Translingual Turn in Composition: Perspectives on an Emerging Pedagogy

Havva Zorluel Ozer[1]
Department of English,
Indiana University of Pennsylvania, USA

Abstract: This study examines prospective composition teacher-scholars' desire to implement translingual pedagogy in college writing instruction. An online survey of 40 doctoral students in a composition program demonstrates the pedagogical aspects of translingual approach from the future generation of compositionists' perspectives.

Keywords: college composition, teacher-scholars, translingual pedagogy

Translingual Approach: A Decade of Research

A brief history of the translingual paradigm shift in composition scholarship begins with Horner, Lu, Royster, and Trimbur's (2011) call for composition community to move approaches to writing instruction from monolingual to translingual; as pedagogical theories and practices grounded in the ideology of monolingualism can no longer respond to the changing cultural, linguistic, and socio-demographic conditions of the world. As communities become melting pots under the influence of digital technologies, globalization, and transnational movements, college composition classrooms become more and more cosmopolitan spaces where students bring different cultures, languages, and identities to enrich the diversity on college campuses (Canagarajah, 2012; Donahue, 2018; Horner, 2010; You, 2018). Unlike traditional approaches turning a blind eye to the varied language resources students bring with them (Bawarshi, 2010), a translingual approach builds upon and cultivates openness to the ways in which language is used, practiced, and performed across a range of writing contexts (Horner et al., 2011; Guerra,

---

[1] Havva Zorluel Ozer is a teaching Associate in the Department of English at Indiana University of Pennsylvania, USA. She can be reached at h.zorluel@iup.edu.

2016; Lee & Jenks, 2016). Drawing attention to the "fluidity, malleability, and discriminatory potential of languages" (Atkinson et al., 2015, p. 384), a translingual approach promotes critical inquiry into "Standard English only" impositions of the long-established instructional policies for the teaching and learning of writing.

Attempts to push against the single language, modality, and discursive approaches to composing (Horner & Selfe, 2013; You, 2016) and pluralize academic writing have attracted attention from the scholarly circles and the last decade has witnessed an outburst of composition studies on translingualism (Hall, 2018). Early studies focused their efforts on theorizing and characterizing the particulars of a translingual approach (Canagarajah, 2012; Horner et al., 2011; Lu & Horner, 2013), for theory is the bedrock of pedagogy, practice, and research. As discussed in these studies, at the heart of the translingual approach is the idea of language as an emergent and dynamic practice, rather than a prescribed and static form (Atkinson et al., 2015; Ayash, 2016; Guerra, 2016; Lu & Horner, 2013). On this view of language, a key aspect of communication is that meaning arises from negotiation practices, rather than residing in a preexisting grammatical system (Canagarajah, 2012). Consequently, in defining communication as a process of negotiating meaning, this view considers language and language differences as resources for sense and meaning making in regarding communicative contexts. Approaching writing from a translingual perspective builds upon the recognition of these rhetorical resources for constructing meaning in writing. As a matter of fact, all writing draws on the writer's repertoire of diverse resources and as Matsuda (2015) states, negotiation of these resources is an essential component of the writing activity.

Building on this new linguistic direction in the field, more recent studies gave their attention to articulating the practical implications of a translingual approach for teaching college writing and communication (Canagarajah, 2013; Guerra, 2016; Hall, 2018; Schreiber & Watson, 2018). Through an examination of the pedagogical aspects of translingual theory and practice, the scholarship contextualized the core principles of translingual orientation within writing instruction and praxis. Leading one of the foremost discussions on what it means to take a translingual approach to writing and its teaching and learning, Guerra (2016) considered the essential purpose of such an approach to be to help students develop a "rhetorical sensibility" that is nested in "a critical awareness of the choices made in the context of the various competing ideological approaches to language difference" (p. 228). The pedagogical value of a translingual approach, then, comes from the fact that it invites students to think about and analyze their use of language, develop an awareness of the link between their language identities and writing, and explore possibilities for writing across language differences. Thus, "it envisions students as active rhetorical agents, positioning themselves in relation not only to genres and rhetorical situations, standard issues in R&C pedagogy, but now also in relation to their individual repertoire of language resources" (Hall, 2018, p. 33). As such, it gives students voice in how they write, making them aware of their rhetorical choices.

Delineating the ways in which translingual approach materializes in the classroom, additional studies outlined pedagogical frameworks for creating and implementing translingual-oriented course designs, projects, assignments, and activities. In working towards situating translingual practice within the context of writing classrooms, several scholars contributed to the development of compelling instructional practices and materials to enhance the field's understanding of how writing is taught through the lens of a translingual approach. While some practice-oriented pieces offered pedagogical descriptions of assignments and lesson activities for teaching writing through a translingual approach (De Costa et al., 2017; Kiernan, 2015; Sanchez-Martin, Hirsu, Gonzales, & Alvarez, 2019; Wang, 2017), ethnographies of classrooms and practitioner inquiries provided even more detail on the incorporation of translingual approach into college writing instruction (Kiernan, Meier, & Wang, 2016; Lee & Jenks, 2016; Liao, 2018; Wang, Samuelson, & Silvester, 2020). Demonstrating the transformative potential of translingual-oriented instructional environments in broadening students' view of linguistic diversity and writing, these studies made it apparent that embracing translingual pedagogy can help to cultivate students' critical dispositions toward their language choices and practices in writing.

As noted above, the work done thus far has established the foundations of a trans era of composition, transforming the field's take up on the issues of language difference in writing. Giving continued attention to these issues, studies have thus far built a common base of translingual practice to address linguistic diversity in the teaching and learning of writing. Whilst a growing body of research supports the idea of a translingual approach, several articles have been published debating and criticizing the implications of translingual pedagogy for college writing instruction, specifically multilingual writing instruction. Atkinson and Tardy (2018), for example, took issue with translingualism arguing for the normative conditions of writing and students' desire to know these norms. Along the same lines, Gevers (2018) problematized the composition instructors' uncritical adoption of translingual pedagogy without regard to multilingual students' needs as writers to succeed in the academia and beyond. Amidst all these expanding pedagogical discussions of translingual approach, the review of literature reveals a gap in terms of empirical research on teachers' curricular beliefs about translingual pedagogy, a pedagogy in-progress and under constant review. In an attempt to address the aforementioned gap, in this article I shed light on the prospective composition teacher-scholars' (1) desire to implement translingual pedagogy in the context of college writing instruction. In the remainder of the article, I first describe the methodological design of this study. Then, I report on the findings from a survey of 40 doctoral candidates in the composition program at a U.S. higher education institution. I conclude the article with a discussion of what we learn from studying the future generations of composition teacher-scholars and why it matters.

The Current Study

This study was conducted at a public research-oriented university in the Northeast United States. The university's doctoral program in composition is recognized as one of the nation's oldest and largest programs dedicated to promoting the growth of students as accomplished teacher-scholars with a comprehensive, interdisciplinary, and research-based understanding of language and literacy practices. The program is inherently diverse and fosters an inclusive environment; it brings together students, faculty, and staff from all over the world and creates a culture of diversity. The program's focus on diversity shapes the curriculum and instructional decisions as well. Through coursework and professional development workshops offered by the program, doctoral students have the opportunity to explore local and global perspectives on literacy instruction, including emerging pedagogies such as the translingual.

The purpose of this study was to explore the doctoral students', i.e. prospective composition teacher-scholars', perceptions of, desire for, and concerns with implementing translingual pedagogy in the teaching of writing. Using a descriptive mixed-methods approach, I sought to answer three questions:

1. What are prospective composition teacher-scholars' perceptions of translingual pedagogy?
2. In what ways do prospective composition teacher-scholars' perceptions influence their desire to implement translingual pedagogy?
3. What are prospective composition teacher-scholars' concerns with implementing translingual pedagogy?

Survey & Analysis

I developed an online survey to collect quantitative and qualitative data in this study. Using the graduate program listserv, I distributed the survey to the doctoral students in the composition program in the Spring semester of 2019. At the beginning of the survey, I asked participants to rate themselves on their level of knowledge about translingual pedagogy, responding on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "not knowledgeable at all" to "extremely knowledgeable". Participants who selected "not knowledgeable at all" could not proceed the survey. Those who selected other options proceeded to the first section of the survey. This section included eight multiple-choice items to explore participants' perceptions of translingual pedagogy and measure their desire to implement it in their writing classrooms. Participants responded to these items on a 5-point agreement Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". There were also two open-ended questions asking participants to describe translingual pedagogy in their own terms

and explain their concerns, if any, with using such a pedagogy in their teaching. The second section of the survey addressed demographic characteristics of the participants. The survey required participants to respond to the Likert-scale items, whereas the two open-ended questions and the demographic questions were optional.

To analyze the quantitative data gathered from the survey, I used the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software. I calculated descriptive statistics to examine the mean ratings for each Likert-scale item. In addition to the descriptive analysis, I conducted a Spearman rho correlation analysis to find out whether and how participants' perceptions of translingual pedagogy influenced their desire to implement it in their teaching. To analyze the qualitative data gathered from participants' written responses to the two open-ended questions, I conducted thematic analysis using NVivo, a qualitative data analysis software program that I utilized to systematically code the emergent themes and categories. This process was as follows: after importing the Word document that I generated from the qualitative data into NVivo, I read the participants' responses thoroughly to get familiar with and get a general sense of the data. At the end of reading over the data set, I labored through the content to label codes. From the emergent codes, I formulated themes, assigning the related codes into thematic segments. Following that, I re-examined the codes for each theme to finalize the analysis process.

Participant Demographics

Forty-two participants responded to the anonymous online survey on Qualtrics (2). Two participants, who selected the "not knowledgeable at all" option, were terminated from the survey, which resulted in a sample size of 40 participants (3). Of these 40 survey respondents, 13 reported to be slightly knowledgeable, 19 moderately knowledgeable, seven very knowledgeable, and one extremely knowledgeable about translingual pedagogy. Twenty-seven participants identified as female, eight participants identified as male, and two identified as other. Twenty-two participants were aged between 25-34, 10 between 35-44, three between 45-54, and two were 55 and over. Participants' self-identified linguistic backgrounds were: "monolingual English" (*N*=5), "native English" (*N*=3), "L1 English" (*N*=3), "American English" (*N*=2), "bilingual" (*N*=5), "multilingual" (*N*=9), "translingual" (*N*=2). Participants' language resources included English, Spanish, French, Portuguese, Italian, Korean, Chinese, Japanese, Sudanese, Indonesian, and Arabic. Regarding their academic backgrounds, 19 participants reported that they were at the coursework stage and 16 participants were at the dissertation stage. Participants' experience in teaching U.S. college composition ranged from none to as many as 5 and more years. On a simple yes/no question, 17 participants reported that they were currently teaching writing in a U.S. higher education institution, whereas 20 participants

were not teaching at the time of the study. Those who were teaching reported teaching a variety of writing courses including basic writing, first-year composition, first-year multilingual composition, and pre-academic writing.

Researcher's Positionality

As a prospective composition teacher-scholar myself, having studied in the fields of Composition, Applied Linguistics, and TESOL, having taught first-year composition courses as a TA, and being a doctoral candidate expertizing in translingual writing instruction, I have the position of an insider in the context of this study. When I was first introduced to translingual approach during my doctoral education, with my role as a multilingual user of English, I found it empowering to view language differences not as problems to overcome, but as resources to draw upon in negotiating meaning (Horner et al., 2011). Exploring theory, research, and practice related to translingual pedagogy has facilitated my growth as a prospective composition teacher-scholar, while at the same time left me facing a dilemma between my emergent translingual orientations and the idealized language standards that I have always believed in, or have indeed been taught to. During my TA practices in first-year composition, I experienced that my prospective teacher-scholar identity positioned me into a less powerful status and my noviceship left me perplexed to take on an emerging pedagogy that has not yet been fully outlined. Was I the only one in these pedagogical dilemmas, or do other prospective composition teacher-scholars also experience such conflicts? How do other prospective composition teacher-scholars perceive translingual pedagogy? Are they willing to take an emergent approach to their teaching, or do they have concerns? The current study was born from my desire to understand and shed light on the nuances of these questions.

Study Limitations

The primary limitation of this study is the relatively small sample size (N=40) drawn from one higher education institution. Although the data collected from survey provide answers to the guiding research questions, the results cannot be generalized to broader populations of prospective composition teacher-scholars. Furthermore, the specific context that this study took place in situates participants in the ecology of a single institution and its philosophical and ideological framework. To address these limitations, more research would be of benefit with larger sample sizes and cross-institutional inquiries.

Results

In this section, I present the results broken down by each research question. To answer the first research question and scrutinize participants' perceptions of translingual pedagogy, I address themes and descriptive data that emerged from the first open-ended question and six Likert-scale items in the survey. To answer the second research question that aims to explore participants' desire to implement translingual pedagogy and explain how their perceptions of this pedagogy influence their desire to adopt it, I report on the findings from descriptive and inferential statistics. Finally, to answer the last research question addressing participants' concerns with implementing translingual pedagogy, I document the themes that emerged from the second open-ended question in the survey.

RQ 1: What are prospective composition teacher-scholars' perceptions of translingual pedagogy?

I begin by looking at the descriptions of what translingual pedagogy meant to participants. Thematic analysis of the participants' written responses to the first open-ended question in the survey (How would you describe translingual pedagogy?) revealed a variety of definitions for translingual pedagogy. Table 1 provides an illustration of different responses from the prospective composition teacher-scholars.

Table 1

Thematic Analysis: Perceptions of Translingual Pedagogy (N=30)

Themes	Examples	N (%)*
Codemeshing	"the acceptance and valuing of multiple languages and discourses in students' writing" "giving multilingual students the chance to use certain words or phrases from their first language in their writing"	24 (80%)
Negotiating	"a way to teach using various negotiation strategies" "writing and writing education involve the negotiation of language differences"	6 (20%)
Teaching multilingual writing	"knowing how to instruct multilingual students" "it won't be interesting to monolingual students"	4 (13%)
Awareness raising	"students might become aware of the notion of communication as dynamic and negotiated rather than bounded and static"	3 (10%)

Challenging dominant ideologies	"monolingualism is an illness that could be cured with translingual pedagogy"	3 (10%)
	"moving out of standardization and the boundaries it creates"	

Note. *Many of the participants described more than one definition in their response.The possibility of a participant's response to be coded at more than one theme causes total percentages to exceed 100%.

As Table 1 indicates, of 40 survey participants, 30 (75%) responded to the first open-ended question that addressed the participants' perceptions of translingual pedagogy. Five themes emerged from this data set: (a) codemeshing, (b) negotiating, (c) teaching multilingual writing, (d) awareness raising, and (e) challenging dominant ideologies.

Codemeshing. Twenty-four (80%) of 30 participants described translingual pedagogy as an approach that allows students to mesh multiple languages, discourses, styles, and/or modalities in their English academic writing. In other words, they perceived translingual pedagogy to be facilitating opportunities for students to codemesh in their writing. One of the participants wrote: "translingual pedagogy prompts students to make use of their diverse linguistic/dialect and cultural resources and across different modalities to participate in class and to complete coursework."

Negotiating. Six (20%) participants shared an understanding of translingual pedagogy to promote a negotiation-based writing instruction model, the premise of which is to facilitate negotiation of meaning across language differences in a classroom setting. This is best illustrated by the quote below:

> Translingual pedagogy is oriented towards the practice of negotiation of meaning between teachers and students with strong awareness of local, translocal, and global ideologies and sociohistorical contexts that influence how teaching and learning are practiced. I believe this pedagogy promotes empowerment to both teachers and students because they collaborate to create a space for both of them to learn from each other.

Teaching multilingual writing. Four (13%) participants associated translingual pedagogy with multilingual writing instruction, believing that it responds to multilingual student needs, rather than the so called "monolingual" students. Elaborating on this issue, one of the participants opined:

> I agree that translingual pedagogy would be important when teaching multilingual writers. However, as a composition instructor who have mainly taught English

monolingual students, I have less confidence to implement translingual pedagogy in my classes.

Awareness raising. Three (10%) participants agreed that teachers can use translingual pedagogy as a way to make students aware of languages and language differences as resources that they can draw on to construct meaning in their writing. To illustrate, one of the responses went:

Translingual pedagogy is teaching writing/language as a practice. It involves inviting students' identities into the classroom, encouraging an openness to linguistic diversity, and helping students to gain metacognitive awareness of their own linguistic resources and rhetorical awareness of how to marshal their resources in various ecologies.

Challenging dominant ideologies. Three (10%) participants reported that translingual pedagogy holds value in teaching students to think critically about and challenge dominant language ideologies that manifest standardized and monolingual principles in written communication. For instance, a participant described translingual pedagogy as "a pedagogy in which students go beyond English standardization."

The results rendered from the analysis of qualitative data demonstrated that prospective composition teacher-scholars had common conceptions about what translingual pedagogy entailed in the teaching of writing. To further analyze and describe participants' beliefs about translingual pedagogy, I computed statistical analysis of the Likert-scale items measuring participants' perceptions. Table 2 presents the quantitative analysis of the regarding survey items.

Table 2

Statistical Analysis: Perceptions of Translingual Pedagogy (N=40)

Items	Mean	SD
Knowing how to implement translingual pedagogy is important.	4.35	.89299
Implementing translingual pedagogy requires a strong theoretical understanding of translingualism.	4.25	.80861
I feel encouraged to implement translingual pedagogy.	3.75	.92681
I am confident that I can implement translingual pedagogy.	3.37	1.29471
I have a difficult time understanding translingual pedagogy.	2.67	1.24833
Implementing translingual pedagogy takes too much effort.	2.62	1.10215

Note. Scale: 1 – Strongly disagree, 2 – Somewhat disagree, 3 – Neither agree nor disagree, 4 – Somewhat agree, 5 – Strongly agree.

Table 2 shows that knowing how to implement translingual pedagogy was important to participants (*M*= 4.35, *SD*=.89), and they confirmed that they needed a strong theoretical understanding of translingualism to apply this pedagogy (*M*=4.25, *SD*=.80). Participants were somewhat undecided about whether they felt encouraged (*M*=3.75, *SD*=.92) or confident (*M*=3.37, *SD*=1.29) to implement translingual pedagogy. Furthermore, they contemplated that they found translingual pedagogy neither difficult to understand (*M*=2.67, *SD*=1.24) nor effortful to implement (*M*=2.62, *SD*=1.10).

RQ 2: In what ways do prospective composition teacher-scholars' perceptions influence their desire to implement translingual pedagogy?

To understand whether participants wanted to adopt translingual pedagogy in their classroom practices on teaching writing, I investigated the descriptive data and analyzed the items related to their desire to implement translingual pedagogy. Table 3 presents the mean and standard deviation values for the two survey items measuring prospective composition teacher-scholars' willingness to enact such a pedagogy in their teaching.

Table 3
Statistical Analysis: Desire to Implement Translingual Pedagogy (N=40)

Items	Mean	SD
I am willing to implement translingual pedagogy in my current/future composition classroom(s).	4.27	.71567
I plan to integrate translingual pedagogy into my course design.	3.55	1.13114

Note. Scale: 1 – Strongly disagree, 2 – Somewhat disagree, 3 – Neither agree nor disagree, 4 – Somewhat agree, 5 – Strongly agree.

As Table 3 displays, participants were consistent in their agreement over their willingness to implement translingual pedagogy in their teaching of writing (*M*=4.27, *SD*=.71). However, when asked whether they plan to incorporate this pedagogy into their course design, they remained undecided (*M*=3.55, *SD*=1.13). In order to explore whether and how prospective composition teacher-scholars' perceptions of translingual pedagogy influenced their desire to implement it in their teaching, I conducted a Spearman rho correlation test. Table 4 demonstrates the findings from this correlational analysis.

Table 4

Statistical Analysis: Correlations between Perceptions and Desire to Implement Translingual Pedagogy (N=40)

Items	Measure	Confidence	Encouragement	Difficulty
I am willing to implement translingual pedagogy.	*Spearman Rho*	.670	.607	-.223
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000*	.000*	.166
I plan to integrate translingual pedagogy into my course design.	*Spearman Rho*	.635	.434	-.438
	(Sig. (2-tailed)	.000*	.005*	.009*

Note. * Correlation is significant at the .01 level

As shown in Table 4, participants' willingness to implement translingual pedagogy was significantly correlated with their confidence level in implementing this pedagogy (r=.670, p=.000) and their beliefs about being encouraged to engage in this pedagogy (r=.607, p=.000). In other words, the more confident and encouraged participants felt, the more desire they experienced to adopt a translingual approach to teaching writing. Feelings of confidence (r=.635, p=.000) and encouragement (r=.434, p=.005) also influenced participants' plans to incorporate this pedagogy into their teaching. Furthermore, results indicated that participants who had a difficult time understanding translingual pedagogy did not plan to integrate it into their course design (r=-.438, p=.009).

RQ 3: What are prospective composition teacher-scholars' concerns with implementing translingual pedagogy?

The second open-ended question in the survey (What are your concerns, if any, with implementing translingual pedagogy?), participants were asked about their concerns with adopting a translingual approach to teaching writing. Table 5 displays the thematic analysis of participants' written responses to this question.

Table 5

Thematic Analysis: Concerns with Implementing Translingual Pedagogy (N=23)

Themes	Examples	N (%)

Institutional Support	"my institution might not be supportive" "there remains a stronghold of 'English Only' epistemologies in my institution"	10 (43%)
Students	"my students might resist a translingual orientation" "the push back I may get from students"	7 (30%)
Across the Curriculum	"to what extent does the concept of translingual pedagogy go along with the idea of writing across the curriculum?"	5 (22%)
Norms	"students need to learn how to write in normative conditions"	4 (17%)
Pedagogical Knowledge	"I don't know how to implement it" "not knowing enough about it to do it"	3 (13%)
Grading	"evaluating students' work is a big concern"	2 (9%)

Note. * Many of the participants described more than one concern in their response. The possibility of a participant's response to be coded at more than one theme causes total percentages to exceed 100%.

As Table 5 shows, of 40 survey participants, 23 (57%) reported their concerns with implementing translingual pedagogy. These concerns represented diverse issues with translingual pedagogy from the perspective of prospective composition teacher-scholars. The qualitative data yielded six major themes: (a) institutional support, (b) students, (c) across the curriculum, (d) norms, (e) pedagogical knowledge, and (e) grading.

Institutional support. Ten (43%) of 23 participants raised concerns about finding institutional support to implement translingual pedagogy in their teaching contexts. For these participants, engaging in translingual practices in their teaching would put them in a position where they had to challenge the standard conventions imposed upon them by their institutions. As one of the participants' comment exemplifies: "I don't think there is very much support for implementing translingual pedagogy in the writing program that I teach."

Students. Seven (30%) participants focused their attention on possible student reactions to translingual pedagogy, hypothesizing that their students would not embrace this pedagogy in their writing classrooms. The following response from a participant demonstrates this concern clearly: "My concerns would be the ideology of native speakerism that my students deeply believe in. In a typical composition class, students demand grammatical feedback that they believe to be the key to a good writing."

Across the curriculum. Five (22%) participants brought out the issues of writing across the curriculum and put the trans-disciplinarity of translingual pedagogy into question. One participant, for example, contemplated: "If I encourage my first-year writing students to use translingualism, what might they write in their upper-level course? And how will those professors view their language use? Am I setting them up to fail later?"

Norms. Four (17%) participants argued for the importance of teaching students how to write in monolingual-standard-English conditions. One of these participants discussed the conditions in which they would welcome translingual practices in student writing by saying:

> I don't have a problem with students translanguaging when they talk to me or each other about their writing ideas. I don't have a problem with students substituting English words they don't know with words in their own language. Where I have a concern, though, is when there is translanguaging in the final product. I think, by then, it should all be in English. I could be wrong, but I think some proponents of translingualism say that translingualism should be embraced even in the final product, and that's where I disagree.

Pedagogical knowledge. Three (13%) participants disclosed that their pedagogical knowledge was not enough to enact translingual pedagogy. Of concern was their lack of understanding concerning the ways to implement such a pedagogy. As it happens, one of the participants asked: "How do you implement translingual pedagogy? How do you incorporate it step by step into your classroom?"

Grading. Two (9%) participants had concerns about assessment in translingual pedagogy. The lack of practical guidelines for how to evaluate student writing that involves codemeshing practices drove prospective composition teacher-scholars skeptical about the implementation of translingual pedagogy. One of the responses went: "If you are utilizing translingualism within a classroom assignment, how do you grade it? What if a teacher and student do not share a common language outside of the English language when the student utilizes codemeshing for instance?"

Discussion

The central aim of the current study was to shed light on prospective composition teacher-scholars' desire to implement an emerging pedagogy in the teaching of writing. Despite the growing body of work on translingual theory, practice, and pedagogy, a review of the literature on composition studies reveals a gap in terms of empirical inquiry into teachers' attitudes towards such pedagogy. Addressing this gap in scholarship, the present study tapped into the elucidation of translingual pedagogy from the perspectives of 40 prospective composition teacher-scholars. The study's findings contribute to the scholarship related to the overarching concept of translingualism and its pedagogization for writing instruction at college level. In this section, I discuss these findings within the context of the field.

Translingual Pedagogy: A Closer Look

In recent professional discussions, scholars move beyond the question of whether to take a translingual approach to teaching writing and rather focus attention on how to do it to articulate the scope and implications of such an approach for teaching and learning writing. Still, the results from this study establish that the term "translingual" itself continues to create confusion amongst future generations of teacher-scholars. Participants' responses to translingual pedagogy in this study demonstrate varied conceptions of this pedagogy and concerned feelings about it. Of particular interest was the finding that a significant number of participants commonly described translingual pedagogy in terms of a particular communicative practice called codemeshing. Scholars of translingualism, however, have recently clarified that the conceptual relationship between translingual pedagogy and codemeshing is more than one being the equivalent of the other (Schreiber & Watson, 2018). Such that, while codemeshing practice is appreciated and acknowledged in translingual writing classrooms, it is not the one and only way to enact a translingual writing pedagogy (Guerra, 2016; Lee & Jenks, 2016; Schreiber & Watson, 2018). Indeed, it is a rhetorical strategy that writers can either choose or not depending on the purpose and context of their writing (Guerra, 2016; Schreiber & Watson, 2018). Therefore, equating translingual pedagogy to codemeshing carries the risk of an inadequate interpretation of this pedagogy.

Another interesting finding was that for some participants, translingual pedagogy was geared towards multilingual writing instruction, not "monolingual". It seems from this finding that an expansive discussion of translingual pedagogy's usage in writing classrooms dominated by English monolinguals is worthy of greater scholarly attention. In their ground breaking opinion piece, Horner et al. (2011) addressed the question of why monolingual students would need to learn a translingual approach to writing, arguing for two reasons: 1. those so-called "monolingual" students are often in fact multilinguals in the sense that they know multiple varieties of English, and 2. even in cases where the students are accepted to be monolinguals, it must be remembered that they still act in multilingual conditions with the possibility of writing for multilingual audiences and reading the works of multilingual authors. Furthermore, as Lee (2016) observes, "certain "native speakers" of English, such as African American students, have historically been also marginalized because of their language differences" (p. 178), which calls for linguistic justice for all. Research shows that a translingual approach can help to deconstruct students' mono-lingual/-cultural/-modal views about writing and cultivate their openness to writing across differences (Wang, 2017). Consequently, scholars in the field propose the notion of translingual pedagogy for all language users regardless of their historical, cultural, ethnic backgrounds given that they are all effected by the ideologies of

monolingualism and standardization (Horner et al., 2011; Lee, 2016; Lee & Jenks, 2016; Wang, 2017).

Translingual Concerns

The primary reason that I embarked upon this research was to explore prospective composition teacher-scholars' desire to implement translingual pedagogy. Interestingly, while demonstrating willingness toward the application of this pedagogy in their teaching, participants were less likely to engage in a translingual-oriented writing instruction as they were doubtful about incorporating translingual pedagogy into their course design. In other words, participants embraced translingual pedagogy in theory, however, they had moments of uncertainty to bring it into practice. This hesitation to put theory into practice can possibly be explained by the various challenges that participants anticipate in taking a translingual approach to teaching writing. Results showed that participants had concerned feelings about implementing translingual pedagogy due to a variety of practical, pedagogical, and institutional issues. While some of these concerns were echoed by the established scholars in the field, some of them were personal. For example, intense concerns about student resistance and the normative demands of academic writing appeared to be the most common criticisms of translingual pedagogy in the literature (Atkinson & Tardy, 2018; Gevers, 2018). Providing an empirical ground to these criticisms, Kafle (2020) found that students indeed have hesitations about bringing their linguistic resources into academic writing, believing that mixing languages is a problem to the conventions of such high stakes writing which would result in low scores. This leads to two critical implications: 1. writing instructors must remember that in translingual pedagogy, codemeshing is not a requirement, but a rhetorical choice for students to make (Schreiber & Watson, 2018), and 2. to help students make informed rhetorical choices, writing instructors should raise students' awareness of their rights to their languages and foster their view of differences as resources, which can happen through the enactment of translingual pedagogy in the classroom.

For translingual approach to be embraced not only in theory but also in practice, it is crucial to acknowledge and address the concerns raised here. The results of this study indicate that many of the participants' concerns stem from the institutional barriers in taking on a translingual approach for teaching writing. While these concerns are inarguably salient considering the role that institutional and administrative policies play in imposing standard language ideologies upon the teaching and learning of writing, it is important to remember that translingual pedagogy "does not disregard established norms and conventions as defined for certain contexts by dominant institutions" (Canagarajah, 2012, p. 8). Rather, it facilitates students' ability to engage more critically in the standard language cultures that they live in (Canagarajah, 2015; Guerra, 2016; Horner et al., 2011).

This also responds to the concerns centered on students' preference to know the norms and composing in the disciplines because a translingual approach to writing does not prevent students from learning the conventions of English academic discourse, but raises their awareness of the options available to them. Finally, for those with personal concerns regarding the issue of not knowing how to enact translingualism in teaching writing, the emerging literature on the pedagogizing of translingual approach will likely contribute to developing nuanced pedagogical knowledge about the implementation of this pedagogy. Meanwhile, writing instructors can attend professional development workshops, engage in fruitful discussions on translingualism, and review relevant publications in the field in order to explore pedagogical ideas to incorporate translingual pedagogy into their course designs and activities.

Conclusion

As Taggart, Hessler, and Schick (2014) state, "there is no single way to teach writing, nor even one unified set of goals all writing teachers need to help students achieve" (p. 1). However, there is the reality of linguistic diversity. College writing classrooms are not linguistically homogeneous environments (Matsuda, 2010) and the pedagogies that teachers use must account for the issues of language difference in the teaching and learning of writing. In meeting this need, translingual pedagogy offers possibilities for creating such a space, encouraging the development of practices that cultivate awareness of and openness to writing across differences. While teachers of writing can continue to draw on the current scholarship to engage in best practices to address linguistic diversity in their writing classrooms, more research is required to build stronger pedagogical knowledge about how translingual approach functions in the teaching of writing, explicating the is, isn't, and how's of such an approach. The more theoretically grounded pedagogies are, the more pedagogically aware teachers become.

Notes

1. The term "teacher-scholar" gestures the indivisible nature of teaching and learning, whereas the preceding adjective "prospective" indicates the positionality of doctoral students as scholars-in-progress.
2. All data were collected from participants in accordance with and under the supervision of Indiana University of Pennsylvania's IRB board.

3. As participants were not required to answer the demographic questions, the total number of participants does not equal the number of participants represented in the demographic data.

4. This study was presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication in 2020.

References

Atkinson, D., Crusan, D., Matsuda, P. K., Ortmeier-Hooper, C., Ruecker, T., Simpson, S., & Tardy, C. (2015). Clarifying the relationship between L2 writing and translingual writing: An open letter to writing studies editors and organization leaders. *College English*, *77*(4), 383-386.

Atkinson, D., & Tardy, C. M. (2018). SLW at the crossroads: Finding a way in the field. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 42,* 86-93.

Ayash, N. B. (2016). Conditions of (im)possibility: Postmonolingual language representations in academic literacies. *College English, 78*(6), 555-577.

Bawarshi, A. (2010). The challenges and possibilities of taking up multiple discursive resources in U.S. college composition. In B. Horner, M. Lu, & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Cross-language relations in composition* (pp. 196-203). Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP.

Canagarajah (2012). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and classrooms.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Canagarajah, S. (2015). Clarifying the relationship between translingual practice and L2 writing: Addressing learner identities. *Applied Linguistics Review, 6*(4), 415-440.

De Costa, P. I., Singh, J. G., Milu, E., Wang, X., Fraiberg, S., & Canagarajah, S. (2017). Pedagogizing translingual practice: Prospects and possibilities. *Research in the Teaching of English, 51*(4), 464-472.

Donahue, C. (2018). Rhetorical and linguistic flexibility: Valuing heterogeneity in academic writing education. In X. You (Ed.), *Transnational writing education: Theory, history, and practice* (pp. 21-40). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gevers, J. (2018). Translingualism revisited: Language difference and hybridity in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 40*, 73-83.

Guerra, J. C. (2016). Cultivating a rhetorical sensibility in the translingual writing classroom. *College English, 78*(3), 228-233.

Hall, J. (2018). The translingual challenge: Boundary work in rhetoric & composition, second language writing, and WAC/WID. *Across the Disciplines: A Journal of Language, Learning and Academic Writing, 15*(3), 28-47.

Horner, B. (2010). Introduction: From "English only" to cross-language relations in composition. In B. Horner, M. Lu, & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Cross-language relations in composition* (pp.1-17). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

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

Horner, B., & Selfe, C. (2013). Translinguality/transmodality relations: Snapshots from a dialogue. *The Working Paper Series on Negotiating Differences in Language & Literacy*. Retrieved from https://louisville.edu/workingpapers/doc/self-horner-working-papers version

Kafle, M. (2020). "No one would like to take a risk": Multilingual students' views on language mixing in academic writing. *System, 94*, 1-10.

Kiernan, J. (2015). Multimodal and translingual composing practices: A culturally based needs assessment of second language learners. *Journal of Global Literacies,Technologies, and Emerging Pedagogies, 3*(1), 302-321.

Kiernan, J., Meier, J., & Wang, X. (2016). Negotiating languages and cultures: Enacting translingualism through a translation assignment. *Composition Studies, 44*(1), 89-107.

Lee, C. (2016). Multilingual resources and practices in digital communication. In A. Georgakopoulou, & T. Spilioti (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language and digital communication* (pp. 118-132). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lee, J. W., & Jenks, C. (2016). Doing translingual dispositions. *College Composition and Communication, 68*(2), 317-344.

Liao, F. (2018). Translingual pedagogy through poetry writing: A case of college composition courses. *Journal of Global Literacies, Technologies, and Emerging Pedagogies, 4*(3), 741-765.

Lu, M., & Horner, B. (2013). Translingual literacy, language difference, and matters of agency. *College English, 75*(6), 582-607.

Matsuda, P. K. (2010). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in U.S. college composition. In B. Horner, M. Lu, & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Cross-language relations in composition* (pp. 81-96). Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP.

Matsuda, P. K. (2015). Writing involves the negotiation of language differences. In L. Adler Kassner, & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 68-70). Boulder, CO: Utah State University Press.

Sanchez-Martin, C., Hirsu, L., Gonzales, L., & Alvarez, S. P. (2019). Pedagogies of digital composing through a translingual approach. *Computers and Composition, 52*, 142-157.

Schreiber, B. R., & Watson, M. (2018). Translingualism =/ code-meshing: A response to Gever's "Translingualism revisited" (2018). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 42*, 94-97.

Taggart, A. R., Hessler, H. B., & Schick, K. (2014). What is composition pedagogy: An introduction. In G. Tate, A. R. Taggart, K. Schick, & H. B. Hessler (Eds.), *A guide to composition pedagogies* (pp. 1-19). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Wang, C., Samuelson, B. L., & Silvester, K. (2020). Zhai nan, mai meng and filial piety: The translingual creativity of Chinese university students in an academic writing course. *Journal of Global Literacies, Technologies, and Emerging Pedagogies, VI* (II), 1120-1143.

Wang, X. (2017). Developing translingual disposition through a writing theory cartoon assignment. *Journal of Basic Writing, 36*(1), 56-86.

You, X. (2016). *Cosmopolitan English and transliteracy*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

You, X. (2018). Introduction: Making a transnational turn in writing education. In X. You (Ed.), *Transnational writing education: Theory, history, and practice* (pp. 1-17). New York, NY: Routledge.