

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Miami, Florida

REFRAMING FIRST-YEAR COMPOSITION: A TRANSLINGUAL APPROACH TO
WRITING ABOUT WRITING

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

ENGLISH

by

Nicole Hope Sirota

2022

To: Dean Michael R. Heithaus
College of Arts, Sciences and Education

This thesis, written by Nicole Hope Sirota, and entitled Reframing First-Year Composition: A Translingual Approach to Writing about Writing, having been approved in respect to style and intellectual content, is referred to you for judgment.

We have read this thesis and recommend that it be approved.

Shewonda Leger

Kimberly Harrison

Vanessa Sohan, Major Professor

Date of Defense: July 1, 2022

The thesis of Nicole Hope Sirota is approved.

Dean Michael R Heithaus
College of Arts, Sciences, and Education

Andrés G. Gil
Vice President for Research and Economic Development
and Dean of the University Graduate School

Florida International University, 2022

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to my father, Greg Sirota, who left us September 15th, 2021. Dad, of all the homework assignments you helped me with, I wish you could've seen this one. I miss you more than words can express. I know, in spirit, you'll be with me in Tallahassee. Until we meet again. Go Noles!

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my committee for their support and guidance throughout this process. When reaching the end seemed impossible, their patience and attention brought me to the finish line. I would like to thank Dr. Leger for encouraging me to always push myself and Dr. Harrison for taking a chance on a student she had never met. I would especially like to thank Dr. Sohan, my Major Professor and mentor, for her grace and her unwavering support during the most difficult time of my life, losing my father to cancer. I can never thank her enough for not giving up on me or letting me give up on myself. Without her I can say, undoubtedly, I wouldn't be submitting this thesis, nor would I have been accepted into the PhD program of my dreams. Thank you will never suffice.

I would like to thank my mom, Fatima Sirota, for being my number one fan, every day without fault. Her support, advice and prayers have been my driving forces during this program and in everything I do. It is because of her, and my late father's, endless love and encouragement that I truly believe that I am capable of conquering all of my dreams and aspirations.

Last, but certainly not least, I'd like to thank my husband, Julian Puppolo, for never leaving my side, for showering me with love, for reminding me every single day how strong and capable I am, and for taking care of our home, our son, and our cats, on the nights I couldn't spare a single second. I want to thank him for being my idea board and contributing, even, to the many assignments included in this thesis. He has inspired me to be better in every way and for that I will forever be thankful.

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS
REFRAMING FIRST-YEAR COMPOSITION: A TRANSLINGUAL APPROACH TO
WRITING ABOUT WRITING

by

Nicole Hope Sirota

Florida International University, 2022

Miami, Florida

Professor Vanessa Sohan, Major Professor

This thesis introduces a course design that brings together two successful approaches to teaching First-Year Writing, Writing about Writing Studies and Translingual Writing, to encourage transfer of writing knowledge and ultimately help students be the best writers they can be. The course situates translingualism within the Writing about Writing approach and suggests assignments that will allow students to recognize their language differences as resources to help create new meanings and fight against the discriminatory expectations of “standard” English often seen in academia. By the end of the course, students will gain agency in their writing allowing them to take greater risks in their use of language to inform their writing processes. Students will also gain practice in using linguistic strategies, regardless of being multilingual or not, so they can write successfully across the curriculum.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	4
Translingual Writing	4
Writing about Writing	10
III. COURSE DESIGN	12
Course Description	12
Institutional Context	13
Theoretical Rationale	15
Expectations	20
Syllabus	28
REFERENCES	37

Introduction

Spending several years as a middle and high school English/Language Arts teacher in a linguistically diverse community has given me a unique perspective of the future first-year composition students that will soon begin their higher education journeys. These students, of which most speak two or more languages and all experience different varieties of English, engage in multilingual practices in most facets of their lives, but are expected to adhere to normative linguistic values in the academic environment. Since many of these students are non-native speakers of English who began their schooling in the American K-12 system still in their formative years, by the time they begin their academic careers in higher education they will not be considered international students, such as those who come to the U.S. solely to attend university, nor benefit from the programs in place to support those international students. However, they continue being native speakers of other languages first, and English speakers second. These inequities do not only apply to students (herein referred to as “multilingual students”) who were born in other countries, but also to those who live a bi-cultural life and often speak their native language at home but can function in English within social and academic settings, often called “emergent bilinguals” (Garcia et al. 6). In Florida alone, one of the biggest multicultural communities in the country, over 250,000 students in the public school system are considered English Language Learners (ELL) and receive accommodations to account for their perceived “deficiencies” in English (Florida Department of Education). As more and more programs are recognizing the need to accommodate students with diverse linguistic differences and continue providing the support many received during their time in elementary and secondary schooling, FYC courses can benefit from integrating pedagogical approaches that increase

student agency, encourage transfer of writing knowledge and allow for non-native English speakers to use their linguistic skills as resources to negotiate how they use language. This is especially true given that many non-native speakers may simply never learn certain nuances of a language they were not alphabetized in no matter how fluent they may become.

While native and fluent English speakers can balance the codes they use to create meaning and effectively communicate in what academia currently considers “standard English,” ELLs are at a disadvantage when participating in writing classes that imply that “heterogeneity in language impedes communication and meaning” (Horner et al.). Instead, composition scholars have called for a *translingual* approach to writing which treats language as “not something we have but something we do” (Lu and Horner 208). This pedagogical approach directly counters the out-dated, and frankly discriminatory, error-focused practices that have dominated writing courses for decades and are especially prevalent in first-year composition classrooms.

The intention behind an introductory class on writing skills for incoming college students is to prepare them for the various genres of writing they will encounter throughout their studies. However, teaching writing as a skill that can be generalized and used the same way across multiple discourse communities and disciplines (see Russell) creates an unrealistic view of what college writing should be. In addition, this take on writing instruction takes for granted the idea that writing knowledge will transfer easily from one class to the next. While practice in writing genres such as narratives, rhetorical analysis, and journal articles may benefit a student in an English program, where these genres are more commonplace, the same cannot necessarily be said for students pursuing majors that are not inherently writing-focused. Nor can these genres “be easily or meaningfully mimicked outside their naturally occurring rhetorical situations,” when considering the genres students are actually engaging with outside of the classroom, such

as professional and technical writing or online writing (Wardle, “Mutt Genres,” 767). In light of this, scholars such as Elizabeth Wardle and Douglas Downs, among others, are advocating for a pedagogical approach where students can learn *about* writing instead of only learning *how* to write with the expectation of increasing transferability of writing knowledge not only from one discipline to another but to the spaces beyond academia where writing is required. The Writing About Writing (WAW) approach encourages students to “consider how writing works, who they are as writers, and how they use (and don’t use) writing,” through the study of writing scholarship framed around “threshold concepts” that dispute the belief that good writers are those with innate talent rather than those who “persist, revise, and are willing to learn from their failures” (Adler-Kassner and Wardle; Wardle and Downs).

Despite the theoretical similarities between WAW and Translingual writing, there is little overlap between the two areas. In fact, WAW has been previously critiqued for lacking inclusivity and its misalignment with the CCCC’s Students Right to their Own Language, which calls for language and dialect inclusivity in academic writing ¹. Further, review of current textbooks such as *Writing About Writing: A College Reader* by Elizabeth Wardle and Douglas Downs and *Naming What We Know Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies* by Linda Adler-Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle highlights a lack of translingual theories and practices of writing which ignore the need for greater attention to language difference among native and non-native speakers of English in FYC courses. And, while they do include texts from multilingual writers and writers that employ translingual practices in their essays like Victor Villanueva, Sandra Cisneros, Vershawn Ashanti Young, Alcir Santos Neto, among others, there is little ¹scholarship that directly addresses translingual writing as a pedagogical practice.

¹ “Academic writing” refers to the writing that occurs within the college setting, as opposed to professional, technical or personal writing, and does not represent one specific genre or mode.

So, how do FYC programs account for language differences in the college classroom? Oftentimes, they don't. But, by intersecting WAW and translingual writing and implementing them in a FYC curriculum, we can move away from traditional pedagogical practices, such as genre-based and error-focused (see Inoue) writing instruction, and develop FYC courses and programs that are more inclusive of languages, dialects, and the identities students bring with them into the classroom. Thus, the course proposal below aims to build on the current scholarship about the Writing About Writing pedagogy and calls for closer attention to translingualism as an approach for academic writing to better serve non-native English speakers and speakers of World Englishes (see Canagarajah) in FYC courses and increase the transfer of writing knowledge to other core disciplines and beyond. If the WAW approach centers around teaching students about the rhetorical strategies they employ in their writing, then translingualism may offer an explanation or rationale as to why they made those choices based on their linguistic skill sets or uses of non-standard varieties of English.

Literature Review

Translingual Writing

Despite the world becoming increasingly multilingual and people striving for fluency in second and third languages, academia continues to hold scholars to “standard” forms of English which serve as a great disadvantage to non-native speakers. In their landmark article “Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach,” Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, Jacqueline Jones Royster, and John Trimbur claim that the United States, through the expectation of Standard English at the expense of languages and their variations, “take as the norm a linguistically homogeneous situation” (303). Nearly 10 years prior, Horner and Trimbur began questioning the monolingual practices of U.S. college composition programs and, at that time,

called for an “internationalist perspective on written English,” (594) as an approach to resist the implied “unidirectional monolingualism” of academia, which has a historical and cultural impact that has gone ignored for far too long, yet heavily influences “our teaching, our writing programs, and our impact on U.S. culture” (595). Paul Kei Matsuda similarly calls attention to the need for more support for second-language (L2) writers, and while he questions the “uncritically accepted and celebrated” (“The Lure” 478) theories of translingual writing, he does argue against the predatory English Only practices in English programs across the country, claiming that “U.S. college composition not only has accepted English Only as an ideal but it already assumes the state of English-only, in which students are native English speakers by default” (“The Myth” 637). Similarly, Bethany Davila places blame on the assumption that Standard English will always be taught in writing courses for the belief that there is one accurate language that is preferred for communication (128).

In an effort to work against this English-only perspective on academic writing, the translingual framework proposes practices that highlight “agentive and ideological qualities of writers’ language repertoires” (Leonard and Nowacek). These qualities allow students to counter the idea that language is unmalleable and fixed, that language practices must conform to what a few have defined for the many that use and manipulate multiple languages. Bruce Horner defines translingual writing as:

- (1) honoring the power of all language users to shape language to specific ends;
- (2) recognizing the linguistic heterogeneity of all users of language both within the United States and globally;
- and (3) directly confronting English monolingualist expectations by researching and teaching how writers can work with and against, not simply within, those expectations. (Horner et al. 305)

The translingual approach to writing does not only aim to push past monolingual practices but multilingual practices as well. Bruce Horner, Samantha NeCamp and Christiane Donahue discuss the differences between multilingual and translingual practices claiming that, in a multilingual perspective, a bilingual person is independently fluent in both languages and is therefore essentially two monolingual people living in the same body (285). Melissa Lee similarly states that “the multilingual model also promotes the same image of the fractured linguistic personality of the bilingual and multilingual individual” (315), recognizing that multilingual individuals still have to work within “standard” sets of linguistic rules of any of the languages they speak. In her article “Shifting to the World Englishes Paradigm by Way of the Translingual Approach: Code-Meshing as a Necessary Means of Transforming Composition Pedagogy,” Lee calls upon the translingual practice of code-meshing as a “pedagogical remedy for the harm that traditional monolingualist composition curricula have inflicted on students whose home languages and language varieties are not the metropolitan Englishes (the “native” varieties spoken in the United States, England, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand) traditionally privileged within the U.S. educational system” (Canagarajah 588, as cited in Lee). Code-meshing is the evolution of the long-standing practice of code-switching, where speakers of two or more languages are able to situationally maneuver between their languages. In “‘Nah, We Straight’: An Argument Against Code-Switching,” Vershawn Ashanti Young argues that code-switching is inherently racist and supporting of “linguistic segregation” which continues to perpetuate the “standard” form of English as the conventionally accepted dialect, whereas a speaker’s native language or dialect is reserved for non-academic audiences. Suresh Canagarajah also advocates for moving past the practice of code-switching which views “language alternation as involving bilingual competence,” (403). Instead, both Young and Canagarajah call for

code-meshing as a translingual practice which allows students to call upon their linguistic diversity as a resource and “treats the languages as part of a single integrated system,” (Canagarajah 403) to bring together “all forms and venues where they communicate,” (Young 62). That being said, code-meshing is just one of the ways students can engage in translingual writing. In fact, translingual writing aims for more than the practical implementation of just one strategy or skill. The translingual approach aims for a receptiveness to linguistic difference and variety that allows for all writing practices and all language users to engage in translingualism, even if that engagement happens in what academia perceives as “standard” English.

Despite translingual writing existing more so in theory than in practice, scholars have been successful at integrating translingual practices into their curricula. Canagarajah details his experience with teaching the course “Teaching of Second Language Writing” in “Translingual Writing and Teacher Development in Composition” where he justifies the choices he made to encourage teachers to “construct their pedagogies with sensitivity to student, writing, and course diversity, thus continuing to develop their pedagogical knowledge and practice for changing contexts of writing” (266). In his course he engages his students/scholars in reflective assignments on their experiences and challenges with writing so they can understand their own awareness of language, as well as the rhetorical strategies they employ and the practices they engage in when composing (269). Similarly, Juan Guerra, who views translingualism as “a set of ideological beliefs, values, and practices that attempts to influence how we/students construct our/their notions of language and culture and deploy them in academic writing and beyond,” (Guerra 229) also aims to introduce students to linguistic negotiation by incorporating translingual practices such as self-reflective essays, like Canagarajah. Specifically, Guerra assigned students the task of critiquing the Horner et al. piece mentioned earlier facilitating a

deeper understanding of the foundations of translingualism in order to better inform their own writing. Daniel V. Bommarito and Emily Cooney both recount their implementations of translingual pedagogies in the courses they designed specifically to meet the needs of multilingual writers and address their linguistic diversity in the classroom. With assignments like narratives on identity and representation and cultural critiques of “authenticity” in transnational food (Bommarito and Cooney 43), they were able to make strides towards creating “a conducive environment,” where “the bulk of [their] attention would need to be directed toward the ongoing process of dislodging monolingual norms pervading our classrooms” (44). This work encourages students to let their identities become a part of their writing, pushing them to fight back against academic standards that have seldom cared for their needs.

Strides towards translingual writing have been in the works since the mid 70’s, with the publishing of the CCCC’s “Student’s Right to Their Own Language,” (SRTOL) which aims to give students the agency to participate in the academic space without having to conform to “standard” English ideologies at the expense of their lived experiences with language. The resolution takes a stance against linguistic discrimination stating that “the claim that any one dialect is unacceptable amounts to an attempt of one social group to exert its dominance over another” (CCCC). Geneva Smitherman recounts the efforts that led to the SRTOL, telling her own story as example of the discriminatory, error-focused practices that have existed in academia for far too long. As a student she was not judged on her work or her effort. Instead she was judged by her use of her own dialect, her own Black English, having to “correct” it through speech therapy until she embraced her bidialectism publishing her essay “English Teacher, Why You Be Doing the Thangs You Don’t Do?” (Smitherman 1972). In *Talkin and Testifyin: the Language of Black America* she calls for a policy that would take a closer look at the linguistic

needs of minority groups that have been denied and excluded solely based on the otherness of their languages. After years of development, the CCCC formulated and adopted the “National Language Policy,” which “recognizes and reflects the historical reality that, even though English has become the language of wider communication, we are a multi-lingual society,” and that “civil rights should not be deny to people because of linguistic differences” (CCCC). In his 2019 CCCC’s Chair Address, Asao B. Inoue compares the figurative bars that confine writers of color to the physical bars of a prison to fight against the white language supremacy heavily perpetuated in our education system. Inoue indiscreetly claims that “if you use a single standard to grade your student’s languaging, you engage in racism,” (Inoue 359). The error-focused practices that have dominated writing courses for decades are not only out-dated, they are flat-out discriminatory to speakers of other languages who maneuver language based on their own needs and experiences.

As scholars have recognized the increasing calls for linguistic diversity in college writing, actionable materials have been created for and disseminated in composition programs across the nation increasingly in the past few years. Alanna Frost, Julia Kiernan, and Suzanne Blum Malley editors of *Translingual Dispositions: Globalized Approaches to the Teaching of Writing* put together a collection of translingual resources ranging from theoretical perspectives of translingual pedagogy and practices that can be adapted by composition instructors with ease. Similarly, Canagarajah’s book *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations* details translingual practices and strategies that he has recognized in the classroom which have facilitated increased language negotiation among college writers and encouraged increased interaction with practices like code-meshing. My course design below aims to add to

the growing number of resources available for educators who are interested in creating spaces for their students to navigate their own experiences with language.

Writing about Writing

Despite its success in increasing transferability of writing knowledge, the Writing About Writing pedagogy lacks actionable material in the foundations of translanguaging and can benefit from paying closer attention to these practices as resources to teaching academic writing in first year composition. The WAW movement came about as a direct counterpoint to the idea that writing exists as a general skill that is transferable across contexts. In their article that initially introduces the concept of a “writing studies” program as opposed to a traditional first-year composition program, “Teaching about Writing, Righting Misconceptions: (Re)Envisioning “First-Year Composition” as “Introduction to Writing Studies,”” Elizabeth Wardle and Douglas Downs refute the claim that FYC courses are capable of teaching the necessary strategies that students will need as they progress through college in one or two years of introductory level classes (553). Instead, their proposed pedagogy advocates for student agency in writing studies through the study of composition theories with the goal of achieving “threshold concepts” (see Adler-Kassner and Wardle) increasing the probability of skills transferring to other areas in academia while bringing awareness to writing as its own discipline of study. Years after publishing the article that proposed the reconfiguration of FYC to Writing Studies, Wardle and Downs’ milestone textbook, *Writing About Writing: A College Reader* was published. The textbook presents students with scholarship on writing and composition studies so students can practice developing deeper understandings of how to relate to texts in order to implement the acquired knowledge across disciplines. In *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of*

Writing Studies, Wardle and Adler-Kassner introduce 37 threshold concepts that are arranged into five categories: Writing is a Social and Rhetorical Activity; Writing Speaks to Situations Through Recognizable Forms; Writing Enacts and Creates Identities and Ideologies; and Writing is (Also Always) a Cognitive Activity. All of the concepts described in the writing studies textbook fall under the metaconcept: *writing is an activity and a subject of study*. This metaconcept comes as a surprise to scholars and students alike “partially because people tend to experience writing as a finished product that represents ideas in seemingly rigid forms but also because writing is often seen as a ‘basic skill’ that a person can learn once and for all and not think about again” (Adler-Kassner and Wardle 15). Essentially, the goals of the Writing About Writing approach to teaching college composition are twofold: help students gain a deeper understanding of how and why they write the way they do and make the decisions they make when composing in order to encourage the transferability of writing skills and call attention to writing studies as a discipline and disseminate the idea that “as a field, we know some things and should teach them” (Wardle and Downs “Reflecting” 4).

So, despite occupying different places in composition studies, the areas of Writing about Writing and translingualism share some similarities. Both encourage students to be more reflective with their writing practices and aim for students to use their knowledge of writing studies and foundations in writing across disciplines. However, Writing about Writing and translingualism rarely intersect. In fact, some scholars argue that the WAW approach disregards translingual writing as well as the scholars of color that contribute to the field of writing studies. Tessa Brown says, “I felt like the editors took concepts about linguistic flexibility from scholars of color but then left out their most politically challenging implications.” She questions how this approach that got so many things right, could be so wrong as to exclude names like Geneva

Smitherman, H. Samy Alim, Esther Milu, Elaine Richarson, Adam Banks, Todd Craig, David F. Green Jr., or Gwendolyn D. Pough (Brown 596). Brown goes as far as calling the approach “color blind” lacking linguistic inclusivity and diversity. Samantha Looker similarly asks how two areas that are “deeply compatible” and “[work] together to nurture linguistic versatility in students” (176) has garnered little attention and scholarship, calling for more intersections between the two.

Course Description

Translingual First-Year Writing is a revamping of the traditional introductory writing course most universities require of their first year students. Typically, first-year writing (FYW) courses, which have come to be known as “English Composition,” “Writing and Rhetoric,” “College Composition,” “Academic Writing,” among other names, aim to introduce students to the academic process of writing with the intention of preparing them for writing in the subject areas they choose to pursue. This proposed section of ENC1101, Writing and Rhetoric I, aims to intersect two approaches to teaching writing to incoming college students using the Writing about Writing approach through a translingual lens to encourage student agency in writing which will allow for negotiation of language difference for multilingual students and to increase the transferability of writing skills beyond the ENC classroom. Using the Writing About Writing (WAW) approach to FYW as a framework, this course will teach students about the foundations of writing and writing studies as its own discipline while integrating translingual practices such as literacy narratives, self-reflection, and rhetorical analysis of translingual scholarship. The class assignments serve the purpose of helping students understand their own writing process and their relationship to language and how they move through it while demonstrating that fluency in any

language is not the only way to make meaning. This course is designed specifically for Florida International University and other HSI universities with a large number of multilingual students.

Institutional Context

As is common amongst universities around the country, incoming first year students are required to take two semesters of ENC (English Composition) “introductory” writing courses that aim to prepare them for the diverse types of writing they will engage in during their studies. The goals of ENC1101 are to introduce students to various rhetorical situations and how to write for specific audiences. In addition, this course focuses on reframing writing as a recursive process where writing and revision happen concurrently. Another major goal of the first-year writing course is to give students the opportunity to practice academic writing including developing a thesis and engaging in academic research to support it (“First Year Core”). For example, at my current institution, Florida International University, the course catalog defines ENC1101 (Writing and Rhetoric I) as:

ENC 1101 Writing and Rhetoric I (3). The first in a two course sequence introduces the principles of college-level writing and research. Students write for multiple rhetorical contexts, with emphasis on critical thinking and revision.

Written work meets the state composition requirement.

Florida International University, located in the multicultural community of South Florida, is the largest Hispanic-Serving Institution in the country and serves a student body that is 63% hispanic (Florida International University). Because of its HSI status, FIU has become a destination for Spanish speaking international and local students, in addition to the students

hailing from all over the globe, all of whom bring their own experiences with language into the classroom. The significant language differences that occur all across the campuses call attention to the need for instruction that can account for and accommodate all of the degrees of English that co-exist. For these reasons, I envision this course being successfully implemented at universities such as this one. However, because multilingualism is not a requirement of translingual writing, this course would be a great addition to any university curriculum.

FIU is a prime example of how translingual writing can greatly benefit students and allow for greater transfer of writing knowledge. Although their course description and student outcomes don't specifically cite translingual writing as a framework for their first-year writing courses, many of the required assignments do engage with translingual practices, such as literacy narratives which encourage engagement with personal issues of language, literacy, and culture. Although FIU is a minority-majority institution, this diversity is not as easily seen amongst the faculty, which is predominantly monolingual (Fang and Lopez 108), a fact that is common in academia. In their chapter titled "Unity in Diversity: Practicing Translingualism in First-Year Writing Courses," FIU faculty members Tania Lopez and Ming Fang detail some of the approaches instructors in the first-year writing program are taking towards redesigning courses to create more inclusive writing environments and towards approaching language difference as an opportunity to create new connections and make new meanings. They say, "each curriculum redesign took a strengths-based approach that valued and used the diverse professional interests of our faculty and rich linguistic and cultural resources of our students as strengths and resources, creating more opportunities for both instructors and

students to negotiate multiple linguistic resources, making use of any and all assets available to them” (111).

The three instructors cited in the article above each addressed translingual writing in a different way: Lopez taking a more direct look at translingual theories of writing including translingual writing as an object of study, Vagnoni allowing students to recognize their various linguistic resources and sensitivities to language and culture difference, and Warman empowering students, especially multilingual students, to discover their voices and how they can be used to fight against the hegemonic and discriminatory practices still present inside and outside of academia. And, while they are only three of the many first year writing instructors at FIU, their approaches to translingual writing represent how fluid and malleable this skill can be and how instructors can use their own relationship with language to shape their experiences with translingual instruction.

Based on FIU’s successes in applying translingual approaches to their FYW curriculum, this course will benefit students of any Hispanic-serving Institution or university with large numbers of multilingual students. Resituating first-year composition to include translingual practices can help develop writing skills that can be used outside of the composition classroom and when taught through a Writing about Writing lens can increase student agency and the transferability of writing knowledge so that students may negotiate their meanings in various contexts and rhetorical situations in addition to learning about writing, and translingual writing, as their own subjects of study.

Theoretical Rationale

Students who speak English as a second language and live in the U.S. are already engaging in translingual practices in their everyday lives. Depending on their fluency in English they often have to make deliberate choices and take risks in conveying their message in the way they truly intend. This is prevalent in higher education and even more so in English classes or classes that are writing-heavy. The section of first-year writing I propose below focuses on showing students that their inner voices aren't wrong only because they aren't speaking "standard" English. In fact, the way they produce their writing is only benefitted by their multilingualism since their knowledge in two (or more) languages gives them just as many more opportunities to create new meanings. The convergence of WAW and translingual writing opens the door for students to understand the power that they hold in their linguistic skill set and how they can wield that power to make their writing their own. By acquiring agency in their writing, students will be able to reflect on how their identity makes their writing, and their choices in writing, unique and use this to fight against and break away from the English Only norms that have been ingrained in them since primary and secondary school. Although the ultimate goal of this course is to transfer writing skills across the curriculum, and beyond, this course also aims to introduce students to rhetoric and composition as its own field of study. Much like a student taking Introduction to Chemistry to learn the foundations of the subject before continuing onto more advanced classes, first-year writing should work the same way for the field of Writing Studies. To accomplish this goal, this course will use the Writing about Writing framework, an approach to FYW that has been used with success, with attention to translingual writing practices to account for the needs of the multilingual

student body. Current literature in Writing about Writing studies don't specifically account for students' linguistic needs, nor the practices multilingual students are already engaging in when writing in college. For that reason, this course intends to join the growing conversation of how translingual practices and a theoretical understanding of composition together can encourage transfer of writing knowledge across the curriculum.

My primary reason for choosing to frame this course around the Writing about Writing approach to FYW, introduced in Wardle and Downs' article "Teaching about Writing, Righting Misconceptions: (Re)Envisioning 'First Year Composition' as 'Introduction to Writing Studies,'" and which has since been used increasingly in writing programs across the country, is my honest belief that writing should be studied as its own discipline. Wardle and Downs argue that teaching genre-based writing as the framework for FYW can create the false idea that all writing in academia is the same and skills can easily transfer from one discipline to another. In reality, they argue, there is no way to know if any one genre of writing will be useful to students in any other context outside of the writing classroom. Although the course does include assignments that produce a specific genre of writing, such as the literacy narrative, the course focuses on demonstrating how writing within this particular genre can continue to inform and improve their writing as they progress in their studies. In this case, a literacy narrative brings students' attention to their relationship with reading and writing which may inform the choices they make in their everyday practices along with recognizing how they incorporate their own identity in their writing. In the *Writing about Writing: A College Reader* textbook, Wardle and Downs claim the WAW approach "consider[s] how writing

works, who they are as writers, and how they use (and don't use) writing" (Wardle and Downs "Writing About Writing").

I chose to design this course using the WAW framework because of its positive impact on the transferability of writing skills among students who participated in courses centered on this pedagogy (Wardle and Downs; Johnson; McCracken and Ortiz).

Similarly, I chose the *Writing about Writing: A College Reader* textbook for two reasons:

1) because who better to learn from than the godparents of WAW themselves, and 2) despite significant scholarship on the topic, there are very few books that actually put the WAW principles into practice. However, this textbook is also evidence of the need for a WAW pedagogy that pays closer attention to translingualism as an approach to writing and that incorporates translingual practices to better serve non-native English speaking students. Despite including a few pieces written by writers of color, this textbook doesn't account for the strides being made in the realm of translingual and multilingual writing, other than a brief introduction to language literacy at the start of the Victor Villanueva excerpt. In order to see more examples of translingual writing in practice, I will supplement the textbook with outside resources such as articles by Bruce Horner, John Trimbur, Vershawn Ashanti Young, Gloria Anzaldua, and Suresh Canagarajah, scholars who have been contributing to the topic of translingualism and who write using translingual practices themselves. Although some of these articles are more challenging than others, they will give students a theoretical understanding of how their own experience with language can influence how they write.

Since the mid 70s, scholars have been advocating for language policies and practices that would fight against the ideals of "Standard English." Scholars such as

Geneva Smitherman, Vershawn Ashanti Young, Asao B. Inoue, Carmen Kynard among other have called for an approach to writing that confronts the discriminatory practices of “linguistic segregation” (Young 62) prevalent in academia which perpetuate the idea that one dialect of English, or language, is better than another. As translingual writing continues to garner attention, practices like code-switching, which has since evolved into code-meshing (Young; Canagarajah), allows students to maneuver between their languages and dialects, taking agency in their writing and making deliberate choices based on their own linguistic bag of tricks. This course emphasizes the writing process and gives students the opportunity to recognize the ways they use language. For example, in the first week of the course students will record themselves in the process of translating an expression or idiom from a different language or dialect they speak so they can listen to the specific choices they make after the fact. By giving students ample opportunities to manipulate language, this course aims to break away from traditional English courses that may, at times unknowingly, continue to support this linguistic divide and give students back the autonomy of writing in and within languages to best benefit themselves.

Since Florida International University is a multicultural institution whose student body is minority-majority, a course that addresses the needs of non-native English speakers and multilingual students and their writing practices is indispensable. Joining the areas of WAW studies and translingual writing can help students understand the choices they make when they engage in writing across their courses and other rhetorical contexts. Suresh Canagarajah claims that “Advances in theorization of translingual practices have far outstripped pedagogical implementation” (Translingual Practice) so the

need for a course like this one arises from the lack of practical material in both WAW studies and translingual writing.

This course was also designed to introduce students to scholarship on writing studies and rhetorical theory from the very start. While this can be a challenge for some students, the complexity of the topics does increase gradually. This course is separated into four modules, each lasting approximately four weeks. During each week the materials will address one of the five “threshold concepts” listed in the *Writing about Writing* textbook: 1). Literacies: Where Do Your Ideas About Reading and Writing Come From?; 2). Individual in Community: How do Texts Mediate Activities?; 3). Rhetoric: How is Meaning Constructed in Context?; and 4). both Processes: How Are Texts Composed” and “Multimodal Composition: What Counts as Writing?” As the sample module below demonstrates, each module will incorporate collaborative writing through discussion posts asking students to reflect on the week’s reading and a larger essay project, involving at least one draft and one opportunity for peer-review. I designed the course in this way so students can interact with texts that are both foundational to writing studies and texts that incorporate translingual practices or discuss translingual theories of writing. While the *Writing About Writing* textbook breaks down and paces the material in a sensible way, my course will deviate from the traditional assignments listed at the end of each unit of the book. Instead, the assignments in the syllabus below will encourage students to start thinking about how they use language in the many facets of their lives and how each context requires a different approach to making meanings.

Expectations

Because I cannot reflect on the successes or shortcomings of my proposed course, I offer instead my expectations for students enrolled in this section of FYW. My main goal with this course design is that by the end of the term students are able to gain agency in their writing and understand that their personal experiences are the largest part of their writing persona. Who they are outside of the classroom affects their writing just as much as what they learn inside. When students are introduced to practices that simply feel “right” to them, it's because they have been in need of strategies that are specific to their linguistic differences. This course brings together two approaches to first-year writing, which, ironically, share many theoretical similarities, yet are brought together so seldomly. If this course is successful in its goals, then students will walk away with a sense of belonging in academia and with writing practices that allow them to write as themselves.

In addition to meeting course objectives, each assignment was created to help students gain a better understanding of writing studies as its own field along with how their identities affect their writing. The syllabus below includes a semester-long overview and a complete first unit with weekly assignments and one larger assignment that will incorporate the skills they read about in the weekly readings and the writing practices they engaged with in the weekly discussions. In lieu of traditional assessments, such as tests and quizzes, students will write four essays of varying lengths that build on each other. For example, in Unit 1, where the threshold concept is “Literacies: Where Do Your Ideas About Reading and Writing Come From?” students will write a literacy narrative where they will take an introspective look at their writing habits and practices and the role reading and writing have taken in their lives.

In Week 1 students will read two texts from the textbook *Writing About Writing: A College Reader*, an excerpt from *Bootstraps: From and Academic of Color* by Victor Villanueva and “The Joy of Reading and Writing: Superman,” by Sherman Alexie. I chose the excerpt of Villanueva’s book, not only because he is himself a multilingual writer, but also because he clearly demonstrates the effect his identity has on his relationship with writing. Although it is not given the name *translingualism*, we do see here that Wardle and Downs discuss the importance of student agency and language negotiation in the “Framing the Reading” section of the book. They say, “Making decisions about what language practices to use is not just a matter of learning something new, but of deciding who to be” (107). This text also serves the purpose of introducing and identifying the concepts of agency and identity in writing, and providing students a brief introduction to rhetoric, a topic they will cover in Unit 3. And, because Villanueva’s text speaks about a time in his adult life, I ask students to read Alexie’s literacy narrative as an example of how our first impressions of reading and writing as children greatly influence how we continue to employ these skills. I also chose this text to counter the denser Villanueva excerpt and so students can experience a more personal side to academic writing. For the discussion post, I ask students to choose an expression or idiom in another language or dialect of English that they speak and record their out-louding thinking as they translate the expression into what most would consider “standard” English. In this assignment I want students to be able to hear themselves making decisions in how they express themselves in either language or dialect in real-time. I ask them to pay special attention to how they balance using the correct words and keeping the same sentiment. In their written responses, I ask students to reflect on the choices they made and how their knowledge in either language or dialect helped them reach their final translation. By the end of Week 1, students should be able to start recognizing

how they negotiate their use of languages in their writing and should have a greater understanding of what a literacy narrative looks and sounds like and how, despite their personal tone, they are academic texts with great value and insight to their own writing processes.

The idea for this assignment came from a non-academic scenario in my own multilingual home, where I was stuck on how to translate a saying in Portuguese so my husband, who speaks Spanish and English, would understand its meaning and its connotation. The phrase was “Vai pra frente!” Now, if I were to translate this straight into English, I could say something like “Go forward!” Although this is a direct translation, “vai pra frente” can mean different things in different contexts. In this case it was said to an athlete as encouragement to “give it their all,” but “give it their all” doesn’t account for the word “frente” which means “forward,” but can also mean “pushing forward.” So, to translate it as “give it your all” takes away the sense of moving in the forward direction but does match the sentiment of encouragement and doing your best.

In week 2 students will engage with academic texts that introduce them to the current state of monolingualism versus multi/translingualism in first-year writing courses in the U.S. I chose to include Dana Ferris’ review of three books that address the English Only movement and the history of language policies: *Cross-Language Relations in Composition* by Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu and Paul Kei Matsuda; *Shaping Language Policy in the U.S.: The Role of Composition Studies* by Scott Wible; *Writing in the Devil's Tongue: A History of English Composition in China* by Xiaoye You. Because of the complexity of these texts, I opted for a review so students are able to understand the main points that each book discusses without being overwhelmed by the depth of the information. This review traces the English Only movement all the way back to when English was adopted as the unofficial language for business and community (Ferris 75). In the review the students will also be introduced to the role English

Only plays in higher education, how these policies can affect student morale and self perception, the Students' Right to Their Own Language (SRTOL) resolution and how it began changing the linguistic landscape of academia, and many of the language policies that came before the SRTOL. The second assigned reading is Vershawn Ashanti Young's essay on multilingualism and code-meshing, "Should Writers Use They Own English." This essay serves two purposes; to demonstrate how English Only practices are discriminatory against students who speak other languages or dialects and to show students what translingual writing looks like in practice. Young veers in and out of AAVE in his essay, never losing his train of thought, but showing how the decision to include his own dialect of English into his writing created even greater opportunities for negotiating the meanings behind his words. Not only does this text define the practice of code-meshing to students, it is a clear demonstration of what pushing past the boundaries of monolingualism can look like, and that it has been done before.

As students begin to prepare their first drafts of their literacy narratives, it is important for them to understand where academia stands on linguistic diversity. Although this shouldn't impact their foundations in literacy, it can encourage them to think critically about where they fit into academia and how using their linguistic skills as resources can help them not only in an English class but in any academic setting. For the weekly discussion post, students will read the SRTOL resolution's position statement on student dialect and reflect on their experiences with language while in elementary and secondary school. I encourage students to think about how language or dialect was either used in their benefit or held against them in the classroom. I also ask students to reflect on how this resolution may affect their experience in college and specifically in college-level writing. As with the texts, the discussion prompt will help students broaden their ideas about the writing practices that they carry with them as they enter college and recognize

how much of their literacy history is rooted in moving through and between two languages or dialects. By the end of the week, students will have an understanding of the English Only movement in writing curricula across the country and of the translingual writing practice of code-meshing. They will begin noticing the many faces of writing scholarship and academic writing in general and will be able to begin identifying how writers adjust and adapt their writing to their readers' needs depending on the contexts.

The *Writing about Writing* textbook has very few, if any, examples of translingual practices in action, so in week 3 students will read a PDF of Suresh Canagarajah's article "The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued," however, I will ask students to begin reading from page 596 "**Toward Multilingual Writing Models.**" Since we cannot read the beginning of the article together, where Canagarajah addresses more complex issues such as the globalization of English, World Englishes vs Metropolitan Englishes, and earlier attempts at making academic writing more inclusive of language differences, I will provide students with a short video reviewing the major points of the first few pages so students have a better understanding of the need for the practical suggestions outlined in the assigned sections. I chose this article as a compliment to Young's article from the prior week which introduced students to the practice of code-meshing. While Young's text embodied code-meshing, Canagarajah offers a more theoretical background to it.

For the weekly discussion post students are asked to locate spaces in their literacy narratives where they can practice code-meshing and reflect on how they engaged with this practice that may seem unnatural for an academic environment. By asking students to pay attention to how they feel while breaking away from the "standard" of English Only in the classroom, they can continue to push for more linguistic diversity, inclusion and tolerance in

college writing. Finally, this week students will participate in peer review which involves pairing them together and asking them to offer feedback on each other's literacy narrative drafts. Peer review is a critical component to the writing process and is good practice for the collaborative work that happens outside of the classroom. During their reviews, students are asked to keep an open mind when they encounter writing they might easily deem "wrong" or needing correcting and using that opportunity to engage with the author allowing for a judge-free zone where language and meanings can be negotiated. By the end of this week, students should be more comfortable with incorporating translingual practices into their literacy narratives and recognizing language differences as zones of negotiation.

Finally, as students finish the final drafts of their essays they are tasked with two final readings, both examples of literacy narratives. To speak of translingual writing and code-meshing and the blurring of language to create new meanings without introducing the work of Anzaldua would be doing the students a very serious disservice. "How to Tame a Wild Tongue" is a clear example of how academic writing can vary in form, in language, and in style, and pushes the boundaries of a "Standard" English-dominated field. In contrast, the Malcolm X excerpt aims to show students that even when working within the walls of English-speaking and English-writing classrooms, who they are outside greatly influences the work they do inside. Since the final draft of the literacy narrative is due this week, students are excused from completing a discussion post and instead should spend time ensuring that their essays are turned in on time.

As the semester progresses, students continue working through the threshold concepts that dictate the theme for each unit. In Unit 2 (Individual in Community: How do Texts Mediate Activities?) students will be introduced to discourse communities and will gain practice in

locating themselves within the different discourse communities they are a part of as well as recognizing the communities where their voices will best serve them. As the final assessment for the unit, students will create a document that reflects the needs of a discourse community of their choosing. Not only will this assessment help students meet the objective of understanding the role the audience plays in writing, it will also broaden their understanding of how their previous linguistic and cultural knowledge can influence their communication. The assignment asks students to consider rhetorical practices that are common to that community as well as accessibility to the information they are including in their document. In addition to the document they create, students will write an essay reflecting on the choices they had to make to be able to reach their intended audience successfully. In Unit 3, students will have the opportunity to practice recognizing rhetorical appeals in composition and media. The assessment asks students to analyze a TV commercial and identify the rhetorical strategies employed. However, students will be required to analyze a TV commercial that is in a language other than English, regardless if this language is one the student is familiar with or one that must be translated into English. Preferably students will work with a commercial in a language they have some familiarity with so that linguistic and cultural nuances aren't lost in the translation. In their rhetorical analysis, students will be asked to evaluate how the advertisement appeals to ethos, pathos and logos (a practice that is common in composition classes), but also consider how language and culture can affect meaning and understanding. Finally, students will have the opportunity to revisit any of the three major projects so they can adapt the information to be presented to their classmates, again bringing attention to the importance of knowing your audience. Students will be invited to “write” in ways they may have never considered appropriate for academia, such as videos, blogs, or podcasts. This final project brings together the practice students have had with translingual

writing in the classroom, their own understanding of their writing processes, and the new concepts of rhetorical appeals reflecting a more well-rounded and real-world experience in writing, one that can be carried with them as they progress through their studies and engage in writing in their professional and personal lives.

Syllabus

ENC 1101C
Translingual College Composition and Rhetoric
Fall 2022
Online Course

Instructor: Nicole Sirota, M.A.

Virtual office hours: MW 2:00-3:00
and by appointment.

Email: nsiro001@fiu.edu

Course LMS: Canvas

Course Overview

ENC1101 is one of two required writing courses for incoming students at FIU. This section of ENC1101 will introduce you to the rhetorical skills you will need to be a successful academic writer. Using the Writing about Writing approach, an approach that treats first-year writing as its own subject of study, through a translingual lens, this course will allow you to reflect on your rhetorical choices and practice writing for various audiences and purposes. Translingual writing involves negotiating your own experience with language with practices that are traditionally monolingual. Since writing is a personal and social practice, this section will encourage you to use this negotiation of

language as a resource to your writing while learning the foundations of why writers write the way they do. In this class you will learn how to push beyond the borders of current monolingual composition practices and take more agency in your writing while participating in a discourse community rather than just reading and writing about one. Throughout the 3 essays, final project and weekly discussion posts in response to assigned readings and the Writing about Writing: A College Reader textbook, ENC1101c will challenge your ideas of writing and invite you to take risks, and defend them, based on your own linguistic values and how they can be used to work within, yet against, monolingual college writing standards.

Course Objectives

By the end of the class, students will be able to:

- Demonstrate ability to respond to various rhetorical situations addressing the needs of particular audiences;
- Engage in writing as a process, including pre-writing, drafting, revising, and peer editing;
- Interact with Writing Studies and Translingual Writing scholarship and identify the employed rhetorical strategies;
- Recognize language differences as zones of negotiation and how linguistic practices are influenced by the rhetorical situations;
- Give and respond to peer feedback demonstrating an understanding of the difference between revising and editing;

- Display appropriate structure and style exhibiting attention to grammar, punctuation, spelling and syntax;
- Effectively choose and incorporate sources depending on the context of the assignment.

Course Materials

Writing About Writing: A College Reader, by Elizabeth Wardle and Doug Downs

Supplemental PDFs posted to Canvas

Regular internet access

Assignments

Weekly Discussion Posts (40%)

Each week you will be assigned 1-2 readings from either your *Writing About Writing: A College Reader* textbook or a PDF posted under the individual week. Some weeks you will be asked to respond to a specific question while other times you will simply reflect on what you read and tie it into the concepts we are covering for that week. These discussion posts serve as a chance for you to ask questions about the readings, make connections with your classmates and gain a perspective different from your own. Initial discussion posts will be due **Wednesdays by 11:59 p.m.** You will then have until **Sunday by 11:59 p.m.** to respond to **two** classmates' posts. Your timely responses will ensure that the discussion board mimics an in-person discussion that would occur in the classroom. Please do not wait until the last minute to respond to your classmates as you are stifling the collaborative nature of this assignment.

Peer Review (20%)

Peer Review will be an integral part of this class. Although many students shy away from giving feedback and dread receiving it, peer review is a great way to “see” your writing from a different perspective which may inform how you continue drafting. Because writing is a discursive activity that is never truly “done,” you will submit several drafts of each major assignment. In between each draft you will be assigned a peer to both provide feedback to and receive feedback from. So your classmates may reap the benefits of peer review, please commit to providing detailed feedback identifying not only the strong points but the areas for improvement leaving space for negotiation of meaning and linguistic or stylistic choices.

Main Projects (30%)

Literacy Narrative

In this assignment, you will write a 1,500 word Literacy Narrative which reflects on your literacy journey. This journey can begin as far back as learning to read or as recent as joining the academic community as a college student. This assignment gives you the opportunity to trace back and map the steps you took that lead you to be the reader and writer you are today. This is your chance to tell the story of who you are and why that matters for how you write and communicate with others. This narrative essay will give you insight on how you fit into the various discourse communities that you interact with in your everyday life.

- What are some of the writing practices that you bring with you today?

- How have they shaped your idea of what “good writing” looks like?
- How has your experience with reading, writing and speaking, whether in English or another language, prepared you to participate in the academic community?

Your Literacy Narrative does not need to necessarily be about the day you learned to read your first word, or the first time you picked up a pencil, nor does it have to consider only your experiences with “standard” English or academic English. If English is not your first language, do not limit yourself from including your experiences with reading and writing in your native language and considering how they affect your writing in English. Use the Young and Anzaldua readings to help give you the confidence to break past your ideas of what typical academic writing should look like.

Discourse Community Analysis

During your literacy narrative you may have started noticing the discourse communities you have participated in. Now that you have read scholarship on discourse communities, this assignment will ask you to pick one and perform an analysis of the rhetorical strategies that are common to this community. You will create a document that reflects the needs of the community you are writing about and pertains to specific issues that are faced within the community. Your document should speak to your particular audience and should employ the rhetorical and linguistic choices that resemble those within your chosen discourse community. In your essay, you must describe your process for creating your document and why you chose the elements you did. How do these elements work toward creating meaning for this discourse community? How did your previous or new knowledge of your chosen community inform your decisions? How does your analysis

demonstrate how this community interacts with others? In your analysis you must refer to at least three of the readings from this module.

Rhetorical Analysis

Now that you have an understanding of the foundations of rhetoric, for this assignment you must choose a TV commercial and perform an analysis of the rhetorical choices made throughout. However, you must select a commercial in a different language. The commercial can be made for U.S. audiences but created in a different language or it can be a commercial made specifically for audiences in their particular region. You may choose a commercial in a language that you speak, but if you choose a commercial in a language you are not familiar with please make sure you will be able to get an accurate translation of what is said/written in the advertisement. In your analysis you should discuss why the rhetorical choices made in the commercial work for their intended audience. How does this commercial appeal to ethos, pathos, and logos? How does the delivery and style affect how the audience receives the message? Are there any linguistic nuances that make this advertisement more or less effective? In order to answer some of these questions, you may need to familiarize yourself with the cultures where the commercial's language is used. Make sure to cite your sources appropriately using the MLA format.

Final Project

For your final project, you will build upon one of the three major projects completed throughout the semester and create a multimodal presentation that will be shared with the

class. You may submit your project as a slideshow presentation, video, podcast, blog, or other format (please see me for any modalities other than the ones listed above). Along with your presentation, you should submit a reflection of the process of taking a written assignment and adapting it for a new audience using visual and audio tools. Your reflection should also address how the class readings helped (or didn't help) facilitate your choices when deciding how to transfer the information from your previous assignment into a new multimodal presentation. How does your experience with language and culture difference affect how you communicate with your audience, in this case a classroom full of students from different backgrounds? While reflecting on the choices you made during this assignment, and this course in general, remember to ask yourself why you did what you did the way you did it.

Sample Module 1 Schedule

Week	Reading	Assignments
<i>Module 1 - Literacies: Where Do Your Ideas About Reading and Writing Come From?</i>		
1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Excerpt from <i>Bootstraps: From and Academic of Color</i>, Victor Villlanueva (Textbook pg 107) 2. "The Joy of Reading and Writing: Superman," Sherman Alexie (Textbook pg 128). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Due Wednesday: Initial discussion response ● Think of a meaningful expression or idiom either in another language you speak or a dialect of English you engage with regularly. Record yourself thinking out loud as you work out how to translate this expression into "standard" English as if someone with no knowledge of your other language or dialect were reading it. Then use your recording to write at least 300 words about how you arrived at your final translation. Pay attention to the ways you work through the translation process. Try to recognize the choices you make so that you aren't translating the expression directly but you also aren't simply giving the gist of it (or its English equivalent) but veering away from the specific words used in the original expression. Which words were easy to express in English (or "standard" English"

		<p>and which ones required using alternate words to translate clearly. Think about the meaning behind the expression in its original form. Does your translation maintain the same emotion as the original? Remember, there are no wrong answers. This exercise should only make you aware of how you move between both languages or dialects seamlessly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Due Sunday: Respond to two classmates
2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pages 73 to 79 of “Review: “English Only” and Multilingualism in Composition Studies: Policy, Philosophy, and Practice” by Dana Ferris (PDF). 2. “Should Writers Use Their Own English,” Vershawn Ashanti Young (PDF). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Due Wednesday: Initial discussion response ● The Students’ Right to Their Own Language reads, “We affirm the students’ right to their own patterns and varieties of language -- the dialects of their nurture or whatever dialects in which they find their own identity and style. Language scholars long ago denied that the myth of a standard American dialect has any validity. The claim that any one dialect is unacceptable amounts to an attempt of one social group to exert its dominance over another. Such a claim leads to false advice for speakers and writers, and immoral advice for humans. A nation proud of its diverse heritage and its cultural and racial variety will preserve its heritage of dialects. We affirm strongly that teachers must have the experiences and training that will enable them to respect diversity and uphold the right of students to their own language.” When you think back to your years of schooling, what was the role that language took in your education? Do you agree with this resolution? How can increased sensitivity to language differences change your experience in college? ● Due Sunday: Respond to two classmates ● Due Sunday: Draft of literacy narrative
3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued,” Suresh Canagarajah (PDF) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Due Wednesday: Initial discussion response ● Return to your draft of your literacy narrative and find two opportunities for engaging in code-meshing. You can choose to include a footnote explaining any writing in another language or let context help reveal what you mean. Then, write a 200 word post reflecting on how you recognized the opportunity to engage in this translingual practice and the steps you took to implement it. Don’t be afraid to write freely between your languages or dialects, but be mindful of the decisions you make

		<p>and think about how they are affected by your relationship with your second language or dialect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due Sunday: Respond to two classmates • Due Sunday: Peer review of literacy narratives
4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “How to Tame a Wild Tongue,” Gloria Anzaldua (PDF) 2. “Learning to Read,” Malcolm X 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No discussion post. • Due Sunday: Final draft of literacy narrative

Policies

Late Work: All assignments must be turned in by 11:59 p.m on the day they are due. Life happens and if you need an extension, these will be granted on a case-by-case basis. You must request an extension at least 24 hours before the due date. Late work that has not been previously discussed will be penalized one full letter grade for each day it is late.

Academic Misconduct: Please see the FIU policy on academic misconduct to familiarize yourself with the disciplinary actions resulting from academic misconduct, including plagiarism.

Conclusion

With this course design, I aim to introduce students to the notion of using their linguistic resources to improve their writing, not only in their English composition classes but across their entire academic careers. While a course that addresses theoretical foundations of writing while introducing new approaches may seem daunting for a first-year program, this course design can be adjusted for Honors students, upper-level classes, and graduate programs. Because my course design cannot satisfy every student’s needs or interests, it is important to recognize that the implementation of a writing studies course with a translingual focus comes with implications of

its own. For example, some students may find fault in allowing other students to submit assignments written in what they consider “non-standard English,” which continues to perpetuate the discriminatory idea that one variety of English is superior to all others. Likewise, students may find professors throughout their studies that are not knowledgeable in or tolerant of translingual writing. Unfortunately, we cannot control how others view, or accept, different uses, dialects and varieties of English. We can, however, use courses such as this one to help fight against the hegemonic perspective of Standard English and its relation to language and literacy within academia.

Works Cited

- Adler-Kassner, Linda, and Elizabeth Wardle. *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*. Utah State University Press, 2016.
- Bommarito, Daniel V., and Emily Cooney. "Cultivating a Reflective Approach to Language Difference in Composition Pedagogy." *Composition Studies*, vol. 44, no. 2, Parlor Press, 2016, pp. 39–57.
- Brown, Tessa. *What Else Do We Know? Translingualism and the History of SRTOL as Threshold Concepts in Our Field*.
<https://library-ncte-org.ezproxy.fiu.edu/journals/CCC/issues/v71-4/30726>. Accessed 19 Feb. 2022.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. 2006. "The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued." *College Composition and Communication*, 57(4): 586-619.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. "Translingual Writing and Teacher Development in Composition." *College English*, vol. 78, no. 3, 2016, pp. 265–73.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. *Translingual Practice : Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. Routledge, 2013.
- CCCC. 1974. Students' Right to Their Own Language. [Position statement.]
<https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/srtolsummary>
- CCCC. 1988. National Language Policy. [Position statement.]
<https://cccc.cte.org/cccc/resources/positions/nationallangpolicy>
- Downs, D. & Wardle, E. (2007). Teaching about writing, righting misconceptions: (Re)envisioning 'First-Year Composition' as 'Introduction to Writing Studies.'" *College Composition and Communication*, 58(4): 552-584.
- "English Language Learners." *Florida Department of Education*, 2022,
<https://www.fldoe.org/academics/eng-language-learners/>.
- Fang, Ming, and Tania Cepero Lopez. "UNITY IN DIVERSITY: Practicing Translingualism in First-Year Writing Courses." *Translingual Pedagogical Perspectives: Engaging Domestic and International Students in the Composition Classroom*, edited by JULIA KIERNAN et al., University Press of Colorado, 2021, pp. 59–91
- Ferris, Dana R. "REVIEW: 'English Only' and Multilingualism in Composition Studies: Policy, Philosophy, and Practice." *College English*, vol. 77, no. 1, National Council of Teachers of English, 2014, p. 73–.

- Florida International University - Digital Communications. "First Year Core." *College of Arts, Sciences & Education | Florida International University*, <https://case.fiu.edu/english/expertise/writing-and-rhetoric/first-year-core/>.
- Guerra, Juan C. "Cultivating a Rhetorical Sensibility in the Translingual Writing Classroom." *College English*, vol. 78, no. 3, National Council of Teachers of English, 2016, pp. 228–33.
- "English Only and U.S. College Composition." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 53, no. 4, National Council of Teachers of English, 2002, pp. 594–630, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1512118>.
- Horner, Bruce, et al. "Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach." *College English*, vol. 73, no. 3, 2011, pp. 303–21.
- Horner, Bruce, et al. "Toward a Multilingual Composition Scholarship: From English Only to a Translingual Norm." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 63, no. 2, 2011, pp. 269–300. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23131585>. Accessed 24 May 2022.
- Inoue, Asao B. 2019a, Mar. 14. "How Do We Language So People Stop Killing Each Other, or What Do We Do About White Language Supremacy?" [Keynote address]. *Conference on College Composition and Communication*, Pittsburgh.
- Lee, Melissa E. "Shifting to the World Englishes Paradigm by Way of the Translingual Approach: Code-Meshing as a Necessary Means of Transforming Composition Pedagogy." *TESOL Journal*, vol. 5, no. 2, June 2014, pp. 312–29. *EBSCOhost*, <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.121>.
- Leonard, Rebecca Lorimer, and Rebecca Nowacek. "Transfer and Translingualism." *College English*, vol. 78, no. 3, 2016, pp. 258–64.
- Looker, Samantha. "Writing About Language: Studying Language Diversity with First-Year Writers." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 44, no. 2, 2016, pp. 176–98.
- Lu, Min-Zhan, and Bruce Horner. "Introduction: Translingual Work." *College English*, vol. 78, no. 3, 2016, pp. 207–18.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei. "The Lure Of Translingual Writing." *PMLA : Publications Of The Modern Language Association Of America* 129.3 (2014): 478–483. Web.
- Matsuda, Paul K. 2006. "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition." *College English*, 68(6): 637-651.
- Russell, David R. "Activity Theory and Its Implications for Writing Instruction." *Reconceiving Writing, Rethinking Writing Instruction*, Routledge, New York, NY, 1995, pp. 51–78.

Wardle, Elizabeth. “‘Mutt Genres’ and the Goal of FYC: Can We Help Students Write the Genres of the University?” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 60, no. 4, 2009, pp. 765–89.

Smitherman, Geneva. *Talkin and Testifyin : the Language of Black America*. Wayne State University Press, 1986.

———. “‘Students’ Right to Their Own Language’: A Retrospective.” *The English Journal*, vol. 84, no. 1, National Council of Teachers of English, 1995, pp. 21–27, <https://doi.org/10.2307/820470>.

———. “English Teacher, Why You Be Doing the Thangs You Don’t Do?” *English Journal*, vol. 61, no. 1, National Council of Teachers of English, 1972, pp. 59–65, <https://doi.org/10.2307/812897>.

Wardle, Elizabeth, and Doug Downs. *Writing About Writing: A College Reader*. 2nd ed., Bedford/St. Martins, 2014.

Wardle, Elizabeth and Doug Downs. 2013. “Reflecting Back and Looking Forward: Revisiting ‘Teaching about Writing, Righting Misconceptions’ Five Years On.” *Composition Forum*, 27. <https://compositionforum.com/issue/27/reflecting-back.php>

Young, Vershawn Ashanti. “‘Nah, We Straight’: An Argument Against Code Switching.” *JAC*, vol. 29, no. 1/2, JAC, 2009, pp. 49–76, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20866886>.