

## CONTENTS

<i>List of Illustrations</i>	ix
<i>Preface</i>	xi
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xv
Introduction	3
1 Language Ideologies in Teaching Writing: A Language Representations and/as Practices Perspective	20
2 Working Translingual Language Representations and/as Practices	41
3 Unpacking Local Language Representations and/as Practices: Portraits of Postmonolingual Tensions from Beirut	63
4 Unpacking Local Language Representations and/as Practices Continued: Postmonolingualism in Seattle	103
5 Translingual Activism: Turning up the Volume of Critical Translation in Writing Pedagogy	140
Conclusion: Lessons on Thinking and Doing Translinguality with Beirut and Seattle	174
<i>Appendix A: An Ethnography of Language Representations and/as Practices</i>	186
<i>Appendix B: Profiles of Featured Participants</i>	195
<i>Appendix C: Student Interview Protocol</i>	196
<i>Appendix D: Teacher Interview Protocol</i>	198
<i>Notes</i>	201
<i>References</i>	213
<i>About the Author</i>	227
<i>Index</i>	229

## INTRODUCTION

*We discussed whether it was correct before we ran it. It's grammatical, if you think about what we're trying to say. It's not think the same, it's think different. Think a little different, think a lot different, think different. "Think differently" wouldn't hit the meaning for me.*

(cited in Isaacson 2011, 330)

*I know that most conventional academic American readers expect me to explain my main argument at the beginning of my essay. However, as a writer who was educated in an eastern culture and whose writing is inspired by the work of an established Chinese writer Xun Lu, I choose to write this essay following a Chinese writing style that keeps the main argument at the end of a writing piece. Due to the complexity and richness of my experiences [with language], readers of my essay need to be a patient because my deep feelings [about language] that have changed over time cannot be captured by a single statement or two. I hope this decision would encourage my readers to focus more on my personal experiences and collaborate with me in order to grasp my conclusion about the power of language in expressing one's feelings and emotions and bringing different writing styles and cultures together.*

(Ruijia, freshman English student, Fall 2013)

Despite prolonged deliberations with a team from a large multinational advertising agency and his in-house editors about the grammaticality of the “*Think Different*” slogan the company chose for its 1997 brand image campaign, Steve Jobs, the late co-founder and CEO of Apple, Inc. at the time, insisted on adopting the now famous line and sticking to the ungrammatical usage of “different” rather than its adverbial form “differently.” Selling a large number of electronic devices to schools and college students nationally and across the globe, Jobs and his team “wrestled with the language” and feared that the grammatically incorrect slogan might cause “English teachers to break out in hives” (Blumenthal 2012, 192). As Jobs explained in his authorized biography,

he intentionally chose to use the word *different* as a noun, as in “think victory” (cited in Isaacson 2011, 330), “think vision,” or “think genius.” Through the term *different*, he also wanted to capture a sense of colloquialism, as in the popular mantra “think big or go home,” which echoed American society’s attitudes toward enterprise, boldness, and success (Isaacson 2011, 330). In addition to manufacturing and distributing what was “inside the boxes” consumers used to accomplish their daily tasks (“Apple Confidential” 2013), Jobs in an internal meeting described his strong desire to (re)build Apple’s identity and purpose as inspiring and empowering people to think and get “outside the box” in the same way the different-thinking figures honored in this brand marketing campaign, as the ad puts it, have “push[ed] the human race forward” (Isaacson 2011, 329).<sup>1</sup> Recounting the genesis and architecture of the “Think Different” campaign and the “different” thinking behind its ungrammatical slogan, Jobs, as illustrated in the above quotation, argued that the standardized grammatically correct phrase “think differently” couldn’t capture the full range of social meanings of significance to his vision and to what he described as the company’s “core values” of “tak[ing] risks,” defying the status quo, and ultimately “chang[ing] the world” by doing things in a different way (“Apple Confidential” 2013; cf. Isaacson 2011). Imbued with a sense of fluidity, malleability, and change, the idiosyncratic phrase “think different” projected an intention to place in the spotlight not what computer products could do in terms of “processor speed or memory” but, more important, “what creative people could do with” them (Isaacson 2011, 328). In other words, the strategic language design in the “Think Different” campaign was intended to encourage consumers to reimagine and reconstruct their own identities as “creative, innovative rebels” by utilizing Apple products over time and across space (Isaacson 2011, 331–32).

One might claim that such a view of language as mobile and fluid and the subsequent practice of strategically shaping it for particular ends is (1) made possible thanks to Jobs’s privileged status and power to “play by his own set of rules” (Isaacson 2011, 117), given his mainstream sociocultural identity and possession of high cultural and economic capital; (2) meaningful and relevant for the kind of attention-getting or thought-provoking marketing and advertising practices necessary in the corporate world; but (3) not authorized in other social spheres, especially the educational realm where various gatekeeping and policymaking mechanisms are often uncompromising in their firm expectations that all language and literate usage abide by the dominant culture’s standardized norms and conventions. For those reasons combined, I

have presented the second excerpt, which demonstrates how Ruijia, a Chinese student in one of my first-year writing courses, chose to revise her introduction in response to my suggestions that she rework and narrow her ideas to a clear, concise statement of her main argument, customarily appearing early on in academic texts.

Ruijia seemed fully aware that conventional academic readers, including myself and her peers, would demand that student writers thoroughly “explain” their position “at the beginning” of a text. Interestingly, she still made an informed choice of refusing to sidestep her sense of what truly mattered to the specificity of the rhetorical situation in which she was writing and what more fully captured, as she stated, the “complexity and richness” of her diverse linguistic and cultural experiences. Rather than blindly conform to the conventions of English academic writing as I had suggested in my written comments, thereby constructing her identity into a passive, unquestioning role, Ruijia reconfigured and reconstituted conventional teacher-student/reader-writer relationships by moving into the more active role of a negotiator. In her individual literate negotiations, for instance, she acknowledged her readers’ expectations and clearly articulated what she was willing to offer them and the type of engagement she expected from them in return for more successful communication and meaning creation (in this case, what she described as favorable dispositions of patience, accommodation, and collaboration). The very act of her entering into a give-and-take dynamic of negotiations with a clearly articulated goal of making deals with her readers about reconsidering the social value, validity, and effectiveness of the nonconventional rhetorical traits of her English written discourse is suggestive of Ruijia’s strong authorial voice and presence. I will revisit Ruijia’s writing selection in chapter 5 to make a case for reimagining academic English writing as dynamic negotiation and translation across asymmetrical relations of power and difference.

Whether we glorify or vilify Jobs’s and Ruijia’s semiotic ways of composing and negotiating meaning in writing, of prime interest to this book is that such difficult, often risky decisions surrounding language use in writing are inextricably linked to much broader “regimes of language” (Kroskrity 2000, 3), the ideas language users/learners from different walks of life have about (and act in relation to) language and various ways of using it in particular communicative situations and contexts, that is, their *language ideologies*. However explicit or covert they may be, language ideologies in literate contexts, as we shall see in subsequent chapters, are never singular or homogeneous and do not operate in a simple manner but are rather “unmarkedly” multiple and

complex (Kroskrity 2000, 12). In the particular case of the teaching and learning of writing in the United States, for instance, we have been witnessing a serious investment in the key features, manifestations, and practical effects of conspicuously contradictory language ideologies of dominant monolingualism and emergent “translingualism” (Horner, Lu, Royster, and Trimbur 2011; Canagarajah 2013b). While a perennially forceful English-only monolingualist ideology posits a unitary view of English-language standards as irrevocable givens and universal signs of high-quality, correct language usage in writing, a counterhegemonic translingual ideology defines and engages with written English as both adaptable and adapting its shape and meaning(s) under diverse socio-cultural contexts and fluctuating power relations.

For English-language users like Jobs and Ruijia, attempts to reconcile these conflicting ways of thinking about and treating language and language use as they emerged in written communication were by no means free of tensions or occurring in smoothly running trajectories. For instance, after his firm’s big economic crisis, to sync up with his message to global and local markets that “Apple is still alive,” Jobs chose to actively resist the restrictiveness of dominant standards of usage and instead put language, in this case English, into work as “living” and socially produced through acts of identity (Isaacson 2011, 328). However, upon his own confession, he still had to deal with a “not-so-small problem” of debating the acceptability of the idiosyncratic language usage in the ad’s tagline and accompanying narrative for promoting his company’s devices and services with skeptical others among his clientele and on his own team who possessed more established ideas of what counted as acceptable or aesthetically pleasing about language-in-use (Blumenthal 2012, 192). In a similar vein, drawing on the range of cultural and linguistic resources in her repertoire, Ruijia felt compelled to justify the specific conditions under which her non-standardized language and rhetorical practices emerged in her writing and under which her readers will have to, in turn, recognize the fluidity of her language usage in relation to the changing rhetorical situation and its demands. I am interested centrally in this book in the material effects of similar complex negotiations of diverse ideologies of language, which generate the particular ways various literate individuals conceive of and treat the status, functions, and meanings of language and language-in-use in their local situations while engaging in a range of social relationships (personal, civic, academic, and professional).

These “classic” tensions between conflicting yet coexisting language ideologies and their unique and complex negotiations, both inside and

outside the Anglo-American sphere, have always been present in various literate situations and evident in a considerable body of language- and literacy-related research (to name a few, see Pratt 1987; Lu 1994; Pennycook 1997; Ivanič 1998; Canagarajah 1999; Harwood and Hadley 2004; Janks 2004). However, the unprecedented, distinctive speed, surge, and complexity of the transcultural and transnational flow of people—and therefore of their language and communicative repertoires and the particular ideas surrounding them—across time, spaces, borders, and communities in an era of globalization have heightened the presence of such tensions and their notable impact on literate individuals, their local language and writing practices, and ultimately their future iterations of such practices (see Kroskrity 2004; Stevenson and Mar-Molinero 2006; Arnaut et al. 2016). It is precisely these complex disjunctures, contradictions, and clashes in the ideologies of language underpinning the act of writing and its teaching and learning in the United States and other parts of the world that the current book further explores, “not by rising above them or going around them or trying to erase [or dissolve] them but by entering” (Pratt 2002, 33) and working through their powerfully flowing traffic. In doing so, subsequent chapters in this book draw out the unexpected linkages in tension-ridden literate negotiations of such language-ideological differences and their reverberations across the divides of location, institution, program, language, culture, and identity. Taking us to the heart of these lived tensions at two urban university campuses in two different cosmopolitan cities, namely Beirut, the capital of Lebanon, and Seattle, the largest city in Washington state in the United States, *Toward Translingual Realities in Composition* explores some of the complexity and messiness involved in the way various undergraduate student writers think about and utilize their diverse language and semiotic resources to negotiate and renegotiate their literate life and work amid relations of power, authority, and difference. As significantly diverse and distant as these two institutional settings are in their size, geographic location, language-ideological histories, sociolinguistic makeup, and sociopolitical agendas and missions (see appendix A for a detailed comparison), they intersect in their shared preoccupations with managing intensified degrees of language and sociocultural diversity and difference and sensitively grappling with the ensuing binds, paradoxes, inconsistencies, and compromises that come their way. The transnational ethnographic perspectives I share in this book, drawn from over five years of fieldwork, reveal the daunting nature of the challenges these young writers face to strike a balance between preserving their diverse language and semiotic resources and

still producing successful academic writings in the eyes of their teachers and other key gatekeepers.

In its reflections on and multilayered analyses of the workings and impacts of conflicting language ideologies in specific literate situations, *Toward Translingual Realities in Composition* looks into the many different manifestations of diverse linguistic-ideological orientations in daily sociolinguistic realities, local language and language-in-education policies, and the design of writing pedagogies and curricula in both contexts. Giving voice to the lived experiences of student writers from diverse language and cultural backgrounds, this book brings into visibility the sticky, messy materiality of their negotiations of language-ideological tensions in academic language and literacy learning amid various historical, sociocultural, (geo)political, and economic considerations in Beirut's and Seattle's cityscapes. As I will reveal in chapters 3 and 4, monolingual and translingual linguistic-ideological orientations shaping existing understandings and usages of language are juxtaposed and coexistent yet operating in a constant tug-of-war, together creating what Yasemin Yildiz (2012) productively terms a "postmonolingual" ideological condition for the urban localities under study here and their writing program ecologies.<sup>2</sup> In more precise terms, a postmonolingual reading of the language-ideological tensions my participants continue to grapple with is a powerful reminder of one of this book's arguments that the multiplicity and contestation in these young writers' understandings of and practices with language get managed and often complicated by a network of invested literate actors in their immediate surrounds who position themselves differently vis-à-vis complex socio-cultural and political-economic forces not of their own making. I turn next to some brief remarks on this project's design, with a much fuller description of the specific procedures of data collection and analysis and of the research sites and participants provided in appendix A for interested readers.

## ON RESEARCH DESIGN

*Toward Translingual Realities in Composition* is a multi-sited critical ethnography that adds not only a critical edge but also a dimension of intervention in linguistic-ideological hegemonies in the teaching and learning of university-level writing.<sup>3</sup> Taking us away from the conventional ethnographic trope of intensive investigation and participation that privileges single-site locations across and within social and geographical spaces, this ethnography of the push and pull of language ideologies in academic

literacy learning and development combines perspectives from and seeks to uncover a web of possible connections between apparently disconnected locations like Lebanon and the United States. The multi-sitedness of such fieldwork, however, does *not* simply “add together” interpretations from two discrete national-cultural sites of inquiry in arithmetic terms (1st site + 2nd site = multi-sited research)<sup>4</sup> but rather offers nuance, “multi-sighted[ness]” (Coleman and von Hellermann 2013, 10), and the “potential to force us to change perspective” (Coleman and von Hellermann 2013, 6) and practice after examining our ways of constructing categories like language and its literate doing(s) in the first place (cf. Marcus 1995; Hannerz 2003). As Leonard, Vieira, and Young (2015, vii, viii; emphasis in original) argue, of great significance in doing transnational research is “not what researchers look at but *how they look*” at relationships of movement and difference “*across space, time, and communities.*” In this sense, by embedding the study and teaching of postsecondary-level writing in the context of the globalization and pluralization of English and the transnational circles of contact and flow among English(es) and other language resources, *Toward Translingual Realities in Composition* reveals how, why, and toward what effects such varied complexes of language resources are represented, framed, negotiated, taken up, and put into work in disparate or intersecting ways in the context of shifting economic, (geo)political, socio-historical, and ideological constraints and possibilities.

With an increased interest in various transnational perspectives on the cultural politics of academic writing and reinvigorated commitments to “internationalizing” writing instruction in higher education (Schaub 2003; Donahue 2009; Lillis and Curry 2010; Martins 2015), it is worth bringing to our immediate attention the fact that these cross-border exchanges (national, cultural, and linguistic) in US composition have a tendency to remain “largely export-based” (Donahue 2009, 214) and still haven’t fully expanded into a systematic, reciprocal, and “mutually transformative relationship” (Hall 2009, 34). With that in mind, *Toward Translingual Realities in Composition* goes against such dominant economies of global intellectual exchange and research that dictate waves of inquiry “*about other countries*” (Ninnes and Hellstén 2005, 3; emphasis added), institutional contexts, and literate individuals or communities, hence suggesting that nothing worthwhile is to be presumably learned or gained in return unless driven by national security motives (Wible 2009) or the advancement of economic and geopolitical self-interest. Contesting such “narrow, local, privileged, Western” flows of knowledge (Martins 2015, 5) about writing research, instruction and program administration, *Toward*

*Translingual Realities in Composition* forces us to slow down and listen intensely with the intention to actively learn *with* and not only *about* less immediately relevant, hence easily overlooked, non-US sites like Lebanon. Such a counterhegemonic engagement, as Christiane Donahue (2009, 214) reminds us, necessitates recognizing “blind spots” (2009, 214) in our local ecologies and “peeling back taken-for-granted practices and beliefs” (Ninnes and Hellstén 2005, 4) involving language and language difference in the interest of self-reflexivity, self-revision, and transformation.

Throughout my description and analysis of the specific orientations to and practices with language and their ideological underpinnings in writing program ecologies at both research sites, I adopted a concurrent mixed method<sup>5</sup> of data gathering composed of sociolinguistic landscaping materials, textual analysis of national-/state-level language policy, various institutional and programmatic documents as well as instructional course materials, classroom observation notes, focus group discussions with writing students, semi-structured qualitative interviews with first-year writing (FYW) students and teachers, and stretches of intensive talk surrounding students’ academic written work. Though the names of the cities and neighborhoods discussed in this book are real, all the names I adopt to refer to the institutions and research participants are pseudonyms. Below is a summary of the data collection methods, time frame, and the number of participants recruited in each research site:

1. Beirut University (BU), Fall 2006/2007–Summer 2012
  - Linguistic landscaping data
  - National language and language-in-education policy texts
  - Institutional and programmatic documents
  - Individual teaching materials
  - Focus group discussion
  - Forty-one FYW student interviews (one to two hours long each)
  - Focused communication around academic texts with eight students
  - Fourteen writing teacher interviews (one hour long each)
  - Descriptive field notes (five–six observation hours per week during one semester; based on one FYW course and three translation courses)
2. University of Seattle (UOS), Fall 2013/2014–Spring 2017
  - Linguistic landscaping data
  - Federal- and state-level language policy discourse and/or texts
  - University-wide and program-specific documents
  - Instructional materials
  - Fifty FYW student interviews (one to two hours long each)

- Focused conversations around texts with seven students
- Eleven writing teacher interviews (one hour long each)

A far from neutral, linguistically motivated, and politicized project like *Toward Translingual Realities in Composition* demands a critical interrogation of my own ideological affiliations, commitments, and subject positionality. It's worth emphasizing to my readers at the outset the impossibility of researching and writing about a thorny and complicated topic like language ideologies in the teaching and learning of writing without an opinion about their desirability or deleterious material effects on various social actors and local writing ecologies. As a US-trained compositionist with a non-mainstream sociocultural identity, navigating—just like my research participants—an often tension-filled path between competing language ideologies and their associated representations, practices, and discourses in my own field of study and other diverse life-worlds, I adopted multiple roles in composing this book. My main goal was to rigorously understand, explore, and explain the multiple and often contradictory roles, manifestations, and workings of the local language ideologies that are vibrant and constantly circulating among and around my participants. At times, I took the role of what Karen Lundsford (2012, 221) describes as an “information broker,” constantly translating and shuttling new knowledge, discourses, and underlying assumptions between national and international research networks. More important, enacting the same calls I make in this book (as echoed in the title of and discussion in chapter 5), my additional role as a translingual activist was also emphasized by deliberately intervening in dominant language ideologies, which strive to “tidy up” the superdiverse sociolinguistic realities in local institutional, writing program, and classroom ecologies through various diversity-stripping and boundary-mapping practices. In fact, the frequent movement and flow of language resources, ideas, information, and insights within the national-cultural sites I explore in this book “lends a character of activism” that is “quite specific and circumstantial to the conditions of doing” multi-sited writing research itself (Marcus 1995, 113). It would be pointless to deny that my own analytical and descriptive research and writing practices in developing this book manuscript themselves constitute an intervention into the current nature and state of language relations in the study and teaching of writing in the United States and elsewhere with the hope that they will encourage us all to identify, question, modify, and alter them considerably.

Necessarily and inevitably, working across national, linguistic, and cultural boundaries, I enjoyed close ties with members of the urban

institutional cultures I researched in both locales. Born and raised in Lebanon and a once insider at the particular institution under exploration in this project, as I was both schooled and held a teaching position there, I experienced high in-group solidarity and affiliation. Currently pursuing my career in Seattle, I was a relatively novice ethnographer still discovering and learning about this research community and had to locate my own information brokers in order to delve deeper into the specific historical, social, cultural, and political contexts that have shaped local assumptions about and responses to language and its difference. Though enjoying different levels of insider/outsider statuses did not automatically grant me expertise in the language politics, policies, and practices I describe in both locales, it gave me a vantage point from where I could be more cognizant of the nature of the explicit and tacit language assumptions and representations structuring, informing, and at times constraining my participants' labor with and on language.

A translingual stance toward language and decisions on its actual and observable use, which this book advocates, is meant to acknowledge and bring out the very fluid, emergent, and unpredictable character of language itself and all communicative practices involving language (as I discuss more thoroughly in chapter 2). With that in mind, I hope my readers approach the outcomes of this project as warrantable, illuminative, yet provisional, unfinished insights and renderings that can contribute to our understandings of how writing students in linguistically and culturally diverse urban institutions of higher education are actually talking and thinking about language generally and English specifically and how that might be influencing—knowingly or not, individually and collectively—what they are (or wish to be) doing with and to English in their academic literacies work. Constantly reminding myself of this, and I hope my readers would do the same, serves to highlight the need to keep working and reworking our ongoing explorations of the translingual understandings and doings of language amid powerful linguistic-ideological tensions in our ever-changing and complex local ecologies.

#### ON NAMING PRACTICES

Scholarly conversations and contributions surrounding language issues in composition studies and other complementary language- and literacy-related fields, including the book you are now reading, are getting increasingly populated with an almost dizzying collection of neologisms,<sup>6</sup> which seek to step outside of traditional terminologies and descriptions we've inherited from a dominant monolingual paradigm

and offer a more nuanced understanding of the dynamic, fluid, and emergent nature of linguistic creations and interactions. This vibrant terminological landscape suggests that dominant ways of describing, talking, and thinking about the nature of language and its doing(s) in an era of globalization, enhanced access to the internet and new communication technologies, and ever-changing sociolinguistic realities and mobility patterns in modern urban life are becoming, at best, theoretically and practically “unsustainable” (Lillis and McKinney 2013, 429). As there are no coherent, agreed-upon labels or even definitions<sup>7</sup> for the same emerging concepts within or across specific language- and literacy-related fields, an explication of the terminology I employ in the present book is necessary.

I have particularly chosen the descriptor “superdiversity” coined by social anthropologist Steven Vertovec (2007) and further qualified in contemporary critical studies in sociolinguistics<sup>8</sup> to make visible the dynamic emergence of linguistic and sociocultural diversity in ways that supersede anything both developed and developing countries, like the case of the United States and Lebanon examined in this book, have experienced before—particularly in terms of acceleration, intensity, spread, complexity, and multi-layering of language contact and change. More specifically, the notion of superdiversity marks the complex heterogeneity of and within the kind of language and cultural diversity lived and experienced on a daily basis in today’s cityscapes on the streets, at home, and in various academic and nonacademic institutions. By adopting the notion of superdiversity throughout this book as a cover term more tuned to the complexity, unpredictability, and messiness of the dynamics of language and cultural difference in urban language landscapes,<sup>9</sup> I attempt to escape from the simplistic arithmetic multiplicity tied to traditional conceptions of “multilingualism,” which have both unwittingly fed and been fed by dominant monolingualist ideologies of language (for more, see chapter 1).

By the term *monolingualism* in this book, I refer to the current-day dominant language ideology and epistemology that can be traced back to eighteenth-century European-based thinking about language and communication and not to the mere presence of one (standard) language as is commonly used to define nation-states or individuals. By the same token, I do not use the term *multilingualism* to refer to different linguistic phenomena involving two or more language resources but rather to alternative language ideologies that have emerged in response to dominant monolingualism and have only superficially overcome its epistemological framework and effects. As I demonstrate in chapter 1,

multilingual orientations to language in teaching writing have rendered observable moments of language difference contingent to a numerical representation of languages, cultures, and identities as nameable, countable, and definable entities and have ultimately constrained the possibilities of seeing and understanding language, the identities of its users/learners, and their literate practices in more dynamic terms as emergent, always varying and variant, “always deferred, always in process but never arriving” (Hopper 1998, 155).

In adopting the notion “translingual” (sometimes featuring the suffixes “-ist,” “-ism,” and “-ity”), which is currently receiving much zeal and attention from US compositionists, I align with a critical “linguistics of contact” that places at the center of its intellectual engagement the workings and reworkings of language “*across* lines of social” relatedness, difference, and domination (Pratt 1987, 60; emphasis in original). My own approach to translingualism throughout this book, which I will briefly introduce in the next chapter and discuss more extensively in chapter 2, synthesizes two intersecting yet different senses of the term employed to date in composition studies scholarship. The first constitutes a branch of translingualism that can be detected in work that theorizes the realization of general performative translingual competence in texts that are obviously written differently, in that they employ the more readily visible rhetorical practice of “code-meshing” or the strategic blending of home and school identities, language and literate practices, conventionally perceived as separate and discontinuous (see Canagarajah 2011; Young et al. 2014). The second sense of translingualism involves a preoccupation with less noticeable, hence easily disregarded, moments of language and cultural difference conveyed by the wealth and breadth of sociocultural and historical meanings available within and across language resources and practices (for instance, see Kramsch 2006; Pennycook 2010; Lu and Horner 2013). In this second sense, translingualism brings attention to the centrality of “translation” as a necessary and constant characteristic of the everyday language and literacy labor of all language users/learners, readers, and writers (see Pennycook 2007, 2008; Lu and Horner 2012; Horner, Necamp, and Donahue 2011).

Rather than present it as a satisfactory, flawless, stable, and enduring concept, I adopt and conceive of the term *translingual* in this book as timely and useful, at least for the time being, for several reasons.<sup>10</sup> First and foremost, the prefix *trans-* doesn’t come with the kind of baggage of numerical plurality the existing prefixes *bi-*, *multi-*, and *pluri-* carry.<sup>11</sup> More specifically, it draws attention away from the quantification of

immobile, bounded languages—as ideologically and institutionally understood and idealized—into the qualification of mobile language resources, the actual and multiple ways of doing language locally in various communicative contexts and domains of life. In addition, its relatively recent emergence in composition scholarship with only a handful of theoretical, methodological, and direct pedagogical reflections (Horner et al. 2011; Canagarajah 2013a, 2013b; Donahue 2013; Horner and Tetreault 2017) surrounding the kind of labor and active engagement it entails suggests that our ongoing (re)conceptualization and (re)working of the notion of “translingualism” can and should gradually and continually be molded and even sharpened. Marking a turning point in US compositionists’ ways of thinking about, teaching, and studying language and its practice in writing, a dynamic construct like translingualism can potentially provide a particular point of entry into critical questions surrounding the increasing complexity of language difference and language-in-use in literacy learning situations: How do our writing students get socialized into or out of particular ways of understanding and treating language, its use, and users? What exactly do they do (or desire to do) with the wide array of language and semiotic resources and practices in their repertoires? What do they choose to make of and with what they do in which writing situations? What sociocultural relations and meanings do they strive to construct, maintain, problematize, or resist through their doing(s), with what investments, and at what cost(s) and what value(s) do they attach to them and the language-based ideologies that surround them? And finally, as the prevailing, sanctioned things we say about and do “within” language in writing, its study, and its teaching have become pervasive and pervasively naturalized in educational landscapes, how do we bring ourselves and encourage our students and one another to start thinking about and engaging within and across socially constructed language boundaries in a transformed translingual lens? This book goes some way to address these and a number of other related questions in later chapters. *Toward Translingual Realities in Composition* is therefore an invitation to us all—writing program administrators, teacher-scholars, and students alike—to launch and sustain this long overdue intellectual exercise.

In this book, I borrow the term *postmonolingualism* introduced in Yasemin Yildiz’s (2012) work when referring to the current state of affairs in teaching writing on both sides of the Atlantic, with the side-by-side coexistence of colliding and competing ideologies of language and language relations. However, the significance of the prefix “post-”<sup>12</sup> in “postmonolingualism” rests not only in its inherent temporal dimension

in the sense of *after* the emergence of monolingualism and its hegemony in various spheres of society and public life. Like other “posts” dominating our intellectual landscape, the term *postmonolingualism*, as deployed in this book, carries a critical, altering potential in that it marks uneasy back-and-forth vacillations and transactions between the simultaneous continuity of and “active rupture (*coupure*)” (Berger 2003, 5; cf. Hirsch 2012, 6) with a dominant ideology of monolingualism and its far-reaching consequences and workings. Understanding and studying language and language use in literate contexts through the fresh, flexible lens and dynamics of postmonolinguality, I will argue, has the potential to shift our focus as writing teacher-scholars and program administrators away from a categorical, dichotomous thinking about whether particular practices with language in academic writing—including practices of describing and evaluating them—are either monolingual, multilingual, or translingual. Rather than focus on one or the other pole, this book brings into sharper focus the actual local conditions of writing instruction (especially in the writing program ecologies explored) as caught up in postmonolingual tensions produced by the cohabitation of the competing local language ideologies of dominant monolingualism, alternative multilingualism, and counterhegemonic translingualism as continually in each other’s presence, absence, and contact. I deal with each of these linguistic-ideological orientations and their coexistence (though not as equal partners) in subsequent chapters.

#### BOOK ORGANIZATION

In chapter 1, rather than treat the key concept of “language ideologies” in writing instruction as indicative of abstract, *in vitro*, amorphous, and elusive forces, as is commonly understood, I give special emphasis to how diverse language ideologies of dominant monolingualism, alternative multilingualism, and counterhegemonic translingualism are made manifest in the pairing of language *representations* and *practices*, that is, the *in vivo* ways of thinking and acting on situations involving language and its literate learning and use. From this perspective, I survey past and more contemporary approaches to teaching writing amid language difference while highlighting the way these approaches emerge from competing and at times overlapping representations and treatments of language, language relations, and language usage in written texts. More specifically, by tagging the three major language-ideological orientations circulating and informing work in composition onto the concretized notions of “representations” and “practices,” this chapter brings into

sharper focus how the key tenets of each ideological orientation are anchored in actual situated practices of designing writing curricula, pedagogies, and assessments in response to inter- and intra-linguistic and cultural difference.

Organized on an entirely different footing from that which drives dominant monolingualism and traditional multilingualism, a nascent translingual orientation to language as constantly in process and therefore emergent in relation to its social, material performativity is the topic of chapter 2. In this chapter and throughout the book, I draw on critical perspectives in linguistics and sociolinguistics, which have highlighted the crucial role of a complex, evolving view of language generally and English particularly in terms of the fluidity and movement of its use and reuse across time, space, and (real or imagined) borders and the exigency for more dynamic discursive practices in representing such an ideological orientation. In view of all this, I elaborate on an alternative set of images, metaphors, and corresponding vocabulary, which can assist in bringing out the intrinsically and perpetually translingual character of language and the necessary labor of movement within, between, and across available language resources and practices in the literate negotiation and production of meaning and difference—which have remained invisible under dominant monolingual and traditional multilingual ideological and epistemological stances. In this chapter, I also suggest that successfully adopting an emerging translingual framework in teaching writing necessitates not only reworking and reconstituting the notion of language itself but also and especially a series of now-classic concepts closely linked to it and to each other. I conclude this chapter by calling into question and reworking the established meanings and associations of some of these constructs pertaining to our and our students' work with language in the teaching and learning of writing—namely, language competence, language standards and conventions, language errors in writing, writerly agency, and the nature of writer-reader relationships amid moments of language difference.

Chapters 3 and 4 further contextualize the linguistic-ideological tensions highlighted and discussed in the preceding chapters in the specific urban sociolinguistic and educational landscapes of present-day Beirut and Seattle. I specifically devote chapter 3 to a detailed analysis of document- and interview-based data on the nature and workings of language ideologies in the case of BU, while the ethnographic fieldwork at UOS comprises the core of chapter 4. The perspectives I offer in these two chapters are in a sequence that begins with macro-level

analyses of three primary sites of linguistic-ideological (re)production and intervention—that is, sociolinguistic landscapes, nation-state and institutional language policies, and writing pedagogies and assessment practices. I then move to a more focused exploration of the nature and salience of first-year writers' representations and rationalizations of language and language difference and how they are supported and impeded in complex ways by those sites of using, managing, and learning languages in relation to each other and their environment. Intriguingly, while the cultural, linguistic, socioeconomic, and (geo)political forces influencing and influenced by institutional and programmatic ecologies of writing and writing instruction at each location are massively divergent, chapters 3 and 4 afford a closer look into some of the intersections between the complex negotiations of student writers in both localities in that they must always and inevitably engage the shifting friction points of monolingualism, multilingualism, and translanguaging—hence their postmonolingual character in learning academic English writing.

In chapter 5, I argue that there has to be an activist dimension to translanguaging in writing pedagogy, which involves a deliberate intervention in taken-for-granted monolingual and multilingual language representations and practices in the FYW classroom in strategic and well-grounded ways. Contesting approaches to teaching writing that legitimate and propagate the view and use of English in writing in its own presence and outside the bodies, identities, histories, and contexts that bring about its translation and transformation, I report on an ongoing project that explores the possibilities and challenges manifest in reconciling translanguaging writing and critical translation practice on firmer ground for the years to come. Given the continuing intellectual and sociocultural pressures of dominant English-only monolingualism and its powerful resonance in teaching academic writing in the United States and beyond, I invite my readers to collaborate on further refining this much-needed bridge between translation and translanguaging writing theory.

By formulating contemporary language-ideological debates and tensions in terms of linkages and contestations in representations of and practices with language in academic reading and writing, transnational ethnographic accounts like those in *Toward Translanguaging Realities in Composition* can help open up not only new understandings of but also new potentialities for intervention in the postmonolingual dynamics of the teaching and learning of university/college English writing in the United States as well as the rest of the world. Bringing together the

various studies featured in individual chapters, I conclude this book by offering insights into how writing teacher-scholars and writing program administrators, through actively and persistently reworking the design and enactment of their curricula, pedagogies, assessments, teacher training programs, and campus-wide partnerships, can more productively intervene in local postmonolingual tensions and contradictions at the level of language representations and practices.

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL  
NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION