

5

Translingual Pedagogy and Anglophone Writing Instruction in a Swedish Department of History

Thomas Lavelle
STOCKHOLM SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Maria Ågren
UPPSALA UNIVERSITY

This chapter describes a pedagogical approach to Anglophone writing instruction brought about by the growing use of English as an academic lingua franca. In order to meet the needs of relatively experienced academic writers located in Sweden but with diverse national and linguistic histories, that approach relies upon three central tenets: 1) learning-and-teaching is a process of *collaborative inquiry*, 2) participants' experience with *lingua-franca communication* and its associated dispositions constitutes a resource to be supported and leveraged, 3) the work of writing takes place in *conceptual spaces* where writers make textual decisions, spaces that can be enlarged and structured through strategies that help student writers activate the prior knowledge derived from their linguistic, rhetorical, and educational backgrounds. This chapter describes these three pedagogical tenets, illustrates them with classroom examples, and ultimately demonstrates that this approach aligns closely with translingual theory and so supports writers as they draw, in their Anglophone writing practice, upon the translingual strategies they regularly, but perhaps not always consciously, employ in their lingua-franca communication.

Keywords: English and academic lingua franca, collaborative inquiry, lingua-franca communication, conceptual spaces, graduate students

The pedagogy we describe in this chapter evolved to meet the needs and abilities of a specific community of academic writers. The members of this community, primarily graduate students in history programs, are academically ac-

completed, all having earned bachelor's degrees and some, advanced degrees. They all are multilinguals, including a few traditionally seen as native speakers of English. Alongside Swedes, the writers in our classes come from a long list of countries, so many come with experience of differences in educational cultures, academic conventions, and their rhetorics. Finally, and importantly, all use English as an academic lingua franca and use it with a disposition attuned to communication across traditional language boundaries. In other words, they all translanguague routinely and without the conflicts that often accompany this strategy in "monolingual" environments. Accordingly, we developed a pedagogy that does what any pedagogy sensitive to this group's needs must do: help these writers extend successful practices from spoken domains into Anglophone academic writing, where dominant conceptions of language (and academic success) represent English as a reified system that demands conformity.¹ Our particular pedagogical choices, therefore, represent a specific application for this community of a more general translanguaging strategy that acknowledges and harnesses student writers' prior knowledge, experience, and linguistic/rhetorical competence. It follows that these choices also evolved in dialogue with a growing body of research on language and writing generally known as translanguaging approaches (e.g., Cangarajah, 2013; Cooper, 2014; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Garcia & Wei, 2013; Horner, 2011, 2016; Horner & Lu, 2012; Horner & Trimbur, 2002; Lu, 1994; Lu & Horner, 2013; Matsuda, 2013; Pennycook, 2008, 2010). Through that dialogue, we have identified a representation of English—including its uses and users, and the ideological networks they exist within—that is a valid and valuable basis for making and articulating specific pedagogical decisions.

In what follows, we first describe briefly the circumstances that created a strategic need for Anglophone writing instruction in the Department of History at Uppsala University. Next, we identify and briefly defend the three theoretical commitments, i.e., translanguaging, that have informed—and continue to inform—our efforts to support Anglophone writing within our target community. Briefly, these are commitments to a de-essentialized concep-

1 The use of *Anglophone* throughout this chapter simply reflects, at one level, a common international expression referring to the use of English and the people using it, particularly when the speakers/writers involved are multilinguals and English represents only one part of their linguistic repertoire; see for instance Flowerdew, 2007; Garcia Ramon, et al., 2006; Ho, 2010; and Lillis & Curry, 2010 for examples. At another level, the expression *English* and permutation of it, such as *English medium*, *EFL* and *ESL*, are entangled, as Horner points out, with default interpretations that suggest "a language fixed in form and meaning" (2011, p. 303); we are working here to complicate such default interpretations.

tion of language and languages (i.e., it foregrounds language as performance and backgrounds language as system), to a recognition that the performative representation inherent in this de-essentialized conception of language, like all other representations, operates ideologically, and to an acknowledgment of language users' strong individual agency in carrying out this performance. Finally, the core of our chapter then describes the three tenets of our pedagogy: instruction framed as collaborative inquiry, instruction aimed at maintaining and leveraging our students' lingua-franca dispositions, and instruction built around learning objects that focus our writers' prior knowledge and that help organize the conceptual space in which they exercise agency. Before concluding, we assess the transferability of our approach to other settings, with particular attention to the United States, where monolingual ideologies occlude the translingual realities.

Anglophone Writing in Uppsala's Department of History

The twenty-first century brought to Sweden, as to many other countries, pressures to internationalize institutions of higher education that had historically been largely national, local-language-speaking organizations. Those pressures accelerated organic processes already underway to increase student exchanges, graduate-student recruitment, cross-border research cooperation and the adoption of Anglophone course literature, particularly in some faculties (such as medicine, natural science, and business) and in larger universities.

Nationally, this pressure led to a revision of degree structures to follow those defined in the Bologna Accords, which aimed to facilitate student mobility across European universities (see Schriewer, 2009 for a description and critical appraisal). At Uppsala University, it also led to increases in the recruitment of international students to master-level programs and the hiring of international faculty, post-doctoral fellows and Ph.D. candidates, along with growing expectations that faculty publish their research internationally. In each of these cases, "international" connotes non-Swedish speaking and by implication, reliance on lingua franca uses of English for academic work (cf. Lillis & Curry, 2010, pp. 6-7).

Parallel to these university-wide responses to academic globalization, there were within the Department of History two rationales for creating a larger role for Anglophone writing instruction, one disciplinary and one ethical. The disciplinary rationale reflected the changing nature of historical research. The research community had moved away from conceptualizing academic history solely as a narrative about the past, particularly the past of a people or a nation, where a national language was self-evidently the suitable medi-

um. Instead, they conceptualized academic history as framing and answering questions about *societies* in the past, which makes necessary comparisons to similar, but not identical, developments in other parts of the world and which in turn requires the use of an academic lingua franca for engagement with the international research literature (Lavelle & Ågren, 2010, p. 216). Informed by these disciplinary changes and by the growing numbers of history graduates in Sweden pursuing international careers (particularly those earning master's and doctoral degrees), the ethical rationale acknowledged the need for graduates to present their work in English and the department's "responsibility today to give students what they will require for success . . ." (Lavelle & Ågren, 2010, p. 203).

In this context, the authors met in 2003 when Ågren (a historian) arranged a half-day workshop for Ph.D. students on writing academic history in English. She invited Lavelle (an applied linguist) to address the linguistic dimensions of second-language writing alongside speakers on Anglo-American historiography and Anglophone rhetoric. This relatively holistic workshop for graduate writers proved successful, and in its wake the department, through the authors, has organized Anglophone writing instruction for various target groups in various formats.

These have included additional doctoral workshops and, from spring 2004 through spring 2007, regular half-day seminars for master's students. In fall 2007, those seminars gave way to a master's-level elective course, Academic Writing in English, which carries the standard 7.5 credits, one quarter of a semester's full-time workload. Since 2014 there has been a similar course for doctoral candidates offered collaboratively with other history departments in the Stockholm-Uppsala region. Alongside this instruction, writing-in-English workshops have also taken place in interdisciplinary research units hosted organizationally in the department, where formats varied and participation is open to senior and junior faculty, post-doctoral research fellows and Ph.D. candidates.

These target groups—graduate students for the most part with post-docs and faculty in much smaller numbers—we have come to believe, are best served with the evolving translingual pedagogy described below.

A Translingual Lens

The success of our pedagogy (i.e., our writers seeing themselves as textual decision makers and going on to make decisions that successfully support their aims as writers) depends in large measure on an accurate representation of what English is and is not. We draw for such a representation upon

a body of translingual theorizing that takes a strong position on the nature of languages, most specifically a position on what they are not, not “single, stable, monolithic, internally uniform sets of forms” (Horner, 2014, p. 1). Instead “languages exist only in and through their speakers, and they are re-invented, renewed and transformed in every interaction, each time that we speak” (Calvert, 1999, 2006, quoted in Cooper, 2014, p. 15). English, from this de-essentialized perspective, is not a closed system to master (or be mastered by), but a network of social practices—many durable, some transient and all, like other social practices, deeply embedded in their performative contexts. This position highlights a gap between dominant, common-sensical representations of language and languages and the more accurate representations offered by linguists, educationalists, and composition researchers. Increasingly, that gap is seen as a question not of language theory, but language ideology, and writ large, inaccurate essentialist representations of language underwrite an equally misleading ideology of literacy (see Horner, 2016; Horner & Lu, 2014). Scholars working with translingual approaches, such as Horner and Lu (2013), Canagarajah, (2013b) and Garcia and Levia (2014), therefore explicitly frame translingualism as an ideology in contrast with and opposition to the rigid monolingualism mentioned above and discussed below. Finally, a performative conception of language also requires and posits agentive, decision-making speakers/writers/readers/listeners, language users, who, in other words, shape language and linguistic exchanges. A translingual lens, then, represents English (and other languages) as performative rather than essentialist, insists on the ideological relevance of representation, and affirms the agency of speakers and writers regardless of whether they choose to follow or flout conventions, norms and social expectation.

Cooper (2014) provides a succinct expression of a translingual representation of languages. She begins by denying reification: “Language does not exist as an entity. Language is not a code, not a means of expression, not a resource,” and continues by affirming sociality: “[w]hat we call language consists of practices—patterns of behavior—that arise out of interactions” (p. 14), a position Cooper integrates into a larger framework for social analysis via Bourdieu’s notion of durable dispositions. She emphasizes that this argument has been made elsewhere, by Wittgenstein, Heidegger, Bakhtin and Davidson among others. Beyond philosophy, it is also made in sociolinguistics, where Pennycook (2010) cites Canagarajah (2007) to define English not “as a system out there” but as “a social process constantly reconstructed” to account for environmental factors (p. 9). In educational research, Creese and Blackledge (2015) also marshal various sociolinguistic insights to rule out both homogeneity and stability (Bloomaert & Rampton, 2011) and the notion

of separate bounded systems (Jørgensen et al., 2011) as viable starting points for the study of languages and their uses. On that basis, Creese and Blackledge conclude instead that “[t]he idea of a *language* . . . may be important as a social construct, but it is not suited as an analytical lens through which to view language practices” (2015; p. 20, emphasis in original). We conclude, therefore, that another lens is also required to teach and to talk about the language practice that is academic writing.

Because essentialist conceptions of language have powerful ideological functions and deep ideological roots, a translingual lens also requires an ideological dimension. While language ideologies are “neither simple nor monolithic” (Creese & Blackledge, 2015, p. 25), their consequences for multilingual writers are well documented. In composition studies, translingual theorists have consistently recognized and resisted those effects. Horner, et al., (2011) makes the case that the ideology of monolingualism (as the essentialist ideology underwriting English-only policies and attitudes is typically called in American composition research) treats languages as discrete and uses that separation as the basis for rankings and hierarchies among dialects and vernaculars of English, with strongly negative consequences for speakers whose usage differs from so-called standard English. Lu and Horner (2013) are even more explicit about the “[t]he continuing denigration of subordinated groups through attacks on their language” (p. 583) and the role language ideology plays in this denigration. Beyond translingual work, research has documented these consequences along at least two parameters: external effects and internal effects. The former manifest, for example, as impacts on grading in university courses (Land & Whitley, 1989; Nielsen, 2014; Severino 1993), on placement and access to for-credit courses (Inoue, 2017; Matsuda & Silva, 1999), and on opportunities to publish (Flowerdew, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2010). The latter manifest as alienation and loss of confidence (Rubin & Williams-James, 1997), anxiety (Leki, 2007) and pressure to conform (Severino, 1993), the last of which speaks most directly to questions of writers’ experience of agency.

In translingual literature, it is Lu and Horner (2013) who provide the fundamental argument for strong writer agency. That argument adopts a temporal perspective on language users’ relationship with language and begins by deploying Butler’s (1997) position that in using language speakers/writers create it; each “site of articulation,” in her terms, is where a language either continues to exist or not. Lu and Horner (2013) dovetail that performative understanding with Giddens’ notion of structuration, where social structures and individual actors operating among those structures are mutually dependent and co-constitutive. In translingualism, the “structures” are languages, instantiated as durable dispositions, and the actors are speakers/writers and

their interlocutors. Some acts of language creation, then, are transient and others remain as “seeming regularities of language . . . best . . . understood not as the preexisting rules determining language practices but, rather, as the products of those practices: an effect of the ongoing process of sedimentation” in which agentive speakers/writers participate (Lu and Horner, 2013, p. 588).

This de-essentialized, performative view of language drives the translingual commitment to strong writer agency, and as we shall see below in discussing our third pedagogical tenet, we aim for the experience of agency to percolate into most aspects of our writers’ writing. The extent of linguistic agency is, however, subject to question even from scholars broadly sympathetic to a translingual agenda in research and teaching. On the basis of linguistic inequality (Blommaert, 2005) or vital materialism (Jordan, 2015; Guerra & Shivers-McNair, 2017), these scholars argue for constraining the role of human agency in analyses of writing practices. Ultimately, however, none of these challenges to writer agency deny it outright, but offer instead ways to modify and complicate that role analytically, and so a strong sense of writer agency remains—alongside a de-essentialized and ideological understanding of English—a centerpiece of the theory informing our pedagogy.

Translingualism in Practice

The preliminary point of this section is first, to clarify how the three tenets of our pedagogical practice (leading collaborative inquiry, foregrounding lingua-franca experience and dispositions, and structuring conceptual spaces for active writerly decision making) relate to the three theoretical commitments we have adopted from the translingual research discourse (that accurate representations of languages are de-essential and performative, that all representations of language are positioned ideologically, and that the exercise of linguistic agency is inevitable even if it is unconscious and inconspicuous). With those relationships in place, the section describes the stream of interventions characterized by each tenet and shows how those interventions follow from our theoretical commitments.

Collaborative inquiry exists as a general approach to organizing teaching and learning, and it is, therefore, potentially applicable to many kinds of content. In our courses and workshops, students’ texts are the objects of inquiry, yet even so, the possibility remains that such an inquiry could seek and find in student writing linguistic forms, rhetorical moves, or genre features that either match or fail to match so-called standard English, academic conventions, or disciplinary norms. Of course, such an inquiry would conflict completely with our theoretical commitments, and so to align collaborative

inquiry with a translanguaging take on language, we focus the inquiry on the relationship of linguistic forms to linguistic norms (accurate representation), the values informing those norms (ubiquitous linguistic ideology), and the outcomes of writerly decisions (inevitable agency).

A similar point applies to our second stream of intervention, the foregrounding of lingua-franca experience and dispositions. That foregrounding leverages the sociolinguistic fact that all our writers use English as a lingua franca, both in the academy and in other endeavors. Their experience guarantees a familiarity with multilingual interlocutors and with well-documented lingua-franca dispositions and communication strategies. That familiarity, whether tacit or explicit, obviates the need Horner identifies to “*develop* attitudes and strategies for reading and writing aligned with . . . successful use of ELF” (2011, p. 302, emphasis added). In a similar vein, our writers consciously see themselves as “contribut[ing] to the transnational flow of literate activity,” an awareness that Roozen (this collection, Chapter 6) highlights for his students. In fact, improving the success and reducing the difficulty of those contributions is what typically brings students to our courses and workshops. However, as becomes clear below, favorable experience, dispositions, and self-awareness provide no guarantee of success.

Finally, our third stream of intervention deploys learning objects that expand and enrich the conceptual space where our writers make the decisions that constitute their writing. Again, that space is available for many kinds of thinking about writing; in fact, given their prevalence, “essentialist language ideologies seep into any conceptual or institutional space not actively occupied by an alternative representation, behavior, or practices” (Lavelle, 2017, p. 194). Therefore, our interventions saturate these conceptual spaces with open questions about the nature of language, about the operation of language ideology, and, especially, about authorial choices and their effects as experienced by immediate readers—peers and instructors—but also to more distant gatekeepers.

Instruction as Collaborative Inquiry

Biggs & Tang (2011) identify collaboration between and among teachers and students as one of four necessary conditions for conceptual change, which in turn is essentially synonymous with effective learning. This is because collaborative “dialogue elicits those activities that shape, elaborate and deepen understanding” (Biggs & Tang, 2011, p. 24). Elmgren and Henriksson endorse this characterization and emphasize the changing role of the teacher in collaborative inquiry (2014). This changing role, however, extends beyond a collaboration-transmission binary, as Horner (2011, 2016) seems to suggest,

and its complexity can be captured in a number of ways. Ramsden (2003), for instance, frames transmission-based teaching as the base of a three-part hierarchy, where it is superseded and subsumed first by facilitative teaching, which primarily organizes students' learning activities, and then by collaborative approaches, where "[t]eaching is comprehended as a process of working cooperatively with learners to help them change their understanding" (p. 110). Lavelle (2008) locates "transmission" within a four-part taxonomy of teaching roles (transmitter, developer, facilitator, transformer), where collaboration follows most naturally from the facilitator role.

However one frames or labels the teaching role, the educational literature cited above makes clear that collaborative inquiry is a methodology, and as such, it is available for the learning and teaching of any subject. Therefore, our second and third tenets yoke this method to a specifically translingual writing pedagogy. Our syllabus relies rather little on delivering predetermined content, and even the assigned types of writing are, rather than ends in themselves, means for exploring textual decisions and the factors that influence them, including speculation about their putative reception. More specifically, our classroom practice consists largely of workshops and seminars where we negotiate various aspects of the texts students submit, for example, their meanings (both semantic and social), their intended audiences, their relationships to other texts operating in the same or similar contexts, and, significantly, the decisions that created them. As detailed below in our descriptions of lingua-franca dispositions in the classroom and of the learning objects used to explore conceptual space for conscious decision making, these negotiations are wide ranging and multi-faceted. Largely student driven, negotiations may address any formal choices from the lexical through the discursive or rhetorical, and be either wholly compliant with or resistant to institutional and disciplinary conventions.

Because our inquiry explores openly what constitutes successful Anglophone writing for a particular group in its own specific sets of circumstances, the pathway of any given exploration cannot be fully planned or predicted. Instead, our courses can and do take surprising, unsettling, yet nevertheless insightful turns. For example, in a course for doctoral candidates on writing academic history, we read a dissertation successfully submitted at another Swedish university and asked would this pass in Uppsala. While our answers remained necessarily speculative, our inquiry shed light on a range of topics relevant to dissertation writers, including reader dispositions, tolerance for innovation, explicit versus implicit assessment criteria, and the interplay between English lexis and syntax on one hand and Swedish expectations and rhetorical culture on the other.

Unsurprisingly, the effects of and conditions for collaborative pedagogy extend beyond the teacher's role and classroom management to include the institutional positioning of courses and the attitudes of everyone involved in a given workshop, seminar series, or course. Participation in all our activities is voluntary. M.A. and Ph.D. courses are pass-fail electives with no prerequisites, and our workshops and seminars for more senior scholars carry no costs for their departments or research projects and thus no obligation to document achievement or involvement. Tellingly, one graduate-student course evaluation claimed, "this is the only course I've ever taken where all I had to do was improve." Simply put, we face none of the institutional impediments reported for other translingual innovations, where to varying degrees institutional architecture of various kinds impedes pedagogical initiatives (see e.g., contributions by Malcolm et al., and Gallagher & Noonan in Horner & Tetrault, 2017).

Instead, we meet groups of writers with relatively high degrees of intrinsic motivation, which we find complements collaborative inquiry and, according to Biggs and Tang, "drives deep learning and the best academic work" (2011, p. 36). In addition, these well-motivated academics share other characteristics that make them willing and capable collaborators. They see themselves as (emerging) experts in their fields and to some extent accomplished writers, almost all having completed at least an undergraduate thesis or substantial term papers in some language and others with theses, dissertations, or articles behind them. Moreover, through the needs analyses incorporated into our teaching, we see that participants' concerns closely mirror our own: simply improved academic writing—where the terms of improvement are specific to each writer—on those occasions when writers choose to (or must) disseminate their research or submit coursework in English. However, as will become clear below, even in this highly favorable collaborative environment, essentialist linguistic ideology generates challenges for our translingual pedagogy and the writers it exists to support.

Lingua-franca Dispositions

Research literature characterizes rather well the dispositions associated with successful lingua-franca communication, both generally and in settings where English functions as the lingua franca. They are dispositions that have two sides: one primarily passive and associated with tolerance, acceptance and patience, the other associated with active meaning making. Canagarajah and Wurr (2011) cite Khubchandani's characterization of lingua-franca communicators in South Asia as "accepting the other on his/her own terms" and

“develop[ing] positive attitudes to variations in speech” (p. 2). Similarly, in their review of research on English as a lingua franca (ELF), Jenkins et al. (2011) find a “strong orientation towards securing mutual understanding regardless of ‘correctness,’ for instance by employing [Firth’s (1996)] ‘let it pass’ and ‘making it normal’ strategies” (p. 293). The active yang to this passive yin is the “putting forth of one’s own efforts” to “achieve [the interlocutors’] common interests” (Khubchandani, quoted in Canagarajah & Wurr, 2011, p. 2). In ELF research, this is observed as “active monitoring” to preempt misunderstanding, which interlocutors carry out because they do not take mutual comprehension for granted, but rather acknowledge it as the worked-for outcome of cooperative meaning making (Jenkins, et al., 2011).

As pointed out above, our students have experience with lingua-franca communication and dispositions, but nevertheless, it remains a challenge for them to maintain those dispositions throughout our instruction. In general terms, this is unsurprising since, as Horner points out, dispositions, too, are performative and exhibit the fluidity of performance and positioning rather than the stability of ingrained characteristics (this collection). More locally, some of our writers’ dispositional fluidity concerns the “common interest” Khubchandani correctly identifies as central to many lingua-franca exchanges. Specific interests naturally vary greatly, from general “communicative objectives (Canagarajah, 2007, p. 95) through the utilitarian “function of transmitting information effectively and efficiently” (Ehrenreich, 2010, p. 418) and the broader transactional and interpersonal work of “furthering corporate activities and maintaining social relations” (Kankaanranta, 2006, p. 218) to the “demanding communicative business” that speakers get done in academic settings (Maruanen, 2006, p. 128). In each case or category, it is a common interest or shared enterprise that provides a higher-order rationale to support both tolerance and cooperation.

For reasons we only partially understand, however, the context of writing instruction adds to our students’ difficulty in sustaining consistently this higher-order common interest or shared enterprise. One simple reason is that most of our courses and workshops enroll, alongside historians and history students, writers from related disciplines such as archeology, ethnography, anthropology, art history, comparative literature, or media studies. Thus, a student of early modern social history may struggle to commit consistently to active meaning making when reading a paper on the methods of ancient archeology. In other words, our observations suggest that if and when engagement wanes for a disciplinary point being made, it becomes more difficult for participants to identify and honor a shared communicative enterprise.

Beyond differences in disciplinary knowledge and engagement, attention to writing as artifact—to written products—contributes to the erosion of the common interests or goals essential to a lingua-franca disposition. As our classroom conversations turn inevitably to words, sentences, paragraphs, introductions, and genre, the risk grows that reified conceptions of language take hold and linguistic form becomes a discursive end in itself and thereby usurps the role of higher-order interest or enterprise. Such shifts in conversational priorities, however temporary, discourage the tolerance for wide-ranging language difference that typically characterizes our classroom interactions.

The mechanism is likely complex by which form and convention usurp the superordinate discursive position in what are typically and ideally tolerant, let-it-pass lingua-franca exchanges. Participants' habits probably play a role. Malcolm's analysis, for example, of her translingual pedagogy, identifies in her students' peer reviewing ingrained attention to formal conventions that she refers to as "concessions to monolingual reading and writing practices" (2018, p. 112). In Uppsala, our participants typically bring with them, in addition to their lingua-franca experiences, many years of classroom experiences of learning English and other languages, experiences that not only inculcate a certain focus on form, but for successful learners, as many academics are, also represent an investment in static, reified and numerable representations of language and languages. So, in addition to habits of various kinds, the social capital that these investments represent also conflict with a lingua franca disposition. Finally, even the institutional labeling of our instruction as *writing in English*—while sometimes necessary to describe what we do—suggests too, as Horner observes, expectation of "conformity to a language fixed in form and meaning" (2011, p. 303). The effects of habit, prestige, and institutional labeling are of course entangled in a network of linguistic ideology more complex than we can untangle here, but one lesson relevant to pedagogy is that because essentialist representations will fill any available space not actively occupied by an alternative conception of language, lingua-franca dispositions require support and encouragement.

Therefore, in order to support an alternative, i.e., translingual, conception of language in day-to-day pedagogy, and thus support our participants' tolerant and cooperative dispositions, we draw, in our collaborative inquiry into student texts, on Blommaert's notion of voice to help sustain a shared enterprise that remains explicitly superordinate to any exploration of forms and conventions. For Blommaert, "voice is an eminently social issue" (2005, p. 68), which differs markedly from conceptions of voice prominent in American composition studies; those conceptions foreground individual expression and individualism, as outlined and critiqued by Ramanathan and Atkinson (1999).

As a social issue, Blommaertian voice foregrounds communicative success or failure and the social conditions, including power relations, that facilitate or hamper such success. More technically, voice is the successful “perform[ance of] certain discourse functions” (Blommaert, 2005, p. 71). Critically, that success depends at least as much upon readers’ dispositions as it does on a writer’s management of language forms. In Blommaert’s case studies, texts that match readers’ expectations—expectations for linguistic correctness or narrative ordering or simply appearance—achieve uptake and execute discourse functions; their writers are granted voice. Texts that do not meet such expectations are denied uptake and perform misaligned discourse functions or none; their writers are not granted voice. Within this power dynamic, writers work to “creat[e] favourable conditions for desired uptake” (Blommaert, 2005, p. 68), but voice, being heard and understood, remains a social question because ultimately it is readers who either grant voice to a writer or deny it.

In our instruction, Blommaert’s theorizing supports the maintenance of lingua-franca dispositions and helps resist the seepage of essentialist conceptions of language into our classroom discussion of participants’ texts. At one level, this social model of communication simply provides participants with a reminder of the sociality of academic communication. At another level, the social construal of voice provides an additional focal point for our collaborative inquiry and thus a new shared enterprise when (inter)disciplinary curiosity waivers. Collectively, we ask what creates favorable conditions for a writer’s uptake. Efforts to answer that question require that we foreground the intellectual work done in a text. It also requires that we include in our inquiry consideration of other readers—gatekeepers such as thesis or dissertation supervisors, journal editors, grant-giving bodies—and their reading dispositions and expectations.

Lingua-franca dispositions, then, are neither stable nor unconstrained and uncontested; they are nonetheless an affordance that follows from the explicitly multilingual environment where we teach. The pedagogical interventions they require are protection and promotion. In and of themselves, however, these dispositions do too little pedagogical work. The kind of learning we aim for only occurs when lingua-franca dispositions are used to envoice the writers of specific texts.

Lingua-franca Dispositions in Our Classrooms

The following paragraph (sentence numbering added) is paragraph two in a 5,000-word conference paper written by a Ph.D. candidate in history who participated in one of our workshops. The paper is an engaging study of

Swedish internment camps in operation during the 1940s. It is rich in empirical detail and theoretically grounded. The paper opens indirectly, with a paragraph on the rollback of “civic rights and liberties” in the US and other Western countries following the September 11 attacks in New York, a paragraph that closes by citing Swedish authorities’ criticism of such measures, particularly the Guantanamo Bay prison camp, which is called a violation of international law. What, if anything might keep a reader from granting this writer voice?

- ① This official Swedish stand has recently been questioned after revelations of an illegal extradition of two Egyptian citizens to the CIA and Egypt in 2004.
- ② The question has been raised what Sweden really keeps on its own back yard.
- ③ With what right do we criticise others and what does our own recent past look like?
- ④ Extremely few people know that the Swedish state during the Second World War and for some time thereafter set up and operated fourteen prison camps for civilian foreigners whose principal design was all but identical to that of Guantanamo Bay.
- ⑤ The first of these camps was set up by the Swedish government in March of 1940.
- ⑥ The motivation was the threatening international situation.
- ⑦ Upon decision by the Swedish national board of health and welfare, foreigners could thereafter be indefinitely imprisoned in camps without trial.
- ⑧ The imprisonment needed not be motivated and could not be appealed, and at most around 1,500 foreigners were imprisoned.
- ⑨ The system constituted a fundamental break with internationally accepted western legal principles.

In accounting for loss of voice, Blommaert emphasizes that semiotic resources do not always move successfully, i.e., the failure in place *y* of forms and strategies that were discursively effective in place *x* (2005, p. 157). Horner explains similar breakdowns in terms of readers underestimating the difficulty inherent in meaning production (2011, p. 302) and “powerful ideological views about what does and does not constitute ‘correct’ writing” generally and for a particular genre (p. 305). Lillis and Curry highlight the effects of “indexical clustering . . . where specific language and rhetorical features are refracted through ideologies of location,” both geographic and linguistic, in disqualifying or dismissing certain texts and authors (2010, p. 153).

Acknowledging a degree of friction present in all communicative exchanges (Horner, 2016, pp. 107-108, p. 148), we envoked this writer (let’s

call him Bengt) and co-create meaning rather comfortably. In the opening sentences (1-3), Bengt shares his indignation and levels indirect charges of hypocrisy at the Swedish state. By introducing hypocrisy over a “camp,” he dramatically anticipates the pending revelation in sentence 4, and he extends the parallel between the 2000s and the 1940s with both the final reference to “accepted western legal principles” and the justification for the camps in the name of national security during a “threatening international situation.” Finally, in the passage that elaborates on this revelation (sentences 4-9), Bengt outlines his empirical findings with little friction and no obvious cause for devoicing beyond perhaps the semantic shading of *motivation* and *motivated* toward *justification* and *justified*, which is how the Swedish cognates are used, and the relatively light use of sentence-to-sentence transition marking typical of Swedish academic writing, both of which may be “indexical” in the Lillis-and-Curry sense.

But our teaching-and-learning objectives turn less on *our* granting voice to our writers—a given—and more on the imagined reactions of the readers informing Blommaert’s, Horner’s, and Lillis and Curry’s analyses. On that basis, our workshops and seminars collaboratively explore writers’ choices and their putative relationship to voice without, we believe, slipping into an assimilationist posture. In the following treatment of this sample, we provide an idealized account of our workshop discussion of how Bengt might create favorable conditions for voice, i.e., for this text to carry out his intended discourse functions and intellectual work, including consideration of potential obstacles to this outcome. By an idealized account, we mean a selection of comments made and questions posed in class augmented by the inclusion of issues and reflections relevant here, but not raised by anyone in real time during the actual seminar. We idealize in this way in order to maximize the illustrative potential of this example in a short chapter.

One site in this excerpt for such exploration is Bengt’s early show of indignation. Workshop participants struggled with this particular discourse function in this context; it could, they proposed, possibly jeopardize Bengt’s voice with academic readers. More specifically, we asked whether and how the indignant tone of exposé and tabloid journalism best supports the other intellectual work his paper does.

Bengt, as it happened, was happy to revise the tone and content of his opening once they were discussed, but because writing instruction for us is largely a collaborative process of foregrounding and informing writers’ choices, we consider here a scenario in which Bengt had chosen to prioritize his indignation and highlight governmental hypocrisy. On one hand, if the greatest risk to Bengt’s voice follows from readers associating this tone and message

with other genre, general strategies for revision could revolve around overcoming those associations or incorporating them into an academic analysis through more active hybridization. On another hand, it may be that for less cooperative readers this passage proves immobile, incorrect, or indexical of foreignness or rhetorical immaturity and thereby license a devoicing (in Blommaert's, Horner's, and Lillis and Curry's terms, respectively). If so, one possible trigger or excuse for this breakdown is the indignant rhetorical question in sentence 3. As a rhetorical question, it evokes certain expectations that are only partially met: the paper does describe what "our own recent past look[s] like," but it does not explore at all the philosophical issue being framed here, whether a social critic must always have an impeccable moral resume. Moreover, "our recent past" may mark the "locality" of the text (Lillis & Curry, 2010) and risk being dismissed as "parochial" (Flowerdew). Another challenge to voice here is the backyard metaphor, which we cooperatively see as occupying some of the same semantic terrain as the familiar glass-houses idiom and the mote-beam-eye injunction of Luke 6:42. Like the businessman Ehrenreich quotes regarding a lingua-franca exchange between colleagues, we "sort of understand" and are content with that understanding (2010), but we are obliged to acknowledge not all readers are cooperatively disposed or satisfied with this kind of understanding. With respect to voice and instruction, our challenge is to support an agentive writer deciding whether to retain an innovative passage, modify it, or remove it. The point of that instruction is not to advocate one path or another, but to create as rich an appreciation as possible for the roles forms can play in the work of meaning making at any given textual site.

In our classrooms, lingua-franca dispositions support collaborative inquiries into specific texts and the question of voice. Implicitly, those dispositions contribute to the process of inquiry as guarantors that in our workshops and seminars every writer is granted voice. While this support draws largely on the passive, tolerant side of a lingua-franca disposition, "active monitoring," also contributes to our collaborative inquiry, for instance when participants test interpretations, identify misunderstandings, pose questions, and propose alternatives. Typically done with reference to voice, this monitoring always defers to writer agency in weighing the tradeoffs involved in choosing, for instance, to express indignation or not, to harmonize dissonant connotations or not, to flout or follow convention in collocations like *civic rights*. Yet despite their contributions to students' understanding of writing decisions and their potential consequences, these explorations have limitations that require an additional, complementary stream of translanguaging writing pedagogy.

Conceptual Space for Writers' Agency

That complementary stream follows from our third tenet and thus provides a set of tools designed to expand the conceptual space where writers make decisions about their texts and their uptake, i.e., voice. We introduce these tools as learning objects to guide our student writers through a three-step process. First, they marshal the prior knowledge they have already acquired while writing in their range of other languages, rhetorical traditions, and educational cultures. Second, they organize the conceptual space constituted by that knowledge into a network of specific writerly options. Third, they make writing decisions by weighing the complex tradeoffs associated with each option. Our definition of learning objects is the simple one that Churchill (2007) ascribes to the term's earliest uses: "curriculum content . . . broken down into small, reusable instructional components that each address a specific learning objective" (p. 479). While the learning objects we deploy are relatively familiar and straightforward, the learning outcome they support—for writers to make active and informed decisions about how best to negotiate the uptake of their texts—is complex and elusive.

Some features of this complexity and elusiveness are well documented. One is that uptake and voice, as discussed above, are inherently social and shifting phenomena. Further, because complexity and diversity lie at the heart of lingua franca communication, criteria for success are "constructed in each specific context of interaction" (Canagarajah, 2007, p. 925). Moreover, although scholars from Firth (1996) to Canagarajah (2013) have identified the success of lingua-franca communication with strategies rather than forms, mastering a catalogue of strategies provides no guarantee of voice as the success of any strategies depends upon the specifics of shared enterprises, audience expectations, and a host of other factors. There is, in other words, no playbook to follow.

Without such a playbook, we work instead to support student-writers' context-specific decision making. Some of that work consists in helping our writers see themselves as decision makers, which does not always come naturally or easily to them. All have studied a range of languages and most have encountered some kind of prescriptive writing instruction; in those endeavors, the identities ascribed to and assumed by students are more likely to be rule-follower and pattern-matcher than decision maker. So as will become clear, we infuse our instruction with a vocabulary of agency, of choice, of volition, and decision making.

Typically, we address four domains for agency: genre, paragraphs, sentences, and vocabularies, each of which simply names heuristic contexts in which

writers enact their writing, i.e., contexts for organizing, framing and executing different kinds of decisions. As a first illustration, we discuss how our instruction tries to create conceptual space for agentive decisions about genre, and in doing so we can address a potential objection to our learning objects.

To stimulate our writers' creation of conceptual space about genre, we employ as a learning object the prescriptive modeling of various genre and their components presented by Swales and Feak (2012). By way of background, we observe that with broad individual variation, our students do only a fair job of answering questions like: What do Dutch editors expect when they commission a book review? or What counts as an effective introduction in a Swedish or Polish research paper? Obviously, we pose such questions to activate and then document the genre knowledge our writers already have, so they can bring it to bear on their performance of genre in Anglophone texts. These same student writers are much more expansive, however, in responding to the prescriptions Swales and Feak offer, for example, on book reviewing: introduce the book, outline the book, highlight parts, provide commentary, prescriptions complete with two or three recipes for executing each of these general aims (2012). Based on their experience with reviews and reviewing in other languages and setting, some students concur, others prefer summative rhetoric throughout, still others want to begin with strong evaluative statements, and so on. Responding to a prescriptive prompt reactivates and focuses their genre knowledge, the first of our three phases. Reactivated, their thinking about book-review content and its possible arrangement moves on to concrete options, for instance, what *other* moves are possible and how might they be instantiated and arranged. Finally, they consider for each option potential effects, including effects on the granting of voice, and how, informed by those considerations, they can execute specific decisions about the performance of the book-review genre in their own texts, i.e., how they exercise active and conscious writerly agency.

Despite our efforts to see our writers always as decision makers, it is possible, even reasonable, to criticize the use of learning objects derived from prescriptive materials as inevitably prescriptive and thus incompatible with translingual pedagogy and active decision making. The prescriptive guidelines of Swales and Feak (2012) draw heavily on Swales' own analysis of genre, and Horner's (2016) discussion of that analysis provides a way both to understand and deflect such criticism. Briefly, Horner uses Swales' analyses of various genre to show how descriptions of textual practices reify language use as stable (and thus misleading) representations. Swales' models are "transformed from terms of analysis to terms of practical prescription" (2016, p. 83); whatever their original function, "the representation then comes to serve not

as a heuristic but as an empirical observation against which . . . practice is judged” (2016, p. 83). Horner’s translingual reading reiterates our point made above, that essentialist representations of language seep into any uncontested arena. In resisting this reification of practices into so-called larger “units of discourse,” he foregrounds the emergent character of any constituents these analyses produce and thus their limitation. Foregrounding of this kind encourages practitioners, like our student writers, to act “not simply within but with and on the [patterns of constituents] identified” (Swales, 2016, pp. 85–86).

This working with and on the provisional constituents of, say, a book review is precisely what happens through the three phases of students’ work with conceptual space for conscious agency. The marshalling of prior knowledge contextualizes Swales’ genre models, and any model, as simply one normative take on Anglophone writing. The identification and organization of options underscores their emergent character and the inherent limitations of each, those derived from models and those derived from experience. Finally, in weighing the effects of following or flouting normative takes and then making their textual decisions, our student writers do what Horner ultimately calls for: they recognize their agency and the mutually constitutive relation between themselves and the partial, provisional models they are continuously revising (Horner, 2016). This reading of Horner’s interrogation of reified genre shows that in the context of a translingual pedagogy—one that promotes writers’ roles as decision makers and supports their lingua franca dispositions through collaborative inquiry into questions of voice and uptake—any learning objects properly used can help to shape space for conscious and active agency.

The learning object we deploy to create similar space around the composition of sentences is a simple grammar for writers that foregrounds the role clauses play in meaning making yet resists essentialist associations of sentence-level language description with correctness and error. In other words, we talk about clauses as sites of performance where writers do intellectual work by profiling certain things, concepts or people as participants in various kinds of actions and relationships. While our own grammar for writers is an original composite of functional, cognitive, and traditional approaches, there are prescriptive takes on clauses in books such as Fish (2011), Lanham (2006), or Williams (1995), and it is possible to treat those models as we treat Swales and Feak (2012) on genre. Whatever model serves as a starting point, our learning objective remains conscious and active decision making as an outcome of a three-phase process of conceptual change.

To illustrate this process in a setting where clauses and sentences provide the heuristic context, consider [1] below, excerpted from a master’s

students' paper for an exercise on framing, executing and evaluating sentence-level decisions.

[1] In his book *Vichy Syndrome*, Henry Rousso, who is a French historian specialising in the events of the Second World War, analyses the evolution of French memory about Vichy France, commonly seen by historians as exceptional studies into French history.

Our grammar for writers identifies Anglophone norms that privilege, for instance, formal features such as relative proximity among obligatory element (e.g., subjects, predicating verbs, and direct objects) uninterrupted by optional elements like adverbials and non-restrictive modifiers and right-branching clauses, i.e., clauses that begin with relatively brief, relatively simple, and relatively familiar constituents and add constituents with more length, complexity, and novelty as a clause unfolds across a page. Obviously, these norms are not universal, and our writers generate any number of alternatives. In that light, we explore collaboratively the placement in [1] of the information given as the non-restrictive relative clause, "who is . . . Second World War." The students in question were uniformly happy with the writer's decision: although the author-profile clause does postpone the central predication of this sentence and separate it from the subject, our writers felt that this information was necessary, that no other position was more attractive, and that postponement does not add difficulty to the meaning-making process. A second decision we discussed concerned "commonly seen by historians as exceptional studies into French history," where many student readers found it difficult to identify exactly what concept or element was in fact "seen . . . as exceptional." Most alternatives offered disambiguated the reference by creating some kind of apposition linking, say, "a topic commonly seen" or "a period commonly seen" with either "the evolution of French memory" or "Vichy France." In each case, we collaboratively weighed communicative pros and cons for the specific options generated.

Interventions and learning objects of this kind provide a description of clausal constituents that stimulates students to activate and focus what they know about these constituents and their relationships in their languages other than English. They initiate discussions that draw upon that collective knowledge to frame networks of possible options for drafting or revising specific English sentences in specific Anglophone situations. Finally, they make conscious choice, however provisional, by weighing the perceived advantages and disadvantages for voice and uptake of competing syntactic alternatives.

A similar process unfolds around the creation of conceptual agency space for decisions about composing paragraphs. Our learning object simply models possible relationships among sets of sentences formatted as a visual paragraph. Introducing this object, again, catalyzes three stages of conceptual change. In our classes, the prior knowledge students marshal coalesces around notions of unity, singularity, or consistency, which seem therefore to be central to the semantics of the paragraph. For our writers, that abstract unity, like the abstract constituents of book reviews, can manifest in many different ways: a central issue given early and elaborated later, a summative wrap pulling together an inductive discussion, a step-wise linear progression proceeding logically or chronologically, and so on. Once generated, this collective understanding of how paragraphs *might* be composed helps to organize the conceptual agency space where writers make decisions about specific paragraphs in specific texts.

The following paragraph on the history of copyright embodies any number of decisions, including those shaping perception of harmony or dissonance between visual marking and propositional content.

① The common law “copyright tradition” focuses on the encouragement of productivity in return for economic remuneration. ② This school of thought concentrates on the labour and skill invested into the creation to produce the copyrighted work. ③ Commentator Lauraine Nocella noted that the common law tradition, which subsists in the United Kingdom, “considers the interests of the public who pay the royalties and aims to protect the work and balances the interests as economic nature.” ④ The first statute within the UK to recognise copyright can be traced back as far as the Statute of Anne of 1710. ⑤ This early legislation enabled the copyright holder to prevent “others from dealing with his work to the public without his consent.” ⑥ Scholar William Cornish noted that the Statute of Anne was to promote the interests of London’s publishers from fierce competition, and this could further support those who argue that the common law fails to offer the author protection of his work, by failing to protect the moral rights of the author, which is at the core of the continental view. ⑦ The continental view, apparent within French law, considers the rights of the authors as the fundamental issue that requires protection. ⑧ The moral rights of the author are of great importance as the “artist is personally involved in his work, with consequences for him, and the art-enjoying pub-

lic, that transcends the realm of purely commercial concerns” which transpires within the common law copyright tradition. ⑨ The moral rights from continental Europe concentrate on the relationship between the author and his work, and the creation will reflect the author’s personality. ⑩ The birth of moral rights came from the 1789 Revolution in France where prior to the Revolution rights of printing were granted by the King through the notion of censorship. ⑪ The Revolution brought about the abolition of the monopoly relating to privileges and moral rights were founded. ⑫ These moral rights are distinct from economic rights in the sense that moral rights cannot be assigned; this has proved to be a major difference between the continental and common law traditions.

Two general responses to this paragraph emerged in classroom discussion. Some commentators were comfortable with the degree of harmony manifest here and pointed to the apparent symmetry in contrasting the common and civil-law traditions and in the strength of sentence 12 in forging a unified understanding of the two. Others read the paragraph as more binary than unitary, thus with a dissonant relationship between format and content. In doing so, they pointed to the richer level of detail in sentences 3 through 6, underscored the scholarly treatment of common law contra a more impressionistic treatment of civil law, and questioned the efficacy of sentence 12 in unifying the two elaborations because of its paragraph-final position and its mix of familiar, backward-looking information and new concepts, specifically the *assignment* of rights. These contrasting readings transcend rather quickly the relatively pedestrian question of paragraph unity—when the writer sees that if she wants to harmonize content and layout, she can add a comparative opening sentence something like or instead of 12—and go on, first, to identify options for the overall composition of this passage and, then, provide guidance for weighing those options.

Moreover, this collaborative classroom inquiry provides a reminder about the questions, comments, summaries, re-framings, and interpretations lingua-franca interlocutors would employ in a *conversation* about copyright law. However, because writing is not literally a conversation, writers like ours gradually learn to anticipate or even postulate putative feedback of this kind and incorporate it into their writerly decision-making processes. Given the well-documented context dependency of lingua-franca communication, such anticipation is necessarily approximate, even speculative, work, but paragraph-level decisions constitute an arena where our student writers combine the exercise of their writerly

agency and an awareness of the sociality of voice and uptake.

Given the prominent role translation plays in thinking about translingual writing pedagogy (in this collection and elsewhere), it is fitting to close this section with an illustration of how our third tenet expands and enriches conceptual space for writerly decisions about lexical translation. As historians, our student writers must make decisions about translation across languages, across time, and across cultures. They do the first when, for example, German source material uses *Erbe* to cover the entire semantic field shared for English by bequest, inheritance, and heritage. They do the second when, for instance, translating the Swedish term *stånd*, which referred from the middle ages to the 1860s both to social groupings of people broadly like classes or castes and to the parliamentary representatives drawn from each group. It is, in other words, a term whose referents no longer exist and whose meaning-making relies upon ideologies and social relationships that belong to another era. They do the third as words cross cultural boundaries and their resonances change, for instance with the Russian *олигарх*, which translates literally as oligarch. However, in Russia it can connote everything from the despotic, corrupt associations Anglophones bring to the word to more neutral or even positive inflections more typical of, say, magnate, representative of big business, or even economic and political elite.

Our instruction supports these decisions with a learning object that initiates the three-stages of conceptual change for student writers. In this case, the object is the lists each student produces of difficult translation decisions that she or he wants to explore collaboratively. That exploration begins with collective reaction to the lists and the problems they pose. Typically, the reaction resembles a word dump, which draws on all the linguistic resources present in a group, lists of words from Swedish, Finnish, Turkish, or French that cover, say, an example mentioned above, *Erbe*, and the semantics of probate. After having expanded the conceptual space available by marshaling a body of prior lexical knowledge, students translate the new candidates into English and in doing so structure the conceptual space with options beyond those mentioned above, for instance, legacy, birthright, or endowment. With concrete options in place, the student writer who nominated *Erbe* for collaborative inquiry can weigh tradeoffs framed by criteria suitable for translation, for example, denotational and connotational range, relative brevity or relative comprehensiveness.

The Mobility of a Translingual Pedagogy

The translingual pedagogy for Anglophone writing described above rests on our three tenets: that learning and teaching proceed optimally through a process of collaborative inquiry; that our student writers arrive with *lingua-franca*

dispositions, which are valuable for their writing but which also require support because like all dispositions they are performative and thus fluid; and that rather traditional learning objects can help students develop conceptual spaces for the active and conscious exercise of writerly agency. Indirectly, but no less importantly, those tenets rest in turn on three theoretical commitments regarding the nature of languages. They are 1) that languages are performed and thus best represented as networks of social practices and misrepresented as stable, finite, essentialist systems; 2) that the choice among competing representations is always and inevitably ideological; and 3) that because language is performance, speaker agency is ubiquitous in this performance even when linguistic ideologies work to occlude it. It is, as we demonstrated above, a felicity to these theoretical commitments in our implementation of the three pedagogical tenets that makes ours a translingual approach to writing instruction.

Such a pedagogy has the potential to move widely and successfully primarily because the conception of language from which it proceeds applies universally. The applicability and desirability of our specific implementation in workshop formats and discussion-based seminars depend, of course, upon local conditions, for instance the particular capabilities of faculty, the willingness of students to participate in open inquiry, and not least the institutional architecture, which will inevitably reflect linguistic and educational ideology. Nevertheless, the pedagogy we perform at Uppsala University *should* travel because its intellectual premises are accurate and fair and *could* travel because its specifics—collaboration, disposition, and conceptual support for self-conscious agency—appear to suit prevailing needs and conditions in a range of local settings.

As outlined above, the validity of our premises receives increasing support in applied linguistic and educational research alongside similar work in composition studies. Exigencies of fairness are also well documented. In the US, nothing shows that more clearly than the reception of Horner, et al. (2011), where the authors make a case for fairer treatment of language difference via translingualism as a disposition and an ideology. In Asian-Pacific contexts, Pennycook's ongoing critique of standard English ideologies (2007, 2010) make a comparable case. In Europe, fairness meets de-essentialized understandings of language at the intersection of research on lingua-franca uses of English and analyses of globalization's negative impact on an already unfair distribution of linguistic resources.

One could argue that our implementation of translingual pedagogy certainly benefits from or even relies on local conditions. Our students come from or come to Sweden, where English is widely used yet not dominant, and so they arrive for instruction already equipped with self-conscious lingua-franca dispositions. We would reply that such dispositions are widely

available, perhaps universal, but they are unacknowledged or even hidden. On Pennycook's reading (2008), all uses of English are lingua-franca uses because the so-called varieties native speakers share, standard or otherwise, are post-hoc constructions that deny the variation of English, variation that suggests instead an open set of local practices. Pennycook rests his claim, first, on the failure of both monolithic versions of English and pluri-centric versions (i.e., World Englishes) to account for the profound diversity of English actually in use. Moreover, this expanded understanding of lingua-franca uses captures performative similarities shared by English users all over the world (Pennycook, 2008). Even students in "monolingual" America have both dispositions for and experiential knowledge of uncodified language practices, although that experience is not always positive (Matsuda, 2006; Smitherman & Villanueva, 2003). In a word, the dispositions that we support in our students and pedagogically direct toward self-conscious agency are resources available for a translingual Anglophone writing pedagogy *anywhere*.

Given then that lingua-franca or translingual dispositions are essentially universal, what are the impediments to more wide-ranging implementation of a pedagogy like ours (or any that follows from a translingual representation of languages)? In his afterword to this collection, Horner points to the pervasive power of monolingualist language ideology; it is dominant, and it has cemented its dominant position despite millennia of lingua-franca communication and its attendant dispositions. More optimistically, he identifies translinguality as also pervasive, the condition of all speakers, just as Pennycook identifies all Anglophones as lingua-franca speakers.

We take Horner's latter point on ubiquity as an argument that a pedagogy like ours is in fact available to anyone; the specific linguistic histories students possess neither qualify them for nor disqualify them from this kind of learning and teaching. Their ideological stances, whether actively or passively adopted, may create challenges, but not prohibitions. Therefore, we speculate that a major impediment to the spread of translingual writing pedagogy, particularly in the United States, is the reluctance of writing teachers to give up the static, reified—and of course privilege-granting—representations of English that essentializing ideologies offer. Some of these reluctant teachers may actively and openly embrace something they call standard English. Others, as Kopelson (2014) explains, support the dominant essentialist take on language through indifference. Most others though are quiet, but active, essentialist, denying for example that speakers/writers/readers co-create meaning, ostensibly on the basis of their "field's history and its enduring legacy practices" (Jordan, 2015, p. 366). This group is large enough and influential enough for Jordan to conclude that a translingual stance on language "can remain a tough sell in rhetoric and

composition” (2015, p. 366). However, his explanation in terms of “history” and “legacy practices” denies the agency of these quiet essentialists and minimizes the consequences of their ideological work. In contrast, Lavelle (2017), forwards Miller’s (1991) indictment of composition programs and practitioners as complicit in sustaining and reproducing the dominant language ideology; he refocuses that indictment specifically on resistance to translingual pedagogy and explains the extensive complicity as the work of both programs and practitioners to defend actively their investments—symbolic as well as economic—in the ideology of standard English. In brief, there are obstacles to the diffusion of a pedagogy like the one described above, and those obstacles lie neither with student populations nor with pedagogical practices themselves but rather with the conflicting investments of reluctant teachers.

Conclusion

As we said in opening this chapter, the pedagogy discussed above evolved to meet the needs of a specific community of academic writers and in dialogue with a growing body of translingual research on language and writing. Because our community of writers consists primarily of graduate students and because graduate education generally calls for a large measure of conformity—to professional expectations, to disciplinary norms, and especially to established discursive practices—our highest priority among learning outcomes is that students can and do execute informed decisions about their Anglophone writing, an experience of agency to temper their experience of conformity. These decisions are variously course-grained or fine-grained, addressing the rhetorical aims of papers, theses, and dissertations, the whole-part relationships within those texts, the clustering of points and propositions into paragraphs, the arrangement of clausal constituents, and, not least, the selection of lexical items—words and phrases whose referents call for translation across languages, across time, and across cultures.

Our tripartite pedagogy reflects this priority. Our most concrete and specific curricular interventions revolve around the learning objects we employ to enrich our writers’ conceptual space for conscious decision making. Those interventions take place in a context theoretically and ideologically informed so as to foreground and sustain explicit *lingua franca* dispositions. Both that contextualization and the interventions are themselves instantiated methodologically through workshop and seminar formats and through an overarching spirit of collaborative inquiry. Students and instructors alike genuinely want to learn about the communicative dynamics of the students’ texts we discuss, for example their potential interpretations, their uptake, and their

challenges. All three elements of our pedagogy can continue to evolve, particularly the central work with learning objects, which is potentially open ended.

Likewise, research on translingualism continues to evolve within various disciplinary research programs in linguistics, education, and composition, to name three. We have already identified our expansive view of human agency as one area for continued theorizing. Another is the status of dispositions, a concept that here straddles its everyday usage and its history in Bourdieu's social theorizing. The notion clearly does substantial work in our pedagogy and research, and more thorough examination, empirical as well as theoretical, will help it to do that work better. For instance, a richer understanding of dispositions and their relationships to specific institutional *habitas* may contribute to a fuller understanding of Blommaert's *envoicing* and *devoicing* (2005), especially as they are enacted in higher-educational settings.

References

- Archibald, A., Cogo, A., & Jenkins, J. (Eds.). (2011). *Latest trends in ELF research*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning: What the student does*. The Society for Research into Higher Education.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2011). Language and superdiversity. *Diversities*, 13(2), 1-22.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. Routledge.
- Calvert, J. (1999). *Pour une écologie des langues du monde*. Plon. (A. Brown, Trans.). *Towards an ecology of world languages*. Polity.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2007). The ecology of global English. *International Multilingual research Journal*, 1(2), 89-100.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (Ed.). (2013a). *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and classrooms*. Routledge.
- Canagarajah, S. (2013b). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.
- Canagarajah, A. S., & Wurr, A. J. (2011). Multilingual communication and language acquisition: New research directions. *The Reading Matrix*, 11(1), 1-15.
- Churchill, D. (2007). Towards a useful classification of learning objects. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 55(5), 479-497.
- Cooper, M. M. (2014). The being of language. In B. Horner & K. Kopelson (Eds.), *Reworking English in rhetoric and composition: Global interrogations, local interventions* (pp. 13-30). SIU Press.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103-115.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 20-35.

- Dryer, D., & Mitchell, P. (2017) Seizing an opportunity for translingual FYC at the University of Maine: Provocative complexities, unexpected consequences. In B. Horner & L. Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing divides: Exploring translingual writing pedagogies and programs* (pp. 135-160). University Press of Colorado.
- Ehrenreich, S. (2010). English as a business lingua franca in a German multinational corporation: Meeting the challenge. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 47(4), 408-431.
- Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On “lingua franca” English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26(2), 237-259.
- Fish, S. (2011). *How to write a sentence*. HarperCollins.
- Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of journal editors to nonnative speaker contributions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(1), 121-150.
- Flowerdew, J. (2007). The non-Anglophone scholar on the periphery of scholarly publication. *AILA Review*, 20(1), 14-27.
- Gallagher, G., & Noonan, M. (2017). Becoming global: Learning to “do” translingualism. In B. Horner & L. Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing divides: Exploring translingual writing pedagogies and programs* (161-177). University Press of Colorado.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2013). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Garcia Ramon, M. D., Simonsen, K., & Vaiou, D. (2006). Guest editorial: Does Anglophone hegemony permeate gender, place and culture. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 13(1), 1-5.
- Guerra, J. C., & Shivers-McNair, A. (2017). Toward a new vocabulary of motive. In B. Horner & L. Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing divides: Exploring translingual writing pedagogies and programs*, (19-31). University Press of Colorado.
- Ho, E. Y. L. (2010). Language policy, “Asia’s world city” and anglophone Hong Kong writing. *Interventions*, 12(3), 428-441.
- Horner, B. (2011). Writing English as a lingua franca. In A. Archibald, A. Cogo, & J. Jenkins (Eds.), *Latest trends in ELF research* (pp. 299-311). Cambridge Scholars.
- Horner, B. (2014). Introduction: Reworking English in rhetoric and composition—global interrogations, local interventions. In B. Horner & K. Kopelson (Eds.), *Reworking English in rhetoric and composition—Global interrogations, local interventions* (pp. 1-10). SIU Press.
- Horner, B. (2016). *Rewriting composition: Terms of exchange*. SIU Press.
- Horner, B., & Kopelson, K. (Eds.). (2014). *Reworking English in rhetoric and composition: Global interrogations, local interventions*. SIU Press.
- Horner, B., & Lu, M. Z. (2012). Toward a labor economy of writing: Academic frictions. In J. N. Christoph et al. (Eds.), *Literacy, economy, and power: New directions in literacy research* (pp. 111-126). SIU Press.
- Horner, B., Lu, M. Z., Royster, J. J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Language difference in writing: Toward a translingual approach. *College English*, 73(3), 303-321.
- Horner, B., & Tetreault, L. (Eds.). (2017). *Crossing divides: Exploring translingual writing pedagogies and programs*. University Press of Colorado.

- Horner, B., & Trimbur, J. (2002). English only and U.S. college composition. *College Composition and Communication*, 53(4), 594-630.
- Inoue, A. B. (2017). Using writing assessment to create the conditions for translingual pedagogies. In B. Horner & L. Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing divides: Exploring translingual writing pedagogies and programs* (pp. 119-134). University Press of Colorado.
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, 44(3), 281-315.
- Johnasson, B. (Ed.). *Att undervisa med vetenskaplig förankring—i praktiken!* [Teaching with a research foundation—in practice]. Uppsala University.
- Jordan, J. (2015). Material translingual ecologies. *College English*, 77(4), 364.
- Jørgensen, J. N., Karrebæk, M. S., Madsen, L. M., & Møller, J. S. (2011). Polylinguaging in Superdiversity. *Diversities*, 13(2).
- Kankaanranta, A. (2006). “Hej Seppo, could you pls comment on this!”—Internal email communication in lingua franca English in a multinational company. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 69(2), 216-225.
- Kopelson, K. (2014). On the politics of not paying attention and the resistance of resistance. In B. Horner & K. Kopelson (Eds.), *Reworking English in rhetoric and composition: Global interrogations, local interventions* (pp. 207-220). SIU Press.
- Land, R. E., Jr., & Whitley, C. (1989). Evaluating second language essays in regular composition classes: Toward a pluralistic U.S. rhetoric. In D. M. Johnson & D. H. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 284-293). Longman.
- Lanham, R. A. (2006). *Revising prose*. Longman.
- Lavelle, T. (2008). English in the classroom: Meeting the challenge of English-medium instruction in international business schools. In P. Mårtensson, M. Bild, & K. Nilsson (Eds.), *Teaching and learning at business schools: transforming business education* (pp. 137-153). Gower.
- Lavelle, T. (2017). The ins and outs of translingual work. In B. Horner, & L. Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing divides: Exploring translingual writing pedagogies and programs*, (pp. 190-198). SIU Press.
- Lavelle, T. & Ågren, M. (2010). Academic writing in English—pedagogical answers to strategic challenges. In B. Johnasson (Ed.), *Att undervisa med vetenskaplig förankring—i praktiken!* [Teaching with a research foundation—in practice] (pp. 202-218). Uppsala University.
- Leki, I. (2007). *Understanding ESL students' academic literacy*. Lawrence.
- Leung, C., & Street, B. V. (Eds.). (2012). *English: A changing medium for education*. Multilingual Matters.
- Lillis, T. M., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in global context*. Routledge.
- Lu, M. Z. (1994). Professing multiculturalism: The politics of style in the contact zone. *College Composition and Communication*, 45(4), 442-458.
- Lu, M. Z., & Horner, B. (2013). Translingual literacy, language difference, and matters of agency. *College English*, 75(6), 582-607.

- Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (Eds.) (2007). *Disinventing and reconstitution languages*. Multilingual Matters.
- Malcolm, K. (2017). Disrupting monolingual ideologies in a community college: A translanguaging studio approach. In B. Horner & L. Tetreault, (Eds.), *Crossing divides: Exploring translanguaging writing pedagogies and programs* (pp. 101-118). University Press of Colorado.
- Mårtensson, P., Bild, M., & Nilsson, K. (Eds.) (2008). *Teaching and learning at business schools: Transforming business education*. Gower Publishing.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in U.S. college composition. *College English*, 68(6), 637-651.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2013). It's the wild west out there: A new linguistic frontier in U.S. college composition. In A. S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Literacy as translanguaging practice: Between communities and classrooms* (pp. 128-138). Routledge.
- Matsuda, P. K., & Silva, T. (1999). Cross-cultural composition: Mediated integration of U.S. and international students. *Composition Studies*, 27(1), 15-30.
- Mauranen, A. (2006). Signaling and preventing misunderstanding in English as lingua franca communication. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2006(177), 123-150.
- Miller, S. (1991). *Textual carnivals: The politics of composition*. SIU Press.
- Nielsen, K. (2014). Self-assessment methods in writing instruction: A conceptual framework, successful practices and essential strategies. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 37(1), 1-16.
- Pennycook, A. (2007). The myth of English as an international language. In S., Makoni & A. Pennycook, (Eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages* (pp. 90-115). Multilingual Matters.
- Pennycook, A. (2008). Translanguaging English. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31(3), 301-309.
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. Routledge.
- Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to teach in higher education*. Routledge.
- Rubin, D. L., & Williams-James, M. (1997). The impact of writer nationality on mainstream teachers' judgments of composition quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6(2), 139-154.
- Schriewer, J. (2009). "Rationalized myths" in European higher education: The construction and diffusion of the Bologna model. *European Education*, 41(2), 31-51.
- Severino, C. (1993). The sociopolitical implications of response to second language and second dialect writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2(3), 181-201.
- Smitherman, G., & Villanueva, V. (Eds.). (2003). *Language diversity in the classroom: From intention to practice*. SIU Press.
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (3rd ed.). University of Michigan Press.
- Williams, J. M., & Columb, G. (1995). *Style: Towards clarity and grace*. University of Chicago.