CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION
Crossing Divides: Exploring Translingual Writing Pedagogies and Programs

Bruce Horner and Laura Tetreault

This collection participates in an ongoing movement in the teaching and study of US college writing to respond productively to language difference in writing. Previous efforts to do so have focused on two kinds of such difference: differences in the varieties of English thought to manifest themselves in writing and differences in the specific languages of students. The first of these, represented most prominently by the 1974 Conference on College Composition and Communication statement Students' Right to Their Own Language (SRTOL), defended the legitimacy of varieties of English that appeared to deviate from what was purported to be standard English, most prominently the legitimacy of the language practices of African Americans, as in African American Vernacular English (AAVE) (Conference on College Composition and Communication 1974). Against charges that these varieties represented deficient forms of English or deficiencies in the cognitive abilities of the users, linguists demonstrated the linguistic legitimacy of those practices—their grammar—and thereby, in turn, the racism underlying denials of that legitimacy (see Bruch and Marback 2004; Smitherman 1999; Rouse 1979; Wible 2013). The second of these, building on theories and programs of second language learning, often took the form of the institutional development of distinct programs and curricula for students for whom English was an additional language—often incorrectly identified as only, and all, international students (see Matsuda 1999, 2006)—as well as distinct professional organizations and journals, such as TESOL and its journal *TESOL Quarterly* and the Symposium on Second Language Writing and its accompanying *Journal of Second Language Writing*.[1]

Both such efforts have been salutary in countering deficit notions of the language practices of minoritized groups and in countering the treatment of members of those groups as somehow cognitively deficient

in light of differences in their language practices. But those efforts have been founded on assumptions about languages, relations between languages, and relations between languages and their users that scholarship in these fields and in the contributing and intersecting fields of bilingualism, English as a lingua franca, World Englishes, intercultural rhetoric, sociolinguistics, and second language acquisition is increasingly calling into question (Baker 2013; Belcher 2014; Blommaert 2010; Calvet 1999, 2006; Canagarajah 2011, 2016; Firth and Wagner 1997; Heller 2007; Khubchandani 1998; Leung 2005, 2013; Leung , Harris, and Rampton 1997; Matsuda 1997; Parakrama 1995; Pennycook 2010). In a critique of these assumptions, Bruce Horner and John Trimbur have observed that composition courses themselves emerged out of a chain of reifications of language, social identities, and the links between them whereby individuals are assumed to have only a single social identity tied to a single language (e.g., "Chinese"), competence with which develops in a linear fashion toward mastery (Horner and Trimbur 2002, 596). But increasingly, the identities and language practices of students, teachers, and the larger social realm are defying such reifications. While monolingualism—the language ideology that dictates a single, reified language and social identity for all—remains dominant, its own legitimacy is increasingly in question, as, in the United States and globally, populations, and languages, move, intermix, and fluctuate in identity. And, in response, a flurry of neologisms have emerged from a variety of disciplines and locations globally to name this alternative state of affairs—including "postmonolingualism" (Yildiz 2012), "plurilingualism" (Zarate, Lévy, and Kramsch 2008), "diversalité" (Bernabé, Chamoiseau, and Confiant 1989, 1999), "translanguaging" (García and Li 2014), "code-meshing" (Young and Martinez 2011), "transculturation" (Zamel 1997), and "translingualism" (Canagarajah 2013; Horner et al. 2011). While these terms are not to be equated with one another and are each in dispute as to their meaning, and while this volume deploys the still unsettled term *translingualism* to name this state of affairs and the appropriate orientation to adopt toward it (see Lu and Horner 2016), we can identify some shared alignments among these terms in the orientation they adopt and advocate toward language and the relations among languages and user identities.

First, they signal the acceptance of the copresence of more than one language as the norm of communicative situations rather than a deviation from that norm. Second, they signal the fluidity of the defining boundaries between these languages. Third, and relatedly, they position language use as entailing the mixing and changing of different

languages, and fourth, and also relatedly, they grant agency to language users to do so rather than seeing such mixing and changing as evidence of linguistic failure, cognitive incompetence, or cultural threat. Fifth, they posit the identities of not only languages but also language users as fluid. And finally, they locate languages not outside material social history, as timeless, discrete universals against which language practices are to be measured, but in the material social realm as the always-emerging outcome of those practices.

Such principles redress the gap between actual language practices and identities and relations between these, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, what the ideology of monolingualism claims about these. While often couched in terms of language theory, it is theory developing out of and intervening in the practical effects of monolingualism, part of a larger movement in the politics of language and its teaching. Two phenomena related to forces of globalization have made that gap increasingly difficult for scholars and teachers of composition to ignore. First, there has been a growth in the number of students (and faculty) at US colleges and universities (as well as at colleges and universities outside the United States) whose language identities defy monolinguallanguage ideology's norm of one language/one identity/one nation (Hall 2014). Second, institutions of higher education have increasingly sought not only to recruit such students (as chapters in this collection by Dryer and Mitchell and by Gallagher and Noonan discuss) but also to extend their reach through internationalization of their campuses and programs (see Hesford, Singleton, and García 2009; Martins 2015). Institutions, as well as their students and faculty, are increasingly and constantly on the move, creating satellite and exchange programs that put their identification with a specific location in question and produce new challenges to writing faculty and writing program administrators, as well as to their students, now dispersed globally (see Cross-Border Education Research Team 2016; Doiz, Lasagabaster, and Sierra 2013; Horner and Kopelson 2014; Jenkins 2014; Seawright 2014; Wingate 2015; Ziguras 2005).

The chapters in this collection describe and reflect on current efforts by composition teachers, scholars, and writing program administrators to address the gap between what the ideology of monolingualism claims is the norm for student and faculty language practices and institutional home identities and the increasingly undeniable fact of students' and faculty's linguistic heterogeneity, the inherent instability of languages as the always-shifting outcome of practices, and the dispersed and shifting location of faculty, students, and programs. While responsive to previous

attempts to address language difference in composition teaching, these current efforts aim to move beyond the limitations monolingualism has placed on conceptions of language difference and how it might best be addressed in our thinking, teaching, and research (see, for example, Canagarajah 2006, 2009; Horner 2001; Horner and Kopelson 2014; Horner, NeCamp, and Donahue 2011; Lu 2004, 2009; Matsuda 2006; Young 2009). In place of maintaining sharp institutional, programmatic, disciplinary, curricular, and pedagogical divides on the basis of the putatively stable language identities and backgrounds ascribed to students, compositionists are attempting to develop alternative ways of imagining and putting to useful work alternative conceptions of language, language relations, and users' language practices and identities.

Those making such attempts draw on disparate traditions in and beyond composition's traditional—that is, monolingualist—disciplinary purview, including (though not limited to) not only scholarly and teaching traditions in what has passed as the norm for first-year writing but also traditions in the study and teaching of second language writing and basic writing, and scholarship on English as a lingua franca, world Englishes, second language acquisition, intercultural and comparative rhetorics, bilingualism, and translation studies. In so doing, of course, compositionists are building on the insights of these traditions. However, given the dominance of monolingualist ideology, those drawing on these traditions must also confront the inevitable, if residual, strands of monolingualism they carry within them, as Thomas Lavelle notes in his response chapter in this book. Further, as Christine Tardy notes in her response chapter, in drawing on diverse traditions of scholarship and teaching, compositionists will inevitably find themselves rediscovering what those well versed in those traditions may see as old news (e.g., the mythic character of the native speaker), though put to possibly different uses. Finally, in efforts to apply insights taken from these diverse traditions to what appear to be novel situations, compositionists will inevitably give new, unauthorized meanings to terms and concepts with established meanings within those traditions—most notoriously, for example, code switching (see Guerra and Shivers-McNair, this volume ; Lu 2009; Matsuda 2013; Young 2009). As Min-Zhan Lu (2004) has noted, composition teachers and scholars have a long history of "poaching" from a variety of "other" fields to address new, or newly discovered, and above all urgent, challenges they face: taking what is claimed to belong to others as, instead, part of the commons and putting what is taken to uses different than what others see as either appropriate or legitimate.

But the chapters in this collection attest that there is a further facet to the challenge compositionists face as they rework old tools to put them to different ends. Not only are the readily available terms and concepts inadequate to describe the reality we face and the ends we aim for—as suggested by the roughly simultaneous emergence of such neologisms as *translingualism, plurilingualism, translanguaging, transcultural literacy, code meshing*, and *diversalité* to replace such terms as *multilingual* and *bilingual*. There is the challenge that the ideology of monolingualism inheres not merely in our discourse but in the academic institutional structures of programs and curricula as well as pedagogies and placement and existing assessment technologies and daily practices. For, to recall Pierre Bourdieu's warning, language ideology "is inscribed, in a practical state, in dispositions which are impalpably inculcated, through a long and slow process of acquisition, by the sanctions of the linguistic market" (Bourdieu 1991, 51). To combat monolingualist ideology, then, requires working not merely on professions of belief but on the inculcation of language dispositions and on sanctions of the linguistic market. In short, those attempting to explore translingual writing pedagogies and programs by crossing institutional disciplinary divides have their work cut out for them.

At the same time, as all the chapters in this collection make clear, there is both excitement and urgency driving such efforts. Resisting the temptation to stabilize (for purposes of analysis) and to parse out differences in the theoretical positions various of these efforts might align or conflict with, the contributors' chapters, and this collection as a whole, are driven by a shared sense of the need to work against monolingualism in writing and its teaching, issuing a resounding "No!" to monolingualism's insistence that students marked by (marked) language difference be quarantined as ESL or BW or (merely) FYW students and kept from admission to the academic community as full members, and to the normalizing of those writers that monolingualist ideology treats as unmarked by language difference. Following the lesson of the Buddhist parable of the poisoned arrow (see Hanh 1991, 299–300), we recognize that what matters most—to our students, ourselves, and our shared work and lives together—is finding the antidote to monolingualism's poison.

This is not, of course, to discount the value of theoretical parsing to verify the effectivity of the antidotes to monolingualism being pursued. As Juan Guerra and Ann Shivers-McNair argue in their chapter, discussions of translingualism have "evolved," shifting from a focus on disenfranchised students to all writers, and in the process have come to be marked by debates on how best to understand the problem, producing a

Bourdieuian "battlefield" of competing terms and concepts both drawn and reworked from a range of disciplinary traditions. Participating in this transdisciplinary effort, Guerra and Shivers-McNair themselves draw on feminist quantum physicist Karen Barad's notions of entanglement and diffraction. These concepts enable them to read (diffractively) the figurations of translingualism with quantum notions of entanglement and diffraction to further understand the significance of the temporal dimension of utterances (and the attendant difference this brings) and its intertwining with the spatial, and to better grasp the sedimentation of language practices and conceptualize the key concept of agency on which much of the debate on translingual writing has focused (see, for example, Lu and Horner 2013).

From a quite different perspective, in their chapter, Sara P. Alvarez, Suresh Canagarajah, Eunjeong Lee, Jerry Won Lee, and Shakil Rabbi take up the charged issue of the relationship between ethnic identities and heritage languages, a relationship a translingual perspective challenges. Noting that "ethnic identities and heritage languages are always already translingual," the authors also recognize the ideological reality of the "unique identity" of the mix of practices identified with any one of these (e.g., Korean, Spanish, Tamil [as ethnolinguistic categories]) (33). Using instances from their own teaching and learning experiences, the authors show the dialectical dance between ascribed ethnolinguistic identities and translingual practice. Acknowledging that there is no escape from ascriptions of "voice, identity, or ethnicity" but also that these are never stable or pure, the authors' accounts show the need to be strategically "proactive" in response to these ascriptions, using whatever linguistic and other resources are available, and those ascriptions themselves, to engage in performances of identity (45).

The chapters in part 2, "Pedagogical Interventions," describe specific efforts to work against the inscription of monolingualist ideology in pedagogy. In "Enacting Translingual Writing Pedagogy: Structures and Challenges for Two Courses in Two Countries," William Lalicker describes two composition courses he identifies as translingual. Not only are the courses intended to enroll students with a diverse range of language backgrounds and practices, but the design of the courses takes that diversity as the norm and context to be engaged in and through assigned course work. Rather than restricting the course focus to students identified as international and/or ESL, and rather than assuming the myth of linguistic homogeneity (all students as "native" English-speaking monolinguals [Matsuda 2006]) as the norm for students to represent and follow, Lalicker's courses take the presence of, and need

to work across, English(es) and other languages as the (translingual) statistical and cultural norm, making "translingual rhetorical interaction central" to the pedagogy and to students' writing (52). However, in the efforts Lalicker describes at achieving equitable exchange in his courses between and among students from China and the United States, he also cautions that "extend[ing] translingualism to its fully international enactment" requires attention to the material conditions necessary to such enactment, conditions currently available only to students with significant financial means (65). Otherwise there is a risk that any international enactment of translingual approaches will come to be both a means and sign of privilege.

In "Who Owns English in South Korea," Patricia Bizzell explores the implications of notions of language ownership by attending to the various senses in which contemporary South Koreans might be said to "own" English despite the status of English in South Korea as a second rather than first language without official status. Drawing on the South Korean history of language politics, Bizzell's own experience teaching English in South Korea, and her study of the teaching of English in South Korea and the employment experiences of expat English teachers in South Korea, Bizzell identifies a range of conflicting treatments of English." These including significant flexibility in the conceptualization and use of English (including an acceptance of Konglish), a racialized concept of English and a racialized, gendered, ageist, and regionalist ideal for teachers of English (with young white female North Americans preferred), a complacent view of the intermixing of languages—such as Chinese, Japanese, and English with Korean—and a progressive view of language learning. Bizzell's account of English "ownership" in South Korea thus throws into sharp relief those approaches to and conceptions of language and language relations dominating practices of US educational institutions and culture while also offering a cautionary tale on celebrations of extending language ownership, highlighting the need to attend to the location and specific ways such ownership is instantiated.

Both Lalicker and Bizzell focus on international exchanges and differences in languages (e.g., Korean, English, Chinese, Japanese) as sites for and means of advancing translingual approaches to writing. In "Teaching Translingual Agency in Iteration: Rewriting Difference," Bruce Horner takes a different route, focusing not on how to accommodate those differences in language monolingualism has already disposed us to recognize as differences but, rather, on differences inherent to any and all utterances, including those monolingualism disposes us to view not as different at all but, instead, as instances of "the same."

Cautioning that pedagogies that might seem to work against monolingualism may inadvertently perpetuate it by accepting its definitions of what counts as language difference, and that pedagogies that might superficially appear to perpetuate monolingualism might call it into question, Horner asks that we design assignments that help us and our students "rethink what differences might be made through and in all writing practices, whether marked by the dominant as conventional writing or as unconventional" (92). And he offers double translation as a means of calling into question monolingualist notions of languages as stable and uniform "codes."

The chapters in part 3 address interventions in the monolinguistic frameworks dominating the teaching of postsecondary writing at the programmatic level: matters of curriculum, assessment, and the larger shifts in student demographics and institutional missions to which writing programs must respond. In "Disrupting Monolingualist Ideologies in a Community College: A Translingual Studio Approach," Katie Malcolm focuses on using acceleration programs in community colleges to advance translingual approaches to writing and its teaching. By calling for "institutional and classroom practices that examine, critique, and resist the monolingualist ideologies that deem certain students in need of remediation from the outset" (103), Malcolm draws attention to the necessity of questioning monolingualist assumptions at the level of programmatic reform. While the elimination or reduction of remedial course requirements that acceleration programs accomplish is a step in the right direction, Malcolm reminds us that the new requirements taking their place must work to instill "pedagogical practices that help students recognize their language differences as iterative assets for disseminating and creating knowledge"(103) to avoid playing into the same monolingualist ideology that has long marginalized multilingual students placed into remedial courses. And to benefit all students, Malcolm calls for an explicit pedagogical focus on seeing differences as important resources, instilling dispositions of openness to negotiate these differences and providing strategies for uncovering and critiquing the systems of valuation that construct some language practices as different and others as the norm.

To investigate how language ideologies inform the ways in which instructors evaluate students, Asao B. Inoue, in "Writing Assessment as the Conditions for Translingual Approaches: An Argument for Fairer Assessments," considers assessment as one site where writing programs can "find ways to cultivate a degree of fair conditions that agree with the basic assumptions translingual approaches hold" (119). Proceeding

from the premise that we need new ways to assess writing if writing teachers and programs are to adopt translingual approaches to language, Inoue posits that "writing assessments must honor and value in tangible ways students' language practices and histories and not punish students for producing language difference (to a hegemonic norm)" (120). To help develop these kinds of assessments that see language difference as a much richer matter than correct or incorrect usage, Inoue argues specifically for assessment approaches that give more power to students through careful respect, listening, and negotiation. Inoue's examination of assessment demonstrates how translingual approaches call for a reconsideration of previously entrenched practices at the pedagogical and programmatic levels and how translingual conditions for learning can be constructed through revised assessment practices.

In "Seizing an Opportunity for Translingual FYC at the University of Maine: Provocative Complexities, Unexpected Consequences," Dylan Dryer and Paige Mitchell argue for a "documentary" approach to writing program administration. Attending to the ways institutional "documents 'enact' intentions tangential to or counter to our efforts" (148), they explore "networks of documents and administrative structures" with which translingual dispositions can be scaffolded (135). Their efforts at Maine show the productive complexities that arise from attempting to teach students within the framework of a translingual curriculum, how translingual approaches may be impacted by a university's recruitment efforts for international students, and how documents such as rater responses to student portfolios can influence dispositions toward language use.

Chris Gallagher and Matt Noonan address similar tensions in "Becoming Global: Learning to 'Do' Translingualism." Gallagher and Noonan examine the dynamic between Northeastern University's "branding" as a global university and the writing program's efforts to develop translingual approaches to instruction and assessment. Their analysis of that dynamic leads them to the realization that translingualism is "not a state of being, but rather a process we must learn and learn again" (165), and that this process will likely look different in various institutional contexts. Treating translingual dispositions as learning practices, Gallagher and Noonan also draw attention to the necessity of preparing teachers and administrators for encountering what is recognized as language difference in student work, which involves "learning about and from students how to teach them" (166). Fostering these learning processes also involves confronting the labor conditions within a writing program that may enable or constrain the ability to prepare

instructors for encounters with language difference. Gallagher and Noonan explore how to foster translingual approaches at two levels—programmatic policy and pedagogy in specific courses—leading them to argue that for such an approach to be "meaningful and productive for students, it must be integrated into, must emerge from, their reading and writing practices" (175), which are also continually evolving.

The chapters by Christine Tardy, Thomas Lavelle, and Kate Mangelsdorf comprising part 4 offer considered responses to and perspectives on the efforts at crossing divides represented by the other chapters. Writing from the perspective of applied linguistics, Tardy cautions that the use of new terminology—such as *translingualism*—for naming language ideologies, practices, and pedagogies may have the unintended effect of cutting off attention to extant relevant and aligned knowledge represented under the guise of more established terms in fields traditionally kept at arm's length from composition—for Tardy, especially the fields of second language writing, World Englishes, and second language acquisition. And, echoing Dryer and Mitchell and others (see, for example, Kilfoil 2014), Tardy calls for reforming graduate education in composition to give renewed emphasis to language study as central, rather than ancillary, to the study of writing and its teaching and thereby to support crossing of the disciplinary divides currently segregating work in all these fields.

In "Ins and Outs of Translingual Labor," Thomas Lavelle uses Imre Lakatos's distinction between centrifugal and centripetal forces in disciplinary work to draw out a tension in contributors' chapters between attempts to articulate translingual beliefs about language and ideology and attempts to enact these in curricula, programs, and pedagogy. In line with the caution from Bourdieu we note above about the inscription of dominant language ideologies in dispositions and institutional structures, Lavelle notes what he terms the "seepage" of monolingualist ideology even into those practices intended to combat it as teacher-scholars and program administrators confront that inscription. This leads Lavelle to offer, as a kind of heuristic for such work, attention to an "arc linking language ideology > individual and institutional complicity > insufficient training in thinking about language > unfair portfolio assessments" (196). While he sees the need for more attention to the third link in this arc as an antidote to monolingualist seepage, he also acknowledges that every link in such cycles has the potential to be simultaneously a point of reinforcement of and break in that cycle.

Kate Mangelsdorf offers a similar assessment. Noting the diversity of pedagogical, curricular, and programmatic practices being pursued

under the translingual rubric, she argues for the need to see efforts at translingual enactments described in the collection's chapters as "developmental," and, in light of the intransigence of institutional structures, she cautions that these will "take a long time to implement, involve a great deal of compromise, and can initially lead to resistance and confusion" (199). Furthering Tardy's call for changes to graduate-program curricula to address language issues, Mangelsdorf also highlights the challenges attempts at such changes face in overcoming entrenched claims to curricular space in graduate programs and the threat renewed attention to language might appear to pose to the privileged space occupied in graduate-program curricula by courses in, say, rhetorical theory and history. But she also calls for pursuing additional avenues by which a translingual orientation might advance, such as its relation to teaching and scholarship addressing the multimodal character of communicative practices.

In the article "Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach," the authors acknowledge that in fact "we are still at the beginning stages of our learning efforts in this project" (Horner et al. 2011, 310). *Crossing Divides* helps those efforts by providing specific, concrete explorations, from a wide variety of institutional conditions and perspectives, of what might be involved in taking up a translingual approach in our work as composition teachers, scholars, and program administrators. To attempt to cross divides means, first and foremost, recognizing the presence of the institutional, disciplinary, programmatic, curricular, and pedagogical divides we face, just as cross-language work must take as its point of departure the presence of languages to be "crossed." Simultaneously, however, crossing these divides requires that we refuse to accept the inherent stability of the borders separating us, recognizing that, though real, those borders are also the outcome of, and are therefore dependent on and vulnerable to, our practices—in our work as teachers, scholars, and program administrators. As Louis-Jean Calvet has warned of linguists' representations of language practices, these representations "act on practices and are one of the factors of change" (Calvet 1999; 2006, 241), noting that, for example, "*the invention of a language* and consequently the *way it is named* constitute an intervention in and modify the ecolinguistic niche" (Calvet 1999; 2006, 248).

Those attempting to cross divides produced by and maintaining the ideology of monolingualism must contend with this dialectic: confronting, by reworking, those representational practices in their work as teachers, scholars, and program administrators that heretofore have helped maintain the hegemonic position of monolingualism, whether by giving new inflections to these representational practices, twisting

their shape and significance, or finding in putatively monolinguistic traditions the bases for monolingualism's demise. Like national borders, divides meant to keep separate can unwittingly bring the underlying continuities they deny into visibility. The divides we cross—of differences in language, identity, discipline, program, curriculum, and pedagogy—while bringing into often sharp relief the work cut out for us, also offer the means by which we can, and must, take up that work. The chapters in this collection show us the shape this work can take.

Note

1.   The focus of the Symposium on Second Language Writing and the *Journal of Second Language Writing* is not restricted to writing only in English as a second language.

References

Baker, Will. 2013. ""Interpreting the Culture in Intercultural Rhetoric: A Critical Perspective from English as a Lingua Franca Studies." 2013." In *Critical and Corpus-Based Approaches to Intercultural Rhetoric*, edited by Diane Belcher and Gayle Nelson, 22–45. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Belcher, Diane. 2014. "What We Need and Don't Need Intercultural Rhetoric for: A Retrospective and Prospective Look at an Evolving Research Area." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 25 (1): 59–67.

Bernabé, Jean, Patrick Chamoiseau, and Raphaël Confiant. 1989. *Éloge de la créolité*. Paris: Gallimard.

Bernabé, Jean, Patrick Chamoiseau, and Raphaël Confiant. 1999. *In Praise of Creoleness*. Translated by Mohamed B. Taleb Khyar. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Blommaert, Jan. 2010. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Edited by John B. Thompson. Translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruch, Patrick, and Richard Marback, eds. 2004. *The Hope and the Legacy: The Past, Present, and Future of "Students' Right to Their Own Language."* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.

Calvet, Louis-Jean. 1999. *Pour une écologie des langues du monde*. Paris: Plon.

Calvet, Louis-Jean. 2006. *Towards an Ecology of World Languages*. Translated by Andrew Brown. London: Polity.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. 2006. "The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued." *College Composition and Communication* 57 (4): 586–619.

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

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. 2011. "Afterword: World Englishes as Code-Meshing." In *Code-Meshing as World English: Pedagogy, Policy, Performance*, edited by Vershawn Ashanti Young and Aja Y. Martinez, 273–81. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

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

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. 2016. "Crossing Borders, Addressing Diversity." *Language Teaching* 49 (3): 438–54.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. 1974. "Students' Right to Their Own Language." Special issue, *College Composition and Communication* 25. http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Groups/CCCC/NewSRTOL.pdf.

Cross-Border Education Research Team. (2016). "Branch Campus Listing." Last updated June 17, 2016. http://www.globalhighered.org/?page_id=34.

Doiz, Aintzane, David Lasagabaster, and Juan Manuel Sierra, eds. 2013. *English-Medium Instruction at Universities: Global Challenges.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

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

García, Ofelia, and Wei Li. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hall, Jonathan. 2014. "Multilinguality Is the Mainstream." In *Reworking English in Rhetoric and Composition: Global Interrogations, Local Interventions,* edited by Bruce Horner and Karen Kopelson, 31–48. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Hanh, Thích Nh t. 1991. *Old Path White Clouds: Walking in the Footsteps of the Buddha.* Berkeley, CA: Parallax.

Heller, Monica, ed. 2007. *Bilingualism: A Social Approach.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hesford, Wendy, Eddie Singleton, and Ivonne M. García. 2009. "Laboring to Globalize a First-Year Writing Program." In *The Writing Program Interrupted: Making Space for Critical Discourse,* edited by Donna Strickland and Jeanne Gunner, 113–25. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Horner, Bruce. 2001. "'Students' Right,' English Only, and Re-Imagining the Politics of Language." *College English* 63 (6): 741–58.

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

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

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

Horner, Bruce, and John Trimbur. 2002. "English Only and U.S. College Composition." *College Composition and Communication* 53 (4): 594–630.

Jenkins, Jennifer. 2014. *English as a Lingua Franca in the International University: The Politics of Academic English Language Policy.* London: Routledge.

Khubchandani, Lachman M. 1998. "A Plurilingual Ethos: A Peep into the Sociology of Language." *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 24 (1): 5–37.

Kilfoil, Carrie Byars. 2014. "The Language Politics of Doctoral Studies in Rhetoric and Composition: Toward a Translingual Revision of Graduate Education in the Field." PhD diss., University of Louisville.

Leung, Constant. 2005. "Convivial Communication: Recontextualizing Communicative Competence." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15 (2): 119–44.

Leung, Constant. 2013. "The 'Social' in English Language Teaching: Abstracted Norms versus Situated Enactments." *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 2 (2): 283–313.

Leung, Constant, Roxy Harris, and Ben Rampton. 1997. "The Idealised Native Speaker, Reified Ethnicities, and Classroom Realities." *TESOL Quarterly* 31 (3): 543–75.

Lu, Min-Zhan. 2004. "Composing Post-Colonial Studies." In *Crossing Borderlands: Composition and Postcolonial Studies,* edited by Andrea Lunsford and Lahoucine Ouzgane, 9–32. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Lu, Min-Zhan. 2009. "Metaphors Matter: Transcultural Literacy." *JAC* 29 (1–2): 285–93.

Lu, Min-Zhan, and Bruce Horner. 2013. "Translingual Literacy, Language Difference, and Matters of Agency." *College English* 75 (6): 586–611.

Lu, Min-Zhan, and Bruce Horner. 2016. "Translingual Work." *College English* 78 (3): 207–18.

Martins, David S., ed. 2015. *Transnational Writing Program Administration.* Logan: Utah State University Press.

Matsuda, Paul Kei. 1997. "Contrastive Rhetoric in Context: A Dynamic Model of L2 Writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 6 (1): 45–60.

Matsuda, Paul Kei. 1999. "Composition Studies and ESL Writing: A Disciplinary Division of Labor." *College Composition and Communication* 50 (4): 699–721.

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

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

Parakrama, Arjuna. 1995. *De-Hegemonizing Language Standards: Learning from (Post)Colonial Englishes about "English."* London: Palgrave.

Pennycook, Alastair. 2010. *Language as a Local Practice.* London: Routledge.

Rouse, John. 1979. "The Politics of Composition." *College English* 41 (1): 1–12.

Seawright, Leslie E., ed. 2014. *Going Global: Transnational Perspectives on Globalization, Language, and Education.* Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Smitherman, Geneva. 1999. "CCCC's Role in the Struggle for Language Rights." *College Composition and Communication* 50 (3): 349–76.

Wible, Scott. 2013. *Shaping Language Policy in the U.S.: The Role of Composition Studies.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Wingate, Ursula. 2015. *Academic Literacy and Student Diversity: The Case for Inclusive Practice.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Yildiz, Yasemin. 2012. *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition.* New York: Fordham University Press.

Young, Vershawn Ashanti. 2009. "'Nah, We Straight': An Argument Against Code Switching." *JAC* 29 (1–2): 29–46.

Young, Vershawn Ashanti, and Aja Martinez, eds. 2011. *Code-Meshing as World English: Policy, Pedagogy, Performance.* Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Zamel, Vivian. 1997. "Toward a Model of Transculturation." *TESOL Quarterly* 31 (2): 341–51.

Zarate, Geneviève, Danielle Lévy, and Claire Kramsch, eds. 2008. *Précis du plurilinguisme et du pluriculturalisme.* Paris: Éditions des Archives Contemporaines.

Ziguras, Christopher. 2005. "International Trade in Education Services: Governing the Liberalization and Regulation of Private Enterprise." In *Globalizing Education: Policies, Pedagogies, and Politics*, edited by Michael W. Apple, Jane Kenway, and Michael Singh, 93–112. New York: Peter Lang.