Translingual Gateways: A Collaborative Autoethnography of Two Transnational Scholars' Academic Socialization and Transdisciplinarities in Writing Studies

Shakil Rabbi, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Md Mijanur Rahman, California State University, Los Angeles

Abstract: In this article, two transnational scholars of English studies engage in a collaborative autoethnography to illustrate the generative potential of translingualism as a scholarly common ground for writing studies and the history of English language studies. The argument hinges on the notion that translingualism's open-endedness to, and welcoming of, students' and instructors' linguistic diversity can make it a disciplinary pathway for transnational scholars to use their diverse World Englishes in writing classrooms. Based on case studies of their autobiographical narratives of professional development, experiences teaching in college writing classrooms, and engagement with translingual scholarship, the article shows how (a) translingualism works as a gateway (i.e., point of entry) into writing studies for scholars who are World Englishes users and (b) histories of the English language mediate this disciplinary socialization. Three major themes that emerge from a comparative analysis of the materials and that relate to the authors' distinct approaches to writing, underlying motivations for linguistic and academic pursuits, and disciplinary orientations are discussed.

Introduction

In early Fall 2023, as we were still finalizing the initial version of this article, one of the co-authors, Mijan, was teaching a class on the history of the English language at his majority Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) in Southern California. He wanted his students to learn about the orthographic, phonological, syntactic, and morphological characteristics of Old English, Middle English, and Early Modern English in the British Isles while also making sense of the global spread of modern English and its evolution into World Englishes. This emphasis on World Englishes in his instructional design allowed him to tap into his personal experience learning a Bangladeshi version of World Englishes and his academic expertise in translingualism and presented the English language's histories in familiar terms to students. This identity as pedagogy practice helped his students develop a situated understanding of their own linguistic practices, which include use of Spanglish, Chicano English, and features of African American Vernacular English despite being exposed to and educated in the mainstream American English in academic and professional contexts. The use of World Englishes varieties is documented around the world, a fact that demands renewed attention to how we talk about the history of the English language in contemporary research and pedagogical practices in language and literacy.

Historically speaking, English, once relatively peripheral, is now central in our contemporary, international society. In *English as a Global Language,* David Crystal (2012) discusses how its

---

status as a global language has important implications for fields studying languages. He observes that the speed and scale of English's spread is unprecedented, admitting that we must now recognize that there is "[indeed] a major shift taking place in the center of gravity of the language … we now have a situation where there are more people speaking it as a second language, and many more speaking it as a foreign language" (p. 69). This rhetorical situation indicates a need to move away from native-speaker norms in our scholarly and research deliberations, recognizing that World Englishes are an essential dimension of English as a global language.

Braj Kachru (1988) has argued that non-native speakers of English problematize what he called sacred cows of language pedagogy. The new center of gravity—or even its suggestion—raises questions about some basic theoretical concepts and implications in the field of English language or writing. The concept of speech community, for example, as we will elaborate on further, must now be expanded to accommodate "bilingual [and multilingual] competence in languages and literary conventions … and multicultural competence, including experiences not shared by the Inner Circle [of the Global Language]" (p. 6). In other words, both Crystal and Kachru propose an exigence that asks us to rethink how we engage with the topic of language and literacy pedagogy in a rhetorical situation where previous givens no longer apply.

In this article, we argue that in writing studies the emergence of translingualism (Horner & Tetreault, 2017) is a fitting response. Recognizing the potential for analytical and pedagogical overdetermination, the translingual paradigm argues that communicative practices are always "generated between and across individuals and communities over space and time" (Canagarajah, 2013, pp. 6-7). The conceptualization of communication addresses the problematics that Kachru (1988) raises as this framework prioritizes "new localized norms for text organization and 'interlocutor expectancy' (what people expect to encounter), culturally appropriate conventions, and the awareness of identities" (p. 7). They call for recognizing linguistic repertoires rather than reified languages to account for divergent World Englishes users' disciplinary socialization with different semiotic and linguistic resources. Their conversations on people's "ability to move translingually and (transculturally) across as well as within abstracted languages and cultures" (Horner, NeCamp, & Donahue, 2011, p. 286) necessitate transdisciplinarities (Prior, 2013) whereby insights from areas like applied linguistics and (historical) sociolinguistics (e.g., history of the English language studies) fertilize writing studies dynamically, dialectically, and productively. They provide multiple points of entry into writing studies to transnational scholars from expanded speech communities to a discipline that has often been described as "a U.S. centric, English monolingual enterprise" (Horner, NeCamp, & Donahue, 2011, p. 291)

We call these points of entry translingual gateways. Through a collaborative autoethnographic study, we examine how we, two early-career transnational scholars from South Asia, who were initially unfamiliar with the discipline, experienced such scholarly convergences and were socialized into writing studies. Our presentation here provides perspectives on the confluences of fields that make up the discourse communities we came to be a part of. We were able to draw on translingual approaches during our graduate education and professionalization processes to pluralize writing studies scholarship and enhance our capacities as members of the field and our students' awareness of linguistic diversity and plurality of Englishes. Our study was driven by the following questions: How does translingualism work as a gateway (i.e., point of entry) for scholars who are World Englishes users into writing studies, and how do histories of the English language mediate this disciplinary socialization?

Literature Review

The overarching theoretical framework informing this article is this special issue's call for finding common grounds, points of scholarly convergence, between two areas of English studies: the history of English language studies and writing studies, which are often assumed to be separated by insurmountable disciplinary boundaries. This paper argues that a close examination of the two areas' evolving focus on language differences across the world, more specifically, tapping into the

World Englishes scholarship, creates pathways for disciplinary collaboration. This article illustrates how we can identify such confluences by focusing on our stories by using a collaborative autoethnographic framework.

As we grapple with a motivation to make the history of English language studies relevant to writing studies and vice versa, we are confronted with a basic question of what exactly the history of English language studies is and what it involves. For this paper, we define it as a broad area of English studies scholarship that trace the origin and development of the English language (especially its phonology, morphology, and syntax) not only in typical Anglophone countries like the U.S., the U.K., Canada, and Australia but also the varieties of English that have proliferated across the world. This scholarship includes texts of historical linguistics like *A History of the English Language* (Baugh & Cable, 2013), which offers ample discussions of British contexts, and *This Language, A River: A History of the English Language* (Smith & Kim, 2017), which has a more focused discussion of American Englishes.

Studying the history of the English language is a necessary project for understanding linguistic diversity, especially when developing and comparing two synchronic descriptions of multiple varieties of English in different places and times. In the U.S., for example, the variationist sociolinguists (e.g., Wolfram & Schilling, 2016) identified the regular features of many varieties of American English like Southern English, African American Vernacular English, Appalachian English, Hawaiian Creole, and Chicano English, which are systematically different from, say, British English or its versions from the past. What is especially relevant for this article is that outside the U.S., the World Englishes paradigm has described the features of many nativized varieties of Englishes around the world, especially in what has been called outer circle and expanding circle countries (e.g., Kachru, 1990; see also the journal, *World Englishes*).

But typically, a history of the English language textbook either totally keeps the World Englishes scholarship beyond the purview of their discussion or groups together the discussion of all Englishes that emerged since British colonial takeover around the world, especially in the last two centuries, to a single chapter-long discussion. For example, Ans van Kemenade and Bettelou Los (2022) in their review of the history of English language textbooks for the Oxford Bibliography refer to 13 books published post-2000, but only four of them incorporated any discussion of World Englishes beyond the Anglophone contexts. While it is important to review the early histories of English, we cannot sidestep the fact that language is not constant, and neither is a body of knowledge like the history of English language studies. While compartmentalization of knowledge and formation of unique disciplines marked much of 20th-century scholarship, many contemporary disciplinary conversations are more interdisciplinary. That's why this incorporation of World Englishes in the history of English language studies creates potential for scholarly confluence if we examine the history of writing studies in the U.S. through translingual lenses.

Writing studies as a discipline (and rhetoric and composition as one of its subdisciplines) typically refers to the practice of teaching writing at U.S. colleges and universities, whether it involves teaching first-year composition, writing in the discipline, writing across the curriculum, or technical writing. But this pedagogical practice has a long, checkered history with language differences. In "Linguistic Memory and the Politics of US English," John Trimbur (2006), examining the discourses around English in the revolutionary period, says that "[i]n the politics of language, we can see how the settlement of the English colonies and the War of Independence looked to the historical primacy of Anglo-Saxon origins and linguistic memories of an older, pure English speech" (p. 3). This framing articulated a dyadic form of the U.S. culture, with Britain as interlocutor and mother culture, and represented the linguistic space of the nation as monolingual and Anglophone, and licensed other linguistic practices as alien. A status quo was put into place through the rhetoric of the early republic that overdetermined the "natural process of assimilation" for immigrants of European descent, and a single common speech was seen as "a major factor in maintaining American unity throughout this period of remarkable cultural

diversification—a 'glue' which brought people together and a medium which gave them common access to opportunity" (Crystal, 2012, p. 36).

Education, the labor market, and civil society were fundamental to this development and institutions were central to this process. Universities and composition and rhetoric in the academic space were part and parcel of this process. Writing classes in college, since their establishment in Harvard, were designed to promote English monolingualism and they practiced a "policy of linguistic containment that has kept language differences invisible" (Matsuda, 2006, p. 641) in a variety of ways. These practices include penalizing students for "weaker" forms of language differences (e.g., supposed "errors" in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and sentence structures) often without teaching these topics. They relegated more substantive aspects of language differences to tutoring centers and L2 writing specialists, maintaining an unacknowledged but widely practiced English-only policy, and finally imagining the student population as linguistically homogeneous, specifically as native speakers of a privileged variety of American English (Matsuda, 2006, pp. 638-642).

The myth of linguistic homogeneity and its concomitant promotion of English monolingualism and standard language persisted in disciplinary scholarship and pedagogy until recently, even though the student populations continued to diversify over time as more and more international students, resident second language writers, functional bilinguals, speakers of World Englishes, and users of local, stigmatized varieties of American English came into universities (Matsuda, 2006; See also Gilyard, 2016). While some scholars now do address this diversity in students (see the 2014 CCCC Statement on Second Language Writing and Writers), a corollary reconsideration of writing instructors is still in its initial stage. Those in front of the class continue to be reified as "Americans who speak and write standard American English," even though increasing numbers of multilingual, international graduate students now teach writing to native speakers (Kitalong, 2017, p. 78). Kitalong, for example, refers to a 2014 cohort of graduate teaching assistants in their writing program at a midwestern university, in which seven out of ten students were from outside the U.S., a scenario our own experiences suggest is common in the field (See also Tseptsura & Ruecker, 2024, for a more recent discussion of instructor diversity in U.S. writing classrooms).

However, the emergence of translingualism as "an intellectual movement" (Matsuda, 2014, p. 478) has made strides toward addressing the linguistic differences that students bring with them in the writing classrooms. Translingualism has been successful in bringing students' diverse language practices and identities to the forefront of conversations in composition scholarship. At the same time, the zeal for linguistic justice in composition scholarship has barely translated into actual pedagogical applications to deal with linguistic differences in writing classrooms (Matsuda, 2014). Notable exceptions include the practice of codemeshing mainly in literacy autobiographies written by advanced undergraduate or graduate students.

Vershawn Young (2007) and Suresh Canagarajah (2011, 2013) have popularized codemeshing as a teachable strategy in a writing classroom. Canagarajah (2011) defines codemeshing as a form of "translanguaging [language mixing] in texts'' that sees a multilingual's multiple linguistic repertoires "as part of a single integrated system" and that "accommodates the possibility of mixing communicative modes and diverse symbol systems (other than language)" (p. 403). But codemeshing is not synonymous with translingual writing (Schreiber & Watson, 2018), and many scholars with expertise in second language writing found the "uncritical adoption" of codemeshing as problematic because it valorizes visible differences and exoticizes students' language practices, leading to what Matsuda called "linguistic tourism" over real engagement with and digging deeper into diverse language practices (Matsuda, 2014). There is also considerable criticism of translingualism for "flattening of language differences" (Gilyard, 2016, p. 284) in that "the translanguaging subject generally comes off in the scholarly literature as a sort of linguistic every person" (p. 285). Gilyard calls the tendency to level student differences a "sameness of difference" model that does not accurately reflect our linguistic practices, which in

turn, we contend, undercuts our ability to deal with language differences in writing classrooms in any effective way.

Translingual scholarship also creates openings for aligning work with the contrastive rhetoric tradition in second language writing scholarship, which has later been called "intercultural rhetoric" (Connor, 1996; Connor, Nagelhout, & Rozycki, 2008; Kaplan, 1966). The revision of the field's label was motivated by an acknowledgment of many L2 writing scholars' efforts at problematizing the notion of culture and insufficient data set (some of which, we find, are legitimate issues) in the contrastive rhetoric literature, but this disciplinary shift, unfortunately, served to discredit decades of work on language differences. We argue that contrastive/intercultural rhetoric's discussion of linguistic differences can still be useful for translingualism, not for essentialized, broad generalizations about language and culture but for the issues they raise about alternative rhetorical styles, genre conventions, and methods of content organization (Kirkpatrick, 1991).

This article argues that translingualism's openness to, and welcoming of, students' and instructors' linguistic diversity can make it a disciplinary pathway for transnational scholars to use their diverse Englishes. These affordances create "translingual gateways" for writing studies. These gateways give voice not only to diverse Englishes and discursivities of transnational scholars but also their writing pedagogy in college classrooms. Consequently, the entry of transnational scholars with expertise in World Englishes into the U.S. writing studies serves to promote what Horner, NeCamp, and Donahue (2011) call the hybridization of writing studies scholarship, broadening its scope and creating opportunities for transdisciplinarity (Prior, 2013).

But this translingual gateway not only invites transnational scholars to writing studies but also encourages scholarly conversations across the disciplinary borders of the history of English language studies and writing studies if we incorporate World Englishes scholarship that overlap with both the disciplines' turfs. To illustrate how this happens, this paper engages two transnational scholars of English studies in a scholarly project that is personal, highlighting our points of entry and sites of disciplinary development. This emphasis on the personal in finding disciplinary confluences is motivated by what Dorothy Holland and Jean Lave (2001) have referred to as a "History in Person" framework, which they define as "a constellation of relations between subjects' intimate self-making and their participation in contentious local practice" (p. 4). Our effort at forging disciplinary bridges may be seen as contentious because of how the two disciplines have been conceptualized historically. But history, disciplinary or otherwise, is always dynamic and amenable to cumulative influences from persons. This is because, as Holland and Lave observe, "the political, economic, social, and cultural structuring of social existence is constituted in the daily practices and lived activities of subjects who both participate in it and produce cultural forms that mediate it" (p. 4). The insights we share in this article emerge from our use of translingual gateways to participate in disciplinary knowledge formation. We argue that our individual, transnational backgrounds affected our U.S. academic socialization and uptake of writing pedagogy and its disciplinary, linguistic, and cultural rhetorics (Wang, 2018). We also show how we take up different generative concepts such as lingua franca, genre, discourse, and grammar in terms of our socialization. We also argue that this disciplinary cross-fertilization is only made possible if the institutional ecologies (Reiff et al., 2015) of the graduate programs in English allow and encourage these international and/or multilingual graduate students to make scholarly conversations across disciplinary boundaries.

Our Collaborative Autoethnography

To answer the research questions motivating this paper, the two of us built on narrative inquiry approaches (Barkhuizen, 2013; Johnson & Golombek, 2002; Nickoson & Sheridan, 2012) and employed a qualitative research method that is "simultaneously collaborative, autobiographical, and ethnographic" (in short, collaborative autoethnography) (Chang, Ngunjiri, & Hernandez, 2012, p. 17). This method helped because it allows us to "imagine a group of researchers pooling

their stories to find some commonalities and differences and then wrestling with these stories to discover the meanings of the stories in relation to their sociocultural contexts" (p. 17).

As teachers and scholars in the field at two large public universities in the U.S., we are both invested in contributing to translingual scholarship through our research publications, and conference presentations. However, this is not our only point of commonality. Both of us are from Bangladesh, a South Asian country with a centuries-long British colonial history, and both of us pursued our doctoral degrees in the U.S. Yet our educational experiences are also considerably different, especially in our experience with the K-12 curriculum. Mijan was educated through a madrasa (a type of Islamic school with a combined focus on religious and general education) and pursued his graduate program in TESOL/applied linguistics. On the other hand, Shakil was educated in a private, English-medium school (using a curriculum developed and administered by the British Council, the United Kingdom's governmental organization for promoting international cultural exchange, English language education, and academic collaboration) and pursued a graduate program in English with a research focus on rhetoric and writing studies. Given these overlaps and distinctions, we got to know each other's works in disciplinary spaces, paving the way for scholarly collaborations.

The call for papers for this issue provided an exigence for collaboration as we both found the call resonating with our stories of academic socialization and our scholarly agenda. We found our common interests in writing pedagogy and translingualism generative for scholarly conversations on how we found our way into the field of rhetoric and writing studies and how that academic socialization relates to the notion of a disciplinary confluence of writing studies and the history of English language studies. Using collaborative autoethnography as a method affords us "the unique strengths of self-reflexivity associated with autobiography, cultural interpretation associated with ethnography, and multi-subjectivity associated with collaboration" (Chang, Ngunjiri, & Hernandez, 2012, p. 17).

Autoethnographic writing has long been part of writing studies research and pedagogical practices primarily in understanding student writing because genres like literacy autobiographies (Canagarajah, 2019) or literacy autoethnographies (Sladek, 2021) can be a wonderful vehicle for multilingual students to share their subjective experiences, to voice their concerns, and to negotiate/resist normative discourses of language and literacy about them (Sladek, 2021). In this paper we build on these research and pedagogical practices to promote our positionalities as multilingual educators and emerging scholars and to place our stories with often marginalized World Englishes at the forefront of the academic conversations in the history of English language studies, showing a path forward for making connections across the disciplinary boundaries. We also argue that an autoethnographic, personal history of writing and language experiences can be a valuable method to not only engage with composition scholarship but also to reconceptualize what counts as "history" within the history of English language studies.

Materials used for this study primarily come from two autobiographical narratives (Pavlenko, 2007) of our academic socialization, professional development, experiences teaching in writing classrooms, and engagement with translingual scholarship during our graduate education in the U.S. We consulted our research projects, conference presentations, and publications to gain additional insights into our scholarly agenda as they relate to translingualism, and how they might speak to convergences of writing studies and the history of the English language.

To be more specific, we engaged in a type of autoethnography that has been described as analytical/interpretive autoethnography as opposed to evocative autoethnography (Jackson & McKinney, 2021) because in writing this article we followed a typical Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion (IMRaD) format and analyzed qualitative data, our narratives, to develop our findings in non-narrative forms. For data analysis, we read each other's narratives asynchronously and coded them for major clusters of ideas. We also engaged in recursive collaborative dialogues meeting once a week remotely during a two-month period before the

initial submission of the paper in early Fall 2023 to discuss common themes emerging from our coded categories, how they advance our take on writing studies, and how they overlap with the World Englishes tradition in the history of English language. These collaborative dialogues turned out to be another data source as we contextualized and asked further questions about our academic and professional socialization in both Bangladesh and the U.S. We utilized the dialogic nature of this process to reflect on how the discipline functions, how we see it, and how our distinct backgrounds and dispositions towards language and writing shaped our transdisciplinary socializations.

Results

What follows are three major themes that emerge from this study and our expositions about what we think they mean. We selected them because we believe they relate to our academic socialization in writing studies in ways highlighting the history of the English language in the South Asian context and speak to discussions of World Englishes generatively.

Written Genres as Transactional Versus Written Genres as a Cultural Identity Marker

The first major theme emerging from an analysis of the narrative materials indicates that despite a common background in World Englishes in the Bangladeshi context, we practice different approaches to writing education and training: written genres as transactional tools (Shakil) versus written genres as cultural identity markers (Mijan). We suggest that this is a function of our different academic training in our graduate programs and the underlying epistemological distinctions each represents (Carter, 2023); in other words, disciplinarities matter. Our distinct emphases in our writing pedagogy show how disciplinary training shaped our professional epistemes and what our goals as teachers of writing are. Shakil prioritizes the development of genre competence because he sees academic writing as a transactional activity. Mijan, on the other hand, sees writing as a crucial articulation of cultural identity, requiring spaces for different preferences for diverse rhetorical modes. He does not deny the emphasis on genre competence. Genre theories remain one of his areas of expertise. At the same time, he prioritizes the knowledge that genres of writing are not uniform or value-free, and that people accomplish writing genres differently in different cultural settings (small culture or big culture). When we acknowledge the cultural variability of writing genres, we make spaces for reflection. It affords the recognition that writing is culturally situated, not only representing values and norms of specific cultural contexts but also producing them (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1993).

Rhetorical genre studies (RGS) often argues for the generativeness of approaching academic communication as a transaction with a given audience (Rabbi, 2020). Shakil prefers this framework in his writing classes because it lets students abstract rhetorical resources across situations (i.e., teach for transfer). It also shapes his writing and communication. His process of pedagogical conferencing with students prioritizes uptake. He prefers normative genre forms – usually the Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion (IMRaD) genre structure – and multimodality in his presentation slides. We also find that the transactional episteme influences Shakil's work in writing centers with graduate students. Echoing his performances for conferences, he sees graduate student writing in terms of written genre expectations such as the IMRaD and consequently would work with graduate writers to create a research space (CARS) schema in papers (Swales, 1990). His notes from the time show its repeated use in consultations because it facilitated the representation of writers engaged in scholarly publishing or communication as "textual transactions" (Rabbi, 2020).

Mijan's view of written genres in terms of identity markers emphasizes the writer as the main resource during the writing process. This sense of identity and working through different discursive repertoires that make up the writer's identity, we find, provides him a way to

foreground different rhetorical modes that can be leveraged for different communicative purposes. He points to his preferences for inductive logical forms as a key part of his cultural identity as a Bangladeshi English writer. Such distinctions in rhetorical styles have been pointed out as socio-historical markers and meaningful in inner, outer, and expanding circles in World Englishes scholarship (Canagarajah, 2006). In his pedagogy, Mijan practices identity as pedagogy (Motha, Jain, & Tecle, 2012) by bringing his linguistically diverse self to the forefront of his classroom discussions. For example, Mijan's dissertation focused on the genre of business letters of requests in Bangladeshi academic settings, identifying its genre conventions and politeness strategies in the letters' reference lines, salutations, beginnings and endings of the letters' bodies, and complimentary closes. He argues that Bangladeshi letters represent a lop-sided power relationship: they are vestiges of the country's colonial past, as every letter reproduces the colonial power dynamic in each iteration even after the colonial period had ended. In comparison, U.S. letters' conventions represent a power relationship that is more horizontal, i.e., a low power difference between reader and writer. Mijan presents this contrastive/intercultural rhetoric study in teaching business letters in writing classes, showing how they differ in different contexts and what implications it has for the power dynamic between readers and writers. The comparison shows the cultural variability of writing genres, indicating that the way people write in the U.S. is just one way of writing, which is by no means universal.

Furthermore, in a recent paper titled "'Return of the Repressed': Celebrating Diverse Writing Practices" at 2023 CCCC, Mijan examines what substantive forms of linguistic differences linguistically and culturally diverse students bring with them to U.S. writing classrooms. He highlights the differences that speak to the students' unique authorial identities but that must be suppressed because of their consistent negative uptakes enabled by unitary perspectives on academic writing and ideologies of English monolingualism and standard language. His study shows students' suppression in academic writing of a variety of diverse language practices that encompass a lot more than explicit codemeshing. Instructors need to recognize these linguistic differences as matters of authorial design rather than dismissing them as signs of negligence or errors. The conversations he had with his students about language differences and their emblematic values helped them assert their positive self-image as writers with diverse practices legitimately integrated into their writing.

Dispositions Around English: Integration versus Instrumentalism

Our narratives also bring up the ways different schooling systems might inculcate different attitudes towards English in outer and expanding circle contexts, showing how there are further variations even within a single context of culture (Holliday, 1990). The medium of instruction in schooling is especially salient in this conversation as it creates important distinctions within World English categories. Without recognizing such practices of distinction, we risk flattening out differences (Gilyard, 2016). English in Bangladesh has been seen to reproduce class ideologies (Hamid & Jahan, 2015) and distinct subjectivities (Sultana, 2014) through the educational apparatus. Such differentiations shape Bangladeshi students pursuing graduate work and careers in writing studies in the U.S. In applied linguistics, these differences in goals of academic socialization and language acquisition have been conceptualized as integrative and/or instrumental (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). An instrumental motivation involves "language learning for immediate and practical goals" while an integrative motivation relates to "language learning for personal growth and cultural enrichment through contact with speakers of the other language" (Lightbown & Spada, 2021). Our narratives suggest that Shakil's disposition foregrounds an integration mindset while Mijan's highlights instrumentalism.

The integrationist tendencies in Shakil stem from dispositions developed through his education in English-medium private schooling, whose "hidden curriculum" represented a common and homogeneous Western, liberal culture. This uniformity was part and parcel of creating identification in terms of "an imagined way of being in the 'Western world,' which [in the students' mind,] epitomizes a pristine form of rationality and a balanced way of being" (Sultana, 2014, p.

53). Local history was taught, in English, in forms "glossing over the colonial narrative" (Alam, 2023, p. 14). Local forms of knowledge were also taught in English while also being minimized: "a hallmark of the neocolonial assimilative practices in postcolonial nations ... the significance of the mother tongue is trivialized in the English-medium schools through associating the colonizer's language with students' upward mobility" (Alam, 2023, p. 81). Bangla was taught as a second and secondary language, and the classroom was the only space where the local mother tongue was represented as legitimate. The curriculum posited that English is a transparent medium of knowledge and culture as such, and eloquence in it was indexical of "the linguistic capital of English for individual and social mobility" that education represented (Hamid & Jahan, 2015, p. 95).

Lightbown and Spada (2021) referred to this as a get two for one language teaching proposal, which includes immersion and content-based language teaching. Yet, our analysis suggests this English-medium curriculum could be a reason that Shakil never saw English as a second or additional language and viewed the primary purpose of education as fitting into a Western way of being. This imagined identification, we believe, overdetermined Shakil's interests in critical rhetorical theory and translingual approaches to writing during graduate school. They were more to his "taste" than courses in curricular design or pedagogy. What was important, for him, was integrating into a Western culture he had imagined through his schooling by practicing their epistemes.

In comparison, an instrumentalist approach characterizes Mijan's academic socialization in his school years, which then continued to affect his postsecondary and graduate educational experience in complicated ways. He completed his K-12 education in madrasas, a stream of public education that combines typical secular areas of knowledge with Quranic literacies, prophetic traditions, and Islamic jurisprudence. Historically, these institutions have typically treated English education with suspicion since the beginning of the British colonial administration in the Indian subcontinent, setting up distinct cultural ideoscapes of Islam, Bengaliness, and the West. The learning of English received at best an instrumental treatment in that it fulfilled the government requirement to adopt English as a foreign language in the curriculum, and students found it useful for the job market and further education.

He learned English as a third language after Bengali and Arabic. Given that Mijan's English learning in his madrasa years was limited to one class period every weekday, English could not but be seen as an artifact by him, a tool for professional goals. It also limited his early exposure to the English language, resulting in him transferring his native Bengali phonotactic constraints in speaking English. His interaction with the outside world reinforced the idea that he had an accent (indeed, an inferior one), and given the exocentric norms in language education in foreign language contexts, he internalized the accent hierarchies around English. This internalized subordination of accentedness undercut Mijan's confidence as a non-native English-speaking teacher of writing in the first-year writing classroom at U.S. universities, which are designed mainly for the supposed native speakers of a privileged variety of American English.

Mijan's motivation, however, shifted over time as he completed his Ph.D. degree with coursework in areas like language ideology, sociolinguistics, and cross-cultural issues in English language teaching, which raised his awareness of how everyone has an accent that works as a crucial cultural identity marker. As he pursued a tenure track job in the U.S. upon graduation, Mijan experienced a moment when his instrumental motivation to language learning expanded into an integrative orientation too in that he now must live in the U.S. As mentioned in the previous section, Mijan found translingualism an especially welcoming message because his linguistic difference turned out to be a reason for celebration both in his pedagogy and scholarship. He was able to translate his linguistically diverse self into pedagogical applications in his writing classrooms.

Rhetoric and Applied Linguistics: Navigating Disciplinary Differences and Traditions

The final point our narratives bring up, we believe, is understanding that writing studies in the U.S. and TESOL/applied linguistics are underpinned by different literature traditions and epistemologies. The rhetorical tradition has been the basis for writing studies and rhetoric through a marriage of convenience (Crowley, 1998). Each field needed a disciplinary ally to make its position in departments constituted around literature tenable. Rhetoric provided composition with a theoretical and epistemic toolkit while writing provided rhetoric with a practical course-list. It also worked well because it is aligned with the broader U.S. culture of civic participation and citizenship through literacy (Brandt, 2001). We suggest that this rhetorical and civic underpinning often gets missed or unacknowledged by many non-U.S. scholars when they start teaching first-year writing. While writing as an area of study is indeed increasingly being adopted transnationally, rhetoric is still overwhelmingly a Western university discipline, and this required some adjustment for Shakil and Mijan.

Shakil's Ph.D. program was well-known for its historical focus on rhetoric, and he took a course on the rhetorical tradition (it was a course all rhetoric and writing studies students were expected to take) during his first semester. In this course he was introduced to the Western canon of rhetoric and learned to conceptualize rhetoric in terms of persuasion (Aristotle) and identification (Burke) rather than flowery, hollow speech (how he previously understood it). This training helped him situate writing studies in terms of the rhetorical tradition and facilitated his understanding of how concepts such as the rhetorical situation and triangle—the foundation of a lot of communication pedagogy—came to be formulated by Lloyd Bitzer and then how the process pedagogy of Flower and Hayes (1981) moved the field forward. This disciplinary socialization inculcated in him a view of civic deliberation as a fundamental framework for writing pedagogy in postsecondary education. For him, this ethic also translated into the primacy of accounting for a social constructivist episteme, where audience and context are key rhetorical resources.

Given this education around the field, translingual approaches allowed Shakil to extend these rhetorical approaches by attending to language in writing education. His study of the history of rhetoric taught him to see it as persuasion rather than flowery speech, as a substantive art rather than a superficial one. Language, in writing studies, occupies a conflicted position of interest, "something we associate with problems, something we expect to occasion hurt or difficulty for students, something we feel anxious about inflicting on others, and something we express little pleasure in knowing" (MacDonald, 2007). In response, the "linguistic turn in critical pedagogy" (Wang, 2018), that is, the translingual paradigm, provided Shakil a gateway to discuss both topics of audience and persuasion within this frame of language as an object of analysis. This pedagogy fostered the development of critical thinking and communication skills within a social constructivist epistemic frame around language and writing, and encouraged learning a rhetorical grammar (Micciche, 2004) of syntax, style, discourse, and organization within discussions of notions of competence or proficiency as evolving, context-dependent constructs.

Mijan enrolled as a TESOL Ph.D. student, and his initial entry into writing studies was in the form of a teaching assignment in the first-year writing program as part of his graduate teaching assistantship. The teaching assignment was accompanied by a required course on teaching composition that introduced the best practices in writing pedagogy, especially the use of the genre approach and writing research identity along with a cultural studies approach to writing. The institutional ecologies of the writing program also accommodated the translingual conversations in writing pedagogy by adding a distinct student learning outcome on linguistic diversity, which drew Mijan further into writing studies. He started taking writing studies courses along with applied linguistics ones, which made him aware of the two areas' disciplinary preferences, epistemologies, and target audience (L1 users of English in writing studies versus L2 learners of English in applied linguistics).

More importantly, translingualism's advocacy for linguistic differences and its celebration along with his academic socialization in his graduate program created a path for an interdisciplinary dissertation project. He built on the contrastive/intercultural rhetoric tradition in second language writing and the genre theories in three traditions of writing pedagogy (Rhetorical Genre Studies, English for Specific Purposes, and the Sydney School) to develop insights on cross-cultural comparisons of writing practices and develop pedagogical applications for first-year writing. One key aspect of this interdisciplinary project is that Mijan brought in features of his variety of World Englishes, those visible in the practices of writing business letters of request in Bangladeshi settings, as illustrations of sociolinguistic variants with its own cultural and/or colonial history, which in the end led his initiation into translingualism and then to writing studies in a more substantive form, i.e., developing a dissertation project in his effort to be part of the Western academic discourse community (Swales, 1990).

Discussion

Writing has always functioned as a gatekeeping mechanism in U.S. universities since the inception of writing pedagogy at Harvard in the nineteenth century. In the 1960s, however, the status quo of U.S. postsecondary education was shaken up in the wake of the social and political transformations of the era (e.g., the Civil Rights Movement), and the field of writing studies emerged to facilitate multicultural integration in the university through writing instruction. A document such as the NCTE's Students' Right to Their Own Language has been discussed at length in such terms and has fostered discussions around dialects and different languages in generative ways since (Gilyard, 2016).

Recent decades have only intensified the transformations the field writing studies faces, as does the university as such. As disciplines and universities have globalized, we must now contend with the specifics of multilingualism and internationalism, and our story illustrates distinct ways international students become members in what had been overwhelmingly a U.S.-centric field that has traditionally performed a gatekeeping role. Our adaptations to teaching writing and socializing into the field, given our distinct education and upbringing in Bangladesh, mirror adjustments many international students must make since writing studies has largely been absent in many contexts outside the U.S. Our valuation of writing as a form of knowledge transaction and a marker of identity is a balance all students must make, but the particulars of our stories show how local histories from non-U.S. contexts come to mediate our conceptualization of writing as genres of communication. They also show how different dispositions around language are shaped by the purpose through which we approach them and our variety of World Englishes.

Shakil and Mijan had different educational experiences in Bangladesh and their post-graduate programs. Even though both came from an outer circle postcolonial society, their schooling framed English as the default, on the one hand, or an additional language on the other. These two types of schooling also meant each was exposed to a different type of curriculum and each came to view the presence of Western culture and traditions in their educational trajectory differently. Shakil took on an integrationist view and subsequently came to see and teach genres in terms of communicative transactions. The purpose of writing was primarily functional. So, when he engaged with translingual approaches, he took on the view of adhering to form and product while making room for difference in the process. His education in rhetoric also helped him see the humanistic underpinnings of writing pedagogy and why democratic deliberations and values were intrinsic to the field (Crowley, 1998). His pedagogy and uptake of the field largely illustrate how multilinguals enact genres that can be understood in terms of "differences in similarity" (Horner et. al., 2011) and how the rhetorical and civic underpinnings of the field often need to be made explicit to international students.

Mijan illustrates a more critical approach, one informed by an applied linguistics background as well as an English as an additional language education. He viewed the language and the liberal

culture of English studies in terms of instrumentation, as tools to make use of for specific purposes. This view also fostered a view of writing and genre that foregrounded their situated nature and the distinctions evident in written genres across social and historical contexts. Identity was crucial to writing, and what was communicated in each text had to be disambiguated for students. Therefore, when Mijan engaged with translingual approaches, he wanted to take up its examinations of language and language politics to foster critical writing knowledge in his students. His education in writing studies draws from contrastive/intercultural rhetoric and the history of English knowledge to provide a gateway to writing pedagogy that works for him. His pedagogy and uptake of the field show how applied linguistics and L2 writing do not necessarily lead to a functional view of writing but can provide another source for critical pedagogy within writing studies.

Conclusion

Through a collaborative auto-ethnographic inquiry (Pavlenko, 2007) of professional development, experiences teaching in U.S. writing classrooms, and engagement with translingual scholarship, this paper discusses how we, two scholars of Bangladeshi origin, entered U.S. writing studies during graduate education through gateways that translingualism opens up. We illustrate how scholars from international contexts might enact transdisciplinarities by drawing on interdisciplinary and disciplinary confluences, such as those between writing studies and the history of the English language studies, especially the World Englishes tradition (Kachru, 1990) that disabuses earlier views that regarded localized Englishes as deviations, errors or interlanguage features.

The field of history of the English language would benefit from further considerations of how scholars from outer circle countries socialize into the U.S. academy and its disciplines. These scholars represent concrete examples of language change in the center of the global system of English language teaching and normativities. They take on roles of teaching and providing the norms of English usage in the classroom, and through their participation in disciplinary conversations, domains that are explicitly tasked with gatekeeping vis-a-vis English usage and what is considered legitimate can be evaluated in an ongoing basis. Furthermore, differences in the dispositions within these bodies of scholars can also bring into relief the complexities of geopolitical histories that get occluded in discussions of the history of language around different binary framings of native/non-native, and inner circle/outer circle.

Our narratives help foreground the utility of the translingual approach for its potential for transdisciplinary collaboration and an approach to working across differences. This approach, when applied within an academic socialization framework, we argue, affords drawing on the diversity of discourses around language that instructors and students bring with them into the writing classroom. It illustrates how different conceptualizations of writing, dispositions around language, and disciplinary socialization can shape how scholars from similar World Englishes backgrounds take up and enter the field. A clear-eyed vision of needing to negotiate normative academic requirements through the framing of World Englishes (i.e., pluralizing academic discourses in the disciplines and teaching language repertoires in the classrooms) can avoid uncritical adoptions (Matsuda, 2014) while adhering to critical and deliberative principles in writing instruction.

The need for such developments will only increase in the coming years as the field globalizes (Frost, Kiernan & Blum-Malley, 2020). Even within given spheres of World Englishes categories and zones of usage, differences and distinctions will abound for socioeconomic, educational, and historical reasons. The ability to negotiate situations and norms without a flattening of differences (Gilyard, 2016) has to be a key foundation for this process to remain equitable. More work is needed in this area and as our field becomes more diverse, which is certainly going to happen. Future work will not only have to tackle what it means to teach writing in classroom spaces where the normative student bodies are heterogeneous but also critically reassess the

bodies of the instructors who make up the field. It will shed light on not just the language repertoires and social justice needs of the students, but also the resources and dispositions (e.g., the purpose of education or the role of English) of the practitioners of our pedagogy.

References

Alam, Firoze. (2023). Postcolonial Bangladesh and neocolonial assimilative literacy practices: the case of private schools and English language programmes. *Third World Quarterly*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2023.2250268

Barkhuizen, Gary (Ed.) (2013). *Narrative research in applied linguistics.* Cambridge University Press.

Baugh, Albert C., & Cable, Thomas. (2013). *A history of the English language.* Routledge.

Berkenkotter, Carol & Huckin, Thomas. (1993). Rethinking genre from a sociocognitive perspective. *Written Communication*, *10*(4), 475-509.

Brandt, Deborah. (2001). *Literacy in American lives*. Cambridge University Press.

Canagarajah, Suresh. (2006). The place of World Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication*, *57*(4), 586-619. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20456910

Canagarajah, Suresh. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *Modern Language Journal*, *95*, 401–417.

Canagarajah, Suresh. (2013). Negotiating translingual literacy: An enactment. *Research in the Teaching of English 48*(1).

Canagarajah, Suresh. (2019). Transnational literacy autobiographies as translingual writing. Routledge.

Carter, Tyler J. (2023). Apples and oranges: Toward a comparative rhetoric of writing instruction and research in the United States. *College English*, *85*(5), 387–414.

Chang, Heewon, Ngunjiri, Faith, & Hernandez, Kathy-Ann C. (2012). *Collaborative autoethnography.* Left Coast Press.

Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC). (2014, revised in 2020). CCCC statement on second language writing and writers. https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/secondlangwriting

Connor, Ulla, Nagelhout, Ed, & Rozycki, William V. (Eds.). (2008). *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Connor, Ulla. (1996). Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second language writing. Cambridge University Press.

Crowley, Sharon. (1998). Composition in the university: Historical and polemical essays. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Crystal, David. (2012). *English as a global language*. Cambridge University Press.

Flower, Linda, & Hayes, John R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, *32*(4), 365–387.

Frost, Alanna, Kiernan, Julia, & Blum-Malley, Suzanne. (Eds.). (2020). *Translingual dispositions: Globalized approaches to the teaching of writing*. The WAC Clearinghouse & University Press of Colorado.

Gardner, Robert C., & Lambert, Wallace E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning.* Newbury House Publishers.

Gilyard, Keith. (2016). The rhetoric of translingualism. *College English*, *78*(3), 284–289.

Hamid, M. Obaidul, & Jahan, Iffat. (2015). Language, identity, and social divides: Medium of instruction debates in Bangladeshi print media. *Comparative Education Review*, *59*(1), 75–101.

Holland, Dorothy, & Lave, Jean. (2001). *History in person: Enduring struggles, contentious practice, intimate identities.* School of American Research Press & James Currey.

Holliday, Adrian. (1999). Small cultures. *Applied Linguistics*, *20*, 237-264.

Horner, Bruce, & Tetreault, Elliot (Eds.). (2017). *Crossing divides: Exploring translingual writing pedagogies and programs*. Utah State University Press.

Horner, Bruce, Lu, Min-Zhan, Royster, Jacqueline J., & Trimbur, John. (2011). Language difference in writing: Toward a translingual approach. *College English*, 73(3), 303–321.

Horner, Bruce, NeCamp, Samantha, & Donahue, Christiane. (2011). Toward a multilingual composition scholarship: From English only to a translingual norm. *College Composition and Communication, 63*(2), 269–300.

Jackson, Rebecca L., & McKinney, Jackie G. (Eds.) (2021). *Self+culture+writing: Autoethnography for/as writing studies*. University Press of Colorado and Utah State University Press.

Johnson, Karen E., & Golombek, Paula R. (Eds.). (2002). *Teacher's narrative inquiry as professional development.* Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, Braj B. (1988). The sacred cows of English. *English Today*, *4*(4), 3-8.

Kachru, Braj B. (1990). World Englishes and applied linguistics. *World Englishes*, *9*(1), 3-20.

Kaplan, Robert B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, 16, 1–20.

Kirkpatrick, Andy. (1991). Information sequencing in Mandarin letters of request. *Anthropological Linguistics*, *33*(2), 183-203.

Kitalong, Karla S. (2017). 'Yep, yep. Got it': Establishing common ground between international teaching assistants and first-year composition students. In Nancy DeJoy & Beatrice Q. Smith (Eds.), *Collaborations & innovations: Supporting multilingual writers across campus units* (pp. 77-94). University of Michigan Press.

Lightbown, Patsy M., & Spada, Nina, (2021). *How languages are learned*. Oxford University Press.

MacDonald, Susan P. (2007). The erasure of language. *College Composition and Communication*, *58*(4), 585-625. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20456967

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

Matsuda, Paul K. (2014). The lure of translingual writing. *PMLA*, *129*(3), 478-483. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24769484

Micciche, Laura. R. (2004). Making a case for rhetorical grammar. *College Composition and Communication, 55*(4), 716–737.

Motha, Suhanthie, Jain, Rashi, & Tecle, Tsegga. (2012). Translinguistic identity-as-pedagogy: Implications for language teacher education. *International Journal of Innovation in English Language Teaching*, *1*(1), 13-28.

Nickoson, Lee, & Sheridan, Mary P. (2012). *Writing studies research in practice: Methods and methodologies*. Southern Illinois University Press

Pavlenko, Aneta. (2007). Autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, *28*(2): 163–188.

Prior, Paul A. (2013). Writing/disciplinarity: A sociohistoric account of literate activity in the academy. Routledge.

Rabbi, Shakil. (2020). Mapping rhetorical knowledge in advanced academic writers: The affordances of a transactional framework to disciplinary communication. *Across the Disciplines*, *17*(3), 69–91.

Rahman, Md Mijanur. (2023). 'Return of the Repressed': Celebrating Diverse Writing Practices. Paper presented at the 2023 CCCC Annual Convention, Chicago, IL, Feb 17, 2023.

Reiff, Mary J., Bawarshi, Anis S., Ballif, Michelle, & Weisser, Christian. (Eds.). (2015). *Ecologies of writing programs: Program profiles in context.* Parlor Press.

Schreiber, Brooke R., & Watson, Missy. (2018). Translingualism ≠ code-meshing: A response to Gevers' "Translingualism revisited" (2018). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *42*, 94–97.

Sladek, Amanda. (2021). "Say what you want to say!": Teaching literacy autoethnography to resist linguistic prejudice. In Rebecca K. Jackson & Jackie G. McKinney (Eds.), *Self+culture+writing: Autoethnography for/as writing studies* (pp. 126-135). University Press of Colorado and Utah State University Press.

Smith, Aaron K., & Kim, Susan. (2017). *This language, a river: A history of the English language*. Broadview Press.

Sultana, Shaila. (2014). Heteroglossia and identities of young adults in Bangladesh. *Linguistics and Education*, *26*, 40–56.

Swales, John M. (1990). Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings. Cambridge University Press.

Trimbur, John. (2006). Linguistic memory and the politics of U.S. English. *College English*, *68*(6), 575–588.

Tseptsura, Mariya & Ruecker, Todd. (2024). *Nonnative English-speaking teachers of U.S. college composition: Exploring identities and negotiating differences*. The WAC Clearinghouse & University Press of Colorado. https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/books/nnest/teachers.pdf

van Kemenade, Ans & Los, Bettelou. (2022). History of the English language. *Oxford bibliographies*.

Wang, Zhaozhe. (2018). Rethinking translingual as a transdisciplinary rhetoric: Broadening the dialogic space. *Composition Forum, 40*.

Wolfram, Walt, & Schilling, Natalie. (2016). *American English: Dialects and variation*. Wiley Blackwell.

Young, Vershawn A. (2007). Your average nigga: Performing race, literacy, and masculinity. Wayne State University Press.

Contact

Shakil Rabbi
Assistant Professor of English
Department of English
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Email: srabbi@vt.edu

Md Mijanur Rahman
Assistant Professor of Writing Studies
Department of English
California State University, Los Angeles
Email: mrahma25@calstatela.edu

Complete APA Citation