3 Expectations, Mismatches, and Translingual Dispositions in Teaching Multilingual Students

Lilian W. Mina
Auburn University at Montgomery

Tony Cimasko
Miami University

With the goal of expanding on translingual opportunities for student writers, this chapter discusses (mis)matches between the experiences and expectations of international multilingual students in a U.S.-based ESL composition program and the program's actual goals and pedagogies. The study found that students are generally receptive to the writing pedagogies within their classrooms, but there are important misconceptions about the role of composition courses, and frustrations in connecting with domestic L1 English users for academic and social purposes. We find that although instructors and students alike are already engaged in translanguaging work in many ways, they are missing opportunities for more. The chapter concludes with recommendations on how to encourage the opportunities that a translingual disposition towards pedagogy presents in a college writing program.

Keywords: ESL composition, student expectations, translanguaging

A translingual approach, or disposition, recognizes that language use is fluid; for instance, speakers and writers often move between languages, modes, and other affordances as they see fit for their own communicative and rhetorical success in a given context. In part, this fluidity reflects and facilitates a language user's movement between social and cultural contexts. A translingual disposition, then, calls for a shift in our conceptualization and worldview of language diversity, language, culture, and practices. In

social contexts, language users make meaning by drawing from their rich repertoire of communicative resources, but the adoption of translingually oriented curricula in post-secondary writing programs is still relatively limited, especially in writing programs that have typically placed multilingual students in designated ESL classes. In this project, we offer the case of one institution and interrogate the degrees to which the program could shift its policies and pedagogies to a translingual approach. In scrutinizing the program, we aim to offer implications and recommendations for other writing programs that are open to the adoption of translingually oriented curricula and practices.

While an essential part of this project is seated in the desire to learn more about the international L2 students enrolled in Miami University's ESL Composition program, the primary purpose, in regard to student linguistic diversity, is to better understand how a translingual pedagogy can more completely prepare students for academic writing. Thus, interrogation of the benefits and drawbacks of drawing on translingually oriented curricula and practices in the program at Miami University shaped our approach to data collection. We began with an examination of the needs assessment data that were collected as part of the standardized curriculum of both the English Composition program and the ESL Composition program. Specifically, we were interested in Nation and Macalister's (2010) suggestions for examining necessities, shortcomings, and student wants as a means of understanding their needs. While student "shortcomings" are often identified through the placement process when they first enter the university, student "wants" remain unidentified in the program's current model of needs assessment. As such, we positioned our data collection to move beyond student "shortcomings," which are too often associated with deficit-model paradigms, to focus instead on student wants and expectations.

Aiming to identify international L2 student wants and expectations and potential (mis)matches between their wants and the program's existing goals and pedagogies, we conducted a program-wide mixed-method study. The findings of this study, though cited briefly in this chapter, worked as the springboard for our recommendations for pedagogical approaches that align with translingually oriented curricula and practices in the ESL Composition program. After reviewing the relevant literature and our research methodology, we present a synopsis of our thematic findings about student experiences, expectations, and responses to the program requirements. We end this chapter with a critical discussion of how to acknowledge the translingual disposition in framing and shaping the recommended curricular changes and teacher training inspired by our findings.

Review of Literature

Student Experiences

Scholars have emphasized the need to understand the prior educational experiences of multilingual students, and particularly their literacy practices, as a condition for selecting better pedagogical approaches to teach these students. Ferris and Hedgcock (2014) claim that many international students find undergraduate writing coursework daunting due to their previous experiences with reading and writing in English. They encourage teachers of writing courses to be aware of students' pedagogical histories in order to craft creative pedagogical approaches that address them. Similarly, Canagarajah (2011) asserts that pedagogies for multilingual students should be developed based on student practices, and Spack (2004) cautions against a pre-designed curriculum that makes assumptions about multilingual learners without any validation of these assumptions. Furthermore, Garcia and Wei (2014) theorize the positive validation of students' experiences, and explain that multilingual students can only establish new language and writing practices in "interrelationship with old ones" (p. 79). They believe that students use their learning and language histories and complex sets of needs and expectations to "invest," using Norton's (2000) term, in learning new practices to achieve these expectations. Transferring previous learning experiences requires integrating old and new language practices in order to create a repertoire of resources that the learner will use in the new learning context, in this case, ESL Composition classes. Therefore, in order to understand whether or not the ESL Composition classes are conducive to the transfer of learning experiences, it was necessary to assess students' expectations and experiences before making program-level changes in pedagogy.

Beyond making pedagogy meaningful for learners, transparently acknowledging past experiences adds a wealth of knowledge and skills to the writing classroom. Canagarajah (2013) urges teachers to build on the strategies that multilingual students have developed instead of "imposing their own understanding of literacy" (p. 9). He calls these strategies "resources" that both teachers and students can use in the classroom. Advocating for a translingual approach in writing, Shipka (2016) furthers this argument and considers difference as a resource. Within Shipka's view, the disparate educational, linguistic, and cultural experiences multilingual students possess can, and should, be utilized as resources that may potentially enrich the writing classroom. Collectively, Canagarajah's and Shipka's argument challenge writing teachers to change their approaches in order to acknowledge different cultural practices, languages, and modes of composing. Further, teachers should combine

these resources of difference with more critical and reflective practices in order to help students "engage with the dominant norms" of the institution (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 9). Thus, it is imperative to unpack and understand the experiences that students bring into the ESL composition classroom before making any decisions regarding program mission, curriculum design, and/or pedagogical practices.

Student Expectations

In addition to students' educational experiences, their varied goals and expectations may inform their engagement and willingness to participate in many activities in a writing class (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014). As such, both teachers and students need to work towards understanding and adjusting their writing class expectations (Ferris, 2009). The need for this understanding and adjustment drives this project, which empirically examined students' expectations to inform possible curricular and pedagogical changes. For example, students and instructors may have conflicting expectations of support for and feedback on writing class work. International multilingual students are concerned about their English language performance and expect extensive language instruction in their writing classes (Evans et al., 2009; Zamel, 2004). Many other aspects of the culture of U.S. writing classes may be problematic for international students. Continuing her discussion, Ferris (2009) alerts writing teachers that international students do not expect to "formulate opinions and arguments" (p. 13) for their writing assignments because this skill may not be a requirement of their previous language-oriented instruction.

Acknowledging this complex relation between students' previous educational experiences and current expectations challenges teachers to create more encompassing pedagogies that will engage students from diverse backgrounds and with a wide spectrum of experiences and expectations. For example, Gilyard (2016) suggests asking multilingual students to compose a translingual literacy narrative/history in which they document how they or someone they know has shuttled between the boundaries of language either locally or globally, academically or socially, in writing or in speaking. Such an assignment would invite students to reflect on their "trans"language and/or "trans"national experiences, forming their own unique opinions on those experiences.

This brief review of literature on international multilingual students' prior experiences and current expectations from the ESL Composition classroom illustrates that Canagarajah (2013), Shipka (2016), and Gilyard (2016) have pluralized student differences, thus advocating for a translingual approach. The question remains about how a translingual approach can transform ESL

composition classrooms in a meaningful and productive way that improves their ability to address multilingual students' experiences, while building on their expectations from the writing class. The remainder of this chapter answers this question.

Context of the Study

The study was conducted in Miami University's ESL Composition program, part of the university's English department. The program's two first-year courses, ENG 108 and ENG 109, form a year-long writing sequence that most new international undergraduates follow. ENG 108 is a writing and U.S. cultures course, with much of the curriculum giving attention to individual rhetorical modes, such as summarizing, defining, describing, and arguing before moving into more complex texts such as a group multimedia project that combines multiple modes. ENG 109 emphasizes rhetoric by starting with personal rhetorical experience and examining the rhetoric of a text before attempting alphabetic and multimedia projects designed around the expectations of particular audiences. Placement in the two courses is based on a test designed and administered by program faculty.

The objectives of the ESL Composition program are divided into specific areas of academic writing including critical thinking, audience awareness, research and reading skills, and language conventions. Students in this program are encouraged to draw from a rich and extensive repertoire of linguistic, cultural, and technological practices as they maneuver their way through the new academic context of a U.S. university and complete the two courses. Program objectives and course descriptions emphasize the importance of students considering multiple cultural points of view, and to move beyond language accuracy to thinking about more complex aspects of writing (Jones & Landis, 2018). Theoretically, as Bou Ayash (this collection) also finds, this program is outwardly inclusive of the translingual practices students have developed before arriving to the program, such as their cultural and technological knowledge and practices. In reality, however, the emphasis is very much on English in American (or more broadly Western) contexts. This discrepancy between the program description and its enactment signals a more monolingual than a translingual approach.

Research Questions

This chapter draws on the results of our survey of the experiences and expectations of international undergraduates enrolled in an ESL composition

program that was growing quickly at the time our study was conducted. Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. How do previous English language learning experiences and early connections with classmates at the university contribute to creating expectations of first-year ESL composition classes among international students?
2. How do these students respond to the challenges of their ESL composition classes, both individually and through connections to peer communities?
3. What points of alignment and misalignment exist between these students' experiences and expectations, and the ESL Composition program's curriculum design and pedagogy?

Participants

Of the students participating in this study (N = 279), an overwhelming majority (96.4%) of them were from China, followed by three students from South Korea and one each from Japan, Pakistan, India, the United Arab Emirates, Russia, Sweden, and Germany. After obtaining IRB approval, students were recruited through their writing course instructors and consented their participation before completing the survey.

Data Collection

The four-page paper-based survey was composed of 22 multiple choice and short-answer questions organized into three sections. The questions addressed students' national and L1 backgrounds, time spent studying in the US and at the university, English language education in their home countries, perceptions of their own English language abilities, expectations of ENG 108 and 109, surprises that they had encountered, and their patterns of networking and studying with domestic and international students. Instructors in their respective ENG 108 and 109 sections distributed the survey. Students were given twenty minutes to complete the survey, after which instructors collected the anonymous surveys and immediately delivered them to the researchers.

Data Analysis

With the goal of meeting Canagarajah's (2011) and Spack's (2004) aim of making instruction more responsive to students' communicative realities a

fundamental feature of a translingual approach to teaching writing, we examined the verbal data inductively, searching for patterns in the matches and mismatches between students and the program. In line with this approach, all data were transcribed verbatim without revisions to the language of any survey respondent's writing, unless a part of a response was illegible. Data from the survey were entered into a spreadsheet program, with codes assigned to each short answer multiple-choice questions. For example, the answer to our question about the number of years spent studying in the US was divided into four columns ("This is my first semester," "Less than one year," "One-two years," and "More than two years"), and for each survey respondent a score of 1 was entered in the corresponding column. This allowed us to make an initial identification of broader patterns in the response. Each of the researchers then read written responses to open-ended questions and compared them with the broader patterns emerging from the quantitative responses for triangulation of data and possible explanations of those responses. We paid particular attention to comparing present classes and past home country experiences (for example, amount of English language writing done prior to and in the U.S. writing classes) to find potential correlations or causational links.

Students' Experiences

The overwhelming majority of participants (83 percent) had had some prior experience with university-level academic work in the US, although most of that had come from Miami University, during the semester at the university preceding our research. Regardless of their U.S.-based experiences, all participants had received English language instruction in their home countries for an average of eight years, going back to elementary school. More than half characterized that instruction as mostly or entirely academic in nature, but a sizable minority saw their English instruction as being equally split between academic (texts written to fulfill course requirements, especially longer and more formal texts) and non-academic English.

Student responses indicate that the dominant academic genres they experienced prior to entering U.S. writing classrooms were highly structured and standardized forms of writing, particularly TOEFL and other standardized test essays and the five-paragraph essay form. In English as a *foreign* language (EFL) settings, where all participants received their prior English instruction, writing of this kind is frequently a prime determinant of academic and professional advancement, and the justification for making it the focus of curricular attention is clear (Reichelt, 2011). Upon entry to U.S. universities, which are English as a *second* language contexts, standardized tests of English

proficiency are suddenly no longer relevant, and writing assignments are likely to be unfamiliar even when the language development level of the assignments is appropriate. Responses about the writing areas students needed help with, when in their home countries, also point to this potential mismatch, with 59 percent of students having been far more concerned about local-level, accuracy-oriented problems of vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics rather than global-level of generation and organization of content. When students encountered difficulties and sought out focused help for their writing in their home countries, they chose to primarily consult teachers, formal internet sources, and more fluent friends and seniors, rather than peers working at the same language level. Combined, these preferences may be interpreted as an orientation toward perceived English language authority.

Expectations of First-Year ESL Writing Classes

The second half of the survey included a direct question that asked, "When you came to ENG 108 or 109, what did you expect of the class?" About 90 percent of participants expressed their eagerness to improve their English skills broadly defined. Moreover, we noticed a clear orientation among students to "learn and think in American way," "write like a native English-speaking student and have American writing habits," and "accept American culture as soon as possible." These statements, on the one hand, display an interest in learning and improving language skills in order to function more effectively in a cross-cultural environment. Students appear to believe that their success is contingent upon and achieved by assimilating the linguistic practices of their American counterparts. On the other hand, these statements may reflect students' fear of failure due to their perceived lack of linguistic ability (Ferris, 2009), or even worse, lack of native-speaking competence. These interpretations were consolidated upon realizing the emphasis, reported by many students in their written comments, on improving grammar, vocabulary, and word choice, equating these with a totality of writing skills. These findings are consistent with those of the study by Evans et al. (2009), indicating that international students have concerns about their English language proficiency and integration into American culture.

Perceptions of Pedagogies in First-Year ESL Writing Classes

Students were also asked, "What have been the most surprising aspects of the class so far?" in the areas of teaching practices, class activities, and assignments. Upon analyzing students' responses to this question, a number of

themes stood out: modalities of teaching and writing, assignment content, and interaction dynamics. Students manifested their surprise at the use of less traditional technologies and media, such as social media sites and games. Other students seemed fascinated by the multimodal teaching materials used in presenting class content, including movies, cartoons, and PowerPoint presentations.

Interaction patterns and dynamics in ENG 108 and 109 classes also surprised participants in our study. These patterns included engaging in interactive group work and discussions, a common practice in first-year writing classes. Interactive group work practices were perceived as novel because they gave students the freedom to express ideas and opinions about topics of discussion. As one student put it, "We can give our own opinion every time." Students expressed their fascination with such opportunities to share their thoughts either in whole-class discussions or in small-group activities. Students also seemed to agree that the level of engagement in class discussions and group work activities varied. While many praised their classmates on their active participation in discussion, others showed their frustration at some of their classmates' silence and resistance to talking, or how many students "never said a word." They described that silence as boring or undermining their learning experiences. This problem of silence or reluctance to participate in class discussions and activities may be interpreted in relation to the earlier finding that students seemed largely keen on improving their English language proficiency. The silence lamented by some students may be due to students' shaky confidence in their English language skills and their perception of their linguistic difference as a deficit rather than a resource (Canagarajah, 2013; Shipka, 2016).

Such students want to move closer to the standards by aspiring to "think and write as American," as one survey respondent worded it, thus signaling a potential dismissal of their translinguality for the sake of standards. Many other respondents shared this perspective on American and native-speaker standard use of English as part of their course expectations. "I expected to have more chances to improve . . . by communicating with my professor and classmate," one student noted, adding, "However, I ended up with a class full of Chinese students (sad smiley face)." "Small groups work with Americans in order to practice English" was a similar priority for another student. In another response, a desire to "help me to correct the habit which may be 'Chinglish' in writing" emerged, and another wrote, "I thought it would teach me to express ideas in a more native style" (underlined by participant). One student reported even deeper differences and a need for native-like writing: "Because Chinese and Americans have different thinking/logical when they

write message. I hope to learn how to write message like Americans people."

Another point of agreement among most participants was on the value of peer review. Many students wrote that peer review was a whole new experience for them. Although not many students described the peer review process in their respective classes, they highlighted the benefits of peer review in improving their essays or their English in general. Some students found peer review to be helpful for identifying their writing mistakes, mostly sentence-level errors. Although not surprising, given students' obsession with grammar and vocabulary, it was interesting, as these same students reported relying heavily on the review of authority figures, prior to their U.S. educations.

Experiences Outside the Classroom

When our participants looked for academic support outside of the classroom, a majority of them routinely showed a preference (57 percent) for working with peers from their own country to address writing and other academic concerns, working with Americans far less frequently (28 percent), and working with internationals from other backgrounds (15 percent) only occasionally. These patterns are similar, but not identical, to their socializing patterns, in which students prefer to spend their spare time with fellow nationals. The academic support that the students find in these peer groups is very widely distributed across problem areas, from large-scale content and discourse issues to local grammar and conventions concerns, with no single problem being more frequent than others. In their responses to the question about the communities with which they interact, only a small portion of students stated that they actively sought the company of Americans for English language practice, expressing widely divergent experiences. A few found their interactions to be quite positive, calling their American contacts "friendly" or "pretty cool," and others seemed to have connected with American students of similar ethnic backgrounds. This finding is similar to Andrade (2006), who found that international students prefer social relationships with people from their home countries if available, and that they may have close friendships with domestic students in the case of absence of opportunities to socialize with students from their countries.

The Translanguaging Conversation

Numerous mismatches were identified between international students' earlier experiences and expectations and the goals and practices of the ESL Composition program in which they studied. The most important of these in the

data was the nature of their pre-university EFL instruction, in China and elsewhere. The survey results point to a majority of learners having received limited writing instruction, and that writing instruction was considered as non-academic, mostly formulaic, and primarily concerned with grammatical and lexical accuracy, unlike the rhetorical orientation of their writing courses. Broadly, translingualism, in prioritizing the intersections of audiences and writers over formal accuracy and reproduction, is one of many pedagogical directions that would fit the philosophy of the ESL Composition program. Offering a translingual approach to writing for linguistically diverse students in the program, though, would initially present students with another element that does not match their prior experiences. Instructors would be obliged to address this mismatch by openly discussing the benefits of such an approach; with this kind of scaffolding, students can eventually shift their focus from mastering the "standard" English language and "thinking and writing like an American" to perceiving language as a diverse resource (Canagarajah, 2016) that can be used rhetorically to achieve various goals. Discussing the concept of correctness within the translingual disposition with students, or putting an emphasis on clarity rather than correctness as Campbell, Fernandez, and Koo recommend (this collection), can be a feasible and productive pedagogical intervention to solve these deep-rooted problems.

Peer support coming from non-native users of English, rather than native-speaking Americans, is a prime example of translanguaging that is already in practice in the program even though it was not initiated by program faculty. The linguistic, social, and experiential support offered by other language learners can frequently be as or more useful than what is offered by native speakers, and can provide advantages that are unavailable otherwise (Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Medgyes, 1994; Rogers et al., 2016). Gilyard (2016) strongly criticizes strict English-only language policies and curricula adopted in some institutions because they may be dismissive of the rich linguistic repertoire international multilingual students bring to the writing classroom. He describes multilingual students as constantly experimenting with multiple languages in the various contexts in which they find themselves. The Miami ESL Composition program could easily build on students' proclivity toward multilingual language use by explicitly approving and encouraging students to continue pursuing it.

The study findings identified a clear orientation toward TOEFL and TOEFL-like standardized test writing in English as a foreign language instruction. This may also be partially responsible for the "speak and write like an American" opinions that highlighted many of the student responses; only non-L1 English foreigners take the TOEFL test; therefore, students may rea-

sonably conclude that "foreignness" in language performance will inevitably be perceived as a problem by native users of English. A sense of foreignness and of native-like performance as the only worthwhile goal of second language development may also explain why a significant number of students do not fully appreciate the emphasis on writing versus other skills, namely oral English and communication skills in ENG 108 and 109. A translingually oriented curriculum would not entirely ignore this background, but would acknowledge the advantages of language accuracy, but as one of a myriad of tools available for rhetorical success, contingent upon their particular audiences and purposes.

Among our results, we have found that students bring a wide continuum of prior English educational experiences to their U.S. studies, particularly in writing, some that create more present or future potential areas for translanguaging than others. While some students bring a substantial familiarity with academic writing activities, others have very limited exposure to such writing and may be comfortable only with informal and spoken forms of the language, opening up opportunities for multimodal composing. However, these incoming students are uniform in expecting improvements in their academic English skills in first-year writing courses; most of their concerns center on local-level issues of grammar and vocabulary, though, with less concern about more global aspects of academic discourse. Divergences between the program and students regarding their appreciation of and responsiveness to American teaching styles, class dynamics and assignments, and cultural differences suggest possible difficulties in introducing more translanguaging. Finally, whether students are generally successful in their writing courses or they have more difficulties, they find some support among peer communities. By and large, these contacts are students from their own countries or regions. Interactions with Americans and with international students from elsewhere are much more limited, and tend to be non-social in nature, due in part to perceived attitudes of disinterest or intolerance among the Americans they meet. Although our study did not go into detail about out-of-classroom practices, it is not difficult to speculate that students would be immersed in translingual work at these times, as they move between papers and textbooks in standard written English and verbal and electronic exchanges about those papers in their first languages.

At the same time, the translingual approach considers language as just one of the many semiotic resources to which students have access (Canagarajah, 2016). Building on students' interest in non-traditional technologies provides an obvious opening for a wider array of compositional tools. Shipka (2016) argues that incorporating a translingual pedagogy will shift the focus to com-

posing practices that entail utilizing all these possible resources as students compose multimodal texts. Yet, Shipka warns against utilizing such tools only for their own sake, what she calls the "agency of things" (2016, p. 251). Using technologies must be connected to audiences and purposes; to make the shift away from simply being effective writers to being effective composers, instructors need to foster an approach from a position of communicational fluency. Starting with students' fascination with the technology, instructors can build activities and reflective exercises that allow students to hypothesize about audience needs and responses when different media are employed. Since the vast majority of students regularly engage in multimodal literacy practices outside their academic work through social media, electronic gaming, and other digital and non-digital activities, bringing the kinds of multimodality that they typically use and care about has the potential to encourage them to look beyond writing accuracy toward broader issues of messaging and audiences.

Implications of the Study

The first of two implications to emerge from the study is that courses and curriculum have room for modification. Curricular and course expectations, objectives, and outcomes can often be antithetical to a translingual approach. Changing composition courses and the curriculum as a whole in translingual ways would more clearly recognize and respect linguistic differences. One potentially useful avenue is a framework recently proposed by Shapiro et al. (2016). In their work, writer agency is the specific outcome; in other words, an effective curriculum creates the "optimal conditions" for students to build their awareness of available resources for composing, awareness of the need to take action in a set of rhetorical circumstances, and the authority to act (Shapiro et al., 2016, pp 32-33). "Noticing" (Shapiro et al., 2016, p. 33), or the ability to analyze and evaluate a set of circumstances and the options available for responding, is the first step in writers exercising agency.

Beyond agency, mismatches like those that emerged from our study between students' expectations and existing program objectives and pedagogies can be addressed by bringing other translingual approaches into writing curricula. Many students may enter first-year composition courses without explicitly understanding their nature, focus, and objectives. Devoting more time at the start of a course or even earlier to explicating these characteristics would contribute even more to creating dialogues with students, to explore and negotiate under what circumstances they should write and speak in English or rely on other languages, when they should pursue traditional writing

or bring in other modes of composition, and when other tools could be appropriate and effective.

Mismatches between international students' expectations of integrating into American academic and social culture and a scarcity of opportunities for communication with American students suggests that other benefits of translingual pedagogy can be realized by bringing international and domestic students together in the same writing classrooms, rather than placing them on separate tracks. Acknowledging the importance of integrating international students into U.S. universities, Matsuda and Silva (2011) called for a "cross-cultural composition course" that would ideally be taught by an instructor who is trained to teach both populations of students (p. 253). More recently, Canagarajah (2016) recommended that writing teachers adopt a translingual approach in their writing classrooms. Such an approach entails capitalizing on students' resources, including multiple languages and language varieties. Also, enhancing the cross-cultural environment in which students study and live requires bringing students' languages, cultures, and technologies to the forefront of the writing classroom. Greater involvement with domestic students and members of the local community would be achieved in the classroom, contribute to international students' verbal and non-verbal social language growth, and expose domestic students to a more diverse group of students. Andrade (2006) suggested that there is a need for increased interaction between domestic and international students for more meaningful intercultural learning for both groups. She rightly argued that interaction in educational activities can contribute to improving cultural understanding.

The second major implication that we see in the study results is that proposed curricular changes call for substantial teacher preparation. Instructors are not always ready to teach courses incorporating translingual approaches even if they are committed to the outcomes that translingual approaches would offer. Canagarajah (2016) encouraged teachers to "negotiate translingual writing" within programs that may be adopting a stricter monolingual ideology and norms (p. 268). It is important for programs engaging in this type of training to not offer this as a one-time event, but as ongoing learning to train faculty and staff to respond to new and wider populations, reflecting the fluid and expanding nature of translingual communication.

Recommendations

The translingual approach to teaching writing respects students' languages and cultural backgrounds (Canagarajah, 2013; Horner et al., 2011). Focusing on pedagogy that positively presents translanguaging and gives students

tools that they can use as needed in the future may be a more productive end. Students will become more appreciative of their ability to use more than one language to communicate efficiently across contexts. Allowing students to use their multiple languages seamlessly to construct texts would make for an invisible but fruitful way of shuttling between those languages (Canagarajah, 2013).

Agency is an important goal of a translingual writing curriculum. However, among students similar to those that participated in our study, this may be a greater challenge. Test preparation and memorization with limited critical analysis were common traits of their writing education experiences, and the limited amount of writing that they did in the past makes noticing in written texts more difficult. Frequent in-class activities that encourage more analysis of sample texts and rhetorical situations would be beneficial. Many of the students in our study cited their interest in the range of media—digital media in particular—that their instructors bring to the classrooms, so another important outlet for agency is to be found here. In situations where the broader requirements of a program or a department limit how often new media can be used in major projects, low-stakes writing done between projects as preparation or as reflection is far more open. Allowing students to go beyond the usual choices of email or forum posts for daily assignments or to comment on what they have learned could encourage more unexpected, creative, and insightful work (Shapiro et al., 2016). Ferris (2009) suggests that low-stakes writing tasks (such as, but certainly not limited to, blog posts, reading responses, note-taking activities, and posts to social media sites) motivate students to write fluently without being intimidated by risking their grades. Some of these assignments may focus on the culture of writing courses, and they may also invite students to use multiple languages.

Enhancing the cross-cultural environment in which students study and live requires bringing students' languages, cultures, and technologies to the forefront of the writing classroom in order for all students to value and appreciate diverse experiences and engage with translingual approach in writing. As students discuss and write on cross-cultural topics, asking students to utilize their language varieties as well as their cultural ones means students will have to make more rhetorically informed decisions and choices appropriate for the composing situation and the audience to which they are writing. Moreover, if and when multilingual students interact with mainstream students whom they perceive as "American" and "native speakers," they will realize that "standard" English is such a myth (Matsuda, 2006) and that "American" students' use of multiple language varieties can be almost identical to international students' use of multiple languages. Instructors may be in a position to work

with international students on how to better connect with their domestic counterparts, and to reach out to the domestic population of their institution to encourage more cross-culture contact, and to advocate against intolerant attitudes like those that were encountered by some of our study's participants.

Many kinds of opportunities exist for instructors and program administrators to bring student and program expectations into greater alignment. Unlike junior students in Campbell, Fernandez, and Koo's study (this collection) who wanted "to write in a rhetorically appropriate and disciplinary way" (this collection), first-year students in our study had a narrower focus on sentence-level concerns. Incorporating lessons on rhetoric early in a course may contribute to shifting students' expectations and goals from the courses. Likewise, in the months between a student's acceptance to a U.S. university and their first day of class, writing instructors and administrators can collaborate on conveying more explicit information on the expectations of writing courses ahead of time. Sharing detailed course descriptions, using social media to network with incoming students, and encouraging students to engage in short and informal reading and writing activities just prior to the start of a semester are just a few possibilities. Early exposure will strengthen students' familiarity with the new standards and help them adjust their expectations of the program. All of these discussions of the expectations of a translingual course would also make explicit that student writers will have access to a range of linguistic and non-linguistic composing tools.

Preparing teachers for these proposed curricular changes and for translingual practices requires careful consideration. For example, training will enable instructors to understand the rationale and value of adding translingual components before they are asked to practice them in their own classrooms. Training should also give program administrators a chance to anticipate and respond to resistance from instructors to practices that may involve a greater time commitment to prepare, read, comment on, and grade. The number of high-stakes projects in a single course and the time allotted to them should be adjusted accordingly, in order to assure equity for instructor workloads. Furthermore, offering mixed sections of first-year composition classes requires substantial teacher training. The overwhelming majority of instructors at the site of our study have been trained to work almost exclusively with multilingual students, whereas instructors outside the program have very limited, if any, training or experience with multilingual students. This is not a unique situation to in first-year composition courses. Thus, it is essential to train both groups of instructors to teach composition to diverse student populations.

Arnold's (2016) experience at American University Beirut can be a good model to start a much-needed conversation on translingualism. She reported

that the responses to the translingual approach were quite diverse, attributing these varied reactions to the fact that most of those writing instructors had been trained in ESL and EFL contexts and on SLW research that pays excessive attention to students' linguistic "problems" and how minimizing these problems is seen as a sign of success for both the student and teacher. Discussion of articles that form the foundation of the translingual approach should be incorporated into suggested teacher training as a response to the kinds of student concerns, expectations, and frustrations expressed in this study. The questions participants in Arnold's study raise are legitimate, coming from multilingual teachers teaching multilingual students whose language proficiency is questionable and who see "their future success depends on their mastery of standard English only" (2016, p. 80).

Finally, complementing the translingual pedagogy's development of student agency, instructors should learn more about the students with whom they work. Just as their ability to evaluate and choose alternatives for composing texts and for communicating about those texts is based on noticing, so too instructors would do well to notice more about their learners' individual, cultural, linguistic, academic, technological, and other backgrounds beyond simple measures of writing and reading ability. Knowing these details as well as students' academic goals enables the development of more useful and more powerful pedagogy.

References

Arnold, L. R. (2016). "This is a field that's open, not closed": Multilingual and international writing faculty respond to composition theory. *Composition Studies, 44*(1), 72-88.

Árva, V., & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System, 28*(3), 355-372.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 401-417.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). Introduction. In A. S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and classrooms* (pp. 1-10). Routledge.

Canagarajah, S. (2016). Translingual writing and teacher development in composition. *College English, 78*(3), 265-273.

Evans, N. W., Carlin, D. B., & Potts, J. D. (2009). Adjustment issues. In M. S. Andrade & N. W. Evans (Eds.), *International students: Strengthening a critical resource* (pp. 25-41). Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Ferris, D. R. (2009). *Teaching college writing to diverse student populations*. The University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2014). *Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Routledge.

Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Horner, B., Lu, M.-Z., Royster, J. J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Language difference in writing: Toward a translingual approach. *College English, 73*(3), 303-321.

Jones, J. B., & Landis, W. (Eds.) (2019). *Miami Composition teacher's guide*. Hayden-McNeil Publishing.

Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in U.S. College composition. *College English, 68*(6), 637-651.

Matsuda, P. K., & Silva, T. (2011). Cross-cultural composition: Mediated integration of U.S. and international students. In P. K. Matsuda, M. Cox, J. Jordan, & C. Ortmeier-Hooper (Eds.), *Second-language writing in the composition classroom: A critical sourcebook* (pp. 252-265). Bedford/St. Martin's.

Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher.* Macmillan Publishers.

Nation, I. S. P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. Routledge.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change*. Pearson Education.

Office of the Registrar. (2015). *Course list*. http://www.admin.muohio.edu/cfapps/courselist/

Reichelt, M. (2011). Foreign language writing: An overview. In T. Cimasko & M. Reichelt (Eds.), *Foreign language writing instruction: Principles and practices* (pp. 3-21). Parlor Press.

Rogers, P., Zawacki, T., & Baker, S. (2016). Uncovering challenges and pedagogical complications in dissertation writing and supervisory practices: A multi-method study of doctoral student advisors. In S. Simpson, N. Caplan, M. Cox, & T. Phillips (Eds.), *Supporting graduate student writers: Research, curriculum, and program design* (pp. 52-77). University of Michigan Press.

Shapiro, S., Cox, M., Shuck, G., & Simnitt, E. (2016). Teaching for agency: From appreciating linguistic diversity to empowering student writers. *Composition Studies, 44*(1), 31-52.

Shipka, J. (2016). Transmodality in/and processes of making: Changing dispositions and practice. *College English, 78*(3), 250-257.

Spack, R. (2004). The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language: A longitudinal case study, updated. In V. Zamel & R. Spack (Eds.), *Crossing the curriculum: Multilingual learners in college classrooms* (pp. 19-45). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Zamel, V. (2004). Strangers in academia: The experiences of faculty and ESOL students across the curriculum. In V. Zamel & R. Spack (Eds.), *Crossing the curriculum: Multilingual learners in college classrooms* (pp. 3-17). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 3-17.