

# Afterword. Translingual Lives and Writing Pedagogy: Acculturation, Enculturation, and Emancipation

Federico Navarro

UNIVERSIDAD DE O'HIGGINS

## The Local and the Transnational: Between-ness, Beyond-ness

Transnational scholarship on teaching academic writing across borders and between languages is a contradictory endeavor. As Christiane Donahue (this volume) explains, national spaces and borders do exist, as checkpoints and armies dramatically remind us. Nations and regions have recognizable linguistic, cultural, educational, and research practices, as well as policies and traditions. Nevertheless, nations are also imagined communities (Anderson, 2006) that include hybridization, mobility, and connectivity beyond the social narratives of homogeneity and institutional control and categorization. According to Jonathan Hall (this volume), a transnational take “regards borders as porous, fluid, as lines which connect more than they divide.” Therefore, transnational scholarship simultaneously fosters cross-fertilization as “between-ness,” working across nations and regions, but also as “beyond-ness” (Donahue, this volume), working to surpass and transform artificial border restrictions and mono(lingual, cultural, and racial) conceptions.

Several chapters in this collection make the point that the varied features of languages, cultures, and nations challenge common assumptions and need to be acknowledged by translingual writing pedagogy and research. From a transnational perspective, these local considerations can help to prevent the positioning of English/Western theories, practices, and settings as hegemonic and exclusionary (Silva et al., 1997), naturalized as a zero point of observation (Castro-Gómez, 2015). Such a position reinforces a colonial relationship across borders that create patterns of neglect (Donahue, 2009) of worldwide scientific initiatives and traditions.

Amy Hodges (this volume) embodies this theoretical claim in the account of her experience in a transnational writing program in Qatar: the well-meaning methods and analysis put in place by U.S. scholars often seem inadequate in that context. Similarly, the coexistence in Canada of two official languages and active bilingual policies (see Gentil, this volume) responds to needs, offers opportunities, and creates demands that are quite different from those emerging from, for instance, the linguistically, racially, and culturally (super)diverse classrooms in the US, where penalizing the use of vernacular language varieties (such as

African American English) may promote segregation and (self-) stigmatization (Young, 2014). In particular, teaching writing in Canada requires institutional support for academic literacy development in two (or more) national languages. This challenge is similar, but also different, to what happens in countries where national academic language instruction coexists, sometimes problematically, with English as a second language, as Hall and Nela Navarro (this volume) explore in their article for U.S. settings.

Another local contrast, reported by Gentil, is the difference between undergraduate syllabi that promote disciplinary interchange and fluidity between programs (as in the US) and syllabi that compartmentalize the curriculum and aim at early disciplinary specialization (as in Canada). The smaller space of the classroom also presents complex contrasts regarding power structures and learning roles in pedagogical practices. Take Japan, where learning is understood as listening without interrupting the teachers (Kwon, this volume), compared to a learner-centered, socio-constructivist approach where writing/speaking is considered to promote the reorganization and transformation of knowledge. The prevalence of content-dominated assessment practices in Nepal and elsewhere is another example of local constraints for those interested in writing instruction (Sharma, this volume).

Finally, languages, cultures, and nations may also have their distinctive writing habitus or “writing sovereignty,” as Mohammad Shamsuzzaman (this volume) puts it when he refers to writing being treated as an idiosyncratic, individual gift in Bangladesh. These practices and shared views may not comply with rhetorical expectations and criteria naturalized elsewhere as universal, as contrastive/intercultural rhetoric has studied for more than half a century (Connor, et al., 2008). Is the primary goal of writing instruction to produce error-free, well-polished papers in English, as Monica Kwon shows for Japan? Or should teachers focus on higher-level cognitive and rhetorical practices and concerns? Is writing prioritized, intertwined (as in the LSP approach explained by Kwon), or separated from the teaching of other skills/modes of communication (as in the “specialist English” reading-translating approach common in China, according to Yongyan Li, this volume)?

These different national, cultural, linguistic, institutional, and educational contexts have an impact on the theoretical take on translingual writing. Each national and regional educational context does not merely face unique exigencies. Theoretical principles—together with blank spots, which we consider underlying assumptions beyond dispute—are often facilitated by the very social, historical, and institutional conditions of specific settings. That is, varied exigencies have determined much of what we—or some of us, or they (cf. Adler-Kassner & Wardle, 2015)—consider threshold concepts of writing studies, composition, and language teaching. However, given that program diversity (see Hodges) and the flexibility/hybridization of research design (Bazerman, 2011; Prior & Thorne, 2014) are at the very core of writing across the curriculum and writing studies, it is not an easy

matter to recognize how epistemic paradigms (Lincoln, et al., 2017), theoretical traditions, and sociohistorical restrictions constrain our view of reality.

As Tony Silva et al. (1997) point out, culturally-situated pedagogical practices, implicit learning-teaching theories (Pozo, et al., 2006), and social narratives and values must be taken into account when teaching writing. Gentil, for instance, establishes a difference between minorities and their nationally recognized languages, such as indigenous peoples in Canada, and diverse minority groups resulting from migration—a dichotomy A. Suresh Canagarajah (2006) has labeled *national/ethnic* minorities. There are several different implications for this distinction in terms of institutional recognition, validation, and promotion of some languages over others. If a particular language is involved in people's identities and political participation, as Gentil points out regarding French for Francophone Canadians (but also Català for Catalans or Mapuzungun for southern Chilean/Argentinean indigenous people), the inclusive effort to fight monolingual/monoglossic ideologies might be counterproductive. In the words of Gentil, "It can be important for language minorities to preserve the linguistic distinctiveness that helps them index and maintain their identities."

In sum, local, national, or regional constraints must be taken into account because they may represent actual barriers or identity values, as Gentil's case clearly illustrates. A translingual/transnational perspective cannot mean a naïve internationalization or globalization ethic, where the ethnocentric perspectives of the privileged are to be considered universal. As Kwon puts it, "the local context significantly informs practice" based on differentiated instructional expectations, experiences, opportunities, constraints, and agendas. These contextual considerations are especially relevant for WAC/WID approaches that have long acknowledged that rhetorical, pedagogical, and curricular transformations and innovations depend on institutional restrictions and opportunities. The same applies to the expectations, alliances, and resistance of stakeholders and disciplines (McLeod, 2000). At the same time, adaptation to local expectations should be negotiated rather than simply accepted. As shown by Joyce Meier et al. (this volume), writing initiatives may include, as part of their goals, the gradual and collaborative transformation of certain conceptions that may be contrary to writing pedagogy.

Interestingly, this transnational diversity coexists with common challenges across contexts. Complaints about time restrictions to incorporate a writing-to-learn approach to disciplinary instruction emerge as a typical comment from faculty across the world, as Kwon demonstrates for Japan. In addition, reading and writing teaching is often perceived as another barrier to teaching disciplinary knowledge, understood as core learning outcomes in higher education, and often delinked from literacy practices. Similar complaints about time restrictions and the pressure to cover "content" opposing time to writing have been found across the disciplines (Scheurer, 2015).

The lack of explicit goals related to teaching writing, including advanced academic/professional genres in course syllabi, is also shared across countries, as Hodges shows for Qatar; Kwon for Japan; and others for Canada (Graves et al., 2010), the US (Melzer, 2009), Lebanon (O'Day et al., 2013), and Chile (Navarro et al., 2020). Research and teaching agendas may exhibit common, global goals, often fueled by center-periphery dynamics. For example, in 2000, the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) shifted its focus to student learning outcomes and promoted technical communication (Williams, 2001). This created local institutional opportunities and financial support to create initiatives to teach writing in the US (Plumb & Scott, 2002), Chile (Ávila Reyes et al., 2013), and Egypt (Golson & Holdijk, 2012).

## Translingualism as People's Choice

People's resistance—a notion explored by Hodges in this volume—and self-identifications are central concepts to consider when discussing frameworks to interpret data or actions for teaching writing. As Hodges illustrates, the same institution or field may well be interpreted, experienced, and embodied differently by diverse individuals, and these experiences might be in conflict within a single community or social group.

Similarly, the same rhetorical issue may be experienced differently. For Gentil's interviewees, to explore how an English technical term is translated/transformed into French promotes metacognitive and rhetorical skills, while for Hodges' interviewees, keeping technical terms in English is one of the critical pragmatic reasons why they have become more comfortable with communicating in English as a supposed "lingua franca" in multilingual settings. A critical discussion of monolingual/monoglossic ideologies in translingual scholarship must accommodate contrasting tendencies on what people do and value in their use of languages. Distinguishing between original, liminal, and adopting identities—whether racial, linguistic or cultural—is a complicated endeavor, as *transfronterizo*/transborder students demonstrate (Cavazos et al., this volume). What students say about their identities and preferences—or what they embody in their language performances—may complicate or contest our initial assumptions, as Hall and Navarro recognize.

The role and attached values of dominant languages, especially English, are also a key differentiator for translingual/transnational pedagogical and research approaches. Is English considered an unavoidable means to address foreigners and survive in a highly globalized economy (Kwon)? Is it a professional lingua franca for professionals who sometimes speak the same local language (Hodges)? Is it a teaching lingua franca (medium of instruction) to attract overseas STEM students that speak a variety of languages (Kwon)? Is it a national language that has a

predominant role and threatens other national or migration-related languages and attached identities and histories (Gentil)? Is it a learning goal in itself to be used in the future to broaden employment opportunities, as for STEM higher education students in Japan (Kwon)? Or is it a dominant language variety that undervalues other varieties of the same language, discriminates against users, and restricts their use to less-prestigious contexts (Canagarajah, 2006; Young, 2014)?

Translingual research seems to accommodate two different overall traditions that respond to different linguistic, cultural, and national needs and roles. On the one hand, scholarship that draws from teachers of English to speakers of other languages (TESOL), languages for specific purposes (LSP), and applied linguistics is mostly fueled by the need to teach additional languages in transnational contexts. On the other, scholarship that draws from cultural and critical studies is mostly fueled by the need to vindicate vernacular/undervalued varieties of the same language and fight racism and segregation in multicultural contexts. A Chinese undergraduate student acquiring English as a second or foreign language might actively demand feedback on (standard) English language issues. In contrast, a first-generation, national minority student in an elite university in an English-speaking country might actively resist such feedback. This broad distinction is more of a continuum and a permanent dialogue—Hall and Navarro’s chapter is an excellent example of such complexity and complementarity. However, it may help to explain different emphases, theoretical choices, and pedagogical preferences.

Interestingly, the authors in this volume also show how they relate differently to languages other than English in their scholarly writing. Note, for instance, that Donahue uses non-translated French quotations for an article in a U.S.-based publisher. Although French can hardly be considered a peripheral language (or culture), this decision is a statement; it challenges the expectation of translated-into-English quotations while gently inviting readers who do not read French to use now powerful and free translation tools, such as DeepL or Google Translator. After all, the sociolinguistic right to speak the language of one’s choice is a threshold concept in translingual scholarship (Horner, et al., 2011a; Navarro, et al., 2022).

## Translingual Lives to Transform Writing Pedagogy: from Deficit to Assets

The translingual/transnational lens helps to conceptualize “international students” and “(long-term) English language learners”—a euphemism used to refer to language-minoritized, low academic-achieving, low-socioeconomic status students (Flores & Rosa, 2015)—not from a remedial perspective, but from a perspective that considers students’ complex linguistic and cultural background unique *learning incomes* and discursive resources (Guerra, 2015), as well as their dynamic and emerging

identity processes, as Hall and Navarro explain. A remedial, hegemonic perspective on “non-traditional students” (Woolf et al., 2019) assumes a naïve view of language and identity as isolated from the dynamics of power within and among diverse languages and discourses, as Min-Zhan Lu pointed out some thirty years ago (Lu, 1991); linguistic stigmatization is not only, nor mainly based on—decontextualized—language use, but on the speakers’ racial and class positions (Flores & Rosa, 2015).

In contrast, a perspective on students’ learning incomes changes the conversation: it is now up to faculty and institutions, and to the pedagogical principles they draw from, to adapt to and learn from the current scenario of higher education (Ruecker et al., 2017) or, as Hall and Navarro programmatically state, “from imposing institutional identities on students to supporting students’ dynamic identity processes” (this volume). Otherwise, the celebrated “global identity” of the present-day university would “fall short of true transnationalism” (Hall, this volume). A more practical—although complementary—argument claims that monolingual and hegemonic writing pedagogies do not prepare students for contexts of linguistic pluralism (Canagarajah, 2006), which are common in many professional and social contexts nowadays.

Thus, it is not a responsibility of non-traditional students to adapt to the traditional university and the monolingual/monoglossic imperative, but a responsibility of traditional universities to adapt to new learning needs and opportunities (O’Shea et al., 2016), as well as new cultures, languages, identities, and trajectories. Students viewed as “problematic” can no longer be sent somewhere out of the classroom to have their language—and their world view—“fixed,” as Hall and Navarro point out. Without neglecting the language or study support some students may need, the central question should be “what writing cultures do international students bring with them?” (Sharma, 2018, p. 192), as these approaches “value difference as assets and resources for learning” (Meier et al., this volume). In the case of multilingual speakers, assets and resources include—but are not limited to—metalinguistic awareness and terminology learned through employing multilingual and multicultural knowledge and performance, as well as through extended formal training. This awareness and terminology can be useful to identify the goals, structures, and audiences of various genres; to plan, monitor, and revise multimodal texts; and to provide feedback to peers or respond to reviewers (see Cox, 2014).

This Copernican turn—from deficit to resource (Canagarajah, 2002; Horner et al., 2011a), from acculturation to transculturalism (Guerra & Shivers-McNair, 2016; Lu, 1992)—is inextricably linked to a paradigm change on crucial educational and literacy issues that have long been explored by the writing-across-the-curriculum approach: What is good writing? Who is responsible for teaching writing? What is the connection between writing and learning? What role do students’ identities and agency have in writing and learning? What are the implicit expectations of students, instructors, administrators, and institutions about writing, teaching,

learning, and participation? Where does writing intersect with social, cultural, and educational histories and configurations?

Meier et al. provide compelling examples of how these implicit prevailing questions are embodied in teachers' dilemmas in the classroom: the writing professor who complains about the lack of international student participation in class discussion but is unaware that international students may come from culturally inflected norms that do not reward active engagement; the biology professor who fails to unpack expectations for their students on writing tasks such as "analyze," "synthesize," or "justify"; or the business professor who recognizes different levels of language expertise, yet struggles to develop differentiated instruction.

The answer to these broader questions is the basis of a central question for translingual scholarship and writing pedagogy: Should teachers suppress, tolerate, or encourage the use of (vernacular) language varieties, hybrid semiotic forms, and culturally-diverse epistemic rationales for academic purposes? Even if teachers decide to ignore this question, their pedagogical practices will necessarily embody a particular answer to it. To suppress language varieties responds to subtractive approaches and promotes a process of *acculturation*; to tolerate language varieties draws from additive and accommodative approaches and promotes a process of *enculturation*; and to encourage language varieties draws from critical and heteroglossic approaches and promotes *emancipation* (see Canagarajah, 2006; Flores & Rosa, 2015; Guerra & Shivers-McNair, 2016; Lu, 1992).

Furthermore, a deficit-to-resource turn seems complementary to the speaker-to-listener turn, as Nelson Flores and Jonathan Rosa advocate: a critical move and examination, in pedagogy and research, from the speakers' stigmatized language "to the role of the listening subject in producing 'competent' and 'incompetent' language users" (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 167). This turn helps to explain why even students proficient in standardized language may still be labeled as "the other" by a racialized gaze.

## New University, New Scholarship: Diverse Profiles beyond Languages

Some findings in translingual research in this volume are similar to what scholars have found in England, Australia, Peru, and Chile when exploring non-traditional students, whether multilingual or not. "We're not regular students. We're the Irregulars," says an international graduate student in U.S. higher education in Hall and Navarro's study; "I have to study twice as much as someone normal," says a non-traditional student in an inclusive program at an elite university in Chile (Ávila Reyes, et al., 2021). Interestingly, both Hall and Navarro and Ávila Reyes et al. draw from a new literacy studies framework that is aimed at social and cultural dimensions of

literacy in present-day, increasingly diversified higher education. Social and institutional stigmatization of non-traditional students' skills, cultures, and languages is often internalized by students as part of their student identity, and it decreases their self-esteem and racial self-concept. "I see myself as undeveloped," states an indigenous first-in-family student in an Australian university (Stahl et al., 2020, p. 1495); this stigmatization may even be directed toward the original community or social group by the student (Young, 2014).

This connection between a translingual/transnational student profile with other aspects that intersect with writing instruction in non-traditional students is worth exploring. Outdated, prevailing expectations in higher education, including but not restricted to deficit models based on hegemonic, monoglossic views of language and language varieties, marginalize many non-traditional domestic and international students "as incompetent outsiders," as Meier et al. (this volume) put it. Creating networks of WAC/WID transdisciplinary partnerships and "natural allies" among faculty and administrators is critical for institutional change, Gail Shuck insists (this volume), as well as promoting linguistically inclusive pedagogical practices and reimagining pedagogy in teacher training and professional development (Cavazos et al., this volume). Students might also be strategic allies in institutional settings and sociohistorical contexts where they enact political agency and social change, as in Argentina (Moyano & Natale, 2012) and elsewhere.

In truth, situated studies of literacy and translingual scholarship go beyond topics of writing pedagogy, the maximization of learning gains, or the return of institutional and personal investment. The translingual/transnational lens is more broadly oriented towards social and linguistic justice and support of people's unique identities, trajectories, and well-being, as equity "includes not only eliminating discriminatory practices but also valuing such work in material ways" (Shuck, this volume). According to Zavala (2019), linguistic justice refers to "a language education that empowers oppressed individuals and groups in sociopolitical battles over language" (p. 347; my translation) within broader structural social inequities.

This translingual/transnational lens works similarly for writing research across borders. The import/export, "provincialism" model for knowledge-making is outdated (Donahue, 2009), together with the superficially more liberal additive model of participation in science research (Horner et al., 2011b). If the transnational identities of students are characterized for sustained—sometimes uncomfortable—liminality and the continuous creation of "networks of connective meaning across physical distances, language interactions, and cultural contexts" (Hall & Navarro, this volume), transnational writing research should embrace a "sociology of emergences" (Santos, 2018, p. 15) and "commit to exchange beyond unilateral sharing" (Sharma, this volume). In other words, it should recognize practices, knowledge, and agents from across borders, even if they might confront the very basis of central epistemologies and privileges in knowledge-making (Navarro, 2023). However,



such mutually beneficial collaborations among educators and scholars are still to be reported (Sharma, this volume). As Donahue points out, U.S. composition studies are based on the narrative of an American “unique knowledge, expertise, and ownership of writing instruction and writing research” (2009, p. 213). This includes “universal courses, sovereign philosophies and pedagogies, and agreed-on language requirements” (Donahue, 2009, p. 213). This narrative goes together with the narrative of absence, lack, youth, and delay—but expansion and interest—in writing scholarship outside the US.

A translingual/transnational take on writing research means an invitation to engage in dialogue and a desire for exchange (Maldonado-Torres, 2007), and a rejection of a totalitarian approach to knowledge (García & Baca, 2019). The goal is to avoid “importing curricular options in unproductive ways,” as Gentil says, and also to advance knowledge on writing teaching and research based on cross-fertilization among traditions. As Donahue suggests (this volume), “U.S. writing studies seems to sometimes ‘other’ writing instruction and research in countries outside the US that might have different teaching and research traditions.”

## More than a Language: Beyond Monolingual, Beyond Monodialectal

The collection is marked throughout by criticism of the monolingual myth as an oppressing and simplifying ideology, unrelated to actual linguistic practices (Flores & Rosa, 2015). The monolingual myth is also faulted for stigmatizing language varieties and missing learning and knowledge-making opportunities in multilingual classrooms. However, despite adopting translingual practices in the classroom, it is easy to maintain a traditional implicit take on languages as unique, univocal systems. That is, sometimes a claim to understand two languages (say, English and Spanish) as a continuum of resources and practices that bilingual speakers/writers draw from might involve assuming that there is such a thing as a single “English” and a single “Spanish” in the first place.

In contrast, challenging monodialectal ideologies is central to translingual scholarship and is situated at the core of code-meshing (Canagarajah, 2006; Horner, et al., 2011a; Lee & Alvarez, 2020; Young, 2014). As Hall explains, a translingual approach assumes that “all the languages a person knows can be active in the present moment of reading or writing, that all the components of one’s complete communicative repertoire are, at least potentially, simultaneously in play in a mutually re-enforcing manner.” Discussion of language varieties within a single language helps to confront a social narrative that undervalues certain language varieties compared to others, racializes some varieties associated with certain underprivileged and stigmatized social and racial groups, and promotes a diglossia that derives in

“vernacular speech ghettos” (Canagarajah, 2006, p. 598). Such an approach should be rejected, as Cavazos et al. point out for standard academic Spanish in some programs in the US: “our assessment practices should be rooted from within the trans-border student experience rather than imposed by an academic standard, existing outside of or in opposition to those realities” (this volume). Linguistic discrimination is a semi-hidden, semi-indirect means of national, ethnic, racial, or class discrimination (Horner, et al., 2011a; Zavala, 2019). As Flores and Rosa (2015) explain, the negative appraisal of the linguistic practices of language-minoritized populations is typically based on their racial positioning in society—as privileged or underprivileged groups—and it reproduces racial normativity.

Languages include national and local varieties (the “lived language experiences” of students: see Cavazos et al., this volume) that are differently appraised, institutionalized, and used. These tensions within languages impact people’s identities, educational histories, job opportunities, and communication practices. In addition, languages include multiple sociolects that correspond to the ways social groups adapt and use language in their activities to signal their identities. Moreover, there are registers within languages that distinguish uses according to contexts (Halliday, 2007). Competing repertoires of registers will have consequences for educational settings: students with more “prestigious” registers (those closer to conventional scholarly communication) will be valued more positively—explicitly or implicitly—in educational and professional settings (Bernstein & Henderson, 2003; Schleppegrell, 2004).

An example of the possibilities for dialogue across fields and traditions is the code-switching/code-meshing controversy, pointed out by Paul Kei Matsuda (2013). Ashanti Vershawn Young rightly confronts a racialized, segregating pedagogical take on code-switching persisting in U.S. educational settings, where “students are instructed to switch from one code or dialect to another . . . according to setting and audience” (2014, p. 2). This definition seems to correspond to what sociolinguists consider “diglossia”: “a situation where two genetically related varieties of a language, one identified as the H(igh) (or standard) variety and the other as the L(ow) (or nonstandard) variety, have clearly distinct functions in the community” (Kamwangamalu, 2010, p. 119). In contrast, according to sociolinguists, code-switching means the “alternating use of two or more languages or varieties of a language in the same speech situation” (Kamwangamalu, 2010, p. 116) to convey strategic meanings, to negotiate roles among participants, and to build, claim or identify with social identities. The latter closely resembles the definition of code-meshing in translingual studies: “to combine dialects, styles, and registers” (Young, 2014, p. 6) and “accommodate more than one code within the bounds of the same text” (Canagarajah, 2006, p. 598), ultimately “blending home and school identities, instead of keeping them separate” (Young, 2014, p. 3). Although scholars engage in conversations pertaining to their own settings and traditions, these quotes demonstrate

that there is much space for more transnational, transdisciplinary conversations and collaborations. This dialogue would embrace the translanguaging living subject as the core student in writing teaching pedagogy, as Donahue suggests.

From a more general perspective, the role of specific language instruction remains a disputed domain in translanguaging scholarship, as some studies and experiences are explicitly situated outside “language-centric programs,” as Meier et al. (this volume) maintain, while others vindicate necessary LSP support. Gentil (this volume) adds compelling arguments based on the institutionalization of languages in Canada to explain how the fluidity of language boundaries is sometimes limited. Similarly, Hall and Navarro (this volume) use evidence from interviews to claim that specific language teaching is part of learning writing—and a part that is recognized and demanded by international English-as-an-additional-language writers—together with the WAC/WID emphasized learning of ways of doing and thinking in the disciplines. As Donahue points out, we need “to understand the language relationships as wholly integrated into our questions about literacy, and we thus need to understand language itself, how it functions, what it does” (this volume). A difference-as-resource approach to multilingual, multicultural students does not mean adopting a hands-off approach to language issues (Cox, 2014).

In fact, there are specific linguistic features of languages and language families that distinguish how they conceptualize the world and how those conceptualizations are instantiated through grammatical and discursive means. The “variety, fluidity, intermingling, and changeability of languages,” as Horner et al. put it (2011a, p. 305), does not mean that specific structural features of individual languages and language families are unimportant, equivalent, or totally malleable. From a grammatical and psycholinguistic point of view, it is problematic to consider that multi/translanguaging students use “one linguistic repertoire with features that have been societally constructed as belonging to separate languages” (García & Wei, 2014, p. 2), as Gentil critically points out.

Let us take the system of evidentiality as an example. It is part of the grammar repertoire of several indigenous languages in South America. Quechua speakers explicitly contrast through grammatical means whether what they say has been told to them by somebody else (evidentiality marker *-si*) or has been experienced by them firsthand (evidentiality marker *-mi*) (Adelaar, 1997), among other evidentiality resources which in some indigenous languages can be simultaneously combined (Hasler Sandoval et al., 2020). This grammatical system does not exist in languages such as Spanish or English. Is evidentiality societally constructed as belonging to Quechua for bi/multilingual Quechua/Spanish speakers? This does not seem to be the case, although some multilingual Quechua/Spanish speakers may experience it this way.

More importantly, how would a pedagogy of writing deal with multilingual students without some knowledge and attention to these structural features of languages? How does translanguaging in languages that are not structurally and

historically close—such as Spanish/Quechua or Chinese/English—change our take on code-meshing? It is not surprising that, for instance, the pedagogy necessary for teaching Spanish as a second language to Chinese speakers is quite different—and not only for commercial reasons—from the teaching of Spanish to speakers of other languages, as illustrated by the various associations, conventions, journals, and research specifically focused on the Chinese learning community (see, for example, [www.sinoele.org](http://www.sinoele.org)).

Thus, the negotiation of language norms and standards, a fundamental principle in a translingual approach (Horner et al., 2011a), is different from the modification of semantic, syntactic, morphological, and phonological language structures. Users of languages and language varieties actively, creatively, and strategically choose between stable-for-now systems of choices and resources for meaning-making (Halliday, 2014). However, these underlying systems are specific to languages and language families, often automatized, and can be freely modified by a single user only to a certain extent, as in the simultaneous centripetal (centralized, conservative) and centrifugal (heteroglossic, creative) language forces that Bakhtin refers to (Bakhtin, 1981).

Needless to say, there are different Mapuzunguns and Quechuas (Hasler Sandoval et al., 2020), as there are multiple Spanishes and Englishes. Structural contrasts may pertain to varieties of the “same” language as well. African American English, for instance, has a durative aspect grammar marker (the naked “be”) that does not exist in present-day so-called Standard English (Gee, 2015). When young Leona famously exhibits sophisticated literate devices and grammar means as in “my puppy he always be following me,” her teachers misrecognize what she is saying and see her as “deficient”; she eventually is told by an authoritative figure in her early steps into schooling that she does not make sense (Gee, 2015, p. 11).

Beyond controversies on the role of language instruction (Atkinson et al., 2015; Matsuda, 2014), most chapters in this collection agree to quote key references from composition and applied linguistics traditions. According to Donahue, translingual scholarship has “pushed new attention on language in writing, the kind of attention L2 scholars have been advocating” (this volume). Multilingual experiences and skills are considered learning and rhetorical assets; linguistic support is considered together with disciplinary learning and participation; and languages are considered complex political, social, and linguistic dynamic phenomena. This shared view is practical evidence of common scholarly interests in the field, and an enriching example of the collaboration across departments and subfields previously advocated by the translingual program (Horner et al., 2011b).

Discussions on the linguistic basis of translingual research are related to a broader question: what would a linguistically and culturally inclusive pedagogy of translingual/transnational writing be like? Or, in Hall’s terms, “how would Writing Trans- the Curriculum be different?” (this volume). As Meier et al. explain, “while

there has been increasing interest by rhetoric and composition scholars into translingual approaches across the disciplines, particularly in terms of language development and transfer, gaps remain in terms of what this perspective might look like in practice” (this volume; see also Cox, 2014). Cavazos et al. advance the same argument: “instructors are left wondering about what a translingual approach might look like in practice” (this volume).

As several of the chapters in this collection show, key strategies include 1) “develop[ing] pedagogical tools that support students’ sustained examination of language difference” to foster agentive, critical, metalinguistic, transferable skills and rhetorical sensibility; 2) “incorporating alternate modes of communication in the negotiation of meaning” to multiply and acknowledge language modes, varieties, practices, and genres in the classroom; 3) “scaffolding and framing new knowledge in relation to the familiar—including the students’ home languages and cultural knowledge” to value funds of knowledge (Moll et al., 1992) and community cultural wealth (Yosso, 2005); and 4) “disrupting taken-for-granted academic and cultural norms” to make teachers’ expectations and institutional, disciplinary and linguistic conventions explicit and to a certain extent negotiable (see Meier et al., this volume).

Constructing visual maps of classrooms as culturally inflected spaces or inviting students to translate cultural texts from their home language into English (Meier et al., this volume) are just some possible examples of how these principles can be put to work. As explained above, these principles are of an urgent need for non-conventional students in general, who—as well as international students—now comprise the most substantial part of learners in expanding higher education systems worldwide; that is, these principles are of an urgent need for higher education as it is today.

## Further Discussion: Languages, Concepts, Methods

The translingual/transnational take of this collection is implicitly restricted by a shared interest in the role of English in writing instruction. Consequently, several chapters explore how translingual writing instruction establishes complex ties—competition, isolation, collaboration—with TESOL and English for specific purposes. Nevertheless, writing instruction from a translingual/transnational perspective is not restricted, not even mostly related to TESOL or English as a medium of instruction. Perhaps the overrepresentation of English-related transnational writing instruction papers responds to the simple fact that the collection is written in English. What kind of transnational interchanges would emerge if other languages were focused on, as in Zavala’s (2019) critical sociolinguistics exploration of the role of indigenous peoples and languages in Peruvian, Spanish-only, higher education institutions?

Similarly, a significant challenge for a translingual/transnational take on writing research and pedagogy is to simply translate technical terms and frameworks to compare our understanding of how pedagogy and research are configured across borders. As Li shows for China, the lack of mentions of a writing-across-the-curriculum approach does not necessarily mean that there is not a complex scenario of approaches to the teaching of discipline-oriented writing; additionally, there is a need for localized terminology, as Sharma suggests.

The methodologies and rationale for knowledge-making used in this collection of chapters are other aspects that deserve attention. They are mostly based on case studies and anecdotal recall of experiences. They use coursework and students' reflections as evidence, although sometimes without going into specifics about corpus/informants' selection, categorization, coding, and qualitative consistency. What is there about the perspective, the field tradition, the parent disciplines, or the conceptualization of the problem that promotes this kind of data collection and argumentation instead of others?

Finally, some of the cases included in this collection could make it appear as if non-Westernized, non-global-North (Rigg, 2007) settings are underdeveloped or lacking. Moreover, they might contribute to the idea that writing/language pedagogy history and development have certain inevitable milestones and principles that are to be reached in all contexts. Evidently, writing instruction and research might have varying degrees of expansion and history in different places. Nevertheless, that does not mean that a collective agreement—based on the premises and histories of central, Northern countries—is to be expected or desired elsewhere.

## Acknowledgments

Funding from ANID/ PIA/ Basal Funds for Centers of Excellence FB0003 and FONDECYT 1191069 is gratefully acknowledged. Mary Jane Curry read an early draft of this article and made enriching suggestions.

## References

- Adelaar, Willem. (1997). *Los marcadores de validación y evidencialidad en quechua: ¿automatismo o elemento expresivo?* [Validation and evidence markers in Quechua: automatism or expressive element?]. *Amerindia*, 22, 3-13.
- Adler-Kassner, Linda, & Wardle, Elizabeth (Eds.). (2015). *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies*. Utah State University Press.
- Anderson, Benedict. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Verso.

- Atkinson, Dwight, Crusan, Deborah, Matsuda, Paul, Ortmeier-Hooper, Christina, Ruecker, Todd, Simpson, Steve, & Tardy, Christine. (2015). Clarifying the relationship between L2 writing and translanguaging: an open letter to writing studies editors and organization leaders. *College English*, 77(4), 383-386.
- Ávila Reyes, Natalia, González-Álvarez, , & Peñalosa Castillo, Christian. (2013). *Creación de un programa de escritura en una universidad chilena: estrategias para promover un cambio institucional* [Creating a writing program at a Chilean university: strategies to promote an institutional change]. *Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa*, 18(57), 537-560.
- Ávila Reyes, Natalia, Navarro, Federico, & Tapia Ladino, Mónica. (2021). “My abilities were pretty mediocre”: Challenging deficit discourses in expanding higher education systems. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000366>
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist, Trans.; Michael Holquist, ed.). University of Texas Press.
- Bazerman, Charles. (2011). The disciplined interdisciplinarity of writing studies. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 46(1), 8-21.
- Bernstein, Basil, & Henderson, Dorothy. (2003). Social class differences in the relevance of language to socialization. In *Class, codes and control 2: Applied studies towards a sociology of language* (pp. 22-43). Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. (2002). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students*. University of Michigan Press.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. (2006). The place of world Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication*, 57(4), 586-619.
- Castro-Gómez, Santiago. (2015). *Decolonizar la universidad. La hybris del punto cero y el diálogo de saberes* [Decolonize the university. The hybris of the zero point and the dialogue of knowledge]. In Zulma Palermo (Ed.), *Des/decolonizar la universidad* (pp. 79-91). Del Signo.
- Connor, Ulla, Nagelhout, Ed, & Rozycki, William (Eds.). (2008). *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric*. John Benjamins.
- Cox, Michelle. (2014). In response to today’s “felt need”: WAC, faculty development, and second language writers. In Terry Myers Zawacki & Michelle Cox (Eds.), *WAC and second language writers. Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices* (pp. 299-326). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2014.0551.2.12>
- Donahue, Christiane. (2009). “Internationalization” and Composition Studies: Reorienting the discourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 61(2), 212-243.
- Flores, Nelson, & Rosa, Jonathan. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149-171. <https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149>
- García, Ofelia, & Wei, Li. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. Palgrave.
- García, Romeo, & Baca, Damian. (2019). Hopes and visions: the possibility of decolonial options. In Romeo García & Damian Baca (Eds.), *Rhetorics elsewhere and otherwise. Contested modernities, decolonial visions* (pp. 1-48). Conference on College Composition and Communication; National Council of Teachers of English.
- Gee, James Paul. (2015). *Literacy and education*. Routledge.

- Golson, Emily, & Holdijk, Lammert. (2012). The Department of Rhetoric and Composition at the American University in Cairo: Achievements and challenges. In Chris Thaiss, GerdBräuer, Paula Carlino, Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams, & Aparna Sinha (Eds.), *Writing programs worldwide: Profiles of academic writing in many places* (pp. 181-188). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2012.0346.2.16>
- Graves, Roger, Hyland, Theresa, & Samuels, Boba. (2010). Undergraduate writing assignments: An analysis of syllabi at one Canadian college. *Written Communication*, 27(3), 293-317. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088310371635>
- Guerra, Juan. (2015). *Language, culture, identity and citizenship in college classrooms and communities*. Routledge.
- Guerra, Juan, & Shivers-McNair, Ann. (2016). Toward a new vocabulary of motive: Re(con)figuring entanglement in a translingual world. In Bruce Horner & Laura Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing divides. Exploring translingual writing pedagogies and programs* (pp. 19-30). Utah State University Press.
- Halliday, Michael. (2007). Language and social man. In Jonathan Webster (Ed.), *Language and society. Collected works of M. A. K. Halliday* (Vol. 10) (pp. 65-130). Continuum.
- Halliday, Michael. (2014). *An introduction to functional grammar* (Christian Matthiessen, Ed., 4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Routledge.
- Hasler Sandoval, Felipe, Olate Vinet, Aaldo, & Soto Vergara, Guillermo. (2020). *Origen y desarrollo del sistema evidencial del Mapudungun* [Origin and development of the Mapudungun evidential system]. *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*, 81, 9-26. <https://doi.org/10.5209/clac.67928>
- Horner, Bruce, Lu, Min-Zhan, Royster, Jacqueline Jones, & Trimbur, John. (2011a). Language difference in writing: Toward a translingual approach. *College Composition and Communication*, 73(3), 303-321.
- Horner, Bruce, NeCamp, Samantha, & Donahue, Christiane. (2011b). Toward a multilingual composition scholarship: From English only to a translingual norm. *College Composition and Communication*, 63(2), 269-300.
- Kamwangamalu, Nkonko. (2010). Multilingualism and codeswitching in education. In Nancy Hornberger & Sandra Lee McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 116-142). Multilingual Matters.
- Lee, Eunjeong, & Alvarez, Sara. (2020). World Englishes, translingualism, and racialization in the U.S. college composition classroom. *World Englishes*, 39(2), 263-274. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12459>
- Lincoln, Yvonna, Lynham, Susan, & Guba, Egon. (2017). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, revisited. In Norman Denzin & Yvonna Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 213-263). Sage.
- Lu, Min-Zhan. (1991). Redefining the legacy of Mina Shaughnessy: A critique of the politics of linguistic innocence. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 10(1), 26-40. <https://doi.org/10.37514/JBW-J.1991.10.1.04>
- Lu, Min-Zhan. (1992). Conflict and struggle: The enemies or preconditions of basic writing? *College English*, 54(8), 887-913.
- Maldonado-Torres, Nelson. (2007). On the coloniality of being: Contributions to the development of a concept. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2-3), 240-270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162548>



- Matsuda, Paul Kei. (2013). It's the wild west out there: A new linguistic frontier in U.S. college composition. In A. Suresh Canagarajah (Ed.), *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and classrooms* (pp. 128-138). Routledge.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei. (2014). The lure of translingual writing. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 129(3), 478-483. <https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.478>
- McLeod, Susan. (2000). Translating enthusiasm into curricular change. In Susan McLeod (Ed.), *Strengthening programs for writing across the curriculum* (pp. 5-12). The WAC Clearinghouse. [https://wac.colostate.edu/books/landmarks/mcleod\\_programs/](https://wac.colostate.edu/books/landmarks/mcleod_programs/) (Originally published in 1988 by Jossey-Bass)
- Melzer, Dan. (2009). Writing assignments across the curriculum: A national study of college writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 61(2), 240-261.
- Moll, Luis, Amanti, Cathy, Neff, Deborah, & González, Norma. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 31(2), 132-141.
- Moyano, Estela, & Natale, Lucía. (2012). Teaching academic literacy across the university curriculum as institutional policy. The case of the Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento (Argentina). In Chris Thaiss, Gerd Bräuer, Paula P. Carlino, Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams, & Aparna Sinha (Eds.), *Writing programs worldwide: Profiles of academic writing in many places* (pp. 23-34). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2012.0346.2.02>
- Navarro, Federico. (2023). The unequal distribution of research roles in transnational composition: towards illegitimate peripheral participation. In Christiane Donahue & Bruce Horner (Eds.), *Teaching and studying transnational composition*. Modern Language Association.
- Navarro, Federico, Ávila Reyes, Natalia, Calle-Arango, Lina, & Cortés Lagos, Ana. (2020). *Lectura, escritura y oralidad en perfiles de egreso de educación superior: Contrastes entre instituciones y carreras* [Reading, writing and speaking in higher education graduate profiles: Contrasts across institutions and majors]. *Revista Calidad en la Educación*, 52, 170-204. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jerpp.21012.nav>
- Navarro, Federico, Lillis, Theresa, Donahue, Tiane, Curry, Mary Jane, Reyes, Natalia Ávila, Gustafsson, Magnus, Zavala, Virginia, Lauria, Daniela, Lukin, Annabelle, McKinney, Carolyn, Feng, Haiying, & Motta-Roth, Desiree. (2022). Rethinking English as a “lingua franca” in scientific-academic contexts. A position statement. *Journal of English for Research Publication Purposes*. 3(1), 143-153.
- O'Day Nicolas, Maureen, & Annous, Samer. (2013). Assessing WAC elements in business syllabi. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, 76(2), 172-187. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1080569912471709>
- O'Shea, Sarah, Lysaght, Pauline, Roberts, Jen, & Harwood, Valerie. (2016). Shifting the blame in higher education—social inclusion and deficit discourses. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 35(2), 322-336. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2015.1087388>
- Plumb, Carolyn, & Scott, Cathie. (2002). Outcomes assessment of engineering writing at the University of Washington. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 91(3), 333-338. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2002.tb00711.x>

- Pozo, Juan Ignacio, Scheuer, Nora, Mateos, Mar, & del Puy Pérez Echeverría, María. (2006). *Las teorías implícitas sobre el aprendizaje y la enseñanza* [Implicit theories about learning and teaching]. In Juan Ignacio Pozo, Nora Scheuer, María del Puy Pérez Echeverría, Mar Mateos, Elena Martín, & Montserrat de la Cruz (Eds.), *Nuevas formas de pensar la enseñanza y el aprendizaje* (pp. 95-132). Graó.
- Prior, Paul, & Thorne, Steven. (2014). Research paradigms: Beyond process, product, and social activity. In Eva-María Jakobs & Daniel Perrin (Eds.), *Handbook of writing and text production* (pp. 31-54). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rigg, Jonathan . (2007). *An everyday geography of the Global South*. Routledge.
- Ruecker, Todd, Shepherd, Dawn, Estrem, Heidi, & Brunk-Chavez, Beth (Eds.). (2017). *Retention, persistence, and writing programs*. Utah State University Press.
- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa (2018). *The end of the cognitive empire: The coming of age of epistemologies of the south*. Duke University Press.
- Scheurer, Erika. (2015). What do WAC directors need to know about “coverage”? *The WAC Journal*, 26, 7-21. <https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2015.26.1.01>
- Schleppegrell, Mary. (2004). *The language of schooling. A functional linguistics perspective*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sharma, Shyam. (2018). *Writing support for international graduate students. Enhancing transition and success*. Routledge.
- Silva, Tony, Leki, Ilona, & Carson, Joan. (1997). Broadening the perspective of mainstream composition studies: Some thoughts from the disciplinary margins. *Written Communication*, 14(3), 398-428. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074108839701400300>
- Stahl, Garth, McDonald, Sarah, & Stokes, Jennifer. (2020). “I see myself as undeveloped”: Supporting Indigenous first-in-family males in the transition to higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 39(7), 1488-1501. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1728521>
- Williams, Julia. (2001). Transformations in technical communication pedagogy: Engineering, writing, and the ABET engineering criteria 2000. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 10(2), 149-167. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427625tcq1002\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427625tcq1002_3)
- Woolf, Susi, Zemits, Birut, Janssen, Amanda, & Knight, Scott. (2019). Supporting resilience in first year of university: Curriculum, consideration and cooperation. *Journal of Academic Language & Learning*, 13(1), A108-A123.
- Yosso, Tara. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69-91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000341006>
- Young, Vershawn Ashanti. (2014). Are you part of the conversation? In Vershawn Ashanti Young, Rusty Barret, Y Shanda Young-Rivera, & Kim Brian Lovejoy (Eds.), *Other people's English: Code-meshing, code-switching, and African American literacy* (pp. 1-11). Teachers College Press.
- Zavala, Virginia (2019). Justicia sociolingüística para los tiempos de hoy. *Íkala*, 24(2), 343-359. <https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.v24n02a09>