

Article

"Bilingual Always": A Study of Second Language Writing's Influence on Writing Studies in the Canadian Association for the Study of Discourse and Writing / l'Association Canadienne de Rédactologie

Christin Wright-Taylor
Wilfrid Laurier University

Abstract

Paul Kei Matsuda (2013) argues that due to a disciplinary division between applied linguistics and composition, modern iterations of language-based theories in composition lack accountability from knowledgeable peers. This article applies Matsuda's critique of U.S. Composition to a Canadian context. By conducting archival research on one of Canada's only two writing studies organizations, Canadian Association for the Study of Discourse and Writing / l'Association Canadienne de Rédactologie (CASDW-ACR), this project seeks to discover if the same disciplinary divide has existed between writing studies and L2 writing. The findings show that, unlike U.S. Composition, writing studies in Canada has long been open to and relied on L2 writing to establish itself as a discipline in Canadian higher education. The opportunities afforded by this historic partnership between writing studies and L2 writing should be intentionally built on in Canadian writing curriculum as internationalization introduces new translingual, visa students to the Canadian writing classroom.

Introduction

Paul Kei Matsuda (2013) once leveled a remarkable critique against U.S. composition: "Much of what passes as new ideas about language in U.S. College composition have already been discussed in applied linguistics" (p. 135). In other words, Matsuda (1999) believes that due to a disciplinary

division of labour between applied linguistics and composition, modern iterations of language-based theories in composition lack accountability from knowledgeable peers. By "language-based theories," this paper refers to theoretical approaches originating from composition that consider the linguistic diversity of students in the writing classroom. Matsuda (2013) calls this swelling interest in language in composition a "linguistic turn" in the field. However, due to the divide between composition and applied linguistics, Matsuda argues that this recent return to linguistic interests has left compositionists articulating well-meaning but ill-defined ideas about supporting linguistically diverse students in the writing classroom.

If Matsuda's critique of U.S. Composition is justified, it merits application to a Canadian context especially given the rise in internationalization in Canadian Higher Education Canadian (Johnstone & Eunjung, 2014, 2017). Canadian colleges and universities are enrolling record numbers of visa students, introducing new levels of linguistic and cultural diversity to our writing classrooms (Keung et al., 2019; Lafleche et al., 2019; Teotonio et al., 2019). Statistics Canada reports that students holding study permits from international home countries have grown from 122,665 in 2000 to 621,565 in 2021 (Crossman et al., 2022). Faculty report facing new literacy challenges among visa students, and faculty and administrators need help implementing education policies that set these students up for success in post-secondary writing (Lafleche et al., 2019). To be clear, perceived literacy crises are nothing new in the history of composition and writing studies (Shaughnessy, 1979). With each new generation, new bodies of students enter higher education and bring a unique set of cultural and linguistic identities that nuance previous conceptions of the ideal writer (Matsuda, 2006).

Back to Matsuda's point: U.S. Composition risks ineffectively helping these new bodies of linguistically diverse students due to the disciplinary divide between composition and applied linguistics. The question remains then, given the particular moment of internationalization in which Canadian higher education finds itself, did this same divide between composition and applied linguistics occur in a Canadian context? Furthermore, how might the historical relationship between these two fields impact writing instruction designed for linguistically diverse students in a Canadian writing classroom?

A quick note about names here: due to the slightly different way that studies in writing instruction have evolved between Canada and the U.S., terminology for the field differs too. For example, the term "composition," as typified by the Conference on College Communication and Composition, has yet to gain uptake in a Canadian context. Therefore, when speaking in a Canadian context, this paper uses

the term “writing studies” as defined by the Writing Commons to refer to the “interdisciplinary community of scholars and researchers who study writing” (Moxley, n.d.). In addition, this paper is interested in the subfield within applied linguistics called “Second Language Writing” or L2 writing, which studies how linguistically diverse students learn to write in English in Academic contexts (Heng Hartse, 2021). To date, no historic investigation exists between writing studies and L2 writing in Canadian higher education. This article reports findings from archival research that explores the historical relationship between writing studies and L2 writing scholarship in one of Canada's two writing studies organizations: the Canadian Association for the Study of Discourse and Writing / l'Association canadienne de rédactologie (CASDW-ACR)..

Theoretical Framework and Terminology

This paper applies a postcolonial framework to illuminate the machinations of internationalization in Canadian Higher Education and the uses of writing instruction to educate linguistically diverse students studying from abroad. Bill Ashcroft et al. (1989) define the term “postcolonial” as referring to all “culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day” (p. 2). The aggressive forces of European imperialism have touched every aspect of modern life. Nothing is left unaltered by the vision of the world that converted land, resources, and human existence into a means for nation-building and revenue generation. This worldview can be found in all elements of Western civilization, not the least of which higher education.

A postcolonial framework highlights the economic priorities that drive institutions to recruit and enroll students from abroad (Knight, 2013). Kemal Guruz (2011) enumerates three impulses that drive modern iterations of internationalization in higher education. First, he names imperialism, defined as a school's means of spreading “the host country's cultural and political values” (Guruz, 2011, p. 175). Another impulse is skilled migration, or recruiting qualified students to earn their degrees and then stay in the host country to bolster the workforce (Guruz, 2011, p. 176). Finally, Guruz (2011) cites revenue generation as a powerful impulse driving modern internationalization. In this scenario, students are recruited from abroad to supplement the institution's income (177). All of these impulses combine to situate students precariously within the institution. This paper builds on the work of these scholars to identify neoliberal forces driving internationalization in modern Canadian higher education– that is to say, forces that have shifted from education “as a public good to education as a commodity” (Johnstone & Eunjung, 2014, p. 210). In this context, neoliberalism in

higher education refers to how Canadian colleges and universities use internationalization for economic and nation-building purposes.

When viewed from this angle, it is essential to reflect on writing instruction in higher education to ensure that it does not inadvertently become a tool to further the institution's imperial, skilled migration, and revenue-generating agenda. Indeed, writing instruction has been used as such before. Ira Shor (1997) applies a postcolonial framework to highlight how these neoliberal influences have infiltrated even writing program administration and writing instruction at the program level. He writes that basic writing instruction has "been part of the undemocratic tracking system pervading American mass education, an added layer of linguistic control to help manage some disturbing economic and political conditions on campus and off" (1997, p. 92). In this way, Shor's use of a postcolonial lens brings to light how writing courses are used as tools to sort and repress students. He pithily says, "I call this language policy, 'comp for containment, control, and capital growth'" (92). By highlighting the power and economic forces behind the administration of writing courses in higher education, Shor points his finger at how writing instruction can inadvertently fail students new to academic culture.

This paper takes up a postcolonial framework, building on Shor's work to investigate how writing studies thinks about and supports culturally and linguistically diverse students studying in a Canadian writing classroom. With this in mind, it is crucial to interrogate the terms used to describe and label these students in Canadian colleges and universities. Traditionally, these students are called "international students." However, this label occludes the precarious political and social nature of their residency in our institutions. To resist these neo-imperial and economic forces behind internationalization, this paper rejects the label "international student" – not the least because it sounds like these students are on vacation while studying in Canada. This paper turns to language coined by Michael P. Jordan (1998): visa student. In his work, Jordan notes that "increased numbers of immigrants and visa students" combined with fewer language resources means that incoming, language-diverse students are less able to succeed in first-year writing courses (p. 41). Jordan's deep understanding of visa students' vulnerable position in Canadian writing courses was a harbinger of later internationalization priorities in Canadian higher education. For this reason, this paper uses his term "visa student" to draw attention to the multiple and complex political, economic, and nation-building policies that simultaneously open doors for these students to study in Canada while also making them vulnerable to exploitation.

Further, it is important to distinguish between the terms "translingual" and "translingualism." The first comes from linguistics and the second from composition. Given Matsuda's critique, this paper intentionally draws on pre-existing linguistic scholarship to define terminology that names students who write in multiple languages. Linguists Ofelia Garcia and Ricardo Otheguy (2020) argue that terms such as "bilingual," "multilingual," or "plurilingual" connote an "additive ideology" as if one language can be stacked upon another in a type of linguistic hierarchy (p. 18). They advocate for using the term "translingual" instead because it situates the act of languaging within a "unitary linguistic system" from which writers and speakers move fluidly across language boundaries and even modes of communication (Garcia & Otheguy, 2020, p. 25). The linguistic term "translingual" should not be confused with "translingualism," which refers to the language-based theory found in U.S. composition. When this article uses the word "translingual writers/students," it uses the linguistic term defined by Garcia and Otheguy, not the composition theory. Therefore, this article uses Garcia and Otheguy's term to name students who speak multiple languages, calling them "translingual writers/students."

Methodology

To better understand the historical relationship between L2 writing and writing studies in a Canadian context, this work engages archival research of one of Canada's two writing studies organizations: CASDW-ACR (formerly the Canadian Association for Teachers of Technical Writing). This project takes as its texts journal archives and conference programs dating back to the first publication of *Technostyle* in 1982. For conference programs, the archival research studied programs for CATTW/CASDW beginning in the early 1990s. In all, the findings from this research cover 48 issues of *Technostyle/Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie*, 13 CASDW conference programs, dating from 1982 - 2019. The discourse analysis of these texts looks specifically for evidence of influence from linguists/applied linguists/second language acquisition/second language writing scholars in CASDW's journal and conferences.

To identify the presence of L2 writing influences, the following terms connoting a linguistic influence were identified in titles, abstracts, works cited, panel and paper titles: language, linguistics, applied linguistics, ESL writers, ESL students, contrastive rhetoric, native writers/speakers, non-native writers/speakers, L2 writing. The following terms were also used: borders/borderless, intercultural, and global/international. The journal articles and conference proceedings were systematically analyzed for these terms as follows:



Figure 1. Article and Conference Presentation Identification Process

When a linguistic influence was identified in an article, the article was cataloged in Table 1 (see Appendix), documenting the Volume, Issue, Year, and Author. When a linguistic influence was identified in a conference presentation, the panel, session, or paper was cataloged in Table 2 (see Appendix), documenting Year, Paper Title, Presenter, Institution, Department, and Language-Minority focus. If the program did not name the presenter's department, further research using the WayBackMachine, institutional websites, and scholar websites was used to discover each presenter's department or field of study.

Findings for CASDW Journal: A Bilingual History Revealed

CASDW's founding reveals an immediate and substantial influence from applied linguistics and L2 writing. In 1981, Joan Pavelich founded the Canadian Association of Teachers of Technical Writing (CATTW). At the time of CATTW's inception, Joan Pavelich was a faculty member in the English department at the University of British Columbia. She shares that she "did things on the cheap" and used her money to help establish the organization (Pavelich & Jordan, 1994a, p. 132). In conjunction with this lack of support from her own English department, when Pavelich decided to recruit a co-

leader, she went outside the department. She recruited Michael P. Jordan, a linguistics and English language scholar from the faculty of Applied Science at Queen's University.

In addition to recruiting help from a linguistics scholar, Pavelich also sought to establish the legitimacy of this budding writing studies organization by emphasizing its Canadian context. One of the ways that Pavelich chose to emphasize the uniquely Canadian perspective on teaching technical writing was to ensure that CATTW would "be bilingual always" (Pavelich & Jordan, 1994b, p. 132). While Pavelich does not explicitly state that this choice was concerning the Official Languages Act, the presence of this policy looms large over her choice as it would have been one of the cultural ways Canadian content could distinguish itself from American content. Choosing to make this bilingual element explicit in the organization, Pavelich enlisted the help of her daughter, who was studying in Montreal, to create the bilingual title for the journal: *Technostyle* (*Technosteel* in French) (Pavelich & Jordan, 1994, p. 132). This choice to make CATTW "bilingual always" immediately introduced a linguistic core to the organization that would persist throughout its maturation.

Jordan's training as a linguistics scholar also helped establish CATTW as a truly bilingual organization with research chops. Pavelich asked Jordan to organize and represent CATTW at the Learned's conference the following year. Learned's was the precursor to Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences. In order to help entice Jordan to take on the responsibility of organizing the first CATTW conference at Learned's, Pavelich explained that he would also be able to join the "rhetoric, linguistics, and ESL societies" at Learned's (Pavelich & Jordan, 1994, p. 135). This invitation proved enticing enough for Jordan to come on board. He writes that though the initial days of the CATTW conference focused primarily on the practicality of teaching writing, he made a choice early on that anything he "presented would be aimed at the scholarly side of CATTW" (Pavelich & Jordan, 1994, p. 136). At the second CATTW conference in Montreal, Jordan presented a bilingual paper as a "real effort to show that [CATTW] could be bilingual," and he writes that his efforts were well received (Pavelich & Jordan, 1994, p. 136). Jordan's linguistic influence can be seen in the choice of publications in *Technostyle* throughout the first three decades of the journal's life.

Findings: Publication History

Below are the findings for archival research beginning with *Technostyle* in 1982 and following through to the publication of *Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie* in 2019. The journal published 50 issues during this time frame. The number of articles published in each issue varies over the journal's

life but ranges from two to 15. See Table 1 in Appendices for a detailed breakdown of articles published that indicate linguistic influence.

The 1980's Bilingual Focus

In the first decade of *Technostyle*, the journal published 100 articles. Of those 100 articles, 19 included a linguistic focus, and 11/19 focused on French/English bilingualism. This heavy emphasis on French/English bilingualism corroborates the observations of a prominent education scholar from Memorial University of Newfoundland, Barbara Burnaby. In her work, Burnaby (1998) observes that the Official Languages Act of 1967 exerted "a great deal of influence on the political agenda, drawing attention and resources away from the language needs of [students] who speak neither official language" (9). In other words, during the 70's and 80s, educational resources funneled primarily to studying and teaching French/English bilingualism in the Canadian classroom. This historical and political backdrop contextualizes early editors' choices when selecting articles from a linguistic lens.

Another interesting finding from this analysis of the early linguistic influences on the journal revealed that five of the 11 scholars who published in French during the 80s worked outside the academy. This detail reveals how the editors opened the doors of *Technostyle* to knowledge workers outside higher education. Whether Pavelich and Jordan did this expressly to include bilingual and L2 writing scholarship is unclear. Whatever the case, inviting and including scholarship from non-academic sectors contributed to the influences between writing studies and L2 writing in the 80s.

The 1990's Turn to Language-Minority Writers

While the 80s introduced a linguistic lens to the journal through the scholarship of bilingualism, in the 90s, *Technostyle* introduced articles that address language-minority writers in the Canadian classroom. During this decade, 13 articles were published from a linguistic/L2 writing perspective.

Technostyle's newfound attention on language-minority writers in the 90s takes on added significance when placed against the backdrop of immigration policy enacted at the federal level during this decade. At the beginning of the '90s, the Canadian government introduced an immigration plan "with the goal of bringing in 220,000 immigrants in 1991 up to about 250,000 per year" until 1995 (Burnaby, 1998, pp. 275–258). This expanded plan for immigration included support for newcomers as they integrated into Canadian society. Language training was a key component, and in

1992, the Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada program was adopted by the government to replace pre-existing federal language training (Burnaby, 1998, pp. 257–258). While some language resources for immigrants were more helpful than others, they did trigger a growing awareness of the need for formalized language support beyond the French/English dichotomy. For example, in 1998, the Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks was established, providing the "official Canadian standards for describing, measuring and recognizing the language proficiency of adult immigrants and prospective immigrants" (*What Is CCLB*, n.d.). While the CLB articulated "Can Do" statements for writing benchmarks, these measures are better calibrated for Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada classes than writing-intensive courses. Still, programs and organizations such as Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada and the Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks grew out of a new focus on immigration at the federal level.

In addition to changes in federal policies for immigration, Canadian Higher Education also gained new interest in internationalization in the 90s. In this decade, higher education institutions began to pivot toward a neoliberal orientation. Before this decade, internationalization in Canadian Higher Education was about hosting students from developing countries who would receive an education in Canada and then return to their home countries to contribute to nation-building there (Knight, 2013). However, in the 1990s, the Canadian government focused on global interests. Johnstone and Lee (2014) write that "since the 1990s, there has been a shift in Canada's policy from a pursuit of world peace and social justice to the imperial' center and periphery' dichotomy that characterizes neocolonial globalization" (212). Moreover, this shift paved the way for the neoliberal uses of higher education to consolidate power, knowledge, and wealth in Canada.

During the mid-20th century, the federal government partnered with higher education to support internationalization projects through organizations such as the Canadian International Development Agency and the Academic Relations Section. However, in the '90s, government funding shifted away from university-based relations internationally to more commercially based projects that built relations with emerging economies such as India and China (Trilokekar, 2010). Funding agencies that had long worked with Canadian higher education started assessing international academic programs regarding how much money they brought in and their direct influence on Canada's trade relations (Trilokekar, 2010). Because most international academic programs were previously oriented to education as a global good rather than a commodity, funding agencies could not draw a direct line between international academic programs and a positive influence on trade. Therefore, they cut

funding. As a result, by the 1990s, Canadian higher education experienced drastic budget cuts in funding from the government.

This season of austerity proved fertile grounds for a neoliberal influence to grow in Canada's approach to the internationalization of higher education. Universities and colleges noted the significant benefits of internationalization when approached from an economic lens. Increased internationalization in higher education "spread[s] the host country's cultural and political values," contributes to the host country's skilled labour force, and, most significantly, supplements the institution's income (Guruz, 2011, p. 175). In its crudest terms, in the 1990s, Canadian higher education began to see that recruiting and enrolling more international students was good for the bottom line.

This combination of federal and education policies courting increasing numbers of immigrants provides the political and academic backdrop for the choices *Technostyle* editors made in the 1990s when publishing articles. By the late 1990s, *Technostyle* publishes two articles that focus on language-minority writers in the Canadian classroom:

Makmillen, S., and Y. Zhang. (1999) "Good Writing in Cross-Cultural Context by Xiao-Ming Li." *Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie*, 15(1) 72-73, doi:10.31468/cjsdwr.436.

Makmillen and Zhang write that this book would be suitable for technical writing instructors as they notice the influx of visa students in their classrooms: "It may be relevant to teachers of technical writing who, noticing the increasing cultural diversity in their classrooms, might appreciate Li's insights into the historical, social and cultural contexts from which their students might gain their understandings of what is 'good writing'" (pg. 72). The acknowledgment here of the influx of diversity in the classroom tracks with the larger educational policies of internationalization that began to direct recruitment in the late '90s and early aughts (Knight, 2013).

Similarly, Jordan responds to the international turn in Canadian higher education by publishing an article about ESL related to students who have immigrated to Canada.

Jordan, Michael P. (1998). "Basic Functional Literacy for Engineering Students: Towards a Linguistic Definition." *Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie*, 14(1) 41-76, doi:10.31468/cjsdwr.422.

Jordan writes about immigrant students and the need for Basic Functional Literacy in Engineering programs (BFL) in this article. Jordan writes that "increased numbers of immigrants and visa students, ... coupled with reduced funding in schools for skilled literacy teaching, ESL instruction and special education, mean that fewer students are capable of benefiting from a technical writing or

first-year writing course" (41). He goes on to advocate for a consensus around minimum levels of written competence in "clear linguistic terms" (42). This call for attention to students' written competence in linguistic terms appears to be the first acknowledgment in the journal of second language writing scholarship for language-minority writers.

The 2000s Dearth of Articles About L2 Writing

Despite the 90's promising sensitivity to L2 writing support for language-minority students, this sensitivity quickly dissipated and almost disappeared during the 2000s. Until the 2010s, the articles published in *Technostyle* attended primarily to technical and professional writing. During this decade, the journal published a total of 61 articles. Five of those 61 articles concerned linguistic theory in writing. The reason for this small percentage could be many. One reason may be that during the 2000s, L2 writing was establishing itself within the larger field of education and momentarily withdrew from publishing in a writing studies journal. One study on the history of L2 writing in Canada reveals that scholars working in linguistics in the 2000s mainly published in *Linguistic*, *Applied Linguistics*, and *TESL* journals (Wright-Taylor, 2021). Another reason for the dearth of publications in *Technostyle* from a linguistic lens could be that the journal prioritized technical and professional writing during this decade, seeking to distinguish itself from American composition, which took a generalist approach to writing instruction. Whatever the case, writing studies scholarship, as published in *Technostyle* during the 2000s, did not prioritize the influence of linguistics. Here are the knowledge workers publishing about linguistics in writing studies during the 2000s:

- Michael P. Jordan: *Queen's University*
- Jacqueline Bossé-Andrieu: *Université d'Ottawa*
- Lilita Rodman: *University of British Columbia*
- Yaying Zhang: *Simon Fraser University*
- Eric Kavanagh: *Groupe Rédiger, CIRAL, Université Laval*
- Janet Giltrow: No affiliated institution listed.

2010's Late Return to Language-Minority Students

By 2011, *Technostyle* was rebranded and appeared as the Canadian Association for the Study of Discourse and Writing / l'Association Canadienne de Rédactologie (*CJSDW*). An awareness of

language-minority students appears again in *CJSDW* in 2018 -- exactly 20 years after Michael P. Jordan's article on language-minority students writing in Engineering. Whether this new interest in language-minority students is a result of a change in leadership or a shift in the research interests of Canadian scholars requires more research. Regardless, language-minority writers have not been absent from Canadian writing classrooms during this twenty-year silence in the journal. While *Technostyle* scholarship focused primarily on technical writing through the 2000s and 2010s, the number of language-minority students steadily grew in writing classrooms across Canadian institutions.

In the 2010s, *Technostyle* published 62 articles across 16 issues. Of those 62 articles, five were concerned with a linguistic perspective, and four of those five included L2 writing scholarship for language-minority writers.

The knowledge workers publishing from a linguistic perspective in the 2010s were:

- Nadeane Trowse: *University of the Fraser Valley*
- Frankie Condon: *University of Waterloo*
- James Corcoran: *OISE/University of Toronto*
- Antoinette Gagné: *OISE/University of Toronto*
- Megan McIntosh: *OISE/University of Toronto*
- Daniel Chang: *Simon Fraser University*
- Amanda Goldrick-Jones: *Simon Fraser University*
- Eugenia Gene Vasilopoulos: *University of Ottawa*

CATTW/CASDW Conference Findings

While *Technostyle* was not publishing work on language-minority students in the aughts and early 2010s, the CASDW conferences at Congress included many papers presented not only from a linguistic lens but also with an awareness of language-minority students writing in English. Though a complete list of conference programs was not available from the inception of CATTW onward, programs for the following years were available through CASDW's digital archives between March and September 2020: 1992, 2000 - 2004, 2008, 2009, 2012 — 2018. See Table 3 in the Appendix for the conferences' Year, Location, and Name.

A review of the papers presented at the above conferences reveals influences from linguistics and L2 writing in writing studies throughout the 2000s and 2010s. Not only were there papers presented

that incorporated linguistic scholarship in these 11 conferences, but there were also papers presented by faculty from the Linguistic and Applied Linguistics departments. However, it was difficult to delineate between papers that focused solely on French/English bilingualism and those which included a language-minority (L.M.) focus, where possible articles with an L.M. focus are noted in the table in the Appendix.

Three Types of Linguistic Influence at Conference Presentations

Though many different types of papers showcase the influence of linguistics, three primary forms of "cross-pollination" demonstrated by the presentation panels merit attention.

Influence One: Linguistic terms introduced by Linguistic Scholars

First, linguistic terminology is introduced to writing studies scholars by linguistic scholars. Though this may seem obvious, the observation is still significant given Matsuda's critique of U.S. Composition. Matsuda argues that language theories in U.S. composition have created confusion precisely because they have not been grounded in scholarship from linguistics. For example, he cites the debate around the term "code-switching." When addressing linguistic diversity in U.S. primary and secondary schools, Rebecca Wheeler and Rachel Swords (2004) first introduced the term "codeswitching" to U.S. Composition. While their explanation of the term stemmed from applied linguistics, they needed to clarify which applied linguistics theory informed their use. Further, they did not acknowledge that experts in the field would not use the term "codeswitching" the way they used it (Matsuda, 2013). Unfortunately, Wheeler and Sword's term gained uptake in other U.S. Composition conferences and papers, leading to an inconsistent understanding of the terminology, its use, and its origin.

While this linguistic term might have been orphaned in U.S. Composition, the same thing does not occur at CASDW. In line 31 of Table 3, the term "codeswitching" appears in a forum dedicated to Canadian writing studies. Unlike "codeswitching's" introduction to compositionists in the U.S., here it is discussed by Olga Makinina from the Department of Language, Literature and Linguistics at York University. It would appear that Matsuda's critique that linguistic terms are introduced in a vacuum of linguistic knowledge cannot be applied in this particular case in Canada: "codeswitching," a linguistic term, is discussed by a member of the Linguistics department.

Influence Two: International Collaborations that Introduce Linguistic Perspectives

Another point of linguistic influence at CASDW conferences appears in the international collaboration between Canadian universities and international universities. For example, in 2003, two faculty from the University of Toronto and Hokkaido University in Japan co-present a paper on L2 writing in undergraduate argumentative writing. In 2015, faculty from the University of Newfoundland and The University of Science and Technology in Wuhan, China, presented a paper on an EAP program in China. Further, in 2015, faculty from Simon Fraser University, the University of Victoria, and Beijing Normal University presented a paper providing feedback on "EFL Writing." This international partnership is a notable contribution to Canadian higher education's cross-pollination of linguistics and writing studies.

Influence Three: Inter-departmental Collaborations that Facilitate Linguistic Perspectives

Finally, a review of the CASDW conference papers reveals that cross-pollination happened between departments at Canadian universities. For example, in line 34 of Table 3, the paper is co-presented by faculty from the School of Communication, Department of Linguistics, and Department of English departments. In line 30, a paper is co-presented between the departments of Communication and Linguistics. In line 44, the paper is co-presented by faculty from the Department of Applied Linguistics and the Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning. This type of inter-departmental partnership represents the ways that multiple disciplines have helped to contribute to the scholarship of writing studies throughout the years.

Discussion

This paper began by asking if the same institutional divide between U.S. composition and applied linguistics had occurred between Canadian writing studies and L2 writing. The short answer appear to be "no." An analysis of CASDW's journal and conferences reveals that at least one of the two writing studies organizations in Canada has not only always been open to the influence and presence of L2 writing scholarship but relied on such scholarship to help establish itself in Canadian Higher education. From the founder, Joan Pavelich's, declaration that CATTW would be "bilingual always" to

the subsequent years of publication and conference history that invited L2 writing influence, it would appear that CASDW did not fall victim to the same disciplinary divide that Matsuda critiques in U.S. composition.

Understanding this historical relationship between writing studies and L2 writing presents new and exciting resources for resisting and countering the neoliberal influences shaping enrollment of translingual, visa students in Canadian writing classrooms. Understanding the roots of both fields and how they have influenced one another through the years means that current writing studies scholars are not left in a figurative vacuum of knowledgeable peers when it comes to addressing the needs of translingual writers. A rich history of cross-pollination allows writing scholars to lean into future partnerships with L2 writing peers to create writing curricula that anticipate the unique needs of visa students learning to write English in an academic context. Writing theories and models built on sound scholarship from L2 writing peers allow writing teachers and administrators to situate translingual writers as human beings rather than human capital. In so doing, both writing studies and L2 writing scholars and practitioners can work to resist the commercial influences at play. No matter how the students have arrived in the classroom, a writing pedagogy that acknowledges both their precarious position in the institution and the diverse linguistic repertoire they bring to the act of learning serves to counter neoliberal influences. Instead, such a writing pedagogy can approach translingual, visa students as learners with diverse cultural and linguistic capacity able to fluidly shuttle between languages to create new meaning and knowledge.

Let us put this in a positive voice: The historic collaboration between writing studies and L2 writing in Canada promises the following benefits:

- An opportunity to work together to highlight the ideological forces shaping Canadian writing curriculum and to decentralize the myth of an ideal native writer.
- An opportunity to build on the momentum of this relationship to create writing curricula and assessments that address the needs of translingual writers in writing-intensive courses.
- An opportunity to collaborate on a language-based writing model for writing-intensive courses and writing programs that accounts for the linguistic capacity of translingual writers

Ultimately, this moment of internationalization in Canadian higher education affords the opportunity to think carefully about how writing studies scholars, writing instructors, and writing program administrators theoretically and practically approach a linguistically diverse classroom. The decades-old relationship between writing studies and L2 writing scholarship should not be taken

for granted. It is as a powerful tool to meet this moment in Canadian higher education with an exciting depth of resources.

Future Research Directions

Understanding the historical relationship between writing studies and L2 writing in Canada leads to more questions: If writing studies has always been open to linguistic perspectives and scholarship, then how can modern writing studies scholars build on this historical relationship to create a writing curriculum that addresses the needs of translingual, visa students? How can writing studies acknowledge the work of L2 writing colleagues and invite further partnership and collaboration to adapt language-based theories to a Canadian context?

While these findings provide a reason to hope for future collaboration between writing studies and L2 writing, CASDW is just one of Canada's two writing studies organizations. For a fuller picture of how both fields may or may not have influenced one another in a Canadian context, more archival research is needed to investigate the second writing studies organization: the Canadian Association for the Study of Language and Learning (CASLL), nicknamed Inkshed. Like CASDW, Inkshed began in the early 1980s and produced regular publications and conferences to help build the field of writing studies in Canada. The same research questions could be applied to Inkshed: To what extent was this body open to influence from L2 writing scholarship? Was there a divide between these two fields in Inkshed? Or, like CASDW, did Inkshed rely on knowledge workers from L2 writing to help establish its scholarship in Canadian higher education?

Further, an updated narrative of the professionalization of L2 writing in Canada is needed to gain a clearer picture of the historical relationship between both fields. Archival research on CASDW and Inkshed investigates the partnership with L2 writing from a writing studies perspective. However, viewing this relationship from the perspective of L2 writing and its professional organizations would be beneficial. In this way, by adding research from Inkshed and L2 writing, a complete picture can be assembled of how writing studies and L2 writing scholarship influenced one another as they "grew up" together in a Canadian context.

Appendix

Table 1. "Linguistic Hits" Published from 1982-2019 This table does not catalogue the issues that didn't include linguistic hits.

	# of Articles Total	Linguistic Hits	Article Titles with Linguistic Hit
Vol 29 (2019)	15	2	Digital Plagiarism in Second Language Writing: Re-Thinking Relationality in Internet-Mediated Writing Eugenia Gene Vasilopoulos EAL Writers and Peer Tutors: Pedagogies that Resist the "Broken Writer" Myth Daniel Chang, Amanda Goldrick-Jones
Vol 28 (2018)	17	2	A Conversation about "Editing" Plurilingual Scholars' Thesis Writing James Corcoran, Antoinette Gagné, Megan McIntosh The Languages We May Be: Affiliative Relations and the Work of the Canadian Writing Centre Frankie Condon
Vol 26 (2016)	4	1	Tim William Machan. (2009). Language Anxiety: Conflict and Change in the History of English. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press Nadeane Trowse
Vol 21 No 1 (2005)	5	1	The Mysterious Barricades: Language and its Limits by Ann E. Berthoff Janet Giltrow
Vol 18 No 1 (2002)	7	1	Entre identité et lisibilité : le cas embarrassant du Canada Eric Kavanagh
Vol 17 No 2 (2002)	6	2	<u>You-attitude: A Linguistic Perspective</u> Lilita Rodman <u>English and the Discourses of Colonialism</u> Yaying Zhang
Vol 16 No 2 (2000)	7	2	Au-delà des genres: décalages stylistiques entre l'anglais et le français Jacqueline Bossé-Andrieu A Pragmatic/Structural Approach to Relevance Michael P. Jordan
Vol 15 No 1 (1999)	7	1	Good Writing in Cross-cultural Context by Xiao-Ming Li Shurli Makmillen, Yaying Zhang
Vol 14 No 1 (1998)	6	1	Basic Functional Literacy for Engineering Students: Towards a Linguistic Definition Michael P. Jordan

Vol 13 No 1 (1996)	7	3	Plainer Legal Language-Untangling Complex Subordination and Restrictives in Acts Michael P. Jordan Writing at the Centre: Language, Institution, and the Discourse on Writing Centres Janet Giltrow The Linguistic Wars, Randy Allen Harris Lilita Rodman
Vol 12 No 2 (1995)	6	2	Linguistic Contradiction: Power and Politeness in Courtroom Discourse Linda Sanderson Technical Writing in French in Canada: Results of Two Surveys Pamela Russell, Helene Cajolet-Laganiere, Jacqueline Bosse-Andrieu
Vol 12 No 1 (1995)	7	2	Ideas About the English Language in Early Technical Writing Textbooks John Hagge The Evolution of the Genre of Canadian Acts: Sentence Structure and Complexity Michael P. Jordan
Vol 11 No 3-4 (1993)	11	1	Le poids de trois siècles de normativisme linguistique Jacqueline Bossé-Andrieu
Vol 11 No 2 (1993)	7	1	The issue of readability in English-speaking and French-speaking countries Jacqueline Bossé-Andrieu
Vol 9 No 2 (1991)	5	1	Le Recul du Français Comme Langue des Sciences Jacqueline Bossé-Andrieu
Vol 9 No 1 (1990)	3	1	The Reader Over Your Shoulder—Some Linguistic Background Michael P. Jordan
Vol 8 No 3 (1989)	4	1	Traduction ou Nouvelle Redaction? Un Exemple de Difficultes Posees par la Traduction Technique Lionel Meney
Vol 7 No 3 (1988)	6	1	Problemes Poses par L'Elaboration d'un Dictionnaire Juridique au Canada E. Groffier, D. Reed
Vol 6 No 3 (1987)	2	1	Some Rhetorical Principles in Technical and Scientific Writing in English and in French Candace Séguinot

Vol 6 No 2 (1987)	4	1	The Language of Evaluation Michael P. Jordan
Vol 5 No 3 (1986)	4	1	Quelques Réflexions sur la Langue de la Rédaction Administrative Jacqueline Bossé-Andrieu
Vol 5 No 2 (1986)	6	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues in Teaching Technical Writing in a Cross-Cultural Environment: The Case of Native Students Juanita Giesbrecht • Teaching Writing Based on Corpus-Based Linguistic Research Michael P. Jordan
Vol 4 No 3 (1985)	6	2	Le teminolgue/The Terminologist Jean-Paul Champagne Meeting a Need (An Administrative Writing Course for ESL Writers) Marian Holobow
Vol 4 No 2 (1985)	7	1	A Survival Course in Aeronautical Report Writing for French-Canadian Aircraft Maintenance Technicians Carolynn Emeyriat
Vol 4 No 1 (1985)	5	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some Clause-Relational Associated Nominals in Technical English M.P. Jordan • Rédaction Spécialisée et Utilisation du Dictionnaire Jacqueline Bossé-Andrieu
Vol 3 No 3 (1984)	6	1	Le Génie du Français Technique Claude Bédard
Vol 3 No 1 (1984)	5	1	Le Metier de Correcteur: L'Art de Vivre Selon le Dictionnaire Sylvie Laferriere
Vol 2 No 3 (1983)	5	1	Writing and Speaking: Different Versions of Language Dick Lazenby
Vol 2 No 2 (1983)	3	1	Co-Associative Cohesion in English Texts: A Progress Report on Research into Systems of Lexical Cohesion in Everyday English Use Michael P. Jordan

Vol 1 No 3 (1982)	5	1	Exemples des Roles Respectifs de L'Anglais et du Francais dans la vie Professionnelle D'Ingenieurs en France, au Quebec, au Canada Anglais et aux Etats-Unis Cedric Briens, Charles Durand
Vol 1 No 1 (1982)	6	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • La Contre-Attaque du Français Scientifique Arnold J. Drapeau • L'Importance de la Communication Ecrite et Verbale Chez L'Ingenieur Claude Guernier

Table 2. Conference Paper Linguistic Hits

	Year	Paper Title	Presenter	Institution	Depart.	LM Focus
	2001					
1		"An investigation into student transfer of learning from a post-secondary content-based ESL writing course to other courses"	Mark James	University of Toronto		
2		"TESOL textbooks and TESOL institutions: Discoursal relationships in different environments"	Adam Kilburn	Australian Centre for Languages, Sydney, Australia	Adult Migrant English Program,	
3		"Dans quel français traduire et rédiger?"	Louise Larivière	Université de Montréal et Université Concordia		
4		"Variation and Contact Phenomena in English-language Writing in Quebec: Manifestations and Motivations"	Pamela Grant and Françoise McNeil	Université Sherbrooke		
5		"Bilingual Literacy practices by a Latin American non-governmental organization: Learning to facilitate self-access"	Ana Traversa	Universidad CAECE, Buenos Aires, Argentina		
	2002					
6		A Follow-up Report on an Investigation into Student Transfer of Learning from a Post-Secondary Content-Based ESL Writing Course to Other Courses : Results and Implications	Mark James	University of Toronto		
7		Understanding Non-Native Students and Their Writing : An Investigation of Contrastive Rhetorical Assumptions	Yaying Zhang	Simon Fraser University		

8		Language Standards and the Regulation of Expertise	Jackie Rea	Simon Fraser University		
9		The Genre of College Entrance/Secondary Graduation Examination Essay : An Inter-Disciplinary Approach to Contrastive Rhetoric	Hongxing Qi	Simon Fraser University		
2003						
10		Genre Conflicts and Cooperation : An Analysis of ESL Writing and Instructor Comments in a First Year Technical Writing Course	Katherine Tiede	University of Toronto		
11		Linguistic Consciousness and Stories of Language Teaching	Dana Landry			
12		Texts, Improvement, and a Finnish Immigrant Community in Pioneer Richmond, BC : An Historical Instance of Genres as Sites of Contest, Cooperation, and Control	Nadeane Trowsen	University of British Columbia		
13		Questioning the importance of voice in undergraduate L2 argumentative writing : An empirical study with pedagogical implications	Rena Helms-Park, Paul Stapleton	University of Toronto, Hokkaido University, Japan		
2008						
14		Representations of Science and the Social Construction of Argumentation in Organizational Discourses: The case of the climate-change debates.	Graham Smart	Carleton University	Linguistics and Applied Languages	
15		Investigating multilinguals' writing processes	Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow	Zurich University of Applied Sciences		
16		'Chalk talk': A principal genre of the mathematics classroom	Natasha Artemeva and Janna Fox	Carleton University	Linguistics and Applied Language Studies	
17		Writing Lab blended learning support for non-native speaker graduate students and faculty for publication in English	Adam Turner	Hanyang University (S. Korea)	Centre for Teaching and Learning English Writing Lab	
18		Globalizing English: Re-writing Error from a Multilingual Perspective	Bruce Horner	University of Louisville	Endowed Chair in Rhetoric and Composition, Department of English,	
19		Common Language Does Not Equal Common Understanding	Diane Boehm	Saginaw Valley State University (MI)		
2012						

20		Workshop: Examining an Alternative Paradigm for Supporting English Language Learners' Academic Writing Skills Development	Elaine Khoo, Maggie Roberts, Tom Robles, Lydia Wilkinson	Not listed		
21		Replying/Responding in Language Studies	Elena Afros	Not listed		
22		Reading and Writing the Linguistic Landscape	Jacqueline McLeod-Rogers	Not listed		
23		Cree Students Writing About Writing in English	Jon Gordon, Anna Chilewska	Not listed		
24		Foundational Academic Literacy at SFU : Multilingualism, Multiliteracies, and Making the Transition to Writing-Intensive Learning	Steve Marshall	Not listed		
25		Negotiating Culture and Voice in Academic Writing	Xuemei Li, Cecile Badenhorst, Morgan Gardner, Elizabeth Yeoman	Not listed		
2013						
26		Chasing the Dragon: Towards a better understanding of Chinese international students and plagiarism	Robin Dahling	University of Science and Technology, Beijing		LM
27		Multilingual learners in the writing-intensive classroom: Pedagogical dilemmas, fractured binaries, and conflicting identities among instructors at Simon Fraser University	Jennifer Walsh Marr & Steve Marshall	Simon Fraser University		LM
28		Academic writing in the first and additional language: A personal narrative.	Xuemei Li	Memorial University of Newfoundland	Faculty of Education	LM
29		Chinese Post-80s overseas graduate students' voice in English academic writing	Hua Que & Xuemei Li	Memorial University of Newfoundland	Faculty of Education	LM
2014						
30		Politeness Strategies in Personal Statements: A Comparative Analysis between Native and Non-Native English Writers	Sibo Chen and Hossein Nassaji	Simon Fraser University, University of Victoria,	School of Communication, Department of Linguistics	
31		Code-switching in Bilingual Writing	Olga Makinina	York University	Department of Languages, Literatures and Linguistics	
2015						

32		Neither French nor English: Institutional Discourses about Writing and Allophone Students in English Colleges in Quebec	Maria Chiras	McGill University	Department of Integrated Studies in Education	
33		Teaching Academic Writing through Process-Genre Approach: A Pedagogical Exploration of an EAP Program in China	Xuemei Li, Xiwen Xu	Memorial University of Newfoundland, Huzhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China	Faculty of Education; N/A	LM
34		Corrective Feedback in EFL Writing Classes: A Case Study on the Perceptions and Preferences of EFL Students in Mainland China	Sibo Chen, Hossein Nassaji, Qian Liu	Simon Fraser University, University of Victoria, Beijing Normal University	School of Communication, Department of Linguistics, Department of English	LM
	2016					
35		Voice and Stance in Statements of Purpose by ESL Writers	Sibo Chen	Simon Fraser University	School of Communication	LM
36		The Efficacy of Teachable Moments in L2 Writing Instruction: Insights from the EAP	Subrata Bhowmik, Marcia Kim	University of Calgary,	School of Education; School of Education	LM
37		Empowering EAL Writers as Effective Peer Reviewers	Amanda Goldrick-Jones, PhD	Simon Fraser University	Writing Services Coordinator	
	2017					
38		Teaching linguistic argumentation through a writing-intensive approach	Kathryn Alexander, Panayiotis Pappas, Maite Taboada	Simon Fraser University	Education/Research Consultant, Linguistics, Linguistics,	
39		Writing Literacy Development of Multilingual Students: An investigation of cultural factors	Subrata Bhowmick, Ph.D., Anita Chaudhuri, Gregory Tweedie, Xiaoli Liu, Ph.D.	University of Calgary, Mount Royal University, University of Calgary, University of Calgary	School of Education; English and Cultural Studies; School of Education; School of Education	LM
40		Navigating Minor Academic Genres: Assessing the Development of L2 Graduate Student Writers' Writing Competences at a Mid-Sized German University	Janine Murphy, Coordinator, Micha Edlich	Leuphana University of Lüneburg, Germany	Writing Center for Academic English,	

41		Claiming Authority: English Language Teachers' Judgments of Language Usage in Writing	Joel Heng Hartse	Simon Fraser University	Faculty of Education
42		Becoming information literate: Developing effective use of external sources in an EFL writing course	May Kocatepe	Zayed University, United Arab Emirates	Dept of English and Writing Studies
2018					
43		Re-conceptualizing Writing for Publication Pedagogy as Critical Plurilingual Practice	James Corcoran Karen Englander	York University	ESL and Applied Linguistics, Linguistics and Applied Linguistics
44		Conversations about "Editing" Plurilingual Scholars' Thesis Writing	James Corcoran, Megan McIntosh and Antoinette Gagné	University of Toronto	ESL and Applied Linguistics; Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning;
45		Critical Language Awareness in First Year Writing at a Historically Black University	Shurli Makmillen,	Clafin University	English Department
46		Teaching Integrity: Charting the impact of an EAP program on plurilingual undergraduates' academic writing	James Corcoran and Bruce Russell	University of Toronto	ESL and Applied Linguistics; Academic Director of International Programs
47		"Why Can't I Find This in English?": Source Attribution and Becoming an Academic Writer in EAP	Gene Vasilopolous	University of Ottawa	Faculty of Education
48		"They Literally Can't Write a Sentence': Ideologies of Writing, Multilingual University Students, and Disciplinary Divisions of Labor"	Joel Heng Hartse	Simon Fraser University	Faculty of Education

Table 3. Available Conference Programs

Year	Location	Name
2001	Universite Laval	"Language, Culture and Society: Text in Social Context"
2002	University of Toronto	"Challenging Boundaries"

2003	Dalhousie University	“Conflict and Cooperation”
2008	University of British Columbia	“Writing Beyond Borders — Writing Studies Across Disciplinary and National Borders”
2012	Wilfrid Laurier University	“Disc”ourse, Writing and Interdisciplinarity
2013	University of Victoria	“Transformations at the Edge: Writing Research, Discourse, and Pedagogy”
2014	Brock University	“Borders without Boundaries: Research and Pedagogy in Writing and Discourse”
2015	University of Ottawa	“Writing Commons: Research and Pedagogy in Writing and Discourse”
2016	University of Calgary	“The Poor of Writing: Explorations of the Energy of Writing and Discourse”
2017	Toronto Metropolitan University, formerly Ryerson University	“The Presence of Writing: Making a Place for the Study of Writing and Discourse”
2018	University of Saskatchewan	“The Diversity of Writing and Discourse”

References

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin. (1989). *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literatures*. Routledge.

Atkinson, D., Crusan, D., Matsuda, P. K., Ortmeier-Hooper, C., Rueker, T., Simpson, S., & Tardy, C. (2015). Clarifying the Relationship Between L2 Writing and Translingual Writing: An Open Letter to Writing Studies Editors and Organization Leaders. *College English*, 77(4), 383–386.

- Burnaby, B. (1998). ESL Policy in Canada and the United States: Basis for Comparison. In T. K. Ricento & B. Burnaby (Eds.), *Language and Politics in the United States and Canada: Myths and Realities* (pp. 243–267). Routledge.
- Canagarajah, S. (Ed.). (2013). *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms*. Routledge.
- Crossman, E., Choi, Y., & Hou, F. (2022). *International students as a source of labour supply: A summary of recent trends* [Economic and Social Reports]. Statistics Canada.
- Garcia, O., & Otheguy, R. (2020). Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Commonalities and divergences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(1), 17–35. <https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2019.1598932>
- Guruz, K. (2011). *Higher education and international student mobility in the global knowledge economy*. State University of New York Press.
- Heng Hartse, J. (2021). *Does “second language writing” exist as a field in Canada?* [Virtual presentation].
- Johnstone, M., & Eunjung, L. (2014). Branded: International education and 21st-century Canadian Immigration, Education Policy, and the Welfare State. *International Social Work*, 57(3), 209–221.
- Johnstone, M., & Eunjung, L. (2017). Canada and the global rush for international students: Reifying a neo-imperial order of Western dominance in the knowledge economy era. *Critical Sociology*, 43(7–8), 1063–1078.
- Jordan, M. P. (1998). Basic functional literacy for engineering students: Towards a linguistic definition. *Discourse and Writing/Redactologie*, 14(1), 41–76.
- Keung, N., Lafleche, G., & Teotonio, I. (2019, September 30). Price of admission: Dreams of a better life can come with a cost. *Toronto Star*, A1, A8, A9.

Knight, J. (2013). The changing landscape of higher education internationalization—For better or worse? *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 17(3), 84–90.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2012.753957>

Lafleche, G., Keung, N., & Teotonio, I. (2019, September 29). The price of admission: Canada is the lure, but the catch is English. *Toronto Star*, A9, A12, A13.

Matsuda, P. K. (1999). Composition studies and ESL writing: A disciplinary division of labor. *College Composition and Communication*, 50(4), 699–721.

Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in U.S. college composition. *College English*, 68(6), 637–651.

Matsuda, P. K. (2013). It's the Wild West Out There: A New Linguistic Frontier in U.S. College Composition. In *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms* (pp. 130–140). Routledge.

Moxley, J. M. (n.d.). *Writing Studies*. Writing Commons.

<https://writingcommons.org/section/writing-studies-definition/>

Pavelich, J., & Jordan, M. (1994a). The Canadian Association of Teachers of Technical Writing: Its Early History. *Technostyle*, 11(3), 131–137.

Pavelich, J., & Jordan, M. P. (1994b). The Canadian association of teachers of technical writing: Its early history. *Technostyle*, 11(3), 131–137.

Shaughnessy, M. P. (1979). *Errors and expectations: A guide for the teacher of basic writing*. Oxford University Press.

Shor, I. (1997). Our Apartheid: Writing Instruction and Inequality. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 16(1), 91–104.

Teotonio, I., Lafleche, G., & Keung, N. (2019, September 28). the price of admission: I've given up everything. *Toronto Star*, IN1, IN3, IN4.

Trilokekar, R. D. (2010). International education as soft power? The contributions and challenges of

Canadian foreign policy to the internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education*,

59(131), 131–147.

What is CCLB. (n.d.). [Professional]. Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks. Retrieved January

19, 2021, from <https://www.language.ca/about-us/>

Wheeler, R., & Swords, R. (2004). *Code-switching: Teaching standard English in urban classrooms.*

National Council of Teachers of English.

Williams, J., & Condon, F. (2016a). Translingualism in Composition Studies and Second Language

Writing. *TESL Canada Journal*, 33(2), 1–18.

Williams, J., & Condon, F. (2016b). Translingualism in composition studies and second language

writing: An uneasy alliance. *TESL Canada Journal/Revue TESL Du Canada*, 33(2), 1–18.

<http://dx.doi.org/1018806/tesl.v33i2.1232>