ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Developing a multilingual literary magazine in an English-only policy environment

Alex Josef Kasula[1]

[1] Universidad de los Andes.

ABSTRACT

The following article discusses the development and outcomes of a multilingual literary magazine, *Olowalu Review*, within an English-only policy in the United States. First, there is a review of current literature surrounding the ideas of monolingual policies in the US (the context of the article) and current research of the theory of translanguaging for multilinguals and its practice thus far in English language learning classrooms (ELL). The article elaborates on the analysis of translanguaging from Kasula (2016) and how this analysis helps to promote multilingualism. Next, there is a discussion on the achievement of the initial objectives of *Olowalu Review*, and how this acted as a first potential step in creating a translanguaging space for multilinguals to express themselves and making change towards a more multilingual language policy.

KEYWORDS: English-only policy; translanguaging; multilingualism; multilingual writing; *Olowalu Review*; Brazil; United States; creative writing.

Desenvolvimento de uma revista literária plurilíngue em um contexto de políticas em língua inglesa

RESUMO

Esse artigo discute o desenvolvimento e os resultados de uma revista literária plurilíngue, *Revista Olowalu*, no contexto de uma política linguística em língua inglesa nos Estados Unidos, além de apresentar, pesquisas atuais sobre teorias de translinguagem para multilinguismo e suas práticas, portanto distanciando-se da aprendizagem de língua inglesa. Esse artigo elabora na análise de translinguajar por Kasula (2016) e como essa análise pode promover multilinguismo. Em seguida, há uma discussão sobre alcance dos objetivos iniciais de *Revista Olowalu*, e como isso serve como primeiro passo para a criação de um espaço translinguístico para multilíngues se expressarem e fazerem mudanças para uma política linguística mais multilíngue.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Políticas em língua inglesa; translinguagem; escrita plurilíngue; Brasil; Estados Unidos; escrita criativa.

Corresponding Author:
ALEX JOSEF KASULA
<aj.kasula@uniandes.edu.com>

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout the world multilinguals and emerging multilinguals are limited in their ability to express, utilize and practice their linguistic identities and recourses in a variety of spaces such as school, work, and even within their community (Menkin & García, 2010). One of the primary reasons multilinguals cannot exercise their complete linguistic repertoire is due to monolingual language policies, particularly in educational and language learning settings (García, Zakharia, & Otcu, 2013). Developing a multilingual language policies have been proposed to contest the negative impacts of monolingual language policies; such as losing or refusing to preserve indigenous or minority communities through the educational right to learn mother tongue, heritage, and minority languages, (Hornberger, 2002; Singh, Zhang, & Besmel, 2012). Although advancements have been made to make stronger multilingual policies in some spaces and settings, multilingualism still remains undesired in some settings, primarily by monolinguals of the majority language. We can see clear examples of monolingual policies in the US (García et al., 2013), Europe (Phillipson, 2003), South America (De Mejía, 2005), and throughout nearly every region around the world (Menkin & García, 2010). This comes in contrast with the ever increasing amount of students and learners who study languages to become bilingual or multilingual because of demands due to a globalized economy and access to information found in other languages, demands that play a heavy role in determining the well-being of a society's members. To gain a deeper understanding of how monolingual policies work and the negative consequences many of them have on those within these policies, it is important to look at recent language policies, specifically English-only policies in the United States, which is the context of this article.

2. MONOLINGUAL POLICIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Although there is no official language of the US at a federal level, the English-only policy continues to have one of the most profound impacts in classrooms throughout the country. The US is home to users of hundreds of languages (Wang, 2015) and urban dwellings alone, like New York, can contain more than 200 languages (García et al., 2013). With a presence of such linguistic diversity, some language learning classrooms are expanding policy to meet new multilingual expectations; however, the majority of existing policy still promotes the idea of monolingualism. Monolingual policies have gotten so strict in some states that bilingualism is outlawed in English language learning (ELL) programs (Baker, 2011; García, 2001; García & Wei, 2014). ELL classrooms tend to be the most affected as the students are more than often from immigrant or minority language families (Wang, 2015). When these students, often the most vulnerable within the neo-liberal education system, are forced into monolingual language policies, not only do we see an issue of their inability to meet needs within the education system, but a potential to not reach their social needs either (Davis & Phrak, 20015; García et al., 2013; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2012). One could argue that these children are educated to be 'less capable', compared to others, of looking at the world critically because of the language barrier. Jozwaik and Sullivan (2005)

explicitly discuss Mexican Americans living in the borderlands of culture and language in the Southwestern US who underperform in school due to monolingual policy and misrecognition of the students' Chicano identity, community, and linguistic background. They argue for a stronger multilingual and multicultural curriculum that gives space to acknowledge the students' own identity and community. In fact, Utakis and Pita (2005) further the discussion when they address language teachers' dissatisfaction of language policy in New York due to not meeting the social needs of their students. Utakis and Pita emphasize the need for a clearer, transnational approach to language policy that better fits the multilingual identities and bicultural lifestyle of their students that live in a transnational setting of both the US and Dominican Republic. In this regard, Garca & Wei (2014) describe how traditional views, specifically in the US, of separating languages into the categories of L1 and L2 have put a disadvantage to multilinguals because of the separation and 'othering' of minority languages and those who speak them. Therefore, a classic separation of L1 and L2 began to take place in ELL, which inevitably led to settings where using only one language seemed appropriate, and the creation of English-only policies. Within the framework of an English-only policy in ELL classrooms, the occurrences of code-switching, or moving between the use of the L1 and L2, is viewed as a lapse in understanding the input of the target language rather than a use of another linguistic resource (García & Wei, 2014; Grosjean, 2010). This belief limits the opportunity for learners to utilize all of their linguistic resources, and further suppresses their ever changing and developing multilingual identity.

3. TRANSLANGUAGING AND MULTILINGUALISM

Multilingualism has continued to exist throughout the world, even among the pressure of substantial monolingual languages policies in education. Some contexts or settings promote a multilingual environment; however, often at the expense of minimizing use of minority languages. For example, as mentioned above, one can look at the large diversity of languages in urban transnational immigrant dwellings like New York (see García, 2013 for a list of languages spoken in New York City), indigenous communities within nation-states (Davis, 2009), the demands on students and professionals throughout the world to learn formal colonial languages to meet globalization standards, and societies and communities across the globe that were multilingual before colonialization and globalization (Canagarajah & Liyanage, 2012). Although there is a common misconception that numerous societies throughout the world are monolingual, it does not take into account emerging or already existent multilinguals because of the before mentioned reasons. Therefore, by trying to force members of society into a monolingual pedagogy, simply does not work due to the need to develop a multilingual identity and culture as mentioned in the previous section. However, with the clear presence of multilingualism, at times a negative presence as a result of monolingual policy suppressing the use of more than one language, there is a strong necessity for learners, teachers and policy makers to comprehend multilingualism and its meaning (Cummins, 2009). Cenoz (2013) describes

the holistic view of multilingualism in which multilingual speakers use their linguistic resources in ways that are different from the way monolingual speakers use a single linguistic repertoire. Although there are several ways to define multilingualism (see Cenoz, 2013), the present definition sufficiently describes multilingualism in the current context of the article. Nevertheless, there is still a need to understand multilingualism, how it is used, and how it represents identity. One way of understanding how multilingualism is transpired in terms of identity and use is through *translanguaging*.

Translanguaging is described by Kasula (2016) as, "a social concept that aims to discuss the use of language among multilinguals, and is a common phenomenon among multilinguals playing a fundamental role in terms of communication, identity, and power" (p. 111). Translanguaging is an approach to language use, or languaging, representative of multilinguals. Rather than viewing language as two or more separate autonomous language systems or structures, as the case in monolingual language policies, it views all language as a part of one linguistic repertoire but with features that have conventionally and societally constructed as belonging to separate languages (García & Wei, 2014). Below (in **Excerpt 1**) is an example of translanguaging from a multilingual literary magazine that uses resources of Spanish, French, English, and Hawaiian.

EXCERPT 1:

E Lei,e
[lay laid laid] 'oe i les leis
ma luna à la lune
i laila, où elle [lie lay lain]
i le lit o lāua

(Amos, E Lei, *Olowalu Review*)

Translanguaging is a highly common practice for multilinguals throughout most multilingual or falsely perceived monolingual societies. However, for translanguaging to occur, it is necessary that a 'space' to translanguage is available; once again, this is often limited by monolingual language policies. Translanguaging gives way for multilinguals to express their multiple identities by not only acknowledging their existence but also exercising them (Kasula, 2016). In this space, the languaging enables its members to express history, values, culture, language, and identity to again negotiate these ideas, co-exist with others, and combine together to create new identities, values and practices (Swain, 2006; Wei, 2011). Translanguaging space is fluid and ever changing alongside the identities of its inhabitants to full-fill desired identities (Wei, 2011). Since translanguaging space is fluid and a rather new concept for language pedagogy experts, its acceptance in language policy has its pushbacks; nevertheless, its appearance in multilingual contexts, in and outside of the language classroom, has not gone unnoticed. When multilinguals are given the opportunity to express their multiple identities and use their full linguistic repertoire within this space, multilinguals become empowered (Cummins, 2009; Davis, 2009). Translanguaging space can even be viewed as an innate linguistic human right as a way to counteract linguistic dominance over minority or indigenous languages (Skutnabb-

Kangas & Heugh, 1998). Therefore, it is necessary to examine translanguaging thus far in terms of existent practices and policy surrounding this view of multilingualism.

4. APPLYING TRANSLANGUAGING TO LANGUAGE PRACTICE AND POLICY

Although translanguaging is only now truly making ground in the field language learning and policy, it has long been a common form of communication among multilinguals. One of the more recent investigations by Wei (2011) discusses the development of translanguaging space through the process of translanguaging done by three Chinese youths in Britain. Wei argues that through the development and existence of translanguaging space, which has commonly occurred among migrant communities in Britain and throughout the world, multilinguals construct a greater sense of identity. Within this new multilingual identity, they find a shared sense of history, culture, and social practices that enable them to find a greater feeling of acceptance within a society dominated by a monolingual ideology. Wei's findings can be cross-culturally applied to show similar cases throughout regions that hold a higher population of immigrants, refugees and other groups who may not be monolingual in the dominant language of their new dwelling.

Different from communicating within language communities like in Wei's (2011) study, language policy, often institutionalized, plays a fundamental role in macro-perceptions and acceptance of multilinguals in the larger society often governed in the dominant language. García et al. (2013) discuss a ground-up methodology, which was later put into policy, of how ELL teachers can develop translanguaging spaces in an elementary school classroom of multilinguals from a variety of L1s. García et al. reveal that when translanguaging space is provided, translanguaging begins to reveal itself as students started to use semiotic resources from their and other student's linguistic repertoire to gain better sense of the 'target' language and surpass class expectations. Also, the translanguaging space generated a community within the classroom of comfortability among students and even involving students' parents and community members. Since translanguaging does not have sufficient research, there is no clear claim that creating this space will develop target or native languages. However, Sayer (2013) found that in a multilingual elementary classroom the use of a pedagogy open to translanguaging enabled students to make better sense of content, learn language and reach desired identities. Wei and Hua (2013) continued this discussion with their research on British-born Chinese university students and how translanguaging aided in the development of group-making which then impacted their interactions, social space, and linguistic and political ideologies. Canagarajah (2013) looked beyond identity formation and expectations in his analysis of translanguaging in essays from multilingual university students. He found that students used a variety of translanguaging writing strategies to utilize their full linguistic repertoire to make sense of content by using writers' semantic resources, communicate with others, and develop literary voice.

Little research has investigated translanguaging outside of community groups and academic settings. However, as previously mentioned,

translanguaging among multilinguals is as old as multilingualism. One example is the literary work of Gloria Anzaldúa (1987), who uses translanguaging to expose the lives of Chicanos living in the "borderlands" of Mexico and the United States to represent their linguistic and social identity. She expresses and reveals the complex identity of the borderlands and those who inhabit it; often affected by the social norms of both sides of the border, although not being fully accepted into either. Alim, Ibrahim, and Pennycook (2009) show a more recent example of translanguaging in transnational hip-hop and its association with group acceptance, language use, and identity construction across national borders. Kasula (2016) recently developed a multilingual literary magazine that spawned from the researcher's own limitations of working within an English-only policy within an ELL program at a university in the United States. The study examined the translanguaging that occurred, applying Canagarajah's (2013) strategies to multilinguals' creative writing. Kasula found that multilinguals enjoyed utilizing their resources to further their literary skills, found it as a good way to practice L1s and target languages, as well as an opportunity to express their multilingual identity that was being surpassed due to the English-only policy. However, Kasula does not go into depth in how to create a multilingual literary magazine and how creating such a magazine based on an understanding of translanguaging can help to contest monolingual language policy.

Therefore, the following article will be examining the development of the multilingual literary magazine, *Olowalu Review*; from Kasula's (2016) study, and how it is one way to provide translanguaging space for multilinguals to exercise their identity, reinforce language skills, and participate in self-expression under an English-only policy.

5. *OLOWALU REVIEW*: DEVELOPMENT WITHIN AN ENGLISH-ONLY POLICY

The following sections describe the development of an online literary magazine, *Olowalu Review* (*Olowalu* meaning "of many voices" in Hawai'ian), by the author at an ELL program within a mid-sized university in Hawai'i. *Olowalu Review* was developed due to a long-standing "English-only" policy within the instructor's institution that teaches near to one-hundred students from a variety of L1 backgrounds. The English-only policy disabled students from expressing their multilingual identities or using resources in their linguistic repertoire. The institution potentially punished students who did use their L1. The English-only policy was enforced because there was concern that students would self-segregate and make social groups based on L1s and not use target language of the institution, English, although there was no clear evidence of this occurring. The instructor did not want to defy the longstanding policies of the institution, which could potentially put the instructor or students at risk of repercussions or penalties. Instead, the instructor decided to create a translanguaging space outside of the classroom, which was also open to other faculties of the same university, the local and national community. With such a diverse linguistic student body within the institution, as well as at the institution's university, creating an open space to translanguage and self-expression in multilingualism appeared essential.

At the time of the instructor's development of *Olowalu Review*, there was no known literary magazine with the aim of promoting multilingualism within the instructor's local and national communities. The need for such a translanguaging space seemed all the more necessary after the examination of some student's L1's as they represented language minorities in the institution, like Arabic, Hawaiian, and Vietnamese.

When creating *Olowalu Review*, the instructor did need to get permission from the administration at the institution. In doing this, he made sure that he was not in violation of the monolingual language policy. The instructor made it clear to the administration that submissions were completely voluntary, would not impact students' class scores or grades, and were not affiliated with the institution. Also, the instructor presented a brief explanation of some translanguaging research and described the activity as an opportunity to practice more outside of class, and that there will be no negative consequences on students acquiring of the target language. Without permission from the administration, it could have appeared as if the instructor was undermining long-standing traditions and values of the institution, which could have led to negative consequences for the instructor's employment and penalties for students who participated.

5.1. Submissions

After an approval from the administration was granted to publicize to students at the institution without any affiliation, it was necessary for the instructor to gather submissions. First, the instructor informed other language teachers and students within the institution about the magazine, through both oral presentations and flyers. In order to gain larger and more diverse submissions, all language departments at the institution's university were contacted. A total of twenty-eight responded, ranging from languages like Spanish, Portuguese, and Persian to lesser-known departments like Tahitian, Samoan, and Cambodian. A flyer was then distributed in paper or digital format to department heads that later provided this information to students. Also, local creative writing Facebook pages in the community where contacted and posted the flyer on their webpages. Finally, to involve a more nation community, three different contacts at US mainland universities were contacted and asked to distribute flyers to their students. *Olowalu Review* was open towards any form of art and expression as long as it was in any way multilingual. Specific categories were recommended as poetry, short stories, nonfiction, and visual art.

After a call for submissions was released, it was necessary for the instructor to find a digital platform, without a budget, for *Olowalu Review*. There was no financial or institutional support from the instructor's institution since it was agreed upon earlier that the project would not have any affiliation. Therefore, the instructor decided to use a free online website design platform, Wix.com. Although other free website creators are available, the instructor decided to use Wix.com because of personal preference.

The last important aspect of *Olowalu Review* was the development of clear objectives and a vision for the magazine. The instructor decided to structure the objectives and vision off of the gap he saw in multilingual needs

of the students and community. Therefore, all of the following objectives of *Olowalu Review* were based on current multilingual theory and opening translanguaging spaces; in addition to the instructor's own perceived needs of the students and community in terms of art and expression. Below are the objectives for *Olowalu Review*.

Objectives of *Olowalu Review*:

1. Raise multilingual and translanguaging awareness.
2. Promote multilingual use and identity.
3. Enable speakers and writers to exercise their multilingual knowledge.
4. Contribute as another resource and example of translanguage/ multilingual literature.
5. Promote arts and expression in the local, national, and global communities.

After the development of *Olowalu Review*'s call for submissions, website, and objectives, a three month period was allotted to communicate with authors, accept submissions, and update the website. After three months, *Olowalu Review* was published as an open access multilingual literary magazine without having violated the monolingual policies of the instructor's institution.

6. OUTCOME

6.1. Submissions

Expectations on submissions for the first issue of the multilingual literary magazine were met with a total of twelve submissions by fourteen different authors. Authors used a wide-variety of languages that span the course of the globe, ranging from languages like English, Spanish and French to Slavic, Korean and Hawaiian to make a total of thirteen different languages used. Authors also provided a "hometown" to represent the transnationalism within a rather localized literary magazine, representing eight different countries. Five of the submissions came from the instructor's institution, with a total of eight from the instructor's university. The remaining four submissions derived from the instructor's contacts at mainland US universities. Seven poems, four non-fiction stories, and one fictional story were submitted. **Table 1** shows the submissions for *Olowalu Review*.

Table 1: *Olowalu Review* submissions (Kasula, 2016)

Hometown	Languages	Type	Authors	Piece
Illinois, U.S.A.	English, Russian, Spanish	Poem	1	Calle San Miguel
Hawai'i, U.S.A	English, French, Hawaiian	Poem	1	E Lei
Illinois, U.S.A.	English, Spanish	Poem	1	El Humo Francés
Taiwan; U.S.A.	Chinese, English, Spanish	Nonfiction	3	地球生態的保護意識 Environmental Protection
Seoul, Korea	English, Korean	Nonfiction	1	First Day at Niagara Falls
Guildford, England	English, Spanish	Poem	1	La Máquina
Jalisco, Mexico	English, Spanish	Fiction	1	Life in the Mountains
Seoul, Korea	English, German, Italian, Korean, Slavic	Poem	1	언어 사랑
Bangkok, Thailand	English, Thai	Nonfiction	1	On Professionalism
Najaf, Iraq	Arabic, English	Poem	1	Sleep Softly
Chiba, Japan	English, Japanese	Poem	1	Time Goes By
Seoul, Korea	English, German	Nonfiction	1	Was I want to tun in Hawaii?

6.2. Translanguaging

The following section will briefly review the findings from Kasula's (2016) research that was more directed at how translanguaging occurred (for a deeper of analysis of translanguaging in *Olowalu Review*, see Kasula, 2016), as this will help to expose how the literary magazine can be used within monolingual policies. Kasula explains that translanguaging did occur in every submission to *Olowalu Review*. Translanguaging occurred naturally without being solicited by another individual, which Canaragajah (2011) states as being a fundamental process of translanguaging. In nearly every submission, the way the authors translanguage was different; however, there were still clear connections between their translanguaging and the translanguaging strategies discussed in Canaragajah (2013), specifically envoicing and interactional strategies. Although each author translanguages differently, an understanding of translingual strategies is the first step in moving towards further supporting and developing pedagogy in multilingual environments. Authors also practiced and used translanguaging in literary devices such as onomatopoeia and what Kasula calls "linguistic imagery", where the writer uses translanguaging to bring forth linguistic images, sounds, or meaning to express a unique idea to the author. The findings from translanguaging are able to use resources from their entire linguistic repertoire to develop creative writing literature. The ability to use multiple resources from the linguistic repertoire enriches the multilingual's ability to explore writing structure (Loffero & Perteghella, 2014). These findings could aid in the theoretical and pedagogical support necessary transforming monolingual language policy towards multilingualism.

Authors also found writing for a multilingual literary magazine to be a rewarding experience. Kasula (2016) describes how authors found the experience to be "fun", "interesting", and a "good way to practice". Beyond enjoying the experience, some of the authors found the translanguaging space as an area to express and construct identity. One case in particular was an Iraqi PhD student at the instructors university, and he claimed that there was not an open space where he felt completely comfortable using Arabic. He found the translanguaging space in *Olowalu Review* to be an area where he could express himself, and reveal his emerging multilingual identity. However, this was not possible at the ELL institution because of the strict English-only policy which held no other Arabic speakers. This brief summary of the results of Kasula's study alludes to the usefulness and necessity of moving away from monolingual policies towards making them more multilingual as spaces like *Olowalu Review* help to foster multilingual language use and identity.

6.3. Political Implications

Although *Olowalu Review* did not directly change the long-standing English-only policy at the instructor's institution, it did fulfill its aforementioned objectives and challenged the policies in an ancillary manner. One of the concerns of the instructor was that *Olowalu Review* would have negative repercussions for either the students who participated or the instructor

himself; however, this was not the case because of the approach the instructor took in the magazine's development. Some of the objectives the instructor laid out during the development of *Olowalu Review* were to 1) raise multilingual and translanguaging awareness, 2) promote multilingual use and identity, and 3) enable speakers and writers to exercise their multilingual knowledge. The achievement of these objectives in itself was a success in the ideas of multilingual language policy (Kasula, 2016).

These objectives were met and with a positive response from the authors. Many authors, in brief interview with the instructor made the claim that they have never thought about writing by translanguaging, and that it "felt natural" and "fun" for them to do so (Kasula, 2016). By simply creating space to translanguage, *Olowalu Review* helped to raise multilingual and translanguaging awareness for those who have never had access to express themselves in such a way. Also, although the instructor was unable to make any changes towards policy within his institution, he was at least able to discuss the issue of monolingual policies and create opportunities outside of the institution for students to practice and construct multilingual identities, helping to achieve *Olowalu Review's* second objective. Both students from within the instructor's institution and multilinguals from the larger university, and nation communities participated, *Olowalu Review* aided in the promotion of multilingual use and identity. In some cases the translanguaging space helped to empower the students, which Davis (2009) claims is necessary to have a ground-up approach to change in policy. It is very clear that the third objective was met by simply looking at all of the submissions to *Olowalu Review*. In a short interview with the instructor, one author said, "I have always been looking for a place to publish my multilingual poems". This quote from an author clearly displays that *Olowalu Review* simply became a place for multilinguals to exercise their multilingual knowledge in spaces that are often presumed to have a monolingual ideology. The last two objectives of *Olowalu Review*, 4) contribute as another resource and example of translanguage/multilingual literature, and 5) promote arts and expression in the local, national, and global communities, were simply met by the success of publishing the online literary magazine. *Olowalu Review* is easily accessible at olowalureview.wixsite.com/olowalureview, and can act as a resource for those interested in translanguaging or multilingual literature. Also, *Olowalu Review* expanded beyond just a local Hawaiian community, but even reached a national level where authors from a variety of linguistic and cultural backgrounds could share their stories, history, language and culture to further negotiate and structure their multilingual identities (Swain, 2006; Wei, 2011).

No policy was directly affected and changed because of *Olowalu Review's* development and success. However, maybe by achieving the previously mentioned objectives, like spreading awareness, creating space to translanguage, empowering multilinguals, and engaging within a multilinguals community, *Olowalu Review* made the first steps in creating change in a long-standing monolingual policy. Online literary magazines, like *Olowalu Review*, can be examples and figureheads of multilingualism and its acceptance on a larger scale. However, to deepen the political implications of such a project, future research could aim at doing similar projects in

an intact classroom. Whereas *Olowalu Review* was confined to having no association with the instructor's institution, future research could include similar projects as a part of course curriculum and provide multilinguals with the exposure to both translanguaging literature and theory prior to developing the project. This may increase participation in the project and offer the writers a reference when developing their own literature. Results from such projects may provide further evidence to make the shift away from strict monolingual policies towards generating classrooms that allow and create translanguaging space.

7. IMPLICATIONS FOR BRAZIL

Due to the scope of this journal and to understand broader international implications of a project that can easily be shifted across national borders, the following section discusses how *Olowalu Review* may be beneficial in a Brazilian context as way to enlighten multilingual language policy.

Much of the current research in Brazil has noted long-standing resistance to English in terms of public and educational policy to preserve and protect Portuguese as a national language from the incursion of English (Rajagopalan, 2005). Such policies have even portrayed the monolingual policies found in the United States, whereas instead of being English-only in the US, it is Portuguese-only in Brazil, echoing another example of a falsely monolingual society (Diniz de Figueiredo, 2014). However, the reality in Brazil is much different from what current policy displays. Along with the increase in globalization encouraging the need to be able to use English as a medium of communication, alongside advances in teacher education, new language programs, and some changes to language learning ideologies, Brazil is becoming more multilingual in terms of language users (Gimenez, et al., 2015). Nevertheless, the increase in English as a lingua franca still does not account for the communities, both immigrant and indigenous, who have long been marginalized in educational language policy (Aikhenvald, 2003).

Therefore, we can view the context of Brazil as very similar to that of Hawai'i, which was presented in this article. With any foreign language being viewed as a threat in the United States, and English-only policy only serves to perpetuate the long-standing misconception that the U.S. is a monolingual nation. Creating a disservice in education of the high percentage on non-native English speaking immigrants marginalized indigenous groups, or heritage learners of language. In Brazil, the Portuguese-only policies continue to perpetuate the ideas that Brazil is and has always been a monolingual nation, when in reality Brazil has a strong heterogeneous linguistic reality (Diniz de Figueiredo, 2014). The monolingual policies in Brazil show similar impacts as those to the U.S., continuing the marginalization on indigenous groups and minority languages, as well as providing a negative connation and disservice to those learning English. Brazilian language policy needs to make a similar shift to that of the U.S., and begin to break away from ideas of monolingual or binary understandings of languages, but instead view language as that in translanguaging where all language can be viewed as a resource to which make better sense of the world through co-construction of meaning, and help to give voice to those wondering the borderlands

of language. Projects like *Olowalu Review* can help to expose and promote multilingualism and be the representation of the diversity and quantity multilingual voices in Brazil to hopefully bring forth a positive change to language policy.

8. CONCLUSION

Olowalu Review was developed as a form to contest long-standing monolingual policies within an ELL institution. Although the instructor who developed the magazine was unable to change the language policy, he was able to fulfill the objectives of the magazine that transpired a multilingual ideology through the use of translanguaging. To further the work done by Kasula (2016), instructors, researchers, and policy makers could consider furthering the development of online literary magazines like *Olowalu Review*. There are some clear limitations to Kasula's work, such as the small number of authors, only having one edition of the magazine, and not making any significant changes to monolingual language policy. Kasula's limitations can be attributed to possibly having no funding, no support from within the instructor's institution, and limited support in the entirety of the magazines development. Future research could aim to exceed these limitations by engaging with a larger multilingual community, and with continual publications of the magazine to keep and continue to grow a multilingual community.

Olowalu Review can be viewed as a great example of how ELL instructors are able to challenge monolingual language policies. Current research clearly supports the ideas of multilingualism in language learning as it has had positive influences in both terms of language use and identity construction. It is up to teachers, researchers, and policy makers to continue exploring ideas of translanguaging and multilingualism to further understand its uses and limitations. *Olowalu Review* can be viewed as only one small example of how instructors can make a positive change in the lives of students, the community, and make attempts to challenge unwarranted language policy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

Aikhenvald, A. 2003. Teaching Tariana, an endangered language from northwest Amazonia. *Small languages and small language communities*, 42, p. 125-139.

Alim, H. S., Ibrahim, A., & Pennycook, A. 2009. *Global linguistic flows: Hip hop cultures, youth identities, and the politics of language*. London, UK: Routledge.

Amos, K. 2015. E lei. *Olowalu Review*, 1. Retrieved from <http://olowalureview.wix.com/olowalureview#!e-lei/cm6k>.

Anzaldúa, G. 1987. *Borderlands/La frontera*. San Francisco, CA: Spinsters/Aunt Lute Book Company.

Baker, C. 2011. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, S. 2011. Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. In: L. Wei (Ed.). *Applied Linguistics Review 2* (p. 1-27). New York, US: Walter de Gruyter.

Canagarajah, S. 2013. Negotiating translanguaging literacy: An enactment. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 48(1), p. 40-67.

Canagarajah, S. & Liyanage, I. 2012. Lessons from pre-colonial multilingualism. In: M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge, & A. Creese (Ed.). *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism* (p. 49-65). London, UK: Routledge.

Cenoz, J. 2013. Defining multilingualism. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 33, p. 3-18.

Cummins, J. 2009. Transformative multiliteracies pedagogy: School-based strategies for closing the achievement gap. *Multiple Voices for Ethnically Diverse Exceptional Learners*, (11)2, p. 38-56.

Davis, K. & Phrak, P. 2015. In the face of neoliberal adversity: Engaging language education policy and practices. *L2 Journal*, 7(3), p. 146-166.

Davis, K. 2009. Agentive youth research: Towards individual, collective and policy transformations. In: T. G. Wiley, J. S. Lee, & R. Rumberger (Ed.). *The education of language minority immigrants in the USA* (p. 202-239). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

De Mejía, A. M. 2005. *Bilingual education in South America*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Diniz de Figueiredo, E. H. 2014. Portugese only: A discourse analysis of 'Projeto de Lei 1676/1999' from Brazil. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 11(3), p. 342-359.

García, O. 2011. Educating New York's bilingual children: Constructing a future from the past. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14(2), p. 133-153.

García, O., Zakharia, Z., & Otcu, B. 2013. *Bilingual community education for American children: Beyond heritage languages in a global city*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

García, O. & Wei, L. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gimenez, T., Ferreira, A., Alves Basso, R. A., & Carvalho Cruvinel, R. 2016. Policies for English language teacher education in Brazil today: Preliminary remarks. *PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 18(1), p. 219-234.

Grosjean, F. 2010. *Bilingual: Life and Reality*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hornberger, N. H. 2002. Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. Language Policy, 1(1), p. 27-51.

Kasula, A. 2016. *Olowalu Review*: Developing identity through translanguaging in a multilinguals literary magazine. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 18(2), p. 109-118.

Loffero, E. & Perteghella, M. 2014. Literary translation as a creative practice in L2 pedagogies. In: D. Disney (Ed.). *Exploring Second Language Writing: Beyond Babel* (p. 57-74). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Menkin, K. & García, O. 2010. *Negotiating Language Education Policies: Educators as Policymakers*. New York: Routledge.

Mermann-Jozwaik, E. & Sullivan, N. 2005. Local knowledge and global citizenship: Languges and literatures in the United States-Mexico Borderlands. In: S. Canagarajah (Ed.). *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice* (p. 269-288). New York: Routledge.

Singh, N. K., Zhang, S., & Besmel, P. 2012. Globalization and language policies of multilingual societies: Some case studies of South East Asia. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*, 12(2), p. 349-380.

Phillipson, R. 1998. Globalizing English: Are linguistic human rights an alternative to linguistic imperialism? *Language Sciences*, 20(1), p. 101-112.

Phillipson, R. 2003. *English-only Europe?: Challenging language policy*. New York: Routledge.

Rajagopalan, K. 2005. The language issue in Brazil: When local knowledge clashes with expert knowledge. In: S. Canagarajah (Ed.). *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice* (p. 99-122). New York: Routledge.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Heugh, K. (Ed.). 2012. *Multilingual Education and Sustainable Diversity Work From Periphery to Center*. New York: Routledge.

Swain, M. (2006). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language learning. In: H. Byrnes (Ed.). *Advanced language learning: The contributions of Halliday and Vygotsky* (p. 95-108). London, UK: Continuum.

Sayer, P. 2013. Translanguaging, TexMex, and bilingual pedagogy: Emergent bilinguals learning through the vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly*, 4(1), p. 63-88.

Utakis, S. & Pita, M. 2005. An education policy for negotiation transnationalism: The Dominican community in New York City. In: S. Canagarajah (Ed.). *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice* (p. 147-164). New York: Routledge.

Wang, D. 2016. From English-only to multilingualism: English in the language policy of the United States. *International Journal of Language Teaching*, 3(1), p. 32-41.

Wei, L. 2011. Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), p. 1222-1235.

Wei, L. & Hua, Z. 2013. Translanguaging identities and ideologies: Creating transnational space through flexible multilingual practices amongst Chinese university students in the UK. *Applied Linguistics*, 34(5), p. 516-535.