THE WRITING PROCESS OF MULTILINGUAL POSTSECONDARY STUDENTS

by © Tessa E. Troughton

Thesis submitted

to the School of Graduate Studies in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Master of Education, Faculty of Education

Memorial University of Newfoundland

May 2021

St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador

Abstract

This research project is rooted in an atmosphere of globalization in Canadian higher education, in which universities are multilingual sites of learning. With an increasingly multilingual population made up of domestic and international students at Canadian universities, more information is needed about the writing practices of multilingual students. The purpose of this study was to learn in detail about the cognitive and strategic steps used by postsecondary students in a mid-sized university in eastern Canada as they wrote their university essays. Results were presented on a study of seven multilingual postsecondary students enrolled at a mid-sized Canadian university. Qualitative interviews were conducted and thematically analyzed. The findings included a continuum of meta-themes: agency/following instructions, experience/inexperience, and explicit teaching/finding their own methods. Findings indicate that the role of prior learning in writing and the learner's context have an impact on the writing. Secondary findings highlight the importance of instructor feedback on learner attitudes and English language learners' need for extra time to develop their academic English. Additional findings show that multilingual postsecondary students use translanguaging as a strategic tool when composing in English. These findings offer insights into the writing process, choice of strategies, and translanguaging practices of multilingual postsecondary students.

Key words: Multilingualism, translanguaging, strategies, writing, postsecondary students

General Summary

This research project relates to globalization in Canadian higher education, the increase in multilingual university students, and seeking ways to support their academic writing. This qualitative study investigated the writing practices of seven multilingual postsecondary students in a mid-sized university in eastern Canada as they wrote their university essays. Qualitative interviews were conducted and thematically analyzed.

Findings indicate that prior learning and the learner's context both have an impact on academic writing. Secondary findings indicate the importance of instructor feedback on learner attitudes and the need for extra time for multilingual students to develop their academic English. Additional findings show that multilingual postsecondary students use translanguaging as a strategic tool when composing in English. This work offers insights into the writing process, strategies, and translanguaging practices of multilingual postsecondary students, and can thus assist universities, colleges, professors, student affairs professionals, and writing centre professionals in understanding learners' writing needs.

Acknowledgments

First, thank you to the participants in this study. I truly appreciate your time and contributions. You allowed me to step inside your experiences as writers and students. Second, thank you so much to my supervisor, Dr. Cecile Badenhorst, for her patience and guidance through the research, writing, and revising processes. Third, thank you to the staff at the Memorial University of Newfoundland Writing Centre and again to Dr. Cecile Badenhorst for assisting with recruitment.

On a personal note, I would like to thank my husband, Dr. Scott Nokleby, for his unflagging moral support and steadfastness through this thesis process. I would like to thank my children, Esteban, Mateo, Chantal, and Natasha, for their patience and belief in me. Finally, my close friends and extended family have been instrumental in their support, caring, and infrequent, but well-placed advice. Thank you to Naomi Cohen and Dr. Hannah Scott for being there through this process.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of my stepdad and dearest friend, Simon L. Lowinsky. Simon was a kind, warm, and unique thinker, who left us too soon in the time of covid 19. Thank you for your caring, generosity, and mentoring. I treasure the years we had together.

Simon Leo "Leonardo" Lowinsky

November 19, 1945 – March 18, 2021

זיכרונו לברכה

List of Tables

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

According to the 2016 Census of Population, over seven million Canadians speak an "immigrant language," at home, in addition to English or French (Statistics Canada, 2017). This number has increased rapidly in the last 20 years according to data from the last three censuses (Statistics Canada, 2018). As a result, in major urban areas in Canada, in addition to an official language, many people speak the language of their country of origin at home. Tagalog, Mandarin, Arabic, and Hindi have experienced over a 30% growth as a language spoken at home in Canada's cities (Statistics Canada, 2018). Furthermore, in 2016, approximately 21.9% of the population was born outside of Canada (Statistics Canada, 2017). The 2016 Census reported that 37.5% of Canadian children were either first- or second-generation Canadians, an increase from the 2011 census (Statistics Canada, 2017). The percentage of children born into first and second-generation Canadian families is expected to grow exponentially over the next 15 years, and by extension, the percentage of Canadians who speak an additional language at home will likely rise.

Postsecondary education, both college and university, is highly valued in Canada. With an average rate of 54% of the population completing postsecondary studies, Canada has one of the highest rates of postsecondary education among the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries (The Daily, Statistics Canada, 2017). If levels of postsecondary education stay the same or continue to rise, it is likely that a large

percentage of enrolled students will speak English or French plus an additional language from their or their parents' country of origin; hence, the postsecondary population is likely to become increasingly multilingual based uniquely on demographic trends.

Furthermore, with increasing emphasis on the internationalization of postsecondary education in Canada (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 2011) and Canada's global role in welcoming refugees and newcomers (Statistics Canada, 2017), the enrolment of multilingual students in the postsecondary system is poised to increase due to the internationalization of universities and colleges, population growth through birth, immigration, and refugees seeking asylum. These demographic trends will lead to current and future students at Canadian postsecondary institutions who may communicate in multiple languages and may have earlier postsecondary learning experiences in a language other than English. The aforementioned trends demonstrate a need for increased research into the knowledge construction process of multilingual postsecondary students, including their academic writing process and the strategies they use when writing. It behooves the academic establishment to better understand the multilingual student population in order to better support their needs as learners.

For the purpose of this thesis, a multilingual will be defined as an individual who speaks three or more languages (De Angelis, 2007), regardless of

the individual's origins and/or mother tongue. In the current research project, no qualifiers will be used around the individual multilingual's proficiency, so that an individual who claims to speak three or more languages reasonably well will be considered to be a multilingual. While much research has been conducted on the composition process at the postsecondary level (Emig, 1994; Lavelle, 2009; Perl, 1994; Sommers, 1994), as well as the writing processes used by multilingual postsecondary students (Frodesen, 2009; Leki, 2011; Ortmeier-Hooper & Ruecker, 2017; Roberge, Losey, & Wald, 2015), less is known about the writing process(es) of multilingual postsecondary students in a Canadian university context (Marshall et al., 2012). As such, more information is required about the writing process and strategies used by this population. The current study on multilingual postsecondary students in urban Newfoundland, Canada will contribute toward filling the gap in the educational research on this population. As such, the current research is an exploratory study of multilingual undergraduate students' writing process and strategies in the context of a mid-sized Canadian university.

The data collected will be interpreted through the conceptual framework of *fluid* multilingualism (Canagarajah, 2002; Canagarajah, 2006) to critically analyze the writing process and needs of a small sample of multilingual postsecondary students. Fluid multilingualism is defined here as the ability to switch back and forth between languages in order to achieve a communicative and/or strategic intent (Canagarajah, 2002; Canagarajah, 2006). Fluid multilingualism is

more suited to the study of multilinguals than other possible theories as it depicts translanguaging, one of the essential characteristics of multilingual communication, as a normal communicative behaviour and, even, as a very particular ability. The phenomena of fluid multilingualism and translanguaging will be contextualized in the history of second language acquisition studies. The results of the current study will also be analyzed in terms of academic literacies theory (Lea & Street, 1998) in that the participants' writing experience is occurring in the context of the disciplinary writing of the academy (Badenhorst, 2011; Lea & Street, 1998). The data will be discussed in light of recent research in additional language writing and translanguaging.

1.1   Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to learn in detail about the experiences and strategic steps used by seven postsecondary students in a mid-sized university in eastern Canada as they wrote their university essays. Areas of concern were the steps the participants took while writing or preparing to write in terms of planning, strategies, and considerations. Other areas of concern were the university support systems available to the multilingual participants, knowledge of academic writing stylistic features, whether this knowledge was learned at the Canadian university or during a prior educational experience, and the types of individuals who supported the participants in writing their academic papers. It is in this context that the following research questions are addressed in the current study:

1. What is the writing process of multilingual postsecondary student participants writing essays at a mid-sized Canadian university?

2. What strategies and support systems do multilingual participant postsecondary students use when they write university essays?

1.2 Significance of the Study

The current study investigates the writing processes and composition strategies of multilingual postsecondary students at a mid-sized Canadian university. This study will provide insight into the steps taken by these student participants in planning and writing their essays. A secondary item of investigation was the support accessed by the participants and the extent to which their prior knowledge assisted them in their academic writing process. Overall, the results of this study will provide a more nuanced description of the academic writing routines, process, needs, and some frustrations of this group of multilingual postsecondary students. This study will help to shed light on a student population that is distinctive to Canada due to the combination of Canadian postsecondary recruitment practices abroad and Canadian university practice, yet about which not a lot is known. The results of this study will be specifically of use to instructors and professors who teach writing at the postsecondary level, consultants in writing centres, as well as those employed in student affairs at the postsecondary level. These results will also be of use to all postsecondary instructors and professors as all university subjects require

academic writing, albeit some more than others. The data about the use of resources by the study participants will be of further use to all postsecondary staff in better understanding the resource requirements of multilingual students.

A variety of terms, such as ESL students, L2 speakers, English Additional Language speakers (EALs), are used to describe English Language Learners (ELLs) in the literature. The differences between these terms relate to how the speaker is positioned with regards to native speakers or mother tongue speakers of the English language. Some of the terms above are viewed as stigmatized, while others are not, yet all carry a nuance of judgment. For the purposes of the current research project, the term English Language Learners (ELLs) will be used to describe individuals who speak, read, and write English as an additional language. This term may be perceived as carrying less judgment than ESL students, for instance. English Language Learners (ELLs) refers specifically to individuals communicating in English, whereas the term L2 speakers could refer to language learners of a language. The term English Additional Language speakers (EALs) could also have been used with equal purpose, but English Language Learners (ELLs) was selected in an effort to standardize terms.

For the purposes of the current research, de Angelis' (2007) definition of multilinguals will be used. De Angelis states, "a multilingual person...[is] an individual familiar with three or more languages to some degree of fluency" (De Angelis, 2007, p. 8). The above definition does not refer to literacy in the language, however, each participant was asked questions about their literacy in

each of the languages in their repertoire.

1.3   Overview of the Thesis

The main purpose of this study was to explore and elucidate various aspects of the writing process and the composition strategies employed by a small group of multilingual undergraduate and graduate students at a mid-sized Canadian university. The theoretical framework of fluid multilingualism (Canagarajah, 2002; Canagarajah, 2006) was used to critically analyze their writing process. A qualitative methodology was used and data was collected through individual semi-structured interviews, coded and analyzed. Participants were young adults enrolled at the bachelors or graduate level. They were recruited through posters placed around campus, in the library, and in the Writing Centre. There is a small sample size of seven participants. As the researcher is a distance student, the research for this project was conducted via distance using a synchronous online platform (Gotomeeting.com), telephone, and email. This online interaction created a limitation in that internet service was not completely stable and sometimes affected the audio connection. Results line up with the literature in that participants' composition process took longer, planning prior to writing was not uniform, participants who were more skilled writers planned globally, and prior knowledge had an impact on the participants' writing performance. Another result that mirrored the literature was that some participants added a personal element of creativity to their academic writing. Furthermore, as

noted in the literature, participants revealed a variety of affective, metacognitive, and interpersonal composition strategies, including accepting the writing process, using resources, seeking mentorship, and translanguaging. Results differed from the literature in the participants' reactions to perceived instructional rules, as well as the impact of previous exposure to academic writing. More questions remain regarding the use of resources, such as online translators and dictionaries, translanguaging and links to level of additional language proficiency. Meta-themes from this research may be viewed as situated on three continua: agency/following instructions, experience/inexperience, and explicit teaching/finding their own methods. The conclusion of the thesis addresses the deficit view of multilingualism in light of the globalization of Canadian universities. The common national origin of the majority of the participants may have presented a limitation, or at least an unforeseeable particularity. Despite these limitations, the data collected was rich and valuable. Implications of this study are that multilingual academic writers require more time for their composition process. Greater awareness of this need for more time would be beneficial to instructors and institutional planners in organizing learners supports.

1.4   Conclusion

This introduction has provided an overview of the issues leading to the development of an increasingly multilingual population of postsecondary students in Canada, the need to learn more about the academic writing experiences of this population, and the chapter also included a description of the

17

major sections of this thesis. The introduction has also outlined this qualitative

study of multilingual Canadian postsecondary students and the process they go

through when writing their university papers. Two research questions have been

stated. A theoretical stance of fluid multilingualism has been proposed for the

context of a small scale, interview-based study of seven multilingual

postsecondary students. The limitations of the study have been outlined. Key

terms related to the participant population of multilinguals have been defined in

terms of the literature. It is hoped findings will be of assistance to university

professors, college instructors, and professional staff in better understanding the

multilingual students and their perspectives at their own institutions.

Chapter 2: Review of Literature

Scholarly literature about multilingual postsecondary students, their academic writing process, and their experience as academic writers is found in the following countries: Australia, China, South America, South Asia, Spain, Taiwan, the Netherlands, the United States, Malaysia, South Africa, and Canada, while the majority of the research took place in the United States and a smaller number of studies in Canada. This review of literature aims to establish a theoretical framework for teaching culturally diverse learners; to explore what is known about multilingualism, the writing process and writing strategies used by multilingual postsecondary students. The scope of this review is within the disciplines of higher education, writing studies and additional language studies. Current research will be analyzed thematically with the goal of elucidating the relationship of these topics to multilingual postsecondary students as they research and write university papers that they consider difficult.

2.1   Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) View of Learning

The population of the current research project is multilingual young adults in a Canadian postsecondary institution. The culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) approach to teaching and learning is defined as "Collectively, sociocultural theories, critical pedagogy, and culturally relevant and sustaining perspectives interrogate relations and contexts, identities, and power in ways that influence the teaching of writing. This approach recognizes that students' lived experiences and cultural ways of being impact how students learn in schools and

navigate the larger social world" (Kinloch & Burkhard, 2016, p. 382). In other words, the CLD approach to learning is critical of social structures and power relations. The CLD approach makes a link between learners' prior knowledge/experiences, their in-school experiences, and their experiences in life, particularly in the context of power relations. The culturally and linguistically diverse approach to teaching and learning is also linked to the effect of prior knowledge, cultural or academic, on writing, as will be developed in the following section, Contextual Factors in Multilingual Writing.

Kinloch and Burkhard (2016) conducted a qualitative study of the literacy practices of high school students in order to learn best practices for a "culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) classroom" (Kinloch & Burkhard, 2016, p. 378). In line with CLD practices, in the Kinloch and Burkhard study (2016), high school students were given freedom to experiment with different academic voices and agency in their writing assignments. Multilingual individuals are experienced with a variety of cultural and linguistic settings, both in and out of school. In the CLD approach to teaching and learning, multilinguals in the classroom are viewed as a strength, and this approach aims to draw on the strengths of a diverse group of learners (Kinloch, 2005; Kinloch, 2009; Kinloch & Burkhard, 2016; Looker, 2016, Paris, 2012). An understanding of the culturally and linguistically diverse view of learning is relevant to the current study as it is based on the experiences and practices of a culturally and linguistically diverse group of postsecondary students who are studying in an

20

educational system that is not necessarily oriented to a diversity of educational and linguistic backgrounds; however, the focus of this research is on writing, including the way it is informed by prior learning, including culture. The research does not focus on culture independently of writing and prior learning, as that is outside of the scope of this project.

2.2   Bilingualism or Multilingualism?

The development of research on bilingualism and multilingualism permits an understanding of *fluid multilingualism* (Canagarajah, 2002; Canagarajah, 2006). Bilingualism, or the phenomena of communicating in two or more languages, has been defined differently by different researchers over the course of more than fifty years. Weinreich (1953) stated in his cornerstone book, *Languages in Contact*, "The practice of alternately using two languages will be called bilingualism, and the persons involved, bilingual…" (p. 1) [Note: Unless otherwise specified, all remarks about bilingualism apply as well to multilingualism, the practice of using alternately three or more languages.] Multilingualism was hence defined as "the practice of using alternately three or more languages" (Weinreich, 1953, p. 1). De Angelis, 54 years later, but in the same field, proposed "a multilingual person to be an individual familiar with three or more languages to some degree of fluency, and a bilingual an individual familiar with two languages, also to some degree of fluency" (De Angelis, 2007, p. 8). For the purposes of the current research, the de Angelis (2007) definition of multilinguals will be used.

Bilingualism and multilingualism are the basis of this thesis because they

are the essential context for writing in an additional language (Leki et al., 2008),

which is the phenomenon under focus in the current study. In the past,

multilingualism and bilingualism were not widely viewed strengths in

communication (Garcia, 2009). Bilingual and multilingual individuals were

potentially viewed from a deficit model of communication, i.e., that bi- or

multilingual individuals were somehow incomplete or flawed in comparison to

the language proficiency of the monolingual (Garcia, 2009). Today, the deficit

approach seems ludicrous in light of recent, international scholarship on

multilingualism (Garcia, 2009; Leki et al., 2008; Manchon, 2011; Manchon &

Matsuda, 2018). In fact, the focus of research has changed radically over the past

66 years from bilingualism (Grosjean, 2008; Romaine, 1995; Weinreich, 1953),

to trilingualism (Cenoz, 2003; Hoffman, 2001; de Angelis, 2007), to

multilingualism (Marshall et al., 2012) and translanguaging (Garcia & Lin, 2017)

(See 2.4 - From Multilingualism to Translanguaging). The term translanguaging

refers to the ability of a multilingual speaker or community to decide when to

use a specific language (Garcia & Wei, 2014); it also refers to the act of

multilinguals mixing different languages to communicate based on the context,

their own needs, and desires (Garcia & Lin, 2014). In essence, it is now widely

viewed as a strength to be able to communicate in more than one language, even

in more than two languages (Canagarajah, 2002; Canagarajah, 2009). The

qualities attributed to multilingualism include: heightened awareness of

rhetorical conventions (Canagarajah, 2006) and the ability to translanguage in order to meet one's communicative needs (Garcia & Lin, 2014; Marshall et al., 2012).

Canagarajah (2006) argues that multilinguals have many unrecognized rhetorical and verbal strengths that should be recognized by educators. In a comparison of academic articles written by the same multilingual participant with different linguistic target audiences, results showed that the participant directed his text to the different rhetorical conventions of specific target audiences (Canagarajah, 2006). The multilingual subject switched back and forth rapidly between different codes while attending to the requirements of different audiences (Canagarajah, 2006; Canagarajah, 2009). In a qualitative study, Marshall et al. (2012) collected primary data on a multilingual, Canadian postsecondary population, the same as the population in the current research, translanguaging in their academic and non-academic lives as university students. The multilingual participants showed evidence of translanguaging in digital and traditional literacies as they prepared their English-only university assignments (Marshall et al.,   2012). Both examples above highlight multilinguals' distinct use of translanguaging to meet their unique communicative needs, as they are functioning within multilingual communities. An understanding of bilingualism and multilingualism is important background knowledge in understanding the following sections on translanguaging and fluid multilingualism. These are foundational notions in the study of the multilingual writing process.

2.3   From Multilingualism to Translanguaging

In 1953, Weinreich asserted that moving back and forth between languages was to be termed "interference" and thus both identified as well as attached a negative connotation to the phenomenon of codeswitching (Weinreich, 1953, p. 1). Weinreich maintained "those instances of *deviation* [italics added] from the norm of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with the language, i.e., as a result of language contact, will be referred to as interference phenomena" (Weinreich, 1953, p. 1). In the time that has elapsed since 1953, the conceptual notions around bilingualism and multilingualism have evolved to the point where what was negatively termed "interference" (Weinreich, 1953, p. 1) is now viewed in a positive light as *translanguaging*.

In the early days of the field of additional language acquisition, bilingual language production was viewed as two totally separate systems, as opposed to one interrelated system (Garcia & Lin, 2017). Under the separate system model, when one language popped into the usage of the other language, it was viewed as an interference from the single language system (Garcia & Lin, 2017). An understanding of these early conceptions of bilingualism is important in situating the current understanding of multilingualism and translingualism/translanguaging, as will be defined below, as normal occurrences in a multidimensional, postcolonial world.

The term translanguaging refers to the ability of a multilingual speaker or community to decide when to use a specific language (Garcia & Wei, 2014). On a more complex level, *translanguaging* refers to the act of multilinguals mixing different languages to communicate based on the context, their own needs, and desires (Garcia & Lin, 2014). This definition will be used in the current research project.

Canagarajah posits that multilinguals have a more active, fluid, and hybrid perception of language based on a larger lexical base that translates into a heightened rhetorical sense (Canagarajah, as cited in Garcia & Lin, 2014, p. 122). Thus, Canagarajah proposes translanguaging as creating a type of individualized, hybrid languaging system. Garcia and Lin (2014) specify that translanguaging operates not only at the individual level, but also at the community level. The notion of translanguaging developed from the concepts of multilingualism and codeswitching (Garcia & Wei, 2014). Translanguaging is relevant to this thesis because it forms the context for writing in an additional language/ELL writing (Leki et al., 2008). Translanguaging is important to the study of the writing of multilingual postsecondary students because, as explained above, it is an organic, integral feature of multilingual language use (Garcia & Lin, 2017; Garcia & Wei, 2014).

Multilinguals have options in the language they choose to express themselves. When multilinguals communicate, they may translanguage naturally

or by choice, *or* multilinguals may choose to communicate by using only one language at a time (Garcia & Lin, 2017; Garcia & Wei, 2014). According to the sociocultural approach to language (Street, 1984; 1993, as cited in Garcia, 2012), it follows that languaging occurs in social situations, whether involving literacy or oral communication (Garcia, 2012), although the focus in the current research is on written language. Canagarajah argues that multilinguals demonstrate intellectual and cultural agility in stepping back and forth between forms, languages, and cultures (Canagarajah, 2011). The translanguaging highlighted by Canagarajah exists because of contact between linguistic groups, so translanguaging is inherently a social activity, and thus in line with Street (1984). The fact that the translanguaging participant in Canagarajah's study was not aware that he was doing anything out of the ordinary in what is, to him, the natural act of "shuttling between languages" highlights a very appealing innocence and an absence of self-consciousness in this case (Canagarajah, 2011).

Marshall, Hayashi, and Yeung (2012) show evidence of translanguaging, similar to that described by Canagarajah in his study of one scholar writing in different languages for different audiences (2011). Marshall et al. (2012) report that multilingual university students are translanguaging both inside and outside of the university environment, including on social media, while working on university assignments, and in informal/personal communications. Marshall et al. (2012) demonstrate that translingual communication occurs in both digital/online spaces as well as traditional forms of literacy leading up to, but not

including the final version of their assignments, which were all submitted in English (Marshall et al., 2012). The young adult population of urban Canada has become increasingly as multilingual as the university students described in Marshall et al. (2012). One might consider the participants in this study to be part of the new, urban Canadian, translingual norm.

2.4   Fluid Multilingualism

The concepts of fluid multilingualism and translanguaging practices are important to the study of the multilingual writing process because these concepts will be used to interpret the way the participants in the current study use language; more specifically, it may be that fluid multilingualism and translanguaging capture the way the participants may choose to bounce back and forth between languages or choose to communicate in one language instead of another (Canagarajah, 201; Garcia & Lin, 2017; Garcia & Wei, 2014). Having multiple languages to draw upon as resources in the writing process distinguishes multilingual individuals from other populations. The conceptual framework of fluid multilingualism (Canagarajah, 2002; Canagarajah, 2006) will be used to critically analyze the writing process of participant postsecondary students at a mid-sized Canadian university. The current research project will investigate how the multilingual participants' additional linguistic resources manifest in the arena of academic writing.

2.5   Teaching Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Populations

With a focus on teaching culturally and linguistically diverse populations, the learner's "context, identities, and practices" (Cumming, 2001; Kinloch & Burkhard, 2016, p. 388) should be taken more into account. In terms of taking the learner's context into account in teaching practices, Cumming (2001) notes that scaffolding within the learner's range of ability is very helpful to ELLs in learning the composition process and different sub-genres of writing. Cummins (2017) recommends that the period of time allotted ELLs to develop their academic English be research-based and that learners from culturally diverse backgrounds should receive the most literacy-enriched learning possible.

Ferris (2018) offers suggestions regarding the use of professor feedback for ELLs at the postsecondary level that may be extended to culturally and linguistically diverse groups: providing "teacher feedback" on student work, with attention paid to clear communication and providing "expert feedback" on grammar and language errors (Ferris, 2018, p. 152). Ferris (2018) notes that both clear communication and grammar directives in feedback have been found to be highly valued in the ELL postsecondary student population. As noted above, Lorimer-Leonard (2013) demonstrated significant benefits to learners when their prior literacy learning was validated and valued by the educational system in their new country. As such, it may be argued that the learner will benefit if the instructional practices can be made to demonstrate that the students' prior learning and context is valued. Thus, a renewed emphasis on a culturally and

linguistically diverse approach to postsecondary teaching could help increase students' engagement in their learning.

Cumming (2001) conducted a review of the literature on the cognitive and sociocultural perspectives on additional language composition from the mid-1980s to 2001. Based on the literature reviewed, three major issues related to writing in an additional language were proposed: "composing processes," "contextual factors," and "implications for education" (Cumming, 2001, p. 1). Findings suggest that additional language writers should pay attention to ideas, as well as language, while writing (Cumming, 2001, p. 5). Moreover, the findings suggest that first language writers, as well as *skilled* additional language writers, do more planning and revision than *less skilled* writers (Cumming, 2001). In contrast, less *skilled* additional language writers need to perform the extra work of searching for the right words and structures, and this extra cognitive work can potentially hold them back (Cumming, 2001). However, when studying skilled and less-skilled ELL writers, the length of time to develop their Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) was not addressed as a variable, and this could be significant (Cummins, 2017). Finally, in the literature, the context of writing is studied in order to understand "social interaction" (p.4) through case studies on the experiences of additional language writers in different real-life contexts.

Cumming's (2001) results on the value of studying the context and/or

social aspects of writing relate to Lorimer-Leonard's (2013) findings on valuing prior literacy knowledge, as well as to Kinloch and Burkhard's (2016) view that the learner's context needs to be considered in successful teaching. These arguments that highlight the social context of English Language Learner writing have implications for postsecondary teaching practices, as well as institutional stances toward international students, as the postsecondary student population is culturally and linguistically diverse. This section highlights the value of a socio-cultural, contextualized approach to all learning, but particularly in the case of ELLs, students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, and/or international, multilingual students. The following section will focus on the link between context and learning, specifically, on the role of context in activating prior learning in multilingual adults.

2.6   Contextual Factors in Multilingual Writing

The activation of prior learning in writing has been shown to be a contextual factor in the cultural adaptation of multilingual adults at the postsecondary level (Cumming, 2001; Ferris, 2018; Kinloch & Burkhard, 2016; Lorimer-Leonard, 2013). Prior learning in writing, as used here, refers to prior learning of composition techniques, prior learning of content related to academic writing topics, and/or prior cultural knowledge applied to school learning.

The perceived value of one's prior learning in the adopted country is a

contextual aspect of learning. Lorimer-Leonard (2013) conducted a qualitative study of 25 multilingual, international adults to investigate the impact of prior knowledge of literacy practices, migration, and change of language on their current literacy practices in the United States (US). Results indicated that certain literacy practices or aspects of literacy practices learned in their home countries were valued in the new country, while others were not valued in the new country (Lorimer-Leonard, 2013). When their prior forms of literacy did not help them get ahead in the new country, and were thus not perceived as valued in the adopted country, it was found to be quite detrimental to the participant's ability to integrate and adapt to the new country; however, when the participant's prior knowledge of literacy was school-based and this was valued by postsecondary institutions, the participants had an easier integration into the educational system in the adopted country. Lorimer-Leonard's (2013) work shows that validation (or lack thereof) of prior knowledge can have a profound impact on a newcomer's success in the new country.

Further related to the effect of context on writing, Ferris has studied the effect of contextual factors, such as curriculum planning, on the English curriculum at US colleges. Ferris (2018) conducted a review of factors affecting additional language writers in postsecondary education in the US and examined the impact of a curricular approach on the learning of culturally diverse undergraduate populations. She describes the current sociolinguistic landscape and the increase in English Language Learners (ELLs) in postsecondary writing

31

courses in the US. Ferris (2018) argued that the writing curriculum, when not centrally planned, can equip some postsecondary students for their subsequent college coursework better than others, thus creating systemic inequalities. Atkinson and Ramanathan (as cited in Ferris, 2018) conducted a qualitative study of two English language writing programs at a college in the US. One program was directed at English as a Second Language (ESL) students and the other, at non-ESL students (mainstream, native speaker of English students). Results indicated that the participants wished the professors from the two programs would make their learning outcomes for writing more similar, so that the students from the ESL program would not have a lack of knowledge of academic genres when they moved from the ESL/developmental program to the mainstream program, and thus be penalized by this lack of knowledge. Ferris (2018) indicated that postsecondary English writing programs in the United States continue to rely on an outdated model of developmental and mainstream English writing programs. Furthermore, Ferris (2018) indicates that institutions typically have two distinct sets of learning outcomes for writing when the developmental/ELL and mainstream English programs are located in two separate departments.

This separation of the units that teach academic writing into different departments, such as ESL/developmental and mainstream English, can complicate learning academic writing for those in a developmental English program and create systemic inequalities. First, two separate writing departments

may mean that the writing curricula are different and may have different learning outcomes. Second, findings showed that the students in the developmental programs were not exposed to more complex expectations for writing, yet when they moved into mainstream coursework, they were expected to have experience with these genres (Atkinson & Ramanathan, as cited in Ferris, 2018; Ferris, 2009; Harklau, 2000). As such, the students who completed the developmental or ELL writing course were functionally handicapped by their lack of exposure to more complex works of academic writing. As a sub-note, Ferris (2018) points out that the ELL writing process may generally differ from those for whom English is the mother tongue due to developmental issues, so enrolment in mainstream classes does not suit them developmentally; nevertheless, it may be argued that being in mainstream as opposed to ELL classes would benefit ELL students in that they could learn more about academic writing genres than in a streamed ELL class. The issue of the placement, curriculum, and teaching of writing to culturally diverse groups in the US postsecondary system is complex and political, with arguments on both sides. Ferris' (2018) work raises the issue of the need to balance the learner's context and needs with the specific content the learner will need to know in order to be academically successful in future.

In addition to striving to validate learners' prior knowledge and reviewing the writing curriculum for consistency across departments, English Language Learners (ELLs) need more time to learn and develop their academic English skills. Cummins (2017; 1979) proposes the basic interpersonal communicative

skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) to explain communication for distinct purposes. The BICS applies to contextualized, informal, playtime communication, while the CALP applies to decontextualized, formal, cognitive, academic communication. Cummins' findings showed that it took several years for children to acquire the CALP, yet only two to three years to learn their BICS or basic communication skills. Raimes' (1985) findings also mirrored Cummins' (2017; 1979), and both sets of findings were useful in advocating for additional time for ELL students to develop their cognitive, academic communication (i.e., reading and writing skills).

Cummins' (2017; 1979), as well as Ferris' (2018) research raise the idea that writing curricula can serve a gatekeeping function in a postsecondary school. The curriculum can be used to prepare postsecondary students for the academic writing they will need in their academic studies; conversely, the curriculum can also be used to teach developmental English, and omit teaching academic writing. If academic writing is not taught to ELLs, then when the ELL students are eventually integrated into the mainstream courses, they have not been exposed to these concepts. This lack of exposure may prove to be a handicap when academic writing style is one of the most important aspects to writing success in undergraduate programs (Ferris, 2018).

2.7   Academic Literacies Approach to Writing

Cumming (2001) states that the context of writing is studied in order to

34

understand the "social interaction" (p.4) in the experiences of additional

language writers in different real-life contexts. Leki, Cumming and Silva (2008)

also advocate a *contextualized* approach in the analysis of ELL writing (p. 9).

The "academic socialization approach," (Badenhorst, 2011, p. 13)

parallels Cumming's "contextual factors" (Cumming, 2001, p.1) in an extremely

specific context - that of the university, and thus, academic writing. The

academic literacies approach (Lea & Street, 1998) focuses on the context of the

writing, which in the case of Lea and Street, is academic writing: academic

literacies suggests a more complex and contested interpretation in which the

processes of student writing and tutor feedback are defined through implicit

assumptions about what constitutes valid knowledge within a particular context,

and the relationships of authority that exist around the communication of these

assumptions. The nature of this authority and the claims associated with it can be

identified through both formal, linguistic features of the writing involved and in

the social and institutional relationships associated with it. (Lea & Street, 1998,

p. 170).

Badenhorst (2011) summarizes the "academic literacies perspective [as]

the perspective that writing is part of a complex network of social practices

conducted within different academic discourses" (p. 3). The central point about

the academic literacies perspective is that academic writing occurs in a very

specific space with very specific rules, both stated (as in university policies about

35

academic integrity) and unstated (as in professor's expectations about what first year postsecondary students know about academic writing. Fluid multilingualism and translanguaging capture the practice of moving back and forth between languages (Canagarajah, 201; Garcia & Lin, 2017; Garcia & Wei, 2014). The academic literacies approach and the fluid multilingualism approach converge in their focus on the author tailoring their writing to their audience, whether linguistic, as in the case of fluid multilingualism, or disciplinary, as in the case of academic literacies. The current project is rooted in the academic literacies perspective, as well as the fluid multilingualism approach, as noted below. Since the project is focused on multilinguals and their views, perceptions, strategies, actions around academic writing, it is important to review the literature on bilingualism and multilingualism. Research had been conducted in the field of second language acquisition for over half a century prior to the point where the current research on multilingualism began, so it would be important to understand how academic literacies and fluid multilingualism approaches fit into the intellectual conversation of bilingualism and additional language acquisition.

2.8   The Writing Process

The writing and the writing process of English language learners (ELL) has been studied to determine whether, how, and in what ways it differs from the writing of English mother tongue speakers. Raimes (1985) conducted a quantitative study to explore the "composing processes of unskilled ESL student writers performing a classroom task" (Raimes, 1985, p. 233). The eight

participants were undergraduate students enrolled in an ESL composition course at a postsecondary institution in the United States. A think-aloud activity was conducted during a class writing activity which was later coded according to a system designed for ELL writers (Perl, as cited in Raimes, 1985). Findings showed overall similarities between the ELLs' writing process and first language writers in that the ELLs were able to compose in a process writing context, yet Raimes (1985) maintains that using the mother tongue-oriented process writing approach *exclusively* with ELLs does not allow for the additional time and instruction they require. Raimes' (1985) recommendation that ELLs require additional time agrees with Cummins' results that the acquisition of academic cognitive language takes years longer than the acquisition of basic interpersonal communication (Cummins, 1979, 1980).

Shortly thereafter, Raimes (1987) conducted a mixed-methods study of eight ELL students at the postsecondary level in the US with the goal of exploring their "composing strategies" (p. 442) and whether these were similar to those of English mother tongue postsecondary students. Raimes (1987) examines what writers say to themselves while they are writing, how they talk themselves through the task, how they plan what they will write, their thought process as they write, and their revision practices. Results showed that ELLs spent more time on process writing (planning, revising, rehearsing, outlining, and editing) than English mother tongue students. Rehearsing is "composing aloud" (Raimes, 1987, p. 461) and indicates a focus on meaning. Rehearsing is

a more important function to ELL writers than revision, as it inspired the participants to write (p. 461). Raimes (1987) reported that her ELL participants were exploring and discovering ideas through their writing tasks in the same way as English mother tongue writers, although the ELL students did more revision. ELL writers are required to pay attention to ideas, as well as language, while writing (Cumming, 2001, p. 5), so they carry more cognitive load.

This section provides overall evidence that ELL writers, in comparison to English mother tongue writers, require additional instructional time to develop their academic English writing because academic writing in another language is simply more difficult, but also that ELL writers invest more time on the writing process in the desire to do well. These features of ELL writing and ELL writers, as they relate to English mother tongue writers, will be used in the data analysis in the current study.

2.9   Composition Strategies

Writers use strategies in the course of their writing process to break down cognitive and linguistic tasks and, generally, go about writing their papers and assignments. Strategies are things that writers do at different points in the writing process to help them accomplish the tasks involved in academic writing. Griffiths calls on the very extensive discussion in the field of learning strategies to define language learning strategies (used by language learners) as "Activities consciously chosen by learners for the purpose of regulating their own language

learning." (Griffiths, 2008, Kindle Location 1159 of 4186). When delving

specifically into writing strategies used by ELLs, strategies are grouped into

cognitive, metacognitive, affective (Wong, as cited in Leki et al., 2008), and

metalinguistic areas (Bialystok, 1991; Bialystok & Craik, 2010). Affective

strategies refer to ways of handling one's mindset, tolerating ambiguity in

writing tasks (Gordon, 2008), and keeping on track with the task. Cognitive and

metacognitive strategies refer to the strategies the learner uses to plan for

learning, choose strategies, reflect on their learning, assess their learning

(Anderson, 2008), and in general, regulate one's learning (Griffiths, 2008). In

terms of writing, learners use cognitive and metacognitive strategies to organize

information, plan their writing, analyze texts, and tools for learning new

information. Metalinguistic knowledge refers to analysis of language,

specifically, the ability to revise and proofread one's own writing, the ability to

analyze language form specifically and pronounced executive control

(Bialystok, 1991; Bialystok & Craik, 2010), as compared to metacognitive

knowledge which is, more broadly, the ability to analyze and reflect on one's

thinking and writing, but also is closely related to executive control.

As noted above, both mother tongue and multilingual writers were found

to use a variety of strategies in their writing process (Gordon, 2008; Wong, as

cited in Leki et al., 2008), although additional language proficiency still strongly

affected the quality of the written product, either positively or negatively (Leki et

al., 2008). The stronger writers were more concerned with the organization of

their essays, and so, more concerned with the bigger picture, genre, and argument requirements of the assigned essay.

In terms of metacognitive strategies, Lay (1983, as cited in Leki et al., 2008) reported that mother tongue writers and ELLs used similar writing strategies, such as "re- evaluating organization, asking questions, and changing vocabulary" (loc. 2732 of 9504). Additionally, Victori (1999) conducted a quantitative study about the link between one's metacognitive knowledge, which he defines as an "awareness of the requirements and processes involved in undertaking the task" (p. 538), including rhetoric, paragraph structure, and the writing strategies used, as measured by two think-aloud protocols recorded while writing assigned essays in English and an interview. In a think-aloud protocol, the participant writes an essay and articulates their thoughts, which are recorded and analyzed (Raimes, 1985, 1987). The goal was to determine whether students with greater metalinguistic knowledge, i.e., analytic knowledge of language, were better writers. Participants were four undergraduate English majors at a university in Spain, two of whom were stronger writers in their mother tongue, and two of whom were weaker writers in their mother tongue. Results showed that the two stronger writers also showed more overall understanding of the writing process, such as the ability to analyze their own use of language and revise their own work, than the weaker two (Victori, 1999). The results of the interviews showed concerns with self-concept, identity as a writer, and reasons for writing. The "better writers focused on global text-level problems, such as

writing coherently and having to restructure ideas after having evaluated them"

(Victori, 1999, p. 541). Victori's findings mirror Leki et al.'s (2008) findings

that stronger ELL writers were more concerned with broad brush, rhetorical

elements of writing.

Leki et al. (2008) reported that more skilled writers focused more on big

picture planning, content, and argument than less skilled writers, which mirrors

the results found by Victori (1999). As previously indicated, strategies related to

planning are cognitive/metacognitive, in that the learner is preparing to learn. As

described previously, skilled additional language writers do significant planning

and work with a text during the composition process (Leki et al., 2008). On the

topic of the writing process, including preparing to write, Leki et al. (2008)

report that "more skilled L2 writers" showed evidence of more planning,

outlining, big picture planning, revising and editing than less skilled L2 writers

(Leki et al. 2008, loc. 2117 of 9504). In other words, skilled L2 writers use more

metacognitive strategies during their writing process. On the whole, the

literature shows that ELL writers who write academic essays that are deemed of

higher quality are much more involved with the texts they write and put more

hours into the composition process at every level from grammar and word

choice to outlining, planning, and revising (Leki et al., 2008).

In terms of English language learners' affective strategies in writing,

Pomerantz and Kearney (2012) conducted a narrative inquiry which focused on

the stories of one ELL graduate student about her writing process and the conversations she had about her writing with writing coaches. They found that, for their participant, the writing process involved writing many drafts with added illustrations and notes, which may be considered cognitive strategies. The participant was frustrated by her process, yet she did not view this lengthy process or frustration as related to her multilingualism, just as a part of the writing process. The participant's accepting attitude towards her writing process may be considered an affective strategy.

The above section explains the different strategies that are used by ELLs while composing. Strategies can be affective, cognitive, metacognitive, metalinguistic, or others. The use of strategies in the writing process helps writers organize their thoughts and regulate their writing in order to attain their academic writing goals.

2.10   Use of Resources in Writing

Writers use various resources to plan for and meet their writing goals, so resources are considered as a strategy here. Collaborative writing, translation/backtranslation, plagiarism, and accessing university supports will be discussed in this section as strategies used by multilinguals in the writing process.

Poe (2013) conducted a longitudinal case study of one international graduate student in the United States who was enrolled in an English

communication course. Over the course of the study, Poe (2013) began to see

the context around the participant and all of the different factors at the university

that affected him and his writing development (p. 177). The researcher noted the

extent to which the participant was mentored by the other engineers in his lab, as

well as internationally. The participant was mentored by and wrote

collaboratively with other researchers in his community of practice, thus learning

key skills in his profession, grant-writing and publishing (Poe, 2013). Results

showed that the participant made fruitful use of his resources, which, in this

case, were more experienced researchers in his laboratory by seeking out

opportunities to be mentored as a writer within his community of practice.

In a much larger, mixed-method study of postsecondary-level English

language learners and their use of strategies, Singh (2017) conducted a study of

70 international graduate students in Malaysia to investigate the strategies used

by the students to learn academic English writing style. The questions focused

on the steps the students took in order to write their essays, resources used,

location of writing, as well as overall feelings about English academic writing.

Singh's (2017) results showed that the graduate students used a very wide

variety of strategies to write their English essays. They translated their writing

from their mother tongue to English [backtranslation]; used plagiarism; read

mentor texts; memorized; used external resources (dictionary, Google, social

media, electronic dictionary/thesaurus and/or Google translate); accessed

university academic support services for graduate students; used paid editors;

used of student services editing service; used IELTS preparation to improve their writing; used friends' or relatives as editors; requested faculty members input into their writing. In Singh (2017), plagiarism was depicted as a study strategy without any judgment attached, and therefore may possibly be considered a strategy used to help multilingual writers meet their academic writing goals. Singh uncovered the use of a range of mostly cognitive and metacognitive strategies used by English language learner multilinguals in the academic writing and revision process.

Dictionary use for translation and/or backtranslation, as a function of monitoring the writing process has shown varied results (Anderson, 2008; Leki et al., 2008). It was noted that using a dictionary makes the writing process take longer (Skibniewski & Skibniewska, 1986, as cited in Leki et al., 2008, loc. 2828 of 9504). The outcome of the dictionary use depends more on the user's ability to discern between lexical options (Christianson, 1997, as cited in Leki et al., 2008, loc. 2843 of 9504), which connects to language proficiency. Victori's results showed the weaker writers made less use of resources such as dictionaries to revise their word choices (1999, p. 550). The use of dictionaries in multilinguals' writing is important as it is one of the material resources that is available to develop a text during the writing and revision process; further, it can be a tool in the strategy of translation and/or backtranslation during the writing process. Finally, the use of dictionaries in translation and/or backtranslation is a strategy that may be used in the translanguaging process.

This section reviewed the use of different resources which range from seeking help from more experienced writers through co-writing and mentorship, using editing services, and plagiarizing in multilinguals' academic writing process. The use of material resources as a strategy, such as the use of dictionaries (paper or electronic), the use of mentor texts, and accessing supports for writing were also reviewed.

2.11   Translanguaging as a Writing Strategy

Multilinguals and English language learners may choose to flip fluidly between languages when they communicate; this phenomenon has come to be known as translanguaging. Van Weijen et al. (2009) examined "writers' use of their first language (L1) while writing in their second language (L2)" (p. 235) in a population of 20 undergraduate English majors in Holland. The participants wrote essays in their mother tongue and English (additional language) while using a think aloud protocol. Results showed that all participants used their mother tongue in writing English to some extent. The undergraduates in the study would revert back to their mother tongue when they felt too challenged by the cognitive load of the task (van Weijen et al., 2009). This result was also mirrored by Rana (2018), as below.

Rana's (2018) results showed that the multilingual undergraduate students in his study used their mother tongues to perform a variety of functions in English writing, such as: "generating ideas, planning their essays, finding the

appropriate target language vocabulary, back-translating the L2 text into their native language, reducing the cognitive load, making a note of the ideas that emerge in course of writing and summarizing what they have read for writing and mediating the texts they have read for collecting information for writing and composing essays" (Rana, 2018, p. 57). Some of Rana's (2018) participants reported a benefit to their English writing from their mother tongue use, while others reported it as a disadvantage.

Wang and Wen (2002), in a study of 16 English learners at a university in China, used a think-aloud during a narrative and an argumentative essay. They found that using the mother tongue while composing was quite common (Wang & Wen, 2002, p. 225). Their findings show mother tongue use for preparing and planning for the writing task, which is also a cognitive/metacognitive strategy. Further, Wang and Wen's (2002) reported more use of the additional language during metalinguistic activities, such as "task-examining and text-generating" which are monitoring strategies (Wang & Wen, 2002, p. 225). Lastly, mother tongue use diminished with increased additional language development, which is in line with other additional language research.

This section has shown that multilinguals use translanguaging between their mother tongue and an additional language as a cognitive, metacognitive, and metalinguistic strategy in planning, monitoring, and evaluating their academic writing. The next section will explore mother tongue use while writing

and some connections to language proficiency.

2.12 Mother Tongue Use while Writing and English Proficiency

A small number of international studies have been conducted on the use of the mother tongue in additional language writing, and results suggest a relationship between mother tongue use and additional language proficiency. Roca de Larios et al. found that use of the mother tongue in additional language writing occurs more frequently in writers who are less proficient in the target language (as cited in Manchon & Matsuda, 2018). They noted incidences of translation and mother tongue use in English additional language writing with the goal of understanding the task or the planning of writing. Writers switched back and forth between their mother tongue and English while writing in English as a metacognitive strategy.

The use of mother tongue in writers who are less proficient in the additional language and its use as a metacognitive strategy aligns with Garcia and Kano's (2014) differentiation between two types of translanguaging based on level of English proficiency (as cited in Garcia & Wei, 2014). Garcia and Kano, as cited in Garcia & Wei (2014) denote the translanguaging practices of established bilinguals (or multilinguals) as following an "independent translanguaging pattern" (loc. 1657). They explain translanguaging as different depending on the level of proficiency in the target language. For language learners, they see switching between languages as following a "dependent

translanguaging pattern, whereas experienced bilinguals tend to use a more

independent translanguaging pattern" (Garcia & Kano, as cited in Garcia & Wei,

2014, loc. 1657). Furthermore, in the case of different types of translanguaging

related to proficiency, the learners' *purposes* for translanguaging would be

distinct in either level of bilingual proficiency. Established bilinguals use

translanguaging to use metacognitive strategies, while English language learners

use translanguaging to perform lower level functions, such as verifying meaning.

Thus, mother tongue use while writing in an additional language (e.g., English)

and English proficiency are closely related, yet they appear to occur to fulfill

different languaging needs.

2.13   The Effect of Aptitude in Mother Tongue Writing on Additional

          Language Writing

   Translanguaging has been linked to aptitude in mother tongue writing, as well

as to high levels of literacy in the mother tongue. Results from Van Weijen et al.

(2009) showed that mother tongue use while writing in an additional language

(English) was linked to aptitude for writing in the mother tongue; those who

were weaker writers in their mother tongue reverted to it more frequently while

writing in the additional language (van Weijen et al., 2009). Conversely, Ferris

and Hedgecock noted that use of the mother tongue in the writing process

occurred frequently when there was a high level of literacy in the mother

tongue, which facilitated the retrieval and transfer of ideas from prior learning

(as cited in Rana, 2018). In this case, translanguaging may be a retrieval strategy

used by multilinguals with well-developed mother tongue literacy to access knowledge in their mother tongue.

In sum, translanguaging while writing in English has been linked to both strong and weak mother tongue writers. Both stronger and weaker additional language writers revert to the mother tongue when writing in an additional language, albeit for different reasons. The stronger mother tongue writers revert to their mother tongue in order to transfer knowledge and skills (Ferris & Hedgecock, as cited in Rana, 2018). High levels of literacy in the mother tongue transfers into higher levels of literacy in new language. Weaker mother tongue writers may revert to their mother tongue when writing in an additional language as a strategy to access needed vocabulary (Van Weijen et al., 2009), although more research is needed in this area. Thus, one should look closely at the learner's level of writing aptitude in their mother tongue, as well as the learner's proficiency in the additional language, English in this case. This research can help explain the meaning of translanguaging in multilingual writers.

2.14   Direct Translation as a Strategy

Use of translation from the mother tongue to the additional language was noted in the writing process, either in the form of direct translation of an essay into the additional language, or sentence by sentence translation (Gosden, 1996, as cited in Leki et al., 2008, loc. 2805 of 9504; Zamel, 1982, as cited in Leki et al., 2008, loc. 2805 of 9504). Singh's (2017) participants discussed combining

two strategies, plagiarism and translation to advance their academic writing. Singh stated "findings indicate that students have resorted to translating academic work in English language into their L1 for reference and producing new academic work in English language based on their understanding in L1 source" (Singh, 2017, p. 637). Raimes (1985) describes her participants' first language and addresses the use of their mother tongue in the writing process (Table 2 - Selected Responses to Questionnaire, p. 239). Leki et al. (2008) note that lower proficiency in the additional language led to more switching between languages and first language use during revision.

2.15   Backtranslation as a Strategy

The practice of backtranslating or backtranslation refers to translating a text that has been written in an additional language into the writer's mother tongue to verify the text's meaning (Rana, 2018). This may be considered a metacognitive strategy as it is used at the planning and preparation level, as well as at the monitoring level to ensure comprehension and accuracy of message. Backtranslation is noted and explored in research (Manchon et al., 2007, as cited in Roca de Larios et al., 2018; Rana, 2018; Singh, 2017; Wang, 2003, as cited in Roca de Larios et al., 2018). Backtranslation is a strategy used when the writer is having difficulty writing in the additional language. Backtranslation is classed with other mother tongue-based writing strategies such as "restructuring, paraphrasing, generation of synonyms, segregation of the intended meaning into manageable L2 items" (Manchon et al., 2007, as cited in Roca de Larios et al.,

2018, p. 278; Wang, 2003, as cited in Roca de Larios et al., 2018, p. 278).

In Rana's (2018) qualitative case study of 18 participants of enrolled in a Basic Writing Course at a university in the United States, incidences of "backtranslating" (p. 63) were noted, i.e., participants were noticed translating what they had written in English into their mother tongue to verify their meaning at the lexical level. Rana (2018) reports that "For many multilingual writers composing essays in English is a bilingual event, because they are likely to use their L1s consciously or subconsciously while writing academic essays as they tend to view their L2 through the perspectives of their L1s" (p. 99). This raises the very important point that even though a multilingual writer may choose to write in one language or another, writing for a multilingual is always "a bilingual event" (Rana, 2018, p. 99) because the multilinguals' linguistic repertoire is ever present. Moreover, the writing strategies used by multilinguals will automatically call on any of the cognitive resources at their disposition; the brain cannot turn off knowledge of a language.

Thus, backtranslation is a strategy rooted in the mother tongue which is used by multilinguals to fill different needs in the writing process. It can be used to verify meaning, to paraphrase, and/or to find lexical options. Backtranslation is similar to translanguaging in that it involves moving back and forth between multiple languages; however, translanguaging differs from backtranslation in that translanguaging is very fluid and backtranslation is very analytical and task

focused, i.e., the opposite of fluid. Nonetheless, backtranslation is one of the several languaging strategies noted in the literature as a fairly common strategy used by multilinguals during their writing process.

2.16   Conclusion

This review of literature explained the theoretical background for this research project, which brings together the culturally and linguistically diverse approach to learning, the contextual factors in multilingual writing, the theory of fluid multilingualism, the academic literacies approach to writing, as well as theories of additional language use. The preceding section reviewed the literature on the writing practices of multilingual postsecondary students. Features of writing by English language learners were examined, such as strategies in the writing process, preparing to write, and use of resources in writing. Linguistic occurrences such as translanguaging, backtranslating, and translation were explored. Finally, the influence of English proficiency on English language learner writing, as well as the influences of mother tongue writing aptitude and literacy in the mother tongue on English writing were explored.

The purpose of this thesis was to learn in detail about the cognitive and strategic steps used by seven postsecondary students as they wrote their university essays. Areas of concern were the steps the participants took in the writing process, in terms of planning, strategies, and revision. Other areas of concern were the way the participants felt about their multilingualism,

knowledge of certain features of academic writing, whether this was due to prior knowledge from the home country, and what sorts of resources were drawn upon for assistance during the writing of academic papers.

Based on the above review of literature, it is noted that the body of research on the writing process and writing strategies of multilingual postsecondary students is international, albeit with limited Canadian research. The issue of writing strategies and writing process have not been studied together in previous studies. As such, this topic has not been adequately addressed in the literature to date, particularly in the Canadian context. As such, the current study aims to fill this gap in the literature by offering an in-depth analysis of the descriptions of the writing process and writing strategies of multilingual postsecondary students at a mid-sized Canadian university.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The previous chapter offered a review of the literature in this field and explained the gaps in the current research. The purpose of the current chapter is to explain the methodology and provide a rationale for each step in the process. As such, this section will explain the research paradigm in use and the methodology; next, a description of the sampling, procedures, and subjects will be provided; finally, the data collection and analysis strategies, researcher role, validity, and ethical considerations will all be addressed.

3.1   Paradigm

A qualitative research paradigm is used in the current project. This is appropriate to the current research problem because it is appropriate when one seeks to learn more about the experiences of the participants through field research (Merriam, 1998). In this case, the research focuses on the participants' experiences of writing in a postsecondary environment. A qualitative paradigm supports the achievement of the purpose of this research by using the researcher as a tool for conducting research and by collecting rich, detailed samples from seven sources (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). A qualitative design with semi-structured individual interviews was chosen because it allows more personal, rich, and detailed data to be collected, and attempts to access an authentic representation of the participants' experience (Creswell, 2015). The method of semi-structured individual interviews allowed the researcher to tailor the interview questions to the participants' responses and situation. The semi-

structured, individual interviews followed pre- established questions (Leavy,

2017). This purposeful sampling of interviews allowed the researcher to collect

rich data that was on target with the research questions. Interview questions (see

Appendix) were written based on the funnel technique starting with more

general questions (Leavy, 2017), such as about one's program of studies or

favourite courses, and leading gradually to more specific questions (see 3.2).

Thus, interview questions were designed to probe the participants' experience and

choices.

3.2   Overview of the Research Design

The research design is a basic qualitative design (Merriam & Tisdell,

2016). The current research project used individual interviews to learn as much

as possible in a limited period of time about the writing processes and composing

strategies of the participant population. The unit of analysis was the participants'

interviews about their university writing experiences. The purpose of the chosen

research design was to gather personal experiences about the composing

processes of multilingual students at a mid-sized postsecondary institution in

eastern Canada. A qualitative interview approach was chosen so that each of the

participants could be situated in their own context and rich details collected in

the data (Cumming, 2001; Garcia & Lin, 2014; Kinloch & Burkhard, 2016).

After the interviews, the data was transcribed and then analyzed multiple times

based on the description in section 3.6 – Data Analysis.

3.3   Sampling Method

A purposeful sampling strategy was chosen because it enabled the researcher to select participants with certain desired characteristics (Leavy, 2017). The broader population consisted of students who speak English as an additional language. The sample size was small (seven students), yet an acceptable number of participants in qualitative research, as qualitative methodology provides rich, in-depth data (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000; Creswell, 2015).

In purposive sampling, the researcher chooses a specific slice of the larger population to include in the sample based on specific criteria (Cohen et al., 2000). Purposive sampling within a qualitative interview approach was selected due to the nature of the research questions, which required participants who met specific criteria; as such, a random sample would not have been appropriate. Furthermore, purposive sampling allowed the researcher to seek out participants who might be able to contribute rich data to this research (Cohen et al., 2000; Creswell, 2015; Merriam, 1998). In this way, sampling was purposeful and targeted. Merriam states, "The criteria you establish for your purposeful sampling directly reflect the purpose of the study and guide in the identification of information-rich cases. You not only spell out the criteria you will use, but you say why the criteria are important," (Merriam, 1998, loc. 830). According to Merriam's guidelines, this type of sample is appropriate because it represents

56

individuals who meet the criteria under study in the current research project. Individuals who do not meet those criteria would not help investigate the research questions. The researcher also asked participants if they could refer a friend with similar characteristics who would be interested in participating in the current study, thus encouraging snowball sampling (Merriam, 1998).

The purposive sampling was based on the following criteria, which are directly related to the research questions (Merriam, 1998). The participants in the study are adults (age 19 to 70), self-identify as speaking more than one language (fluently), and are registered as students at the postsecondary institution in question, who are willing to discuss their experiences with writing university papers and enter into an electronic correspondence with the researcher.

3.4   Procedures in the Data Collection Process

The target population was students at Memorial University of Newfoundland who self-identify as speaking more than one language (fluently) and from birth. All participants were between the ages 19, the age of legal consent in Newfoundland, and 70. The sample size was four undergraduates, two graduate students currently enrolled at the Memorial University of Newfoundland, as well as one recent graduate, totaling seven in all. A decision was made to include the two graduate students and one recent graduate who presented themselves for the study because not many students had shown interest in participating, but also because of the contributions they could make to the data

as more experienced writers than the undergraduates, although this decision was not a part of the original design. Recruitment was done through posters, word of mouth, and the snowball method, whereby the researcher asked participants to mention the study to peers with similar characteristics who might be interested in participating as well (Merriam, 1998; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016) at the Memorial University of Newfoundland (MUN) St. John's campus. A poster was designed and the researcher's contacts at MUN were asked to post them around campus. Potential participants emailed the researcher to schedule meetings. A small incentive of a $25 gift card was offered to each participant upon completion of the consent, interview, and any follow up. The project was approved by the Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research (ICEHR) at Memorial University of Newfoundland and followed the ICEHR guidelines in all aspects. All ICEHR ethical obligations were adhered to in the course of data collection. Research instruments and approvals are presented in the appendices.

Participants learned general details and selection criteria about the research project through the Recruitment Letter (See Appendix). The researcher then sent the potential participants the Consent Form by email (See Appendix) which detailed the project purpose, procedures, time commitment, foreseeable risks and benefits, measures to ensure their confidentiality, their rights to withdraw from the study and to have their data withdrawn. The participants gave their consent freely when they emailed the researcher their consent. The

study site for data collection was online, so the participants could be either on-campus or off-campus.

3.5   Stages of Data Collection

3.5.1   Recruitment

An initial email was sent to the potential participants to ascertain whether they were postsecondary students and whether they spoke languages other than English. A list of selection questions used to determine the eligibility of potential participants is included in the appendices. According to these criteria, potential participants were evaluated to determine whether they met the criteria of being students at Memorial University and whether they spoke home languages other than English. If so, they were contacted by the researcher and offered different options for dates and times for a video-conference. When a potential participant emailed the researcher, the researcher would reply and ask how many languages they spoke and their level of matriculation. One individual presented himself to the researcher as a potential participant, but it became clear that they only spoke English and may not have been a matriculated student, so they were not invited to participate in the study. Initially, not many students responded to the researcher about participating in the study. When the participant who was a recent graduate and the two participants who were graduate students emailed the researcher about being in the study, there were not a lot of other participants at that point; more importantly, they all had very interesting, multilingual, and varied profiles, so the researcher chose to select them for participation in the

study in the hopes that they would enrich the sample. Overall, the recruitment

period was between five and six weeks, from the period of start up of the fall term

to Thanksgiving in October. The recruitment was done in a batch. As such, all

recruitment was completed prior to beginning the interviews. According to

Merriam and Tisdell (2016), recruitment is complete once the point of

"saturation" (p. 101) is reached and similar responses begin to be heard from the

participants. One of the limitations of the current study is then that the number of

participants was decided prior to data collection, so that it was not possible to

take the concept of saturation into account. Bias was mitigated through the

recruitment of anyone who met the selection criteria.

3.5.2 Outline of the Interview

During the appointment by video-conference, the researcher

conducted a semi- structured interview. The individual participants were

asked open-ended reflective questions about what it is like to write academic

papers at this university (see the questions in Appendix). During the

interviews, the researcher made an audio recording and took notes.

3.5.3 Framework for the Interview Questions

Due to the grounding of the current research in an academic

literacies, as well as translingual approach, the interviews were designed to

focus primarily on academic writing. Other genres of writing within the

academy are outside of the scope of this project. Interview questions were

written (see Appendix) to provide the core structure of the interview, but the interviews were open-ended enough for the respondents to add what they felt was necessary. An open-ended, semi-structured, "funnel" technique (Lavrakas, 2015, as cited in Leavy, 2017, p. 140) was chosen for the interviews with the intention of making the participants feel comfortable with the interviewer before proceeding to more specific topics (Leavy, 2017). When using the funnel technique, the interviewer begins with general questions, then gradually builds a certain amount of trust with the participants, and then moves on to specific questions. The interviewer also intended to use the answers to the general questions to guide some of the specific questions later on (Lavrakas, 2015, as cited in Leavy, 2017).

The selection questions (see Appendix 1) were initially used to establish eligibility to participate in the study. When the scheduled interview occurred, the selection questions served as a starting point for the interview, for example, by asking questions about the participants' languages spoken and the contexts in which they were acquired and used. Next, the interview questions (see Appendix 1) were designed to start off slowly inquiring about the participant's studies and gradually probe deeper into their writing process. Examples of questions used in the initial moments of the interview are: "How is your term going? What year are you in? What is your major? Are you enjoying your major?" (see Appendix 1). Examples of questions used to delve deeper into the participant's writing process were: "How do you go about

writing the different sections of your essay? How do you go about writing the introduction? How do you go about writing the conclusion? Tell me more about how you write the different sections of your essay." and "When you feel you are done with your essay, do you revise it? If you revise it, how do you do this? Do you use software? Do you get help from a friend or go to the writing centre? Do you do anything else?" (see Appendix 1).

3.5.4 Follow Up and Member Checking

The researcher contacted the participants with a follow up email to clarify any questions from the interview, to send them the transcript of the interview if they wished to read it and to ask the participants if they felt the transcript adequately portrayed what they had said during the interview. This feedback on the data by the participants is also known as "member checks" or member checking and is used to improve validity of the data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 246).

3.5.5 Closing Out the Data Collection Process

The researcher thanked the participants for their participation by email and sent them the gift card for a coffee shop, as described in section 3.4 - Procedures in the Data Collection Process.

3.6 Data analysis

Saldana (2016) proposes that data is analyzed in a cyclical and recursive manner. According to Saldana, the first cycle of coding involves direct coding of

the data based on identified characteristics. First, I read through the data multiple times to get a good understanding. Next, the dataset was coded in two major cycles. In the first cycle, attribute coding was used to identify information such as setting, participant personal/demographic traits, and data format (Saldana, 2016). Next, initial coding was used after the initial readings to create some interim codes (Saldana, 2016). After that, process coding was used to refine the codes from the participants' described experiences. This consisted of an effort to group the raw data, previously coded into elemental methods, into larger patterns. In the second coding cycle, the categories established in the first cycle were reviewed and codes were either added or edited (Saldana, 2016). The second cycle concluded with establishing the themes in the data that appeared the most significant (Saldana, 2016). These themes are shown in Table 3.1: Meta-Themes, Themes, and Codes in Dataset. After that, codes and themes were finalized, as presented in Table 3.1. Finally, met-themes were decided upon, as presented in Table 3.1. An example of the coding process is as follows: the level one codes were assigned after multiple readings of the dataset "assessment of writing", "feedback", and "prof's expectations", became the theme titled "Expectations at University". I decided that this theme would be described by the meta-themes experience/inexperience, explicit teaching/finding own methods, and agency/following instructions, as presented in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Meta-Themes, Themes, and Codes in Dataset

Meta-Theme	Theme	Code
experience/inexperience	Affective factors	concern about being judged
		difficult aspect of writing
		dislike English papers
		dissatisfaction w Canadian educational experience
		fear of writing
		reprimand by prof
		shame
		stress
		study style
		worry about evaluation
agency/following instructions	Academic integrity	academic integrity
experience/inexperience		plagiarism
experience/inexperience	Expectations at University	assessment of writing
explicit teaching/finding own methods		feedback
agency/following instructions		prof's expectations
explicit teaching/finding own methods	Genre	academic writing
experience/inexperience		comparison of genres
agency/following instructions		critical analysis
		lab report
		summary
		technical report
explicit teaching/finding own methods	Learning to Write	emulating style
experience/inexperience		improvement of writing
agency/following instructions		learned to write essays
		learning vocabulary from textbooks
		papers they have written
		peer feedback technique
		what made you improve your writing
explicit teaching/finding own methods	Parts of Essay	conclusion
experience/inexperience		headings
agency/following instructions		introduction
		revision
		summary
		thesis statement
		thesis statement: topic statement
		thesis statement:hypothesis
		transitions

explicit teaching/finding own methods	Resources for Writing	dictionary
experience/inexperience		friends editing
agency/following instructions		Google as a writing resource
		Grammarly
		library database
		peer-reviewed journal articles
		revision: writing support
		thesaurus
		use of resources
		writing centre
		writing materials
explicit teaching/finding own methods	Stages in Writing	outlining
experience/inexperience		preparing to write
agency/following instructions		proofreading
		reading to write
		research
		revision
		revision: writing support
		summary
experience/inexperience	Studies in Country of Origin	prior education
explicit teaching/finding own methods	Study Skills	hours to write a paper
experience/inexperience		memorization as a study tool
agency/following instructions		translation as a study tool
		use of etymology
explicit teaching/finding own methods	Writing Strategies	routines for writing
experience/inexperience		translation
agency/following instructions		writing general

3.7   Validity/Trustworthiness

Prior to the analysis of the data, member checking was used to verify that the researcher's interpretation of participants' stories was valid. This process is explained in section 3.5.3. In writing the report on the data, the stories and experiences of the participants in this study were treated with utmost respect. In addition to respecting and protecting the participants' privacy, the researcher has told the story thematically with rich description, while being careful to portray the participants in a realistic and truthful manner. As such, the detailed description adds veracity to the accounts.

3.8   Conclusion

As this research is qualitative, it cannot be generalized to all multilingual students, however, the richness of the data allows for natural generalizability where readers can apply the findings to their own contexts (Creswell, 2017). This research is a snapshot of the participants' experience at a particular moment in time (Creswell, 2017). The small sample size is a limitation, as the results cannot be generalized as one would find in quantitative research, yet it is also a feature of qualitative methodology.

This chapter has explained the research paradigm, a description of the research design, and offered a description of the sampling method. Data collection procedures were outlined. The target population and sampling method were explained. The recruitment methods, informed consent, and data collection strategy were elucidated. The issues of data analysis, validity/trustworthiness, and ethical considerations were addressed. In the next chapter, the results of the data analysis will be presented.

Chapter 4: Results

4.1   Introduction

The purpose of the current study was to learn in detail about the writing

process and composition strategies used by seven multilingual undergraduate

and graduate students in a mid-sized university in eastern Canada. Areas of

concern were the steps the participants took in preparing to write and while

writing, in terms of prior knowledge of the academic writing genre,

metacognitive strategies, and the university resources the students accessed.

The study also probed the participants' perception of themselves as multilingual

writers and what that meant to each as individuals. It is in this context that the

following research questions were addressed in the current study:

1.   What is the writing process of multilingual postsecondary student

        participants writing essays at a mid-sized Canadian university?

2.   What strategies do multilingual postsecondary students participants

        use when they write university essays?

This chapter presents the results of the analysis of data collected from

interviews with the participants in the study. The analyzed data is presented in

tables which describe the participants' known languages and demographic

characteristics in Table 4.1 - Description of Participants' Known Languages,

participant profiles in Table 4.2 - Demographic Description of Participants, and

thematic analyses of the interviews with the participants. The major themes that

emerged from the data collection are analyzed and reported in Table 3.1 - Meta-Themes, Themes, and Codes in Dataset.

At the analysis stage, the seven participants who came forward to join the study had been randomly assigned non-gendered, invented pseudonyms. These seven individuals represent a range of mother tongues and additional languages from different geographical areas (sometimes within the same country), literacy histories, and report a variety of mother tongues. In Table 4.1 - Description of Participants' Known Languages, the languages known to the participants are described. The languages are listed in terms of L1, L2, L3, L4, and L5, meaning first language (or mother tongue), second language, third language, fourth language, and fifth language learned. The participants' knowledge of the language in question was described in terms of whether *they* described themselves as able to speak, read, and or write each language. No proficiency testing was conducted as a part of this research. The data under analysis is all based on self-reported information.

Table 4.1 - Description of Participants' Known Languages

	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5
Jessen	English - Read - Write - Speak	French - Read - Write - Speak	German - Read - Write - Speak	Russian - Read - Write - Speak	
Zachel	Hindi - Read - Write - Speak	Telugu - Speak	Punjabi -Read	English - Read - Write - Speak	Sanskrit -Speak - Read - Write
Ryid	Gujarati -Speak	Hindi - Read - Write - Speak	English - Read - Write - Speak	Bengali - Read - Write - Speak	Nepali -Speak
Hayron	Gujarati -Speak	Hindi - Read - Write - Speak	English - Read - Write - Speak	Bengali - Read - Write - Speak	
Saranie	Bengali - Read - Write - Speak	Hindi - Read - Write - Speak	English - Read - Write - Speak		
Jasmey	Sylheti - Read - Write - Speak	English - Read - Write - Speak	Bangla - Read - Write - Speak	Hindi -Speak	Urdu -Speak
Trex	German - Read - Write - Speak	Portuguese - Read - Write - Speak	Spanish - Read - Write - Speak	English - Read - Write - Speak	Russian - Read - Write - Speak

In Table 4.1 - Description of Participants' Known Languages, the demographics of the participants are described with pseudonyms instead of the participants' actual names. The gender and age of each of the participants is listed. Their mother tongue, country of origin, and current level of study or completion are listed in the table. In Table 4.2 - Demographic Description of Participants, it is noted that five out of seven of the participants were from India, although they had different mother tongues. They were also from different regions of India, although this information is not included. The preponderance of participants from one country may have been partly due to participants telling students they knew about the study, i.e., the snowball method of recruitment. Table 4.2 - Demographic Description of Participants also shows a range of ages from 20-27 with three females and four males. Four participants were undergraduates, two graduate students, and one was a recent graduate of an undergraduate program.

Table 4.2 - Demographic Description of Participants

Participant	Gender	Age	Mother tongue	Country of Origin	Level of Current Study
Jessen	Female	27	English	Canada	BA recently completed
Zachel	Male	22	Hindi	India	3rd year undergraduate
Ryid	Male	23	Gujarati	India	Master's
Hayron	Male	20	Gujarati	India	2nd year undergraduate
Saranie	Female	21	Bengali	India	2nd year undergraduate
Jasmey	Female	21	Sylheti	India	2nd year undergraduate
Trex	Male	24	German/ Portuguese	Germany	Master's visiting student

4.2   Participant Profiles

Kinloch and Burkhard (2016) assert that students' life experiences affect their learning and way of being in the world. Moreover, in the definitions of translanguaging used herewith, the act of translanguaging arises out of a contextual situational need (Garcia & Lin, 2014; Garcia & Wei, 2014). As such, participant profiles have been included to explain the participants' context and background as learners. As noted in the implications section, all languages spoken and language proficiencies were self-reported by the participants. No proficiency testing was given.

4.2.1   Participant 1 - Jessen

Jessen is a 27-year-old young woman born and raised in eastern Canada. She is a recent graduate from an undergraduate arts degree. Jessen is literate in multiple languages. Her mother tongue is English. She learned to read and write French before English, as she went to a French Immersion program from kindergarten through grade 12. In high school, Jessen chose German as her additional language. Later in high school, she had the opportunity to choose another foreign language. She chose Russian, and studied it for the last two years of high school, and later in university.

Today, Jessen is working full-time in an educational setting using French. She is considering going back to school to take more courses. She values travel to countries where they speak the languages she speaks, although she has not been able to travel outside of Canada. She has travelled to French-speaking

provinces in Canada two or three times and values these experiences highly. Jessen comes across as very well-spoken and eager to share her experiences as a multilingual. She is very descriptive in her use of English.

4.2.2   Participant 2 - Zachel

Zachel is a 22-year-old man from India studying applied sciences. He is in his third year of undergraduate studies. Zachel speaks many languages. Overall, he struck me as a very intelligent individual. Zachel self-reports that his mother tongue is Hindi, which he reads and writes. He also reads and writes Telugu, Sanskrit (he says at an intermediate level), English (very high oral proficiency). He reads Punjabi and Urdu (also intermediate level). Zachel is from Hyderabad, in south central India, where Telugu is the official language. Zachel lived with his grandmother during high school, as his parents were living abroad. With his family, he speaks mostly Hindi, although he speaks some Punjabi with the older generation and English with the younger generation. Zachel reports that, in second year applied sciences, he is currently learning material that he learned in high school in India. As a student in the applied sciences, Zachel does technical writing for his classes. He asked me if I was interested in hearing about that kind of writing and, after I said yes, he went into enormous detail about a technical report that he had written about a recent placement in a company.

During the interview, I found Zachel to be intensely engaged in his major and his studies overall. He had built relationships in his faculty and

sought a placement in a company, which he took extremely seriously. He came across as a very alert and intelligent person, hardworking, studious, and very keen to succeed. He was forthcoming with his answers and the interview went on for a long time.

4.2.3 Participant 3 - Ryid

Ryid is a twenty-three-year-old man from India who lives with his younger brother, Hayron (see participant 4, below). He completed an undergraduate degree in India. He is currently doing a master's in business administration. His mother tongue is Gujarati, which he spoke only at home. He also speaks Bengali and understands Nepali. Ryid reads and writes Hindi and English. Ryid began to study English as an additional language in primary school. He lived in the state of Bengal, so when speaking to a stranger, he would address them in either Bengali or Hindi. His parents sent him to a boarding school in Darjeeling for high school, where he learned to speak Nepali which he would use, for instance, if he needed to speak to a stranger in the street. The language of instruction in the boarding high school was English, which is a lingua franca in India, although Hindi is the official language (Schwartzberg et al., 2020). Overall, Ryid struck me as a very sensitive, perceptive and intelligent young man. He was in the middle of a master's of arts that he was not particularly enjoying, but there was no question that he would finish the program.

4.2.4   Participant 4 - Hayron

Hayron is twenty years old. He is a second-year undergraduate student from India studying applied science at a Canadian university. His mother tongue is Gujarati. He also speaks Bengali. He reads and writes English and Hindi. He has two sisters nearby in Canada and speaks Gujarati with them. He lives with his older brother, Ryid (Participant 3, above) who is also a university student. Hayron learned English in primary school as an additional language. He went away to boarding high school in another region in India. English was the language of instruction in that high school (see Ryid's profile above).

As an applied scientist, Hayron struck the me as a man of few words who communicates out of necessity, rather than desire. His answers were clipped and he gave minimal detail. He described actions in terms of steps taken. He showed interest in his major and appeared disinterested in courses not related to his major.

4.2.5   Participant 5 - Saranie

Saranie is a 19-year-old female who is a second-year undergraduate student in life science. She is from India and her mother tongue is Bengali. She learned her second language, Hindi, at approximately age two or three. She reports learning Hindi from watching television and reading the closed captions, then later learning to read and write Hindi in school. She learned English as an additional language, her third language, at approximately age four or five, when

she started primary school. The last two years of Saranie's high school in India were fully in English. She reported that her studies were going well. She takes a full course load of five courses with labs, as well as works at two part-time jobs. Saranie comes across as extremely focused and engaged by her studies. She takes her studies very seriously. Saranie's plan after graduation is to remain in Canada and work, if possible. She is a highly motivated young woman who comes across as very bright and studious.

4.2.6   Participant 6 - Jasmey

Jasmey is a 19-year-old female from India. She is beginning her second year of undergraduate studies in life science. Her mother tongue is Sylheti, which she tells me is spoken by millions of people in Assam, India. Jasmey's mother's mother tongue is also Sylheti. She learned to read Sylheti at home with her mother. At age two, Jasmey was sent to religious school where she learned to read and write Arabic. Next, when she went to national school at age four or five, Jasmey learned Bangla, which is her national language. She started learning English as an additional language at age four or five, also, but she began to study it more in depth starting at age ten. Later on, as an adolescent, Jasmey learned to speak, understand, and read Hindi and Urdu for cultural reasons, but she does not write them. She was exposed to Hindi and Urdu through watching television with Hindi and Urdu subtitles, which she learned to read. Jasmey also learned to speak Hindi and Urdu socially, through her school friends. In total, Jasmey speaks six languages and is literate in four. Jasmey's parents are from

Bangladesh. They can read Arabic, speak their mother tongue, Sylheti, speak Bangla with an accent, and also speak a few words of English.

Jasmey did an exchange program to the United States during high school. There, she learned certain foundations of writing which she applies to her current university writing. Jasmey was enjoying her major in life sciences in Canada, yet she reported that there were many scientific terms to learn and that understanding the question for an essay or an exam is sometimes a challenge for her. This could indicate that, although her English met the required testing level to enter university as an international student, her reading and writing proficiency levels were not as high as they should have been.

Overall, Jasmey appeared to be culturally and linguistically overwhelmed by the experiences she was having at university in Canada. Her multilingualism seemed to support interpersonal connections and relationships, but her written English proficiency may have been a bit low for academic writing and that has caused some stress. She mentioned that she needed more instruction and feedback on writing prior to evaluation. She also noted an incident that seems significant where she received harsh feedback on her writing from her professor. Her tone indicated that she was deeply hurt by the incident. Jasmey said she did not like academic writing as a result of that incident.

4.2.7   Participant 7 - Trex

Trex is a 24-year-old German male who is an exchange student in a

master's program in the natural sciences. He is on an exchange in Canada for one term, as opposed to five out of seven of the other students who were international students with the intention of doing their entire degree in Canada. Trex came to Canada to improve his English.

Trex's mother tongue and primary language of literacy is German, which he speaks with his father and in Germany. His second mother tongue is Portuguese, which he speaks with his Brazilian mother. He learned Spanish and English in middle school and high as additional languages, so Trex can read and write in both Spanish and English. He learned Russian at age 22 as the result of a few months' travel to Russia where he made friends. Trex reports that he reads and writes all five languages (German, Portuguese, English, Spanish, and Russian). Trex reports that today, in Canada, he uses mostly English and German on a daily basis. He writes in Russian and German via email from Canada every day.

Trex was one of two graduate student participants in the study. He presented as someone extremely bright, interested in deep learning, with both sensitive and clinical sides. Trex had several factors in his favor as a student: he studied daily; he did not have a part-time job; he had already taken a course in academic writing as an undergraduate in Germany; and during the interview, his level of spoken English proficiency was quite high. These factors combined to help him achieve good marks on his reports, assignments, and papers. Trex

regularly received positive feedback from his graduate school professors, of which he appeared proud as he spoke of it often and offered to share his marked papers with the interviewer.

4.3   Summary of Participant Profiles

These participant profiles indicate a genuine dedication to education and personal advancement. The participants are students with a range of English language proficiency and prior academic learning. These youth are all very brave and independent, as they were eager to travel to the other side of the world to seek future opportunity through education. Most of the students travelled alone with no hope of returning home for years, although there were two brothers in the study who also had two sisters in the St. John's area. All of the international participants had learned additional languages for instrumental or social reasons. They came from zones such as Europe or South Asia, where multilingualism and learning to write and write additional languages are standard practices. The domestic student's motivation was different; it was based on personal interest and love of additional languages. Overall, these profiles indicate 1) diversity in English language proficiency, 2) dedication to postsecondary learning, 3) a strong propensity for learning additional languages and cultures to meet instrumental or non-instrumental goals, 4) diversity in prior educational experiences, 5) evidence of multilingual languaging practices in their everyday lives, 6) sensitivity to their professors' expectations, 6) a desire

to be academically successful, and 7) the use of a range of strategies and resources in the writing process. The implication of these participant profiles is that the university is recruiting highly intelligent, multilingual, driven youth to come and study in Canada, whether on exchange or to complete a degree.

4.4   Analysis: Emergent Themes

As noted in Table 3.1 - Meta-Themes, Themes, and Codes in Dataset, the themes that emerged from the data analysis were affective factors, academic integrity, expectations at university, genre, learning to write, parts of essay, resources for writing, stages in writing, studies in country of origin, study skills, writing strategies. The seven interviews generated an enormous dataset; for the purposes of the current study, the themes listed above and in Table 3.1 are synthesized to the following units of analysis: learning academic writing in Canada, the writing process, and the composition strategies of multilingual postsecondary students. The meta-themes listed in Table 3.1 will be discussed in Chapter 5 – Discussion.

4.4.1   Learning Academic Writing in Canada

As noted in the Literature Review above, it is important to approach culturally and linguistically diverse learners in terms of their whole profile as learners, to consider and value the learner's home culture (Kinloch & Burkhard, 2016). Moreover, it is noted that the learners' adaptation to the new country is more likely to be successful when their prior learning is drawn upon and valued

(Lorimer-Leonard, 2013). Participants were asked to describe the experiences they had while learning academic writing in Canada. Some participants had completed an undergraduate degree in their home country, but for the majority, the undergraduate experience in Canada was the beginning of their postsecondary studies, including their first exposure to professors, and their introduction to academic writing. In the case of the two graduate students, they had previous exposure to university studies in their home countries, but this was their first exposure to university studies and academic writing in a Canadian context. So, an important issue is that, in addition to learning the expectations around academic writing in Canada, the participants were largely adapting to a new country, new academic system, new language, and totally new environment.

Overall, a number of the participants mentioned that the professors who taught them to write essays were extremely specific in their instructions, for example: "The prof said, 'No matter what you are writing, you have to follow these steps'" (Saranie) and "I had to be very particular because our professor wanted us to use these topic statements for every paragraph," (Zachel). The participants did not appear to really understand why the professor was so emphatic about the steps or the topic statement, but they very dutifully followed the instructions. In the case of the participants who had attended high school in India, they were not accustomed to receiving such forceful instructions regarding essay writing. These participants seemed to accept that university professors

81

were very exacting individuals. Most of the participants complied completely with their professors' instructions in order to achieve the best marks possible, but one also had the sense that many of the participants truly desired to please their professors.

Zachel's professor made some comments about the conclusion of his paper, which Zachel took with utmost seriousness. For example, "The first essay that I ever did in the University, I introduced a new recommendation in the conclusion and my English Professor [sic] was very angry about that. He was like, oh that's not what you're supposed to do. And then he told me that you don't do this and from next time on I never did never introduce new things on the topic in the conclusion." It is interesting to note that Zachel thought his professor was "very angry about that" and thus, the reaction made a big impression on him and he remembered the advice. It could be that the professor merely meant to give advice and not be perceived as angry, but it was interpreted as anger. This sort of meaning-making may be based on very different cultural styles of stating specifications and making recommendations between India and Canada.

Another situation arose as one of the students, Jasmey, was not used to receiving direct, borderline blunt feedback from her high school teachers in India and the United States. For example, Jasmey's professor wrote on her essay, "Your conclusion is non- existent". For this student, that comment was disheartening; however, she felt that receiving difficult feedback was also part of

growing up and being at university. Jasmey reflected on the feedback she had received when she said, "Now [at university], you are treated like an adult". Jasmey later explained that she had some negative feelings about academic writing due to her professors' comments on her essays; however, the feedback given to Jasmey ("Your conclusion is non-existent") was not very detailed and did not explain the next steps.

For four of the seven participants, this experience of post-secondary studies in Canada was their first time in postsecondary education, their first exposure to professors, as opposed to high school teachers, as well as their first time living away from home. Two of the seven participants had previously experienced university studies as undergraduates in their home countries, so studies in Canada were new to them, and academic writing in English was new to six of the seven participants. Some of the students were taken aback by the difference in the feedback they received from their Canadian professors, as well as the intensity of the delivery of this feedback.

4.4.2   The Writing Process

Participants were asked to explain their writing process. In this section, their responses are recorded under five themes: preparing to write/routines; steps in writing; writing introductions; outlining the essay; writing conclusions.

4.4.3   Preparing to Write/Routines

With the goal of learning whether the participants had specific routines in

starting a writing session, participants were asked how they went about starting to write an essay. The participants described degrees of specificity in their routines. For example, Jessen had highly specific routines, whereas others (Trex, Jasmey, and Hayron) followed practices that were more open-ended, such as always going to a quiet corner of the library. Finally, some participants did not follow a routine to begin writing.

When Jessen was asked how she went about preparing for a writing session, she confessed that she had a ritual and asked the interviewer not to laugh. She explained how she would create a special space with candles, crystal, and incense all around the room. She would prepare pens of specific colors and start making jot notes. At the beginning of the writing session, she would tell herself, "I can do this. Whatever I make, I will not judge". She also mentioned that she was a fan of recording voice notes while in bed. Jessen's routine was a way of signaling to herself that it was going to be time to unleash her creativity and write.

When preparing to write an essay for the required English classes, Saranie would read the essay question a few times, identify what she thought was the most important aspect of the question, and then translate it into Bengali, her mother tongue. Saranie's goal with this routine was to understand the requirements of the essay questions or themes. Thus, for Saranie, her routine to start writing involved beginning with translation and understanding the topic.

Saranie focused on establishing meaning prior to writing.

Hayron and Trex both followed a simple routine of going to the library and looking for a quiet space. Hayron would get up early and get the essay done as quickly as possible. Trex would go to the library during the day between or after classes, but he would also work on his papers methodically day by day, as opposed to trying to write a paper in one day, like Hayron. Trex invested quite a bit more time in doing background reading and in writing his papers, as will be seen in the next section.

When Jasmey was preparing to write her papers, she felt the need to concentrate for at least three hours. She would go to a quiet spot in the library and focus alone. Jasmey disclosed some deep concerns when she stated, "I have a fear of writing". This fear of writing began after a professor gave her some heavy-handed feedback in her first semester at university. Jasmey was not used to having her writing criticized. She took it very much to heart, but developed a fear of writing essays as a result. On a positive note, Jasmey's major was based mostly on lab reports and exams, with few essays required.

In the sections above, it is clear that for both Jessen and Jasmey, preparing to write an essay evokes emotions, and both young women have developed routines which help them manage their emotions around academic writing. Both Jessen and Jasmey's routines were designed to give themselves the confidence they needed to write. In Saranie's case, it may be that her

English proficiency was not as advanced as the others', so she relied on translation. The male writers either did not follow a routine or, if they did, followed a simple one. Overall, about half of the participants followed a routine and about a quarter of them followed a highly detailed routine.

4.4.4   Steps Taken in Writing a University Paper

As a part of the interview process, the participants were asked about the steps they followed in writing a university essay. Overall findings were that two of the female participants (Jessen and Jasmey) were trying to *creatively* write an essay with qualities that were difficult to quantify, "something that has a flow" (Jasmey) and uses "beautiful diction" (Jessen). Two of the male participants, Trex and Zachel, approach essay writing from their individual, highly methodical, systematic vision. Saranie, like Trex and Zachel, the third female participant, is also methodical and structured in her approach, but she was guided by her professors' instructions about the structure of paragraphs and essays.

When asked about the steps she took to write a university paper, Jessen explained her writing process in detail and referred to examples from her papers. First, she would "come up with a catchy title". Jessen told the researcher that, in writing university papers, it was important to use a lot of "beautiful diction," which referred to her choice of words. Next, she would come up with a hypothesis. After that, she would think of different ways she planned to "attack"

the topic. She would conduct research to confirm or nullify her hypothesis. On writing a paper, Jessen said, "You have to attack it". This "attack" strategy could be interpreted as sitting down for a writing session and focusing on really addressing the hypothesis and developing a solid first draft of the essay; this is the impression I received during the interview. The "attack" refers to the writer fully committing herself intellectually to her chosen topic through the physical act of writing a draft. The term "attack" also refers to a focused writing session as a battlefield. When Jessen gave examples of papers she had written in the social sciences, it was clear that she had chosen topics of personal interest, conducted data collection, and had been very committed to having the writing process culminate in a paper. Jessen was not a procrastinator.

When Jasmey was interviewed, she said the steps in her writing process involved, first, converting the question into "an easy English" so that she could understand the question well. She would then begin writing her first draft with a focus on smooth reading: "I try to come up with something that has a flow". Jasmey's routine also involved going to write in a quiet area in the library. She would go there "last minute", in that she did not have a schedule or a planned time to go to the library, but Jasmey also gave the impression of not perhaps investing the necessary time in her writing; however, Jasmey expressed being overwhelmed by her academic writing, discouraged by feedback she had received, and not really enjoying her major overall. In light of Jasmey's struggles with writing, her "last minute" writing makes more sense.

Trex reported that the steps he followed when writing a university paper began with reading articles, which "takes a bit of time". He would "scan[s] them, skim[s] over the methodology up to three times" for approximately three or four hours. While he was at the computer, he would write notes, comments and highlights on the PDFs of the articles, then "when I have an idea of what I can criticize, I make a note in a comment box". After this work reading and annotating, Trex would draft the assignment. He would then spend two more sessions of three to four hours writing. He reported that the "writing part is not that hard when you understand the articles". For Trex, the steps in writing focused on preparing to write.

Trex grouped his master's level writing into two types of assignments: the first was reading, summarizing, and critiquing articles to hand in; the second type of assignment was writing descriptions of his steps in solving science problems. His reports would include an introduction, a summary of the results, and a critical analysis. Trex made strategic decisions about which section of the paper to emphasize. He stated that he thought the professor was looking for analysis, so he invested most of his efforts in the analysis section. Trex explained that, in Europe, there are type one, two, and three assignments, and *analysis* is considered a type three assignment. He had been taught explicitly how to write an analysis in Germany, either as an undergraduate or as a graduate student, and he applied that experience to his writing at a Canadian university with good results.

So, it is clear to the researcher that Trex had been previously prepared for the written work he did in graduate school. His prior knowledge from his country of origin (Germany) had given him a distinct advantage, in that he knew exactly what steps to follow in academic writing in the applied sciences. The results for Trex were praise from his professors in comments such as, "excellent analysis". In addition to being well prepared by his prior studies, Trex was consistent in his study habits. Finally, Trex's English proficiency seemed quite high, but also, he invested time in lexical choice (as will be noted in the section on translation below). To sum up the steps in Trex's writing process, he would begin with close reading, annotation, and seeking points of critique of the assigned articles. Next, he would draft his reports, focusing on the analysis section.

When Zachel was asked, he enthusiastically described the steps he followed in writing a university essay. His first step was to learn about his topic by researching online and looking for "the perfect book". When asked how he looked for this book, Zachel said he looked for a "reliable source". He would look through many sources using One Source, the university library database, in order to find a detailed, organized book. He looked for a book with what he considered a "thorough definition" of the terms he was focusing on. After choosing "the perfect book", Zachel would then read the book, make sure he understood the concepts, outline the book, then use that outline to structure his paper. While writing the paper, he would look for other books as sources. Here,

Zachel told me that the most important part of a technical report is the summary that goes in the beginning. "If it's not perfect [the executive summary], then you won't do well on the report". The interesting point in Zachel's description of his writing steps is that he seemed very confident that his method of writing was sound. It did not strike him as unconventional that he was basically imitating the structure of the book, instead of reviewing the literature and then proposing a research problem based on a gap in the literature. It would appear that, although Zachel had taken a required English class, he had not been taught the steps of writing a review of literature for research. Another perspective is that, in mimicking the structure of a book he admired, Zachel was teaching himself how to write in his discipline.

Next, Zachel described a paper in which he was taught to develop an argument. He had written this for his English class and the topic was the use of mobile technology in classrooms. In comparing his research paper in the applied sciences (previous paragraph) to the argumentative one in English class, Zachel demonstrated his understanding of different academic genres when he said that "there was a lot of difference between writing a regular essay and a technical report". Regarding the English essay, he explained, "the paper has to be interesting while you're transitioning from one paragraph to another". He found it very difficult "sticking to the topic statement". He had noticed that "profs tend to downgrade [the paper] if you deviate from the topic". Similar to Saranie, Zachel has interpreted his professors' instructions as untouchable. Interestingly,

Zachel did not see that these instructions about "sticking to the topic statement" and "transitioning from one paragraph to another" could also be applicable to the applied sciences. He did not see how the writing techniques he learned in his English class could transfer to a technical report in the applied sciences. Zachel sought a model for technical research writing in a technical book, as opposed to or in addition to applying some of the stylistic techniques he learned in English class. Zachel showed resourcefulness in finding a model for his writing, as his English class only broached argumentative essays; research writing was not taught.

In terms of planning and outlining his ideas before writing an essay, Hayron said he would outline the essay, write it, finish his ideas, hand in a draft to the professor, make the professor's corrections, and then hand in the essay again. When writing an essay, Hayron would look up key phrases on the internet, type them in his own words, make sure the essay was the right length, and then submit it. Hayron was matter-of-fact, verging on mechanical, in his description of the steps he followed. He did not seem to take any interest in writing an essay and merely completed the essay-writing task as it was a requirement.

Saranie's steps in writing an essay were very different from Hayron's. Saranie reported that her first step, if she needed external sources for her essay, was to look them up in the university library. Next, she would "make a rough

sketch of what I will write". This included writing the first sentence of each paragraph and bullet points for the rest of the paragraph. Following this outlining, she would write out the first draft of the essay. Finally, Saranie would go through the essay several times "to make sure there is connection between the paragraphs". She would then review the essay further, focusing on grammar, spelling, and return to the essay question. Saranie reported that she has noticed a difference between essays back home in India and at university in Canada. For instance, a key learning moment for Saranie when she first learned to write essays in the required English class and in her electives was when the professor said, "No matter what, you have to follow these steps". Similar to Zachel, Saranie has interpreted the professor's instructions as inviolable. Saranie was also very dutiful in her approach to writing essays. In this case, the steps that she was taught appear to be leading her to success in writing, as she outlines before writing; however, Saranie was not far enough along in her life science program to have done any research writing, so one did not have the impression that she had yet written about a topic which inspired her.

Although the students are at different points in their students, there seems to be a type of divide between those who seek a creative vision (Jessen and Jasmey) when they write essays and those who rigorously apply a method that they have learned (Zachel, Trex, and Saranie). Those who followed specific steps gave the impression that they religiously followed their professors' instructions. They took an instrumentalist approach writing their essays, in that they viewed

92

only one way of going about it. The participants who sought inspiration may have followed certain steps that once the creative process had begun, but their priority was to start their ideas flowing.

4.4.5 Writing the Introduction

While writing his introduction, Trex would usually have a title in his head. Trex stated, "I always start with the introduction. It's a good way to start the session because it's the easiest". He reported that he would ask himself, "What is X? What is Y? How does this connect with another aspect of the topic? The introduction should explain the title and general topic". Trex uses analytical language to describe his thought process. The fact that he is a more experienced and confident writer also comes through.

When Trex thinks about an introduction, he thinks about the communicative function that the introduction should complete, i.e., what it should do in the essay. One might consider this a very advanced way of thinking about the structural parts of an essay. Yet one has noted previously that Trex was quite strategic in his approach to academic writing. He was strategic in his thoughts about writing the introduction to an essay when he noted, "I think for me the introduction is kind of kind of a good way to start into the topic. It's kind of general. I don't really have to think about the articles. I can kind of think it's a good way to start the session because for me, it's the easiest part." So, for Trex, starting with the "easiest part" is strategic because he knew it would get him into

the topic.

When asked if there are any particular things she does for specific sections in her essays, Saranie reported that she tries to put a bit of "creative flair" in her introductions. Sometimes she liked to start an essay with a quote or a definition in her own words. However, Saranie explains that the lab reports she writes in her major are very different from the way she was taught to write in English class. She explained, "you have to put a thesis statement in the last sentence of the first paragraph and every paragraph will have its own thesis statement". Saranie takes the professor's instructions to heart, yet she seems to combine it with her creative side. Saranie is exercising agency when she adds "creative flair" to her essays.

The major differences between Saranie and Trex's approaches to writing their introductions could be explained by the fact that Saranie is early in her undergraduate studies and Trex is in his master's. Trex is a much more experienced student with a repertoire of strategies and techniques to call upon when writing.

4.4.6 Outlining the Essay

Some of the participants reported that they outline their essays, while others did not. Zachel and Saranie said that they outlined their essays. Zachel replied in detail (see Steps in Writing a University Paper above) about his outlining technique when writing university essays. Zachel would look for a

library book that would best sum up the approach to the problem or issue he wanted to write about. Next, Zachel would copy the outline of the book and use it as the outline for his own essay. Zachel was very dedicated to following this method.

Alternately, Jasmey and Trex reported that they did *not* make an outline prior to writing an essay. Jasmey's reasons for *not* outlining were interesting. She said outlines did not make any sense to her. Jasmey wondered where to start with an outline and what might be included in one. She thought her professors assumed that she already knew how to write an outline because her IELTS overall score was good. When Jasmey was tasked with writing an outline for English class, she felt she had not had adequate instruction in writing these. After she handed it in, her professor marked it, but did not provide feedback. So Jasmey did not outline prior to writing an essay, but not because she did not want to. She did not outline because she did not know how and had not learned about outlines in her English class.

Further, Trex's reasons for *not* outlining were completely different. Trex reported that he did not write out an outline when planning a paper, but that he would have an outline "in his head" while he was writing his essay; conversely, Trex's routine in writing a paper involved extensive note-taking, which may have performed a cognitive function similar to outlining in helping him organize his thoughts and plan where they would go in the essay. Trex, as a skilled and

veteran university student, knew what outlining was and how to do it, yet he found that he did very well on his essays just outlining in his head. On the other hand, Jasmey, as a novice undergraduate student, would have liked to outline, perhaps as a type of scaffolding, but she felt that she did not know how and was confused by the idea, so she did not.

4.4.7 Revising

Jasmey, Jessen, Zachel, and Trex all reported that they revised their essays in different ways and using different resources (human or object). By far, the most zealous reviser was Jessen, who had a well-developed process. When asked about the steps that she took to revise her essays, Jessen said that she would first revise by herself and look for words that were "too jargony" or that she found unnecessary. Next, she would give her draft to a friend who was a generalist in the field and ask for feedback. Jessen did not use any software to revise her writing; in fact, when asked, she volunteered that she really disliked apps and never used spell-check at all. She used only paper dictionaries and said that she owned several in different languages.

When Zachel was asked about his revision process, he reported that he used Grammarly to revise as "the university gives it to us for free". He would also approach an English native speaker friend who worked at the university to ask them to edit his introduction and conclusion.

Trex does not revise his writing when he does problem-solving

assignments. He does, however, revise when he writes critical analyses. He proofreads them on the computer and adds the citations. In one of his classes, the professor had the graduate students give peer feedback on each other's writing.

Among those participants who revised their writing, there was a wide range of practices. Generally, all the participants viewed revising as a way to remove their mistakes in style or grammar. Trex had previously been taught to do in-text citation by one of his professors, so he was the only participant who indicated that he worked on his citations as the revision stage.

4.4.8 Time for Writing

Jessen explained that everything takes two hours "once you put the kettle on". In her reading and writing process, she would allocate approximately two hours to outline, two hours to writing, two hours to revising, and two hours spent with a friend to get feedback. Her motto was to "read every piece of work three times".

Jasmey reports that she dedicates about two hours to writing a lab report. She finds the genre of lab reports repetitive and struggles with the "set structure" of lab reports. Further, she finds it challenging that she does not receive any feedback; the professor only gives her a score.

4.4.9 Improving Their Writing

When asked about an experience that helped improve her essays, Saranie stated that writing many essays helped her the most. She wrote at least four essays in her first year of university, and felt more confident about her skills at the end of the year.

When Trex was asked whether there was anything that he had done or learned during his exchange experience that had improved the quality of his writing, Trex referred to a time when a professor sent him some information about different citation styles. This helped him learn how he was expected to cite sources in Canada. Trex states astutely that we write in styles we have read. In his natural science major, the problem- solving assignments are very textbook-based. He has learned transition words such as hence and thus from his textbooks, and successfully incorporated them into his academic writing. So, Trex modelled his writing on the discourse in textbooks to improve. Trex was able to incorporate feedback and write from models in order to take his academic writing to a higher level.

4.4.10 Translanguaging as a Strategy

Regarding which language she thought in while writing in English, Jessen said she would "flick back and forth," but that she was more critical in French and more creative in English. She felt more logical in French and would think in French when editing. On the topic of translation, Jessen first began to translate popular songs from French to English in order to sing them to an English

audience. She keeps four personal journals and has always "flick[ed] back and forth". "The languages that I chose, I chose because they had nothing else in common. There's no common ground because I can approach it from another standpoint."

Hayron said he uses translation in his everyday life, "if someone doesn't understand English, I explain in Hindi". Hayron could see many advantages of multilingualism. He reports that he is able to help new students on campus as he can understand their language; he can make friends with all cultures. "Everyone knows I can speak their mother tongue; they can greet me in their mother tongue." He sees no disadvantages to his multilingualism; in fact, he describes it in a positive light. Currently in his second academic year in Canada, Hayron reports that he does all of his academic writing and thinking in English, but that his program requires minimal writing.

Saranie is self-confident in her multilingualism as an added communication tool. "Because I know Bengali language, I can connect to people who speak Bengali more easily. It helps me connect on a deeper level with people and can communicate more easily". Saranie uses her linguistic ability as a social tool to help her in social situations.

In addition to social situations, Saranie also uses translanguaging to start understand the essay question and start writing. When preparing to write an essay for the core English required classes that she took in her first year, Saranie would

read the essay question a few times. She would identify what she thought was the most important aspect of the question and translate it into Bengali, her mother tongue, with the goal of understanding what was required. Thus, for Saranie, her routine to start writing involved beginning with translation to be sure that she understood the topic. Saranie used translanguaging to establish meaning prior to writing.

Jasmey explains that she speaks English at the Canadian university where she studies. She speaks Bangla with her roommates, but she texts in Sylheti. Some of Jasmey's friends speak Hindi as their main language, so she speaks Hindi with them. Jasmey usually thinks in English. Once in a while she thinks in Bangla and tries to translate into English.

Jasmey says, "as a multilingual, you can connect more with people, especially back home, because there is more diversity of languages". She notes that at the airport, here in Canada, she often translates for people who speak her languages, then they try to buy her food. "There is an automatic trust" when you speak the same language as someone. Jasmey meets new people at university because she understands their language. When she sees new people on the bus who may not speak English, she offers them information in Hindi or Bangla.

When asked about his multilingualism and his social skills, Trex reports, "it holds me back when there are a lot of Germans". He reported that there were many Germans on campus all speaking German, and that he felt this hindered his

ability to really have an immersive English experience in Canada. Trex reports that he understands people's private conversations when, for example, some Brazilians pass by, and he recently heard and understood Russian in a public space on campus.

4.4.11 Thoughts about their Translingual Lives

When speaking about multilingualism, Jessen became even more engaged. She reported, "That's what I'm living right now. I'm trying to forge an identity." Regarding linguistic uncertainty, Jessen disclosed that she felt shame at being an anglophone. She stated that there were "absolutely benefits" to being multilingual, but also that "there's a burden"; finally, she mentioned that she took "pride in being a multilingual and chatty person". She explained, "my chattiness and energy is part of my multilingualism". Jessen maintained that many things were better said in French or German. Ultimately, Jessen felt positive about her multilingualism when she stated, "multilingualism is the best gift you can give yourself".

When we discussed the advantages and disadvantages of multilingualism, Zachel said, "If you know how to manage things, it's an advantage. When I overthink it, it causes a sense of bewilderment", but then later he contradicted himself by saying, "in my opinion it [multilingualism] doesn't make much of a difference." He continued, "it gives you different ways of understanding things". When asked whether there were any disadvantages to multilingualism, he replied, "If you do not have good organizational skills, it can be a disadvantage,

but overall, it is an advantage". Zachel stated, "in my opinion, it [multilingualism] doesn't really give you an edge. A language kind of helps you form a bond more strongly." This appears to indicate that Zachel has mixed feelings about his multilingualism.

Saranie reports, "when I was small, I read literature in three different languages and it is an advantage for me". She maintains that being a multilingual is not more difficult. On the topic of potential advantages and/or disadvantages of multilingualism. She values her exposure to literature in different languages, as "being exposed to literature helps you develop an imaginative mind". Saranie is emphatic that there are no disadvantages to multilingualism.

On the topic of multilingualism, Jasmey feels that her multilingualism does not really have an impact on her academic English, but she finds multilingualism "exhausting". Jasmey sometimes finds it exhausting to speak in English. Nonetheless, Jasmey notes that the advantages to being multilingual outweigh the disadvantages when she said: "I haven't seen not a good side to it".

4.4.12 Composition Strategies

A strategy that Jessen used was to write half of her paper and "put it down" for a week to see if she viewed it differently or had misinterpreted anything. She would "come back with fresh eyes". Jessen stated, "You kind of go through a journey when you're writing it [the paper]".

Saranie states that a very important strategy that she uses is time

management. She allocates a minimum of four to five hours to write a 1000-word essay. She always takes the length of time she allocates. When she needs to write a lab report, Saranie plans for two to two-and-a-half hours. She says, "it's more specific; we know what we need to write" for a lab report. Saranie does not attend study groups as she feels they may not be beneficial. She reports, "When I have to study, I need to give myself the time; it will be difficult to connect" at a study group.

One of Jasmey's strategies for improving her English is reading books to learn more about writing style. She appears to take improving her English seriously.

4.4.13 Translation as a Writing and Comprehension Strategy

Some participants actively use translation and back-translation as a strategy for checking meaning when writing, checking comprehension, mental planning, or learning new material. Some participants use translation as a tool to analyze the ideas in question through one of their other languages to offer an alternate perspective. All of the participants have high language proficiency which enables them to rapidly switch between languages when they so desire.

4.4.13.1 Saranie

When asked whether she translates from Bengali, Saranie stated that she thinks in Bengali and writes in English. She does a live translation in her head. Saranie said, "I think of an idea in Bengali and then I translate it to English."

Saranie's conceptual thoughts are more easily accessed in Bengali, but she is accustomed to writing her thoughts in English. When she has a particularly difficult assignment, the first thing she does is translate the question to Bengali; she feels it is most important to understand the question; this shows that Saranie understands complex concepts best in Bengali.

When asked about an experience that might have improved her essays, Saranie stated that writing many essays helped her the most. She wrote at least four essays in her first year of university. When she writes a sentence, she back-translates it to Bengali to see if it makes sense. She reports that it is hard to make sure she has enough time to complete the essay. It follows that Saranie's writing process would take an unusually long time if she cross-checks every sentence by back-translating it to Bengali.

Nonetheless, Saranie expresses confidence in her language ability in English and Bengali which enables her to move between languages. "I think I have quite a good ability to move between languages. If I want, I can switch quickly, depending on the situation". This ability to rapidly switch is part of Saranie's normal language use and one of many linguistic skills she possesses.

When Zachel and I discussed being a multilingual writer, the topic of translation arose. Zachel explained a translation and memorization strategy he uses: "I write something in Hindi to memorize if I have to explain something to myself. I write that in Hindi, read it once again, then write it in English and read

it once again." Zachel sees translation as a sort of assessment of understanding. He said "If you can translate one thing to another in your head, it confirms that you know it." Zachel noted that he used to think in Hindi and structure his writing in Hindi, similar to Saranie. He has since begun thinking and writing directly in English, although he said he still uses Hindi first sometimes, followed by English. He said, "I first understand everything in my mother tongue, then translate everything to English". He does not write his essays in Hindi and backtranslate; he just thinks them through in Hindi as a part of his mental planning process, although he noted, "Nowadays, I'm thinking in English". So, it would appear that Zachel's language use for both conceptualizing and writing is more evenly distributed these days between Hindi and English. It is not clear whether Zachel is on a path to changing his primary language of thought to English over Hindi, although this appears to be a possibility.

4.4.13.3 Trex

Trex reported that his multilingualism definitely made it easier to write essays. He stated that he used translation, his knowledge of languages and etymology to assist him in his writing process. He stated that when he is checking the meaning of a word, he looks up the etymology on Google Translate. He then makes connections to other languages he knows and uses these associations to choose the best word to express his meaning. Trex described his use of translation as, "I translate some German expressions and try to get rid of that by looking at the etymology of words".

Three of the seven participants used translation as an articulated strategy in their meaning-making writing process. Each of the three individuals had varying levels of spoken English proficiency. Saranie was probably the least proficient in English and Trex was probably the most proficient, closely followed by Zachel. One wonders about the relationship between translation and additional language proficiency. A final point of interest is that Trex seemed to take a linguist's analytical approach to language, perhaps stemming from his classroom experiences as a student of Spanish and English as an additional language.

4.4.14 Use of Resources to Support the Writing Process

In terms of use of resources, Jessen said that she did not look for peer-reviewed articles when writing an essay. She did not know how to use the online library databases, nor was she very interested in using it; she said she preferred to go to the library in person. She said that when she had to read a book for English class, she would read it, then read online reviews to see the discussion and see how people interpreted the source. When asked about writing outlines for papers, Jessen said, "I have to have it right in front of me to understand it". To create her outlines, she would take the major points of the hypothesis she had planned to address and divide them. One outline would take Jessen approximately two hours to write.

Zachel went to the Writing Centre once or twice. He felt they were a good

help in the beginning of the writing process. He also described a staff member in his faculty who provides support with technical writing. Zachel had previously befriended this individual and asked them to proofread the executive summary, introduction, and conclusion of his technical report. When Zachel was asked about his revision process, he reported that he used Grammarly to revise as "the university gives it to us for free". He would also approach professional friends to ask them to edit key sections of his writing.

In terms of resources, Hayron uses Wikipedia and the library databases to look for articles. He does not feel it was necessary to go to the Writing Centre. Hayron does not use any software to correct his English. Regarding the use of resources, Saranie reported using an online dictionary to find more academic vocabulary. She was uncertain of the register of her own vocabulary: "I know the English, but that word would be very informal," so she reported frequently looking up synonyms on a thesaurus website. She also used Google translate. Saranie did not go to the Writing Centre on campus. When asked where she likes to go to write, Saranie says her preference is the campus library, which allows her to focus. When she is short of time, she stays in her room to write.

Jasmey uses Google Translate to translate word by word. She uses Google Translate to translate from Bangla to English, but notes that Google Translate is not accurate. She uses a synonym dictionary and different types of dictionaries as resources. She also uses the library databases.

Jasmey goes to the Writing Centre for help. She also uses the software Grammarly, as it "helps identify the issues". She goes to the Writing Centre to get started on an essay and then returns later to improve it. She says they give her "sets of questions". Jasmey likes to write on paper as opposed to electronically. She reports that she likes to feel the flow of the words and sentences on paper.

Trex does not use Grammarly. He looks up expressions online on Google. For example, he recently used Google Define to understand the word *ludicrous*. He uses Google Define as a resource, which he likes because it provides synonyms as well as etymology. Trex does key-word searches on Google Scholar when researching articles. He scans the references in the articles to find other sources. Trex had not been to the Writing Centre. He encountered the poster advertising the current study in the library.

4.4.15 Agency/following instructions

4.4.15.1 Agency

One of the meta-themes in the data collected is agency, which is conceived of on a continuum with following instructions. When the participants did something deliberate with the goal of producing a particular effect, they showed agency. There are many examples of the exertion of agency in the data. For instance, Trex showed agency when he made strategic decisions about which section of a paper he wanted to emphasize, based on what he knew about the

professor's expectations. He tried to strategically focus on certain sections which were more important to the professor in the hope of getting a higher grade. Another example of showing agency is when Jessen planned her routines and rituals before beginning a writing session; she knew that following these rituals would make it possible for her to do her best writing. Another situation when the participants showed agency was when they translated and back-translated essay prompts and sections of their essays as a part of their meaning-making and writing process. In this case, they said they wanted to see the words in their mother tongue quickly so that they could conceptualize their ideas and understand the problem.

When Jessen and Jasmey wished to *creatively* write an essay with qualities that were difficult to quantify, "something that has a flow" (Jasmey) and uses "beautiful diction" (Jessen), they showed agency. Saranie's wish to spice up her essays with "creative flair" is an example of showing agency in writing. They envisioned specific qualities in the texts they planned to produce, and then set about creating them. They showed further agency in choosing to create aesthetically pleasing texts, even though this aspect was not included in the technical requirements because it was part of their vision for their writing. Overall, when the participants resolved to take a specific strategic approach to their writing process that was in addition to the requirements, they were exercising agency in the writing process.

4.4.15.2 Following instructions

Following instructions came out as a meta-theme in the data. Following instructions is at the other end of the continuum from agency. Overall, when the participants were describing their writing process, a number of them expressed a desire to adhere exactly to the instructions both out of fear of angering the professor, as well as out of desire for a good mark. Hayron's writing process is a good example of following instructions, as he followed them extremely closely. However, he did not communicate that he was engaged by the process and trying to get a good mark, but this was evident in multiple points of his interview. Saranie followed the professor's instructions very closely. She took note of their instructions, "you have to put a thesis statement in the last sentence of the first paragraph and every paragraph will have its own thesis statement". Another aspect of following instructions is not doing something if we have not been instructed how. For example, Jasmey did not outline her essays; she did not feel confident doing so, as she had not been instructed how to outline. She said that her professors expected her to have learned how to outline in high school, but she had not and felt at a loss. In general, the participants took professors instructions quite literally and followed them exactly. Sometimes the participants appeared to interpret the instructions rigidly, but this was because they had received very strong directive feedback on their writing in the past.

4.4.16 Experience/inexperience

4.4.16.1 Experience

Trex is an experienced academic writer. He had a class about academic

writing as an undergraduate student in his home country, and has had time to

assimilate the learning into his practice. Currently, Trex is a master's student. He

has benefitted from helpful feedback on his disciplinary writing from his

professors, and he was able to incorporate their feedback to improve his writing.

4.4.16.2   Inexperience

Zachel is an example of an eager writer who lacks experience, but who

will certainly improve over time due to his efforts.

4.4.17 Explicit teaching/finding their own methods

4.4.17.1   Explicit teaching

Saranie and Zachel both interpreted their writing professors' instructions

quite rigidly. For example, Zachel did not see that these instructions about

"sticking to the topic statement" and "transitioning from one paragraph to

another" could also be applicable to the applied sciences. He did not see how

the writing techniques he learned in his English class could transfer to a

technical report in the applied sciences. Another example of explicit teaching is

when Saranie reported that her professor said, "No matter what, you have to

follow these steps" and she took that comment very seriously.

4.4.17.2   Finding their own methods

When Zachel decided to find a book on his paper topic and use it as a

model for the outline for his paper, he showed both agency and that he was

capable of findings his own methods to learn something. He showed that he could be a self-guided learner.

4.4.18 Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to present the results from the research questions described in chapter 1: Introduction. The participant profiles, as well as Tables 4.1 - Description of Participants' Known Languages and 4.2 - Demographic Description of Participants were developed based on the dataset. As noted in Table 3.1 - Meta-Themes, Themes, and Codes in Dataset, the themes that emerged from the data analysis were affective factors, academic integrity, expectations at university, genre, learning to write, parts of essay, resources for writing, stages in writing, studies in country of origin, study skills, and writing strategies. The units of analysis were one level higher than that of the themes and were learning academic writing in Canada, the writing process, and the composition strategies of multilingual postsecondary students. As such, the data revealed three primary units of analysis and many themes. In the following chapter, the research questions will be discussed in terms of the meta-themes (agency versus following instructions, experience versus inexperience, and explicit teaching versus finding their own methods) and their connection to the major concepts from the review of literature.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

In a globalized world in which Canadian universities are internationalizing, students from all over the world pursue degrees and exchanges at Canadian universities. In a multicultural country such as Canada, many Canadian students are also from multilingual homes. More research is needed about the learning experiences of multilingual international and domestic students in Canada, particularly how they learn to meet university expectations in composition and how they manage those expectations in the context of English when it is one among several of their known languages. The current research project came about as a result of working with multilingual students in a university and wondering how it worked for them to be multilingual writers at university.

Existing research on the composition process of English language learners at the postsecondary level (Emig, 1994; Lavelle, 2009; Perl, 1994; Sommers, 1994), second/additional language writing at university, as well as translanguaging in society (Frodesen, 2009; Leki, 2011; Ortmeier-Hooper & Ruecker, 2017; Roberge, Losey, & Wald, 2015) has much to say about these issues, but the topics have not yet been brought together in a Canadian context to investigate the manner in which multilingual postsecondary students approach their academic writing assignments in English, the steps they take and the strategies they use, as well as the resources they use. The current study on multilingual postsecondary students in Newfoundland, Canada adds to the field

113

of additional language research with new insights into the writing process of the multilingual university student population in Canada.

The purpose of this study was to learn in detail about the process and strategic steps followed by seven postsecondary students in a mid-sized university in eastern Canada as they wrote their university essays. Specific areas of inquiry were the steps the participants took while writing and preparing to write in terms of planning, strategies, and resources used. Other areas of interest were the effect of prior learning related to composition in the home country, strategic use of translanguaging in the writing process, and key takeaways in improving one's academic writing. The current project was designed to address the following two research questions: What is the writing process of multilingual participant postsecondary students at a mid-sized Canadian university? What strategies do multilingual participant postsecondary students use when they write university essays?

5.1 Research Question 1

What is the writing process of multilingual participant postsecondary students at a mid-sized Canadian university? The most related themes are the composition process, prescriptive instruction and adherence to rules, planning prior to writing, prior knowledge of academic writing, experienced versus inexperienced writers. In the composition process, the data showed that participants spent longer on the writing process, and this was similar to what had

been noted in the literature (Cumming, 2001; Raimes, 1987). For many, the data also showed that the composition process includes an element of creativity which makes the participants feel good; this aspect was not reflected in the literature. On the theme of prescriptive instruction and adherence to rules, the surface reading shows an eagerness to please the professor by adhering to their stipulations, yet a deeper reading could indicate more about cultural notions of giving and receiving direction. In addition, examples of writing feedback received by participants from professors did not line up with Ferris' (2018) recommendations for giving feedback on writing to ELLS. Regarding the theme of planning prior to writing, the data mirrored Victor (1999) in that some people practice it and others do not. Cumming (2001) and Leki et al. (2008) reported that more skilled ELL writers did more global planning; this was also reflected in the findings of the current study. Regarding the theme of prior knowledge of academic writing, the current data lines up with the literature in showing that prior knowledge can contribute enormously to ELL writing performance in the target language. The meta-theme of experienced versus inexperienced writers may be linked to themes of prescriptive instruction and adherence to rules, as well as to prior knowledge of academic writing, in that a number of participants were very early on in their undergraduate studies, had less prior knowledge of academic writing to draw upon, and may have been more vulnerable to critical feedback due to their youth. These themes were not reflected at all in the literature, nor were they anticipated.

5.1.1   The Composition Process

Raimes' ELL participants spent time on process writing (planning, revising, rehearsing, outlining, and editing) and rehearsing, i.e., "composing aloud" (Raimes, 1987, p. 461), which indicates a focus on meaning. Raimes' noted that her participants took more time to write because they spent longer on the composition process. This coincides with Trex's practice of going to the library and revising his papers for many days. Most of the participants reported that they revised their essays. Some used software such as Grammarly, some use dictionaries, and others asked a native-speaker friend.

Cumming (2001, p. 5) later noted that ELL composition takes longer as writers need to attend to the conceptual level and the linguistic level simultaneously, and thus carry more cognitive load. Participants reported between two hours to write a lab report to about ten hours to write an essay. Many of the international students had very tight schedules because they worked two part-time jobs at fast food restaurants, in addition to studying full-time. It is not clear if they did not spend more time on their papers because they did not have more time, or because they thought they were allocating enough time to complete the essay appropriately. Ultimately, it would have been useful for the participants, as well as the university, to know about Cumming's (2001) assertion that ELL writing takes longer so that they could plan appropriately.

Seeking an element of personal creativity in one's academic writing also

116

arose. Jessen and Jasmey both had a need to begin their academic writing in a creative headspace, but also to write an essay that had some aesthetic qualities, as in, "something that has a flow" (Jasmey) and uses "beautiful diction" (Jessen). These findings mirror Victori (1999). In his study, one of the weaker writers interviewed said, "I write according to my inspiration" (Victori, 1999, p. 546).

5.1.2   Prescriptive Instruction and Adherence to Rules

Participants noted that some of their professors were very exacting in the way they wanted their essays written, for example: "The prof said, 'No matter what you are writing, you have to follow these steps'" (Saranie) and "I had to be very particular because our professor wanted us to use these topic statements for every paragraph," (Zachel). The participants who experienced this kind of rigid instruction from their professors had not been accustomed to this type of exacting behaviour in their home countries, but they accepted it and complied completely. In complying, the participants followed the professors' instructions very rigidly, so that they, in turn, had a rigid view of the possibilities in academic writing.

Zachel explained, "The first essay that I ever did in the University, I introduced a new recommendation in the conclusion and my English Professor [sic] was very angry about that. He was like, oh that's not what you're supposed to do. And then he told me that you don't do this and from next time on I never

117

did never introduce new things on the topic in the conclusion." Zachel perceived his professor as "very angry" which made a big impression on him. A second incident was relayed by another participant in which the professor gave strong feedback, "Your conclusion is non-existent" [Jasmey], and the comment was interpreted as hurtful. In addition to showing an instrumentalist approach to academic writing on both the professors' and the students' part, these vignettes may also provide information about different cultural styles of stating specifications, making recommendations, giving feedback, and displaying anger between Canadian and South Asian cultures.

Ferris (2018) gives suggestions for providing "teacher feedback" on student work, with attention paid to clear communication and providing "expert feedback" on grammar and language errors (Ferris, 2018, p. 152). Ferris (2018) notes that both clear communication and grammar directives in feedback have been found to be highly valued in the ELL postsecondary student population. The quotes of professor feedback above "The prof said, 'No matter what you are writing, you have to follow these steps'" (Saranie) are clear, while others, such as "'Your conclusion is non-existent'" [Jasmey], are easily misinterpreted in the context of a written exchange instead of a conversation. More consistent, clear, and expert feedback that comes across as supportive is an area of university andragogy that could be improved.

5.1.3   Planning Prior to Writing

Victori's results showed that some ELL participants prefer mental

118

planning while others prefer written outlining (Victori, 1999, p. 546), which mirrors perfectly the results in the current study. The current study found some additional levels of detail regarding planning. Some of the current participants had developed routines prior to planning their essays which seemed to help them deal with their anxious emotions around academic writing. "I have a fear of writing" [Jasmey]. At the beginning of the writing session, Jessen would tell herself, "I can do this. Whatever I make, I will not judge".

Zachel had developed his own planning routine by copying the outline of a published book. He would then use this as the outline for his technical report. This participant, Zachel, was trying to meet his writing need as the students had been required to take English composition but not technical writing. Conversely, Cumming (2001) found that planning was linked to writing skill, in that more skilled writers spend more time planning. The current study found that the writer who was the most confident spent a lot of time reading and analyzing articles to be sure about meaning and points of critique, but not outlining on paper [Trex]. Leki et al. (2008) report that "more skilled L2 writers" showed evidence of more planning, outlining, big picture planning, revising and editing than less skilled L2 writers (Leki et al. 2008, loc. 2117 of 9504), so Zachel as well as Trex were on the right track, although they each went about it differently.

5.1.4 Prior Knowledge of Academic Writing

Prior to coming to Canada as a graduate student, Trex had taken a course

as an undergraduate student on academic writing for university. He had learned that there are type one, two, and three assignments, and analysis is considered a type three assignment. He had been taught explicitly how to write each of these types of academic essays at university in his home country and felt confident executing them.

Lorimer-Leonard (2013) demonstrated that there are significant benefits to learners when their prior literacy learning is validated and valued by the educational system in their adopted country. As such, perhaps the learner will benefit if the teaching methods show the students' prior learning and context in a positive light. Thus, a renewed emphasis on a culturally and linguistically diverse approach to postsecondary teaching could help increase students' engagement in their learning. In Trex's case, his prior learning of academic writing really put him on solid ground in Canada. He did not discuss his prior learning with his professors, but he felt validated when he received good grades and positive feedback.

5.1.5   Experienced versus inexperienced writers

Given that the group of participants ranged from a first-year student to a second- year master's student, there was a range of academic expertise in the group. It may be that the less experienced writers took their professors' instructions verbatim because they were inexperienced. Jasmey felt that she was lacking knowledge that her professors expected her to have, such as how to

120

make an outline, but she had never learned how to do that in her home country.

Overall, one has the impression that in the English class which the participants (except the exchange student) reported taking, as well as the other university classes where writing played a role, writing was presented in a decontextualized manner in that it was not anchored to a discipline, nor did it draw on learner knowledge. The skills of writing were not consistently taught and false assumptions were often made about what writing skills the students possessed; yet, when writing was explicitly taught, it was not connected to any real-world activity related to the academic world, such as writing lab reports, paraphrasing, writing research proposals, or research reports; nor did writing instruction, in most cases, draw on the participant's prior knowledge of writing or any other topic from their home country. Thus, the academic writing that the participants learned in their English class, as well as those in their majors was decontextualized. These practices do not follow research findings about teaching ELL writing *in context* (Cumming, 2001; Leki, Cumming and Silva, 2008), nor do they follow those regarding valuing learners' prior knowledge and lived/cultural experiences (Kinloch & Burkhard, 2016; Lorimer-Leonard, 2013).

5.2   Research Question 2

In response to research question 2, "What strategies do multilingual participant postsecondary students use when they write university essays?" the participants revealed a variety of affective, metacognitive, and interpersonal

121

composition strategies, including   accepting the writing process, using

resources, seeking mentorship, and translanguaging.

5.2.1   Accepting the Writing Process

The participant called Jessen had an accepting attitude towards the

writing process, the time, and the effort that it required. She prepared for her

writing sessions by setting up her physical environment and breaking the writing

process down into four two- hour sessions. She prepared all of her special tools

(coloured pens, dictionaries, crystals)   and then prepared for battle, "You just

have to attack it [the writing]". The accepting parts of her approach are

comparable to those of the participant in Pomerantz and Kearney's narrative

inquiry (2012). She did not stress about the writing process, perhaps because she

had employed these strategies to organize her thinking and her time for writing.

Further, Jessen's strategy is best described as an affective strategy, in that she

manages her thinking about the writing process in order to achieve the outcome

she desires (Gordon, 2008).

5.2.2   Using Resources

Jessen was the only participant who said she used paper dictionaries. She

was quite enthusiastic about them and said she owned several. The literature

shows mixed results on dictionary use and ELLs, depending on the writer's skill

at using them (Christianson, 1997, as cited in Leki et al., 2008, loc. 2843 of

9504; Skibniewski & Skibniewska, 1986, as cited in Leki et al., 2008, loc. 2828

of 9504). Interestingly, Victori showed that weaker writers made less use of resources, such as dictionaries, to revise their word choices (1999, p. 550). Conversely, Trex was a strong writer who was proficient in English (an additional language for him), and he used Google translate to look up words and study the etymology. The remaining five writers in the group did not report using dictionaries, on paper or online.

The use of dictionaries or websites in the composition process is a cognitive or metacognitive strategy, depending on the way it is used (Anderson, 2008). Trex described using resources to analyze and compare etymology across the languages in his multilingual repertoire. This is a metalinguistic strategy which requires advanced knowledge executive control (Bialystok, 1991; Bialystok & Craik, 2010) and was also reported by some of the participants. Further, some of the participants (Trex and Zachel) described analysis of and reflection on their thinking and writing, which are indicators of metacognitive knowledge and control strategies (Bialystok, 1991; Bialystok & Craik, 2010).

Thus, the use of resources as a strategy in the composition process may be linked to additional language proficiency or skill at using the particular resource. Moreover, using resources such as dictionaries (online or paper) is a metalinguistic strategy which demonstrates advanced executive control and which was employed by the most experienced and apparently skilled writers in the group.

5.2.3 Seeking Mentorship

The participant, Zachel, actively sought out mentorship in his field by opting for a placement in industry as well as befriending a Canadian staff member familiar with technical writing. This seeking mentorship mirrors Poe (2013) who studied an international graduate student in the applied sciences who sought out mentors in their research lab and elsewhere in the field. Seeking mentorship shows good use of one's resources in one's own writing community. Seeking mentorship in writing is an interpersonal strategy that is only addressed in the literature by Poe (2013), but it was effective for Zachel as well as for the participant in Poe (2013).

5.2.4 Translanguaging as a Strategic Tool

Van Weijen et al. (2009) and Rana (2018) found that additional language learners revert back to their mother tongue when they felt too challenged by the cognitive load of the writing task. This mirrors the reports by some of the participants in the current study that they used translation to get started on their essay questions and to make sure they understood the question correctly. As cases in point, Saranie and Jasmey described beginning an assignment by translanguaging to ensure that they understood the question correctly and to get key concepts in place.

On the other hand, Zachel and Saranie translanguaged fluidly and

consistently throughout the writing and studying process whenever it helped them move forward with the composition task at hand. Zachel and Saranie's translanguaging is similar to that described by Canagarajah (2006, 2009) and Marshall et al. (2012). The use of translanguaging as a strategy in the composition process highlights multilinguals' distinct translanguaging abilities which they use to meet their unique languaging needs (Canagarajah, 2006, 2009; Marshall et al. (2012).

Rana (2018) found that a number of participants used their mother tongues in brainstorming. The current findings, however, point to translation being used in understanding the question or the focus of the writing assignment, or at another point in the process if it suited their composition needs. Furthermore, Rana (2018) found that participants used their mother tongue for searching for vocabulary. Saranie described doing this and searching for the *perfect* word. Rana (2018) also noted incidences of "backtranslating" (p. 63), i.e., translating their English writing into their mother tongue to verify the meaning at the lexical level. Results from the current data showed that a number of the participants in this research used translation to get started on their essay questions and to make sure they understood the question correctly. These results are more comparable to Van Weijen et al. (2009). Moreover, Manchon et al. (2007, as cited in Roca de Larios et al., 2018) have noted incidences of translation and mother tongue use in English additional language writing used as a strategy to understand the professor's description of the assignment or in their

planning process of their writing. This mirrors the results in the current study quite closely.

Less skilled additional language writers need to perform the extra work of searching for the right words and structures, and this extra cognitive work can potentially take longer (Cumming, 2001). Thus, translating into the mother tongue and into the target language is has been described as back-translation (translating in reverse). This is one of the strategies used by participants in the writing process when they attempt to understand writing prompts. Cumming (2001) viewed translation and back-translation as a sign of lack of proficiency, which it may be, but it may also be viewed as evidence of the ease and fluidity of translanguaging (Canagarajah, 2006). Saranie described translanguaging as, "I think I have quite a good ability to move between languages. If I want, I can switch quickly, depending on the situation". Zachel also described frequent translanguaging from Hindi to English and back as a strategy in planning his essays, as well as at points in the writing process.

When Jasmey was interviewed, she said the steps in her writing process involved, first, converting the question into "an easy English" so that she could understand the question well. Saranie also described translanguaging as one of her first steps in understanding the assignment. Jasmey struggled with writing and used translanguaging to get started on her essays. Although proficiency testing was not included in the current study, Jasmey's struggles could

126

potentially have been related to possessing basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) and having a cognitive-academic language proficiency (CALP) that was insufficiently developed for the academic writing at hand (Cummins 2017; 1979).

Ultimately, the multilingual postsecondary student participants reported using strategies when they wrote their university essays that ranged from affective and metacognitive strategies to translanguaging. There was consistency on a number of points related to translanguaging theory and practice (Canagarajah, 2006, 2009; Marshall et al., 2012); however, more questions remain regarding use of resources and translanguaging as they relate to level of additional language proficiency and use of specific resources (dictionaries, online versus print) under specific conditions. Further, targeted research is required into (a) translanguaging for specific functions and (b) the use of dictionaries for specific purposes, in both cases as they relate to additional language proficiency.

5.3   Meta-Themes and Conclusions

The meta-themes found across the data were continua of agency/following instructions, experience/inexperience, and explicit teaching/finding their own methods. Agency versus following instructions relates to the notion of the culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) approach to teaching and learning, according to which pedagogy should pay attention to

students' lives, cultures, and prior learning (Kinloch & Burkhard, 2016; Lorimer-Leonard, 2013). The extent to which one demonstrates personal agency is heavily reliant on prior learning, in particular, prior cultural learning and educational experiences. The meta-themes of agency versus following instructions, as well as experience versus inexperience, and explicit teaching versus finding their own methods also relate to the importance of incorporating the learner's "context, identities, and practices" (Kinloch & Burkhard, 2016, p. 388; Cumming, 2001) into one's instructional approach. Doing so includes allowing speakers of additional languages additional time in order to adequately develop their cognitive academic English (Cummins, 2017). The continuum of explicit teaching/finding their own methods harkens back to Ferris' (2018) recommendations on providing feedback on ELL writing which indicate that clear, expert, and direct feedback on grammar and language errors has been well-received by ELLs at the postsecondary level (Ferris, 2018).

The participants in the current study showed agency in some situations (for example, when Zachel strategically befriended a professional writer in his faculty), but followed instructions extremely closely, as in all of the participants' adherence to the professors' feedback and instructions. Two of the writers were experienced, but the majority were early in their university years and lacked experience. Certain points had been explicitly taught by professors, such as writing thesis statements and paragraph development, but other aspects of academic writing, such as discipline-specific techniques for writing, had not

128

been addressed at all. This absence of instruction led the participants to find

their own methods for learning how to write within their disciplines.

Historically, multilingual individuals have been viewed in English-

speaking North America from a deficit perspective; these individuals were

viewed as deficient in comparison to the higher language proficiency of the

monolingual (Garcia, 2009). Over the past decades, there have been waves of

international scholarship first on bilingualism, then multilingualism, which have

demonstrated that multilingualism is not a linguistically deficient state (Garcia,

2009; Leki et al., 2008; Manchon, 2011; Manchon & Matsuda, 2018).

Furthermore, it has been established that multilingual individuals are very

talented at strategically choosing and using their language of expression to suit

their communicative intent (Canagarajah, 2006, 2009; Garcia, 2009; Garcia &

Wei, 2014; Marshall et al., 2012). The current research has shown that the

postsecondary multilingual participants in this study used one or more languages

as strategic tools to improve their metalinguistic ability when composing in

English. It has also been shown that some of the participants possessed

advanced affective, relational-interpersonal, metacognitive, and metalinguistic

strategies which they used to plan and organize their composition process, as

well as to analyze language in order to advance their composition process in

English. The current research has shown the participants to have many qualities

as learners, particularly intelligence, a broad general knowledge, and most

importantly, a powerful drive to succeed at university; yet, they also showed

themselves to be eager to please their professors which made them sensitive to feedback common in Canadian academia, which may be at times perceived as abrasive.

There is room for improvement in the way we approach this group of multilingual postsecondary participants. Current practices in many postsecondary institutions do not allow multilingual students additional time to develop their cognitive academic language proficiency, as advocated by Cummins (2017), nor do they contextualize learning according to research by Cumming (2001), Kinloch and Burkhard (2016), and Lorimer-Leonard (2013). Allowing multilingual students extra time in their program to develop their cognitive academic language could make composition in English, as well as coursework, less of a challenge. Finally, the antiquated deficit view of multilingual language proficiency creates an unproductive, stratified atmosphere on campus which is unsupportive, particularly given that Canadian universities market globally.

5.4   Teaching and Curricular Recommendations

Based on the review of literature and the findings from the current study, the following recommendations for teaching and curriculum may be ventured. First, although generalizations cannot be made from qualitative research, the data indicate that some of the participants in this study were not clear on what steps to follow in undertaking different writing tasks in their program, such as writing a

report or even writing an outline, and taught themselves to write in this way by seeking mentorship or reading about it. Using resources such as books and seeking mentors is a good thing, but in addition, one of the current teaching/curricular recommendations is that writing for research purposes should be taught in undergraduate programs. Further, writing should be taught according to each discipline, as opposed to writing in a general English or writing class. Writing for research purposes would include different elements for each discipline, but might include such topics as summarizing, paraphrasing, referencing, writing a review of literature, critiquing research, writing different styles of essay, and writing research reports. Within writing instruction, the writing process and how to write at each of the various recursive stages should be taught. All new students should be required to study writing in their discipline, regardless of their English language ability. No student should be able to "test out" of academic writing class. In terms of instruction focused on multilingual students, at the beginning of each term a series of workshops could be offered that would offer a review of academic writing, including the major points of the provincial high school curriculum. These workshops or online modules should be made available to all students, but particularly encouraged among newly arrived international students or any other student who may wish a review of the expectations in postsecondary writing.

Kinloch and Burkhard (2016) recommend that instruction be more culturally relevant to the students' lives, lived realities, and linguistic

131

repertoires. Culturally relevant teaching practices may help activate students'

prior learning and thus, assist in achieving positive learning outcomes. This

could be implemented by means of an institutional pamphlet, modules, and/or

webinar offering input, ideas, and suggestions on culturally relevant teaching

practices which could be made available to faculty and teaching assistants as a

part of new faculty orientation and teaching assistant training. Regarding the

giving and receiving of feedback on essays, professors and teaching assistants

might endeavor to provide consistent, clear, and expert feedback in a neutral,

yet supportive tone. An institutional pamphlet, modules, and/or webinar on

culturally meaningful writing feedback could be shared with professors and

teaching assistants, also as a part of new faculty orientation and teaching

assistant training. At the institutional level, a stance and vision on

multilingualism and translanguaging within a diverse student population should

be drafted, brought to student and administrative consultation, and shared with

all university units so that all are apprised of this approach.

    Future researchers in the area of multilingualism and writing would do well

to investigate the relationship between translation and additional language

proficiency, to probe the impact of providing culturally safe writing feedback,

and finally, to examine whether it is expedient to directly teach concrete writing

skills, such as notetaking, outlining, paraphrasing, and report writing, at the

undergraduate level.

5.5   Limitations of the Current Study

The first limitation of the current study relates to the fact that the majority of participants (five out of seven) were from the Indian subcontinent. This demographic imbalance was unplanned and simply occurred based on individuals who responded to the poster and met the selection criteria. All potential participants who met the eligibility criteria were accepted; the majority of applicants just happened to be from India and Bengal. This could be indicative of an enrolment trend at the Canadian institution where the research was conducted. The national origin of seven out of eight of the participants may have influenced the data collected in terms of possible parallels in prior educational experiences, cultural attitudes towards feedback, cultural attitudes towards multilingualism, or other factors, but this is speculative and outside of the scope of this paper.

A second limitation of the current study is related to the English language proficiency of the participants. The participants' English proficiency was not assessed as a part of the study. All of the participants would have need to have the minimum English language proficiency required to enter the university, but beyond that, there could have been variation in proficiency levels. This presents a limitation to the research, as there was no objective assessment of English conducted; the participants' description of their English proficiency, writing skills, reading skills, and all language skills were based on information conveyed to the researcher.

133

A third limitation of the study is that the participants' multilingualism was self-assessed. During the phone call between the researcher and the potential participants to see whether they met the selection criteria, the participants reported the languages they knew to the researcher, there was no outside assessment of whether the participants actually spoke, read, or wrote the languages that they said they knew. Conversely, the researcher asked about their proficiency and order of acquisition, and it would have come to light if a potential participant had cleaned to know languages falsely. In fact, one potential participant was turned away for this reason.

References

Anderson, N. J. (2008). Metacognition and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners* (loc. 1311 of 4186). Cambridge University Press.

Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. (2011). *Trends in Higher Education*, Vol. 1. Retrieved November 16, 2018, from content/uploads/2015/11/trends-vol1-enrolment-june-2011.pdf

Badenhorst, C. (2011). Academic writing: The key to student retention? *The Morning Watch*, *38*, 3–4. Retrieved from http://www.mun.ca/educ/faculty/mwatch/win11.htm

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Routledge.

Bialystok, E. (1991). Metalinguistic dimensions of bilingual language proficiency. In E. Bialystok (Ed.). *Language processing in bilingual children* (pp. 113-140). Cambridge University Press.

Bialystok, E., & Craik, F. (2010). Cognitive and linguistic processing in the bilingual mind. *Current Directions in Psychological Science. 19*(1), 19-23.

Botelho de Magalhães, M., Cotterall, S., & Mideros, D. (2018). Identity, voice and agency in two EAL doctoral writing contexts. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *43*(April), 4–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.05.001

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Writing to learn and learning to write by shuttling between languages. In R. M. Manchon (Ed.), *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an*

additional language (pp. 111–132). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Canagarajah, S. (2006). Toward a writing pedagogy of shuttling between languages:
Learning from multilingual writers. *National Council of Teachers of English*,
68(6), 589–604. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/25472177

Canagarajah, S. (2002). Multilingual writers and the academic community: towards a
critical relationship. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 1*(1), 29–44.

Canagarajah, S. (2009). Multilingual strategies of negotiating English: From conversation
to writing. *Journal of Academic Composition*, *29*(1), 17–48.

Canagarajah, S. (2005). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students*. University
of Michigan Press.

Cenoz, J. (2003). The additive effect of bilingualism on third language acquisition: A
review. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *7*(1), 71–87.
https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069030070010501

Cumming, A. (2018). Theoretical orientations to L2 writing. In R. Manchon & P. K.
Matsuda (Eds.), *Handbook of second and foreign language writing* (pp. 65–90).
De Gruyter.

Cumming, A. (2012). Learning to Write in a Second Language. *International Journal of
English Studies*, *1*(2), 2002–2004. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-
6_698

Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive/Academic language proficiency, linguistic
interdependence, the optimum age question, and some other matters. *Working*

Papers on Bilingualism. Travaux de recherches sur le bilinguisme, *19*, 197–205.

Cummins, J. (2017). BICS and CALP: Empirical and Theoretical Status of the Distinction.

In *Literacies and Language Education, Encyclopedia of Language and*

Education (pp. 59– 71). Springer International Publishing.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02252-9_6

Cummins, J. (2007). Research Monograph # 5 - Promoting Literacy in Multilingual

Contexts. *Student Achievement Division*. Retrieved from

http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/literacynumeracy/inspire/research/ESL_math.pdf

de Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or additional language acquisition* (Second Language

Acquisition 24). Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Emig, J. (1994). The composing process: Review of the literature. In S. Perl (Ed.),

Landmark essays on the writing process (pp. 1–22). Hermagoras Press.

Ferris, D. (2009). *Teaching college writing to diverse populations (The Michigan Series*

on Teaching Academic English in US postsecondary Programs) (e-book). The

University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. (2018). L2 writers in higher education. In R. Manchon & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.),

Handbook of second and foreign language writing (pp. 141–160). De Gruyter.

Fitzgerald, J. (2006). Multilingual writing in preschool through 12th grade: The last 15

years. In C. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing*

research (1st Kindle ed., p. loc. 7502 to 7912 of 10594). Guilford Press.

Frodesen, J. (2009). The academic writing development of a generation 1.5 "Latecomer."

In *Generation 1.5 in college composition* (pp. 91–104). Routledge.

Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the twenty-first century*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Garcia, O., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2017). Translanguaging in Bilingual Education. In O. García,
A. M. Y. Lin & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education* (3rd ed., pp.
118–130). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02258-1_9

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*
[Kindle]. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765

Gordon, L. (2008). Writing and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons
from good language learners* (loc. 3132 of 4186). Cambridge University Press.

Green, S. (2013). Novice ESL writers: A longitudinal case-study of the situated academic
writing processes of three undergraduates in a TESOL context. *Journal of English
for Academic Purposes*, *12*(3), 180–191.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2013.04.001

Griffiths, C. (2008). Strategies and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons
from good language learners* (loc. 1101 of 4186). Cambridge University Press.

Grosjean, F. (2008). *Studying bilinguals*. Oxford University Press.

Harklau, L. (2000). From the "Good Kids" to the "Worst": Representations of English
Language Learners across Educational Settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, *34*(1), 35.
https://doi.org/10.2307/3588096

Hirvela, A. (2011). Writing to learn in content areas: Research insights. In R.
Manchon (Ed.), *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional
language* (pp. 37–59). John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Hoffmann, C. (2001). Towards a description of trilingual competence. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, *5*(1), 1–17.

Horner, B., Necamp, S., & Donahue, C. (2011). Toward a multilingual composition scholarship: From English only to a translingual norm. *College Composition and Communication*, *63*(2), 269–300. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23131585

Kinloch, V. F. (2005). Revisiting the Promise of Students Right to Their Own Language: Pedagogical Strategies. *College Composition and Communication, 57*(1), 83–113.

Kinloch, V. (2009). Suspicious Spatial Distinctions. *Written Communication*, *26*(2), 154–182. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088309332899

Kinloch, V., & Burkhard, T. (2016). Teaching writing in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

Lavelle, E. (2009). Writing through college: Self-efficacy and instruction. In M. N. R. Beard, D., Myhill, & J. Riley (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of writing development* (pp. 415–423). SAGE Publications Ltd.

Lea, M. R., & Street, B. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, *23*(2), 157–172. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075079812331380364

Lea, M. R., & Street, B. (2006). The "academic literacies" model: Theory and applications. *Theory into Practice*, *45*(4), 368–377. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40071622

Leavy, P. (2017). *Research design*. New York: Guilford Press.

Leki, I. (2011). Learning to write in a second language: Multilingual graduates and undergraduates expanding genre repertories. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language* (pp. 85–109). John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Leki, I., Cumming, A., & Silva, T. (2008). *A Synthesis of research on second language writing in English*. Routledge.

Looker, S. (2016). Writing about Language: Studying Language Diversity with First-Year Writers. *TETYC*, *44*(2), 176–198. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Lorimer-Leonard, R. (2013). Traveling literacies: Multilingual writing on the move. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *48*(1), 13–39. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24398645

Manchon, R. (Ed.). (2011). *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language*. John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Manchon, R., & Matsuda, P. K. (2018). *Handbook of second and foreign language writing*. De Gruyter.

Marshall, S., Hayashi, H., & Yeung, P. (2012). Negotiating the multi in multilingualism and multiliteracies: Undergraduate students in Vancouver, Canada. *Canadian Modern Language Review/ La Revue Canadienne des Langues Vivantes*, *68*(1), 28–53. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.68.1.028

Merriam, S., & Tisdell, E. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.

Morton, J., Storch, N., & Thompson, C. (2015). What our students tell us: Perceptions of three multilingual students on their academic writing in first year. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *30*, 1–13.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy: A Needed Change in Stance, Terminology, and Practice. *Educational Researcher*, *41*(3), 93–97. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X12441244

Perl, S. (1994). The composing process of unskilled college writers (1979). In S. Perl (Ed.), *Landmark essays on writing process* (pp. 39–62). Hermagoras Press.

Poe, M. (2013). Research on multilingual writers in the disciplines: The case of biomedical engineering. In S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and classrooms* (pp. 170–181). Routledge.

Pomerantz, A., & Kearney, E. (2012). Beyond "write-talk-revise-(repeat)": Using narrative to understand one multilingual student's interactions around writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*(3), 221–238. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.05.013

Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, *19*(2), 229–256.

Raimes, A. (1987). Language proficiency, writing ability, and composing strategies - A study of ESL college student writers. *Language Learning*, *37*(3), 439–466.

Rana, L. B. (2018). *L1 Use in L2 writing: A Case of multilingual undergraduates in a basic writing course* (Number:10788112). [Master's thesis, Minnesota State

University]. ProQuest.

Roberge, M., Losey, K. M., & Wald, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Teaching U.S.-educated*

multilingual writers. University of Michigan Press.

Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). SAGE

Publications Inc.

Singh, M. K. M. (2017). International EFL/ESL master students' adaptation strategies for

academic writing practices at tertiary level. *Journal of International Students*,

7(3), 620– 643. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.570025

Sommers, N. (1994). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers.

In *Landmark essays on the writing process* (pp. 75–84). Hermagoras Press.

Statistics Canada. (2017). *The Daily - Education in Canada: Key results from the 2016*

Census. Retrieved July 23, 2018, from https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-

quotidien/171129/dq171129a-info-eng.htm

Statistics Canada. (2017). Immigration and ethnocultural diversity: Key results from the

2016 Census. Retrieved July 23, 2018, from https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-

recensement/2011/as-sa/98-314-x/98-314-x2011001-eng.cfm#fnb2

Statistics Canada. (2017). Immigrant languages in Canada. Retrieved November 16,

2018, from https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/11-627-m/11-627-

m2017025-eng.pdf?st=NajuH_RB%0A

van Weijen, D., van den Bergh, H., Rijlaarsdam, G., & Sanders, T. (2009). L1 use

during L2 writing: An empirical study of a complex phenomenon. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*(4), 235–250. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2009.06.003

Victori, M. (1999). An analysis of writing knowledge in EFL composing a case study of two effective and two less effective writers, *27*, 537–555.

Wang, W., & Wen, Q. (2002). L1 use in the L2 composing process: An exploratory study of 16 Chinese EFL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *11*(3), 225–246. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(02)00084-X

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems* (9th ed.). Mouton Publishers.

Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, *17*(2), 165. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586647

Appendix 1: Research Instruments

Selection Questions

1. Are you an undergraduate student?

2. Do you speak at least three languages?

3. What language(s)have you spoken since earliest childhood?

4. What languages do you use today?

5. How old are you?

Interview Questions

- How are you today?

- How is your term going?

- What year are you in?

- What is your major? Are you enjoying your major?

- I would like to hear about what you do when you are preparing to write an essay for one of your university classes.

- What steps do you take when you get ready to write an essay?

- What actions do you typically take in terms of preparing materials, resources or your workspace? Do you go to a different place or do anything specific?

- Once your workspace and resources are set up, do you plan what you are going to write or do you just sit down and write?

- Do you write an outline in advance? If yes, why? If not, why not?

- Do you look for journal articles before writing? Do you read journal articles and take notes on them before writing? If you use journal articles, where do you get them? Tell me more about this.

- How do you go about writing the different sections of your essay? How do you go about writing the introduction? How do you go about writing the conclusion? Tell me more about how you write the different sections of your essay.

- When you feel you are done with your essay, do you revise it? If you revise it, how do you do this? Do you use software? Do you get help from a friend or go to the writing centre? Do you do anything else?

- In your opinion, what are the most important steps in writing a university essay? Why are these steps important to you?

- Since you speak different languages, do you feel this helps you write university essays or makes it more difficult for you?

- In your opinion, how does speaking multiple languages affect your university writing? Do you feel it has a positive effect, no real effect, or a negative effect?

- Can you tell me about anything you have done or learned that has improved your university essays?

- Do you follow any specific strategies or techniques in writing your essays? If so, where did you learn these strategies?

- Do you translate from one language to another while writing?

- Do you think in English or in another language when you write?

- How do you think having more than one language increases your ability to move from one language to another?

- What advantages do you perceive multilingualism brings you? What advantages or disadvantages?

- Tell me specifically how you went about composing on your assignment.

- Tell me how you started with this assignment, and then what did you do?

- How did your strategies change between the two assignments?

Appendix 2: Recruitment Script

Hello,

My name is Tessa Troughton, and I am a student in the Faculty of Education at Memorial University of Newfoundland. I am conducting a research project called The Composing Process of Multilingual Undergraduate Students for my master's degree under the supervision of Dr. Cecile Badenhorst, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland. The purpose of the study is to investigate the composing process of multilingual undergraduate students at Memorial University of Newfoundland.

I am contacting you to invite you to participate in an online interview in which you will be asked to explain what you do when you have to write an essay for one of your classes. Participation will require 75 minutes of your time and will be held via Google Hangout or Skype and email.

To participate in this study, you must be between the ages of 18 and 70, speak at least three languages, and be an undergraduate (Bachelor's) level student at the Memorial University of Newfoundland.

If you are interested in participating in this study, please contact me to arrange a meeting time.

If you have any questions about me or my project, please contact me by email at ….

If you know anyone who may be interested in participating in this study, please give them a copy of this information.

Thank you in advance for considering my request.

Tessa Troughton

The proposal for this research has been reviewed by the Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research and was found to be in compliance with Memorial University's ethics policy. If you have ethical concerns about the research, such as your rights as a participant, you may contact the Chairperson of the ICEHR at icehr.chair@mun.ca or by telephone at 709-864-2861.

Appendix 3: Informed Consent Form

Title: The Composing Process of Multilingual Undergraduate Students
Researcher: Tessa Troughton, Candidate in MEd, Curriculum, Teaching
              and Learning

Supervisor(s): Dr. Cecile Badenhorst; Associate Professor; Faculty of
               Education; Memorial University of Newfoundland

You are invited to take part in a research project entitled, "*The Composing Process of Multilingual Undergraduate Students*".

This form is part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. It also describes your right to withdraw from the study. In order to decide whether you wish to participate in this research study, you should understand enough about its risks and benefits to be able to make an informed decision. This is the informed consent process. Take time to read this carefully and to understand the information given to you. Please contact the researcher, Tessa Troughton, if you have any questions about the study or would like more information before you consent.

It is entirely up to you to decide whether to take part in this research. If you choose not to take part in this research or if you decide to withdraw from the research once it has started, there will be no negative consequences for you, now or in the future.

Introduction:

I am a master's student in the Master of Education program in Curriculum, Teaching and Learning in the Faculty of Education at Memorial University of Newfoundland. As part of my master's thesis, I am conducting unfunded research under the supervision of Dr. Cecile Badenhorst in the Faculty of Education.

Purpose of Study:

The current research is an exploratory study of multilingual undergraduate students' composition process and strategies. The objective of the study is to investigate the composing process of multilingual undergraduate students at Memorial University of Newfoundland. The data collected will be interpreted

through the conceptual framework of fluid multilingualism (Canagarajah, 2002; Canagarajah, 2006) to critically analyze the composition needs of Canada's postsecondary students.

What You Will Do in this Study:

In this study, you will be asked to describe the process that you go through when you write a university essay. You will be asked to describe in detail what you do, how you plan and manage your work on an essay. You will be asked to meet me in a video- conference, talk to me about these things and explain your composition process to me.

Length of Time:

The video-conference interview will take 45 minutes. I will follow up with another email that may take you 30 minutes to answer. The total time commitment required to participate in this study is 75 minutes.

Compensation:

A $20 gift card to Tim Horton's will be offered to you after participation.

Withdrawal from the Study:

You may withdraw from the study at any time by informing the researcher via email, phone or video-conference. If you choose to withdraw, the notes from your interview will be destroyed.

You may also choose to have your data removed from the study after the data collection has ended until November 1, 2019.

Possible Benefits:

a)   You may enjoy telling your story to the researcher. You may enjoy the attention and the audience. If this is the case, then telling the story of your writing experience to the researcher could be of benefit to you.

b)   The scholarly community and, ultimately, society as a whole, will benefit from you telling your story in the interview, as it will be anonymized and shared in the form of a publication. As such, the scholarly community and society will be able to benefit from each participant's lived experiences of composition.

Possible Risks:

Potential harms due to participation in this study could include psychological stress if your interview causes you to relive stressful events or experience anxiety. I will give you the contact information for the Student Wellness and Counselling Centre in the event that you experience distress (see below). If this interview brings up topics which make you feel strong emotional reactions, please contact The Student Wellness and Counselling Centre for support at the contact below or call the community mental health support numbers below.

The Student Wellness and Counselling Centre (SWCC) Hours:

Monday - Friday 8:30 AM - 4:30

PM (Summer Hours 8:30 AM -

4:00 PM)

Appointments can be made in person or by telephone, 864-8500 (Option

#2). Student Wellness and Counselling Centre

5th Floor University Centre, UC-

5000 Memorial University of

Newfoundland St. John's, NL

A1C 5S7

If you have urgent mental health concerns, you may wish to contact the following community-based services:

- 24-hour mental health crisis line: 737-4668 (local) or 1-888-737-4668 (province- wide)
- Mobile Crisis Response Team: 1-888-737-4668 St. John's Region
- Psychiatric Assessment Unit: 777-3021 or 777-3022 24-hour Walk-in Crisis Service at the Waterford Hospital Site on Waterford Bridge Rd.
- Health Sciences Emergency Department on Columbus Drive in St. John's 777-6335

Confidentiality:

The ethical duty of confidentiality includes safeguarding participants' identities, personal information, and data from unauthorized access, use, or disclosure. In order to protect your identity, I will separate your name and any identifying information from your interview recording and transcript. Although the data from this research project will be published and presented at conferences, the data will be reported in an anonymized manner so that it will not be possible to identify individuals. Further, the consent forms will be stored separately from the interview transcript, so that it will not be possible to associate a name with any given set of responses.

Anonymity:

Anonymity refers to protecting participants' identifying characteristics, such as name or description of physical appearance. Every reasonable effort will be made to ensure your anonymity. You will not be identified in publications without your explicit permission.

Use, Access, Ownership, and Storage of Data:

Data will be stored according to the Memorial University protocol, as follows: three copies of the transcribed interviews will be retained in password protected files. The data will be located in a Dropbox file, an external hard drive, and a Google drive file. The data will be backed up after every change to the file. The contingency plan for restoring lost data is to get a copy of the files from one of the two other locations. Consent forms will be scanned and stored electronically in three locations. The researcher will be the only person with access to the data. Data will be kept for a minimum of five years, as required by Memorial University's policy on Integrity in Scholarly Research.

Third-Party Data Collection and/or Storage:

Data collected from you as part of your participation in this project will be hosted and/or stored electronically by Dropbox and Google Drive and is subject to their privacy policy, and to any relevant laws of the country in which their servers are located. Therefore, anonymity and confidentiality of data may not be guaranteed in the rare instance, for example, that government agencies obtain a court order compelling the provider to grant access to specific data stored on their servers. If you have questions or concerns about how your data will be collected or stored, please contact the researcher and/or visit the provider's website for more

information before participating. The privacy and security policy of the third-party hosting data collection and/or storing data can be found at: https://www.dropbox.com/security and https://www.google.com/drive/terms-of-service/

Reporting of Results:

The data will be reported only in an aggregated and/or summarized form. The data will be shared with the public through my master's thesis, and potentially, through the publication of peer-reviewed journal articles. Upon completion, my thesis will be available at Memorial University's Queen Elizabeth II library, and can be accessed online at: http://collections.mun.ca/cdm/search/collection/theses

Sharing of Results with Participants:

After the project is complete, the link to my master's thesis will be shared with the participants by email.

Questions:

You are welcome to ask questions before, during, or after your participation in this research. If you would like more information about this study, please contact:

Tessa Troughton, Candidate in MEd, Curriculum, Teaching and Learning; tet451@mun.ca; 289-356-0529 or Dr. Cecile Badenhorst; Associate Professor; Faculty of Education; Memorial University of Newfoundland, cbadenhorst@mun.ca

OPTION 1 - hardcopy consent form:

Consent:

Your signature on this form means that:

· You have read the information about the research.

· You have been able to ask questions about this study.

· You are satisfied with the answers to all your questions.

· You understand what the study is about and what you will be doing.

· You understand that you are free to withdraw participation in the study without having to give a reason, and that doing so will not affect you now or in the future.

· You understand that if you choose to end participation during data collection, any data collected from you up to that point will be retained by the researcher, unless you indicate otherwise.

· You understand that if you choose to withdraw **after** data collection has ended, your data can be removed from the study up to August 1, 2019.

By signing this form, you do not give up your legal rights and do not release the researchers from their professional responsibilities.

I agree to be audio-recorded	Yes	No
I agree to the use of direct quotations	Yes	No

Your Signature Confirms:

I have read what this study is about and understood the risks and benefits. I have had adequate time to think about this and had the opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered.

I agree to participate in the research project understanding the risks and contributions of my participation, that my participation is voluntary, and that I may end my participation.

A copy of this Informed Consent Form has been given to me for my

records. Signature of Participant: Date

Researcher's Signature:

I have explained this study to the best of my ability. I invited questions and gave answers. I believe that the participant fully understands what is involved in being done in the study, any potential risks of the study, and that he or she has freely chosen to be in the study

Signature of Principal Investigator   Date

The proposal for this research has been reviewed by the Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research and was found to be in compliance with Memorial University's ethics policy. If you have ethical concerns about the research, such as the way you have been treated or your rights as a participant, you may contact the Chairperson of the ICEHR at icehr@mun.ca or by telephone at 709-864-2861.

OPTION 2 - online consent form:

Consent:

By completing this questionnaire, you agree that:

·   You have read the information about the research.

· You have been advised that you may ask questions about this study and receive answers prior to continuing.

·   You are satisfied that any questions you had have been addressed.

·   You understand what the study is about and what you will be doing.

· You understand that you are free to withdraw participation from the study by closing your browser window or navigating away from this page, without having to give a reason and that doing so will not affect you now or in the future.

· You understand that if you choose to withdraw, you may request that your data be removed from the study by contacting the researcher before August 1, 2019.

I agree to be audio-recorded	Yes	No
I agree to the use of direct quotations	Yes	No

By consenting to this online survey, you do not give up your legal rights and do not release the researchers from their professional responsibilities.

Please retain a copy of this consent information for your records. *** If possible, include a PDF of the consent form that participants can download***

Clicking <u>accept </u>below and submitting this survey constitutes consent and implies your agreement to the above statements.

The proposal for this research has been reviewed by the Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research and was found to be in compliance with Memorial University's ethics policy. If you have ethical concerns about the research, such as your rights as a participant, you may contact the Chairperson of the ICEHR at icehr.chair@mun.ca or by telephone at 709-864-2861.

MEMORIAL
U N I V E R S I T Y

**Interdisciplinary Committee on
Ethics in Human Research (ICEHR)**

St. John's, NL Canada A1C 5S7
Tel: 709 864-2561 icehr@mun.ca
www.mun.ca/research/ethics/humans/icehr

ICEHR Number:	**20200663-ED**
Approval Period:	September 4, 2019 – September 30, 2020
Funding Source:	Not Funded
Responsible Faculty:	Dr. Cecile Badenhorst Education
Title of Project:	*The Composing Process of Multilingual Undergraduate Students*

September 4, 2019

Ms. Tessa Troughton
Faculty of Education
Memorial University of Newfoundland

Dear Ms. Troughton:

Thank you for your correspondence of September 1, 2019 addressing the issues raised by the Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research (ICEHR) concerning the above-named research project. ICEHR has re-examined the proposal with the clarification and revisions submitted, and is satisfied that the concerns raised by the Committee have been adequately addressed. In accordance with the *Tri-Council Policy Statement on Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS2)*, the project has been granted *full ethics clearance* to September 30, 2020. ICEHR approval applies to the ethical acceptability of the research, as per Article 6.3 of the *TCPS2*. Researchers are responsible for adherence to any other relevant University policies and/or funded or non-funded agreements that may be associated with the project.

The *TCPS2* **requires** that you submit an Annual Update to ICEHR before September 30, 2020. If you plan to continue the project, you need to request renewal of your ethics clearance and include a brief summary on the progress of your research. When the project no longer involves contact with human participants, is completed and/or terminated, you are required to provide an annual update with a brief final summary and your file will be closed. If you need to make changes during the project which may raise ethical concerns, you must submit an Amendment Request with a description of these changes for the Committee's consideration prior to implementation. If funding is obtained subsequent to approval, you must submit a Funding and/or Partner Change Request to ICEHR before this clearance can be linked to your award.

All post-approval event forms noted above can be submitted from your Researcher Portal account by clicking the *Applications: Post-Review* link on your Portal homepage. We wish you success with your research.

Yours sincerely,

Kelly Blidook, Ph.D.
Vice-Chair, Interdisciplinary Committee on
    Ethics in Human Research

KB/bc

cc: Supervisor – Dr. Cecile Badenhorst, Faculty of Education