Overview

This WPA-CompPile Research Bibliography offers guidance to WPAs and writing teachers and tutors looking for program designs and teaching practices identified with a translingual approach to language difference in student writing. It is our hope that this bibliography will help readers sort through the growing scholarship on translingual approaches to writing and its teaching in deciding how they might adopt and adapt these in their work as program directors, curriculum designers, teachers, and tutors. There is growing urgency among all those involved in writing instruction to understand and address language difference in writing not only to meet the needs of students but also, and more importantly, to help students and their teachers in the work of writing and revising language.

To be sure, translingualism is currently a work in process, involving many. Moreover, by its own principles, it should be understood, like languages, as always in process, and the ever emerging outcome of the labor of all, students included. Hence, however polemical the debates on translinguality and alternatives to it might seem, those advocating for a translingual approach might best take up this process by resisting efforts to offer any final definition, program, or pedagogy for translinguality, and by directing their efforts instead toward creating conditions for exploring ways to define it with their colleagues and students (Lu and Horner, “Translingual Work”; Gallagher and Noonan; Guerra; Tardy, “Enacting”). In this way, translingual writing and its teaching are best conceived and pursued as ongoing projects rather than set approaches. And while to some this might understandably be a source of frustration, even confusion, WPAs know well that such projects are what give life to the work of writing programs: writing that takes up the question of difference in language and the difference it might make. WPAs can use this bibliography to join in the work of those represented here in taking up the project of translingual writing and its teaching.

We’ve divided the selected works into three sections. Section One, “Theoretical and Sociohistorical Backgrounds and Contexts,” focuses on scholarship that provides the theoretical underpinnings of translingual theory/ies, including disputes on how best to define translingual writing and its teaching in relation to other kinds of writing and writing instruction. Section One also includes work that locates this theorizing in specific social and historical contexts. Much, though not all, of this scholarship is found in fields of language study outside rhetoric and
composition *per se*, including the teaching and learning of second and foreign languages, critical applied linguistics, and sociolinguistics.

Section Two, “Translingual Interventions in Writing Programs,” presents scholarship that describes specific instances of efforts to introduce translingual approaches into the curriculum and teaching of writing through professional development, graduate education, curriculum design, and program assessment. Included in this section is also work on second language writing that takes up questions of translinguality.

Section Three, “Translingual Writing Pedagogies,” presents scholarship on specific pedagogical strategies by which to implement a translingual approach. Readers of this bibliography may find this scholarship helpful both in their own teaching and in their work on teacher education.

We exclude from this bibliography research that simply reports on ordinary, extracurricular language practices deemed translingual, such as informal spoken conversation, and scholarship addressing research methodologies on such practices insofar as these are not of direct concern to users of this bibliography, however significant they may be in other respects. We also exclude from this bibliography work on second language writing, bilingualism, multilingualism, and second language acquisition except insofar as their relationship to translinguality is addressed (see our comments on multilingualism as language ideology below); hence, for example, we do not include here the growing body of scholarship on translanguage (what might appear to be the mixing and meshing of languages within utterances). Likewise, we do not include here the vast body of scholarship on theories of language difference except insofar as that work either addresses translinguality explicitly or the conditions of its emergence.

As will be evident from the scholarship represented in this bibliography, defining translinguality in writing, and a “translingual” approach to writing and its teaching, is an ongoing matter of debate and research (note the recurrence of “clarifying” in three different works here, each appearing in a different section [Atkinson et al., “Clarifying”; Canagarajah, “Clarifying”; Watson and Shapiro, “Clarifying”]). That said, it will also be evident from the scholarship presented here that certain issues recur across the sections. Perhaps first and foremost is the issue of agency among students and teachers in the work they perform with and on language (e.g., DePalma and Ringer; Lu and Horner, “Translingual”; Paudel). Against the prevailing language ideology of monolingualism, which presents languages as stable and discrete entities for teachers to enable students to write within, a translingual approach to language grants students agency and responsibility for language as the emerging outcome of their writing practices, with language difference thus an inevitability rather than a choice (as in repetitions unavoidably differing from what they repeat). Acknowledging students’ agency as writers for sustaining and revising language(s) changes the pedagogical dynamics of the writing classroom and, necessarily, the work of writing program administration. Translingualism’s quite different positioning of language as the always differing outcome of writers’ labor necessarily requires a rethinking of the structure of the writing curriculum and practices for assessing student writing, whether for purposes of student course placement or advancement (see, for example, Costino and Hyon; Dryer; Dryer and Mitchell; Gallagher and Noonan; Inoue; Malcolm).

At the same time, students, teachers, and WPAs take up such work in the context of the continued dominance of the language ideology of monolingualism, an ideology that operates both externally—say, in the form of institutional and public policies and expectations—and
internally, in the presuppositions and seemingly natural concerns of writers and readers (see, for example, Davila; Gal and Irvine; Guerra; Kimball; Milroy; Watson and Shapiro). How to confront the dominance of that language ideology remains an issue of concern in translingual scholarship. One common response to that dominance noted by several of the works presented here is a turn to the language ideology not of translingualism but multilingualism—monolingualism pluralized. But while seeming to accommodate language difference by acknowledging the existence and legitimacy of different languages, multilingualism (as ideology) retains fixed notions of languages and their relation to civic and social identities of writers (see Bou Ayash, “Conditions”; Horner, “Teaching”). Admittedly, the relationship between multilingualism and translingualism remains vexed—is the former a precondition for the emergence of the latter, or does it simply offer a more appealing alternative to the latter as a language ideology? That said, the common conflation of the two is testimony to the perduring power of the monolingualism to subsume alternatives to it.

Several scholars do investigate the relation between translinguality and multilinguality, raising questions about what kind of teachers, and/or teacher preparation might be called for by those pursuing a translingual approach, and what role the learning of languages (other than English) might play in such preparation (see, for example, Canagarajah, “Translingual”; de Costa et al.; Hesford et al.; Kilfoil; Modern Language Association Ad Hoc Committee; Logan; Tardy, “Crossing”; Zapata and Laman; Zheng). Likewise, there is interest in how students identified or identifying as multilingual, as well as those identified or identifying as monolingual, might make use of their knowledge of languages as resources in pursuing translingual writing (Canagarajah, “Clarifying”; Guerra; Hall; Jordan; Kiernan et al.; Kimball; Kramsch; Lorimer Leonard; Horner and Tetreault, “Translation”). While translingualism’s blurring of language boundaries problematizes such language identifications, those identifications might nonetheless prove useful as starting points for students and teachers to work together toward alternative ways of imagining themselves and their work as writers of language (see Sohan; Stanley; Watson and Shapiro). But, to reiterate, albeit with an inevitable difference, such a possibility, along with countless others, is one that writing programs—that is to say, students, teachers, and program administrators collectively—can explore as an ongoing project: how to rethink their relations to language, and to reimagine and remake language through their work as writers, learners, and teachers of language.

I: Theoretical and Sociohistorical Backgrounds and Contexts

Atkinson, Dwight; Deborah Crusan; Paul Kei Matsuda; Christina Ortmeier Hooper; Todd Ruecker; Steve Simpson; Christine Tardy. “Clarifying the Relationship between L2 Writing and Translingual Writing: An Open Letter to Writing Studies Editors and Organization Leaders.” College English, vol. 77, no. 4, 2015, pp. 383-86.

Abstract: Advises those responsible for selecting reviewers for conference proposals, reviewing manuscripts for journals that deal with second language writing practices, or organizing job searches for candidates equipped to teach writing in a second language to remember the unique qualifications of L2 scholars. The authors argue that translingualism is not an outgrowth of nor replacement for L2 Writing; L2 Writing is a distinct, international, transdisciplinary field that need not situate itself in relation to translingualism.
Keywords: L2, ESL, discipline, hiring


Abstract: Argues that a “World Englishes” approach to composition would productively complicate the monolingual ideology underpinning much of composition studies. Such an approach would require compositionists to reconsider native/nonnative dichotomies and come to see English as a multinational language. Canagarajah suggests that skillful negotiation of World Englishes is necessary to the communicative competence of global citizens and thus a pedagogical imperative in the 21st century. To this end, Canagarajah proposes a “codemeshing” (i.e., the blending of different linguistic codes) model for composition pedagogy that moves beyond mere tolerance for linguistic difference toward active instruction in the rhetorical negotiation of Englishes.

Keywords: ESL, pedagogy, classroom, international, world Englishes, world-Englishes, academic, discourse, code meshing, code-mixing, multilingual, pedagogy, pluralization


Abstract: Explains that despite the field’s commitment to linguistic equality (as demonstrated by the Students’ Right to Their Own Language position statement), writing studies still reinforces standard language ideologies by positioning Standard Edited American English (SEAE) as linguistically neutral, in part based on the tacit assumption that SEAE will always be taught to some extent because it benefits all students. This assumption has the effect of positioning SEAE as superior to other linguistic varieties. Davila asked instructors at three different US public research universities to respond to a series of student essays and describe their impression of the student-authors, finding that instructors continually framed SEAE as both “normal” and “natural,” (131) not influencing or interfering with ideas but simply transmitting them. Furthermore, instructors assumed SEAE was widely accessible to all students and therefore did not need to be explicitly taught. Davila advises writing instructors to pay greater attention to the ways in which they may reinforce such standard language ideologies by recognizing and naming SEAE, rather than referring broadly to the English language when they mean SEAE.

Keywords: first-year composition, language acquisition, language ideology, linguistic diversity, standard language

Abstract: Argues that the notion of transfer prevalent in scholarship on L2 writing and composition has focused on how previous writing knowledge is reused in new contexts without adequately accounting for how that knowledge is reshaped or transformed in response to new writing situations. Accordingly, the authors advance a theory of adaptive transfer that emphasizes adaptive transfer as dynamic, rhetorical, and multilingual, with writers drawing from a range of linguistic resources and repertoires as they adapt previous writing knowledge for new contexts and purposes. This perspective, DePalma and Ringer contend, can move disciplinary discussions of transfer away from a focus on whether transfer occurs toward an investigation of how students reshape their writing knowledge for new rhetorical situations. For composition instructors, such a shift entails considering what students do with language, as opposed to whether they adhere to the (usually monolingual) expectations of academic discourse.

Keywords: transfer, L2, writing


Abstract: Claiming that boundaries between languages are ideological constructs that reinforce identity categories along ethnic and national lines, the authors suggest that boundaries between academic disciplines are also maintained by the same political ideologies that enforce linguistic boundaries. The authors demonstrate three processes by which linguistic boundaries are created. First is iconicity, which links linguistic features to beliefs about a group’s behavior, thereby suggesting such language practices are inherent to their nature. Second is the process of differentiation, in which qualities said to separate larger groups are applied to smaller units to create subcategories, such as when syntactical patterns are said to separate both different social classes (e.g., farmers and craftsmen) as well as different dialects across villages. Third, and most importantly, is erasure, which simplifies linguistic practices by ignoring what does not fit into the established separation between various languages, such as when European observers cataloged three discrete languages in Senegal and ignored the grammatical features and similarities that did not align with their perceived distinctions. After multiple historical examples to demonstrate the way these processes create linguistic boundaries, the authors demonstrate how similar processes are at work in discussions of methods that are unique to various disciplines, suggesting the boundaries between both languages and scholarly disciplines are not natural. They conclude by expressing a desire that a recognition of the artificialness of these boundaries will lead to a greater focus on the ways linguistic practices are embedded in social life.

Keywords: language ideology, linguistic diversity, standard language


Abstract: Expresses concern that some approaches to translingualism risk flattening linguistic difference and abstracting language in a manner that could harm scholars and
students of color. He notes that translingualism’s relationship to the 1974 CCCC Students’ Right to Their Own Language resolution is not straightforward; SRTOL responded directly to the opening of higher education to African American students, whereas translingualism responds more directly to the linguistic realities brought about by globalization. Gilyard suggests that proponents of translingualism take care to note that not all language users differ from a perceived “standard” in the same ways and to attend to the material power afforded to certain language performances but not others. Nonetheless, although he wants to see the rhetoric of translingualism fine-tuned, Gilyard fully endorses translingualism’s rejection of monolingual ideology.

Keywords: translingual, language difference, diversity, Students’ Right to Their Own Language, race


Abstract: Examines how globalization in francophone Canada led to the commodification of bilingualism as a skill rather than an ethnonational marker, as well as how francophone identity has been commodified apart from language. Heller provides segments of transcripts from a 6-year longitudinal study of over 400 interviews; excerpts include call centers marketing bilingualism in their workforce as well as heritage tourism’s commodification of a non-linguistic francophone identity. Heller argues that the study of ethnolinguistic minorities can illustrate the changing valuation of bilingual repertoires in a globalized new economy. As state powers attempt to regulate and commercialize bilingualism, Heller’s interviews reveal a tension at play between the “pure” language assets desired by the government and the hybrid realities of her participants.

Keywords: Globalization, multilingualism, Canada, identity, commodification, economy


Abstract: Horner et al. catalyze the disciplinary conversation surrounding translingual writing by arguing that language use is always already diverse and fluctuating. The authors call for a new paradigm for US college composition: a translingual approach to writing that takes language difference not as a problem to eradicate but as a rhetorical resource. This approach moves beyond the rhetoric of “rights” concerning language difference (advanced by SRTOL in 1974) toward a rhetoric of “resources.” This perspective also emphasizes that, instead of simply learning to adhere to linguistic “standards” in their writing, students must learn how such standards are “contingent and negotiable” (305). At the programmatic level, this paradigm shift requires several changes to curricular and professionalization efforts, including training teachers to better attend to language difference in the classroom; promoting cross-disciplinary work in foreign languages (including in graduate curricula); and emphasizing translation in writing pedagogy. The authors conclude by anticipating several questions that
compositionists may have regarding this new approach, responding to possible concerns surrounding the monolingualism of teachers and students, error, standards, and students’ future writing contexts.

Keywords: dialect, language-rights, difference, translingual, rhetorical-analysis, Students' Right to Their Own Language, CCCC, policy, fluency, proficiency, competence, ESL, bilingual, bibliography, multilingual, pedagogy, internationalization, globalization, language difference


Abstract: Traces the tacit language policy of English Only monolingualism through the history and current practice of US college composition. Drawing parallels between debates surrounding “English Only” anti-immigrant legislation and basic writers, they argue that a rhetoric of foreignness and threat reinforces the legitimacy of a unidirectional English monolingualism in both cases. As a partial corrective, they recommend that composition curricula embrace a broader perspective on English’s relationship to other languages, especially in the context of globalization, and that compositionists resist oversimplified understandings of the relationship(s) between language and identity.

Keywords: language, FYC, sociolinguistics, language policy, curriculum, globalization, internationalization, history, English Only, language policy, pedagogy, monolingualism, immigration, foreign languages


Abstract: Advocates for developing new pedagogies in TESOL that take speakers' linguistic abilities and identities into consideration, while working against assumptions of an idealized native speaker who speaks “perfect” standard English. The authors draw upon Rampton (1990) to argue that instead of using the term “native speaker,” teachers should adopt the terms “language expertise,” “language inheritance,” and “language affiliation” (554-557) to convey a more accurate understanding of speakers’ relationships with language varieties.

Keywords: pedagogy, TESOL, identity, multilingualism, bilingualism


Abstract: Provides the results of a series of life history interviews with multilingual immigrant writers, in which the author found that writing across languages, locations, and cultures rhetorically attunes the ear of the multilingual writer to a sensitivity towards difference, negotiation, and the impact of cultural history and politics on language and
writing. Rhetorical attunement is therefore cultivated through dynamic practice and accumulated over time, as opposed to being a static, fully-formed resource that a writer possesses.

Keywords: multilingualism, immigration, rhetoric, attunement


Abstract: Argues that disciplinary conversations surrounding translingualism and transfer can inform each other in productive ways, especially concerning methodology. The authors call upon transfer scholars to consider the role of language ideologies in transfer, specifically investigating how translingual pedagogies might affect students’ transfer of writing knowledge in later classes and writing contexts. Translingualism, they claim, also challenges transfer scholars to reconsider the notion of failed transfer by rethinking what counts as “failure.” Lorimer Leonard and Nowacek also call upon scholars of translingualism to adopt the “longitudinal and cross-classroom methodologies” common in transfer research as a means of providing data to demonstrate the broad relevance of the translingual approach (262).

Keywords: turn; multilingualism; translingualism; world Englishes; internationalization; terminology; nomenclature; research-methods; literacy, transfer, methodology


Abstract: Calls for compositionists to delay assumptions about what their students need until studying students’ understanding of their own complex discursive resources. To illustrate the value of doing so, Lu examines the phrase “collecting money toilet” (21) in “Chinglish” (20)—a term Lu cites as used in Beijing to decry the city’s preponderance of putatively incomprehensible English signs—as well as teen writing appearing in *The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*. By approaching all writing as a matter of design, all speakers of English can learn to responsibly wield its power in a world dominated by fast capitalism; the composition classroom is a site for the boundary work within and among Englishes and other languages. WPAs might direct teachers’ attention to the variety of pedagogical possibilities outlined between pages 39-43.

Keywords: fast capitalism, globalization, ethics, social justice


Abstract: Outlines the problems inherent in the metaphor of code switching, proffering transcultural literacy as an alternative. Code switching offers an acknowledgement of the pressures students feel to demonstrate mastery of Standard Written English, but at the
cost of implying that linguistic codes are obvious, discrete, easily transmitted, and determined by forces outside of a student’s control. In contrast, transcultural literacy, with its connotations of transaction and transformation, shifts the focus to a student’s agentive choices and inculcates a disposition of deliberation and proactivity. Similar to DePalma and Ringer’s theory of adaptive transfer (2011), Lu’s transcultural literacy reframes the disciplinary discussion away from un/alignment with standards and towards the study of how students explore and negotiate language in context.

Keywords: metaphor, language difference, SWE, agency, code switching


Abstract: Introduces a symposium on translingualism in this special issue of College English by first articulating the tenets of a translingual approach to composition that inform the issue. These tenets include the understandings of language as performative, communicative practices as (meso)political, and language users as engaged in (trans)forming linguistic conventions, among others. After providing an overview of the contributions to the symposium, the authors argue that writing and rewriting language—the work/labor of translingualism—is a process in which we are always engaged with our students.

Keywords: translingual, language difference, diversity, labor


Abstract: Argues that much scholarship attempting to honor language diversity reinforces monolingual ideology by positing the existence of linguistic norms from which certain writers “deviate.” Using the “White Shoes” student essay discussed in David Bartholomae’s “Inventing the University,” they show that even writing that appears to reproduce “standard” language practices evinces agency. By foregrounding the linguistic labor that this “mainstream” writer undertakes to negotiate language difference, they argue for a translingual approach to all student writing in order to emphasize student agency. This orientation works to prevent translingual approaches from being deemed “irrelevant” to mainstream writers and thereby from reinforcing the problematic assumptions of language stability that translingualism unsettles.

Keywords: difference, language pluralism, world Englishes, monolingualism, USA, translingualism, agency, praxis, convention, pedagogy, language rights


Abstract: Describes translingualism’s recent popularity as "linguistic tourism" (482), claiming some scholars ride the coattails of translingualism in their eagerness to enact ethical practices in their classrooms and satisfy their fascination with language difference.
Matsuda reviews some of the acquiescence to demands for visible, translingual pedagogies, but warns that this unending curiosity may lead to stereotyping students and the pedagogical drive to ask students to explicitly mix language in their writing, a request that ignores students’ varying capacities to do so.

Keywords: pedagogy, ethics, stereotype


Abstract: Argues that the imagined student audience of composition teachers erroneously includes only native English speakers. He traces the origins of this situation to the rise of the first-year composition requirement, which was prompted by what he calls “weak language difference.” Alternately, what Matsuda terms “strong language difference” has become the purview of basic writing or L2 sections of composition, amounting to a policy of “linguistic containment.” However, this perception of general composition students as linguistically homogeneous does not match the reality of the composition classroom as a multilingual space, as illustrated through historical and contemporary data. Matsuda calls upon composition teachers to reimagine the classroom space accordingly, with writing programs training all composition teachers to address the unique needs of L2 writers.

Keywords: pedagogy, history, L2, ESL, USA, homogeneity, monolingualism, myth, mainstreaming, native-nonnative, language difference, multilingual


Abstract: Acknowledges that linguists have both been influenced by and contributed to standard language ideologies which take for granted that some forms of language are “correct” while others are “wrong.” Recognizing that standardization of languages is a process that is never fully achieved, the author demonstrates the ways standard language ideologies impose notions of uniformity and stability onto various languages, such as analyses of their internal structure. Furthermore, he demonstrates how historical linguistics works to legitimize standard varieties by historicizing their origins in particular nation-states, such as beginning the history of “English” when speakers of German dialects arrived on what is now British soil. Because the author recognizes such ideologies are not universal, as some cultures do not recognize distinct boundaries between language states, he advocates for academics to be more aware of the attitudes towards language they are advancing.

Keywords: language ideology, language varieties, linguistic diversity, standard language, standardization

Abstract: Charged with responding to the nation’s “language deficit” in the post-9/11 era, the Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages argues that American institutions should transform foreign-language programs to foster greater “translingual and transcultural competence” among students. This competence can be achieved, the Committee explains, by unifying language and literature sequences (which are traditionally separate curricula) for a more interdisciplinary approach, by “situat[ing] language study in cultural, historical, geographic, and cross-cultural frames within the context of humanistic learning,” and by increasing collaboration among tenure-line and non-tenure-track faculty members across related fields.

Keywords: foreign language, higher education, cultural competence, interdisciplinary


Abstract: Argues that WPAs and instructors should refrain from overemphasizing correctness of standard English and focus instead on fostering awareness of diversity in meaning-making and tolerance toward language difference. Paudel proposes a “mesodiscursive approach” to understanding how language use emerges from “tensions between individual agency and the social/historical constraints implicated in language structure on how one exercises that agency” (208). This approach resists the monolingual model of languages as stable and discrete entities and avoids perpetuating romanticized notions of multilingual individuals with “free-floating agency” in language use. Applying a mesodiscursive approach to the issue of student placement, Paudel argues that non-ESL and ESL students should be integrated into the same composition classes. He also asserts that new writing teachers should become familiar with scholarship on language acquisition as well as learn from exchanges with multilingual writing faculty.

Keywords: language difference, agency, semiodiversity, mesodiscursivity


Abstract: Argues that English “needs to be seen in the context of other languages” to be understood as a “language always in translation” rather than as “an entity on its own” (34), pointing out that language fortress, lingua franca and World Englishes approaches still assume a stable English core and perpetuate the very frameworks they aim to move beyond. English language teaching should be seen as translingual activism by
foregrounding how teaching and learning languages means entering the ever-diversifying “global traffic of meaning” (43).

Keywords: translation, English language teaching, lingua franca, ELF, world Englishes


Abstract: Draws parallels between three identified themes in Crossing Divides (programmatic and institutional change, interrelations of language and identity, and teacher education) and the seminal work of other disciplines—particularly second language writing and applied linguistics—in arguing that transdisciplinary collaboration and study are necessary to rhetoric and composition’s development of translingualism. Tardy points out that the collection’s call for teacher support in developing translingual pedagogies is at odds with the field’s trend away from cross-disciplinary coursework and foreign-language proficiency at the graduate level.

Keywords: interdisciplinary, transdisciplinarity, second language writing, applied linguistics, graduate education


Abstract: In her critical analysis of 28 U.S. university websites examining dominant discourses of internationalization, Tardy finds main discourses of the university and its students as leaders in a global marketplace and participants in a global community. She argues that there is relatively little emphasis on the value of foreign language study, despite a focus on the importance of global citizenship. While university websites generally portray diversity as a resource, writing program websites tend to depict diversity as “something to be responded to” rather than valued, thereby perpetuating the myth of linguistic homogeneity. Tardy recommends that WPAs should understand these broader institutional discourses within which they can more strategically situate programmatic needs and decisions.

Keywords: Internationalization, U.S. higher education, diversity, foreign language, global citizenship, websites


Abstract: Thatcher, Montoya and Medina-Lopez forward an “etic-then-emic” approach (168) for intercultural and global research, an approach they model with their examination of the complex dynamics of the U.S.-Mexico border. The authors compare U.S. and Mexican rhetorics as seen in two health communications texts, discussing not
only stylistic differences but underlying cultural reasons for these differences. The authors offer six categories of writers, each with unique cultural and rhetorical backgrounds and preferences, to help instructors understand how students might have different approaches to navigating expectations of U.S. writing classrooms.

Keywords: Mexican rhetoric, ESL, multilingual, intercultural rhetoric, global writing theory


Abstract: Debunks a common argument against English Only efforts: that the Founding Fathers of the United States refused to give official status to English in order to preserve linguistic diversity. The author instead identifies a tacit language policy of expediency between 1763 and 1830: the Founding Fathers permitted language diversity when such efforts furthered their mission of sovereignty, similarly promoting monolingualism when expediency dictated. English was always seen as the inevitable print language of the United States and the priority spoken language. Trimbur explores a variety of historical language issues of concern to U.S. policies of sovereignty, domination, and expansion, including pidgins and creoles, the slave trade and maritime trade, indigenous languages, the myth of Anglo-Saxon settlement, and Webster’s dictionaries.

Keywords: English Only, language policy, language rights, pidgin, creole, sovereignty, monolingualism


Abstract: Traces a history of close reading starting with Shaughnessy, to Bartholomae, then through to Horner and Lu’s work in the 1990’s, finding that all four scholars use close reading to shed new light on the meaning of language difference. Trimbur sees Shaughnessy and Bartholomae’s close reading as rooted in a New Critical approach to finding intention, logic, and pattern in the seemingly chaotic writing of open admissions students, in contrast to Horner and Lu, who close-read in order to highlight unequal power relations made apparent when writers draw on all available linguistic and rhetorical resources, prefiguring their translingual approach.

Keywords: close reading, language difference, open admissions, basic writing


Abstract: Aligning with Atkinson et al.’s claim that translingual writing should not be taken up as a replacement for L2 writing, Williams and Condon contend that
misinterpretations of translingualism reinforce conceptions of L2 writing as discriminatory: while translingualism is embedded in inclusive rhetorics, wherein “difference is a source of strength” (9), L2 writing is positioned as “prescriptive, enforcing conformity,” and “eradicat[ing] difference” (11). Williams and Condon state that collaboration across fields remains unlikely as long as these misinterpretations persist. However, the authors provide examples of L2 research on grammar and genre instruction that offer theoretical common ground and open up possibilities for future collaboration.

Keywords: second language writing, ESL, grammar, genre

Young, Vershawn Ashanti. “‘Nah, We Straight’: An Argument Against Code Switching.” *JAC*, vol. 29, nos.1/2, 2009, pp. 49-76.

Abstract: Argues that pedagogical approaches that encourage code switching are equivalent to pedagogies of linguistic conversion and segregation, since asking students to switch to Standard English in certain contexts reinforces a hierarchy in which Standard English is privileged and other varieties are devalued. The author draws parallels between arguments for code switching between African American English (AAE) and Standard English and the “separate but equal” logic of segregation in limiting the use of AAE to home settings. This linguistic segregation reproduces DuBois’ concept of double consciousness. As an alternative, the author advocates for code meshing, in which students strategically blend their home languages with Standard English as a way to avoid implicitly teaching students that their home varieties of English are incompatible with Standard English. In part, this argument is premised on the recognition of Standard English as a mythical construct in that its linguistic practices often remain unmarked. However, while all writers make errors, those made by people of color are used as evidence of nonstandard language usage, so the author argues that pedagogical approaches to code switching are not only unethical but also ineffective.

Keywords: African American English, code meshing, code switching, language ideology, linguistic diversity, standard language

**II: Translingual Interventions in Writing Programs**

Arnold, Lisa R. “‘This Is a Field That's Open, Not Closed’: Multilingual and International Writing Faculty Respond to Composition Theory.” *Composition Studies*, vol. 44, no. 1, 2016, pp. 72-88.

Abstract: Recognizes that composition researchers in North America can learn from writing teachers in other linguistic contexts even if those teachers have not had extensive coursework in rhetoric and composition. Therefore, Arnold suggests that North American graduate programs need to recognize their limited perspectives and prepare graduate students to work outside of their national borders. She reports on workshops at the American University of Beirut that introduce the faculty to translingual scholarship and examines the ways the faculty there are able to position themselves as experts because
their experience teaching in a linguistically diverse region necessitated a translingual approach.

Keywords: faculty, international, linguistic diversity, multilingual, pedagogy, international, training, translingual


Abstract: Offers a comparative approach that focuses on 1) language policies, 2) on-the-ground language use, and 3) curriculum design to assess conditions for institutionalizing translingualism across multilingual sites. Drawing from an analysis of Lebanon and Singapore, the author argues that WPAs should turn to cross-national contexts to gain more nuanced understandings of how translingual approaches can be adopted in the U.S. Specifically, WPAs should advocate for the type of multilingual language policy seen in Lebanon in order to institutionally recognize and appreciate students’ linguistic resources, and to “fight for curriculum change by bridging the gap between language learning and actual language use” (239) while acknowledging the “negotiable and changeable” nature of language conventions (239).

Keywords: cross-national, cross-language, language policy, curriculum design, pedagogy


Abstract: Argues that programmatic adaptations to support monolingual English writers and ESL writers do not fully attend to the unique needs and strengths of diverse bilingual/multilingual students at the U.S.-Mexico border. Drawing from their work at New Mexico State University and The University of Texas at El Paso, they recommend a range of strategies for WPAs to better adapt to the complex rhetorical context of border institutions, such as designing more nuanced admissions forms and data-driven writing course placement procedures, developing more dynamic writing curricula, offering adequate professional development for instructors, and facilitating programmatic collaborations between ESL and mainstream writing courses.

Keywords: Mexico, Generation 1.5, bilingual, ELL, placement, curriculum design, border

Abstract: Claims that teaching Standard English as an ideological construct rather than a discrete set of skills better prepares students to negotiate expectations for Standard English. Canagarajah questions the practice of separating students in writing classrooms based on language proficiency, arguing that labels such as “native speaker” and “nonnative speaker” construct notions of language proficiency premised on inaccurate notions of language homogeneity. As an example of how local policy may negotiate policies influenced by monolingualism to introduce a translingual orientation that recognizes language acquisition as circulatory and always evolving, Canagarajah draws on the “New York State Bilingual Common Core Initiative,” which renders students’ home language and English as complementary to each other in their development. While he suggests NYSBCCI is still working to meet the standards of the CCSS, and thus it is not a fully-realized translingual approach to language acquisition, he argues it is well-informed by translingualism in the ways that it recognizes language acquisition as multidirectional and suggests that all of the students’ language resources are useful in their acquisition of English. He suggests this policy negotiation demonstrates how translingualism can be useful in developing notions of literacy that can counter myths of monolingualism.

Keywords: L1, L2, language acquisition, language ideology, language policy, pedagogy, placement, second language writing, translingual


Abstract: Responding to the question of whether L2 composition students should be placed in separate ESL composition courses or mainstream composition courses, Costino and Hyon argue for directed self-placement procedures in which the differences between the instructional approaches in either course are explained to students, rather than expecting the different labels to adequately convey the differences between courses. The authors advocate for this position after finding that students may have different perceptions about identity labels than instructors or administrators. This conclusion is based on interview data from students at a California state university who took either a mainstream or ESL basic writing course followed by a mainstream composition course. While students had different perceptions about various linguistic identity labels—such as English Language Learner or ESL student—and these perceptions had no correlation to their residency status (U.S. born, immigrant, or international student), all participants, whether enrolled in the ESL or mainstream BW course, indicated they felt they chose the right class because it contained students with similar English language skills. Because these students did not conform to perceived links among residency status, identity label, and course preference, the authors suggest placement decisions require such input from
the students, as instructors and administrators may have misperceptions about which placement is best for them. An implication of such procedures is that the curricula in either ESL or mainstream courses must be designed to meet the needs of diverse linguistic abilities.

Keywords: basic writing, first-year composition, L2, language acquisition, linguistic diversity, multilingual, placement, writing program administration


Abstract: Argues that a deeply flawed and empirically invalid understanding of language underlies most language proficiency testing. Dryer calls upon writing programs to adjust their own documents—such as “syllabi, teacher-training manuals, student handbooks, catalogue descriptions” and, more urgently, “rubrics, grading scales, scoring bands, scoring guides and trait descriptors” (275)—to better align with a translingual understanding of language. These documents and the broader systems of language proficiency testing (e.g., the TOEFL, GRE, etc.) that permeate our society need to be revised to place greater value upon successful rhetorical and linguistic negotiation and flexibility. Such a shift would be consistent with the commonplace standards of language use that are widespread outside the context of high-stakes testing.

Keywords: translingual, assessment, language difference


Abstract: Reports that after initial attempts to enact a translingual section of FYC comprised of both L1 and L2 students, complex portfolios by L2 students were consistently rated worse than those by L1 students and often for criteria other than those outlined on the assessment rubric, despite attention in TA training to translingual pedagogies. Noting that dispositions towards language are enacted through institutional documents, argues for document redesign as a productive approach to addressing the obstacles faced by these L2 students. Thus the authors focus on assignment and rubric redesign, providing examples of these revised documents as an appendix. To provide TAs with more resources to rethink their approach to language, the authors call for more attention in the TA practicum to theoretical issues of language acquisition and the historical emergence of “academic English” before exposing them to translingual pedagogies.

Keywords: assessment, first-year composition, L1, L2, pedagogy, TA, training, writing program administration

Abstract: Highlights the necessity of distinguishing between international ESL students, resident ESL students, and monolingual basic writers, as the three are often conflated for placement purposes but have different educational needs. Friedrich focuses more on resident ESL students, suggesting they are the most frequently overlooked population of the three. Noting the challenges faced by resident ESL students (such as the possibility that they may not have received the same formal English instruction as their international ESL peers), the author offers several suggestions for writing programs attempting to address these students’ needs. First, she argues for focusing on the linguistic resources students already possess, rather than focusing on what they lack, and for drawing on those resources as a foundation for developing their English literacies further. She also argues composition programs should engage in more direct work with other disciplines and the writing center to ensure that ESL students do not receive conflicting messages about writing. Last, she reports that resident ESL students often require feedback that is more directive than the rhetorical questions English professors often ask, and that feedback should be focused more on rhetorical patterns than on surface-level errors.

Keywords: basic writing, ESL, L1, L2, language acquisition, linguistic diversity, placement, second language writing


Abstract: Reporting on faculty’s initial negative responses towards writing by multilingual students, Gallagher and Noonan discuss a writing program’s efforts to train faculty to confront language difference more effectively. Conceiving of translingualism as an orientation towards language that must be repeatedly and consistently practiced, they demonstrate that programmatic and institutional policies provide the necessary conditions for translingual pedagogies to occur, but such policies cannot guarantee translingual pedagogies are consistently enacted. The authors conclude with an approach to enacting translingual reading practices in FYC, which they contrast with treating translingualism as a course topic.

Keywords: assessment, faculty, first-year composition, L2, pedagogy, placement, training, translingual, writing program administration

Abstract: Advocates for the cultivation of a multilingual faculty, the incorporation of interdisciplinary research in professional development, the engagement of multiple Englishes in the classroom, and the pursuit of institution-specific research on student populations as ways that writing programs can acknowledge the reality of multilinguality. Results are provided from a 2009 institutional study which found that 68% of student respondents made some use of a language other than English in their lives. In order to highlight the linguistic presuppositions at work in U.S. education, the author fictionalizes an alternate model of higher education in which a monolingual student is positioned at a disadvantage.

Keywords: multilingualism, plurilingualism, interdisciplinarity, universal design, professional development


Abstract: Outlines a grant proposal written to address the pedagogical challenges faced by international graduate teaching associates and GTAs of color. The grant resulted in an ongoing peer mentoring group, a think tank where GTAs could contribute to a transnational composition pedagogy, an expanded GTA handbook, and workshops. These aforementioned initiatives were part of a programmatic effort to acknowledge such GTAs’ engagement with cultures as emergent, contested, fragmented and dialogic (in opposition to corporate multiculturalism).

Keywords: GTA, graduate education, international students, labor, grant


Abstract: Argues that effective translingual approaches to composition pedagogy require assessment practices that are consistent with the tenets of translingualism. Such practices, he contends, must avoid penalizing language difference and reinforcing the idea of language standards, and must instead treat language practices as negotiable. He explores two assessment practices that fit this bill: directed self-placement and labor-based grading contracts. Directed self-placement allows students to make informed decisions about their writing placements based upon the amount of time and attention they wish to devote to working on their writing; labor-based grading contracts allow for grades to serve as a function of student labor as opposed to a judgment of quality with implied linguistic
standards. These practices, Inoue argues, help to create a fair classroom assessment ecology consistent with a translingual view of language.

Keywords: assessment, directed self-placement, contract grading

Jerskey, Maria. “Literacy Brokers in the Contact Zone, Year 1: The Crowded Safehouse.” *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms*. Ed. A. Suresh Canagarajah. New York: Routledge, 2013. 197-206.

Abstract: Explores how the creation of writing workshops to help multilingual faculty and staff at CUNY’s LaGuardia Community College publish academic texts led to productive collaborations that benefitted both multilingual and monolingual writers. These collaborations were made possible by supplementing the literacy-broker emphasis of the program with a peer-learning/writing circle framework and opening the program up to additional categories of writers, such as administrators who worked at the college (204).

Keywords: publishing, literacy, multilingual, faculty, workshops


Abstract: Argues for reconceptualizing composition in the multilingual university by changing terms such as ESL, recognizing multilingual competencies, and creating an assessment framework based on the Council of Europe’s work on intercultural communicative competence (ICC). Highlights pedagogical practices such as using writing assignments that feature linguistic contact, real-world artifacts such as websites, native speaker and non-native speaker peer interactions, and ICC portfolios.

Keywords: multilingual, competence, assessment, writing center, writing program


Abstract: Presents findings from a survey of language requirements of doctoral programs in rhetoric and composition as listed in *Rhetoric Review*, as well as an analysis of 38 institutional websites, concluding overall that language requirements in these programs are decreasing and those that remain are framed as tangential to scholarship. Kilfoil recommends departing from practices based on monolingual ideologies (exams, emphasis on reading ability, preference for European languages) and towards translilingual approaches to linguistic diversity, including cross-language teaching and research activities (coursework on translation theory, writing scholarship in other languages, attending global conferences, and including non-English texts on exam reading lists).

Keywords: graduate education, graduate program, language requirement, translation

Abstract: Encourages traditional English-only writing centers to adopt a multilingual writing center (MWC) model, where tutors are available to work with students on writing assignments in languages other than English. At the Dickinson College MWC, which collaborates with members of foreign language departments, multilingual tutors help writers adapt to culture-specific genre and rhetorical conventions. MWCs challenge monolingualist assumptions and allow writers to work “simultaneously within and/or across multiple languages and writing cultures” (5), preparing them for global citizenship.

Keywords: writing center, multilingual, foreign language, global citizen, writing culture


Abstract: Identifies multilingual graduate students’ anxieties about teaching English 101 due to their unfamiliarity with the course as well as concerns about their own language use, and advocates for correcting the misperceptions these TAs have about their own language practices by approaching English as an additional language. With this EAL approach to teaching English 101, Logan claims multilingual TAs can cultivate in their students appropriate attitudes towards linguistic diversity and language ownership, as well as help their students tackle conventions of written English they are unfamiliar with.

Keywords: TA, training, monolingual, linguistic diversity, pedagogy


Abstract: Demonstrates how an acceleration program combining English 101 and a credit-bearing online support course labeled English 100 “Critical Literacy for College” at a highly diverse community college encouraged translingual negotiations of error and genre and challenged monolingual ideologies that attempt to erase linguistic diversity. For instance, English 101 + 100 encouraged in-class translingual negotiations about discourse practices and conventions during peer review and challenged the logic behind institution-wide monolingual ideology, such as long-held placement practices like separating “native” and nonnative English speakers (117).

Keywords: WPA, community college, accelerated program, ESL

Abstract: Describes a writing collaboration between undergraduates and immigrant maintenance workers at Emerson College. When the texts produced by these writers were rejected by traditional print venues, these writers covered a van with their texts to create a mobile work of translingual rhetoric. They drove this van from Boston to CCCC in Indianapolis in 2014, among other conferences. This project provides an example of how compositionists might use their institutional positions to engage in translingual activism.

Keywords: translingual, self-efficacy, international, globalization, ethnicity, transnational, resistance, protest, activism, collaboration, immigrant writing, mobility


Abstract: Encourages WPAs to address linguistic diversity in writing programs in workshop development, faculty orientation, and TA training. Recommends hiring faculty with experience working in linguistically diverse environments and addresses myths about second language writing that have the effect of silencing student diversity, such as the idea that second language writers are easily identifiable.

Keywords: training, linguistic diversity, writing program, myth, TA, faculty


Abstract: Gives examples of teaching assignments which enhance her students’ awareness of linguistic and cultural “shuttling” (Canagarajah, 2006) in their own lives and communities. Calling for change at the two-year college, the author suggests mandating ELL pedagogy in job requirement descriptions (to drive change in graduate programming), cross-departmental collaboration, ongoing professional development, the combination of technology grant proposals with training in language difference, and the development of textbooks on heterogeneous language practices which could be easily adopted by contingent faculty.

Keywords: community college, two-year college, pedagogy, grant, textbook, contingent faculty

Abstract: Utilizes the import/export metaphor of writing centers where tutors export, and multilingual students import, knowledge about how to improve writing. In drawing on this metaphor, the authors advocate for a reciprocal import/export model of knowledge sharing that encourages tutors to negotiate language with multilingual writers, give multilingual writers agency, and broadly challenge monolingual practices. In this equitable exchange model, tutors inquire about multilingual students’ language backgrounds, which allows the tutors to challenge assumptions about their own language, writing, and culture, and this mutual learning leads to more equitable textual collaboration.

Keywords: writing center, multilingual, transnational, collaboration, genre


Abstract: Argues that WPAs should engage in a “systemic redesign of composition programs” (48) to anticipate significant changes in the demographics of college composition classrooms, where linguistically and culturally diverse students will comprise a majority of students. The authors suggest that WPAs should conduct needs-analyses and draw more heavily on L2 research when designing curricula and teacher training programs in order to make “linguistic and cultural acquisition issues” an “integral” aspect of teaching composition (50). For example, instructors should receive training in contrastive rhetoric and language acquisition; curricula should explicitly teach academic English language standards, including grammatical conventions, while also staying attuned to L2 students’ needs as they adjust to a new postsecondary academic culture.

Keywords: L2, diversity, teacher training, curriculum design


Abstract: The author draws on interview data from faculty and students at a public US postsecondary institution to examine the attitudes towards language enacted in first-year composition and uses those beliefs to frame an examination of these instructors’ understanding of the relationship between monolingualism and language policy. She finds that student and faculty attitudes towards language reflect monolingual ideologies despite a programmatic policy focused on the development of multiple discourses and demonstrates how changes to programmatic language policies are more likely to be
effective when faculty are involved in their development, as opposed to when such changes are prescribed by administrators. Through this discussion, faculty reflect on the uses and limitations of specific language policies and the separation between beliefs about language and language practices.

Keywords: faculty, first-year composition, language policy, pedagogy, training, translingual, writing program administration

III: Translingual Writing Pedagogies


Abstract: Considers how the translingual emphasis on difference as the norm of all language use can inform understandings of genre performance. Bawarshi argues for a broader notion of genre agency as inherent to all genre uptakes, including the conventional as well as the creative. In the classroom, he suggests giving students more practice with uptakes of the “same” genre convention under shifting conditions, enabling them to consider how these changing conditions and asymmetrical relations of power influence genre users’ uptakes. The goal here is to help students understand genre uptakes as strategic and negotiable, moving away from a more static view of genre conventions as a means of access to dominant discourses.

Keywords: translingual, genre, uptake


Abstract: Argues that translingual work in composition needs to continue to attend to the many languages and language varieties in use around the world while also taking up the notion of a flexible “Common English” as essential to transcultural communication. The author describes her efforts to help students gain access to this Common English in two courses at a small liberal arts college, a composition course for first-year students and an upper-level course on expository writing (both electives). She explains in detail her goals in teaching these courses and the progression of readings and assignments used to reach these goals. She considers the programmatic challenges of undertaking this translingual work, including students’ perceptions that they do not need to use multiple languages to succeed in college amidst the broader institutional structures that valorize Standard Written English.

Keywords: pedagogy, liberal arts

Abstract: Reflecting on the difficulty of enacting translingual pedagogies due to still-dominant monolingual ideologies, the authors suggest that while current scholarship on translingual pedagogy assumes students already possess a welcoming attitude towards language heterogeneity, composition teachers need to identify and resist monolingual norms to create the conditions in which such attitudes are fostered. Reporting on their work in different first-year writing courses at Arizona State University, the authors demonstrate that most of their work in enacting a translingual pedagogy involved helping students to develop a “reflective approach to language difference,” which, due to entrenched monolingual ideologies, first involved negotiating multilingual norms, as many students reacted negatively to policies, such as the inattention to grammar usage in assessment. The authors also argue that teachers need to reflect on their own attitudes towards reading student writing, as they both had emotional responses to language usage perceived as nonstandard, despite such usage not affecting comprehension. They suggest that instructors should work to negotiate shared terms in the class to demonstrate such experiences negotiating language usage. However, noting that such shared experiences are highly situated in the specifics of the course, the authors suggest a successful translingual classroom cannot import class materials from another setting without significant adaptation to the specific context of the course.

Keywords: first-year writing, language ideology, monolingualism, translingual


Abstract: Demonstrates how dominant conceptions of monolingualism constrain student writing and produce ambivalence towards academic writing. By examining English-only policies at a university in an Arab country previously colonized by France and interview data from students there, the author examines the tensions between the writers’ translingual realities, which require a fluid approach to language, and the monolingual constraints of their writing for school, which conceptualizes languages as static and bounded. All the students demonstrated abilities to negotiate diverse linguistic resources but were limited by the monolingual ideologies surrounding them. As such, the author argues that the first-year writing classroom should invite students to unlearn notions of language as static, and that writing program administrators should work with colleagues in other disciplines to convey language as malleable and interactive.

Keywords: first-year composition, language policy, linguistic diversity, monolingualism, pedagogy, translingual

Abstract: Emphasizing that communication transcends individual languages, Canagarajah calls for a pedagogical orientation towards “translingual practice,” which focuses on developing strategies for students to engage with multiple and diverse codes and to draw on their semiotic resources in creative ways. The author outlines four components of translingual negotiation strategies that he has identified his students using: envoicing, in which speakers attempt to develop a particular identity through their language; recontextualization, in which they frame their language in ways likely to achieve the intended responses; interactional, in which speakers engage in reciprocal strategies to negotiate shared ways of communicating; and alignment, in which speakers match their linguistic resources with the current context. The author analyzes student interactions to demonstrate the ways students engage in these strategies to achieve different goals before turning to how students can use such strategies in writing, and in responding to writing by their peers, advocating for strategic employment of diverse linguistic resources via code-meshing. He suggests such an approach will foster a performative competence in students, which allows them to reject the notion that they must master one language before moving to another in favor of developing an open-ended competency in which they use different linguistic resources for distinct purposes.

Keywords: code meshing, language acquisition, language ideology, linguistic diversity, pedagogy, performative competence, translingual


Abstract: Argues that common approaches to training composition teachers are insufficient, especially in developing a translingual orientation, which he defines as a recognition of languages as always in contact and generating new meanings out of this contact. In order for teachers to engage in a pedagogy that encourages students to strategically negotiate their language use, the author suggests teachers must be trained to develop their pedagogy in response to the diverse needs of their students and the changing contexts of their writing. Reporting on his design for a course titled “Teaching of Second Language Writing” (267), Canagarajah suggests that such courses must be practice-based and must encourage students to reflect on their own attitudes towards language and their pedagogical practices while attempting to enact translingual writing. He engages in this practice-based pedagogy by assigning a semester-long “Literacy Autobiography” (267) that students continually revise in response to peer and instructor feedback. They work to convey their experiences with language by negotiating the readers’ responses, which the author suggests reflects an ecological course design open to being shaped by the participants themselves. In explaining this ecological design, the author acknowledges that different instructors and students will shape the course in different ways as a result of their different evolving beliefs about language, thus instructors should not attempt to impose particular translingual orientations.

Keywords: L1, L2, pedagogy, second language writing, TA, training, translingual, writing program administration

Abstract: Recognizing the need to rethink common approaches to language instruction, the pieces in this forum are organized around three pedagogical principles: broadening students’ understandings of their semiotic resources, expanding their repertoire of such semiotic resources, and developing a critical awareness of language. Each author presents their own pedagogical strategy to reach these educational outcomes, such as asking students to reflect on the colonial histories of their languages or asking students to translate cultural stories and reflect on the process of their translations. Such approaches move away from deficit models to frame students’ diverse semiotic resources as beneficial as they work to develop greater awareness of these resources.

Keywords: L2, language acquisition, linguistic diversity, pedagogy, translation, translingual


Abstract: Suggests that the interconnections between translingualism, rhetorical genre studies, and multimodality offer new ways of conceptualizing how students—particularly L2 students—engage in rhetorical boundary-crossing in their composing practices. Gonzales presents focus group data suggesting that L2 students are particularly adept at pushing the boundaries of multimodal genres to create new meaning. This rhetorical dexterity can guide composition instructors attempting to teach genres in less prescriptive ways, and the author’s data adds to the disciplinary evidence that challenges deficit understandings of L2 writers.

Keywords: genre, multimodality, rhetorical dexterity

Guerra, Juan C. “Cultivating a Rhetorical Sensibility in the Translingual Writing Classroom.” *College English*, vol. 78, no. 3, 2016, pp. 228-33.

Abstract: Argues for a translingual pedagogy that develops students’ critical understanding of how language works in specific contexts by introducing students to competing approaches to language difference. He describes one student’s writing and her commentary upon that writing to illustrate that students may interpret translingual pedagogy as conveying a teacher’s preference for code-meshing. This student’s limited notion of translingualism, Guerra believes, reflects his own misunderstanding, as the instructor, of how and why students transfer language practices between different rhetorical contexts. To more effectively cultivate a “rhetorical sensibility” concerning language difference, Guerra calls upon composition instructors to attend explicitly to different ideological approaches to language difference and ask students to reflect upon how these approaches inform their own linguistic choices.

Keywords: translingual, rhetoric, code-meshing, multilingual, language difference, pedagogy, ideology

Abstract: Outlines the survey results of a classroom exercise in which 40 composition students self-identified as monolingual used Google to translate keywords associated with their research projects, later using their language, topic, and genre knowledge to extract meaning from non-English language websites found using their translated keywords. Strategic use of translation technology in the writing classroom uproots students’ assumptions that English-language websites provide all possible perspectives and that fluency is needed to extract information.

Keywords: translation, digital media, technology, survey, monolingual


Abstract: Distinguishing between an accommodationist approach and a translingual approach to language difference, the author describes his experience using classroom assignments involving mixed-language writing and translation. Such activities lead students and the author to question what counts as dominant or marginalized language conventions and to recognize difference as a product of all writing. The author asserts that translingual ideology is not an explicit set of precepts to be transmitted to students but, like the ideology of monolingualism, is revealed and reworked through ongoing practice.

Keywords: mixed-language writing, translation, difference


Abstract: Describes classroom pedagogies that analyze perceived error to demonstrate how reconceptualizing English as a language “in translation” (Pennycook 2008) allows both native and non-native English speakers to notice the hybridity of language and identity, rely on their linguistic repertoires, produce new meanings in English, and build understanding towards language difference (69). For instance, Horner and Lu draw upon the discussion surrounding a student author’s use of “can able to” in her paper to demonstrate how a class may interrogate perceived error, and notably, this activity leads students to realize that English is unable to express the writer’s intentions, therefore peer reviewer and author should work with English to "articulate and legitimate, as well as rethink, experiences and beliefs" (73).

Keywords: pedagogy, translation, error, English Only, language difference

Abstract: The authors posit a pedagogy of translation as a framework for contesting monolingualism and exploring translanguaging in the writing classroom. Students read different translations of the same text, an activity which brings to the fore language as an emergent and constructed practice. Through translation, students explore how slippages in meaning make writing a site of struggle. These activities highlight for students neoliberal capitalism’s narrative of translation as smooth, equivalent, and invisible. Treating all writing as translation, this pedagogy reveals paraphrasing, analysis, and interpretation as translation practices occurring internally within a language. This reconfiguration aids students in engaging with neoliberal capitalism’s problematic portrayal of language in general.

Keywords: translation, translator, paraphrase, language ideology, neoliberal capitalism, monolingualism


Abstract: Demonstrates four “fleeting moments” in different TESOL classes in which the author drew upon her translinguistic identity in response to students, thus leading to fruitful discussions about meaning shifting across Englishes and creating possibilities for building on students' linguistic and translinguistic competencies.

Keywords: TESOL, pedagogy, identity, World Englishes


Abstract: Describes how a hybrid multimodal/translingual assignment sequence about ethnic food encouraged second language learners to “shuttle” (Canagarajah 2006) between, as well as across, languages, cultures, and modes in a way that encouraged rhetorical analysis and audience awareness of language and food. Highlights the meaning-making and community building potential of such work while providing sample assignment prompts and artifacts related to this pedagogical exploration.

Keywords: multimodality, composition, SLL, assessment, multilingual, food
Kiernan, Julia, Joyce Meier, and Xiqiao Wang. “Negotiating Languages and Cultures: Enacting Translingualism through a Translation Assignment.” *Composition Studies*, vol. 44.no. 1, 2016, pp. 89-107.

Abstract: Provides the results of a qualitative study in which monolingual teachers asked international students to independently translate a text written in their home language into English, then assigned them to work in groups comprised of their peers who shared the same home language. Groups were asked to compare their translations for similarities and differences in the choices made during the translation process; students afterwards wrote reflectively about the experience. The authors found that positioning students as experts and their home languages as assets drove students’ engagement and analysis of their translations, leading to a kind of “productive fretting” (103) over the affordances of English, furthering appreciation of the depth of their knowledge.

Keywords: qualitative, bridge, international, transnational, assignment, translation, reflection, anxiety


Abstract: Suggests that attention to the translingual nature of communication can foster more productive university-community partnerships. Kimball describes one such partnership, in which students enrolled in university English and Spanish courses volunteered as tutors/conversation partners for Spanish-speaking ESOL learners at a local community center. Acknowledging the difficulty of convincing students and other stakeholders that language barriers are not fixed and discrete, the author explains how she recruited students for the course and how she used class time and readings to prepare them for the community engagement component of the course. She analyzes students’ reflective responses as evidence of their evolution toward understanding language as translingual, arguing that students gained an appreciation for linguistic flexibility and, in some cases, came to see their own monolingualism as a disadvantage.

Keywords: community engagement

Krall-Lanoue, Aimee. “‘And Yea, I’m Venting, but Hey I’m Writing, Isn’t I’: A Translingual Approach to Error in a Multilingual Context.” *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms*. Ed. A. Suresh Canagarajah. New York: Routledge, 2013. 228-34.

Abstract: Demonstrates a translingual approach to error negotiation in student writing, particularly in terms of verb tense, word choice, and sentence boundaries, and bases these negotiations on reading students' writing as-is instead of automatically assuming the writer’s intentions and then suggesting fixes.

Keywords: error, pedagogy, negotiation, meaning, conventions, monolingual

Questions the notion of the monolingual which suggests “one native speaker, one language, [and] one national culture” (26-27), by pointing out that everyone uses different language varieties. Therefore, Kramsch advocates discarding the outdated monolingual pedagogical model permeating language classes in favor of a pedagogy aimed at intercultural speakers, or those speakers who carefully maneuver among various language varieties and potential “cross-cultural misunderstandings” (27). One potential assignment in this “pedagogy of the intercultural speaker” requires students to summarize texts in their own voice and then contrast these summaries with other students’ work to discover how meaning is constructed based on their ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds, among other factors (28).

Keywords: pedagogy, intercultural, native speaker, multilingual


Abstract: Kubota reports that a lesson unit on the global spread of English taught to US native-English speaking high school students enhanced understanding of second language acquisition and speech sample comprehension, but otherwise had no significant effect on students’ perceptions of, and desire to communicate with, speakers of World Englishes. Although the lesson did not improve students’ preexisting negative attitudes towards linguistic diversity, those with previous interest in intercultural communication maintained or heightened their positive attitudes toward WE speakers. Based on these findings, Kubota highlights the need for engaging students in dialogue to promote critical inquiry, opportunities for experiential learning, and approaches to foreign language instruction that promote cultural understanding.

Keywords: world Englishes, intercultural communication, stereotype, student opinion, quantitative


Abstract: Recounts an attempt to design intercultural English composition classes based on a model of equitable exchange in which American and Chinese students from West Chester University and Guizhou University, respectively, study composition abroad at each other’s universities via their globally networked learning environment (GNLE). The failure to enact the course in China underscores writing programs’ need to improve material conditions for students so that a variety of them can participate, and one potential way is to link transnational writing courses with general courses such as language courses so that two or three courses can be taken at once, thereby saving the students money.
Keywords: transnational, intercultural, writing program, study-abroad, multilingual


Abstract: Argues that the conversation surrounding translingualism needs to move toward deeper consideration of how to assess writing from a translingual perspective. Lee’s concern is that translingualism’s promise for advancing linguistic social justice cannot be realized without attending to the assessment technologies—including placement testing and rubric scoring—that ultimately determine which discourses are valued. Lee suggests three moves that composition instructors can make to “translanguage assessment.” First, he proposes that teachers work to position their own authority as negotiable. Second, he calls on composition instructors to individualize assessment practices in accordance with students’ expressed goals. Finally, Lee warns teachers against valorizing the obviously translingual over the apparently monolingual.

Keywords: assessment, social justice


Abstract: While acknowledging that translingual dispositions (defined as a general openness to language plurality and difference) are highly contextualized and cannot be expected to be performed in a uniform or preconceived manner, the authors report on their attempts to foster translingual dispositions through a partnership between a first-year writing course at a US university and a required course for English majors at a Hong Kong university. Through analyzing student writing produced in both courses, in which students reflect on their work engaging with peers across contexts, the authors found that monolingual students were able to identify ways their experiences using English in a variety of contexts are similar to the multilingual students’ experiences translanguaging, and that they also recognized the consequences of not conforming to standard language ideals the multilingual students often face. Other students, however, including multilingual students, remained committed to a standard language ideology. Recognizing that the development of translingual dispositions is an ongoing process, the authors conclude by suggesting that composition courses should engage students in material that challenges their engrained beliefs about language.

Keywords: first-year composition, language ideology, linguistic diversity, multilingualism, pedagogy, translingual


Abstract: Demonstrates a world Englishes (WE) approach to composition that incorporates code-meshing (the practice of switching dialects within a single utterance) in
specific assignments such as a multimedia interview and transcription assignment that involves identifying varieties of code. Students then reflect on whether these assignments reinforce hegemony and the idea of language varieties being static.

Keywords: pedagogy, world Englishes, code-meshing, TESOL


Abstract: Argues that teachers must consider creative pedagogies when teaching a second language to students from different socioeconomic backgrounds because well-off students bring the right habitus, or social capital, which includes “language use, skills, and orientations, attitudes, dispositions, and schemes of perception that children are endowed with by virtue of socialization in their families and communities” (407). This habitus translates into easily acquiring English via immersion, while working class students lack such advantages and should thus be taught via approaches utilizing both the native and target languages.

Keywords: pedagogy, bilingual education, discourse analysis, TESOL


Abstract: Demonstrates teaching language diversity in writing via classroom practices such as writing prompts about language, grammar exercises, analyzing non-Edited American English (EAE) in ads and other genres, and writing prompts such as multigenre papers on the same subject within different situations.

Keywords: pedagogy, language difference, Edited American English, grammar, genre


Abstract: Argues for a multicultural approach to style that requires a reconsideration of “error” in student writing. The author claims that many compositionist teachers position “style” as either separable from meaning or as only relevant in “expert” writing, despite their theoretical commitment to the inseparability of content and form in all writing. Given that English teachers increasingly understand language to be a site of power struggle, she suggests (re)considering the composition classroom as a “contact zone” in which student writing is treated as “real” and thus meaningfully engaged in this struggle. Such an approach asks students to understand stylistic choices as negotiations rather than always as attempts to reproduce Standard Written English. She describes at length one student’s “can able to” structure as an illustration of the invention of new meaning that becomes possible when deviation from the monolingual norm of Standard Written English is viewed as a skillful rhetorical negotiation rather than an error. She argues that
this approach is effective in developing the critical capacities of even those students who ultimately aim to reproduce the stylistic norms of academic discourse. She concludes by considering the practical difficulties of enacting this pedagogy, including the unpredictability of any given class discussion.

Keywords: multiculturalism, pedagogy, style, error, ghettoization, political, contact-zone, idiosyncratic, ideology


Abstract: Argues that the Greco-Roman *progymnasmata* exercises, originally designed to help develop “stylistic agility” (195), can be modified to help students practice translingual writing—specifically code-meshing—to experiment with style. The author offers adaptations of three classroom exercises (*gnome, ethopoeia, and ekphrasis*) for instructors to use to promote metalinguistic awareness. Although classical approaches are commonly viewed as monocultural and monolingual, the author’s rereading of Quintilian reveals an openness to linguistic innovation to highlight the potential for a “reanimation of the classical rhetorical tradition from the perspective of linguistic diversity” (206).

Keywords: rhetoric, progymnasmata, code-meshing, Quintilian


Abstract: Shipka argues that we should adjust our dispositions and practices to foreground “processes of making” rather than focus solely on finished products to more fully appreciate the “dynamic, highly distributed, embodied, translingual, and multimodal aspects of all communicative practice” (253). Paying attention to processes of making, Shipka suggests, helps us recognize that “not all multimodal texts are created equal” (252). Working with new technologies such as video, for example, involves experiencing effects of affordances distinct from those associated with print-based texts. Despite these differences, the author notes that it is important to avoid conflating newness with digital texts: more familiar, traditional modes may be used in new, creative ways. Shipka stresses the importance of accounting for both human and nonhuman participants in processes of creating a text, product, or performance to move away from human-centric understandings of agency and composing.

Keywords: multimodality, agency, materiality

Abstract: Advocates for a pedagogy emphasizing critical reading of both monolingual and multilingual texts and asks teachers to recognize how students already mesh meaning within them. Sohan argues teachers should pay close attention to student writing and instead of simply identifying error, understand how writers attempt to shift perspectives, or relocalize themselves, in response to texts.

Keywords: code-meshing, pedagogy, Standard English, reading, listening, feedback


Abstract: Advocates for a deeper consideration of form in translingual practice, drawing from transcripts of sentence workshops in her basic writing classroom in which students initiated discussion of the phrases “English’s” (37) and “tradition rule” (47). The author proposes a second language acquisition model of “noticing” (43) to help students distinguish between a mistake and an error (an error being unnoticeable by the writer and therefore negotiable), a distinction Stanley claims needs exploration in translingual theorizing. Sentence workshops, rather than aligning students to a standard, gave them the linguistic knowledge they needed to better negotiate their meaning and refine their rhetorical attunement.

Keywords: error, mistake, translingual, second language acquisition, noticing, grammar


Abstract: Argues that viewing linguistic diversity as a resource in the classroom is not enough to challenge monolingual assumptions: compositionists need a more “fully-dimensional disciplinary understanding of monolingualism” to explicitly combat the material consequences of linguistic oppression. Recommends a sample course outcome for FYC curricula looking to draw more explicit attention to language politics. Drawing from an extensive literature review, the authors examine four competing versions of monolingualism—standard language ideology, tacit English-only policies, the myth of linguistic homogeneity, and the myth of linguistic uniformity, stability, and separateness—to assert that *all* facets must be considered to holistically dismantle monolingualism.

Keywords: monolingualism, language ideology, discrimination, learning outcomes


Abstract: Argues that in the age of globalization, composition classrooms should adopt a cosmopolitan perspective, which emphasizes intercultural openness and human connectedness despite linguistic and cultural differences. The author offers Cosmopolitan
English (CE) as a way to refer to “English as it is actually used by individuals across the globe, each with differences inflected in his or her pronunciation, vocabulary, syntax, and/or discourse structures” (10). You examines linguistic and cultural boundary crossing through empirical case studies of CE users mixing English with Japanese and Chinese. He proposes a transliteracy pedagogy which emphasizes “blurred boundaries” among languages, modalities, cultures, and identities (137) and brings out-of-school literacy practices, including code-switching, into the writing class.

Keywords: Cosmopolitanism, transliteracy, globalization, intercultural competence


Abstract: Proposed that community members, including families and local authors, writing teachers’ own language repertoires, and linguistically diverse literature can serve as valuable models for translingual approaches to writing in the elementary school classroom. Through a cross-case analysis comparing three unique elementary school contexts, the authors analyze aspects of teachers’ translingual dispositions, including awareness of diverse language practices and a willingness to interactively construct meaning across language difference.

Keywords: elementary school, bilingualism, biliteracy, literature, community


Abstract: Through two ethnographic case studies, Zheng outlines how effective deployment of translingual identity in international teaching assistants (ITAs) can be a pedagogical asset. The author’s subjects varied in their degree of translanguaging in the classroom and identification as translingual teachers, leading to the conclusion that without critical reflection and institutional support of linguistic diversity, identity as pedagogy can serve to reinforce feelings of inferiority in ITAs. Full realization as translingual teachers was constrained by perceived linguistic competence (such as accent). The author ends with programmatic suggestions for the support of ITAs regarding screening, coursework, publication, mentoring, and community. Ideas include screening ITA applicants through context-specific interviewing rather than test scores, encouraging translingual publishing, and hosting workshops on reflective teaching.

Keywords: teacher identity, international teaching assistants