



# Introduction

Alanna Frost

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA HUNTSVILLE

Julia Kiernan

KETTERING UNIVERSITY

Suzanne Blum Malley

METHODIST UNIVERSITY

[T]here is the challenge that the ideology of monolingualism inheres not merely in our discourse but in the academic and institutional structures of programs and curricula as pedagogies and placement and existing assessment technologies and daily practice.

—*Horner & Tetreault, 2017, p. 7*

This [translingual] disposition allows individuals to move beyond pre-conceived, limited notions of standardness and correctness, and it therefore facilitates interactions involving different Englishes. Considering the historical marginalization of “nonstandard” varieties and dialects of English in various social and institutional contexts, translingual dispositions are essential for all users of English in a globalized society, regardless of whether they are “native” or “nonnative” speakers of English.

—*Lee & Jenks, 2016, p. 319*

The construct of translanguageing has taken hold in the research and pedagogies of post-secondary writing instructors. Teachers of writing have long been troubled by the implications of promoting the Standard Written English (SWE) that is imagined to be necessary for educational advancement, global business, and educated citizenship. Forces of globalization, in general, and the global movement of multilingual students and scholars through new physical and digital spaces, in particular, have demanded that we engage in reflexive critique of the monolingual and colonial assumptions that undergird our approach to writing instruction. The capital afforded by English coupled with a desire for linguistic social justice<sup>1</sup> for students and teachers increasingly drives exploration of what to do with “language difference” (Horner &

---

1 Writing studies as a field has been articulating the political tenets of language and languageing since the ubiquitously cited 1974 *Students' Right to their Own Language* <https://secure.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Groups/CCCC/NewSRTOL.pdf>

Tetrault, 2017) in writing classrooms.

In response to the exigencies listed above, a translingual understanding of language use clearly resonates with scholars working in English-medium writing programs. The response to the initial call for contributions to this collection was so enthusiastic that we, as editors, were able to curate a second collection, *Translingual Pedagogical Perspectives: Engaging Domestic and International Students in the Composition Classroom*, focusing on describing classroom assignments informed by an understanding of translanguaging as practice. Contributors to both collections include those who have experienced the movement of U.S.-program philosophies into non-U.S. institutions, those who teach in increasingly linguistically diverse classrooms in the US, and those who appreciate that a pedagogy that approaches language difference as a deficit is not in our students' best educational interests. While use of the term translanguaging has evolved over the course of the past several years and has intersected with numerous other descriptive labels,<sup>2</sup> a shared, central tenet has emerged that reconceptualizes language use in terms of "fluid and dynamic practices that transcend the boundaries between named languages and other semiotic systems" (Li, 2017, p. 9). The term remains contested, but by focusing on the utility of the translanguaging construct to counter monolingual constructs, the scholars in this collection offer the results of their search for ways to open our theory and praxis to wider and more informed understandings of translanguaging. Indeed, those who adhere to explorations of the pos-

---

2 It is important to acknowledge that any exploration of the impact of translingual dispositions on English-medium writing classrooms is influenced by the many scholarly understandings of linguistic negotiation of meaning that have surfaced recently across research disciplines, including a variety of naming conventions for the perspectives that challenge deeply held political, social, and cognitive beliefs about language use, including: "symbolic competence" (Kramsch & Whiteside, 2008), "superdiversity" (Arnaut, 2015; Blommaert, 2013; Rampton, & Spotti, 2015), "heteroglossia" (Blackledge & Creese, 2014—via Bakhtin), "translanguaging" (Garcia & Leiva, 2014; Garcia & Wei, 2014), "translingual approach" (Horner et al., 2011), "translingual model" (Horner et al., 2011), "translingual literacy" (Canagarajah, 2013; Lu & Horner, 2007), "translingual practice; negotiated literacies" (Canagarajah, 2013); "tricotissage" (Domp martin-Normand, 2011), "rhetorical attunement" (Lorimer Leonard, 2014), "metrolingualism" (Otsuji & Pennycook, 2015), and "lingua franca English" (Canagarajah, 2013; Firth & Wagner, 1997). This robust list of neologisms created to address our collective, and increasingly nuanced, complex, and trans, approaches to languaging is by no means comprehensive, particularly in terms of international orientations towards linguistic and social negotiation of meaning, but it serves as a reminder that we are in the early stages of theory-and-practice-building in relation to translingual dispositions toward languages and literacies.

sibilities for translingual dispositions in purportedly “English” institutions, embrace such dispositions as a means of ethically attending to the increasing number of global citizens requiring English-medium writing instruction in university classrooms nationally and internationally.

Contributors to this collection are invested in the multiple disciplinary perspectives and representations of language ideology that fuel considerations of the *trans-* aspects of language and languaging and in the ways in which a focus on language practices can transform the writing classroom. A focus on the social action of *trans-* further emphasizes a move away from *multi-* understandings of language and culture (e.g., multilingual, multicultural, etc.), namely the fact that the prefix *multi-* defends linguistic systems as discrete and compartmentalized. Therefore, we intentionally invited our contributors to explore their work in English-medium writing classrooms and contexts through the frame of a *translingual disposition*, which responds to the proclivity of the prefix *trans-* for characterizing language as fluid and actional across social contexts, and to the intellectual orientation(s) that such an approach to language and language practices requires.

That writing instructors adopt a translingual disposition was first suggested by Horner et al. (2011) as part of an appeal for writing instructors to employ a “disposition of openness and inquiry that people take toward language and language differences” (p. 311). Since that appeal, and in the midst of continuing research in applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, education, and writing studies, scholars have negotiated the value of translinguaging in the writing classroom and have engaged in what Li Wei (2017) describes as a “perpetual cycle of practice-theory-practice” that constructs knowledge through “descriptive adequacy” (p. 3). This descriptive cycle has allowed for a proliferation of applications of translingualism to English-medium writing classrooms, which has generated much debate and limited consensus.

In this context, the act of pulling together an entirely coherent collection of the elements of a translingual disposition is no easy task. Nor does the effort result in descriptions of shared practices that constellate around a single, united, central definition. In short, we do not yet have enough representations of the ways a translingual disposition can manifest in the myriad ways English-medium writing programs are facilitated. In the afterword to this collection, Bruce Horner takes up the dissonance created by the competing and uneven descriptions of practice attached to translinguaging, noting:

But such dissonance is the inevitable accompaniment to another “trans” term: transition. It is both a sign of change and a sign of the friction necessarily accompanying such change

. . . A translingual disposition attuned to that dissonance is what globalized approaches to the teaching of writing may require, and afford.

To that end, this collection directly engages the need for nuanced explorations of how a translingual disposition might be facilitated in English-medium postsecondary writing classrooms and programs. As the global reach of English, with its attendant monolingual-ideologies, increases, so too does the need for range of investigation and reflection offered here.

Contributors to this collection diverge in their approaches to translanguaging in diverse classrooms, but they collectively battle the monolingual monolith that undergirds the narrative of English-medium writing classroom curricula. Further, they share their experiences of what it means to facilitate a translingual disposition, through which they strive to respect the diversity of students seeking English-medium education and the diversity of the Englishes students employ. Notably, one aspect of consensus around working with and through a translingual disposition is evident throughout the collection: that there is limited visibility of translingual processes in final written products. Contributors subscribe to Paul Matsuda's argument that: "Restricting the scope of translingual writing to the end result can obscure more subtle manifestations of the negotiation as well as situations where writers make rhetorical choices not to deviate from the dominant practices" (2014, p. 481). A translingual disposition, then, necessarily involves a writing curriculum that invites linguistic choice and fosters linguistic awareness, but also necessitates attention to students' development of a "rhetorical sensibility that reflects a critical awareness of language as contingent and emergent" (Guerra, 2016, p. 228).

Overall, chapter authors interrogate the implications of work that recognizes translanguaging in national and international, English-medium, educational settings where monolingual ideologies remain entrenched. Included are writing scholars from an array of teaching and learning contexts with a corresponding range of institutional, disciplinary, and pedagogical expectations and pressures. For example, one contributor is a multilingual, U.S.-based scholar who designed a curriculum with a Hungarian counterpart and asked students in the US and Hungary to share English-medium blog posts; while another contributor, also U.S.-based and multilingual, designed a writing group that was guided by the use of Korean-only in order to engage students to a translingual perspective through monolingual writing. Yet another multilingual scholar investigated multilingual students' experiences in an explicitly monolingual, first-year-writing course in Lebanon, while a fourth

contributor, a monolingual English speaker, engaged his largely monolingual students with the literacy practices of a student who purposefully immersed herself in learning Japanese.

The collection is divided into three thematic sections. *Part I: Multilingual Students' Experiences in English-Medium Classrooms* includes chapters that offer analyses of the ways multilingual students encounter monolingual writing curricula and theorize what those encounters mean in terms of a translingual disposition. Nancy Bou Ayash (Chapter 1), Shireen Campbell, Rebeca Fernandez, and Kyosung Koo (Chapter 2), Lilian Mina and Tony Cimasko (Chapter 3), and Yuki Kang (Chapter 4) productively illuminate the curriculum of programs that we think of as familiar, those which deal in the teaching of academic writing to multilingual student populations, but whose tacit and entrenched monolingual English policies and practices clearly problematize considerations of any translingual pedagogical choices. Each of these chapters carefully investigates the possibilities of translingual pedagogy through analyses of participants' experiences, perceptions, and texts.

Further, the studies in this section—one chapter is situated in Lebanon, with the remainder situated in the US—consider students' in-and-out-of-school languaging experiences as implicated in classroom outcomes. For Bou Ayash, this means framing her study of three students' classroom writing experiences with a clear description of the linguistically diverse socio-political climate of Lebanon and the national language policy landscape. Both Chapter 2, authored by Campbell, Fernandez, and Koo, as well as Chapter 3, authored by Mina and Cimasko, pay similar attention to students' language experiences, but in these U.S.-based studies, the terms of students' expectations for the English-medium classrooms are the central foci rather than their out of school literacy practices. Campbell, Fernandez, and Koo use participants' voices and experiences to explore how multilingual student needs and desires can complicate monolithic applications of translingual approaches. Their data demonstrates that while participants showed significant improvement in clarity and accuracy, and increased confidence as writers, they also reported a loss or atrophying of L1 skills and slight discomfort with the perceived rigidity of disciplinary expectations and practices. Mina and Cimasko similarly report on a study of international student experiences and expectations in an English as a Second Language (ESL) composition program. Their explication of student experiences and expectations speaks to the ways the enactment of a translingualism disposition can challenge socially constructed norms and expectations of ESL writing programs that uphold SWE conventions. In Chapter Four, Kang explores her students' experiences in a "single language writing group," in which students explore academic En-

glish production through their Korean home-language. Kang demonstrates how this learning environment empowers and enables students to not only draw upon multiple languages, but to challenge the ubiquity of immersive language philosophies

*Part II: Investigations of Deliberately Translingual Pedagogy* includes chapters that describe pedagogical practices that explore students' rich, varied, and complex communicative practices. These chapters focus on the exigencies for pedagogy and program design, dependent on the "translingual character of their [students] uses of language" (Roozen, Chapter 6, this collection); thus, chapter authors Thomas Lavelle and Maria Ågren (Chapter 5), Kevin Roozen (Chapter 6), Marylou Gramm (Chapter 7), and Santosh Khadka (Chapter 8) describe pedagogical practice crafted for students' immersed in literacies which clearly evince a translingual disposition.

Thomas Lavelle and Maria Ågren describe a Swedish graduate course, created to meet the English-production needs of thesis-writing students, and designed to attend to those students' multilingual realities. As they assert, their pedagogical decisions, importantly entail

commitments to a de-essentialized conception of language and languages (i.e., it foregrounds language as performance and backgrounds language as system), to a recognition that this performative representation of language, like all others, operates ideologically, and finally to an acknowledgment of individual language users' strong individual agency in carrying out this performance.

Kevin Roozen (Chapter 6) describes a pedagogy that asks students to map their literate activities and reveals that translingual activity is the purview of both mono- and multilingual speakers. Focusing on one writer's literate mappings—her engagement with language and culture across a variety of textual activities and borders—enables Roozen to make transparent how translingual literacies continually re-use languages, images, texts, and textual practices across literate engagements. Roozen argues that for teachers especially, such engagements with linguistic mapping is crucial for understanding the richly literate lives their students lead both in and out of school. Marylou Gramm (Chapter 7) establishes the importance of conferencing in encouraging a translingual disposition in the writing process. Specifically, Gramm describes strategies of the translingual student-teacher conference as a means of facilitating her ESL students' exploitation of rich grammatical deviations that engender innovative ideas. Santosh Khadka (Chapter 8) similarly engages with translingualism via a multiliteracies approach, presenting findings from

a qualitative study that examines how diverse students in a sophomore level writing class at a large U.S. research university responded to a curriculum and pedagogical approach framed around multiliterate development.

*Part III: Translanguaging Practices* includes chapters that examine the affordances of a translingual disposition in graduate classrooms, in online classrooms, in writing centers, and for transnational scholars. Central to this section is the awareness that translingualism and translanguaging practices are not confined to undergraduate, traditional, US-based classroom work—despite the fact that this is where much of the current research happens, due to the prevalence of freshman composition both nationally and internationally—and that, for growing populations of students and faculty, this research is developing as the norm across all levels of academic communicative practice. Zsuzanna Palmer (Chapter 9), Rula Baalbaki, Juheina Fakhreddine, Malaki Khoury, and Souha Riman (Chapter 10), Sarah Summers (Chapter 11), and Ligia Mihut (Chapter 12) engage the translanguaging reality of linguistic diversity and report on student and public texts produced in these environments.

Zsuzanna Palmer (Chapter 9) presents an analysis of textual and multimodal representations of both monolingual ideology and translingual practice observed in an online blog writing project between U.S. and Hungarian students. Palmer finds that employing a cosmopolitan approach, one that asks for respect of diverse cultures and languages, offered the students in this program a productive means of practicing a translingual disposition. Rula Baalbaki, Juheina Fakhreddine, Malaki Khoury, and Souha Riman (Chapter 10) offer the results of their investigation of the texts students produce when invited to translate literature, written in their first languages, for the “English” papers they write in their composition class. Their findings suggest that multilingual students who are encouraged to analyze writing in multiple languages are better able to negotiate meanings, more skilled at constructing knowledge, and capable of producing meaningful connections in writing across language and cultural differences.

Sarah Summers (Chapter 11) focuses her study on a two under-represented aspects of translingual research: graduate students and graduate writing centers. Using transcripts of graduate writing center (GWC) tutorials with multilingual graduate writers Summers describes tutoring experiences as being pulled between two poles: the need to help navigate academic writing and the desire to help challenge linguistic norms. Of specific interest in Summers’ work is the way she characterizes translingual principles as tied to patience, respect, and inquiry, as well as how tutoring based within these principles is often focused on confidence building. Finally, Ligia Mihut (Chapter 12) reports on an understudied population in translingual writing scholarship:

transnational, multilingual scholars. Using the frame of linguistic justice, which she explains “offers students discursive frames and critical knowledge to understand and develop local, translocal, and intercultural communication” (Chapter 12, this collection), Mihut critically examines the politics of language difference performed in the public texts of nine transnational, multilingual writing scholars. Mihut’s chapter is especially telling as much of the current work being accomplished by both U.S. and international writing scholars is (as this collection illustrates) intimately connected to their own linguistic identities. Consequently, this chapter illustrates that in order to garner a comprehensive understanding of the nuances of a translingual disposition there is an inherent need to examine the influences and pedagogical approaches of transnational, multilingual scholars because these scholars are able to shape pedagogies of language difference in a particular way.

Overall, the work of these chapters offers readers cases of translingual dispositions that do the following: (1) consider both the personal, pedagogical, and institutional challenges associated with the adoption of a translingual disposition; and (2) interrogate academic translingual practices in both U.S. and international English-medium settings. What we gain from these considerations is an increasing weight of scholarship focused on challenging the assumptions of monolingual education, which are able to describe a wide range of approaches to fostering a translingual disposition in writing classrooms. As such, this collection contributes to the “descriptive adequacy” (Wei, 2017, p. 3) necessary to continue to deepen our understanding of languaging in the writing classroom.

## References

- Guerra, J. C. (2016). Cultivating a rhetorical sensibility in the translingual writing classroom. *College English*, 78(3), 228-233.
- Horner, B., Lu, M. Z., Royster, J. J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Opinion: Language difference in writing: toward a translingual approach. *College English*, 73(3), 303-321.
- Horner, B., & Tetreault, L. (2017). “Introduction.” *Crossing divides: Exploring translingual writing pedagogies and programs* (pp. 3-16). Utah State University Press.
- Lee, J. W., & Jenks, C. (2016). Doing translingual dispositions. *College Composition and Communication*, 68(2), 317-344.
- Matsuda, P. (2014). The lure of translingual writing. *PMLA*, 129(3), 478-483.
- Wei, L. (2017). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 1-23.