linguistic repertoire with them to the shared learning space. Third, in addition to teaching, I also serve as the faculty mentor for the writing tutors, which allows me to provide additional guidance to tutors in terms of the peer tutoring and workshop sessions. Fourth, English is the medium of instruction for all courses at the institution.

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

* **Bakhtin’s notion of heteroglossia** (see also Otsuji & Pennycook, 2010; Madsen;

2014; Pietikäinen & Dufva, 2014; Nouguerón-Liu & Warrier, 2014; Schilling, 2016) **–** Madsen (2014, p. 44) points out the term was created by Bakhtin’s translators to cover “diversity in ‘speechness’[,],..‘languageness’…[, and] ‘voicedness.’” Otsuji and Pennycook (2010, p. 252) write: “Heteroglossia, as Bailey (2007, p. 258) reminds us, ‘encompasses both mono and multilingual forms’ allowing a ‘level of theorising about the social nature of language that is not possible within the confines of a focus on code-switching.” Heteroglossia, which extends beyond code-switching, involves the meshing of divergent varieties, registers, codes, voices, lects, and languages between and/or within utterances (see Otsuji & Pennycook, 2010, p. 252; Schilling, 2016, pp. 44–50). Language variability and hybridity, including fluidity pertaining to temporal, spatial, and diatopic (geographic) components are integral to Bakhtin-*esque* heteroglossia (Pietikäinen & Dufva, 2014, pp. 64–7; Schilling, 2016, pp. 49–50).

* **Auer’s diaglossia** (see also Rutten, 2016a; Cerruti & Regis, 2014) **–** Auer (2005, p. 22) explains: “A diaglossic repertoire is characterised by intermediate variants between standard and (base) dialect.” A given linguistic landscape may yield diaglossia, in particular once an exoglossic standard and later endoglossic standards similar to a vernacular have taken root. Diaglossia could be said to be emerging when non-standard (sub)varieties *seep* into indigenous-based standards (see Rutten, 2016a; Cerruti & Regis, 2014), thereby inhabiting “the space between…dialect and standard” (Auer, 2005, p. 22) and comprising “intermediate forms that are neither distinctly dialectal nor standard” (Rutten 2016a, pp. 7–8). Through such innovative shifts in register, variety, and style, the languager is thus able to forge an identity of self that is not fettered to the standard/non-standard divide.
* **Canagarajah’s** (e.g. 2011, 2016)**, Li Wei’s** (e.g. 2017), and  **García & Otheguy’s** (2020) **(tras)languaging framework, in particular in the context of translingual writing –** As pointed out by Li (2017), the notion of translanguaging can be traced back to Baker’s (2001) English translation of a Welsh term, namely *trawsieithu*, that was employed to describe a pedagogical practice that was observed by Williams (1994) with regard to language revitalization efforts. Li (p. 15) writes: “[I]t is not conceived as an object or a linguistic structural phenomenon to describe and analyze but a practice and a process – a practice that involves dynamic and functionally integrated use of different languages and language varieties, but more importantly, a process of knowledge construction that goes beyond languages.” That is, such a translingual process centers around the engagement of the languagers themselves – rather than a static entity of a particular named language. Translanguaging, as Li explains, also has its roots in languaging, in particular in the writings of Humberto Maturana and Francesco Varela: “‘[T]here is no such thing as Language, only continual languaging, an activity of human beings in the world’” (cited in Li, 2017, p. 16). In other words, the focus is not on a finished object, but rather “the process of being made” (p. 16). The foundations of translingual writing and pedagogy are based on (trans)languaging, which is credited to have taken root by scholars of language education from marginalized speech communities in the fringes and borderlands (García & Otheguy, 2020, p. 24).
* **Langer and Havinga’s** (2015) **linguistic invisibilization** (see also Joseph Rutten, & Vosters, 2020; and also Gal and Irvine’s (1995) erasure) – Joseph, Rutten, & Vosters (2020, p. 175) point out that “the gradual disappearance from writing of forms commonly used in the spoken language, often until the present day, has been termed *invisibilization* (Langer and Havinga 2015).” When a given linguistic construction or feature was not included in the officialized norm, despite usage practices, it is said to have been ‘de-selected’ or have undergone ‘non-selection’. Joseph et al. comment: “The term [invisiblization] reflects the more or less conscious removal of certain forms from the written tradition, limiting their use to (informal) spoken registers (cf. the concept of erasure, discussed by Irvine and Gal 2000)” (p. 175). Tsitsipis (2003a, p. 247) writes: “According to Gal and Irvine (1995: 974), erasure is a powerful ideological strategy in the process of which certain phenomena such as linguistic structures, cultural products, social groups, sociolinguistic varieties, etc. are rendered invisible… The processes that index this erasure are fragmentation, marginalization, sublimation, and repression.”
* **Research methodologies**, of, among others, **Flores & Rosa** (2015)**, Lorimer Leonard** (2021**); and Özer** (2021) – These scholars present important perspectives on translingual writing processes that are relevant to the current investigation. These scholars approach translingual writing in a way that decenters monolingual ideologies and instead centers the languagers and their linguistic repertoires in the context of translingual writing in the 21st century.

***C. Glossary*:**

Translanguaging

Languaging

Translingual writing

Heteroglossia

Diaglossia

Linguistic invisiblization/erasure

**Working draft:**

**Dismantling linguistic invisiblization: The (re)surfacing of marginalized varieties in**

**translanguaging**

During recent years mixed linguistic repertoires have gained considerable attention in various academic circles, including with regard to academic writing (see Blackledge & Creese, 2014; Canagarajah, 2016; Kaufhold, 2018). Such translingual assemblages (Pennycook, 2017) often involve regional variation, contact-induced areal features, diaglossia, whereby dialectal forms are intertwined with the standard variant (Auer, 2005; Cerruti & Regis, 2014; Rutten, 2016), and numerous named languages, such as English (see García & Li, 2014; Li, 2018). These codemeshed constructions (see Canagarajah, 2011; Young, 2013) are occasionally accompanied by concerns of disrupting hegemonic language ideologies (see Milroy, 2001; Ayres-Bennet, 2020), including regarding monolingualism (Heller, 2007; Makoni & Pennycook, 2006; Kaufhold, 2018; Turner & Lin, 2020). In this paper we turn our focus to a relatively understudied realm, namely select speech communities within Southeastern Europe where employment of once stigmatized and marginalized constructions are in the process of being embraced, including in translanguaging practices in various processes involved in academic writing. The admittance of such alternative linguistic elements into mainstream discourse, including academic domains, was (and sometimes still is) often met with obstruction and consequently suppression and invisibilization (see Byron, 1976, 1978, 1985; Havinga & Langer, 2015; Havinga, 2018; Joseph, Rutten, & Vosters, 2020, p. 175; Elspaß, 2020; Hickey, 2020). Influenced by a relatively recent easing of language attitudes, among other variables, select diaglossic configurations containing previously proscribed forms may be in the process of qualifying as felicitous options (see Camaj, 1984; Rutten, Vosters, & Vandenbussche, 2014) through implicit codification (see Hickey, 2020; Joseph, Rutten, & Vosters, 2020, p. 172) and revalorization (Elspaß, 2020, p. 296) from below.

The aim of this paper is to examine various (multimodal) materials, including online corpora (see Schilling, 2016) and academic writing activities, where heteroglossic and translingual processes (see Deumert, 2010; Coupland & Kristiansen, 2011; Elspaß, 2020, pp. 288-9) involving a (once) marginalized variety (see e.g. Seals & Olsen-Reeder, 2020) of Albanian emerge. Such instances demonstrate periodic resistance to asymmetrical linguistic bowing (see Morales-Gálvez, 2017, p. 655) to various language(s) ideologies in Kosovo.

1. **Language ideology, (trans)languaging, invisibilization, and linguistic bowing**

Considerable attention during the past few decades has been allocated to scrutinizing past and present hegemonic language ideologies, including concerning historical and contemporary linguascapes. Such efforts were exerted to counter various repressive standard language cultures, including language engineering and linguistic purism campaigns, prevalent during the previous century (Milroy, 2001; Lippi-Green, 2012; Joseph, Rutten, & Vosters, 2020). Whereas linguistic variation deviating from the officialized norm was often considered a threat to the progress of the nation-state, a homogeneous standard language was concomitant with modernization (Ricento, 2000, p. 198; Ruttens, 2016b, p. 45). In opposition to variability in non-standard alternatives (Milroy, 2001, pp. 531–2), immutable standard grammars consisted of invariable fixed uniformity (Ricento, 2000, p. 201; Ruttens, 2016b, p. 41). A critical paradigm shift, however, eventually came to fruition. Rigid language policies came to be seen in terms of the proliferation of societal injustices. Including in academic spheres, marginalization and stratification of speakers of non-dominant varieties became the loci of discussions (Ricento, 2000, pp. 201–6; Milroy, 2001, pp. 532, 540; Low & Sarkar, 2014, p. 104). The framing of emergent dynamic, flexible, and porous linguistic repertoires exhibiting “pools of linguistic resources” (Grace cited in Milroy, 2001, p. 540) as being deficient were now being challenged by a counter narrative (see Deumert, 2010; Flores & Rosa, 2015). These disturbances to the hierarchies of dominant language ideologies involved moving away from centralized forces toward peripheral ones (see Low & Sarkar, 2014, p. 113).

Disruption to the impositions of hegemonic language policies can be observed in the dynamics of heteroglossic language practices, thus serving as part of a counter narrative. Heteroglossia, which often extends beyond code-switching (e.g. see Schader, 2006, e.g. p. 87), can involve the meshing of divergent varieties, registers, codes, voices, lects, and languages between and/or within utterances (see Schilling, 2016, pp. 44–50; García & Othegy, 2020). Language variability and hybridity, including fluidity pertaining to temporal, spatial, and diatopic (geographic) components, are integral to Bakhtin-*esque* heteroglossia (Pietikäinen & Dufva, 2014, pp. 64–7; Schilling, 2016, pp. 49–50). Multiple competing vistas are played against each other, whereby “‘every concrete utterance is a microcosm of this struggle between ‘centripetal’ and ‘centrifugal’ forces that simultaneously unify and stratify language at all stages of its historical existence’” (Nouguerón-Liu & Warrier, 2014, p. 182). At play are language choices concerning employing either the rigid hegemonic, homogeneous standard, or varied non-standard vernaculars. These push and pull dynamics also involve the stratification of languagers, depending on the linguistic forms selected (Bell, 2011, p. 179). This tension between centripetal unitary language policies and centrifugal linguistic variability, fuzzy boundaries, and languager identity, among others, is paramount in the development of living languages (see Schilling, 2016, pp. 49–50).

Diaglossia can also be of relevance to discussions revolving around the meshing of divergent linguistic forms. As the relaxing of prescribed norms transpires, diaglossic repertoires may emerge, particularly where centripetal and centrifugal linguistic systems surface in the linguascape. Auer (2005, p. 22) explains: “A diaglossic repertoire is characterised by intermediate variants between standard and (base) dialect.” A given linguistic landscape may yield diaglossia[[1]](#footnote-1), in particular once an exoglossic standard and later endoglossic standard(s) similar to a vernacular have taken root. Diaglossia could be said to be emerging when non-standard (sub)varieties *seep* into indigenous-based standards (see Rutten, 2016a; Cerruti & Regis, 2014), thereby inhabiting “the space between…dialect and standard” (Auer, 2005, p. 22) and comprising “intermediate forms that are neither distinctly dialectal nor standard” (Rutten 2016a, pp. 7–8). Through such innovative shifts in register, variety, and style, the languager is thus able to forge an identity of self that is not fettered to the standard/non-standard divide[[2]](#footnote-2).

Destandardization is also of pertinence to such hybrid linguistic constructions. Davies (2012, pp. 50–1) points out: “The concept ‘de­standardisation’…usually refers to two different processes: (i) greater structural variability within the standard variety and (ii) greater visibility and acceptability of non-standard varieties in domains previously reserved for the standard.” Destandardization permits (previously) stigmatized regional and non-standard features to surface in spaces once reserved for the standard (see Auer, 2005, p. 25; Rutten, 2016a, p. 8). With regard to destandardization, Auer points out that “regional elements are increasingly tolerated in the standard (Auer 2005: 25)” (qtd. in Rutten, 2016a, p. 8). Repertoires containing destandardization involve “centrifugalisation[,]…a scattering away from the standard in all directions, and an unshackling of language from the idea of a standard” (Bell, 2011 p. 179). The centripetal standard’s position of ‘best language’ is vacated (see also Coupland & Kristiansen, 2011, p. 28). Explicitly interrogating the assumptions woven into the standard variety is crucial, particularly when examining the current state of language, including oscillating levels of standard-dialect combinations where linguistic hybridity emerges (see Deumert 2010, p. 247).

The mixing of linguistic codes can also be observed in translanguaing. As pointed out by Li (2018, p. 15), the notion of translanguaging can be traced back to Baker’s (2001) English translation of a Welsh term, namely *trawsieithu*, that was employed to describe a pedagogical practice that was observed by Williams (1994) with regard to Welsh language revitalization efforts; the teacher would often employ Welsh and the learners might respond in English. In other instances, the pupils might read a text in Welsh and the instructor would extrapolate in English. Li explains that translanguaging “is not conceived as an object or a linguistic structural phenomenon to describe and analyze but a practice and a process – a practice that involves dynamic and functionally integrated use of different languages and language varieties, but more importantly, a process of knowledge construction that goes beyond languages” (2018, p. 15). That is, such a translingual process centers around the engagement of the languagers themselves – rather than a static entity of a particular named language. Translanguaging, according to Li, also has its roots in the notion of languaging, in particular in the writings of Humberto Maturana and Francesco Varela: “‘[T]here is no such thing as Language, only continual languaging, an activity of human beings in the world’” (cited in Li, 2018, p. 16). In other words, the focus is not on a finished object, but rather “the process of being made” (p. 16). Translanguaging has since been considered as a plausible instructional approach, including as a process for learners to construct meaning and develop identity (p. 15).

Translanguaging is pertinent to language practices that challenge the hegemonic forces of dominant languages, including rigid monolingual mindsets (see also Turner & Lin, 2020). Canagarajah (2011, p. 401) maintains that translanguaging is “the ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system.” These language users possess linguistic repertoires (see discussion of Gumperz, 1964 in Kaufhold, 2018, p. 3) that consist of reservoirs of multifaceted linguistic resources that are not bound by the fixed confines of static, named standard languages and varieties (see also García & Otheguy, 2020[[3]](#footnote-3)). Canagarajah (2011, p. 403; see also Young, 2010, 2013; García & Otheguy, 2020) mentions that codemeshing is often involved, where various languages, varieties, lects, registers, linguistic constructions, among others, are “part of a single unitary system” – unlike codeswitching which treats such elements as “switches between two different systems.” Ossa Parra and Proctor (2021) explain that such bi/multilingual languagers “inhibit or select features from their linguistic repertoire based on the communicative context (García & Kleifgen, 2018), but their full linguistic system is always active” (p. 769). Instead of being a double (or triple) monolingual with two (or more) separate systems, or a “two solitudes” way of thinking (Cummins, 2007, cited in Turner & Lin, 2020, p. 425), bi/multilinguals call upon a unitary system that contains a wealth of lived linguistic experiences in their expansive communicative linguistic repertoires that guide their language choices and behaviors (see also Turner & Lin, 2020). As Turner and Lin (2020, p. 427, citing Bailey, 2012, p. 505) point out, translanguaging and Bakhtin’s heteroglossia share similar lines of thinking: “‘[A] distinctive characteristic of heteroglossia is that it conceptualizes language meaning as a function of both linguistic forms and historical social relations.’” Such is the case with translanguaging as well, especially with regard to Bakhtinian polyglossia as an integral part of heteroglossia, where a sociolinguistic lens is of relevance. García and Kleifgen (2019, p. 556) point out that “translanguanging is a political act focused on reinterpreting language as a decolonizing process and liberating the language practices of bilingual…populations.” Such practices can yield transformative experiences that address structural inequalities, including in educational settings with monolingual ideologies (see also Turner & Lin, 2020). Translanguaging spaces provide such users of language with a “legitimate in-between space” (p. 557) to explore their “linguistic baggage” (see Busch, 2017, p. 341 in Kaufhold, 2018, p. 3) and collaborative transgressions (Kaufhold, 2018, p. 7), where speaker agency and voice, languager empowerment, the leveraging and harnessing of linguistic resources, as well as critical metalanguage awareness, among others, can be fostered (e.g. Kaufhold, 2018, p. 8; Turner & Lin, 2020, p. 425, 431).

Numerous scholars have investigated translanguaging, namely translingual writing, and embraced it as an instructional approach (e.g. Horner, et al., 2011; Canagarajah, 2011, 2016; Young, 2013; Cushman, 2016; Guerra, 2016; Kaufhold, 2018; Lee & Canagarajah, 2019; Seals & Olsen-Reeder, 2020; García & Othegiy, 2020; Özer, 2021; see also Matsuda, 2013, 2014). Cushman (2016, p. 236) underscores that by utilizing the pedagogical stance of translanguaging in academic writing, various marginalized languagers “could ideally see their home languages valued, taught, and practiced in reading and writing assignments and classroom discussions in ways that sustain one of many Englishes (Perryman-Clark; Wetzel; Young and Martnez; Richardson).” Instead of relegating various linguistic resources solely to a particular domain, e.g. the home front, these linguistic repertoires could be woven into academic discourse, such as in written assignments that are shared with a multiplicity of readers and audiences (see also García & Otheguy, 2020). As Cushman (2016, p. 235-6) points out, employing such a decolonial and post-monolinguistic pedagogical approach could mean that “[h]eritage languages and scripts that were lost or being eroded and (re)learned alongside English could become a scholarly, curricular, and pedagogical focus (McCarty and Lee; McCarty and Nicolas).” Language varieties that have undergone varying degrees of political and linguistic marginalization and attrition could be meshed into academic writing process, including by being foregrounded. Such a stance is also presented by Seals & Olsen-Reeder (2020), who are involved in developing socially responsive pedagogy for sustainable translanguaging initiatives (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017) that support language revitalization and maintenance for the Māori and Samoan speech communities in New Zealand. Translingual pedagogy, thus, underscores “difference in language not as a barrier to overcome or as a problem to manage, but as a resource for producing meaning in writing, speaking, reading, and listening” (Horner, Lu, Royster, & Trimbur, 2011, p. 303). A pedagogical approach that incorporates translingual writing, however, would also need to address Matsuda’s (2014, p. 482-3) notion of “linguistic tourism” so that critical metalinguistic awareness, speaker agency, and meaning making, among other goals of translanguaging, are not sidelined (see Britton & Lorimer Leonard, 2020; Lorimer Leonard, 2021).

Erasure, orinvisibilization, of non-standard and regional forms not selected to be integral elements of the hegemonic standard is also pertinent to studies involving hybrid linguistic configurations, including translingualism (read: (trans)languaging). Joseph, Rutten, & Vosters (2020, p. 175) point out that “the gradual disappearance from writing of forms commonly used in the spoken language, often until the present day, has been termed *invisibilization* (Langer and Havinga 2015).” When a given linguistic construction or feature was not included in the officialized norm, despite usage practices, it is said to have been ‘de-selected’ or have undergone ‘non-selection’. Joseph et al. comment: “The term [invisiblization] reflects the more or less conscious removal of certain forms from the written tradition, limiting their use to (informal) spoken registers (cf. the concept of erasure, discussed by Irvine and Gal 2000)” (p. 175)[[4]](#footnote-4). When a given form is de-selected for the (written) codified norm, such a construction is relegated to the realm of non-standard oral options, often undergoing stigmatization as it lacks the overt prestige of the standard[[5]](#footnote-5). Such structures are consequently rendered invisible in written materials generated by standard-gazing gatekeepers, including in documents (re)produced by scribes and prescriptivist proofreaders (see also Havinga, 2018; Elspaß, 2020; Hickey, 2020, p. 222-3). Attempts to sidestep such stigmatized elements, including rendering them as ‘invisible’ as well as deeming them as ‘handicaps’ and ‘non resources’, could be considered a type of linguicism (see Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1995, pp. 105-6; Uekusa, 2019, p. 356[[6]](#footnote-6); see also Franolic, 1980, p. 55; Duncan, 2016, p. 462, 467-8).

Also germane to investigations of linguistic amalgamscontaining (once) stigmatized non-standard forms, including codemeshed elements,is implicit codification. As Hickey (2020, p. 222) points out, if speakers, including those of a non-vernacular variety in particular, “do not perceive a structure or feature as vernacular then it can slip through the net and be incorporated into the…implicitly codified variety.” That is, with this type of codification, various ‘deviant’, ‘deficient’, non-standard forms can be woven into the standard (see also Flores & Rosa, 2015). The inclusion of such ‘transgressive’ constructions in the officialized norm “may manifest…as a preference for, or tolerance of, particular structures or phrasing” (p. 223). Hickey explains that “some features which were initially stigmatised by being typical of vernacular varieties can percolate upwards into a supraregional variety and lose their stigma in the process,” as with the adoption of velarized [ɫ] of Dublin English into Irish English (p. 226). When such structures are no longer regarded as being indexical of *katunarçe* linguistic features and repertoires, covert codification, among other processes, may result (p. 228-9).

Linguistic bowing by languagers of divergent and diaglossic varieties, including with regard to translingual communication, should also be addressed. Asymmetrical linguistic bowing, or accommodation, is when “one part of the citizenship always has to change its language in order to communicate with the other. That means that these citizens have to learn the strongest language, but not the other way around, imposing all the cooperation costs of living in society on some groups but not to others…always forcing the others to ‘linguistically bow’ in front of them” (see Van Parijs, 2011, pp. 54, 174 in Morales-Gálvez, 2017, p. 655). In instances of asymmetrical bowing, one segment of the community may feel empowered when their hegemonic norm surfaces, while another segment may feel linguistically disenfranchised when ‘deviant’ (codemeshed) forms undergo erasure as they may feel those options have been (un)wittingly wiped clean (deleted with no chance of recovery) by the gatekeepers from their linguistic inventories. Such linguistic bowing, however, can also be reciprocal, where “[e]very individual settling on the territory is expected to gain proficiency in the vernacular language, to bow to the vernacular speakers in some contexts” (Van Parijs in De Schutter & Robichaud, 2015, p. 102). Injustices arise, however, when asymmetrical accommodation is the prevailing default, whereby unilateral linguistic bowing to the hegemonic standard reigns (p. 100-1).

1. **The case of Albanian (Note: a work in progress)**
   1. **Research questions**

The research questions for this component of the study are as follow:

a. Is implicit codification of the target (named) variety or varieties (e.g. of non-standard Albanian) taking place in the relevant speech communities and/or social networks? (If yes, in which linguistic ecosystems and contexts - and to what extent?)

b. How does linguistic invisibilization (erasure) of a person’s (named) L1 variety (e.g. of non-standard Albanian) impact various language practices, including with regard to translingual writing?

c. What are various equitable and sustainable solutions to be pursued regarding integrating (multilingual and multidialectal) translanguaging, including the code(s) that had once been erased from academic discourse, into assessed writing activities, in particular in light of linguistic and social (in)justices in the given linguascapes, such as with non-standard Albanian in Southeastern Europe (e.g. Kosovo)?

The upcoming subcomponents of the paper will attempt to address these questions.

* 1. **Linguistic invisibilization: Albanian**

Given a relatively recent past marred by linguistic erasure of non-standard constructions, some languagers of Albanian circumvent the hegemonic centripetalstandard language in various linguistic ecosystems via transgressive sidestepping of the overt norm, including by employing heteroglossic language practices exhibiting destandardization, diaglossia, and implicit codification.

Linguistic invisiblization can be of relevance when considering suppressed varieties, including the Geg dialect of Albanian. Such a situation can be observed when examining language codification decision-making, in particular during the previous century (Ismajli, 2005). In Shkodër (Albania), Tirana (Albania) and Prishtina (Kosovo), among other locations, prior to 1967 Geg and Tosk varieties regularly appeared in print, sometimes even in the same document, including in language standardization materials, such in *Rregulla mbi orthografín e gjuhës shqipe të shkrueme të vendosuna prej komisís letrare* in 1917 where the Geg variety of Elbasan was proposed to be the basis of a common standard, in particular since this subvariant contained a harmonious mix of the two dialects (see Ismajli, 2005, pp. 225-232). This document paved the way for other publications, namely *Ortografia e gjuhës shqipe*, written by language scholars in the Geg variety at the Institute of Sciences in Tirana in 1948, as well as later in 1951, but in Tosk; both publications allowed for Geg and Tosk to co-exist in the linguistic landscape of publishing. In the People’s Socialist Republic of Albania just five years later in 1956 the Geg variety, however, went from being employed in a wealth of genres, including language primers and literary, religious, scientific, and newspaper materials, to being relegated to footnotes in Tirana’s version of *Ortografia e gjuhës shqipe* (Ismajli, 2005, p. 277-307), despite appearing in many school textbooks in Kosovo (e.g. Vokshi, 1959) and select literary pieces, such as by Migjeni, among a limited number of written materials appearing in Geg on both sides of the (PSR of Albania-the Autonomous Socialist Province of Kosovo) border. Subsequently, just over a decade later the Geg variety was nearly eliminated as a legitimate linguistic code for publication of scholarly, scientific, and other official materials, via erasure and proscription, including in 1967 by a team of linguistic authorities under the auspices of the University of Tirana (see *Rregullat e drejtshkrimit të shqipes* in Ismajli, 2005, pp. 357-520) and in 1968 in the Autonomous Socialist Province of Kosovo by a group of linguists at Prishtina’s Albanological Institute (see *Konkluzat e konsultës gjuhësore të Prishtinës* in Ismajli, 2005, p. 521).

Unified Literary Albanian (ULA) of 1972 based primarily on the southern Tosk dialect of Albania came to be the hegemonic standard of the PSR of Albania and the ASP of Kosovo (see Ismajli, 2005, pp. 523-630; Byron, 1976, 1978, 1985). That is, in roughly two decades, the Geg variety went from being associated with culture to undergoing considerable linguistic invisibilization. Political decisions, including in language planning, of the late 1960s and early 1970s in Southeastern Europe shaped the linguistic landscape of language standardization of Albania and Kosova. While the Tosk dialect had thus been elevated to overt prestige by being selected for the new standard, the Geg variety and its speakers were stigmatized (see also Byron, 1976, 1978, 1985) and thus marginalized.

**2.3 Unscripted codemeshing and online corpora (Note: a work in progress)**

So as to obtain a dynamic optic of the contemporary linguistic ecosystem of Albanian, the methodology and data collection of this study involved listening to six videos recently published online[[7]](#footnote-7), taking notes, and transcribing the relevant portions (based on the methodology of…). Of the 45 speakers whose spoken language was considered for this study, 25 are women and 20 are men (speakers: n = 45; women: n = 25, 56%; males: n = 20, 44%); 12 of the women are from Kosova, 10 from Albania, 2 from North Macedonia, and 1 from Montenegro; 14 of the men are from Albania and 6 are from Kosova. In these materials, the interlocuters possess linguistic repertoires containing Tosk (T), Geg (G), and ULA, among others. Although an array of spoken language practices in Albanian emerges, diaglossic (translingual) speech, which was found to be employed in varying degrees by speakers, is of particular interest.[[8]](#footnote-8)

In these materials of particular salience were various morphological elements that surface in diaglossic speech, in particular the Geg participle (e.g. *pasë* ‘have’). It was coded in terms of what preceded it: i.) the Tosk/ULA ***duke*** (e.g. *duke pasë* ‘while having’; cf. T/ULA *duke pasur*, G *tue pasë*); ii.) the Geg marker of the short infinitive ***me*** (e.g. G *me pasë* ‘to have’; cf. T/ULA *të kesh*); and iii.) ***other*** (e.g. G/T/ULA *për të* ‘in order to’, *duhet* ‘should’, *mos* ‘not’, *pa* ‘without’). In reference to Figure 1, in the natural speech of the subjects, out of a grand total of 1,020 instances for all three of the aforementioned categories (women: n=456 or 45%; men: n=564 or 55%), 35 tokens surfaced whereby *duke* (T/ULA element) preceded a Geg participle, with 37% (n=13) of the tokens being uttered by the women and 63% (n=22) by the men. In regard to *me* (Geg marker of the infinitive, e.g. *me pasë* ‘to have’), e.g. preceding a Geg participle, a total of 423 were employed, 44% (n=185) by the women and 56% (n= 238) by the men. In terms of when any other item preceded the Geg participle, the total number of tokens was 562, with 46% (n=258) being uttered by the women and 54% (n=304) by the men. These data suggest that heteroglossic speech is present in contemporary language practices, both for the women in men, where the men take a slight lead in all three of the categories considered, despite having five fewer speakers in the study.

Figure 1: Token frequency and percentage of Geg participles in natural speech according to category of preceding element

Various Geg lexical entities of interest, including *nji* (cf. T/ULA *një* ‘one’), s*hpi* (cf. T/ULA *shtëpi* ‘house’), among others, were also coded given their salience in the language practices of the subjects of this study, with a grand total of 491 occurrences (women: n=138 or 28%; men: n=353, or 72%; see Figure 2). The item *nji*[[9]](#footnote-9) (cf. T/ULA *një* ‘one’) was uttered a total of 345 times, with the women using it in 21% (n=73) of the instances, and the men in 79% (n=272) of the cases. The lexical item *shpi* (cf. T/ULA *shtëpi* ‘house’) was heard a total of 27 times, whereby all the utterances were uttered by the men. The Geg participle *pasë* (cf. T/ULA *pasur*/*patur* ‘have’) was used a total of 87 times, with the women employing it in 55% (n=48) of the cases, and the men 45% (n=39) of the time. In regard to the Geg participle *ardhë* (cf.T/ULA *ardhur* ‘come’), a total of 18 cases surfaced, with the women uttering it 61% (n=11) of the time, and the men in 39% (n=7) of the cases. The Geg participle *shku* (cf. T/ULA *shkuar* ‘go’) was employed 14 times, 43% by the women (n=6) and 57% (n=8) by the men. These data are aligned with the overall results in Figure 1, namely that the men take the lead in employing divergent forms that contribute to heteroglossic and diaglossic speech, in particular for *nji*, *shpi*, *and shku*; the women, however, were found to have uttered more instances of the Geg participles *pasë* and *ardhë*.

Figure 2: Token frequency and percentage of select Geg lexical items in natural speech

As displayed in Figure 3, similar linguistic behaviors in Albanian can also be observed in written language, including in online corpora. When investigating non-standard and hybrid constructions in the Albanian National Corpus (ANC), occasionally a few tokens of non-standard forms surface. Such numbers suggest that although the hegemonic standard is present, it faces some competition from diaglossic elements, such as those in the natural language observations in Figures 1 and 2.

Figure 3: Token frequencies of selected lexical items (Gheg, Tosk/ULA) in the ANC

**2.4 Translingual writing: Traces of a (once) marginalized variety (Note: a work in-progress)**

The second component of this study goes beyond identifying how (trans)languaging (i.e. codemeshing; see Canagarajah, 2011; Young, 2013) is present and employed in Southeastern Europe (namely non-standard Geg in relation to Tosk and Unified Literary Albanian, a.k.a. Standard Albanian) in unscripted situations and online corpora; this portion examines how such communicative practices are also able to find a home in academic writing, including when the dominant language is English(es). In particular, the focus here is on translingual experiences of first-year[[10]](#footnote-10) undergraduate students (n = 180)[[11]](#footnote-11) in Southeastern Europe (Kosovo) for various academic writing assignments, including during process writing activities (e.g. involving prewriting, drafting, peer feedback, peer-guided tutoring sessions and workshops, as well as instructor consultations and feedback) while attending a writing course at a global campus of a private university based in the US. The materials considered for this study are from the fall semesters of 2020 and 2021 while COVID-19 restrictions were in place (namely a combination of hybrid, online, and in-person modes of delivery of instruction). At the time of the writing of this draft of the paper (a preliminary pilot study), the number of the instructors involved is n = 1, namely the author of this paper. The methodology for this portion of the study is based in part on that of, among others, Flores & Rosa, 2015; Lorimer Leonard, 2021; Özer, 2021…..(Note: a work in progress…)

Occasional translingual elements did emerge in some portions of the academic writing assignments, including during various processes that students utilize while developing ideas for the final draft. What appears below is an explanation of various elements of this course, in particular in relation to academic writing where the dominant language is English(es).

**Course assignments**. For both semesters in question, on the first day of class students had the opportunity to select from a range of writing prompts to introduce themselves to the course instructor. One of the selections was a literacy narrative. Albeit many students chose this option, they tended not to employ codemeshing, i.e. translingual writing practices, in the version that was submitted to the instructor (as either an electronic document uploaded to the online course management system or as a hard copy on a conventional piece of paper). Throughout the semester students were given three major writing assignments, where process writing (a portfolio approach) was involved for each one of them. The first assignment focused on narrative writing, where the literacy narrative was (again) a possibility. The other two assignments involved researched writing (including annotated bibliographies). For all of these assignments, students were explicitly encouraged to incorporate translingual writing.

**Prewriting**: The students were provided numerous examples for the prewriting activities, including reading selections that provided detailed discussions of this component. Some students did employ translingual writing practices in this component, in particular when brainstorming and mind-mapping. This was particularly the case when the prewriting was generated on a conventional (hard copy) piece of paper using a traditional writing utensil (e.g. pen, pencil, and/or marker) – rather than typed as a Word document and uploaded to the online course management system.

**Drafting**: Students were asked to produce at least three drafts for each of the writing assignments. During the drafting phase, including for the first draft, some students made written notes to themselves in the text (including in the margins); this is where codemeshing would often appear. The students, however, often did not submit these translingual versions for the instructor to provide feedback on. The instructor had a glimpse into this translingual writing in the instances when the student made an appointment with the instructor to discuss these preliminary ideas and in some cases shared the written materials with the instructor (via a shared Zoom screen) at that time.

**Peer reviews**: Once the first draft was completed, students were paired up to provide feedback on each other’s writing. During this process, students were encouraged to provide written and oral comments to their peers. In some of the oral discussions between peers, considerable codemeshing emerged. For many of the students, this is how they were most comfortable sharing their ideas. Such translingual communications were not hindered by the instructor.

**Peer tutors (workshops and individual tutoring sessions)**: Many of the students attended targeted writing workshops and tutoring sessions where their trained and experienced peers were the facilitators. The peer tutors were free to express themselves in a way they felt most suitable for their audience; for each session the peer tutor and student tutee negotiated what worked best for the given situation in terms of (trans)languaging options. Much of this communication also contained translingual elements.

**Instructor consultations (conferences)**: For each writing assignment, each student was required to meet with the instructor to orally discuss their writing project prior to submitting the final draft. Some students employed codemeshing, depending on the topic they were exploring and researching and how comfortable they were with the technical terminology of the given subject matter. Prior to the initial consultation session with the instructor, written formative and summative feedback was provided by the instructor on a preliminary draft. The instructor explicitly shared with the students that they were welcome to employ the type of language they were comfortable with. Codemeshing was not discouraged. Often students were reminded to experiment with their translingual communication – both in the written feedback from the instructor and orally during the consultations.

The following includes examples of translingual communication from students enrolled in the noted writing course.

1.

2.

…..

**3. Conclusions and implications (Note: a work in progress)**

Cases of asymmetrical bowing are plentiful in Albanian. A case in point surfaces in one of the videos[[12]](#footnote-12), where at least two participants spoke primarily in the hegemonic standard, not bowing linguistically to the speech of those of non-standard and/or diaglossic varieties. Instances of reciprocal linguistic bowing toward divergent variants in Albanian, however, are also present, as evidenced in the diaglossic utterances in these videos and some select items in the ANC (see Figures 1-3). One such case surfaced when a speaker of T/ULA uttered at least five instances of ‘deviant’ forms, e.g. *nji* (cf. *një* ‘one’), *e arnume* (cf. e *arnuar* ‘patched’), *gegnishte* (cf. *gegërishte* ‘Geg (variety/dialect)’), *shqipnia* (cf. *shqipëria* ‘Albania’), and *ardhë* (cf. *ardhur* ‘come’), all woven into a hegemonic linguascape, illustrating a glimpse of linguistic justice on the horizon where implicit codification transpires. It perhaps could also be that this languager was simply employing a more vibrant version of their linguistic repertoire than was expected by some audience, in particular given the position in society of this particular individual, namely as a public figure in the news media; the languager was employing those linguistic resources that resonate with interlocuter. Numerous cases of Geg speakers employing ‘deviant’ forms also transpire in these materials, thus illustrating resisting to bow to the hegemonic norm – and thus (strategically) leveraging their linguistic repertories to refuse invisibilization.

In terms of linguistic bowing in academic writing, the bowing is frequently to the dominant monolinguistic ideology that has been entrenched in societal expectations and standards in the region; minor traces of the dynamic linguistic repertoires of the students can be seen, more so in the preliminary stages of translingual writing activities, e.g. during the prewriting, consultation sessions, tutoring and workshop sessions, and rough drafts, than the final product that is submitted. The invisibilization of assemblages containing (once) stigmatized elements in student translingual writing is not surprising, in particular given the erasure of such components in written materials in the academia in the region (source needed). Recently the ministries of education in Kosovo and Albania in the winter of 2021, during a joint meeting in Elbasan (Albania) announced that the two countries would cooperate to produce a joint language primer for both countries (source needed). Time will tell if the current institutional status quo will budge much in terms of leveraging the linguistic resources of those who reside in the region.

In order for students to feel more empowered to leverage their vibrant linguistic resources in their writing, including the final draft stage, additional support at the pedagogical and institutional levels could assist in addressing this issue. Also, additional resources could be provided to students so that they understand what translingual writing can be, what constitutes (trans)languaging (and plurilingualism). Such materials could include additional samples of translingual writing, explicit indepth discussion of a translanguaging pedagogical stance with students. Also, additional training sessions for peer tutors could be organized so that they are provided with the necessary tools to guide their tutees in creatively exploring voice and agency, critically examining language awareness, and participating in reflective experiences regarding language practices, among others. Professional development opportunities could be provided to interested faculty so that they could expand their horizons regarding embracing a translingual approach in pedagogy (see e.g. Flores & Rosa, 2015; Lorimer Leonard, 2021; Özer, 2021).…..[Note: work in progress.]

These dynamic heteroglossic (see Flores & Rosa, 2015) and translingual elements that constitute sites of potential erasure are not alone; they can be considered alongside other marginalized varieties of Albanian that also reflect hegemonic forces at work. Two linguistic repertoires that have also endured varying degrees of invisibilisation (see Hamp in Tsitsipis, 1995, p. 544) include the Arvanitis in Greece and the Arbëresh in Italy (Tsitsipis & Elmendorf, 1983; Tsitsipis, 1995; 2003; Derhemi, 2006). Given various institutional and governmental structures, including legal frameworks, the Arbëresh speech communities may have a more advantageous standing than the Arvanitis, for which language attrition, progressive erasure, and obsolescence may be at a more advanced stage, in particular when considering the absence of linguistic autonomy for these speakers during the previous century (see Hamp in Tsitsipis & Elmendorf, 1983, p. 289; see also Derhemi, 2006). Albeit the diaglossic (read: heteroglossic, translingual) repertoires of the Albanian-speaking communities in Kosova (and, e.g. Albania) are not experiencing language attrition to the extent of the aforementioned communities in Italy and Greece, hegemonic forces are still prevalent. Guaranteeing gate-opening (Kraus & Kazlauskaite-Gürbüz, 2014), counter-hegemonic institutional support, governmental funding, as well as legal framework advocating for the linguistic diversity of these marginalized varieties employed in daily discourse could reinforce the importance of renegotiating symbolic power, language (as well as dialect) maintenance and transmission of these linguistic practices (see Tsitsipis, 2003, p. 545). The recognition of the validity and value of such linguistic varieties and emerging diaglossic and translingual constructions in shared spaces (Morales-Gálvez, 2017, p. 657) by various authorities could foster renewed appreciation for such (trans)lingualism (see also García & Otheguy, 2020) . At least the writing assignments in a first-year writing course offer some ‘space on the page’ for these (once) marginalized and invisiblized ‘assemblages’ that are part of the cultural heritage and identity of a segment of the global community.
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1. Rutten (2016a, p. 8) writes: “Auer (2005, 2011) presents a typological and historical analysis of the rise of diaglossic repertoires in Europe. The typological development runs from a previous state of diglossia to diaglossia. The diglossic phase is first characterized by an exoglossic standard such as Latin, Church Slavonic or Arabic, and vernacular spoken varieties…Then there was a transition to a situation with an endoglossic standard, which is structurally related to the vernacular.” [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. As Rutten (2016a, p. 8) explains, quoting Auer: “Such intermediate forms enable language users ‘to act out, in the appropriate contexts, an identity which could not be symbolized through the base dialects (which may have rural, backwardish or non-educated connotations) nor through the national standard (which may smack formality and unnaturalness and/or be unable to express regional affiliation). (Auer 2005:23).” [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. García & Otheguy (2020, p. 25) write: “Translanguaging rests on the idea that the concept of the named language, and the related concepts of language purity and verbal hygiene were constructed to support ideologies of racial, class, and gender superiority (Cameron 1995). These ideas circulated as integral parts of undertakings aimed at nation-state building and their often associated ventures of colonial expansion (Makoni and Pennycook 2007; Mignolo 2000; Quijano 2007). By disrupting the hierarchies of named languages and the ideologies of language purity, translanguaging is said to be ‘a political act’ (Flores 2014). Translanguaging interrogates named languages, pointing to an answer that includes their being con- structed by nation-states as a tool for the domination of language minoritized communities. The named language tool excludes these communities from social, political and economic opportunities by authorizing, legitimating, naturalizing and opening paths only to those who speak what is con- structed as the common, autonomous and whole, national language…. Otheguy, García, and Reid (2015) have defined translanguaging from a linguistic perspective as ‘the deployment of a speaker’s full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named (and usually national and state) languages’ (283). Rather than perceiving multilingual speakers as possessing the plurilingual ‘repertoire of languages’ supported by the Council of Europe, translanguaging sees multilinguals as possessing a unitary linguistic system that they build through social interactions of different types, and that is not compartmentalized into boundaries corresponding to those of the named languages (Otheguy, García, and Reid 2015, 2018).” [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Tsitsipis (2003, p. 247) mentions: “According to Gal and Irvine (1995: 974), erasure is a powerful ideological strategy in the process of which certain phenomena such as linguistic structures, cultural products, social groups, sociolinguistic varieties, etc. are rendered invisible… The processes that index this erasure are fragmentation, marginalization, sublimation, and repression.” [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Havinga (2018, p. 1, footnote 1) comments: “The term ‘invisibilisation’ is more forceful than ‘disappearance’ and implies a degree of deliberate agency, i.e. a particular variant or variety is no longer written down for a reason, not accidentally. Skutnabb-Kangas’s (2000) wider use of ‘invisibilisation’ corresponds with this understanding of the term. In her discussion of the suppression or marginalisation of minority languages, cultures, and peoples, she refers to cases where languages are not acknowledged, are not granted the label ‘languages’ or regarded as small parts of the majority language. Thus minority languages and cultures are stigmatised and made invisible by those in power (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000: 662).” [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Uekusa (2019, p. 356-7) writes: “The concept of linguicism was first introduced by Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, who define it as ‘[i]deologies, structures and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (both material and non-material) between groups which are defined on the basis of language’ (Phillipson 1992, quoted in Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson 1995:105). Although their original concept of linguicism emphasizes language-related structural discrimination, such as limited governmental service access in minority languages, linguicism could be conceived as a form of discrimination based on language, which also operates at a micro-level (Uekusa 2009:1). In an extremely simple sense, linguicism is a form of discrimination based on language against linguistic minorities, operating at multiple levels such that it even includes people's discriminatory practices in everyday interpersonal interactions based on the intensity of one's accent (Lippi-Green 1997; Woodrow 2006)….Gramsci’s *hegemony*…” See also García & Otheguy (2020, p. 27): “Following Bouaventura de Souza Santos’ concept of ‘abyssal thinking’ (2007), it is important to make visible bilingual students’ translanguaging which has been rendered invisible in schools.” [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. # List of videos: Ora 7: “Sekreti i Altin Prengës nga Mrizi i Zanave Agroturizëm për kuzhinën shqiptare-16.06.2021(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0BBTkLbTdoI>); Rudina Xhunga: “Mrizi i Zanave” – 18.01.2020 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=voHwABhLvzI>); Opinioni: “Çfarë do të thotë të jesh femër në trevat shqiptare?” – 12.06.2021 (<https://tvklan.al/opinion-live-12-korrik-2021/>); Opinioni: “Vendet më interesante të Tiranës” – 3.06.2021 (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gPrEdkMv094); Jeta në Kosovë: “Gratë në Qeversije” - 13.02.2020 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vHmU5g84sBs>); RUBIKON Klan Kosova: “Dita e Qeverisë Kurti II” - 22.03.2021(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2-ylO09pafE).

   [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Many of these speakers have lived in Geg regions; are of Geg heritage; and/or have been exposed to this variety for a considerable period of time. In each of these cases, multimodal dialect contact in various public and private spheres, e.g. with friends and acquaintances, including in televised programs, is of pertinence to this investigation. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Including all lexical items where *nji* surfaced, e.g. *nji shpi* (‘one/a house’), *njiqind* (‘one hundred’), *nji mijë* (‘one thousand’). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Although undergraduate students who are (and were) second-year, third-year, fourth-year, and so forth, may also attend these courses, and have in the recent past, the majority of the students enrolled tend to be first-year students. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. This is an ongoing study where additional students will be included in the coming semesters. Additional instructors will also be included. This paper serves as a preliminary pilot study on translingual writing at the institution. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Opinioni: “Çfarë do të thotë të jesh femër në trevat shqiptare?” – 12.06.2021 (<https://tvklan.al/opinion-live-12-korrik-2021/>) [↑](#footnote-ref-12)