


Exploring the Writing Process of Multilingual Postsecondary Students

Tessa E. Troughton 

Volume 34, 2024

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1109514ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31468/dwr.1045>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Canadian Association for the Study of Discourse and Writing

ISSN

2563-7320 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Troughton, T. (2024). Exploring the Writing Process of Multilingual Postsecondary Students. *Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie*, 34, 24–42. <https://doi.org/10.31468/dwr.1045>

Article abstract

With an increasingly multilingual population made up of domestic and international students at Canadian universities, there is more to learn about the writing practices of multilingual students and the needs of multilingual postsecondary writers in a Canadian context. The purpose of this study was to learn in detail about the individual writing process of multilingual postsecondary students in a mid-sized university in eastern Canada. A qualitative methodology consisting of semi-structured interviews was followed. A small sample size of seven participants consisted of young adults enrolled at the postsecondary level who were recruited through posters on campus. The interviews were transcribed, coded holistically, and thematically analyzed using software. Findings reveal the individual writing process, use of strategies, and translingual practices in writing. Secondary findings highlight the impact of instructor feedback on learner attitudes and English language learners' need for extra time to develop their academic English. These findings offer insights into the translingual writing process of multilingual postsecondary students.

© Tessa E. Troughton, 2024



This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/>

Érudit

This article is disseminated and preserved by Érudit.

Érudit is a non-profit inter-university consortium of the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. Its mission is to promote and disseminate research.

<https://www.erudit.org/en/>

Article

Exploring the Writing Process of Multilingual Postsecondary Students

Tessa E. Troughton
Ontario Tech University

Abstract

With an increasingly multilingual population made up of domestic and international students at Canadian universities, there is more to learn about the writing practices of multilingual students and the needs of multilingual postsecondary writers in a Canadian context. The purpose of this study was to learn in detail about the individual writing process of multilingual postsecondary students in a mid-sized university in eastern Canada. A qualitative methodology consisting of semi-structured interviews was followed. A small sample size of seven participants consisted of young adults enrolled at the postsecondary level who were recruited through posters on campus. The interviews were transcribed, coded holistically, and thematically analyzed using software. Findings reveal the individual writing process, use of strategies, and translanguaging practices in writing. Secondary findings highlight the impact of instructor feedback on learner attitudes and English language learners' need for extra time to develop their academic English. These findings offer insights into the translanguaging writing process of multilingual postsecondary students.

Exploring the Writing Process of Multilingual Postsecondary Students

Many postsecondary students in Canada are literate in multiple languages due to parental immigration (Statistics Canada, 2017a; Statistics Canada, 2017b), attending bilingual schools in Canada (Wernicke, 2022), arriving in Canada as multilingual, international students (Usher, 2021; The Daily, 2021), or other reasons (Marshall et al., 2012; Marshall, 2020). Existing literature on the writing process at the postsecondary level is not set in a Canadian context on individual writing practices (Griffiths, 2008; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2013; Raimes, 1987; Usanova & Schnoor, 2021; Wong, 2005). Thus, the purpose of this study was to learn in detail about the writing process of seven multilingual postsecondary

students in a mid-sized university in Canada as they wrote their university essays, with the goal of better understanding their writing process and strategies. Writing at university is challenging and if multilingual students understand their writing process, this might help them navigate the writing obstacles they face. Areas of concern were the participants' experiences of the writing process and the resources they used during the writing process. In order to add to the knowledge base about a multilingual postsecondary student population, more research is required about the writing strategies of multilingual postsecondary students in Canada. It is in this context that the following research question is addressed in the current study: What is the writing process of multilingual postsecondary student participants writing essays at a mid-sized Canadian university?

The theory of fluid multilingualism (Canagarajah, 2002, 2006, 2013) serves as a conceptual framework in this research. 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, 2006, 2013). The fluid multilingualism approach emphasizes the author tailoring their writing to the linguistic audience as in the case of fluid multilingualism. This approach is also critical of power relations that impact the writer or speaker's communication with their genre. Fluid multilingualism (Canagarajah, 2002, 2006, 2013) depicts translanguaging (Garcia & Lin, 2017; Garcia & Wei, 2014) as a communicative behaviour and a distinguishing feature of multilingual communication. Translanguaging refers to multilinguals mixing different languages to communicate based on the context, their own needs, and desires (Garcia & Lin, 2017). The theory of fluid multilingualism (Canagarajah, 2002, 2006, 2013) was chosen for this study as it perfectly depicts the fluid movement between languages described by the participants. For the purpose of this paper, a multilingual is defined as an individual who speaks three or more languages (De Angelis, 2007), regardless of mother tongue. No qualifiers were used around participants' proficiency, so that an individual who claimed to speak three or more languages was considered a multilingual speaker.

Review of Literature

Scholarly literature about multilingual postsecondary students, their academic writing process, and their experience as academic writers is found internationally, with some research conducted in the United States and Canada. This review of literature on the writing process of multilingual postsecondary students includes the following sub-topics: multilingualism (Canagarajah, 2002, 2006, 2013; Garcia, 2009; Leki et al., 2008; Manchon, 2011; Manchon & Matsuda, 2018; Weinreich, 1953) and the writing process (Cumming, 2001; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2013; Leki et al., 2008; Raimes, 1987) and

writing strategies (Anderson, 2008; Bialystok, 1991; Bialystok & Craik, 2010; Gordon, 2008; Griffiths, 2008; Wong, 2005). The scope of this review is interdisciplinary and is situated within the disciplines of education, writing studies, and additional language studies.

Multilingualism

Understanding multilingualism is part of understanding fluid multilingualism. In a cornerstone work, *Languages in Contact*, Weinreich (1953) defined multilingualism as “the practice of using alternately three or more languages” (p. 1). Of interest here is that the multilingual’s languages are used “alternately” (Weinreich, 1953, p.1), which implies switching between languages. Historically, multilingualism and bilingualism were often viewed from a deficit model of communication, i.e., that bi- or multilingual individuals’ language proficiency was flawed in comparison to that of the monolingual (Garcia, 2009). Today, the deficit view has been revised in light of international scholarship on multilingualism (Garcia, 2009; Leki et al., 2008; Manchon, 2011; Manchon & Matsuda, 2018).

In the current era, multilingualism is viewed from an additive perspective and it is considered a strength to be able to communicate in multiple languages (Canagarajah, 2002; Canagarajah, 2009). Certain attributes have been ascribed to multilingualism, including heightened awareness of rhetorical conventions (Canagarajah, 2006) and the ability to translanguage in order to meet one’s communicative needs (Garcia & Lin, 2017; Marshall et al., 2012). Canagarajah (2006) argues that multilinguals have many rhetorical and verbal strengths that should be recognized by educators. In a case study of a multilingual participant writing for different linguistic target audiences, results showed that the participant oriented their writing to the different rhetorical conventions of specific audiences (Canagarajah, 2006). Results showed the multilingual subject switched rapidly between different languages while attending to the requirements of different audiences (Canagarajah, 2006; Canagarajah, 2009). Furthermore, Marshall et al. (2012) reported translanguaging in multilingual students’ academic and non-academic lives. 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 highlight multilinguals’ use of translanguaging to meet their unique communicative needs, while functioning within multilingual communities. Translanguaging refers to the ability of a multilingual speaker or community to decide when to use a specific language (Canagarajah, 2013; Garcia & Wei, 2014), as well as to multilinguals mixing different languages or other communication systems based on the context, communicative needs, and/or desires (Garcia & Lin,

2017). 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, 2006; Garcia & Lin, 2017; Garcia & Wei, 2014).

The Writing Process of Multilingual Language Learners

The writing process of multilingual language learners (MLLs) has been studied to distinguish it from the writing of English mother tongue speakers. In early research, Raimes (1985) shows overall similarities between the MLL and first language writing process in that both groups engaged in process writing, yet maintains that using the mother tongue-oriented process writing approach exclusively with MLLs does not allow for the additional time and instruction they require. Raimes' (1985) recommendation that multilingual learners require additional time is in line with Cummins' (1979; 2017) findings that the acquisition of academic cognitive language takes years longer than the acquisition of basic interpersonal communication.

Raimes (1987) examined what MLL writers said to themselves while writing, how they talked themselves through the task, how they planned, their thought process as they wrote, and their revision practices. Results showed that MLLs spent more time on the writing process (planning, revising, rehearsing, outlining, and editing) than English mother tongue students (Raimes, 1987). Rehearsing, i.e., "composing aloud" (Raimes, 1987, p. 461) while writing indicated a focus on meaning. Raimes asserted that rehearsing was a more important function to MLL writers than revision, as it inspired the participants to write (p. 461). Raimes (1987) reported that MLL writers were exploring and discovering ideas through their writing tasks in the same way as English mother tongue writers, although the MLL writers did more revision. MLL writers are generally required to pay attention to ideas, as well as language, while writing (Cumming, 2001, p. 5), so there is a greater cognitive load, and hence, the writing process takes longer.

The previous section presents and discusses research that MLL 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 MLL writers invest more time in the writing process in the desire to do well, and hence, require additional writing time.

Writing Strategies and Multilingual Writers

Multilingual writers use specific strategies during their writing process to break down cognitive and linguistic tasks; these are strategic actions undertaken by writers at different points in the writing process to help them accomplish the tasks. Griffiths (2008) defines language learning strategies as “activities consciously chosen by learners for the purpose of regulating their own language learning” (Loc. 1159 of 4186). Writing strategies used by MLLs are grouped into cognitive, metacognitive, affective (Wong, 2005), 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 the writing process, learners use cognitive and metacognitive strategies to organize information, plan their writing, analyze texts, and use tools for learning new information. Metalinguistic strategies draw on analysis of language, specifically, revising and proofreading one’s own writing, as well as analyzing language forms, specifically while using pronounced executive control (Bialystok, 1991; Bialystok & Craik, 2010). Both mother tongue and multilingual writers were noted to use a variety of strategies in their writing process (Gordon, 2008; Wong, 2005), although additional language proficiency strongly affected the quality of the written product (Leki et al., 2008).

On the topic of metacognitive strategies and MLL writers, researchers have found strongly similar results. Lay (1983, as cited in Leki et al., 2008) initially reported that MLL writers used similar writing strategies as English-as-a-first-language writers, such as “re-evaluating organization, asking questions, and changing vocabulary” (loc. 2732 of 9504). Moreover, in a small-scale study about the link between metacognitive knowledge and writing skill among English majors at a Spanish university, the stronger writers showed more overall understanding of the writing process (Victori, 1999). They used their time on “global text-level problems” (Victori, 1999, p. 541). Cumming (2001) also found that skilled additional language writers do more planning and revision than less skilled writers. Leki et al. (2008) reported that skilled additional language writers do significant planning and work with a text during the composition process (Leki et al., 2008). Overall, more skilled MLL writers focused more on metacognitive skills, such as big picture planning, content, and argument than less skilled writers (Cumming, 2001; Lay, 1983, as cited in Leki et al., 2008); Leki et al., 2008; Raimes, 1985; Raimes, 1987; Victori, 1999). Thus, skilled MLL writers are found in the literature to use more metacognitive strategies than less skilled MLL writers during their writing process. On the whole, the literature also shows that MLL 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, particularly at the higher level, in terms of outlining, planning, and revising.

Dictionary use/word study is a multifaceted metacognitive strategy which has been used historically by MLL writers for translation and/or backtranslation with varied results (Anderson, 2008; Leki et al., 2008; Singh, 2017). Some MLL writers have voiced that dictionary usage makes the writing process take longer (Skibniewski & Skibniewska, 1986); nonetheless, the impact of dictionary use on quality of writing depends more on the user's ability to discern between lexical options (Christianson, 1997, as cited in Leki et al. 2008), which in fact, relies on the writer's language proficiency. Victori (1999) found that weaker writers made less frequent use of resources, such as dictionaries, to revise their word choices (p. 550). The use of dictionaries in multilinguals' writing is an important metacognitive strategy, as it is one of the resources that can be used to develop a text during the writing and revision process; furthermore, word study can be a tool used in the strategy of translation and/or backtranslation during the writing process. By extension, the use of dictionaries in translation and/or backtranslation is a strategy used in the translanguaging process.

In terms of affective strategies used in the writing process by MLLs, Pomerantz and Kearney (2012) found that, for their participant (n=1), the writing process involved using cognitive strategies, such as writing many drafts with added illustrations and notes. The unique participant was frustrated by the length of her writing process, yet did not consider this as related to her multilingualism, but viewed it as a part of the writing process. Their accepting attitude towards the writing process may also be considered an affective strategy. Poe (2013) reported a longitudinal case study in which the participant was mentored by and wrote collaboratively with other researchers, thus learning academic writing by relying on affective strategies of drawing on interpersonal/relational resources. In a larger-scale study, Singh (2017) reported the use of a range of both metacognitive and interpersonal strategies used by multilinguals in the academic writing process.

Salient points in this review of literature which are specifically relevant to the research question are: multilinguals' use of translanguaging to meet their unique communicative needs, while functioning within multilingual communities and the need for additional time for the writing process for multilingual writers; greater use of metacognitive strategies by skilled multilingual writers in the writing process; minimal studies exploring affective strategies in the multilingual writing process; dictionary use by multilinguals in writing as a metacognitive strategy, as well as in the translanguaging process; and the use of strategies by multilinguals in the writing process helps them organize their thoughts and regulate their writing in order to attain their academic writing goals.

In the review of the different strategies used by multilinguals while writing, one critique of the existing research is that the sample sizes are very small. Strategies can be affective, metacognitive, or metalinguistic.

Methodology

This section will outline the research paradigm and methodology, sampling, data collection and analysis strategies, researcher role, validity, and ethical considerations. All names used herewith are pseudonyms. The project was approved by the Committee on Ethics in Human Research. For this research project, a qualitative methodology was chosen to allow more personal, rich, and detailed data to be collected, and to portray an authentic representation of the participants' experience (Creswell, 2015; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The data collection was built around purposive sampling within a qualitative interview, enabling the researcher to select participants (Leavy, 2017). Furthermore, purposive sampling allowed the researcher to seek out participants who would be able to contribute valuable data during their interviews (Cohen et al., 2000; Creswell, 2015; Merriam, 1998). Snowball sampling (Merriam, 1998) was also used in that participants were asked if they could refer a friend who met the selection criteria (ages 19 and 70, self-identified as multilinguals speaking three or more languages, and students or recent graduates). The age range was chosen because it is the range of adult but not geriatric individuals. The sample was four undergraduates, two graduate students, and one recent graduate, totaling seven. The sample was chosen because they were the only ones who presented themselves and met the criteria. An insufficient number of undergraduates came forward as undergraduate candidates, so the sample was widened to include graduate students. A small incentive of a \$25 gift card at a coffee shop was offered to each participant upon completion. Participants were asked open-ended reflective questions about writing academic papers during individual video-conference semi-structured interviews. The researcher made an audio recording and transcription and took notes. The interviews focused on academic writing.

After the interviews, the researcher undertook member checking to improve validity of the data by contacting participants with the transcript (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). After clearing up any clarifications on the data, the researcher thanked the participants for their participation and sent them the agreed upon gift card for a coffee shop.

In analyzing the qualitative data, cyclical and recursive analysis was performed (Saldana, 2016). The codes were separated into themes and meta-themes. An example of the coding process is as follows: (1) level one codes were assigned after multiple readings of the dataset. (2) codes such as "assessment

of writing”, “feedback”, and “prof’s expectations”, were grouped into the theme titled “Expectations at University”; (2) the theme “Expectations at University” falls under the meta-themes of experience/inexperience, explicit teaching/finding own methods, and agency/following instructions. As this is qualitative research, it is a snapshot of the participants’ experience at a particular moment in time, which is a feature of qualitative methodology (Creswell, 2015).

Findings

The following section presents the findings from the interviews structured first thematically, then by meta-theme. The coding process through which the themes and meta-themes were arrived at is described in the methodology section.

The Writing Process

An important finding was that several participants highlighted that the writing process, for them, must include what they expressed as an enjoyable creative process, and they then built this into their planning and writing experience. One participant stated: "I think it's really important to use a lot of really beautiful diction in a way that kind of makes the reader feel that much more intelligent for having read it [the essay]" and was pleased if their writing “looks harmonious”. Another participant said they wanted to write “something that has a flow”. For these participants, there was a creative and personal aspect to writing university essays.

In discussing their writing process, most participants explained their revision process in essay writing. Some participants described using software such as Grammarly, others described using dictionaries, and others asked a native-speaker friend to edit their writing. The participant, Trex, had the practice of going to the library and revising his papers for many days coincides with Raimés’ (1987) finding that MLL participants spent lengthy periods on process writing (planning, revising, rehearsing, outlining, and editing) and rehearsing, i.e., "composing aloud" (Raimés, 1987, p. 461), indicating a focus on meaning.

Raimés (1987) noted that her MLL participants took more time to write because they spent longer on the composition process. Participants in the current research project reported requiring between two hours to write a lab report to ten hours to write an essay. Most of the participants worked at two part-time jobs, in addition to studying full-time. It is not clear if lack of time prevented them from spending more time on their papers or whether they felt satisfied with the length of time they spent.

This finding is related to Cumming's (2001) finding that MLL composition takes longer as writers need to attend to the conceptual level and the linguistic level simultaneously, and thus carry more cognitive load. More research is required on the topic of multilingual writers and how long it takes them to write essays in order to determine to what extent the findings would mirror Cumming (2001) and Raimes (1987).

The theme of seeking an element of personal creativity in one's academic writing also arose. Jessen and Jasmey both expressed the need to begin their academic writing in a creative headspace, as well as the desire to write essays that aesthetically met their personal vision. For example, they were less concerned than other participants about their readers' reactions to their essays. For them, it was more important to write "something that has a flow" (Jasmey) and uses "beautiful diction" (Jessen). Saranie reported that she tries to put a bit of "creative flair" in her introductions. These findings mirror Victori's (1999) findings in which one of the multilingual writers interviewed said, "I write according to my inspiration" (Victori, 1999, p. 546). Clearly, some writers have a need to connect with their writing at an affective level. This has not been found in the literature.

Prescriptive Instruction and Adherence to Rules

Participants noted that some of their professors were very exacting in the way they wanted essays to be 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 had not been accustomed to such exacting demands in their home countries, but they were compliant. Participants adhered rigidly to the professors' instructions, and they, in turn, developed a rigid view of 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 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. Another participant described feedback from the professor as hurtful: "Your conclusion is non-existent" [Jasmey]. The participants received feedback on their essays which they sometimes interpreted as quite hurtful, yet they accepted it. In some cases, the feedback made them lose interest in writing, while in other cases, they used the strategy of seeking further resources to improve their writing.

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 expectations, making recommendations, giving feedback, and displaying dissatisfaction across cultures. A participant described the professor's prescriptive feedback as: "The prof said, 'No matter what you are writing, you have to follow these steps'" (Saranie). Other feedback, such as "Your conclusion is non-existent" [Jasme], was negative and open to various interpretations. Ferris (2018) states that both clear communication and grammar directives in feedback have been found to be highly valued among the MLL postsecondary student population.

Planning to Write

Some participants had routines around planning and preparing to write which may have helped them manage their anxiety about doing the writing. For example, at the beginning of the writing session, Jessen would tell herself, "I can do this. Whatever I make, I will not judge".

In another example, Zachel had developed his own planning routine by copying the outline of a published book, and then using the outline of the book as the outline for his own technical report. Zachel was attempting to self-instruct, as he had been required to take English composition, but not technical writing. These findings echo Victori's (1999) findings that some of his MLL participants preferred mental planning while others preferred written outlining (p. 546). In addition, the current findings identified additional details regarding planning, such as motivational statements or copying an outline, that have not been found in the literature. Conversely, findings showed that the most confident writer among the participants (Trex) spent lengthy periods reading and analyzing articles to be sure about meaning and points of critique, but not outlining. 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). Although Trex and Zachel each went about it differently, their planning behaviour aligns with Leki et al. (2008) in that Zachel and Trex both expressed self-confidence about their writing skills when they described their writing process; they spent more time on big picture planning.

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 courses. He had been taught in his home country that "there are

type one, two, and three assignments” and that “analysis is considered a type three assignment”. He had been taught explicitly how to write each of these numbered types of essays at his university in his home country and felt confident writing them. Trex fully incorporated the three-type framework of essays into his worldview of academic writing, and it helped him make sense of assignments at graduate school in Canada. He received helpful feedback on his writing and received excellent marks. Lorimer-Leonard (2013) argues that there are significant benefits to learners when their prior literacy is valued by the educational system in their adopted country. The learner benefits if the educational system in the adopted country values the students’ prior learning and context of learning (Lorimer-Leonard, 2013). In Trex’s case, prior learning of academic writing meant that he felt he already knew how to write argumentative and analytical essays in English when he began graduate school. These skills enabled Trex to write with intention in his master’s program in Canada. He did not discuss his prior learning with his professors, but he felt validated when he received good grades and positive feedback. He also experienced his professor showing him the next steps in writing by teaching him citation and referencing. Trex felt deeply validated by this individual teaching. Trex showed strong self-confidence when he described his experience as a writer and a graduate student.

Experienced Versus Inexperienced Writers

There were different levels of writing expertise in the group. Perhaps the less experienced writers took their professors’ instructions verbatim because they were inexperienced. Jasmey felt that she was lacking specific knowledge about writing an outline, as she stated, that her professors expected her to have, but she had never learned how in her home country and did not mention trying to learn this outside of class. Jasmey seemed to lack confidence in writing and in seeking support for writing.

Overall, a major finding on the writing process was that academic writing was presented to the participants in a decontextualized fashion, in that it was not rooted in their disciplines, nor did it draw on their prior knowledge from studies in their home country. Assumptions may have been made about multilingual students’ prior knowledge of writing techniques. Conversely, when writing was explicitly taught in a course, the writing style needed for specific university programs was not taught, and learners were required to use their own strategies to learn that style. The participants’ reported learning to write essays in ways that were not linked to their majors; these experiences in their writing classes were not consistent with research indicating that multilingual English language writing should be taught in context (Cumming, 2001; Leki et al., 2008) and that learners’ prior knowledge and lived/cultural experiences should be shown to be valuable (Kinloch & Burkhard, 2016; Lorimer-

Leonard, 2013). Thus, the participants reported that their learning of academic writing was decontextualized.

Strategic Translanguaging

The language use behaviours of the participants lined up with the literature on multilinguals' strategic translanguaging (Canagarajah, 2006; Garcia & Lin, 2014; Marshall et al., 2012; Marshall, 2020) and awareness of the requirements of different audiences (Canagarajah, 2006, 2013). For example, one participant stated: "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 this participant's everyday language and one of many linguistic skills they possess. The participants also used translanguaging as a metacognitive strategy (Anderson, 2008; Leki et al., 2008; Singh, 2017) to meet their communicative goal, the English essay. Another participant mentioned 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." For this student, translation is an assessment of understanding. He said, "If you can translate one thing to another in your head, it confirms that you know it." Another participant described their thought and writing process between French and English as:

Honestly it I flick back and forth. I can never predict it. I tend to dream and friends that don't speak French in my everyday life will speak French to me in my dream. So I mean if I'm writing in English and then another idea comes to me in French first, right that is in French, then I will go back to writing it in English. I tend to be more critical in French and more creative in English. So I mean if I have this amazing idea that will come to me in French and I'll write it down in French. So I am more logical in French. In English, I'm more creative and rambly, but I tend to think in French when I'm editing or being reasonable.

"Flick[ing] back and forth" describes how multilingual writers use the technique of "shuttling" (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 113) between languages to maximize the affordances of each language in order to create a meaning that is the most accurate to them and most accurately reflects their socio-linguistic reality and perception.

Discussion

In answering the question, “What is the writing process of multilingual postsecondary student participants writing essays at a mid-sized Canadian university?”, the most significant themes in the data are *the writing process*, *prescriptive instruction* and *adherence to rules*, *planning prior to writing*, *prior knowledge of academic writing*, and *experience versus inexperience* in writing. The meta-themes were themes which gathered together the many smaller themes in the coding process. Thus, the meta-themes were continua of agency/following instructions, experience/inexperience, and explicit teaching/finding their own methods. On the theme of prescriptive instruction and adherence to rules, an analysis shows an eagerness to please the professor by adhering to their stipulations, yet a deeper reading could indicate cultural norms of giving and receiving direction. On the theme of planning prior to writing, some writers plan and others do not, which mirrored Victori’s (1999) findings. Current data also showed that participants spent longer on the writing process, mirroring findings by Abas and Abd Aziz (2016), Cumming (2001), Raimes (1987), and Roca de Larios et al. (2008). More skilled writers spent more time on global planning, echoing findings by Cumming (2001) and Leki et al. (2008).

Connections Between Meta-Themes and the Literature

The meta-themes found across the data were continua of agency/following instructions, experience/inexperience, and explicit teaching/finding their own methods. Examples and discussion of each will be given below.

The meta-theme of agency/following instructions in writing may be influenced by the participants’ home cultures. The extent to which the participants exercised their own agency versus followed instructions can be explained by 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). Agency is interwoven with prior learning, in particular, prior cultural learning and educational experiences (Kinloch & Burkhard, 2016; Lorimer-Leonard, 2013). Pursuant to this theme, participants showed agency in certain situations. For example, when Zachel strategically befriended a professional writer in his faculty and asked them to edit his essay. Nonetheless, all of the participants followed instructions and feedback extremely closely.

Under the meta-themes of experience/inexperience and explicit teaching/finding their own method, two of the participants were experienced, but the majority were early in their undergraduate studies and lacked experience. Certain writing 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 and styles, had not been addressed at all. This absence of instruction led the participants to find their own methods for learning how to write within their specific disciplines. The meta-theme of explicit teaching/finding their own methods harkens to Ferris' (2018) recommendations on providing feedback on writing that is clear, expert, and direct feedback on grammar and language errors (Ferris, 2018).

The meta-theme of experienced versus inexperienced writers is linked to prior knowledge of academic writing, in that a number of participants were very early in their undergraduate studies and had limited prior knowledge of academic writing, and thus, may have taken feedback more to heart. The meta-themes of agency/following instructions, as well as experience/inexperience, and explicit teaching/finding their own methods all relate to the importance of incorporating the learner's "context, identities, and practices" (Cumming, 2001; Kinloch & Burkhard, 2016, p. 388) into the instructional approach. Doing so includes allowing speakers of additional languages additional time in order to adequately develop their cognitive academic English (Cummins, 1979; 2017), as well as to allow for the necessary additional planning time (Cumming, 2001; Raimes, 1987).

This paper contributes to the knowledge base in the fields of composition studies and teaching English as an additional language in Canada through its focus on the writing lives of students at a university in Canada as planners and writers of essays and reports, as well as receivers of feedback.

Concluding Thoughts

The key findings of this research project were that the participants' writing process included developing their own strategies to support their writing process, including using resources, translanguaging, and seeking mentorship. Translanguaging was used as a strategic tool when composing in English. Additionally, for some participants, it was essential for them to connect with their writing at an affective and creative level, as well as to perform rituals around preparing to write (Bhowmik, 2016). Participants do not appear to have been accustomed to receiving challenging feedback in their prior educational experiences, perhaps related to lack of experience in the postsecondary educational system. Nonetheless, they were keenly aware of the high stakes of their Canadian educational experience and tried to meet the professor's requirements. The absence of instruction in discipline-specific writing led the participants to find their own methods for learning. Overall, these findings offer insights into the translingual writing process of multilingual postsecondary students.

One wonders why academic writing was taught centrally, as opposed to by discipline or faculty, and what knowledge the writing professors had of their students' prior education. The power dynamic in providing feedback is a factor that has gone unexamined, yet the academic literacies approach leads us to question it.

Limitations of This Work

The first limitation of this current study is that the English language proficiency of the participants was not assessed. Participants met the English language proficiency required to enter university, but there was some variation in proficiency which could have affected their written work and the feedback they received. Another limitation of the study is that the participants' multilingualism was self-assessed; however, the participants' languages spoken and order of acquisition were cross-checked to their geopolitical areas of origin. Despite these limitations, the data proved to be rich and contributes to what is known about the academic writing practices of multilingual writers in a postsecondary setting.

Implications for Practice

The current findings can be applied to teaching and approaching multilingual postsecondary writers. As such, emphasis on a culturally and linguistically diverse approach to postsecondary teaching has the potential to improve students' engagement in their learning. Culturally and linguistically diverse teaching approaches could be introduced at new faculty orientation, teaching assistant training, and by making available resources on culturally meaningful teaching and feedback. Multilingual postsecondary writers might benefit from receiving more consistent, clear, supportive, and expert feedback on their writing and contextualized instruction. Moreover, an institutional statement in support of multilingualism and multilingual students by the university would clarify the approach to multilingual students and their writing. Ultimately, it would be useful for students and faculty to be aware of Cumming's (2001) finding that when writing in an additional language, it simply takes extra time to develop one's cognitive academic language. Thus, allowing multilingual students extra time to develop cognitive academic language would benefit the development of their English composition.

Future researchers in the area of multilingual writing would do well to investigate translation while writing in relation to additional language proficiency, the impact of culturally safe writing feedback, and whether it would be useful to directly teach writing within the discipline at the undergraduate level, with specific skills such as note taking, outlining, paraphrasing, and report writing.

References

- Abas, I. H., & Abd Aziz, N. H. (2016). Classification of L2 writing process and writing strategies. *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Generating Knowledge Through Research UUM_UMSIDE*, 1(1), 367–380. <https://doi.org/10.21070/picecrs.v1i1.505>
- Anderson, N. J. (2008). Metacognition and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners* [Kindle]. Cambridge University Press.
- Badenhorst, C. (2011). Academic writing: The key to student retention? *The Morning Watch*, 38, 3–4. <http://www.mun.ca/educ/faculty/mwatch/win11.htm>
- Bhowmik, S. K. (2016). Agency, identity and ideology in L2 writing: Insights from the EAP classroom. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 8(2), 275–308. <https://doi-org.uproxy.library.dc-uoit.ca/10.1558/wap.26864>
- 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.
- 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. (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. (2009). Multilingual strategies of negotiating English: From conversation to writing. *JAC*, 29(1), 17–48.
- 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, A. S. (2013). Introduction. In A. S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and classrooms* (pp. 1–10). Routledge. <https://doi-org.uproxy.library.dc-uoit.ca/10.4324/9780203120293>
- Christianson, K. (1997). Dictionary use by EFL writers: What really happens? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6(1), 23–43. [https://doi-org.uproxy.library.dc-uoit.ca/10.1016/S1060-3743\(97\)90004-7](https://doi-org.uproxy.library.dc-uoit.ca/10.1016/S1060-3743(97)90004-7)

- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in Education* (6th ed.). Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Creswell, J. (2015). *Educational research* (5th ed.). Pearson.
- Cumming, A. (2001). 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
- de Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or additional language acquisition*. Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- 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.
- 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>
- Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the twenty-first century*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gordon, L. (2008). Writing and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners* (loc. 3132 of 4186). Cambridge University Press.
- Griffiths, C. (2008). Strategies and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners*. Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2013). L1/L2/L3 writing development: Longitudinal case study of a Japanese multicompetent writer. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(1), 4–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JSLW.2012.11.001>
- Leavy, P. (2017). *Research design*. Guilford Press.

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

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

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

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>

Marshall, S. (2020). Understanding plurilingualism and developing pedagogy: Teaching in linguistically diverse classes across the disciplines at a Canadian university. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 33(2), 142–156, DOI: 10.1080/07908318.2019.1676768

Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (2nd, Kindle). Jossey-Bass.

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

Poe, M. (2013). Research on multilingual writers in the disciplines: The case of biomedical engineering. In S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Literacy as translanguaging 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.

Roca de Larios, J., Manchón, R., Murphy, L., & Marín, J. (2008). The foreign language writer’s strategic behaviour in the allocation of time to writing processes. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(1), 30–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.08.005>

- 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>
- Skibniewski, L., & Skibniewska, M. (1986). Experimental study: The writing processes of intermediate/advanced foreign language learners in their foreign and native languages. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia: An International Review of English Studies*, 19, 143–163.
- Statistics Canada. (2017a). 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. (2017b). 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>
- The Daily. (2021, November 24). Prior to COVID-19, international students accounted for the growth in postsecondary enrolments and graduates. Statistics Canada.
<https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/200512/dq200512a-eng.htm>
- Usanova, I., & Schnoor, B. (2021). Exploring multiliteracies in multilingual students: Profiles of multilingual writing skills. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 44(1), 56–73.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2021.1890649>
- Usher, A., (2021). The state of postsecondary education in Canada, 2021. *Higher Education Strategy Associates*. https://higherstrategy.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/HESA_SPEC_2021.pdf
- Victori, M. (1999). An analysis of writing knowledge in EFL composing: A case study of two effective and two less effective writers. *System*, 27(4), 537–555. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(99\)00049-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00049-4)
- Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems* (9th ed). Mouton Publishers.
- Wernicke, M. (2022). "I'm trilingual – So what?": Official French/English Bilingualism, Race, and French Language Teachers' Linguistic Identities in Canada. *The Canadian Modern Language Review - La Revue Canadienne Des Langues Vivantes*, 78(4), 344–362.
- Wong, A. T. Y. (2005). Writers' mental representations of the intended audience and of the rhetorical purpose for writing and the strategies that they employed when they composed. *System*, 33(1), 29–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SYSTEM.2004.06.009>