TRANSLINGUAL PEDAGOGICAL PERSPECTIVES

Engaging Domestic and International Students in the Composition Classroom

EDITED BY
JULIA KIERNAN
ALANNA FROST
SUZANNE BLUM MALLEY

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Logan

Published by Utah State University Press
An imprint of University Press of Colorado
245 Century Circle, Suite 202
Louisville, Colorado 80027

Manufactured in the United States of America

The University Press of Colorado is a proud member of the Association of University Presses.

The University Press of Colorado is a cooperative publishing enterprise supported, in part, by Adams State University, Colorado State University, Fort Lewis College, Metropolitan State University of Denver, Regis University, University of Colorado, University of Northern Colorado, University of Wyoming, Utah State University, and Western Colorado University.

∞ This paper meets the requirements of the ANSI/NISO Z39.48–1992 (Permanence of Paper).

ISBN: 978-1-64642-111-4 (paperback)
ISBN: 978-1-64642-112-1 (ebook)
https://doi.org/10.7330/9781646421121

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Kiernan, Julia, 1980– editor. | Frost, Alanna, 1969– editor. | Blum-Malley, Suzanne, 1966– editor.
Title: Translingual pedagogical perspectives : engaging domestic and international students in the composition classroom / Julia E. Kiernan, Alanna Frost, Suzanne Blum Malley.
Description: Logan : Utah State University Press, [2020] | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2021015262 (print) | LCCN 2021015263 (ebook) | ISBN 9781646421114 (paperback) | ISBN 9781646421121 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: English language—Rhetoric—Study and teaching (Higher) | English language—Study and teaching (Higher)—Foreign speakers. | Academic writing—Study and teaching (Higher)—Social aspects. | Multilingualism. | Translanguaging (Linguistics)
Classification: LCC PE1404 .T764 2020 (print) | LCC PE1404 (ebook) | DDC 428.0071/1—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2021015262
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2021015263

Cover illustration: mural © Icy and Sot, https://icyandsot.com; photograph by Tawny Saez

CONTENTS

Foreword

Ellen Cushman vii

Introduction

Alanna Frost, Julia Kiernan, and Suzanne Blum Malley 3

PART I: ENACTING TRANSLINGUAL PEDAGOGIES IN FIRST-YEAR COMPOSITION

1. Addressing Monolingual Dispositions with Translingual Pedagogy
   Ghanashyam Sharma 17

2. Criteria-Mapping Activities and the Transformation of Student-Teacher Relations in the Composition Classroom
   Daniel V. Bommarito and Emily Cooney 39

3. Unity in Diversity: Practicing Translingualism in First-Year Writing Courses
   Ming Fang and Tania Cepero Lopez 59

4. Keepin' It Real: Developing Authentic Translingual Experiences for Multilingual Students
   Norah Fahim, Bonnie Vidrine-Isbell, and Dan Zhu 92

5. An Integrative Translingual Pedagogy of Affirmation and Resource Sharing
   Gregg Fields 125

6. "Hay un tiempo y un lugar para todo": Literacy Autobiographies and the Cultivation of Translingual Rhetorical Sensibilities
   Esther Milu and Mathew Gomes 149

PART II: ENACTING TRANSLINGUAL PEDAGOGIES IN INTERDISCIPLINARY SPACES

7. Writing on the Wall: Teaching Translingualism through Linguistic Landscapes
Mark Brantner 173

8. Following Labors of Recontextualization: Toward a Pedagogy of Translingual Mapping
Brice Nordquist 191

9. Writing-Theory Cartoon: Toward a Translingual and Multimodal Pedagogy
Xiqiao Wang 212

10. Translingualism as Pedagogical Methodology for Preservice Teachers and Peer Writing Consultants in Training
Naomi Silver 236

11. A Framework for Linguistically Inclusive Course Design
Julia Kiernan 263

Afterword
Thomas Lavalle 284

Index 293
About the Authors 303

INTRODUCTION

Alanna Frost, Julia Kiernan, and Suzanne Blum Malley

As Claire Kramsch (2018) has argued in "Trans-Spatial Utopias," "Translanguaging reveals the deep relations that have always been there between codes, modes, and modalities but have been occulted by the artificial borders set up by nation-states, disciplines, professions, and linguists" (109). The exploration of those relations and their borders has, indeed, "captured [the] imagination" (Wei 2018, 9) of scholars in a wide range of fields connected to human communication. The construct of translanguaging, investigated by linguists, educators, and writing studies scholars,[1] describes the negotiations of and between language users who seek communicative clarity by drawing on a repertoire of semiotic resources. Such practices have long been evident in everyday communication, such as when people negotiate business contracts, share stories with friends, order food, shop, or text their mums. Since the early 1990s, sociolinguists and applied linguists studying language use in such exchanges have often presented their research as a direct challenge to the hegemony of English-language standards and a monolinguistic ideal. In such critiques, translanguaging troubles named language systems (e.g., Standard Written English as a dynamic and unfixed version of English) and historic separatist theories of language use (e.g., code meshing, code mixing, and multilanguaging) and challenges the theory that languages are discrete systems at all. Such systems create "artificial borders," as Kramsch (2018, 108) describes, and they prescribe a socially constructed, fixed set of codes that do not reflect the reality of usage. A trans perspective on languaging, in contrast, posits that "users treat all available codes as repertoire in their everyday communication, and not separated according to label" (Canagarajah 2013, 6), implying fluid and evolving repertoires of semiotic resources users continually draw from to make meaning.

This collection addresses the *lure* (Matsuda 2014) of translanguaging for writing studies scholars in relation to college-level, English-medium composition classes in the United States. As a discipline, rhetoric and composition has long wrestled with the complicity inherent in the

DOI: 10.7330/9781646421121.c000b

promotion of institutional and public narratives of the existence of a standard English. Many reflections on the merits of the concept of translanguaging in the writing classroom begin by noting that the history of disciplinary attention to students' language use began in 1974 with the publication of the "Students' Right to Their Own Language" by the Conferences on College on Composition and Communication (Gilyard 2016; Horner et al. 2011). The political language statement, crafted by writing studies scholars concerned with the role of the institution in both homogenizing and denigrating the dialects of diverse US students, remains relevant in contemporary translanguaging scholarship. For example, its premise is noted by Jerry Lee and Christopher Jenks (2017), who assert that "assumptions surrounding standardness, correctness, and legitimacy of a particular variety of English are not inherent to the language itself but sustained through the work of institutional agents such as public education" (320). Politically and theoretically, then, there is widespread acknowledgment in writing studies that our collective adoption of translanguaging in the writing classroom supports the modification of our standard charge, which has historically been to instruct and measure English-writing performance. Notably and problematically, that performance is assessed against the "bankrupt" concept that there is one English against which to measure (Horner et al. 2011, 305). This conundrum leaves rhetoric and composition scholars at an important moment as we collectively evolve our theory and explore ways to open our praxis to greater awareness of the affordances of a translingual disposition.

We remain mindful that the affordances of translanguaging are intertwined with tenets of existing critical pedagogies. Importantly, contributors to this collection describe classroom practice and assignments framed by the construct of translanguaging as practice. Translanguaging itself, according to Li Wei (2018), "is using one's idiolect, that is one's linguistic repertoire, without regard for socially and politically defined language names and labels" (11). Importantly, this collection does not promote an investigation of translingual practices as evidenced in student writing with visible use of labeled idiolects, for example. Rather, the focus of the collection is on showcasing the ways translanguaging is used as a construct that undergirds continual and socially flexible language practice. It offers classroom practices and assignments that facilitate students' understanding of an essential, possibly intangible, facet of translanguaging theory, which, as Wei asserts "is not conceived as an object or linguistic structural phenomenon to describe and analyse but a practice and a process. It takes us beyond linguistic systems and speakers to a linguistics of participation" (7).

As editors of this collection, we have actively sought to counter the use of translanguaging as a catchall for language diversity, and we have worked to productively demonstrate our awareness that the term has been criticized fairly as a "popular neologism" (Wei 2018). Scholars working in second language writing have thoughtfully critiqued the uncritical adoption of translanguaging (Atkinson et al. 2015; Wei 2018; Matsuda 2014) and as Thomas Lavalle asserts in the afterword of this collection, translingualism as a threshold concept presents definitional "difficulties." Heeding such critiques, we adopt an emerging, writing studies epistemological lens for translanguaging as *disposition*, which Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, Jacqueline Jones Royster, and John Trimbur (2011) describe as "openness and inquiry that people take toward language and language differences" (311). The writing studies translingual disposition toward language and languaging has evolved to include calls for reexamining writing research using a translingual lens (Gilyard 2016; Trimbur 2016), creating awareness that "in translingual writing the process of negotiating assumptions about language is more important than the product" (Matsuda 2014, 481), carefully describing the assessment practices a translingual writing curriculum should employ (Dryer 2016; Lee and Jenks 2016), and ethically investigating the translingual practices in multilingual communities (Bloom-Pojar 2018). The writing studies dispositions lens, then, reinforces the call for a more thoughtful and considered process for developing the "descriptive adequacy" applied linguist Li Wei (2018) describes as the first step in creating the knowledge necessary for a "perpetual cycle of theory-practice-theory" of translanguaging as a practical theory of language (12).

One of the primary challenges inherent in bringing complex theories of translanguaging as continued process into writing-classroom practice is that a translingual disposition resists simple definition and straightforward implementation. Lee and Jenks (2016) emphasize this key difficulty, noting, "Although composition can become a space that facilitates opportunities for students to 'do' translingual dispositions, these dispositions are constitutive of a constellation of highly complex sociocultural issues and experiences and therefore cannot be expected to be actualized or articulated in a preconceived and uniform manner" (319–320). In response to this challenge, we do not attempt to present in this collection a unified process for teaching translanguaging or a static and definitive catalog of translanguaging attributes. Rather, the range of terms in the work our contributors share highlights the complexity we are trying to showcase while providing pedagogies that develop a translingual disposition and are replicable and adaptable for

a variety of learning opportunities in postsecondary, English-medium writing classrooms, writing centers, and writing programs populated by monolingual and multilingual students. By providing descriptive and reflective examples of the "changes being made at the organizational level to rethink the ways in which English is represented in US composition teaching, the design of composition and writing program curricula, and the preparations of (future) teachers of postsecondary writing" (Horner, NeCamp, and Donahue 2011, 271), this collection moves to fill the gap between the range of theoretical inquiry surrounding translanguaging and existing translingual pedagogical models for writing classrooms and programs in the United States.

Our contributors affirm that it is necessary to more fully engage pedagogies of translanguaging and translingualism because our legacy (and overwhelmingly monolingual) approach to English does not do what our increasingly multilingual student populations demand of it. And, while this collection aims to offer a variety of approaches to the teaching of diverse learners via a translingual disposition, it also moves to interrogate the affordances and constraints of translingualism as a pedagogical strategy through each chapter's inclusion of curricular strategies and specific writing assignments. As we note above, readers may identify some of the approaches to writing pedagogy described in each chapter, particularly those that engage critical pedagogies, as approaches to teaching writing they already employ. Clearly, asking students to investigate language ideology is not an innovative suggestion; however, we argue, a translingual disposition, when taught as a rhetorical strategy, reimagines traditional approaches to writing assignments and opens new spaces for student responses to them in important ways. What contributors to this collection bring to the table is the added notions that languages do not work in discrete systems, that we are always languaging, and that such negotiation is a central part of both monolingual and multilingual students' writing processes. To stress, these chapters contribute to the important conversation on the ways translanguaging has made its way into our writing classrooms.

The eleven chapters in this collection consider teacher, student, and institutional perspectives in the development and implementation of translingual pedagogies and are divided into two parts, beginning with translingual pedagogies enacted within first-year writing and ending with a consideration of translingual pedagogies in interdisciplinary contexts. In this way, the collection develops out of a focus on single classroom activities to a wider lens that considers translingual pedagogies across courses, writing centers, and writing programs. Each chapter

offers detailed descriptions of translingual-oriented teaching, including an overview of the institutional context and linguistic makeup of both the department/program and participants (e.g., students, teacher-researcher, etc.); an analysis of the ways each approach fits into current theoretical conversations about translingual composing practices; descriptions of classroom practices and experiences; and considerations of the limitations, challenges, and uptake of the pedagogies offered. Additionally, chapters close with detailed appendices that provide assignment prompts, as well as other necessary information for readers to fully adopt and adapt these strategies into their own classrooms.

Part I, "Enacting Translingual Pedagogies in First-Year Composition," offers focused snapshots of work being done across a number of first-year writing courses in various US universities and colleges. These chapters are especially useful in that they offer a spectrum of both scaffolded and stand-alone assignments that engage a translingual disposition. The following paragraphs offer brief chapter overviews in order to orient readers to what contributions may be most useful to their own teaching.

The collection opens with Shyam Sharma's chapter, "Addressing Monolingual Dispositions with Translingual Pedagogy," which contends that the hegemonic proliferation of a Standard Written English dispositions in US writing programs, "the monolingual regime" (chapter 1), remains one of the central barriers to engaging pedagogies that invite and privilege translingual communicative competence. Sharma thus offers writing-classroom practice that positions "*translingual* pedagogy as a means toward larger educational goals," so that students understand they are not only simply indulging in non-SWE writing but learning to interrogate language and literacy practice and policy. Sharma emphasizes the need for both top-down and bottom-up promotion of a translingual disposition. Moreover, given the growing diversity of student populations across postsecondary institutions, this opening chapter is important in surfacing the various contexts where translingual pedagogies thrive due to emphasis on diversity of knowledge across cultures and societies, as well as rhetorical traditions and practices.

In chapter 2, "Criteria-Mapping Activities and the Transformation of Student-Teacher Relations in the Composition Classroom," Daniel Bommarito and Emily Cooney use criteria mapping (an adaptation of literacy mapping) to consider how classroom discussions of language differences can enhance students' agency and learning. Using this approach, the chapter emphasizes A. Suresh Canagarajah's description of the translingual negotiation entailed in any communicative act and employs Bob Broad's (2003) concept of dynamic criteria mapping to

weave "the negotiation of language directly into the fabric of the curriculum. In this way, language negotiations are not an afterthought, tacked onto a 'language neutral' curriculum—rather, such negotiations *are* the curriculum." The chapter contends that this approach invites a recognition of linguistic diversity, makes this diversity visible, and allows for pedagogical flexibility.

In chapter 3, "Unity in Diversity: Practicing Translingualism in First-Year Writing Courses," Ming Fang and Tania Cepero Lopez present case studies of three instructors as they work to enact a translingual orientation in their first-year writing classrooms. Offering a descriptive analysis of instructor engagement with redesigned curricula, Fang and Cepero Lopez reiterate one of the premises in this collection: that there is no one way to foster a translingual disposition. Rather, there are key tenets that support translingual pedagogies, including holding "diversity as the norm, creating opportunities for linguistic negotiation, and encouragement of rhetorical dexterity." This chapter is a useful starting point for instructors who are developing translingual courses and assignment sequences. The authors examine how adaptation is an inherent tool in the development of a translingual disposition within a common course and offer personal adaptations "filter[ed] through the lens of each instructor's professional interests, as well as their personal linguistic and cultural background."

In chapter 4, "Keepin' It Real: Developing Authentic Translingual Experiences for Multilingual Students," Norah Fahim, Bonnie Vidrine-Isbell, and Dan Zhu bring together translingualism and neuroscientific approaches in order to surface connections between translingualism as a theoretical approach that views languages as fluid, and neurological studies that support the brain's movement towards fluidity across languages as it seeks optimization. The chapter presents a series of activities designed to allow students to define translingualism for themselves and make rhetorical decisions about their own access to their various linguistic resources. In this way, Fahim, Vidrine-Isbell, and Zhu advocate for learning environments where multilinguals can engage their different selves and linguistic repertories, which in turn engages students' diverse languages and encourages students to practice their authentic multilingual voices.

In chapter 5, "An Integrative Pedagogy of Affirmation and Resource Sharing," Gregg Fields advocates for connecting translingualism to pedagogies designed to help students evaluate and reevaluate their linguistic resources, as well as the cultural and experiential knowledge that undergirds these resources. Fields argues that this approach, which

is encapsulated in an integrative translingual pedagogy, leads to a pedagogy of affirmation, a linguistic healing of sorts, not just for traditionally defined bilingual, multilingual, and nonnative speaker students but even for students who traditionally are considered monolingual or native speakers. This chapter describes Fields's pedagogical moves and strategies in order to surface how instructor support and student engagement with a variety of linguistic resources invite students into a process of reenvisioning and reevaluation.

In chapter 6, "'Hay un Tiempo Y un Lugar Para Todo': Students' Writing and Rhetorical Strategies in a Translingual Pedagogy," Esther Milu and Mathew Gomes explore the redesign and implementation of a linguistic autobiography assignment. The authors position their research as a coming together of an "integrationist theory of translingualism and transmodality" and describe how this assignment positions students' language(s) and languaging as the central topic and site of inquiry. In examining student interaction with (and fulfillment of) this assignment, Milu and Gomes affirm and extend scholarship regarding the beneficial outcomes of pedagogies informed by transmodal and translingual theories of language and writing. Additionally, their chapter illustrates how inviting modal and linguistic experimentation can help students develop a translingual disposition as part of their rhetorical sensibilities.

Part II, "Enacting Translingual Pedagogies in Interdisciplinary Spaces," broadens the focus of the first section beyond first-year writing and, in one case, beyond the traditional US classroom. This section provides a wide range of translingual perspectives, including international contexts, multisited ethnography, writing center tutoring and training, and courses outside the first-year writing framework.

These chapters are especially useful in that they offer a kaleidoscopic cross-section of the work being done outside the first-year writing classroom. As editors, we suggest this second section is most useful in its attention to fluidity of engagement with a translingual disposition across learning contexts. Again, the following paragraphs offer brief chapter overviews in order to orient readers to what contributions may be most useful to their own teaching.

The second section begins with Mark Brantner's "Writing on the Wall: Teaching Translingualism through Linguistic Cityscapes." Brantner's study builds upon a literacy-autobiography assignment (similar to that discussed in Milu and Gomes's chapter); however, his chapter offers an interesting distinction from the work in Part I in that his research and teaching, while developing out of US theory and practice, is situated

in an international context. In his examination of a literacy landscapes assignment, Brantner describes how translingual approaches can be positioned to invite students to explicate their own lived realities of linguistic division. This chapter's recognition of the mobility of resources students bring to their negotiation of linguistic heterogeneity provides a framework for faculty to ground their assignments, lessons, assessments, and teaching in the concrete conscious (and unconscious) practices students engage in.

Building upon the negotiative practices in chapter 7, Brice Nordquist's chapter, "Translingual Literacy and the Mobile Labor of Recontextualization," considers the value of understanding and tracing mobile literacies for both translingual theory and pedagogy across in-school and out-of-school contexts. Nordquist highlights that "linguistic mobilities necessitate perpetual translations. These translations involve not only linguistic transactions but also social, economic, geopolitical, and cultural transactions across asymmetrical relations of power" (chapter 8). This chapter emphasizes the mobility of meaning enabled via linguistic diversity and describes how a translingual disposition is able to illuminate the fluctuating, internally diverse, and intermingling character of languages.

In chapter 9, "Writing-Theory Cartoon: Toward a Translingual and Multimodal Pedagogy," Sonja Wang engages with a different student audience: college students enrolled in a bridge writing course. In this chapter Wang presents an assignment in which students are invited to draw writing-theory cartoons that represent key ideas, assumptions, and approaches they associate with experiences with multiple languages and literacies. Her analysis of student responses describes how the assignment creates opportunities for students to attend to the interrelationship of semiotic systems as part of the rhetorical repertoire essential for translingual negotiation. Like the work of Brantner and Norquist, Wang's assignment can be understood as inviting mobility through the opportunities created for students to reflect on language differences and translingual relationships in light of broader contexts of transnational experiences. These findings extend conversations in writing studies concerning the unique affordances of multimodality to develop metalinguistic awareness and translingual disposition, known contributors to successful writing practices.

Chapter 10, "Translingualism as Methodology for Peer Writing Consultants-in-Training," focuses on the ways translingual practices can be taken up in nonclassroom learning environments. The author, Naomi Silver, describes the introduction, and subsequent revision, of

a unit on translingualism within a semester-long training course for undergraduate peer writing consultants. Like many of the chapters from Part I of this collection, Silver focuses on integrating translingual approaches within a mainstream, or traditional, writing studies context; within this chapter we see how translingualism can be offered as a module rather than the exclusive theme (as seen in Julia Kiernan's chapter [chapter 11]), and this addition of translingualism as a topic module also points to the elasticity of translingualism as a pedagogical approach. Also important to this chapter is the reasoning behind integrating translingualism; Silver characterizes the writing center as having "a strong commitment to social justice principles, which includes seeing students' language differences as resources to be mobilized in pursuit of their own communicative purposes."

The closing chapter, "A Framework for Linguistically Inclusive Course Design," also considers the role of translingual approaches in bridge writing programs. Julia Kiernan considers the pedagogical benefits and drawbacks of developing and implementing a semester-long transnationally themed writing course open to and accepting of translingual dispositions. Through exploring the linguistic gaps in current approaches to traditional curricular design, this research offers a framework for reassessing, reimagining, and redesigning writing pedagogy. An examination of student reflections points to the usability of linguistically sensitive curricula within US writing classrooms, particularly in terms of the placement of value on translingual competences, which in turn reflects a shift toward asset-based, culturally sustaining pedagogical practices.

NOTE

1. As editors, we recognize that the growing interest in and exploration of translingualism as a construct is linked to assumptions that undergird our collective understanding of complex languaging and literacy practices. We believe part of this exploration is the acknowledgment of the many points of contention surrounding translanguaging and a translingual approach from different lenses in rhetoric and composition (Bou Ayash 2013, 2015; Donahue 2013; Horner 2010; Horner and Kopelson 2014; Horner and Lu 2007, 2012; Horner et al. 2011; Horner, NeCamp, and Donahue 2011; Horner, Selfe, and Lockridge 2015; Jordan 2015; Lee and Jenks 2016; Lorimer-Leonard 2014; Lu and Horner 2013), second language writing (Leki 2003; Matsuda 2006, 2013, 2014; Matsuda and Matsuda 2010; Matsuda and Silva 2011; Silva 1993; Shuck 2010; Spack, 2004; Thaiss and Zawacki 2006; Zamel and Spack 2004), education (García and Wei 2014), and applied linguistics (Canagarajah 2002, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2018; Firth 1990, 2009; Firth and Wagner 1997; Kachru 1986; Kramsch 2018; Kramsch and Whiteside 2007, 2008; Park and Wee 2013; Wei 2018), as well as the points of conversion and shared stances toward opening our disciplinary languaging theories and practices beyond

an insistence on discrete language systems. While the contributors in this collection do not always reach back into this rich history, as editors, we fully acknowledge that without the work of those cited above, this collection, and the valuable insight of the contributors, would not be possible.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, Dwight, Deborah Crusan, Paul Kei Matsuda, Christina Ortmeier-Hooper, Todd Ruecker, Steve Simpson, and Christine Tardy. 2015. "Clarifying the Relationship between L2 Writing and Translingual Writing: An Open Letter to Writing Studies Editors and Organization Leaders." *College English* 77 (4): 383–86.

Bloom-Pojar, Rachel. 2018. *Translanguaging Outside the Academy: Negotiating Rhetoric and Healthcare in the Spanish Caribbean*. Champaign, IL: NCTE.

Bou Ayash, Nancy. 2013. "Hi-*ein*, Hi نيي or يين Hi? Translingual Practices from Lebanon and Mainstream Literacy Education." In *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms*, edited by A. Suresh Canagarajah, 96–103. New York: Routledge.

Bou Ayash, Nancy. 2015. "(Re-)Situating Translingual Work for Writing Program Administration in Cross-National and Cross-Language Perspectives from Lebanon and Singapore." In *Transnational Writing Program Administration*, edited by David S. Martins, 226–42. Logan: Utah State University Press.

Broad, Bob. 2003. *What We Really Value: Beyond Rubrics in Teaching and Assessing Writing*. Logan: Utah State University Press.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. 2002. *A Geopolitics of Academic Writing*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. 2006. "Toward a Writing Pedagogy of Shuttling between Languages: Learning from Multilingual Writers." *College English* 68 (6): 589–604.

Canagarajah, Suresh. 2007. "Lingua Franca English, Multilingual Communities, and Language Acquisition." *Modern Language Journal* 91 (1): 923–939.

Canagarajah, Suresh. 2009. "Multilingual Strategies of Negotiating English: From Conversation to Writing." *JAC* 29 (1/2): 17–48.

Canagarajah, Suresh. 2011. "Translanguaging in the Classroom: Emerging Issues for Research and Pedagogy." *Applied Linguistics Review* 2: 1–28.

Canagarajah, Suresh. 2013. *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. London: Routledge.

Canagarajah, Suresh. 2018. "Translingual Practice as Spatial Repertoires: Expanding the Paradigm beyond Structuralist Orientations." *Applied Linguistics* 39 (1): 31–54.

Donahue, Christiane. 2013. "Negotiation, Translinguality, and Cross-Cultural Writing Research in a New Composition Era." In *Literacy as Translingual Practice*, edited by Suresh Canagarajah, 150–161. New York: Routledge.

Dryer, Dylan B. 2016. "Appraising Translingualism." *College English* 78 (3): 274–83.

Firth, Alan. 1990. "'Lingua Franca' Negotiations: Towards an Interactional Approach." *World Englishes* 9 (3): 269–80.

Firth, Alan. 2009. "Doing Not Being a Foreign Language Learner: English as a Lingua Franca in the Workplace and (Some) Implications for SLA." *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 47 (1): 127–56.

Firth, Alan, and Johannes Wagner. 1997. "On Discourse, Communication, and (Some) Fundamental Concepts in SLA research." *The Modern Language Journal* 81 (3): 285–300.

García, Ofelia, and Li Wei. 2014. "Translanguaging and Education." In *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*, edited by Ofelia García and Li Wei, 63–77. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gilyard, Keith. 2016. "The Rhetoric of Translingualism." *College English* 78 (3): 284–89.

Horner, Bruce. 2010. "From 'English Only' to Cross-Language Relations in Composition." Introduction to *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*, edited by Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Kei Matsuda. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Horner, Bruce, and Karen Kopelson, eds. 2014. *Reworking English in Rhetoric and Composition: Global Interrogations, Local Interventions*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Horner, Bruce, and Min-Zhan Lu. 2007. "Resisting Monolingualism in 'English': Reading and Writing the Politics of Language." In *Rethinking English in Schools: A New and Constructive Stage*, edited by Viv Ellis, Carol Fox, and Brian V. Street, 141–57. London: Continuum.

Horner, Bruce, Min-Zhan Lu, Jacqueline Jones Royster, and John Trimbur. 2011. "Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach." *College English* 73 (3): 303–21.

Horner, Bruce, Samantha NeCamp, and Christiane Donahue. 2011. "Toward a Multilingual Composition Scholarship: From English Only to a Translingual Norm." *College Composition and Communication* 63 (2): 269–300.

Horner, Bruce, Cynthia Selfe, and Tim Lockridge. 2015. "Translinguality, Transmodality, and Difference: Exploring Dispositions and Change in Language and Learning." Enculturation/Intermezzo. http://intermezzo.enculturation.net/01/ttd-horner-selfe-lockridge/.

Jordan, Jay. 2015. "Material Translingual Ecologies." *College English* 77 (4): 364–82.

Kachru, Braj B. 1986. "The Power and Politics of English." *World Englishes* 5 (2–3): 121–40.

Kramsch, Claire. 2018. "Trans-Spatial Utopias." *Applied Linguistics* 39 (1): 108–115.

Kramsch, Claire, and Anne Whiteside. 2007. "Three Fundamental Concepts in Second Language Acquisition and Their Relevance in Multilingual Contexts." *The Modern Language Journal* 91: 907–22.

Kramsch, Claire, and Anne Whiteside. 2008. "Language Ecology in Multilingual Settings. Towards a Theory of Symbolic Competence." *Applied Linguistics* 29 (4): 645–71.

Lee, Jerry Won, and Christopher Jenks. 2016. "Doing Translingual Dispositions." *College Composition and Communication* 68 (2): 317–44.

Leki, Ilona. 2003. "Living through College Literacy: Nursing in a Second Language." *Written Communication* 20 (1): 81–98.

Lorimer-Leonard, Rebecca. 2014. "Multilingual Writing as Rhetorical Attunement." *College English* 76 (3): 227–47.

Lu, Min-Zhan, and Bruce Horner. 2013. "Translingual Literacy, Language Difference, and Matters of Agency." *College English* 75 (6): 582–607.

Matsuda, Aya, and Paul Kei Matsuda. 2010. "World Englishes and the Teaching of Writing." *Tesol Quarterly* 44 (2): 369–74.

Matsuda, Paul Kei. 2006. "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition." *College English* 68 (6): 637–51.

Matsuda, Paul Kei. 2013. "It's the Wild West Out There: A New Linguistic Frontier in US College Composition." In *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms*, edited by Suresh Canagarajah, 128–38. London: Routledge.

Matsuda, Paul Kei. 2014. "The Lure of Translingual Writing." *PMLA* 129 (3): 478–83.

Matsuda, Paul Kei, and Tony Silva 2011. "Cross-Cultural Composition: Mediated Integration of U.S. and International Students." In *Second-Language Writing in the Composition Classroom*, edited by Paul Kei Matsuda, Michelle Cox, Jay Jordan, and Christine Ortmeier-Hooper, 252–65. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Park, Joseph Sung-Yul, and Lionel Wee. 2013. *Markets of English: Linguistic Capital and Language Policy in a Globalizing World*. New York: Routledge.

Shuck, Gail. 2010. "Language Identity, Agency, and Context: The Shifting Meanings of Multilingual." In *Reinventing Identities in Second Language Writing*, edited by Michelle

Cox, Jay Jordan, Christina Ortmeier-Hooper, and Gwen Gray Schwartz, 117–38. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.

Spack, Ruth. 2004. "The Acquisition of Academic Literacy in a Second Language: A Longitudinal Case Study, Updated." In *Crossing the Curriculum: Multilingual Learners in College Classrooms*, edited by Vivian Zamel and Ruth Spack, 19–45. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Thaiss, Christopher J., and Terry Myers Zawacki. 2006. *Engaged Writers, Dynamic Disciplines: Research on the Academic Writing Life*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Trimbur, John. 2016. "Translingualism and Close Reading." *College English* 78 (3): 219–227.

Wei, Li. 2018. "Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language." *Applied Linguistics* 39 (1): 9–30.

Zamel, Vivian, and Ruth Spack. 2004. *Crossing the Curriculum: Multilingual Learners in College Classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.