



Toward a Multilingual Composition Scholarship: From English Only to a Translingual Norm

Author(s): Bruce Horner, Samantha NeCamp and Christiane Donahue

Source: *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 63, No. 2 (December 2011), pp. 269-300

Published by: National Council of Teachers of English

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23131585>

Accessed: 01-03-2018 17:40 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

National Council of Teachers of English is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *College Composition and Communication*

Bruce Horner, Samantha NeCamp, and
Christiane Donahue

Toward a Multilingual Composition Scholarship: From English Only to a Translingual Norm

Against the limitations English monolingualism imposes on composition scholarship, as evident in journal submission requirements, frequency of references to non-English medium writing, bibliographical resources, and our own past work, we argue for adopting a translingual approach to languages, disciplines, localities, and research traditions in our scholarship, and propose ways individuals, journals, conferences, and graduate programs might advance composition scholarship toward a translingual norm.

Linguistic ideology affects not only the product of scholarly activity about language. It is also crucial in the self-constitution and demarcation of scholarly disciplines.

—Susan Gal and Judith T. Irvine, “The Boundaries of Languages and Disciplines: How Ideologies Construct Difference”

Examination of the large area of studies of writing in languages other than English . . . would repay consideration by adding needed depth to theories of rhetoric and writing.

—Tony Silva, Ilona Leki, and Joan Carson, “Broadening the Perspective of Mainstream Composition Studies”

CCC 63:2 / DECEMBER 2011

269

While recent years have seen significant challenges to the English monolingualism dominating composition teaching, these challenges have left largely unaddressed its domination of composition scholarship. In this essay, we argue that compositionists need to move to a multilingual approach in not only their teaching but also their scholarship, changing what we recognize as normal and desirable in the preparation, scholarly practice, and publications of compositionists. Making this move, we argue further, will involve not only the rejection of monolingualism but also a shift in our understanding of multilingualism from a traditional, additive model of multilingualism rooted in monolingualist ideology to a translingual model of multilingualism emphasizing working across languages

We offer a preliminary definition of a “translingual” model of multilingualism that we believe would benefit composition scholarship, and we conclude with specific recommendations for how compositionists might pursue such a translingual approach in their work.

(see Horner et al.). Shifting away from a monolingual norm in our scholarship will provide compositionists with the benefits commonly attributed to learning and using additional languages—the

metalinguistic awareness, for example, that comes from comparing linguistic formulations—and also with perspectives on issues in the study and teaching of writing not ordinarily associated with multilingualism per se—discipline-based differences, for example, embedded in other research traditions and institutional-cultural contexts.

As the domination of much teaching and scholarship in the United States at all levels by English monolingualism demonstrates, the problem we are addressing is not a peculiarity or a failing attributable to individual composition teacher-scholars, journals, or graduate programs. Rather, it is a limitation structured into the social historical conditions with which composition teacher-scholars, journals, and graduate programs must inevitably contend. We intend our critique and recommendations not simply to bring to recognition the effect of those conditions on our scholarship but, more importantly, to suggest ways by which we might resist their limiting effects on all our work.

We begin with a review of the current state of English monolingualism in composition scholarship through an analysis of journal publication practices and specific instances of scholarship, and we highlight what might be gained from adopting a multilingual approach to research and publication. We offer a preliminary definition of a “translingual” model of multilingualism that we believe would benefit composition scholarship, and we conclude with specific

recommendations for how compositionists might pursue such a translingual approach in their work.

Background: Composition and English Monolingualism

As argued in Horner and Trimbur's "English Only and U.S. College Composition," despite official policy statements by CCCC and NCTE opposed to English Only legislation and, we suspect, despite the opposition of many compositionists to such legislation, there is a long and ongoing, if tacit, tradition of English monolingualism in composition.¹ This is in keeping with the domination of U.S. culture by English monolingualism generally. There is, however, a growing movement within composition studies that challenges the domination of composition instruction by English monolingualism.² While we recognize that this movement has yet to significantly alter teaching practices in the United States (or elsewhere), there are changes being made at the organizational level to rethink the ways in which English is represented in U.S. composition teaching, the design of writing programs and curricula, and the preparation of (future) teachers of postsecondary writing (see, for example, the Conference on College Composition and Communication's "Statement on Second Language Writing and Writers").

We see this movement as salutary in its challenges to using problematic language "standards" to exclude populations from postsecondary education or from mainstream college classrooms and in the directions to which it points in developing pedagogies that would better prepare students for writing in a world in which it is no longer clear that an Anglo-American elite "owns" English (see Widdowson) and in which there is greater traffic among languages and their users (Kramsch; Pedersen; Pennycook). And it is a movement that helps those of us who work "in" composition make the shift from seeing composition primarily as located in, responding to, and having effects on only the U.S. sociopolitical scene to adopting a global perspective on our work.³

But while we applaud these challenges to the domination of English monolingualism, we argue that to further advance such shifts in our work and thinking will require that we pursue multilingualism—specifically, a new model of multilingualism—not just in the classroom but in our scholarship as well. For it remains the case, as we demonstrate, that our field operates on

For it remains the case, as we demonstrate, that our field operates on the tacit assumption that scholarship in composition is located—produced, found, and circulated—in English-medium, U.S.-centric publications only.

the tacit assumption that scholarship in composition is located—produced, found, and circulated—in English-medium, U.S.-centric publications only.⁴ That assumption is one we call into question.

As we demonstrate below, the dominance of this assumption is evident in the publication practices of journals in rhetoric and composition and the language policies of our conferences; the bibliographic resources on which scholars ordinarily rely; and the practices of scholarship even in those instances where we might expect a break from such domination. Of course, much of the composition work in question has been written in the United States for U.S. readers. But not only are U.S. readers and the classrooms and institutions about which they are writing becoming more heterogeneous linguistically and in social and civic identity, but there is also growing recognition of the need to broaden the context within which even work addressing U.S. composition

The dominance of composition scholarship by English monolingualism is manifested not simply in the language(s) of the scholarship produced but the language(s) of scholarship cited, the bibliographic resources on which composition scholars rely, the forums in which the scholarship circulates, and the arguments it makes.

is situated. Drawing on that broader context would help make visible what Lillis and Curry identify as the “locality” of the U.S. context, including its linguistic terrain, rather than allowing its location to “go unmarked . . . granted a universal status in global knowledge making” (*Academic* 165).

Our intent here is to underscore the huge value of shifting our assumptions and the huge loss if we do not. And we are not alone. Recent scholarship has highlighted the intense need to

learn from beyond our borders as well as the intense challenges in doing so, among them the challenge of interacting in speech and writing across languages and contexts without defaulting to English for “efficiency,” without examining the geopolitical and cultural inequalities and effects of these interactions (Donahue, “Internationalization”), or without addressing the plurality of English uses and values ascribed to those uses (Canagarajah, “Place”; Pedersen). And it will require going against the grain of dominant monolingualist ideology not only embedded in our thinking but also shaping our training, histories, and institutional practices, including, importantly, our understandings of multilingualism.

English Monolingualism in Composition Scholarship

The dominance of composition scholarship by English monolingualism is manifested not simply in the language(s) of the scholarship produced but the

language(s) of scholarship cited, the bibliographic resources on which composition scholars rely, the forums in which the scholarship circulates, and the arguments it makes. Examinations of these reveal (1) the exclusion of non-English texts and presentations and deterrence of ESL scholars from publication, presentation, or consideration; (2) a focus on the learning of English writing to the exclusion of the learning of writing in other languages; and (3) neglect of the findings of scholarship circulating in non-English medium texts. These forms of dominance have roots in both practical realities and embedded power relationships. Of course, the Englishes with which composition scholars have engaged—both in their writing and in what they read—are heterogeneous, and the heterogeneity of English(es) has itself been the subject of scholarly investigation (see Canagarajah, “Toward”; Smitherman; Kells, Balester, and Villanueva). But we are arguing that scholarship in composition has not engaged non-English-medium scholarship published outside the United States.⁵

The most obvious evidence of the “English-only” character of composition scholarship is the restriction of texts considered for journal publication to only those written in English. Every rhetoric and composition journal we know of, for example, accepts only submissions that are written in English. While a few journals’ guidelines for submissions state this requirement explicitly (*Computers and Composition*, *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *Assessing Writing*), most simply imply this by the style guides recommended. (The same is true of most U.S. composition conferences, whose calls for papers appear to assume that all proposals and all presentations will be in and only in English, with no accommodation for other languages.) Of course, the specific charge of some journals publishing composition scholarship—for example, *College English*—would appear to justify this, although even here we can imagine the shared conceptual work of college English in the United States, college German in Germany, college Turkish in Turkey, and so on, that might make international dialogue worth inviting into *College English*.

But at least to judge by their mission statements and claims to international status, the English-only language requirement for submissions to other journals is more questionable.⁶ For example, nothing about the stated missions of *Assessing Writing*, *Computers and Composition*, *Rhetoric Review*, *Journal of Teaching Writing*, *Kairos*, or *PRE/TEXT* would seem to require restriction of submissions to English only. Even though not all the readers of these journals would be able to access the resulting articles, the journals might, in fact, broaden their base of subscribers and their international presence. Yet the first two of

these journals state explicitly that submissions must be in English (without explanation), and the others appear simply to assume that they will be.

Of course, we recognize that because almost all scholarly journals in almost all fields restrict submissions to those in only one or two languages, composition journals might well be excused for following this tradition by restricting submissions for consideration to texts in English. After all, even the journal *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* considers for publication only English-medium texts. That said, in light of evidence that texts believed to be by writers who are not native speakers of English may be judged more harshly by reviewers of manuscripts for journals (Canagarajah, *Geopolitics* ch. 2; Flowerdew; Lillis and Curry, *Academic*; Tardy and Matsuda; Uzunur), it is at least possible that journals' English-only requirement precludes the field from benefiting from at least some scholarship from such writers. As we suggest above, this is a complex issue, involving both broader societal norms and complicated questions of what is meant by "publishing in one language."

Given the complex logistical issues that a broadening of these require-

What we find far more troubling than the requirements restricting the language of submissions is that the essays published in the composition journals we've reviewed appear to suffer from a similar limitation in the language of the scholarship cited.

ments under current conditions would entail, we have no expectation that journals' language requirements will change radically in the near future. What we find far more troubling than the requirements restricting the language of submissions is

that the essays published in the composition journals we've reviewed appear to suffer from a similar limitation in the language of the scholarship cited. In our review of the works cited over five recent years in some of the leading journals of composition scholarship—*Assessing Writing*, *College Composition and Communication*, *College English*, *Computers and Composition*, *JAC*, *Kairos*, *Rhetoric Review*, and *Written Communication*—we have found very few citations to non-English-medium scholarship (see Table 1). Moreover, what few citations there are tend to be concentrated in a handful of articles. For example, of the 6 works in languages other than English cited in *CCC* that we have located in our review, 4 appear in one article, and 19 of the 35 found in *College English* appear in one article. And of the 35 works in languages other than English that are cited in that journal, 13 cite not scholarship but works of literature. This suggests that, while at least in some disciplines (e.g., musicology), texts lacking demonstration that the authors have considered scholarship in languages other

Table 1

Journal	Issues Surveyed (inclusive)	No. of Articles Surveyed	No. of Articles with Non-English Citations	% of Articles with Non-English Citations	No. of Non-English Citations
<i>Assessing Writing</i>	8.3–13.1	62	3	4.8	25
<i>CCC</i>	54.3–59.3	214	3	1.4	6
<i>College English</i>	65.3–70.5	197	11	5	35
<i>Computers and Composition</i>	20.1–25.1	155	8	5.1	22
<i>JAC</i>	23.2–28.1/2	246	8	3	43
<i>Kairos</i>	8.1–12.2	114	0	0	0
<i>Rhetoric Review</i>	22.1–27.1	228	10	4.3	41
<i>Written Communication</i>	20.1–25.3	98	16	16.3	181

than English may be viewed with suspicion for being less than comprehensive, such a suspicion does not operate in the discipline of composition studies.

As indicated in Table 1, the issues of *Written Communication* we surveyed include more citations to scholarship in languages other than English than do the other journals.⁷ More significantly from the perspective of the dominance of English monolingualism, several of these articles specifically address writing in such languages.⁸ That is, these articles attest to the recognition by writers for that journal that writing means, and includes, writing not just in English only. The other exception to English-only monolingualism in composition scholarship is, unsurprisingly, the *Journal of Second Language Writing* (hereafter *JSLW*), which, given its charge, clearly recognizes that writing includes writing not just in English only. While *JSLW*, like other Elsevier composition journals (*Computers and Composition* and *Assessing Writing*), requires that submissions be in English only, it supplements its published articles with abstracts in at least six other languages (Arabic, Chinese, French, Japanese, Korean, Spanish—see Matsuda, “Multilingual”), surely a commendable accommodation to readers of other languages, especially given the challenge of producing such abstracts.⁹

That is, *JSLW* recognizes the need to make scholarship published there more accessible to those more at ease with languages other than English.

At least one practical explanation for the absence of references to non-English medium scholarship in composition is that standard bibliographical resources to which composition scholars might turn for help are themselves limited to English only. *Comppile*, for example, indexes 306 journals (some of them waiting for “volunteers”), but none that are not in English. The *CCCC Bibliography of Composition and Rhetoric* identifies itself as restricted in focus to “an annual classified listing of scholarship on English and its teaching for the years 1984–1999.” And as Tony Silva, Ilona Leki, and Joan Carson observed over

It bears emphasizing that we make these observations not to criticize the efforts of those who have contributed to producing these journals and bibliographic resources: it is hard and enormous work of direct benefit to scholarship carried out often with little or no institutional support (or reward). Rather, we see the restriction to English monolingual scholarship as a further manifestation of the field’s domination by English monolingualism.

a decade ago, reviews of empirical research have been similarly limited. They note, for example, that George Hillocks’s volume on *Research on Written Composition* explicitly excludes from consideration “research written in languages other than English” (Hillocks xviii, qtd. in Silva, Leki, and Carson 401).

It bears emphasizing that we make these observations not to criticize the efforts of those who have contributed to producing these journals and bibliographic resources: it is hard and enormous work of direct benefit to scholarship carried out often with little or no institutional

support (or reward). Rather, we see the restriction to English monolingual scholarship as a further manifestation of the field’s domination by English monolingualism: for example, given the difficulty of finding individuals willing and able to assist in producing these bibliographic resources in their current versions, it seems likely to be nearly impossible to find individuals willing and able to help expand the reach of these bibliographies to include non-English medium scholarship.

In other words, the ideology of English monolingualism is not simply a belief to be shucked off, however difficult psychically, by individuals, but rather a practice ingrained institutionally and historically that produces linguistic limitations in scholars that in turn restrict the horizon of what is understood to be possible or realistic, and thus is all the more challenging to resist. The authors of this essay are ourselves painfully aware, two of us from personal experience, of the difficulties that the dominance of English-only policies in U.S. education poses for those educated in the United States who wish to pursue

any kind of multilingual approach. While one of us has achieved recognizable fluency in two languages (French and English), two of us are more typical in our experience of the restrictions English monolingualism has imposed on many of those—like us—schooled in the United States: our schooling in languages other than English, and official incentives to pursue the study of languages other than English, have been limited. U.S. students who do grow up bilingual or multilingual often find little support in school for those abilities.

These difficulties are obviously located in the broader cultural context of tensions for much of U.S. history between a diverse, multilingual, and multidialectal society and its domination by a tacit policy of English monolingualism as the precondition for socioeconomic success. But all three of us believe that (1) at least some of the difficulties in pursuing multilingual approaches arise from problematic assumptions about languages generally and multilingualism specifically, and that (2) the benefits of shifting away from the restrictions English monolingualism places on composition scholarship merit efforts to overcome the difficulties of pursuing multilingualism that remain.

Of course, it may be objected that, after all, composition is a U.S. phenomenon: no comparable institution appears to exist in postsecondary education outside the United States, and, hence, we imagine there is no scholarly literature in languages predominating outside the United States that focuses on “composition.” For example, as Christiane Donahue has observed, there is no single equivalent name or professional identification for French scholarship about writing in higher education (*Écrire*, ch. 1).¹⁰ It might further be objected that while there may, indeed, be scholarship of interest to U.S. composition scholars published in languages other than English, it will likely be translated, given the hegemonic position of the anglophone realm. After all, scholars from other language backgrounds typically gain a status that is fast becoming required for institutional promotion insofar as they are able to publish their work in English and in English-medium journals (see Lillis and Curry, *Academic*; Lillis et al.; Canagarajah, *Geopolitics* ch. 2), whereas the translation of English-medium scholarship into other languages, while a sign of prestige, is not deemed necessary to the global circulation of its ideas. But as critics of such assignments of value have observed, accepting that English facilitates global circulation implicitly accepts that English is the best language for the topics at hand, or at least adequate; that nothing is lost in translation; and that language serves primarily as a transparent conduit for ideas.¹¹

Alternatively, we argue for the need to attend to and engage local, institutional, regional, and national differences in thinking about writing and

writing instruction. Thus, for example, while it indeed appears to be the case that there is no ready French equivalent to “composition studies,” there is a deep tradition of francophone scholarship that intersects with “composition studies” that English monolingualism precludes “compositionists” from recognizing, benefiting from, and responding to (as Donahue’s *Écrire* attests). That is, that monolingual view disallows both the labor of linguistic and disciplinary translation and the benefits such labor can yield.

Venturing outside English Only in Composition Scholarship

To illustrate, we examine the ways in which one of our own published essays is impoverished by its failure to consider at least two works of francophone scholarship extant at the time of its writing. The irony here is that the essay in question—Bruce Horner’s “‘Students’ Right,’ English Only, and Re-imagining the Politics of Language”—specifically critiques the English monolingualism of composition studies and the CCCC “Students’ Right” statement for neglect of languages other than English and identifies features of English-only monolingual ideology operating in arguments both for and against English Only legislation. Our point in examining this essay is not simply to highlight the irony of one of us engaging in English-only scholarship while critiquing English-only scholarship but rather to identify (1) the challenges facing those of us wishing to increase linguistic diversity in our work and (2) the specific benefits of doing so.

Horner’s “Students’ Right” essay appeared in 2001. Briefly, in that essay, Horner uses the elision of languages other than English in the CCCC “Students’ Right to Their Own Language” resolution (hereafter SRTOL) to illustrate the dominance of a view of language and sociocultural identity as indelibly linked insofar as that view permeates both SRTOL and arguments on both sides of debate on English Only legislation in the United States. Horner identifies that view with an “archipelago” model of language diversity whereby discrete groups speak discrete languages in discrete locations (743), and students are expected to become full U.S. citizens only insofar as they master the dominant code of Edited American English. Drawing heavily on (a translation of) Pierre Bourdieu’s *Language and Symbolic Power*, Horner argues for a focus in our teaching and theorizing on power relations in language. Emphasizing the crucial role Bourdieu assigns to granting or withholding recognition of the legitimacy of particular language practices and Bourdieu’s articulation of the contingent relation between various forms of “capital,” Horner argues for teaching students

ways to negotiate such recognition of legitimacy in their reading and writing to rework the valuation officially assigned to their writing.

Necessarily speculating after the fact, we believe that Horner's argument might have been both significantly broadened and deepened by engaging with at least two francophone works of scholarship published earlier and hence available for Horner's consideration in drafting his essay: Gabrielle Varro's article "Les élèves 'étrangers' dans les discours des institutions et des instituteurs," which appeared in the journal *Langage et société*; and Jean Bernabé, Patrick Chamoiseau, and Raphaël Confiant's book *Éloge de la créolité*. Varro's analysis of differences in conceptualizations of the relationship between language and civic and developmental identity in what she identifies as the *discours des instituteurs* and the *discours des institutions* could have helped Horner illustrate the contingent relationship between individuals' perceived language ability and the civic status and maturity level assigned to individuals. And Bernabé, Chamoiseau, and Confiant's characterization of *diversalité* could have helped Horner not only to distinguish the "archipelago" model of language diversity from the model of language difference he aimed to advance, but also to recognize, and address, English Only's intolerance for the *opacité* inevitable in all communications. The latter, in turn, might have strengthened his critique of the problematic assumptions about communication rehearsed in SRTOL as well as in larger debates about English-only policy by identifying the limiting, and mistaken, basis for much of the anxiety about "clear communication" among student writers and their teachers.

Varro's essay uses discourse analysis to demonstrate a disparity between, on the one hand, governmental terms (*le discours des institutions*) categorizing distinctions between native-French-speaking students and immigrant students in French schools, as evidenced in a 1994 report commissioned by the Conseil Économique et Social (Bocquet), and, on the other hand, terms used in everyday discourse by teachers to identify and categorize such students (*le discours des instituteurs*). The *discours des instituteurs*, Varro finds, is based on a model of fluidity and progression toward integration into a linguistically and socioculturally homogeneous entity, whereas the *discours des institutions* offers more of a fixed model of sociocultural identity. In the broader French context of the deeply embedded relationship between language and national identity, the instituteurs expect students to move from former languages to French, establishing their validity as students (and not "only" children, called by their first names) in the process, whereas the *discours des institutions* maintains their status as other (*étrangers*).

For example, the discourse of institutional documents exhibits a tacit policy of discrimination against nonfrancophone students in restricting use of *élève* (pupil) to identify francophone students and use of *enfant* (child) and *étranger* (foreigner) to identify nonfrancophone students. By contrast, *le discours des instituteurs* makes distinctions in terms of students' agency: teachers' general use of *enfant* encodes student dependency, a dependency that can only be erased by adopting French, for, as Varro puts it, in a French school, not speaking French means not speaking at all ("à l'école française, ne pas parler français équivaut pratiquement à ne pas parler du tout" [Varro 87]). Teachers' terms for students (*enfant*, *gamin* [kid], *élève*) mark gradations in their correlative mastery of French, their autonomy, and their citizenship status, indicating teachers' linking of language mastery with students' sociocultural identity, but an identity that is expected to change and develop (toward French citizenship and language mastery, and independent adulthood). This practice suggests that as a student's language use changes, the person changes, while the person's "worth" remains stable. Varro's study thus supports but complicates the discursive terrain mapped in Horner's discussion of the discourse of monolingual ideology, showing not only the operation of that discourse in discussions outside the United States but also the complex permutations of that discourse in a specific site and the agency of groups—in Varro's study, *les instituteurs*—in resisting official language education discourse and pursuing alternatives to it.

Of course, Varro's discussion of monolingual ideology takes place in a context that frames the same discussion of questions of power relations in language quite differently. France and the United States share a cultural context that includes belief in monolingualism as the norm (in spite of each country's multicultural history) and in education as the normalizer for both writing and speech. But English Only policy is tacit in the United States (at least, for the moment, at the federal level), while "French Only" is and has long been overt policy in France, limiting use of words in other languages in advertising and setting unilateral school requirements spelled out in centralized curricular circulars. More generally, the language question in France must be understood in the broader context of perceived threats to the state and its language by European Union impositions, the spread of English as a global lingua franca, and so on. The question of the language medium of scholarly writing is likewise different in France than in the United States. In the past, French scholars were expected to write (and publish) in French, partly as a response to the perceived threat of English becoming the de facto default language medium for global scholarly

exchange. Recently, however, the state has put French-medium scholarship at risk through institution of a new centralized and competitive way to fund research via the Agence nationale de la recherche: all applicants, with the exception of those in the humanities, must apply in English, and the shifting culture includes evaluating university research teams and assigning additional points for “international” publication (in English-language journals). Horner’s analysis of the SRTOL statement and its implications for students and scholars can thus be usefully contextualized in terms of these complex issues in other countries.

From a very different research tradition more closely aligned with literary study, the authors of *Éloge de la créolité* argue against what Horner’s article terms an “archipelago” model of language diversity. They argue instead for what they alternately term *créolité* and *diversalité* (distinguished from *diversité*):

La créolité n’est pas monolingue. Elle n’est pas non plus d’un multilinguisme à compartiments étanches. Son domaine c’est le langage. Son appétit: Toutes les langues du monde. Le jeu entre plusieurs langues (leurs lieux de frottements et d’interactions) est un vertige polysémique. Là, un seul mot en vaut plusieurs. Là, se trouve le canevas d’un tissu allusive, d’une force suggestive, d’un commerce entre deux intelligences. Vivre en même temps la poétique de toutes les langues, c’est non seulement enrichir chacune d’elles, mais c’est surtout rompre l’ordre coutumier de ces langues, renverser leurs significations établies. C’est cette rupture qui permettra d’amplifier l’audience d’une connaissance littéraire de nous-mêmes. (*Éloge de la Créolité* 48)¹²

Their concept of *créolité/diversalité* offers a useful category distinct from both monolingualism and ordinary conceptions of multilingualism based on, and hence that ultimately support, monolingual ideology: against monolingualism’s and ordinary multilingualism’s treatment of languages as discrete and reified, it insists on “le jeu entre plusieurs langues”; against maintaining fixed codes for these, it insists that we must “renverser leurs significations établies.” And against efficiency of communication, the authors argue:

Notre plongée dans la Créolité ne sera pas incommunicable mais elle ne sera non plus pas totalement communicable. Elle le sera avec ses opacités, l’opacité que nous restituons aux processus de la communication entre les hommes (*Éloge de la Créolité* 52). (Our submersion into Creoleness will not be incommunicable, but neither will it be completely communicable. It will not go without its opaqueness, the opaqueness we restore to the processes of communication between men. [*Éloge* 113, trans. M. B. Taleb-Khyar])

Bernabé, Chamoiseau, and Confiant’s insistence on the need to restore opacité “aux processus de la communication entre les hommes” highlights the

conduit model of communication operating in the monolingualist ideology Horner's article aimed to critique, and it offers a corrective of conceptual and pedagogical significance: by redefining language difficulty as the communicative norm, it counters both monolingualist ideology's common identification of language difference with deficit and the false notion of transparent translation from one discrete language community to another heralded in traditional models of multilingualism. Thus it offers a useful alternative means by which students might re-cognize language difference in their work with writing (and reading), an alternative that would have helped Horner elaborate the pedagogy he was attempting to articulate in his essay.

As it happens, we cannot account for Horner's neglect of Bernabé, Chamoiseau, and Confiant's *Éloge* as a consequence of its location in the "foreign" domain of "being in French": while the text was (at least in a sense) francophone, an English translation by M. B. Taleb-Khyar had also appeared in the 1990 Johns Hopkins University Press edition (as well as in *Callaloo—A Journal of African American and African Arts and Letters*).¹³ Instead, we account for this neglect as a consequence of the conceptual location of the text outside two *nonlinguistic*, but disciplinary, boundaries nonetheless still associated with

First, breaking past monolingual restrictions must be understood as both a cross-linguistic and a cross-disciplinary move.

monolingualism: that dividing traditional composition studies from francophone Caribbean literature and literary studies, and that separating concerns with English language politics from concerns of language politics surrounding other standardized languages (in this case, language politics surrounding the constitution of French and Creole). English monolingualism would place both areas of study outside the perimeter of composition's purview. These disciplinary boundaries were subsequently crossed only through Horner's discovery of the reference to *Éloge* in Alastair Pennycook's "English as a Language Always in Translation," an English-medium article published much later in the *European Journal of English Studies*—a journal that while distinct from was nonetheless more closely identified with the imaginary of composition studies.

From this speculative exercise, we distill several conclusions. First, breaking past monolingual restrictions must be understood as both a cross-linguistic and a cross-disciplinary move: Varro's study participates in a tradition of discourse analysis from which composition has been largely absent (see Barton and Stygall 1–9), and, moreover, focuses on discourse dominating primary and secondary education, spheres of concern that, notoriously, composition has

likewise kept to its periphery. *Éloge de la créolité* emerges out of the concerns of Caribbean writing and writers—writers and writing that, despite their close proximity to the geographic “home” of composition studies in the United States, have likewise been kept well outside the conceptual periphery of composition studies’ imaginary, for complicated disciplinary and linguistic as well as geopolitical reasons. (Significantly, neither Varro’s nor Bernabé, Chamoiseau, and Confiant’s work appear in the field’s databases.)

Second, the work of crossing such divides will, of necessity, be labor-intensive. The authors of *Éloge de la créolité* warn of the “opacity” of *créolité*. This, too, must be understood not simply as a linguistic barrier but also as a disciplinary and cultural barrier.¹⁴

Second, the work of crossing such divides will, of necessity, be labor-intensive.

However, it is not only monolingualism’s stranglehold on the linguistic capacities of composition scholars that stands in the way, but also its stranglehold on what is imagined to be involved in the crossing of such barriers. As Confiant, one of the coauthors of *Éloge de la créolité*, observes elsewhere of Haitians attempting to cross linguistic divides:

après cinq ou dix années de scolarité plus ou moins chaotique, l’Haïtien moyen parvient à peine à articuler une phrase correcte en français alors que lorsqu’il émigré aux USA, au bout de six mois, il parle déjà anglais relativement couramment! . . . La raison est la suivante: en français, il est paralysé par l’épée de Damoclès d’une norme rigide, il crève de peur de commettre des fautes alors qu’en anglais, rien de tout cela ne pèse sur lui. Personne ne lui fera de remarque désobligeante sur son accent ou sur telle ou telle faut qu’il pourra inévitablement commettre au cours de son apprentissage.¹⁵

Although we do not share Confiant’s faith in Americans’ tolerance for *diversalité* in speaking English, we find useful his highlighting of the damaging effects of monolingual ideology’s tenet of reified language standards on the ability of speakers to use language productively, as well as the questions of power embedded in its material practice. It is this belief in and striving to achieve an “appropriate” target in both language practice and disciplinary norms that can stand in the way of accomplishment.¹⁶

Here we may draw on the attitudes that scholars have identified with effective engagement in English as a lingua franca (ELF). Studies of the use of English among speakers for whom English is an additional language show that the attitudes necessary to effective engagement with ELF include “tolerance for variation, and a focus on mutual cooperation and intelligibility” (Rubdy and

Saraceni 12); an understanding that “variation from the norm in lingua franca communication is itself likely to be ‘the norm’” (12); an orientation to issues of “process” rather than “product”; humility and a willingness to negotiate meaning; the practice of “letting ambiguities pass” (Canagarajah, “Negotiating” 204–5; Canagarajah, “Lingua” 926, 931; Firth 243–45); and a recognition of language “as changing rather than static” and not just “context-appropriate but context-transforming” (Canagarajah, “Negotiating” 211; cf. Khubchandani 20–21).

These studies pose a model of language dispositions for compositionists to follow in their scholarly efforts. Such attitudes insist on both the labor of

These studies pose a model of language dispositions for compositionists to follow in their scholarly efforts. Such attitudes insist on both the labor of translation and the recognition that such labor is necessary even on those occasions when conditions appear not to warrant it.

translation and the recognition that such labor is necessary even on those occasions when conditions appear not to warrant it. For example, to make responsible use of Varro’s study requires translation of not simply French, and not just the scholarly tradition in which Varro is working, but also the history of educational and

language policies and practices in France. Likewise, the provision of an English translation of *Éloge* is only the beginning of the work of translating the concerns and the disciplinary, historical, and geopolitical contexts motivating that text to the concerns and contexts composition scholars see themselves as facing.

And, of course, any act of translation is an act of rewriting, necessarily provisional and productive of different meanings. Such work is arduous, but it is also necessary if composition is to reach beyond the boundaries set by its monolingual past. Such work moves beyond linguistic difficulty to the difficulties of retooling assumptions and encountering unfamiliar languages, research traditions and conditions, and institutional frames—in short, the work of reimagining composition’s place in the world.

Fortunately, in taking up such work, composition, as an inherently cross-disciplinary practice, can draw upon and learn from its long tradition of “poaching” from other disciplines (see Lu, “Vitality”). While that tradition includes examples of what have proved to be unwarranted applications, those examples typically result from elision of the actual labor of translation, as when scholars have cherry-picked models of cognitive “divides” and cognitive development from other disciplines to explain away, rather than provoke further study of, students’ difficulties with writing (for a critique of such “borrowing” see Rose). But other examples of that tradition have encouraged practices likely to better,

though not lighten, the labor of translation: collaboration, reflection, revision, consultation. Our own efforts in producing this essay have demanded precisely these practices.

Multilingualisms

Our analysis of the need for cross-linguistic scholarship would seem on its face to demand multilingual scholars and hence pursuit of multilingualism in the preparation of compositionists. And so far as it goes, we agree. Indeed, it is a commonplace not only among compositionists, and not only among academics, but also among the population at large that it is preferable for an individual to be multilingual. (To this we add that currently in the United States, such multilingualism is common in everyday life, as is dialect mixing within languages, though not always recognized or granted legitimacy.) While President Obama took some heat from conservative quarters for his suggestion during the 2008 presidential campaign that Americans should become more intentionally multilingual (see “Obama”; Patrick; Schlafly), few dispute the benefits, at least to individuals, of being so.

Simultaneously, however, English monolingual ideology holds that what is good for individuals is a problem for nations and global commerce: the specter of Babel is invoked as a warning against what might happen should multilingualism become the social norm. Behind this warning is the traditional view that a multilingual society consists of discrete groups whose members speak a language unintelligible to members of other groups. Languages themselves are imagined as reified, discrete sets of forms, and users either speak a language fluently or not. In this vision, the multilingual individual is someone fluent and “competent” in more than one language and hence able to move from one group to another—someone with the equivalent of dual citizenship by virtue of his or her knowledge of the language of each group. In this model, those individuals possessing imperfect knowledge of a second language would possess incomplete membership in the group to which that language was “proper.” The “true” bilingual in this model is that rare linguistic hermaphrodite: someone who is essentially two monolinguals residing in one person (see Auer 320–21; Grosjean 468–69; Martin-Jones 166–67).

As useful as it has been in furthering multiple important cultural, political, intellectual, and educational agendas, this “silo” model of multilingualism is at odds with the findings of scholarship on plurilingual societies, lingua francas, and bilingualism (Khubchandani; Meierkord; Grosjean; see Pennycook’s critique of the language “fortresses” model of language diversity, 37). This scholarship

demonstrates that, contrary to what the silo model would suggest, members of multilingual societies typically speak more than one of the languages linguists might abstract from their speech practices, and play with and revise various linguistic forms in pursuit of achieving meaning. Further, contrary to the notion of discrete languages, and contrary to the identification of nationality with language, the statistical norm is that of speakers who speak a variety of fluctuating “languages” and participate in not only the reproduction but also the revision of these languages through their use of them (Khubchandani).¹⁸ The global spread of English, for example, has led to the production of multiple versions of English that themselves remain in flux as they encounter other

In other words, this multilingualism taps not only linguistic ability within single languages but also the ability to move translingually (and transculturally), across as well as within abstracted languages and cultures.

“languages” (see Brutt-Griffler; Lillis et al.), just as the global spread of French has led to what today is a complex tapestry of “Frenches” of varying statuses and themselves evolving in en-

counters with English and other languages. In other words, this multilingualism taps not only linguistic ability within single languages but also the ability to move translingually (and transculturally), across as well as within abstracted languages and cultures. This is the kind of ability highlighted in the call of the MLA Ad hoc Committee on Foreign Languages to shift the aim of “foreign” language instruction from achieving “the competence of an educated native speaker” to achieving “translingual and transcultural competence” (3-4; see also Council of Europe).

In alignment with this perspective acknowledging a fluctuating multilingualism as the statistical social norm is recent scholarship demonstrating that the bilingual is not, as monolingual ideology would have it, “the sum of two complete or incomplete monolinguals” but instead someone with a unique and shifting blend of practical knowledge and use of multiple languages (Grosjean, esp. 471). Features of bilingual practice such as code-switching, code-meshing, borrowing, and blending of languages, rather than being seen as instances of language interference or incomplete mastery of discrete languages, would from this translingual perspective be understood as the norm. It is only by assuming monolingualism as the norm that such practices can be understood as deviations or evidence of “incomplete” bilingualism (Auer 320; Grosjean 468–70). Conversely, from the perspective of a translingual multilingualism that rejects reifications of languages, such practices are to be embraced as evidence of a different kind of language competence—what Vivian Cook has

called “multicompetence,” with a focus, as Juliane House puts it, on “language use rather than on development and acquisition, and on the sociopragmatic functions of language choice” (House 558).

Monolingual Model	Traditional Multilingual Model	Translingual Model
Languages are static, discrete, and defined by specific forms	Languages are static, discrete, and defined by specific forms	Languages and language boundaries are fluctuating and in constant revision
Fluency in other languages is deemed a threat to fluency in English	Multilinguals have discrete fluencies in more than one discrete, stable language	Multilinguals are fluent in working across a variety of fluctuating “languages”
Non-English speakers should strive to achieve an “appropriate” target in English language practice to be considered “fluent”	Fluency in each discrete language is determined by achieving an “appropriate” target of language practice	Focus is on mutual intelligibility rather than fluency; language use has potential to transform contexts and what is “appropriate” to them
Fluency in multiple languages threatens intelligibility	Fluency in each discrete language determines membership in language group	Code-switching, borrowing, and blending of languages are understood as the norm
English language is linked to social identity and citizenship	Language is linked to social identity and citizenship	All language use is an act of translation; language use values transnational connectivity
“Bilingual” is imagined as two monolinguals in one person	“Bilingual” is imagined as two monolinguals in one person	“Bilingual” is imagined as a unique and shifting blend of practical knowledge and language use

For the purposes of our argument, this translingual notion of multilingualism is salutary for scholarship in shifting our focus away from the confines of national borders toward transnational connectivities, and away from treating “local” language practices of teaching and learning writing as discrete toward recognizing all language use as acts of translation (see Pennycook). Translation is in this case a form of renegotiation of meaning in every language act, both within and across traditional languages (cf. Schor; Canagarajah, “Toward”), a “highly manipulative activity that involves all kinds of stages in that process of transfer across linguistic and cultural boundaries” (Bassnett and Trivedi 2). Rather than striving for “fluency in” a particular language or set of languages,

we believe it more appropriate, and more broadly accessible, to develop ways to grow fluent in working across and among languages, including, for those of us identified as native English speakers, learning to think of our own work with English as always “in translation” (see François; Gannett; Horner et al.; Pennycook; Schor). While the ambition of achieving a high degree of fluency in another language is certainly admirable, its pursuit can prevent the flexible, fluid relationship with languages we believe might be more effective for this work.

This translingual notion of multilingualism also shifts our focus away from individuals, located on a fixed scale of competence toward “mastery” of a reified “target” language, and toward groups of people working in collaboration to use all available linguistic resources; and it shifts our focus away from disciplinary boundaries separating specific traditions of scholarship on writing and its teaching, and toward putting these diverse traditions in dialogue with one another to the benefit of all those working “in” them. It is this translingual version of multilingualism that will allow us to move forward as a field, and one

The work of a new translingual composition scholarship will involve changes in the conduct of current scholarship, the venues for scholarly distribution, and the preparation of scholars.

that, in fact, builds from our field’s growing awareness of English as a heterogeneous, bustling, complicated, shifting, fluid mix of languages, dialects, and creoles. While we would expect scholars to do the best they can, in cooperation and collaboration

with others, in working across and among languages, such translingual work is quite different from imagining ourselves working serially and fluently within the confines of individually fortified silos of “diverse” languages. Translingual work should encourage us to think of and use those research traditions with which we are most familiar and “fluent” to be likewise “in translation,” subject to alternative inflections and in competition and, ideally, dialogue with alternative research traditions, in or “out” of English. To do so, however, first requires that we recognize the ways in which current traditions of composition research remain circumscribed by monolingualism in their assumptions and practices, whether intentionally or simply by unexamined default.

Taking up Translingual Scholarship

The work of a new translingual composition scholarship will involve changes in the conduct of current scholarship, the venues for scholarly distribution, and the preparation of scholars. These are not changes that can or will sweep the field; they will incrementally build a different norm. And they must, of course,

both prompt and co-develop with broader cultural changes in the United States. A primary move should be to encourage the learning of additional languages to make possible the translingual and transcultural competence now being called for (MLA Committee; Council of Europe). The more people engage in language learning, the less likely they may be to demand linguistic perfection and “native-speaker” fluency of themselves or others. (The authors of this essay can personally attest that the experience of reading a text or attending a conference conducted in an unfamiliar language can make apparent the necessity of developing attitudes of humility and tolerance and strategies of accommodation and negotiation.) Those compositionists having limited experience with languages other than English might pursue translingual scholarship by not only retooling their own knowledge of additional languages but also collaborating with those with greater facility in languages other than English. (This is what the two of us fitting the former characterization—Bruce and Samantha—have done in the work of drafting this essay in collaboration with Christiane.) But this retooling should be carried out in conjunction with, rather than being seen as a prerequisite to, engagement in non-anglophone scholarship. And it might conceivably lead to productive work with colleagues in other areas of language study, in other languages. Though we anticipate that the same tenets of monolingual ideology dominating composition operate in these other areas of study as well, those tenets might begin to fragment under the force of actual practices across languages (and across disciplinary divisions).

There are potential dangers to these activities. As Donahue has recently observed, there is a strong temptation, not always resisted, to settle for multilingual, transnational, and globalizing efforts that are superficial and reductive in their stances toward “the other” (language, discourse, institutional configuration, or person) (Donahue, “Internationalization”). To guard against these tendencies, we would emphasize the importance of a shift in attitude, not just language: a shift that treats *opacité* as the communicative “norm” and hence language dispositions of humility, openness, tolerance, and patience as the foundation for scholarly exchange.

Composition journals and conferences can play a crucial leadership role in this shift through the roles they play in the scholarship they call for, edit, adjudicate, and distribute. For example, composition journals might draw readers’ attention to non-anglophone scholarship by adopting or adapting *PMLA*’s policy of publishing English translations of relevant scholarship originally published in other languages (see Modern Language Association, “Submit-

ting”). In making recommendations to prospective authors, journal editors and manuscript reviewers might encourage authors to locate their work in the context of non-anglophone scholarship as well as beyond the confines of the United States. In addition, composition journals might well follow *JSLW*'s example of providing abstracts of English-medium articles in multiple languages to make English-medium scholarship more readily accessible to non-anglophone scholars.¹⁹ Soliciting book reviews of works published outside of the United States, in other languages, would also help to provide much-needed windows into the rich diversity of work we are missing. And finally, to build on the steady increase in attention to issues of English and multiple Englishes in some publications, journals might also foreground articles that study writing and issues of writing in languages other than English or writing by writers who work at the intersections of other languages with English, even as the studies themselves are published in English.²⁰

For their part, composition conference organizers can encourage presenters not only to address multilingual issues explicitly but also to include in their presentations (via PowerPoint, handouts, or other means) translations of their work into one or more languages other than English.²¹ The production and distribution of such translations will work toward combating monolingualism, not necessarily by changing the language abilities of audiences (though it might prompt such changes by helping to render a multilingual environment and translanguaging dispositions “the norm”), but by changing the thinking, as well as language abilities, of those producing them as they attempt to translate from one language to another. It might also encourage scholars to seek out bilingual colleagues with whom to work, colleagues who might not currently consider their linguistic abilities an active advantage in their scholarly production.

To be sure, taking on these leadership roles is complicated. Journals are by necessity answerable to readers, who can be encouraged to shift assumptions by the journals' practices, but who must also embrace those practices if the journals are to survive. The shift required is, in other words, a communal one. Preparation of beginning scholars and the retooling of current scholars for a translanguaging, rather than monolingual, environment is thus essential. Graduate programs might proceed through retooling the standard “reading in French/Spanish/Chinese” courses used to fulfill language requirements still on the books of most MA and PhD programs to include reading non-anglophone scholarship in rhetoric and language education, and through encouraging the production of translations of non-anglophone journal articles into English and

the production of abstracts into other languages of English-medium articles—translations that, as we suggest above, the journals should encourage. Insofar as translation is anything but a mechanical task, the work of producing such translations would not simply provide a “service” but would necessarily help in individuals’ professional development as scholars. To further such development, investigation of non-anglophone scholarship might be incorporated into the work of graduate seminars and examinations—not as an add-on burden, but in ways integral to that work. (This would, of course, help in the retooling of those faculty designing such seminars and examinations; graduate programs with an emphasis on cross-cultural or transnational questions may be able to model useful practices.)

In addition to revitalizing a second-language requirement that currently seems a relic of the past (see White), these efforts would push composition from its parochial status as a U.S.-centric, English monolingual enterprise to a discipline directly confronting, investigating, and experimenting with, rather than simply correcting, language practices on the ground. And far from directing compositionists’ attention away from the circumstances of teaching, these ef-

And far from directing compositionists’ attention away from the circumstances of teaching, these efforts would at the very least push compositionists toward greater recognition, appreciation, and use of the heterogeneity of students’ language resources.

orts would at the very least push compositionists toward greater recognition, appreciation, and use of the heterogeneity of students’ language resources (see Preto-Bay and Hansen 36–40; Matsuda, “Myth”), perhaps even opening up new possibilities for linking composition and language study. While, in accord with the CCCC statement, we agree that such attention should continue to grow, we would emphasize the importance to scholars of the experience of working across languages. Bourdieu has warned that “recognition of the legitimacy of the official language has nothing in common with an explicitly professed, deliberate and revocable belief, or with an intentional act of accepting a ‘norm.’ It is inscribed, in a practical state, in dispositions which are impalpably inculcated, through a long and slow process of acquisition, by the sanctions of the linguistic market” (51). Hence, to be effective, challenges to the grip of monolingual ideology must work at the level of dispositions and through “sanctions of the linguistic market” rather than purely at the conceptual level.

Through their work as scholars, teachers, and writing program administrators, compositionists are developing a variety of curricular and programmatic

strategies for achieving alternatives to English-only composition instruction (see, for example, Hesford, Singleton, and García; Kirklighter, Cárdenas, and Wolff; Matsuda and Silva; Miller-Cochran; Shuck). These help to produce an institutional environment welcoming various forms of multilingualism. In the larger arena of composition studies, we are arguing for a sea change of proportional magnitude: a change in what we recognize as normal and desirable in scholarly practice, publication, and preparation for compositionists. While we should not underestimate the difficulties such a change entails, we should also not allow those difficulties to keep us from realizing the potential it holds for our field's growth. Against the restrictions imposed by monolingualism, we can begin to move beyond English Only in all our work.

Notes

1. Official policy statements include the "CCCC Guideline on the National Language Policy" position statement, and the NCTE "Resolution on English as a Second Language and Bilingual Education," "Resolution on English as the 'Official Language,'" and "Position Statement . . . on Issues in ESL and Bilingual Education."
2. See, for example, Bean et al.; Canagarajah, "Place"; Elbow; Horner, Lu, and Matsuda; Horner et al.; Horner and Trimbur; Lu, "Essay"; Matsuda, "Composition"; Nero, *Dialects*, "Discourse," and *Englishes*; Shuck; Smitherman and Villanueva.
3. Cf. Muchiri et al.'s 1995 call for composition researchers to "see how much of [their] work is tied to the particular context of the U.S." (195), and Silva, Leki, and Carson's complaint that "little consideration has been given [in mainstream composition studies] to writing in languages other than English" (399–400).
4. We recognize that this is aligned with the increasing dominance of English globally as a medium for scholarly exchange (see Ammon). But we also recognize that this comes at a cost (see Ammon again).
5. It also appears that composition scholars tend not to cite English-medium scholarship published outside the United States, but that is a separate argument (see, for example, Lillis et al.).
6. This is in addition to the longstanding emphasis that manuscripts submitted must be in what journal editors and manuscript reviewers recognize as "good" "academic" English. For recent work addressing this specific permutation of the language politics of academic publication, see, for example, Canagarajah, "Place"; Schroeder, Fox, and Bizzell.
7. While it might be tempting to attribute the higher number of citations of non-English works to the broader range of its focus (all written communication), the equally broad focus of other journals not containing similar numbers of such cita-

tions argues against doing so.

8. Cahill; T. Donahue, "Cross-Cultural"; Gentil; Liddicoat; Lillis and Curry, "Professional"; Markelis; Pérez-Sabater et al.; Soffer.

9. *L1 Studies in Language and Literature* and other online European journals in English provide a similar service, as has *Reading Research Quarterly*.

10. In the three years since *Écrire* appeared, the field of University Literacies has taken shape in France.

11. On the dominance of English-medium scholarship around the globe, and the deep problems that dominance creates, see Ammon; Baynham; Brock-Utne; Canagarajah, *Geopolitics*; Flowerdew; Kachru; Lillis and Curry, *Academic*; Medgyes and Kaplan; Phillipson; and Ramanathan, among others.

12. Creoleness is not monolingual. Nor is it multilingualism divided into isolated compartments. Its field is language. Its appetite: all the languages of the world. The interaction of many languages (the points where they meet and relate) is a polysonic vertigo. There, a single word is worth many. There, one finds the canvas of an allusive tissue, of a suggestive force, of a commerce between two intelligences. Living at once the poetics of all languages is not just enriching each of them, but also, and above all, breaking the customary order of these languages, reversing their established meanings. It is this breach that is going to increase the audience of a literary knowledge of ourselves. (Bernabé, Chamoiseau, and Confiant 108–9 [trans. M. B. Taleb-Khyar]).

13. *Ibid.* 8. This journal was subsequently renamed *Callaloo: A Journal of African Diaspora Arts and Letters*.

14. Cf. Davidson and Goldberg's caution: "To become fluent interdisciplinarily is not simply to learn more than one language, to multiply the syntactic and semantic structures and cultures known. It means to assume a different, if related (even derivative), mode of speaking, to inhabit a different culture. It is to learn—to inhabit—a creole culture (and perhaps to be treated as Creoles so often have been treated)" (57).

15. After five or six years of more or less chaotic study, the average Haitian scarcely achieves the ability to articulate one correct phrase in French whereas, when he emigrates to the U.S.A., after six months, he already speaks English relatively fluently! . . . The reason is as follows: in French, he is paralyzed by the Damocletian sword of a rigid norm, he is afraid to death of committing faults, whereas in English, none of these bear down on him. No one will make unkind remarks on his accent or about this or that fault which he will inevitably commit in the course of his apprenticeship" (our translation).

16. For a case study documenting an English language "learner" facing the equiva-

lent paradox in his use of English in a composition classroom versus on a website he managed, see Lam.

17. See Lillis and Curry, *Academic*, for powerful, detailed stories of the multilingual norm.

18. Cf. Young on the problems arising from African Americans believing they have to choose between the equivalent of fortified silos of language varieties of BEV (Black English Vernacular) and WEV (White English Vernacular).

19. In making these recommendations, we join Lillis and Curry, *Academic*, and Canagarajah, *Geopolitics*. Lillis and Curry recommend “inclusion of citations to work outside the Anglophone centre and/or in languages other than English; evidence of engagement with research carried out in a range of localities; involvement of editors and reviewers from across all geographic locations; explicit discussion at editorial level about varieties of English and the politics of style” (*Academic* 170). Canagarajah suggests that we foster multilingual publications; be flexible in terms of publication conventions and writing styles; attend to access for non-U.S.-mainstream scholars; use peer review as a mode for identifying and supporting international scholarly work; specifically invite international scholars to write for our journals; use the Web for broader inclusion and cross-referencing; and encourage hybridity and negotiation. As Canagarajah points out, “if a journal claims to be international in scope, then it should attempt to widen its coverage” (*Geopolitics* 276). We are in particular agreement with his point that this new approach is not about fulfilling some quota of international representation, but rather about our need for the scholarship being produced in other contexts, which he points out can help to “enrich, expand, and reconstruct mainstream [U.S.] discourses and knowledges. In fact, the clash of diverse perspectives is valuable for its own sake: it affords an opportunity to reexamine the basic assumptions and beliefs of a community” (303).

20. These kinds of changes are already heralded in composition scholarship by the increasing frequency of articles published in our flagship journals that focus attention on English as it is used, inhabited, co-opted, and transculturated in contexts within and outside of the United States (Pedersen; Canagarajah, “Toward”) and of special issues focused on global contexts of writing.

21. This approach has been used successfully in the United States (Writing Research Across Borders 2008 and 2011 conferences) and in Europe (European Association of Teachers of Academic Writing; International Conference on University Literacies: Knowledge, Writing, Disciplines/Colloque International: Litéracies Universitaires: Savoirs, Écrits, Disciplines [Université Charles de Gaulle—Lille 3, 2010]). Outside the United States, bilingual and trilingual conferences are the norm.

Works Cited

- Ammon, Ulrich. "Global Scientific Communication: Open Questions and Policy Suggestions." *AILA Review* 20 (2007): 123–33. Print.
- Auer, Peter. "Monolingual Bias in Bilingualism Research; or, Why Bilingual Talk Is (Still) a Challenge for Linguistics." Heller 319–39. Print.
- Barton, Ellen, and Gail Stygall. Introduction. *Discourse Studies in Composition*. Ed. Ellen Barton and Gail Stygall. Cresskill: Hampton, 2002. 1–18. Print.
- Bassnett, Susan, and Harish Trivedi, eds. *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, 1999. Print.
- Baynham, Mike. "Code Switching and Mode Switching: Community Interpreters and Mediators of Literacy." *Cross-Cultural Approaches to Literacy*. Ed. Brian Street. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 294–314. Print.
- Bean, Janet, et al. "Should We Invite Students to Write in Home Languages? Complicating the Yes/No Debate." *Composition Studies* 31.1 (2003): 25–42. Print.
- Bernabé, Jean, Patrick Chamoiseau, and Raphaël Confiant. *Éloge de la créolité*. Paris: Gallimard, 1989. Rpt. as *Éloge de la créolité/In Praise of Creoleness*. Trans. M. B. Taleb-Khyar. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1990. Print.
- Bocquet, Jacques. "La scolarisation des enfants d'immigrés." *Journal Officiel de la République Française* 17 (19 July 1994). Avis et Rapports de Conseil Économique et Social. Print.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Ed. John B. Thompson. Trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1991. Print.
- Brock-Utne, Birgit. "The Growth of English in Academic Communication in the Nordic Countries." *International Review of Education* 47.3–4 (2001): 221–33. Print.
- Brutt-Griffler, Janina. *World English: A Study of Its Development*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2002. Print.
- Cahill, David. "The Myth of the 'Turn' in Contrastive Rhetoric." *Written Communication* 20.2 (2003): 170–94. Print.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. *A Geopolitics of Academic Writing*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2002. Print.
- . "Lingua Franca English, Multilingual Communities, and Language Acquisition." *Modern Language Journal* 91 (2007): 923–39. Print.
- . "Negotiating the Local in English as a Lingua Franca." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 26 (2006): 197–218. Print.
- . "The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued." *College Composition and Communication* 57.4 (2006): 586–619. Print.
- . "Toward a Writing Pedagogy of Shuttling between Languages: Learning from Multilingual Writers." *College English* 68.6 (2006): 589–604. Print.
- Conference on College Composition and Communication. *The CCCC Bibliography of Composition and Rhetoric, 1984–1999*. Ed. Todd Taylor et al. Conference on College Composition and Communication, n.d. Web. 26 Oct. 2010.
- . "CCCC Guideline on the National Language Policy." Conference on College Composition and Communication, 1992. Web. 26 Oct. 2010.
- . "CCCC Statement on Second Language Writing and Writers." Conference

- on College Composition and Communication, Nov 2009. Web. 26 Oct. 2010.
- Confiant, Raphaël. "Créolité et francophonie: Un éloge de la diversité." *Potomitan*, n.d. Web. 26 Oct. 2010.
- Cook, Vivian. *Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition*. New York: St. Martin's, 1993. Print.
- Council of Europe/Conseil de l'Europe. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. Print.
- Davidson, Cathy N., and David Theo Goldberg. "Engaging the Humanities." *Profession* 2004: 42–62. Print.
- Donahue, Christiane. *Écrire à l'université: Analyse comparée en France et aux États-Unis*. Villeneuve d'Ascq: Presses universitaires du septentrion, 2008. Print.
- . "Internationalization and Composition Studies: Re-orienting the Discourse." *College Composition and Communication* 61.2 (2009): 212–43. Print.
- Donahue, Tiane. "Cross-Cultural Analysis of Student Writing." *Written Communication* 25.3 (2008): 319–52. Print.
- Elbow, Peter. "Inviting the Mother Tongue: Beyond 'Mistakes,' 'Bad English,' and 'Wrong Language.'" *JAC* 19.3 (1999): 359–88. Print.
- Firth, Alan. "On the Discursive Accomplishment of Normality: On 'Lingua Franca' English and Conversation Analysis." *Journal of Pragmatics* 26.2 (1996): 237–59. Print.
- Flowerdew, J. "Problems in Writing for Scholarly Publication in English: The Case of Hong Kong." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 8.2 (1999): 243–64. Print.
- François, Frédéric. *Le discours et ses entours*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 1998. Print.
- Gal, Susan, and Judith T. Irvine. "The Boundaries of Languages and Disciplines: How Ideologies Construct Difference." *Social Research* 62.4 (1995): 967–1001. Print.
- Gannett, Cinthia. "Lost (and Found) in Translation: Translation as Process and Product in Writing Center and WAC Work." *Composition in the Center Spaces: Building Community, Culture, and Coalitions*. Conference on College Composition and Communication. Chicago. 22–25 Mar. 2006. Roundtable presentation.
- Gentil, Guillaume. "Commitments to Academic Bilinguality: Case Studies of Francophone University Writers." *Written Communication* 22.4 (2005): 421–71. Print.
- Grosjean, François. "The Bilingual as a Competent but Specific Speaker-Hearer." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 6.6 (1985): 467–77. Print.
- Heller, Monica, ed. *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2007. Print.
- Hesford, Wendy, Edgar Singleton, and Ivonne M. García. "Laboring to Globalize a First-Year Writing Program." *The Writing Program Interrupted: Making Space for Critical Discourse*. Ed. Donna Strickland and Jeanne Gunner. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 2009. 113–25. Print.
- Hillocks, George, Jr. *Research on Written Composition*. Urbana: NCTE, 1986. Print.
- Horner, Bruce. "'Students' Right,' English Only, and Re-imagining the Politics of Language." *College English* 63 (2001): 741–58. Print.
- Horner, Bruce, Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Kei Matsuda, eds. *Cross-Language Relations*

- in *Composition*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2010. Print.
- Horner, Bruce, Min-Zhan Lu, Jacqueline Jones Royster, and John Trimbur. "Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach." *College English* 73.3 (2011): 299–317.
- Horner, Bruce, and John Trimbur. "English Only and U.S. College Composition." *College Composition and Communication* 53.4 (2002): 594–630. Print.
- House, Juliane. "English as a Lingua Franca: A Threat to Multilingualism?" *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7.4 (2003): 556–78. Print.
- Kachru, Braj, ed. *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*. 2nd ed. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1992. Print.
- Kells, Michelle Hall, Valerie Balester, and Victor Villanueva, eds. *Latino/a Discourses: On Language, Identity and Literacy Education*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 2004. Print.
- Khubchandani, Lachman M. "A Plurilingual Ethos: A Peep into the Sociology of Language." *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 24.1 (1998): 5–37. Print.
- Kirklighter, Cristina, Diana Cárdenas, and Susan Wolff Murphy, eds. *Teaching Writing with Latino/a Students: Lessons Learned at Hispanic-Serving Institutions*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2007. Print.
- Kramsch, Claire. "The Traffic in Meaning." *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* 26.1 (2006): 99–104. Print.
- Lam, W. S. E. "L2 Literacy and the Design of the Self: A Case Study of a Teenager Writing on the Internet." *TESOL Quarterly* 34.3 (2000): 457–82. Print.
- Liddicoat, Anthony J. "Grammar as a Feature of Text Construction: Time and Rhetorical Function in French Journal Articles in Biology." *Written Communication* 21.4 (2004): 316–43. Print.
- Lillis, Theresa, and Mary Jane Curry. *Academic Writing in a Global Context: The Politics and Practices of Publishing in English*. London: Routledge, 2010. Print.
- . "Professional Academic Writing by Multilingual Scholars: Interactions with Literacy Brokers in the Production of English-Medium Texts." *Written Communication* 23.1 (2006): 3–35. Print.
- Lillis, Theresa, Ann Hewings, Dimitra Vladimov, and Mary Jane Curry. "The Geolinguistics of English as an Academic Lingua Franca: Citation Practices across English Medium National and English Medium International Journals." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 20.1 (2010): 111–35. Print.
- Lu, Min-Zhan. "An Essay on the Work of Composition: Composing English against the Order of Fast Capitalism." *College Composition and Communication* 56.1 (2004): 16–50. Print.
- . "The Vitality of the Ungrateful Receiver: Making Giving Mutual between Composition and Postcolonial Studies." *JAC* 19.3 (1999): 335–58. Print.
- Markelis, Daiva. "'Talking through Letters': Collaborative Writing in Early Lithuanian Immigrant Life." *Written Communication* 20.2 (2003): 153–69. Print.
- Martin-Jones, Marilyn. "Bilingualism, Education and the Regulation of Access to Language Resources." *Heller* 161–82. Print.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei. "Composition Studies and ESL Writing: A Disciplinary Division of Labor." *College Composition and Communication* 50 (1999): 699–721. Print.
- . "Multilingual Abstracts." *JSLW Online*, 15 Nov. 2007. Web. 26 Oct. 2010.
- . "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition." *College English* 68.6 (2006): 637–51. Print.

- Matsuda, Paul Kei, and Tony Silva. "Cross-Cultural Composition: Mediated Integration of US and International Students." *Composition Studies* 27.1 (1999): 15–30. Print.
- Medgyes, Peter, and Robert Kaplan. "Discourse in a Foreign Language: The Example of Hungarian Scholars." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 98.1 (1992): 67–100. Print.
- Meierkord, Christiane. "Syntactic Variation in Interactions across International Englishes." *English World-Wide* 25.1 (2004): 109–32. Print.
- Miller-Cochran, Susan K. "Language Diversity and the Responsibility of the WPA." *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*. Ed. Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Kei Matsuda. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2010. 212–20. Print.
- Modern Language Association. "Submitting Manuscripts to PMLA." Modern Language Association, 4 Jan. 2010. Web. 26 Oct. 2010.
- Modern Language Association Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. "Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World." Modern Language Association, 2007. Web. 28 Aug. 2009.
- Muchiri, Mary N., Nshindi G. Mulamba, Greg Myers, and Deoscorous B. Ndoloi. "Importing Composition: Teaching and Researching Academic Writing beyond North America." *College Composition and Communication* 46.2 (1995): 175–98. Print.
- National Council of Teachers of English. "Position Statement Prepared by the NCTE Committee on Issues in ESL and Bilingual Education." NCTE, 1981. Web. 26 Oct. 2010.
- . "Resolution on English as a Second Language and Bilingual Education." NCTE, 1982. Web. 26 Oct. 2010.
- . "Resolution on English as the 'Official Language.'" NCTE, 1986. Web. 26 Oct. 2010.
- Nero, Shondel J., ed. *Dialects, Englishes, Creoles, and Education*. Mahwah: Erlbaum, 2006. Print.
- . "Discourse Tensions, Englishes, and the Composition Classroom." *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*. Ed. Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Kei Matsuda. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2010. 142–57. Print.
- . *Englishes in Contact: Anglophone Caribbean Students in an Urban College*. Cresskill: Hampton, 2001. Print.
- "Obama English-Only Comment Stirs Controversy." Transcript. *FOX News Channel*, 10 July 2008. Web. 20 July 2009.
- Patrick, Thomas Cullen. "LANGUAGE: English Dominates the World." Editorial. *Miami Herald* 3 Aug. 2008 F1LA ed.: L3. Web. 20 July 2009.
- Pedersen, Anne-Marie. "Negotiating Cultural Identities through Language: Academic English in Jordan." *College Composition and Communication* 62.2 (2010): 283–310. Print.
- Pennycook, Alastair. "English as a Language Always in Translation." *European Journal of English Studies* 12.1 (2008): 33–47. Print.
- Pérez-Sabater, Carmen, Gemma Peña-Martínez, Ed Turney, and Begoña Montero-Fleta. "A Spoken Genre Gets Written: Online Football Commentaries in English, French, and Spanish." *Written Communication* 25.2 (2008): 235–61. Print.
- Phillipson, Robert. *English-Only Europe? Challenging Language Policy*. London: Routledge, 2003. Print.

- Preto-Bay, Ana Maria, and Kristine Hansen. "Preparing for the Tipping Point: Designing Writing Programs to Meet the Needs of the Changing Population." *WPA* 30.1-2 (2006): 37-57. Print.
- Ramanathan, Vaidehi. "Of Texts AND Translations AND Rhizomes: Postcolonial Anxieties AND Deracinations AND Knowledge Constructions." *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: An International Journal* 3.4 (2006): 223-44. Print.
- Rose, Mike. "Narrowing the Mind and Page: Remedial Writers and Cognitive Reductionism." *College Composition and Communication* 39.3 (1988): 267-302. Print.
- Rubdy, Rani, and Mario Saraceni. Introduction. *English in the World: Global Rules, Global Roles*. Ed. Rani Rubdy and Mario Saraceni. London: Continuum, 2006. 5-16. Print.
- Schlafly, Phyllis. "Obama Rejects English Language Assimilation." *Copley News Service* 16 July 2008. Web. 27 Sept. 2009.
- Schor, Sandra. "Composition Strategy as Translation." *College English* 48.2 (1986): 187-94. Print.
- Schroeder, Christopher, Helen Fox, and Patricia Bizzell, eds. *ALT DIS: Alternative Discourses and the Academy*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 2002. Print.
- Shuck, Gail. "Combating Monolingualism: A Novice Administrator's Challenge." *WPA* 30.1-2 (2006): 59-82. Print.
- Silva, Tony, Iлона Lekı, and Joan Carson. "Broadening the Perspective of Mainstream Composition Studies: Some Thoughts from the Disciplinary Margins." *Written Communication* 14.3 (1997): 398-428. Print.
- Smitherman, Geneva. "CCCC's Role in the Struggle for Language Rights." *College Composition and Communication* 50.3 (1999): 349-76. Print.
- Smitherman, Geneva, and Victor Villanueva. Introduction. *Language Diversity in the Classroom: From Intention to Practice*. Ed. Geneva Smitherman and Victor Villanueva. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2003. Print.
- Soffer, Oren. "The Case of the Hebrew Press: From the Traditional Model of Discourse to the Modern Model." *Written Communication* 21.2 (2004): 141-70. Print.
- _____. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. "Notes for Contributors." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, n.d. Web. 26 Oct. 2010.
- Tardy, Christine, and Paul Kei Matsuda. "The Construction of Author Voice by Editorial Board Members." *Written Communication* 26.1 (2009): 32-52. Print.
- Uzuner, Seder. "Multilingual Scholars' Participation in Core/Global Academic Communities: A Literature Review." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 7.4 (2008): 250-63. Print.
- Varro, Gabrielle. "Les élèves 'étrangers' dans les discours des institutions et des instituteurs." *Langage et société* 80 (June 1997): 73-99. Print.
- White, Edward M. "A Proposal: Get Serious about the Foreign-Language Requirement." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 4 Apr. 2008: A39. Print.
- Widdowson, H. G. "The Ownership of English." *TESOL Quarterly* 28.2 (1994): 377-89. Print.
- Young, Vershawn Ashanti. *Your Average Nigga: Performing Race, Literacy, and Masculinity*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2007. Print.

Bruce Horner

Bruce Horner is Endowed Chair in Rhetoric and Composition at the University of Louisville, where he teaches courses in composition, composition theory and pedagogy, and literacy studies. His most recent book is *Cross-Language Relations in Composition* (Southern Illinois UP, 2010), co-edited with Min-Zhan Lu and Paul Kei Matsuda.

Samantha NeCamp

Samantha NeCamp is an assistant professor of English at Midway College, where she teaches first-year composition and basic writing. Her interests include historical literacy and teaching practices and the politics of language. Her work also appears in *JAC*, the *Journal of Appalachian Studies*, and the *Aldous Huxley Annual*.

Christiane Donahue

Christiane Donahue is director of the Institute for Writing and Rhetoric at Dartmouth College. She is a member of the Théodile-CIREL research group at l'Université de Lille III and collaborates with European and U.S. colleagues to explore international writing research. Her publications about cross-cultural analysis of university texts, assessment and research methods, and discourse analysis of student writing appear in European and North American journals and edited collections.