University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching,
Learning and Teacher Education

Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher
Education

9-2016

Translanguaging in the Writing of Emergent Multilinguals

Lydia Kananu Kiramba

University of Nebraska–Lincoln, lkiramba2@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/teachlearnfacpub>

Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Language and Literacy Education Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Kiramba, Lydia Kananu, "Translanguaging in the Writing of Emergent Multilinguals" (2016). *Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education*. 248.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/teachlearnfacpub/248>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Translanguaging in the Writing of Emergent Multilinguals

Lydia Kananu Kiramba

Department of Teaching, Learning & Teacher Education, University of Nebraska–Lincoln, Lincoln 68588;
email kkananul@gmail.com

Abstract

This article discusses the findings of an empirical study that investigated the writing practices in a multilingual, rural, fourth-grade classroom in Kenya. The study was undergirded by Bakhtin's heteroglossia. Analysis of texts indicated that these emergent multilinguals used multiple semiotic resources to maximize the chances of meeting the communicative goals through translanguaging. However, the translanguaging process in writing was a tension-filled process in terms of language separation and correctness. The emergent multilingual writer went through tensions in the process of finding a balance between authorial intentions and the authoritarian single voicedness required by the school and the national curriculum. The author suggests that translanguaging in writing disrupts unequal voices and language hierarchies by transgressing standard ideologies in academic writing. It is recommended that educators consider multilingual resources as legitimate cognitive tools and resources for communication in school contexts to allow authentic voices and inclusive instruction.

Keywords: Emergent multilinguals, heteroglossia, translingual writing

Recent research has documented that linguistically and culturally diverse individuals draw on their collective linguistic repertoires of resources to meet their communicative goals in a given situation. This indicates that their language use is not strictly compartmentalized but fluid and mobile. Researchers have used several terms to describe this phenomenon, including: plurilingualism (Jørgensen, Karrebæk, Madsen, & Møller, 2011), heteroglossia (Bakhtin, 1975/1981; Bailey, 2007), flexible bilingualism (Blackledge & Creese, 2010), code-meshing (Canagarajah, 2011), translanguaging (García, 2009), and others. These multilingual practices have led to different scholars questioning the fields of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and language allocations and restrictions in teaching. For example, Kachru and Sridhar (1994) lamented the lack of historicity in the field of SLA and claimed that the SLA research had ignored areas that have stable multilingualism in the global south. Recently other scholars have conducted research on multilingual communicative practices (Blackledge & Creese, 2010, 2014; García, 2009; Velasco & García, 2014) among others. These scholars have argued that language separation is an ideological construct rather than actual language practices.

Multilingual discourse has been studied for several decades. Earlier research focused on the mixing of languages in discourse and particularly on code switching (CS). Most of the work studied was spontaneously produced data, and most of it was done in informal contexts. For example, there are studies on the pragmatic functions of code-switching (e.g., Appel & Muysken, 2005; Heller, 1988; Romaine, 1995) that have been largely influenced by Gumperz's (1982) pioneering typology. Their purpose was to identify the sociopragmatic motivation for the occurrence of particular code-switched utterances and eventually classify them under a fixed category such as quotation, elaboration, and reiteration, among many others.

Study of spoken discourse in the classroom has gained momentum in multilingual settings (Canagarajah, 2011; García, 2009). However, research on how two or more languages interact and affect knowledge

construction in regard to writing is limited. Only a few studies have offered to analyze multilingual texts in classroom settings (Canagarajah, 2011, 2013; Velasco & García, 2014), particularly in African settings where there is stable multilingualism. The reasons for ignoring mixed languages in writing includes the fact that written text has been considered as normative and has had a tendency to have a pedagogical focus (Canagarajah, 2013; Sebba, Mahootian, & Jonsson, 2012). This tendency has produced a monolingual bias, which makes it difficult for researchers who are identified with and specialize in the study of specific languages. Sebba decries that CS in writing has not been theorized, unlike the spoken CS, and recommends that mixed-language written texts be studied within literacy frameworks to understand the practice within the literacy practices it is part of.

This article is an attempt to analyze writing within a literacy framework, to create a dialogue around multilingual learners' access to literacy as they work to become proficient writers and readers in different languages of their nurture and schooling. In the next section, I briefly review research on monolingual ideologies that have focused on language purism in multilingual settings, followed by translanguaging (TL) in writing. Canagarajah (2011) defines translanguaging as "the ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoires as an integrated system" (p. 401). Translanguaging as defined in this paper involves CS and translation (García, 2009). Grounded in sociocultural theories, I draw heavily in this article on Bakhtin's (1975/1981) notion of heteroglossia.

Monolingual habitus in multilingual settings

In schools, children with complex linguistic repertoires typically experience institutional policies that are rooted in traditional monolingual habitus (Gogolin, 2002). Monolingual habitus is a set of assumptions that are built on the fundamental myth of uniformity of language and culture (Gogolin, 2002). Such schools prioritize English-only language for instruction. Since independence in 1963, Kenyan schools have historically been sites for English acquisition and implement language policies that are aimed at promoting what Bakhtin (1975/1981) would identify as unitary language and language homogenization, despite the stable multilingual status of the children. Additionally, academic writing has been historically considered as a monolingual practice in Kenya, where all exams are written in English. African languages are relegated to oral communication, while English and other European languages have been promoted to academic and other acts that are considered literate (Mbaabu, 1996). Benson (2013) has correctly noted that research in multilingual contexts often fails to recognize multilingualism as a social and individual reality. Benson (2013) calls this an imperfect fit designed for learners. Instead of meeting learners where they are in terms of languages, cultures, identities, and experiences, school officials impose an unrealistic and rigid curriculum and approach on learners, prevent a number of pupils from succeeding, and increase school dropouts.

Early research in the West problematized this monolingual view of literacy. For example; Heath (1982) and Street (1984) challenged the autonomous view of literacy. Autonomous literacy, according to Street, is viewing literacy itself as having an effect on other social and cognitive practices. It is imposing Western conceptions of literacy on other cultures (Hernández-Zamora, 2010). Heath, Street, and Hernández-Zamora situate literacy in social contexts as a part of local social relations. They also emphasize the agency of individuals who adopted unauthorized literacies. Recently scholars have discussed code-switching in spoken language in African classrooms in Mozambique (Chimbutane, 2013), in Kenya (Meritt, Cleghorn, Abagi, & Bunyi 1992), and in South Africa (Setati, Adler, Reed, & Bapoo, 2005; Makalela, 2015). Even then, there is a paucity of research studies that have addressed multilingual writing practices in African classrooms. Additionally, most research on writing practices in the classroom has been written from first-world perspectives, which have been historically monolingual. In this article I attempt to answer the question: How are children's linguistic repertoires displayed during writing practices in the classroom? I draw from a research study that was conducted in rural Kenya.

Translanguaging

Several scholars have offered translanguaging (TL) as a possible solution to educational challenges facing linguistically and culturally diverse students (Busch, 2014; Canagarajah, 2013; García, 2009). Busch (2014), drawing on a study carried out in a state primary school in Vienna among culturally and linguistically diverse students, identified a struggle with linguistic needs of the children with multiple languages who are required to use only one language. Busch advocated for opening up spaces for children by acknowledging the different languages as a resource, to bring into dialogue their individual repertoires to engage in metalinguistic discussion and negotiation, with a goal of transforming the enforced monolingual habitus into a multilingual habitus. Similar arguments are held by García and Leiva (2014), who view TL as an act of bilingual performance and pedagogy, pointing out that the use of flexible linguistic resources in a classroom resists historical and cultural positioning of multilingual students within English monolingualism. According to García and Leiva (2014), the use of languages flexibly is a practice of social justice because TL serves a role in releasing voices and new prejudices, and it provides students who are confronted with unfamiliar languages with alternative representations that release knowledge and voices that have been silenced by English only.

The possibility of using TL for rhetorical purposes in writing has been explicated. Hélot's (2014) analysis of authors crossing language borders in children's books explored how TL in writing can support creativity in bilingual and multiliteracy pedagogy. Analyzing different configurations of TL used by multilingual authors and how these authors negotiate their identity through translation of their own work or invention of new hybrid forms of language, Hélot questioned the possibility of envisioning TL as a pedagogical approach in bilingual teacher education in Alsace where French or German languages are taught separately. She argued that using TL in literary texts is more appropriate in offering ways of legitimizing language mixing and that translingual texts offer an excellent basis for discussing what it means to be bi- or multilingual and exploring the notion of identity; because translingual authors break the traditional ideological barriers that separate languages, new bi/multilingual voices and identities emerge.

Use of TL for creativity has been echoed by Sebba, Mahootian, and Jonsson (2012), who indicated that code-mixing in writing affords authors a way to satisfy both demands of norms and voice using their languages in a qualified manner. Authors merge their languages in rational ways for significant rhetorical and performance reasons. Therefore, CS practices in the text are the authors' means to represent their identities and pluralize their texts to satisfy their own need for voice, preferred codes, and conventions. Use of TL could allow students to succeed in mainstream discourse without sacrificing criticality or their voices. In support of this argument, Mahootian (2012) points out that the style, register, and the languages authors choose to express themselves all contribute to who they think they are, how they are, how they want others to see them, and how others actually identify them. Thus, language constructs, indexes, and reveals an individual's identity. TL acknowledges the complex relationship among language, identity, and sociopolitical power (García & Leiva, 2014). Canagarajah (2013) has described the multilingual strategy described by Mahootian (2012) as *envoicing*. Envoicing is appropriating a text or talk, personalizing the speaker, distinguishing their work, accentuating their differences by deviating from the homogeneous uses and collective norms to provide identity and voice. From this viewpoint, negotiation of meaning is not separable from identity representation. Thus, writers negotiate their voices in the text they write. Canagarajah argued that attaining success in communication does not involve forfeiting people's uniqueness. He, however, warns that translingual practices are not guaranteed for success, considering the ideological measures on what is good academic writing.

Canagarajah (2013) has pointed out that, although the power of monolingual orientation in educational settings prevails, multilingual texts are becoming increasingly common as a result of increasing language contact in everyday life. He views multilingual texts as an important mode of writing for multilingual students to represent their identities in English. Moreover, Canagarajah (2013) pointed out that languages are always in contact and mutually influence each other. Suggesting that multilingual users have integrated competency

and do not separate language and that languages are not essentially at war with each other, Canagarajah chose the term *translingual* to break away from the conception that languages are kept separate.

Canagarajah (2013) perceives *translingual* writing as a means to resolve challenges of writing pedagogy, arguing that it is a “pragmatic resolution that is sensitive and important for challenging inequalities of languages (p. 113). Individuals who are *translanguaging* are learning the dominant languages for social and educational means at the same time. Research on the role *translingual* writing plays in development of the target language is important to inform discourses about how the languages are learned concurrently. Scholars view the deviation from standard written English as costly, and resistance to or *transgressing* from the established academic writing norms that leads to authors being treated as unproficient and are penalized accordingly because writing is strictly gate kept (Canagarajah, 2013; Sebba et al., 2012).

The major constraints on *translingual* writing and studying multilingual writing are monolingual assumptions that conceive literacy development as unidirectional acquisition of competence, preventing individuals from fully understanding the resources multilinguals bring to texts (Canagarajah, 2011). Language homogenization policies position learners as acquirers of skills that are useful for basic functioning and accepting predetermined roles about identities. In contrast, multilingual writing is seen as agentive, shuttling creatively between languages and discourses to achieve their communicative goal (Canagarajah, 2011). Multilingual speakers select features from a repertoire and assemble their language practices in ways that fit their communicative situations (García, 2009; Velasco & García, 2014). Multilinguals use their multiple semiotic resources to negotiate meaning with the text. Velasco and García (2014) argued that students use TL in writing to achieve higher standards of thought, creativity, and language use compared to the writing of a monolingual. Further, TL goes beyond acknowledging language as a social construct that reflects nation-state ideologies (Heller, 2007).

Taken together, the literature I have been discussing (Busch, 2014; Canagarajah, 2011, 2013; García & Leiva, 2014; Hélot, 2014; Mahootian, 2012; Sebba et al., 2012; Velasco & García, 2014) points to the need for embracing multiple linguistic repertoires in writing in order to enable writers to negotiate restrictive policies, voice, and identity.

Heteroglossia

To investigate students’ writing, I employ Bakhtin’s (1975/1981) notion of *heteroglossia*. *Heteroglossia* is heterogeneity of signs and forms in meaning making, which incorporates the aspects of tension-filled interaction, indexicality, and multivoiceness. Bakhtin’s (1975/1981) work is important for this study because it focuses broadly on historic and economic forces of language use (Wertsch, 1991). Wertsch recommends the work of Bakhtin to link the individual’s mental functioning to cultural, historical, and institutional settings. According to Bakhtin (1975/1981), as explicated in Wertsch (1991), “the production of any utterance involves the appropriation of at least one social language and speech genre . . . (which are themselves) inextricably linked with historical, cultural, and institutional setting” (p. 66).

Heteroglossia denotes the different strata (social, professional, dialects, jargons, etc.) in the same language. *Heteroglossia* is opposed to the idea of a unitary language. For Bakhtin, unitary language and *heteroglossia* are in constant struggle, a struggle that is characterized in terms of centripetal and centrifugal forces. Duranti (1998) explains these terms as follows:

The centripetal forces include the political and institutional forces that try to impose one variety of code over others.... These are centripetal because they try to force speakers toward adopting a unified linguistic identity. The centrifugal forces instead push speakers away from a common center and toward differentiation. These are the forces that tend to be represented by the people (geographically, numerically, economically, and metaphorically) at the periphery of the social system. (Duranti, 1998, p. 76)

According to Bakhtin (1975/1981), language is characterized by social tensions. Bakhtin described the social tensions in language as explicated previously by Duranti (1998), the opposing pull of “centrifugal” and “centripetal” forces. The centripetal force constitutes the push toward the “unitary language,”

homogeneity, standardization, and correctness. The centrifugal force pulls toward heteroglossic disunification and decentralization. These forces are never free of each other, however, as the centripetal forces of language operate in the midst of heteroglossia and coexist with centrifugal forces. For Bakhtin, unitary language is constantly opposed to the realities of heteroglossia and “makes its real presence felt as a force overcoming this heteroglossia, imposing specific limits to it” (Bakhtin, 1975/1981, p. 270). In this article, the tensions between policy and practice in multilingual writing practices will be discussed through these two concepts. The centripetal forces may represent the language policies or assumptions on the part of teachers, parents, and communities that it is better to learn in one unitary language, while the centrifugal forces, such as TL in writing, arise from the heteroglossia found in linguistically diverse classrooms.

Language points to or indexes a certain point of view, ideology, social class, profession, or other social position (Bakhtin, 1975/1981; Blackledge, Creese, & Takhi, 2014). Bakhtin’s notion of heteroglossia attempts to account for social, functional, generic, and dialectological variation within languages. The relationship between the indexical form and meaning is brought into being through historical association. Utterance is always embedded in a history of expressions by others in a chain of ongoing cultural and political moments. Bakhtin (1972/1984) believed that the study of language requires an examination of questions that go beyond the usual scope of linguistics and encompass the philosophical, cultural, ideological aspects of “language in its concrete living totality” (p. 181).

Multivoicedness is the interrelationship between our own word and the word of the other in a discourse that is dialogic. According to Bakhtin (1975/1981), “all utterances are inherently dialogic. They have, at the same time, a history and a present which exist in a continually negotiated state of intense and essential axiological interaction” (p. 279). The word is shaped not only by other words in the past and present but also by the anticipated word of the other. All utterances, therefore, have a history and an anticipated future. According to Bakhtin (1986), to speak is to envoice, to accentuate or populate language resources with our own intents and histories. This practice of dialogue focuses on cultural and interpretational dimensions of language and examines discourses that are formed by multiple voices.

In this study, Bakhtin’s heteroglossia provides me with a framework to explicitly discuss the linguistic utterances in students’ writing with the sociohistorical relationships that give meanings to those utterances. Therefore, I adopt a heteroglossic lens to discuss students’ translanguaging writing.

Methods

Data presented in this article were collected as a part of a six-month ethnographic case study of communicative practices in a multilingual, rural, fourth-grade classroom in Kenya. The larger study focused on communicative practices in language arts, science, and math in the fourth-grade classroom. This article analyzes data collected from one of my focal participants in order to examine emergent multilingual students’ writing practices. The question I attempt to answer here is: How are children’s linguistic repertoires displayed during writing practices in the classroom? I used a qualitative design (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007) with a focus on case study methods (Stake, 1995). Case study methods were suitable for this study because I had no control over the behavior of participants.

Context of the study

Kenya is a multilingual East African country that attained independence from Britain in 1963. There are approximately 67 live languages (Lewis, Gary, & Charles, 2016). English and Kiswahili are the official languages. Kiswahili is the national language and the Language of Wider Communication (LWC). English has been the language of instruction from fourth grade onward since independence. Therefore, teachers and other educated members of the society have varying proficiencies in English, Kiswahili, and other home languages.

This study took place at a rural primary school in the Umoja region, Eastern province, Kenya. The school is located in Amani (pseudonym) county. The study was carried out at Tumaini Primary School. Tumaini

(pseudonym), a public primary school, was selected on the basis of its location (rural setting) and its adherence to the transitional bilingual education (TBE) early-exit program.

At the time of data collection the school had 12 teachers, including one teacher for the kindergarten school and another who taught the Special Education class. The school had a total student population of 267 students (boys and girls), one class for each grade (K–8). As a public day school that operates with very few financial resources, Tumaini has predominantly served economically disadvantaged families in the community and did not have access to English outside school. The children in these classes can be termed as multilingual (speaking two to three languages) or emerging multilingual (speaking at least two languages and acquiring one or more additional languages) either due to intermarriages or speaking different but mutually intelligible dialects. The majority of the people in the community speak Kimeru, and a good majority speak Kiswahili, the national language. Kimeru and Kiswahili are mutually intelligible languages; therefore, most people understand the lingua franca, although they may not speak it. At Tumaini School, both teachers and students had proficiency in one or more local languages. Students learned Kiswahili and English at school. All students in the fourth-grade classroom were English language learners with low proficiencies in both written and spoken English. However, because Kiswahili is the LWC and a national language in Kenya, students had access to it outside school and thus a higher proficiency.

Participants

For this study, I focused on a fourth-grade classroom. I chose to study students' writing in the fourth-grade classroom because at this level students are at least bilingual and acquiring English. Additionally, fourth grade is the transitioning year from mother-tongue instruction to English-only instruction as per the language in education policy in Kenya. There were a total of 28 students in this class, 16 boys and 12 girls, aged between 9 and 12 years. All the students spoke Kimeru and Kiswahili, and a few spoke Kikuyu and Kiluhya at home. All the fourth-grade students agreed to participate in this study. For the purposes of this article, I draw on the whole class writing practices during language arts lessons to showcase the extent of translanguaging among emergent multilinguals and then illustrate translingual writing practices using artifacts collected from one of my focal students, Adila (pseudonym). Adila was a 9-year-old girl who was an emerging multilingual. She spoke Kimeru and Kiswahili fluently and was acquiring English. She did not speak in English; she used English words sparingly during her conversations with friends. On the playground and at home, Adila spoke Kimeru mostly or code-mixed with Kiswahili in a few instances. I chose Adila as a representative sample of the TL writing practices in this classroom because she used multiple linguistic resources to communicate in all her writing samples.

Data collection and analysis procedures

The main sources of data for this article are students' writing samples and curricular documents. In this study, fourth-grade students were given writing tasks in two different languages—English, which is taught as a subject and language of instruction, and Kiswahili, which is only taught as a subject. The data were collected from six English compositions and three Kiswahili compositions on different topics throughout the school term. Each essay was written individually in class within a 40-minute lesson, after which the scripts were collected by the teacher for grading.

For the analysis of translanguaging (TL) in writing, I use textual analysis because "a major source of data for writing research is writing itself; the use of texts as objects of study" (Hyland, 2010, p. 198). In this study, the analysis of TL in the written texts is aimed at investigating students' communicative repertoires displayed in writing practices. This is in line with Paltridge and Wang's (2010, p. 257) assertions about the aims of textual analysis as follows:

1. "Knowledge about language beyond the word, clause, phrase and sentence that is needed for successful communication."
2. "The relationship between language and the social and the cultural contexts in which it is used."

In this analysis I discuss overall TL practices in the classroom. I then showcase TL practices by following Adila's writing across different languages and different prompts. The focus in TL presentation here is on data and not individuals. The texts presented here were selected in terms of two factors: use of three languages or more in one text and the extent of TL used.

Data presentation and findings

Writing practices in a fourth-grade classroom

The most common form of writing experienced in a fourth-grade classroom were filling in the blanks, writing a summary, writing in correct order, guided story, matching beginnings and ending of a sentence, responding to passage questions, punctuation and capitalization exercises, spelling, completing sentences, short responses to prompting questions, and putting sentences in a sequence (see the appendix for a complete list of writing activities).

In this article, I focus on students' individual writing activities with a concentration on composition or longer texts. All the tasks given were supposed to be written in one language or the other without mixing. Any mixing of languages was considered an error that was penalized during grading. The grading rubric had four major sections that were scored: content/themes, vocabulary, grammar, and structure. All words in an essay that were not in the target language earned half a point deductions. I collected writing texts nine times during the term, from all the students present during the writing tasks, in both English and Kiswahili. The essay topics were chosen by the teacher and were mainly on simple topics in students' environment. The focus of writing was on the product rather than the process of writing. Six of the compositions collected were in English and three were in Kiswahili. Table 1 shows different written tasks that were collected.

Most of these topics were based on students' experiential knowledge. Other composition writing topics were based on the course text reading. For example, the creative writing tasks were based on reading comprehension passages that had been read in the class text, and students were required to respond to the questions. In these two compositions, the teacher used the pictures in the two stories and asked students to compose on the topic. This could be looked at as retelling the same story.

Table 1. Writing tasks across languages.

Essay topic	Type of task	No. of scripts collected	No. of scripts using mixed languages	% scripts using mixed languages	Source
The languages spoken in our classroom	Descriptive	25	2	8	Environment
Our forest	Descriptive	20	7	35	Nature walk
Swimming day	Narrative/ biography	25	4	16	County exam
The hyena and the calf	Narrative/ creative	24	3	12.5	Course text
Adventure in the mountain	Narrative/ creative	26	3	10.7	Course text
The day I was very happy	Narrative	28	4	14.3	County exam
<i>Umuhimu wa miti</i> (Importance of trees)	Persuasive	28	8	28.6	County exam
<i>Matembezi msituni</i> (A walk in the forest)	Narrative	21	6	28.6	Nature walk
<i>Msitu uliopo karibu na shule yetu</i> (The forest near our school)	Descriptive	28	5	17.9	Environment

As shown in Table 1, students used their semiotic resources to meet their communicative goals. Although students were required to write strictly in one language, TL permeated their writing. A few students used TL writing strategies, ranging for 8% to 35% in different tasks. The reason for higher TL in some tasks than others is not my focus in this section. It is worth recalling, however, that mix of languages in essay writing was considered an error, and the students were required to know and use the required vocabulary items to communicate effectively in the target language. The curriculum dictated use of one language only in academic writing, and teachers tried to enforce this and control the exclusion of students' language practices. However, TL was beyond the teacher's control, as shown by the percentages of TL practices. Students drew from their multiple communicative repertoires to communicate rather than one specific language required by the task guidelines. In the following I showcase Adila's TL writing practices across languages.

On the case: Adila's translingual writing practices in Kiswahili

Msitu uliopo karibu na shule yetu

Msitu uliopo karibu na shule yetu kuna vitu vingi sana kama miti imejaa kwenye msitu uliopo karibu na shule yetu. miti hii ina majina yao na majina aya ni kama *example* kama *muthanduku*, *muthithi*, *mumbaumauta*, *musakaranda* na *mutemana*. unaona ukija kwa msitu uliopo karibu na shule yetu utapata vitu vinavyokufuraisha tena msitu uliopo karibu na shule yetu kuna wadudu tofauti sana. na awa wadudu hawafanani na wengine kama nyoka, nzi, *nting'oti*, *rwanga*, na *kulosiyaroja*. Msitu uliopo karibu na shule yetu kuna wanyama kama ndovu, pundamilia, *mbongo*, *manka*, *nsoro*, *njirafu*, *swara*, *nthuni*, *biti*, *ngiri*, *mbweha*, *nyati*, *nyani*, *ndege*, *maji*...unaona ukija kwa msitu uliopo karibu na shule yetu kuna majani, vyakula, kuna wanyama, kuna watu wanaokuja msituni wakiongojea watoto wasichana watoke shuleni ili wawaibe, tena kuna watu wanaotoka mbali wanaokuja kuona msitu uliopo karibu na shule yetu. utapata wanafunzi wakicheza uwanja wa shule yetu. tena msitu una wanyama wakali sana, wageni wakiwa karibu na msitu uliopo karibu na shule yetu wanashangaa sana kama kuna shule karibu na msitu. Asante sana *mwakimu*

English Translation: The Forest Near Our School

The forest that is near our school has very many things like trees have filled the forest near our school. These trees have their names and these names include *example*, *wattle trees*, *muthithi*, *eucalyptus*, *jacaranda* and *mutemana*. You see when you come to the forest near our school you will get things that make you happy and it also has different types of insects. These insects do not resemble one another and other (animals) like snake, housefly, *beetle*, *rwanga* (a type of an insect), and *praying mantis*. The forest near our school has animals like elephants, zebra, *buffalo*, *manka* (a type of animal), *columbus monkey*, *giraffe*, *Gazelle*, *dick-dick*, *biti*, *warthog*, jackal, buffalo, baboon, birds, water. You see when you come to the forest near our school there are leaves, food, animals, also there are people who come there waiting for girls to come to school so that they can steal them. There are also people who come from far to see the forest near our school. You will get students playing in the school field. The forest has very dangerous animals. Tourists while near the forest near our school get surprised that there is a school near a forest. Thank you very much *teacher*.

Adila's text above is written in Kiswahili. She has used three languages/codes, English, Kiswahili, and Kimeru. The words used in Kimeru and English in the Kiswahili essay are highlighted in italics in both Swahili essays and English translation.

In Text 1, Adila has used three languages to write and communicate her goal. While the text indicates she has mastery of Kiswahili, she uses the English word, *example*, in the fifth sentence. The examples of trees, animals, and insects found in the forest are given in her home language, *Kimeru*. These words are *italicized* in the transcription and in the English translation. Although Adila has not used paragraphs, her text is coherent and detailed. She begins with a general explanation of the forest and what is found there, and she provides comprehensive lists of animals, insects, and trees found there. She also tells of the dangers: that bad people hide there to attack girls on their way home. Adila also mentions tourism that takes place near their school, and people's reaction about the school location. This essay is well knit, and Adila uses her multiple linguistic repertoires to meet her objective. While she is aware that she was supposed to write in Kiswahili only, the language boundaries did not seem to exist in her writing and were not a constraint to meeting her communicative goal.

UMUHIMU WA MITI

Umuhimu wa miti ni kama vile usitumie miti ovyo ovyo. tena miti utupatia *baita* nyingi sana kama vile miti ukipasua unapaka nyumba nzuri sana. tena miti utupatia kuni za kupika chakula. na ukipika chakula kitamu ujue ni iso kuni na iso kuni sitakua simetoka kwenye iyo miti. tena tusitumie miti vibaya kwa sababu miti utupatia faida nyingi sana kama miti utupatia mbao na iso mbao ujega nyumba nzuri sana katika mashambani mwetu. katika mashambani mwetu kuna miti mingi sana. kuna miti tofauti tofauti kama vile *muthithinda*, *muthanduku*, *mubaomauta*, *musakalanda*, *mubokando*, *muembe*, *mudukati*, *mubera*. tena miti ina faida nyingine kama vile miti utupatia matunda. na aya matunda ni kama pera, *pawpaw*, embe, *avocado*, *ndukati* na *kadamia*. ukiwa umepanda miti wewe una faida nyingi sana. tena wewe ukiwa umepanda miti wewe una faida na isi faida ni wewe unaweza kuuza kuni na isi kuni sinatokana na miti kwa ivo wewe usitumie miti ovyoovy. kwa sababu ukikataa kutunza miti yako wewe hauna faida tena. tafadhali usiaribu miti yako ovyoovy, tumia miti kwa utaratibu na adabu nyingi sana. kama unataka faida ya miti tutunzeni miti vizuri.

English Translation: Importance of Trees

The importance of trees are like do not use trees wastefully. Trees also give us very many *benefits* like when you cut trees you can build a very nice house. Trees also give us firewood to cook food. And when you cook delicious food it is as a result of that firewood and that firewood come from those trees. Again we should not use trees inappropriately because trees give us many benefits like they give us timber and those timbers are used to build very nice houses in rural areas. In rural areas there are a lot of trees. There are different types of trees like *cypress*, *wattle*, *eucalyptus*, *jacaranda*, *avocado tree*, *mango tree*, *loquat tree* and *guava tree*. Trees also have other benefits like they give us fruits. And these fruits include guavas, *pawpaw*, mango, *avocados*, *loquats* and *macadamia nuts*. If you have planted trees you have many benefits. And these benefits are (that) you can be able to sell firewood and those firewood come from trees so you should not use trees inappropriately, because if you don't care for your trees you do not have benefits. Please do not destroy your trees (use haphazardly?).

In Text 2, Adila again has used three different codes; English (pawpaw), Kiswahili and Kimeru (*baita*, different tree and fruit names) as highlighted in the English translation piece. Text 2 was a county test. Adila is aware that it should be written in Kiswahili only, but still several words from her linguistic repertoires find their way into the text—an index of Adila's agency as an author. Under the language separation orientation and policy, Adila was penalized for these words as mistakes. It is notable also that even a word that Adila has a Kiswahili version of in the same text has been written in mother tongue *baita* (gain/benefit) in line two. This word appears elsewhere in Kiswahili, an indication that she has knowledge of its Kiswahili equivalent. This is an indication that the argument that multilingual language users select different terms to fill a lexical gap may not hold in this student's writing. It also shows the tensions the writer is going through in the process of finding a balance between authorial intentions and the teacher's expectations of her writing. Adila's choice of linguistic resources had other functional uses. She is using her linguistic repertoires as a rhetorical style, as indicated in the range of choice of vocabulary items based on everyday knowledge and topic-specific language of trees and fruits. In her essay, she takes up an authoritative voice that is filled with emotion and opinions (do not use trees inappropriately) and shares her ideas for her stance.

Adila's translingual writing in English texts

Our Forest

where forest and are the maene (many) thing lake (like) elephant, mankey (monkey) snakes, snale (snail), boeforlo (buffalo), giant, huge, gallezelle (gazelle) trees, and *nkurungu* and thise (these) trees are name lake (like) *muthanduku*, *mubaomauta*, *muembe*, *mubokando*, *mubera*, *mbilo*, *ntindo*, *nthia*, *nkuno*, *muthithinda*, *pundamilia*, air (hare) hyena. people ngone (go) to take farewood (firewood) forest eas near the forest in were school elephant come in were (our?) school to eat the banana and to drink water in were school. there was a many thing forewood e see that you will go to forest to take the forewood one day I was goine (going) whith forest I see mankey (monkey) eating the maize e see me and me stat to laen (run) when as goig (going) to were (our) home my mother agin? me is whote and me tell me that me is a good gail (girl).

Words used from Kimeru and Kiswahili languages in Text 3 included:

Nkurungu antelope
Muthanduku wattle tree
Mubaomauta eucalyptus
Muembe mango tree
Mubokando avocado tree
Mubera guava tree
Mbilo a wild fruit
Ntindo wild animal
Nthia gazelle
Nkuno mushroom
Muthithinda cypress tree
Pundamilia Zebra (Kiswahili)

Adila's English texts were less coherent compared to her Kiswahili Texts 1 and 2, although she drew from her multiple linguistic repertoires. The first two texts show that Adila has immense knowledge of the forest. Her first essay in Kiswahili is very extensive. In Text 3, Adila is still using her experiential knowledge in naming trees and animals, but the spelling and sentence structure in English is challenging for her. TL allowed her to communicate a little bit, without which this text would be difficult to make meaning. She was restricted by the policy and was conscious of this, to the extent that she tried to write most of the essay in English.

THE DAY I WAS VERY HAPPY

The day I was very happy I was happy when December was came date 25 and good ...because eats food that I was not ears again and I was happy becuse I going Nairobi with my sister and that fast I going with my grandmather and that day I was happy that was called *mashujaa* day my mother cook *chapati*, *nyama*, *mchere na nyama*. Another day I was happy is the day that mr kaburu tank (took) us whith sweeming pull (swimming pool) and I was happy that day I was happy resety (name of a person) was in where (our) home my mother thank a (her) whith where house and give a (her) food and tea why and open the televishon and reseter stat to eat the food when he see us see (watch) the televishon. Another day I was happy is December and December is very good and December my mother buy me klouth (clothes) and shoush (shoes) and I was happy your will come whith where home your see was very clean and smart you see that your will not moru? whith where home again becuse (because) where home everday was clean and smaets where visiter came whith where home my mother was happy becuse visiter come whith where home and my mother give food and tea and this food was colled (called) chapati and nyama maet when my mother give them food food

In this English text Adila has used the following words:

mashujaa day heroes day (Kiswahili)

chapati flat bread

nyama beef (Kiswahili/Kimeru)

mchere na nyama rice and beef (Kiswahili/Kimeru)

In Text 4, Adila uses Kiswahili and Kimeru in the English text. Again, she is aware that this is English composition, but that does not deter her from using her multiple semiotic repertoires to communicate. Her text has several spelling mistakes. Adila has shared the different days she was happy. She does not develop each day by extensively explaining what happened; she provides a few explanations for each and moves on to other days. Although she has used the Kiswahili/Kimeru word *nyama* in the line six of her essay, in the last sentence she is conscious that this is an English text: She writes *nyama* and crosses out and replaces it with English word, *meat*, which is not spelled correctly. This essay superficially shows the tensions that exist in the writing of a multilingual learner. The semiotic choice is a tension-filled exercise for Adila, and the outside forces toward uniformity make her choose the institutional language, which is not the language of her reality.

Discussion of Adila's texts

For this section, I do not compare writing across codes, but I focus on translingual writing in relation to a heteroglossic lens (Bakhtin, 1975/1981).

Evidently, TL in Adila's texts has several advantages in her engagement with literacy. She has used the resources at her disposal to meet her communicative goal. Her Kiswahili texts are well developed, coherent, and well organized, and her voice as an author is clear. In English texts, she is having a lot of difficulties in both authorial and secretarial aspects of writing. Her English texts as well are made clearer through use of other languages. However, in English texts, the centripetal (unifying and centralizing) forces are stronger than centrifugal (decentralizing and stratifying) forces (Bakhtin, 1975/1981), and this impacts the meaning of the English texts by constraining her writing. Although Adila was continuously penalized for including Kiswahili and Kimeru vocabulary items in all her writing tasks, she continued using translanguaging in her writing throughout the term. This suggests that for Adila, communicating through her writing was her major goal, and she met it using the semiotic tools at her disposal. This practice indicates the tension-filled utterance, especially in terms of correctness and separating languages. Her TL strategies help a multilingual reader to understand her text, but due to language restrictions she receives a low score.

Adila's use of multiple semiotic resources has maximized her chances of communicating through her written texts. She chose from her linguistic repertoires to solve problems in constructing English and Kiswahili texts. This corroborates Hornberger's (2005) assertions that "bi/multilinguals' learning is maximized when they are allowed and enabled to draw from across all their existing language skills rather than being constrained and inhibited from doing so by monolingual instructional assumptions and practices" (p. 607).

Adila's choice of languages also indexes a disruption of language hierarchies (Bakhtin, 1975/1981) and monolingual habitus ideologies in multilingual settings. Language-separation practices and perpetuation of monolingual practices do not indicate ways in which children access knowledge naturally (Makalela, 2015). African states, and Kenya in particular, have maintained policies where students are socialized unrealistically on language use. African scholars have termed this language use as the *stupidification of children* (Brock-Utne, 2001; Kiramba, 2014). Makalela (2015) has argued that languages are not in boxes (packaged), and multilingual children may use one language in output and another in input. Multilinguals have expanded codes from which they pick, as the situation demands. The heteroglossic practices by Adila can best be described as transgressing the norm (Pennycook, 2007). Adila's texts transgressed the bounds of separate languages, disrupted standard ideologies on academic writing, and incorporated multiple voices through this transgression. Adila's use of different languages is not only transgressing the monolingual norm but also reflects a struggle for her to appropriate legitimized vocabulary items in her writing while at the same time communicating her reality. While Adila's writing transgressed the writing norms established by the national curriculum, it also raises questions for teaching practices, to consider inequalities constructed through language use. Pennycook has noted that transgressing is not disorder or chaos but always implies order.

Adila's transgression gives her voice, thus disrupting unequal voices. Wertsch (1991) defines voice, noting it provides a view of personal identity largely determined according to where one lives, works, plays, and with whom one interacts. Blommaert (2005) notes, "Voice refers to the capacity to make oneself understood as a situated subject..." (p. 222). Therefore, a writer is establishing who s/he is as a situated subject when s/he presents an essay. Similar views are held by Ivanič (1998) in the preface of the book *Writing and Identity* (1998, p. 1):

Who am I as I write this book? I am not a neutral, objective scribe conveying the objective results of my research impersonally in my writing. I am bringing to it a variety of commitments based on my own interests, values, beliefs which are build up from my own history....

Canagarajah (2013) used the term *envoicing* to describe ways in which writers mesh semiotic resources for their identities and interests. Bakhtin (1975/1981) noted that language is stratified; each act

of communication is laden with values. Through use of TL in writing, Adila envoiced her texts through incorporation of home languages, experiences, and localities.

In the writing, Adila uses three languages. These could be equivalent to three voices that have contributed to the production of the text. According to Bakhtin (1975/1981), each utterance has a history and a future. The textual meaning does not reside solely in language or text but in all resources of the text and the context. The different voices, according to the author, are recognized as legitimate and complementary in production of meaning, as opposed to the authoritarian single-voicedness requirement by the school and the national curriculum. Her texts index her own various sociopolitical historical contexts. Her texts are an example of heteroglossia in practice, wherein her utterances' centripetal and centrifugal tensions are in place, in a context where correctness is key. Each of the voices indicates Adila's real life; the sociocultural context and her environmental background play a role in language use and word choices together with her local histories. Allowing students' use of their resources allows for authentic voices, a move away from monolingual language development to a more all-inclusive language instruction. Adila accurately documented her experiences with the forest by listing animals, ants, insects, different types of trees, etc., which she may not do in English only. Similar observations have been made by García and Flores (2014), who points out that use of TL offers space to voices that have been silenced through use of English only. It is therefore important to build on students' voices and lived experiences by using students' repertoires and especially their L1 as a cognitive tool.

A teacher is expected to uphold the established writing norms. As Bakhtin (1975/1981) noted, sociopolitical forces encourage individuals to adopt a voice of the authority. In a multilingual classroom in rural Kenya, the favored voice of authority influences the manner in which children appropriate and transfer information from second language to first and vice versa. This voice can silence a learner's voice. A look at Adila's essays in both Kiswahili and English attest to the fact that adopting homogenous discourse for multilingual children is disadvantageous. Adila's essays were penalized for failure to stick to one language only in writing. In this case, the school failed to acknowledge the natural ways that multilingual learners use language(s) and to help Adila affirm her multiple identities and connect her knowledge to the requirements of the school curriculum for academic success.

Conclusions, recommendations, and implications for practice

While school organizations continue to reinforce language separation in literacy practices such as writing, research is showing that students draw from multiple available semiotic resources at their disposal. Additionally, both teachers and students use their resources despite the constraints placed on them by the institutional policies.

The findings in this study are consistent with the work of scholars who argue that translanguaging (TL) is not a practice of deficiency (Canagarajah, 2011, 2013; García, 2009) and other scholars who view transgressing from the norm as not a chaotic practice but organized to communicate (García, 2009; Pennycook, 2007). As Adila's writing has shown, TL in writing is a complex linguistic and rhetorical competence (Canagarajah, 2013) and makes silenced voices heard (Blackledge et al., 2014; García & Flores, 2014; Hélot, 2014) and unrevealed identities renegotiated. Analysis of Adila's texts suggests a potential for expansion of the classroom space to encourage students' home languages in writing as cognitive tools to facilitate metacognitive awareness (Wertsch, 1991).

Considering the history of English-only education in Kenyan schools and the lack of initial literacy in a mother tongue, TL in writing is seen as a transgressive form from a monolingual habitus. It offers a base for discussing what it means to be multilingual and explore identity and traditional ideological barriers that separate languages, overlooking the permeability across languages for multilinguals, especially in the process of acquiring an additional language. Additionally, use of TL in writing raises questions regarding the role of local languages, which have continually indexed not only illiteracy but also poverty among Kenyans.

The separate code ideologies as regards writing and other literacy practices in multilingual Kenya is a barrier to excellence for rural children. Instead of the schools empowering learners to discover and create their unique identities informed by their experience and interpretation of the world around them, schools indoctrinate learners to perpetuate the monolingual view of literacy. This impedes learners in solving their problems of existence today.

Therefore, educators should consider multilingual resources and take them as a legitimate cognitive tool and as a resource for communication in school contexts. The school should challenge the discourses of devaluation of indigenous languages within the wider society and increase the opportunities for literacy engagement. Adila's use of a variety of languages to share knowledge of trees and animals attests to the need for indigenous knowledge inclusion in formal education to enable connections between different knowledge systems and cultures. This kind of knowledge is an important element of both identity and diversity. The use of the home language improves learners' self-esteem, cultural pride, motivation to learn, and encourages students to be active and competent learners (Ball, 2011). The knowledge acquisition and cultural identity are inseparably connected with language. Adila's use of her languages suggests a need for valuing multiple languages in formal education systems.

Teachers are called upon to allow multilingual spaces to diffuse the negatives that are attributed to African languages and to take multilingualism as a resource, power, and understand that the use of a full range of repertoires is transformative for students. As Cummins (2005) has noted, patterns of colonization and devaluation of aboriginal cultures and languages within school and wider society are some of the sociological factors that lead to educational failure, and education programs have a duty to challenge the colonial legacy and contemporary discourses of devaluation. Students from rural Kenya could be empowered by affirming their identity through their language use, challenging patterns of power relations, and teachers actively getting involved in challenging language hierarchies through instruction that creates an interpersonal space where identities are asserted could promote collaborative relations of power. This could be achieved through acknowledging how multilingual children learn naturally. In a multilingual fourth-grade rural classroom in Kenya, TL provided open spaces for potentialities for the translingual writers, voices, and discourses as a resource.

ORCID — Lydia Kananu Kiramba <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0231-4711>

References

- Appel, R., & Muysken, P. (2005). *Language contact and bilingualism*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.
- Bailey, B. (2007). Heteroglossia and boundaries. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism: A social approach* (pp. 257–276). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
- Bakhtin, M. M., (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. (M. Holquist, Ed. & Trans., & C. Emerson, Trans.) Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. (Original work published 1975)
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1972)
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Ball, J. (2011). *Enhancing learning of children from diverse language backgrounds: Mother tongue-based bilingual or multilingual education in the early years*. Paris, France: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- Benson, C. (2013). Towards adopting a multilingual habitus in educational development. In C. J. Benson & K. Kosonen (Eds.), *Language issues in comparative education* (pp. 283–299). Boston, MA: Sense Publishers.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London, UK/New York, NY: Continuum International.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2014). *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- Blackledge, A., Creese, A., & Takhi, J. K. (2014). Beyond multilingualism: Heteroglossia in practice. In May, S. (ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 191–215). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). Bourdieu the ethnographer: The ethnographic grounding of habitus and voice. *The Translator*, 11(2), 219–236. doi:10.1080/13556509.2005.10799199

- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: Theories and methods*. New York, NY: Pearson.
- Brock-Utne, B. (2001). Education for all — in whose language?. *Oxford Review of Education*, 27, 115–134.
- Busch, B. (2014). Building on heteroglossia and heterogeneity: The experience of a multilingual classroom. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Writing as translingual practice in academic contexts*. Hoboken, NJ: Taylor & Francis.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 401–417. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x
- Chimbutane, F. (2013). Codeswitching in L1 and L2 learning contexts: Insights from a study of teacher beliefs and practices in Mozambican bilingual education programmes. *Language and Education*, 27(4), 314–328. doi:10.1080/09500782.2013.788022
- Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 585–592.
- Duranti, A. (1998). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O. & Flores, N. (2014). Multilingualism and common core standards in the US. In May, S. (ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 147–166). New York, NY: Routledge.
- García, O., & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 199–216). Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- Gogolin, I. (2002). Linguistic and cultural diversity in Europe: A challenge for educational research and practice. *European Educational Research Journal*, 1(1), 123–138. doi:10.2304/eeerj.2002.1.1.3
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge, UK/New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, S. B. (1982). Questioning at home and at school: A comparative study. In G. Spindler (Ed.), *Doing the ethnography of schooling: Educational anthropology in action* (pp. 102–131). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart; Winston.
- Heller, M. (Ed.). (1988). *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heller, M. (2007). Bilingualism as ideology and practice. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism: A social approach* (pp. 1–22). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hélot, C. (2014). Rethinking bilingual pedagogy in Alsace: Translingual writers and translanguaging. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 217–238). Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- Hernandez-Zamora, G. (2010). *Decolonizing literacy: Mexican lives in the era of global capitalism*. Bristol, U.K.: Multilingual Matters.
- Hornberger, N. (2005). Opening and filling up implementational and ideological spaces in heritage language education. *Modern Language Journal*, 89(4), 605–609.
- Hyland, K. (2010). Researching writing. In B. Paltridge & A. Phakiti (Eds.), *Continuum companion to research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 191–204). London, UK: Continuum.
- Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discursive construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Jørgensen, J. N., Karrebæk, M. S., Madsen, L. M. and Møller, J. S. (2011). Polylinguaging in Superdiversity. *Diversities*, 14(2), 23–38.
- Kachru, Y., & Sridhar, S. N. (1994). Sources of bias in SLA research. *Monolingual bias in SLA research [and] a reality check for SLA theories*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(4), 795–805. doi:10.2307/3587564
- Kiramba, L. (2014). Classroom discourse in bilingual and multilingual Kenyan primary schools. In E. C. Zsig, B. O. Tlale, & R. Kramer (Eds.), *Languages in Africa: Multilingualism, language policy, and education* (pp. 17–33). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Lewis, M., Gary, F. S., & Charles, D. F. (Eds.). (2016). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (19th ed.). Dallas, TX: SIL International. Retrieved from <http://www.ethnologue.com>
- Mahootian, S. (2012). Repertoires and resources: Accounting for code switching in media. In M. Sebba, S. Mahootian, & C. Jonsson (Eds.), *Language mixing and codeswitching in writing: Approaches to mixed language written discourse* (pp. 192–211). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Makalela, L. (2015). Moving out of linguistic boxes: The effects of translanguaging strategies for multilingual classrooms. *Language and Education*, 29(3), 200–217. doi:10.1080/09500782.2014.994524
- Mbaabu, I. (1996). *Language policy in East Africa: A dependency theory perspective*. Nairobi, Kenya: Educational Research and Publications.
- Merritt, M., Cleghorn, A., Abagi, J. O., & Bunyi, G. (1992). Socializing multilingualism: Determinants of codeswitching in Kenyan primary classrooms. In C. Eastman (Ed.), *Codeswitching* (pp. 103–122). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Paltridge, B., & Wang, W. (2010). Researching discourse. In B. Paltridge & A. Phakiti (Ed.), *Continuum companion to research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 256–273). London, UK: Continuum.
- Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Sebba, M., Mahootian, S., & Jonsson, C. (2012). *Language mixing and code-switching in writing: Approaches to mixed-language written discourse*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Setati, M., Adler, J., Reed, Y., & Bapoo, A. (2002). Incomplete journeys: Code-switching and other language practices in mathematics, science, and English language classrooms in South Africa. *Language and Education*, 16(2), 128–149. doi:10.1080/09500780208666824
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Street, B. (1984). *Literacy and theory in practice*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Velasco, P., & García, O. (2014). Translanguaging and the writing of bilingual learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37 (1), 6–23. doi:10.1080/15235882.2014.893270
- Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Appendix

A complete list of writing practices in fourth grade as indicated in the teacher's English course text guide:

- Writing a summary—writing in correct order
- Description, e.g., Writing true sentences about animals
 - Describing a picture, e.g., Write five sentences about the picture
- Retelling a story
- Completing a personal letter
- Writing a story
- Guided story
- Picture composition
- Completing a story
- Writing a report, e.g., What happened during birthday?
- Writing narratives, e.g., Write a story about a journey home, A journey by *matatu*
- Letter writing—friendly letter
- Diary writing
- Matching beginnings and ending of a sentence
- A review of teacher's guide indicated the following as the writing areas:
 - Responding to passage questions
 - Encouraging classroom talk
 - Relating passage to their own lives
 - Vocabulary
 - Punctuation and capitalization
 - Spelling
 - Completing sentences
 - Responses to prompting questions
 - Putting sentences in a sequence