

Creating a Transnational Space in the First Year Writing Classroom

Edited by

W. Ordeman

University of North Texas

Series in Literary Studies



VERNON PRESS

Copyright © 2021 by the authors.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of Vernon Art and Science Inc.

www.vernonpress.com

In the Americas:
Vernon Press
1000 N West Street, Suite 1200
Wilmington, Delaware, 19801
United States

In the rest of the world:
Vernon Press
C/Sancti Espiritu 17,
Malaga, 29006
Spain

Series in Literary Studies

Library of Congress Control Number: 2020949840

ISBN: 978-1-62273-952-3

Cover design by Vernon Press using elements designed by Freepik.

Product and company names mentioned in this work are the trademarks of their respective owners. While every care has been taken in preparing this work, neither the authors nor Vernon Art and Science Inc. may be held responsible for any loss or damage caused or alleged to be caused directly or indirectly by the information contained in it.

Every effort has been made to trace all copyright holders, but if any have been inadvertently overlooked the publisher will be pleased to include any necessary credits in any subsequent reprint or edition.

Table of contents

	<i>List of figures and tables</i>	<i>v</i>
	<i>Abstract</i>	<i>vii</i>
	<i>Introduction</i>	<i>ix</i>
	<i>Part 1. Creating Transnational Spaces through Ethnographic Reflections</i>	<i>1</i>
Chapter 1	Erasing the Idea of Monolingual Students in Translingual Spaces: A Study of Translingual Pedagogy in First-Year Writing	3
	Norma Denae Dibrell <i>University of Texas Rio Grande Valley</i>	
Chapter 2	Translanguaging and Academic Writing: Possibilities and Challenges in English-Only Classrooms	17
	Abu Saleh Mohammad Rafi and Professor Anne-Marie Morgan <i>James Cook University</i>	
Chapter 3	Language, Home, and Transnational Space	41
	Naoko Akai-Dennis, PhD <i>Bunker Hill Community College</i>	
	<i>Part 2. Creating Transnational Space through Pedagogical Designs Focused on Genre</i>	<i>63</i>
Chapter 4	A Confluence of Xings: A Nested Heuristic for Developing and Networking Individual, Programmatic, and Institutional Spaces of Transnational Work	67
	Andrew Hollinger and Colin Charlton <i>University of Texas Rio Grande Valley</i>	

Chapter 5	<p>All Writers Have More Englishes to Learn: Translingual First-Year Composition Classes' Promotion of Composition's Threshold Concepts</p> <p>Asmita Ghimire and Elizabethada A. Wright <i>University of Minnesota Duluth</i></p>	85
Chapter 6	<p>Translingual and Transnational Pedagogies Enacted: Linguistic and Cultural Trajectory Narratives in First-Year Composition</p> <p>Demet Yigitbilek <i>Illinois State University</i></p>	103
	<p><i>Part 3. Creating Temporary Transnational Space through Assignment Design</i></p>	121
Chapter 7	<p>Learning by Writing: Possibilities of Tele-Collaborative Transnational Education In and Beyond a First-Year Writing Classroom</p> <p>Maria Houston <i>Texas A&M University Texarkana</i></p> <p>Ekaterina Gradaleva <i>Samara State Technical University</i></p>	123
Chapter 8	<p>Investigating Translingual Practices in First-Year Writing Courses: Implications for Transnational Composition Pedagogies</p> <p>Phuong M. Tran, Kyle Lucas, and Kenny Tanemura <i>Purdue University</i></p>	143
	<p><i>Afterword</i></p>	165
	<p><i>Author Biographies</i></p>	167
	<p><i>Index</i></p>	171

List of figures and tables

Figure 1.1 Writing Assignment.	12
Figure 2.0 “ENGLISH PLEASE” sign on the AUE classroom walls.	24
Figure 2.1 Student Observations.	25
Figure 2.2 Translanguaging to assess students’ general linguistic performances.	28
Figure 2.3 An example of a well-argued response in a slightly translanguaged script.	29
Figure 2.4 An example of a well-argued response in an English script.	29
Figure 2.5 An example of a well-argued response in a slightly translanguaged script.	30
Figure 2.6 An example of language specific performance of translanguaging pedagogy.	31
Figure 2.7 Student Reflection.	33
Figure 2.8 Ms Shila’s Recommendation.	36
Table 7.1 The stages, elements, and tasks of the International Conference Project.	130

Abstract

The chapters in this volume offer new ways of thinking about and applying theories of transnational rhetoric in first-year composition classrooms. Transnationalism is still a rather nascent field in rhetorical studies, and the growing body of literature has thus far focused on the critical necessity of laying theoretical groundwork. There remains a lack of applied pedagogical research teachers can use to help create and nurture transnational spaces in the classroom. While several works in this volume contribute to our understanding of the breadth and depth of transnational rhetoric, the goal of this work is to offer applicable pedagogy that helps create and nurture transnational spaces within a specific writing context.

Introduction

Theoretical Groundwork

What do we mean by “transnationalism”? In her article, *What’s the Difference Between “Translingual” and “Transnational” Composition?: Clarifying the Relationship between two Terms*, Carrie Kilfoil claims that these terms can often seem synonymous and that understanding their nuance requires intentional study. Still, it’s not uncommon to hear the terms interchangeably. After all, aren’t all translinguals also transnationals (and vice versa)? Don’t both denote the blending of culture ideologies? Part of this confusion, Kilfoil claims, stems from citizens of monolingual societies presuming all nations are monolingual entities. It is true that many nations represent monolingual societies - some even creating laws to enforce monolingualism (such as the English Only movement), and nation states have used linguistic colonization to subjugate translingual communities (see Anzaldúa). But as Yasemin Yildiz has argued, there is a false assumption that “individuals and social formations...possess one ‘true’ language (their ‘mother tongue’) and through this possession [are] organically linked to an exclusive, clearly demarcated ethnicity, culture, and nation” (2). While translingual communities represent identities informed by language with multiple languages represented in a single community, a transnational perspective, as Yildiz puts it, “puts the emphasis on human agency: such groups are the result of cross-border activities which link individuals, families and local groups” (2). Using transnational and translingual interchangeably reinforces a limited definition of rhetoric - that it is a strictly linguistic act. It is important that students and faculty obtain a framework for understanding spaces where national interest and national identities are concurrent with but exist apart from language.

In 2008, Hesford and Schell argued “all national formations are constructed within and often solidified by transnational connectivities” (464) and called for research in composition studies that recognizes these transnational connectivities. The following year, Christiane Donahue reiterated this when she called more “deep intercultural awareness” to avoid “efforts [that] will remain stuck in a-historical, a-contextual, and highly partial modes of intellectual tourism.” (236) Since then, discourse in transnationalism composition has begun to address these relationships and lay theoretical groundwork for further study.

The introduction to the recent *Transnationalism: Theory, History, and Practice* edited by Xiaoye You argues the foundation of transnationalism

consists of translanguaging, transculturalism, and cosmopolitanism – each having a distinct role in our conception of transnationalism. This foundation has been partly constructed by research mentioned above and discourse on related areas including immigrant and migrant studies (Pandey; Simon; Vieira), digital literacy (Berry et al.; Lam and Rosario-Ramos), and globalization in higher education (Kang; Lorimer Leonard; McNamara) and transnational feminist studies (Dingo). The works of these individuals suggest transnational rhetoric create transnational space - begging the question, how do these created spaces influence agents therein?

Encouraging translanguaging practice in the classroom is crucial to empower students to influence and recognize influence within their environments. Language has no doubt affected the transnational composition classrooms, but as Xiaoye You has argued and the authors in this volume point out, translanguaging functions as the predicate of transnational pedagogy which deserves to be seen as an independent agent (*Transnationalism: Theory, History, and Practice*). Understanding the relationship of these two ideologies not only helps teachers develop pedagogy that creates space for developing and examining transnationalism and translanguaging independently, it will also reaffirm to our students the threshold concepts we believe about writing.

Answering the Call

Teaching writing within these transnational spaces helps foster what Rebecca Lorimer Leonard calls *rhetorical attunement*: “an understanding that assumes multiplicity and invites the negotiation of meaning across difference” (“Multilingual Writing as Rhetorical Attunement”288). Sara Alvarez claims transnational writers can “sustain and foster transnational literacies and networks via various forms of writing that are of value to the academy” (344). This volume responds to this assertion. Each chapter addresses one of the following questions: “How can we use the resources at our disposal to incorporate transnational ecologies in homogeneous classrooms?” and/or “What can be done to foster transnational literacies and networks as a direct response to transnational spaces outside the classroom?” All authors see transnational space in the classroom as an opportunity to help students see rhetoric as highly contextual and subject to the agents involved. David S. Martin’s recent work, *Transnational Writing Program Administration*, has helped illuminate long-standing assumptions about program curriculum and pedagogy within writing programs. This volume continues in research that understands “transnational activities are thoroughly shifting the questions we ask about writing curricula, the space and place in which writing happens, and the cultural and linguistic issues at the heart of the relationships forged in literacy work” (Martins 1).

This volume also addresses Leonard's call in her short essay "Moving Beyond Methodological Nationalism" when she calls for research that is "more precise and less restricted." (129) Readers will find precision for the term transnationalism through the specific pedagogical projects each author has introduced in their classes. Restrictions in terms of correct/appropriate/right and incorrect/inappropriate/wrong are guided by each author's specific pedagogical goal.

Several authors in this volume were afforded the opportunity to teach rhetoric to students who live in *transnational spaces* where the rhetoric is reflective of an altogether unique phenomenon happening outside the classroom. The authors share their analysis and results in an effort to find effective teaching methods that satisfy student learning outcomes while creating ecologies that reflect the values and perspectives of the students in the room. Other authors in this volume teach in homogeneous classrooms (classrooms where one cultural group accounts for the majority of the students) where they themselves bring a representation of transnationalism by teaching English writing courses as a non-native speaker of English. Their purpose is not so much to reflect the ecologies of the students' transnationalism, but rather to reveal the transnational spaces they as instructors create. Translingualism is a common theme throughout the work as translingual pedagogies are commonly used to help construct/reflect transnational ecologies. As both are still relatively novel pedagogical approaches, there are a number of new ways of analyzing, implementing, and evaluating their pedagogy.

Where previous work on transnational pedagogy has focused on theory, the goal of this volume is to offer examples of transnational pedagogy *in action* followed by discussions of what these applications imply to our understanding of the field. By building a larger database of transnational pedagogy, teachers will better be able to develop writing curricula that create transnational space - a space many students and teachers are already living and operating in.

Chapter Sections

All the authors in this volume are connected by their shared vision of cultivating transnational spaces in the first-year writing classrooms. They write to cross the border between scholarship on transnationalism as rhetorical theory and applying this theory to first-year writing curriculum and pedagogy. *Creating a Transnational Space in the First Year Writing Classroom* is structured along the border of pedagogical research methods and classroom application and thus divided into three sections based on the author's implementation and research methodology. The chapters are divided into these sections to help align the reader's goals with correlating goals of the authors. Researchers who are most interested in understanding their

students' relationship with transnationalism might find the chapters in Part 1 most beneficial as they incorporate ethnographic research. Readers who are in a position to create transnational courses study might find chapters in Part 2 most helpful. Educators who are interested in applying a piece-meal approach might find the chapters in Part 3 helpful as they are concerned with specific assignments. By dividing the work thus, readers can guide themselves toward sections most pertinent to their objectives.

Creating Transnational Spaces through Ethnographic Reflection

The authors of this section use ethnographic reflections as a means of both evaluating and then inventing new pedagogical models. Their qualitative approach to research begins without a materialized hypothesis and is facilitated by inductive reasoning allowing them to discover insights specific to where they teach. These teachers explore first-year writing pedagogies via collecting qualitative data through the ethnographies of the students. Norma Dibrell begins her inquiry without asking specific questions, but rather from a position of understanding the students' experience outside the classroom. She uses their reflections as a means of challenging constructs of linguistic homogeneity. Abu Saleh Mohammad Rafi and Anne-Marie Morgan, on the other hand, begin by asking three open-ended questions specific to the efficacy of Rafi's classroom – one that is a transnational ecology. He uses several methods of gathering qualitative data to assess the efficacy of his teaching methods. Naoko Akai-Dennis' research begins by questioning assumptions about agency in transnational spaces. Akai-Dennis has her students collect data of language-use outside the classroom and uses the students' ethnographies to highlight the shortcomings of current theoretical constructs of translingual contact zones. All three authors undertake their research in the understanding that, as with most novel fields of research, not all of the "appropriate" questions have been conceived. Sometimes, an instructor has a vision for where they are going but lacks the fundamental inquiries that will drive progress. Similarly, the authors in this section first offer a literary synthesis as a means of providing the reader with their vision, and then offer ethnographic data as a means of validating and/or invalidating fundamental claims made by the theory of transnationalism.

Creating Transnational Spaces through Course Design focused on Genre

In this section, authors conduct their research by designing course content and course materials that emphasize genre. They do so in order to foster ideas of transnational spaces through classroom discourse, classroom activities, and writing prompts. The roles of the authors in this section include Writing Program Administrators, Professors, and Graduate Teachers of Record, giving

the reader a unique perspective of how one can create transnational spaces based on their professional level of influence. Andrew Hollinger and Colin Charlton are writing program directors at a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) where transnationals make up the majority of their student body. Their program is designed around *writing about writing* curriculum through transnational writing environments. Asmita Ghimire shares her insight as a transnational graduate assistant in a predominately homogeneous environment. She and Elizabethada Wright have built their transnational curriculum to address this type of dichotomy. Demet Yigitbilek shares a similar experience as the graduate teacher of record in a university in the midwest. She designed the course *Language and/as Identity* and uses her transnational experience to teach genre in her rhetoric classroom. All these authors offer reflections that are particularly helpful for course/program designers who are looking for research that includes comprehensive implementation of transnational pedagogies.

Creating Transnational Spaces through Assignment Design

Authors of this section use specific assignments as a means of incorporating transnational pedagogy for specific course modules within a first-year writing course. Their aim is to create transnational spaces within their classrooms to achieve specific learning outcomes in addition to those common to first-year composition courses. Maria Houston and Ekaterina Gradaleva's chapter specifically studies the efficacy of a transnational composition assignment that teaches digital literacies as well as collaborative writing. Authors Phuong Minh Tran, Kyle J. Lucas, and Kenneth Tanemura synthesize data collected from numerous transnational composition assignments to compare their successes and failures and offer suggestions to instructors on how they can be used to create transnational spaces.

W. Ordeman
January 2020

Works Cited

- Alvarez, Sara P. "Multilingual Writers in College Contexts." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, vol. 62, 2018, pp. 342-345.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands: The New Mestiza = La Frontera*. 1st ed. San Francisco: Aunt Lute, 1987.
- Berry, Patrick W., et al. *Transnational Literate Lives in Digital Times*. Computers and Composition Digital P/Utah State UP, 2012.
- Dingo, Rebecca. *Networking Arguments: Rhetoric, Transnational Feminism, and Public Policy Writing*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 2012.
- Donahue, Christiane. "'Internationalization' and Composition Studies: Reorienting the Discourse." *College Composition and Communication* 61.2 (2009): 212-243.

- Hall, Stuart. "Subjects in History: Making Diasporic Identities." *The House That Race Built: Black Americans, U.S. Terrain*. edited by Wahneema Lubiano, Pantheon, 1997. Pp. 289-300.
- Hesford, Wendy S., and Eileen E. Schell. "Introduction: Configurations of Transnationality: Locating Feminist Rhetorics." *College English* 70.5 (2008): 461–470.
- Kang, Yu-Kyung. "Tensions of Local and Global: South Korean International Students Navigating and Maximizing US College Life." *Literacy in Composition Studies*, vol. 3, no. 3, 2015.
- Kilfoil, Carrie. "What's the Difference Between 'Translingual' and 'Transnational' Composition?: Clarifying the Relationship between two Terms." *Transnational Writing*. Transnationalwriting.wordpress.com, Sept. 6 2016.
- Lam, Wan Shun Eva., and Enid Rosario-Ramos. "Multilingual Literacies in Transnationally Digitally Mediated Contexts: An Exploratory Study of Immigrant Teens in the United States." *Language and Education*, vol. 23, no. 2, 2009, pp. 171-90.
- Leonard, Rebecca Lorimer. "Multilingual Writing as Rhetorical Attunement." *College English*, vol. 76, no. 3, 2014, pp. 227–247. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/24238241. Accessed 3 Oct. 2020.
- . "Where We Are: The 'Global Turn' and Its Implications for Composition." *Composition Studies*, vol. 44, no. 1, Mar. 2016, pp. 127–130.
- Martins, David S., editor. *Transnational Writing Program Administration*. Utah State University Press, 2015.
- McNamara, Tom. "Diminishing Returns at Corporate U: Chinese Undergraduates and Composition's Activist Legacy." *Literacy in Composition Studies*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2018.
- Pandey, Iswari. *South Asian in the Mid-South: Migrations of Literacies*. U of Pittsburgh P, 2015.
- Simon, Kaia. "Daughters Learning from Fathers: Migrant Family Literacies that Mediate Borders." *Literacy in Composition Studies*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2017.
- Vieira, Kate. *American by Paper: How Documents Matter in Immigrant Literacy*. U of Minnesota P, 2016.
- Yildiz, Yasemin. *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2012. Print.
- You, Xiaoye, editor. *Transnational Writing Education*. New York: Routledge, 2018.

PAGES MISSING
FROM THIS FREE SAMPLE

Author Biographies

Chapter 1 - Erasing the Idea of Monolingual Students in Translingual Spaces: A Study of Translingual Pedagogy in First-Year Writing

Norma Denaë Dibrell is a former high school English teacher and current first-year writing lecturer at the University of Texas at Rio Grande Valley. She is a native of the Rio Grande Valley. Her research interests include transfer, translingualism, feminist theory, first-year writing studies, cultural rhetoric and decolonial studies.

Chapter 2 - Translanguaging and Academic Writing: Possibilities and Challenges in English-Only Classrooms

Abu Saleh Mohammad Rafi is a PhD candidate in Linguistics at James Cook University, Australia. He has been exploring the promises of translanguaging pedagogical approaches in the context of Bangladeshi higher education. Previously, he studied Sociolinguistics at Liverpool Hope University, United Kingdom.

Anne-Marie Morgan Professor and Dean of the College of Arts, Society and Education at James Cook University in Australia. She has over 25 years of experience working with teachers of languages in schools and universities. Her research interests include plurilingualism, translanguaging as classroom pedagogy, the teaching of languages including English, and the work of teachers in engaging with the diversity of student cohorts. She has over 50 major publications and has conducted more than 20 major research projects into languages education as Chief Investigator, including two current projects with the Australian Government and the Australian Research Council.

Chapter 3 - Language, Home, and Transnational Space

Dr. Naoko Akai-Dennis obtained a PhD in English and Education from Columbia University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. Her research interests are the relationship between language and self, autobiography as an inquiry, storytelling, and teaching of writing. Theoretically she is persuaded by post-colonial theory, post-structural feminist theory, and started to delve into post-humanist theory. She currently teaches College Writing I, College Writing II, College Writing I paired with Integrated ELL Level 3 Learning Community course, and an accelerated cluster Writing Skills II and College Writing for Early College Program at Bunker Hill Community College, Massachusetts, as an

assistant professor of English. She enjoys and appreciates the diverse community of students, staff, and professors at the college.

Chapter 4 - A Confluence of Xings: A Nested Heuristic for Developing and Networking Individual, Programmatic, and Institutional Spaces of Transnational Work

Andrew Hollinger has taught at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (formally UTPA) since 2012 in the Department of Language & Writing Studies, and has been the WPA for the first-year writing program since 2015. He teaches primarily first-year composition and technical communication where his previous experience as a high school teacher allows him to work closely with students transitioning from K12 or career paths into the university. His work focuses on writing pedagogy, writing administration, event theories and design, genre, and materiality.

Colin Charlton graduated with a PhD in English and a specialization in Rhetoric & Composition from Purdue University in 2005. He has taught at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (formerly UTPA) since 2005, where he has been the Department Chair of Writing & Language Studies since 2015. He teaches at all levels, but really enjoys his work in transitional and first-year writing courses and teacher training courses at the upper-undergraduate and graduate levels. His research includes writing pedagogy, event theories and design thinking, and (writing program) administration.

Chapter 5 - All Writers have more Englishes to Learn: Translingual First-Year Composition classes' Promotion of Composition's Threshold Concepts

A PhD student at the University of Texas at El Paso, **Asmita Ghimire** holds a Master of Arts in English from Tribhuvan University, Nepal and Master in English, Linguistics and Writing from the University of Minnesota Duluth. She was invited to the Young Scholar program organized by the British Academy of Writing 2018 where she presented and published "The Other Side of Afghan War: Women, War and the Question of Social Injustice." Focusing on transnational and translingual writing, she and Wright are publishing a special edition of *Academic Labor: Research and Artistry*.

Professor at the University of Minnesota Duluth, **Elizabethada A. Wright** teaches in the Department of English, Linguistics, and Writing Studies and is a member of the faculty at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities' Literacy and Rhetorical Studies Program. She has published in *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, *Rhetoric Review*, *College English Association Critic*, *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, as well as in a number of other journals and books.

Chapter 6 - Translingual and Transnational Pedagogies Enacted: Linguistic and Cultural Trajectory Narratives in First-Year Composition

Demet Yigitbilek is a PhD student in English Studies at Illinois State University (ISU) where she mainly designs and teaches FYC, theming them around what excites her at the time. Her research interests center around translingualism and linguistic diversity in Applied Linguistics, Second Language Writing, and Composition Studies. Her teaching is greatly influenced by her transnational identity as a Turkish scholar who has taught in Spain, Turkey and now in the US higher education. She enjoys experimenting with new ideas and pushes students to think beyond the walls of the classroom. So far, she has taught FYC as Language and Identity, Critical Writer-Researchers, and Composing In/Of Our Lives.

Chapter 7 - Learning by Writing: Possibilities of Tele-Collaborative Transnational Education In and Beyond a First-Year Writing Classroom

Ekaterina Gradaleva is an Associate Professor at Samara State Technical University. She is a graduate of Samara State University with a Doctorate in Germanic Languages. At present, she lectures EFL and Business English at the Department of Linguistics, Cross-Cultural Communication and Russian as a Foreign Language, and serves as a scientific mentor supervising student research in Linguistics and Business Studies. Her research interests involve Cultural Studies, Professional Communication, Project-Based Learning, and Teaching English for Specific Purposes.

Maria Houston is an English Faculty member at Texas A&M University in Texarkana. Maria currently teaches courses in Digital Writing and is in process of designing a Business Course with a focus on professional communication and cultural intelligence. She has an extensive record of publications in Second Language Literacy, Transnational Pedagogy, Collaborative Programming and Transnational Digital Rhetoric and Communications.

Chapter 8 - Investigating Translingual Practices in First-Year Writing Courses: Implications for Transnational Composition Pedagogies

Puong Minh Tran is a PhD Candidate in Second Language Studies/ESL at Purdue University. Her research encompasses second language writing, intercultural competence in writing studies, transnational composition pedagogies, Backward Design in curricular development and World Englishes. Puong is a member of the Transculturation in Introductory Composition project which focuses on intercultural competence development in first-year writing students and which has received several internal and external grants, including the CWPA Research Grant from the Council of Writing Program

Administrators in 2018. Phuong's work on cultural studies can be found in the edited collection *Building a Community, Having a Home: A History of the Conference on College Composition and Communication Asian/Asian American Caucus* (2017). Her other publications are forthcoming in the *Journal of World Englishes* and the edited collection *Teaching and Studying Transnational Composition*. At Purdue, Phuong is an instructor of mainstream and L2-specific First-Year Writing and Professional Writing.

Kyle J. Lucas is a PhD student in the English Department at Purdue University. His research focuses on the use of genre analysis and corpus linguistics to analyze student and professional academic writing. He is particularly interested in analyzing and comparing the rhetorical structures of research articles across academic disciplines. His most recent project involves English for Specific Purposes research in the field of philosophy. Other research interests include the role of critical thinking instruction in English for Academic Purposes curriculum as well as how genre-based and corpus-based analytical approaches can be used as pedagogical methods in English for Specific Purposes and English for Academic Purposes classrooms.

Kenneth Tanemura is a PhD Candidate in Second Language Studies/ESL at Purdue University. His research focuses on motivation in heritage language and L2 learning, and particularly how the L2 motivational self-system as conceptualized by Dörnyei can measure stages of learning. Kenneth is currently involved in various collaborative, duoethnographic projects about disciplinary identity and motivation in L2 researchers, specifically how scholars are motivated to investigate the integration of disability studies in the L2 writing syllabus, and the motivation to explore and analyze motivation itself as a subfield of applied linguistics. He also has work forthcoming in the *Journal of World Englishes*.

Index

A

academic writing 1, 10, 13, 17 – 19,
21, 28, 30, 33, 35, 79, 89, 129
agency ix, xii, 20, 34, 41, 47n2, 48 –
49, 57 – 59, 107, 131, 145, 149,
157
alien 33, 64, 87 – 89, 112
Anzaldúa, Gloria ix, 2, 42, 50 – 54,
64, 68, 107, 152
application xi, 131, 147, 161
assignment xiii, 5, 11 – 15, 50 – 51,
63 – 65, 69, 75, 79 – 81, 83, 86, 90
– 97, 107, 111, 114 – 115, 121 –
122, 126 – 130, 138, 143, 146 –
161

B

bilingual 4, 10, 13, 17, 21, 26, 28,
32, 47n2, 71, 78
border xi, 1, 4, 6, 11, 13, 45, 52, 56,
63

C

Canagarajah, Suresh 2, 5 – 7, 18 –
21, 26, 28, 35, 37, 45 – 51, 57, 87
– 88, 91 – 92, 103 – 105, 108, 126
– 127, 137, 145, 149, 153, 156
centrifugal 21 – 24, 29, 34
centripetal 21 – 25, 29, 34, 37
code-switching 6, 22, 51, 67
code-meshing 10 – 11, 13 – 15, 51,
152, 154, 157, 161
coding 23 – 24, 148

collaborative/collaboration xiii, 7,
22, 83, 106 – 107, 121, 123 – 130,
132 – 136, 139, 140, 144, 151,
153, 155
communities ix, 6, 10, 21, 35, 42,
44 – 47, 49 – 51, 54, 68 – 71, 74,
79, 92, 98, 108, 112 – 114, 115 –
116, 139, 145, 153
construct xii, 2, 46, 51, 55, 63 – 65,
74, 91 – 94, 118, 145
contact zone xii, 2, 42, 48 – 54, 57 –
59, 137, 158
curricula xiii, 1, 18 – 19, 27, 37, 43,
51, 63 – 64, 67, 69, 72 – 73, 76,
78, 80 – 83, 86 – 87, 89 – 99, 121 –
122, 125, 129 – 131, 134

D

diversity 3 – 5, 8, 64, 79, 99, 103 –
105, 112, 119, 125, 144 – 145,
149, 153, 157 – 158, 161
Donahue, Christiane ix, 48, 64, 87
– 93, 158, 160

E

ecology xii, 1, 18, 24, 33, 36, 63 –
64, 70, 74, 79, 81, 103 – 104, 115,
126 – 127, 131 – 132, 149, 153,
157
English-medium instruction 17 –
19, 22, 115
English-Only movement 1, 19, 24 –
25, 31 – 34, 37
environment x, xiii, 1, 4, 6, 11, 20,
24 – 25, 32, 35, 64, 67, 76, 92,

122, 125, 128 – 129, 131, 137 – 139
 ethnography xii, 1 – 2, 18, 22, 41, 118, 152 – 153, 158

F

first-year composition (FYC) 64, 85 – 90, 95, 98, 103 – 104, 106, 115, 146, 161
 first-year writing (FYW) xi – xiii, 1, 3 – 4, 18, 41 – 43, 51 – 52, 58, 67, 69 – 75, 78 – 79, 114, 121 – 122, 123 – 124, 129, 143 – 147, 148 – 149, 152, 155 – 159, 160

G

García, Ofelia 1 – 3, 6 – 8
 genre xii – xiii, 18, 50, 63 – 65, 73, 94 – 97, 103 – 104, 106 – 107, 109 – 110, 115, 119 – 120, 138, 152, 158
 global writing/composition 123, 136 – 137
 graduate teaching assistant (GTA) xii – xiii, 64, 86, 98, 107

H

hegemony 19, 69 – 70
 heteroglossia 1, 17, 21 – 23, 25, 29
 heuristic 67, 70 – 72, 75, 77 – 83
 home language 18, 150
 homogeneous x – xiii, 31, 42 – 45, 47 – 49, 64, 87 – 88, 96, 111 – 112
 Horner, Bruce 1, 8 – 9, 20, 47 – 48, 64, 85, 87, 90, 93, 105, 108, 122, 150
 hybrid 23, 44, 47, 55, 73, 157

I

immigrant x, 53
 indigenous 5, 87
 Inoue, Asao 70 – 71, 76
 institutional policies 19, 26, 36
 intercultural xi, 51, 113, 125 – 129, 135 – 137, 145, 149
 internationalization 143 – 145, 155

L

language diversity .4 – 5, 8, 79
 lingua franca English (LFE) 46 – 49, 150 – 151
 literacy 19, 23, 47, 49 – 50, 55 – 56, 64, 79, 98, 105, 114, 121, 145, 152 – 157

M

Martin, David x, 144, 146, 155
 meaning-making 3, 5, 9, 35, 131, 138, 145, 159
 metacognition 2, 72, 78, 150
 metalinguistic 3 – 4, 17, 19 – 20, 28, 150
 monolingualism ix, 1, 7, 17 – 18, 24, 34, 45, 55 – 57, 85 – 91, 93, 99, 103 – 104, 109 – 110, 125, 144, 146, 152 – 153, 160
 mononational 97 – 98, 151
 multicultural 15, 35, 125, 144 – 145, 149
 multimodal 119, 153 – 154
 myth 19, 45, 47, 87 – 88, 94, 111

N

national ix, 22, 44 – 45, 123, 125 – 126, 129 – 130, 133, 135 – 136, 138, 146, 161
 network x, 129, 139

non-native English speaking
Teachers (NNEST) xi, 58 – 59,
64, 85 – 89, 91, 96, 99

P

Pennycook, Alastair 2, 41, 45 – 49,
56, 121, 138 – 139
performative 7, 68, 126

R

reflection xii – xiii, 1, 9 – 11, 14, 33
– 34, 69 – 70, 95, 99, 104 – 105,
109, 118, 121, 130, 150, 153

S

second language learners (L2)
5, 9, 19 – 20, 72 – 73, 107, 119,
149, 155, 159
social justice 67, 81
society 7, 35, 81
sociolinguistics 3 – 5, 9, 31, 37, 156
Standard Edited American English
(SEAE) 4 – 5, 10 – 11
Standard English 1, 18, 20, 63 – 64,
68, 110, 115, 161
standardize 21, 25, 48, 52, 82, 160
student learning outcomes xi, 1 –
2, 77, 121 – 122
syllabus 77, 80, 107, 170

T

threshold concept x, 64 – 65, 76,
80, 83, 85 – 87, 95 – 96, 98
transculturalism 121, 126
transfer 5, 7, 12, 18, 31, 37, 108,
126, 129, 131, 160 – 161
translation 7, 25 – 27, 31, 71, 146,
150 – 152, 158

V

values xi, 5, 44 – 45, 49, 54, 69, 74,
85, 92, 110, 114, 119, 126, 138
voice 21, 23, 31, 34, 67 – 68, 145,
154

W

writing instruction 17 – 18, 26, 37,
68, 70, 79 – 80
writing program administrator
xii, 63, 75, 98, 124, 146, 155
writing program 63, 67, 69 – 82,
103 – 104, 106 – 108, 126, 144