12 Enacting Linguistic Justice: Transnational Scholars as Advocates for Pedagogical Change

Ligia A. Mihut
Barry University

This chapter examines the politics of language difference performed in the public texts of nine multilingual/ transnational writing scholars and the proposed pedagogical practices included in these scholars' texts. While much attention has been devoted to the translingual and transnational approach— in particular to theoretical underpinnings, the student body, and the changing of the U.S. writing classroom—little notice has been paid to the influences and pedagogical approaches of multilingual, transnational scholars in the US and abroad. Drawing on the analyzed pedagogical suggestions of transnational scholars, this chapter shows how these scholars employ public texts to enact a politics of difference and interconnect personal, professional, and public spheres. Based on these findings, this chapter proposes a *linguistic justice* approach as a frame for pedagogies of language pluralism, a model that simultaneously and necessarily incorporates two moves: on the one hand, it exposes monolingual standards and on the other hand, it actively integrates cross-cultural rhetorics and translingual writing in the classroom. In a linguistic justice frame, both actions—*critique* of monolingualism and *integration* of plurilingual practices and theories—are essential to centering and valorizing linguistically-rich practices.

Keywords: transnational writing; linguistic justice; language difference; transnational scholars

While much attention has been devoted to the transnational turn and more recently, to the translingual approach—in particular to theoretical underpinnings, student demographics, and the changing of the U.S. writing classroom (e.g., Donahue, 2009; Martins, 2015; Tardy, 2015)—we need to hear more directly from multilingual, transnational writing scholars on their approaches

to writing pedagogy in the US and abroad.[1] Their experiences across diverse academic contexts and through different roles both expose the limitations of classroom practices and suggest new approaches. In this chapter, I examine a series of pedagogical suggestions proposed by transnational writing scholars for the ways in which these pedagogies *reorient* and *attune* students' discursive practices to language difference, global geopolitical and social contingencies, and cross-cultural rhetorics. I call this *orientation* of writing instruction a *linguistic justice approach.* Linguistic justice implicates an enactment of the politics of difference defined not only in U.S. terms but rather developed across rhetorical traditions and writing cultures. In a linguistic justice frame, both actions—*critique* of monolingualism and *integration* of plurilingual practices and theories—are essential to centering and valorizing linguistically-rich practices. Ultimately, pedagogies grounded in linguistic justice offer scholars practical suggestions on how to develop and enact plurilingual discursive frames and critical knowledge in the classroom and beyond.

Author's Background

I identify as a multilingual, transnational scholar. The "transnational" descriptor is particularly significant as an identifier of my personal and professional work since I view *nation* as a term that needs to be both acknowledged and contested in multiple ways. Nation-states manage identities and literacies in ways that must be continuously interrogated and deconstructed. Originally from Romania, over the course of years, I have developed a broad linguistic repertoire—English, Romanian, French, and Latin—either through exposure or practice. As I mention later in this chapter, listing my language proficiency in a linear progression, L1, L2, or L3 would misrepresent how languages operate in my experience and in my students' lives. I ground my work on the premise that languages are dynamic, tied to spaces of affinity and experience: Romanian, for instance, is the language of my home and family; English is the language of written expression and academic professionalization; Latin

---

1　The viability of the translingual approach was formally acknowledged with the publication of "Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach" (2011). I say *formally* because evidently cross-cultural, global, or international initiatives developed earlier than 2011. The translingual approach gained momentum in rhetoric and composition with the publication of the aforementioned article, the significance of which was reinforced by the appended undersigning of approximately 50 teacher-scholars. Criticism of this approach has been multifold. In his *PMLA* article (2014), Paul Kei Matsuda offers a more extensive assessment of the term and its various roots in applied linguistics.

is the language of my ancestors, one associated with formalist grammar, and with Romanian linguists' efforts of legitimation as they sought to demonstrate the Romanian language's ties to Latin, and thereby, to reclaim a certain prestige as a Romance language; French is my foreign language—one that I studied assiduously through quizzes and drills in high school and college; it remained foreign to me, far from my heart and experience as I rarely interacted with its active users. This, however, is changing due to new encounters with Creole-speaking users in the Miami area. As I grew up in a border zone in Western Romania, I was also exposed to several border languages: Hungarian, German, Serbian, and Czech. These are languages of trespassing and contact zones since they throve in shifting territories, wars, and occupations.

Prior to my move to the US, I worked as an English teacher at a public high school in Romania, a school specifically intended for German, Hungarian, and Roma minorities. Currently, I am Associate Professor of English at Barry University and a multilingual writing pedagogy consultant. From exposure to my students' linguistic repertoires, I have learned to expand my own views of languages and to consider additional variations such as Cuban Spanish, Mexican Spanish, Jamaican patois, French, German, Italian, Puerto Rican Spanish, Creole, American English, British English, Arabic, and several others. Many of my students went through the process of acquiring one language, losing another, and occasionally, recommitting to relearning a lost home language. Many carry with them histories of reading and writing that cannot be squeezed into English-only academic contexts. In South Florida, Spanish, Portuguese, Creole, Russian, and even Romanian permeate our social worlds—stores, local neighborhoods, radio programs, or homes. In light of this linguistic pluralism, it is my responsibility as a teacher-scholar to explore practices that valorize my students' linguistic repertoires and educate them to communicate effectively and ethically in a globalized world. For me, multilingualism has always been the norm. In my research and pedagogy, I practice and advocate for multilingualism and transnational orientation as the norm, an orientation that in this chapter I call *linguistic justice*.

Trends in Transnational and Translingual Scholarship

In the introduction of the edited collection *Transnational Writing Program Administration*, David S. Martins (2015) directs readers' attention to the changing face of higher education and the exigency to reframe the common responsibilities of a writing program administrator (WPA), including curricula design, assessment, and faculty training, in light of dynamic global shifts that impact academia. Introducing various definitions of transnationality and

the set of relationships established between various entities, Martins (2015) also points to the unequal partnerships established in transnational exchanges. He gives the example of transnational educational programs set-up between "a delivery institution" and recipients, namely campuses located internationally. Other scholars (e.g., Donahue, 2009; Tardy, 2015) have critiqued U.S. composition's tendency to practice export-based models of internationalization. While Martins (2015) acknowledges critical power relationships between globally positioned institutions, one element is omitted—the fact that local or "delivery institutions" may have already experienced a diversification of faculty. International mobility does not implicate only students, but faculty as well. Recent trends show that upon graduation, former international students in rhetoric and composition increasingly secure employment at U.S. institutions. This leads to the possibility that "delivery institutions" are becoming more transnationalized from the inside out, through the changing of the teaching staff. What are the implications of this trend? How do these transnational scholars approach the politics of language difference? What impact does their transnationality and border-crossing experience have on the pedagogies that they profess?

Representing a slice of the internationalization of our field, the transnational lives of multilingual,[2] transnational scholars have been explored but only limitedly. Comparing U.S. scholars with expertise in transnational work and international scholars with similar scholarly interests, Santosh Khadka (2013) illuminates a few methodological distinctions between these two groups. Specifically, Khadka explains that the multilingual, international scholars tend to use more prominently self-reflexivity, Bhabha's "double vision,"[3] literacy narratives, and other anecdotal evidence in addition to more established methodologies. A few other transnational scholars have referred to their personal literate trajectories in terms of the digital divide (Pandey, 2006), the path toward purposeful publication as a graduate student (Matsuda, 2003), and more recently, Ghanashyam Sharma's (2015) reflection on his

2   I acknowledge and problematize the term "multilingual" for its erroneous treatment of languages as two or more separate, non-interfering systems. Yet, I prefer to use it as an adjective knowing that these scholars have deployed their language repertoires in a dialogic manner, across and within multiple contexts. I will employ the term translingual to refer to the approach and the method of acknowledging and cultivating language difference practices.

3   Double vision is a term introduced by postcolonial critical theorist Homi J. Bhabha that captures one's dual affinity or membership to different linguistic, cultural, or national communities. The term captures the notion of hybridity, which was further taken up by Canagarajah through the "shuttling" metaphor.

own literacy narrative and this genre's role in the context of transnationalism and global mobility. While additional studies pay attention to international scholars' experiences (e.g., Lillis & Curry, 2006; Sharma, 2013), the focal subjects in the process of internationalization remain multilingual students (see Berry et al., 2012; Canagarajah, 2016; Lorimer Leonard, 2013).

In this chapter, I shift the lens onto multilingual, transnational scholars for their critical role in shaping pedagogies of language pluralism in mono- or multilingual writing classrooms. Specifically, I examine the public texts of nine multilingual scholars, and the ways in which their pedagogical suggestions advance a politics of language difference in the classroom. Drawing on my analysis of these scholars' pedagogical propositions, I argue that, collectively, this work advances a linguistic justice agenda and the manifestation of this "justice" is largely geographical/ socio-politically dependent. While these texts promote a dynamic view of language and writing that crosses cultural and geopolitical borders, much of their practices and beliefs is shaped by local and or national ideologies. In my subsequent discussion of these scholars' texts, I will make a necessary distinction between multilingual, transnational scholars at U.S. institutions and transnational scholars in international settings since their approach to the teaching of writing differs in scale. While both of these groups of scholars approach writing pedagogy with attention to language pluralism, the U.S.-based transnational scholars discuss pedagogy with closer attention to classroom activities, pedagogies, and belief systems, whereas scholars from international contexts are more attuned to larger national, global, and institutional contexts that shape writing instruction. An important characteristic of U.S.-based transnational scholars is the accumulation of experiences as students in their home countries, former international students in the US, and as current faculty at U.S. institutions. Thus, their predispositions to language pluralism and cross-cultural writing have been configured through personal and professional histories with language across multiple national and educational contexts. Taken together, these scholars' consideration of pedagogies of language pluralism responds pertinently to a pedagogical gap noted by Dana Ferris' (2014) review essay "'English Only' and Multilingualism in Composition Studies" where she rightly notes a tendency to underscore a "philosophical rather than pedagogical" approach to multilingual matters (p. 80).

In this chapter my interest lies in what these multilingual, transnational scholars *do* with their accumulated language and rhetorical experiences across borders. Collectively, the different pedagogical approaches proposed by these scholars—suggestions that address course themes, readings, assignments, belief systems, and other concrete practices promoting linguistic pluralism—may be culled together under a coherent instructional frame. I call this frame a *linguistic*

justice approach, a pedagogical construct built through integration of these scholars' personal stories, accumulated experiences, and agility in various rhetorical traditions. Offering both a *critique* of monolingual practices and *actions* that promote language rights, a linguistic justice approach is constituted through a series of activities that function on two levels: on the one hand, they deconstruct rigid, one-dimensional models of writing, and on the other hand, they introduce varied discursive practices as the norm, practices that some might call *alternative*. In adopting the term linguistic justice I was influenced by Philippe Van Parijs' discussion of linguistic justice in Europe (2002). However, I depart from his development of the term that resorts to an economic exchange model to explain "asymmetric bilingualism." Rather, I envision linguistic justice within a social justice frame, calling for specific attention to language and discourse. A linguistic justice model is exigent since for decades, we have affirmed that students should have the right to their own languages; we have stated language relations expressed in writing are *shaped* by socio-economic and political factors. But, we need to act more directly on these beliefs. A language justice model calls for such action. Premised on the fact that languages and discourses have unequal power in their deployment in social fields, language justice is a concept that invites concrete yet heterogeneous actions. Drawing on an analysis of pedagogies centered on language pluralism and cross-cultural rhetorics proposed by transnational scholars located both in the US and abroad, I suggest a linguistic justice frame wherein pedagogical practices *challenge* standards, wherein we *adapt* to different and multiple discursive contexts, and wherein we *integrate* more directly cross-cultural rhetorical traditions in the writing classroom.

Literature Review: Three Models of Language Difference

I have found it generative in my own scholarship and analysis, particularly in terms of the linguistic justice approach I am proposing here, to consider translingual and transnational conversations in terms of the following three models. This is not intended as a comprehensive overview of scholarship on language difference. Rather, the purpose is to ground our understanding in particular frames useful for the latter part of the chapter where I discuss pedagogies of language difference proposed by transnational scholars.

The first set of scholarship—the sovereignty model—approaches language pluralism with an eye to ideologies of domination and subordination associated with monolingualism and multilingualism, respectively. In "Translingual Literacy, Language Difference, and Matters of Agency," Min-Zhan Lu and Bruce Horner (2013) challenge ideologies that feed negative attributions and attitudes toward language difference—the ideology of monolingualism. Lu and

Horner (2013) expand on the view that monolingualism imposed itself as an elitist, mainstream ideology; monolingualism is an ideology of the center cast against "subordinate social groups" (p. 583) where the latter are identified with multi/pluri or translingualism. In presenting this sovereignty paradigm, Lu and Horner (2013) aim to dislodge underlying ideologies associating mainstream with acceptable, standardized practice and language plurality with the subordinate or minority groups. Ultimately, their goal is to advocate for the translingual approach as the "norm" not as a deviation from the mainstream (Lu & Horner, 2013). Framed as a relationship of dominance-subordination, monolingual ideology holds sovereign power over the subordinate pluri-lingual subject. This frame of linguistic conquest connotes the United States' expansionist ideology throughout history. It comes as no surprise, then, when in a linguistic justice pedagogical model, significant action in the classroom is directed toward critiquing monolingual, U.S.-based ideologies and standardized forms of writing and instruction.

Another category of scholarship concerned with language difference takes an expansive approach—moving from the local to the internationalization of our discipline. Specifically, Christiane Donahue (2009) identifies three major areas: 1) the teaching of writing, 2) scholarship focused on writing, and 3) consulting about writing or language-related programs/ initiatives/ curricula, etc. These forms of internationalization, Donahue (2009) argues, reinforce a model where the US remains the center of expertise. Donahue's (2009) pertinent critique exposes a misunderstood trend of internationalization—the U.S.-export model where U.S. scholars transport their knowledge to other parts of the world. In this polarized construct, we find the US at the center, and the world, as a unified other, at the margins. Essentially a business model, the exchanges may allow benefits on both sides of a transaction, or at least, result in some fringe profits to additional stakeholders, but the US remains the center of expertise, knowledge, and delivery to other parts of the globe. It should be noted that the business model that Donahue (2009) critiques is not metaphorical. In comprehensive analysis of the websites of twenty-eight U.S. institutions, Christine Tardy (2015) offers a clear description of the public discourse on the internationalization of these campuses. Tardy (2015) explains two dominant trends: one where the international is represented through global markets, which aligns with Donahue's export model (2009); and one where the international is represented via a global community, generally expressed as global citizenship, which is more prevalent at privileged, liberal arts colleges. Both of these trends are present in the pedagogical approaches in my data. In this current study, Monique Yoder, a Lithuanian scholar, exemplified in her blog post the import model of the U.S. education presented earlier as she referenced the university where she has been

teaching as a liberal arts college "founded by North Americans . . . in 1991."

A third model reflecting language/cultural/ discourse difference—the center-periphery dichotomy model—is similar to the business model except that it employs a spatial parlance. Spatial metaphors seem to be particularly valued in our field. In *Geographies of Writing*, Nedra Reynolds (2004) explains extensively the multiple ways in which spatial metaphors have flourished in the field of rhetoric and composition. Reynolds (2004) notes that most recently, in the postmodern frame, binary metaphors are quite widespread: "metaphors of inside and outside, margin and center, boundaries and zones" (p. 28). Of these, one of the most acknowledged, Reynolds shows, is *borderlands* (Gloria Anzaldua). While *borderlands* would more adequately capture translanguaging—the mixing of languages and cultures—the center-periphery binary has been used to show the power relationship established between academic culture of the West and the "minor" academic scholars situated at the margins. This center-periphery conception has been more extensively discussed in Canagarajah's *A Geopolitics of Academic Writing* with reference to the academic publishing sphere. Since knowledge-making and writing conventions are dictated by the center, a hierarchical structure is preserved in terms of U.S. English and Standard Written English (SWE) as principles representing the center's ideology. The rest of the languages, including varieties of English, are relegated to the periphery. In my analysis, this center-periphery model defined in terms of geopolitical spatiality is the most pervasive in the case of transnational scholars situated in international settings. In this chapter, scholars coming from Eastern Europe, a fairly heterogeneous region, made numerous references to their positionality relative to Western Europe. In certain blog posts, Eastern Europe is perceived as going through a development delay in writing instruction compared to Western Europe, thus following the center-periphery model discussed in the literature review where Western Europe represents the advanced rod stick against which countries from the former Eastern bloc are measured.

To sum up, these three models attending to the internationalization of writing studies, and specifically, to language difference, reveal frames based on sovereignty, business and economic realities, and geopolitical mapping. Each one of these frames has value in revealing power relations governing discourses, and by extension, language users. While the import-export model accentuates the economics of language difference, the center-periphery frame introduces more forcibly the perspective of the marginalized. Yet, these models have deeper roots than is often acknowledged. In his 2014 PMLA article, Paul Kei Matsuda explains that many of the newly proposed directions in translingual writing have been discussed for some time in applied linguistics. He gives the examples of Braj B. Kachru work's on World Englishes and Robert Phillipson's discussion

of linguistic imperialism as early as the 1980s. Although elsewhere Matsuda (2013) expresses more enthusiasm (albeit reserved) with regard to a language pluralism turn in writing studies, in his *PMLA* article, he questions a bandwagon mentality of writing scholars, as well as a tendency to readily adopt new positions and practices without much interrogation. Many scholars, Matsuda suggests, join in this new intellectual wave for fear of being on the wrong side of the current.

While I value Matsuda's critique especially the connections established to applied linguistics, I propose another alternative for why transnational and translingual approaches to writing have gained popularity. For many scholars, particularly for scholars with multilingual and transnational backgrounds or situated in international contexts, the translingual/ transnational approach[4] has been *the norm*. Thus, this turn becomes the long-awaited moment to claim and advocate the translingual/transnational movement that has guided many scholars' orientation prior to its development into a coherent, explicit manifestation in the US. Many of these scholars have long, often unacknowledged in U.S. histories with language difference and cross-cultural rhetorics. In the following section, I center my analysis on nine accounts written by such scholars, precisely because their understanding of language difference has originated in global sites, and many of them negotiated multiple transitions into the U.S. educational system, first as international students and then, as teachers/ scholars of rhetoric and composition. These scholars' public texts function as advocacy platforms for multilingual pedagogies; they also index contexts where translingual and transnational language practices have been "the norm." As they become advocates for *the value* of writing across languages, cultures, and across difference, they also seek to *legitimize* linguistic pluralism.[5]

Methodological Choices in Studying the Public Texts of Multilingual, International Scholars

As a data set, I selected nine, pedagogy-focused, public blog posts of multilingual and/ or transnational scholars published on the blog platform of

---

4   Clarifying the relationship between two terms, Kilfoil (2016) eloquently establishes a clear distinction between "translingual" and "transnational." A basic clarification comes from understanding that "languages and nations are very different things."

5   For a discussion of valorizing and legitimizing language practices, see Whyte, 2013.

the Transnational Composition Special Interest Group (SIG). The *Transnational Composition SIG* achieved standing group status in April 2015 as part of the U.S.-based professional organization, College Conference on Composition and Communication. Prior to and following this date, a team of scholars with interests in transnational issues collaborated actively in building the group's social media presence on Facebook, Twitter, and a WordPress blog. Several of these scholars—Santosh Khadka, Shyam Sharma, and Moushumi Biswas—volunteered to jumpstart the transnational composition blog with entries on their own choice of topics. Others—Ivan Eubanks, Brooke Ricker Schreiber, Natalia Smirnova, and Monique Yoder—responded to an open call—a call that I launched to foreground work and scholars from Eastern Europe. Circulated on the European Association for the Teaching of Academic Writing (EATAW) listserv, the call attracted the interest of established scholars whose work in Eastern Europe is widely known—Otto Kruse and John Harbord—and emerging scholars who responded to the initial message (Eubanks, Schreiber, Smirnova, and Yoder). Since the topic of our interactions and their blogs were concerned with the teaching of writing in Eastern Europe, their blog entries, including my contribution as a facilitator and curator of these posts were incorporated in this study. Since the publication of the first blog entries, this scholarly network has grown in recognition and membership (871 members in the FB group as of May 20, 2019).

Since weblogs offers a means of examining writing for public, rather than solely academic, audiences, I center my analysis on blog entries on language difference and cross-cultural writing instruction. According to Miller and Shepard (2010), a blog is "a complex rhetorical hybrid with genetic imprints from prior genres, such as the diary, clipping services, broadsides, commonplace books, and even ship's logs" (cited in Bawarshi & Reiff, 2010, p. 164). Building on Miller and Shepherd's view on the blog as both personal and public, Kathryn Grafton and Elizabeth Maurer (2007), examining blogs that take on social issues such as homelessness and community events, remarked on bloggers' performance of "mediated selves," as they engaged public issues. In the blog entries examined in this chapter, some authors mixed the personal and public while others used digital space as a way to foreground the work of scholars from regions that have been traditionally neglected such as Eastern Europe. Similar to Bazerman's (2002) remarks on the proliferation of political websites as public genres and the Internet's power to change civic participation, I note the impact of the Internet on the ways in which scholars have begun to take advantage of digital affordances including web blogs, social media networks, and digital communication. Particularly in our globalized world, blogs as public genres provide discursive spaces where knowledge is more

fluid and open to transnational interactions irrespective of physical geographical boundaries. It is also a space where academic conventions, standards, and discourses can be more easily challenged.

Once I identified the blogs as the data set for my analysis of public texts of multilingual, transnational scholars, I adopted critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a tool for analysis. Jan Blommaert (2005) defines CDA as having "lively interest in *theories of power and ideology*" (emphasis in original, p. 27). Positioned at the juncture between agency and social structures, CDA is often used to examine public and macrodiscourses such as political discourse, advertising, gender, education, etc. (Blommaert, 2005). Theoretically, CDA is a "dynamic model" in that language and discursive practices are understood as simultaneously being shaped by and constitutive of social structures and ideologies. Given the frame and purpose of this study—to examine conversations about pedagogies that center on language difference—I focused on nine (of a possible eighteen by September 2016) blog posts that addressed directly this topic. A comprehensive list with the authors, titles of the blog entries, foci, and date of publication can be found in the Appendix.

Using Fairclough's (1992) *discourse-as-text* analytical tool, I marked patterns of lexicon, grammatical structures, and repeated textual markers indexing linguistic pluralism and writing pedagogies. First, I coded all the instances in the nine posts (including my own) when an aspect of pedagogy was mentioned and in what form. For instance, I coded for all references to student writing: transition essays, argument-based essays, essays focused on a universal concept, etc. Then, I grouped all these under the subcategory of "composition assignments." I also marked the use of or references to linguistic pluralism such as "cross-cultural," "transcultural," "global issues," "translingual skills," "cross-border," "intercultural," etc. Based on the codes and subcategories, I developed the following four broad categories:

1. beliefs about language standards and writing such as language ideologies and views on writing;

2. methods of writing instruction and assignments (e.g., discussion-based seminar, lecture, multimedia instruction, teaching grammar rhetorically, argument-based papers, etc.;

3. cross-cultural, globally-oriented curriculum including integration of cross-cultural themes and readings (e.g., readings on global citizenship and transnational socio-political issues, transcultural knowledge, classical texts from China, writing style in Japan, etc.); and

4. cross-linguistic approaches of transnational scholars in international settings: rhetorical traditions, national, and global reforms.

Although personal experience especially of transnational writing scholars located in the US was marked as a significant code, it turned out that it represented an angle from where a scholar advanced a particular pedagogical insight. Thus, I did not consider it as a separate category. For instance, for some, the experience of being a former international student in the US (Khadka) motivated the writing of the blog post; personal experience also functioned as a tool for establishing one's ethos in the teaching of writing as cross-cultural experience (Khadka). For others, personal experience represented a springboard for foregrounding the experience of translingual and/or international students (Biswas).

Analysis of the Public Texts of Multilingual, International Scholars

Beliefs about Language Standards and Writing

To a certain extent, each blog entry published by the transnational writing scholars in the US carries an underlying critique of U.S. writing instruction's monolingual, English-only approach. This critique is enacted in how assignments are structured to accommodate linguistic pluralism, cultural adaptations, and global perspectives. Challenging U.S.-centric standards is a recurrent theme operationalized in a need to reassess methods of instruction such as the discussion-based seminar and the unchallenged use of SWE as the sole acceptable norm of communication. Several scholars ask that instructors adopt a more "expansive notion of writing with the students" that recognizes the "situated nature of writing" (Khadka), that we acknowledge various rhetorical traditions and writing across cultures and contexts (Sharma), that we valorize students' linguistic repertoires (Biswas), and that we understand the role of the writing classroom as a gateway to critical thinking and global orientation (Nezami).

Challenging Standards, Advancing a Translingual Approach

With this frame in mind, I will discuss more explicitly Moushumi Biswas', a doctoral candidate at University of Texas at El Paso, proposal to challenge such standards. Biswas draws from her experience as a student in India and the US when she proposes a reconceptualization of first-year writing (FYW). While Biswas proposes a three-pronged pedagogy of change—language pluralism, attention to writing education prior to college, and grammar as a rhetorical tool—her commitment to challenging beliefs about language and writing instruction through the English-only lens is central to her agenda.

Biswas starts her blog post with this statement:

> *Even as we speak for the cause of the many Englishes*, I realize
> that those of us who are from other countries have tried to
> conform to the so-called standards of American English as
> we strove to succeed in the academy. (italics mine)

The three main themes combined together—speaking for the advancement of linguistic pluralism ("many Englishes"), personal experience of foreign internationals ("those of us who are from other countries"), and the challenge of discourses of power ("so-called standards of American English" and "in the academy") formulate an agenda for a linguistic justice approach to writing instruction. Biswas' strategy here is marked by a call to dismantle conformism and singular, U.S. models of writing. In each of her pedagogical proposals, Biswas questions the "conformity" to the standards of U.S. writing. Juxtaposing her experience as a multilingual learner against standard-driven U.S. composition, with each of her points, Biswas breaks free from the bondage of uniformity. First, she identifies FYW's historical connection to the "need to *standardize* college-level academic writing" (italics mine). She further confesses her own choice of adhering to the "so-called *standards* of American English" as a strategy to avoid miscommunication and to attain good grades (italics mine). In her second move, she advises on the repurposing of the FYW classroom as a space of writing instruction that would accommodate diverse language repertoires, border students, and their rich literacy histories. It is in this critical space where we can "help students gain their right to their own languages while using the language differences as resources," explains Biswas.

I expound on Biswas' challenge of ideologies about writing and language standards here because without this move to critique and question conformist practices, it is rather futile to incorporate global and cross-cultural perspectives in our curriculum. A linguistic justice approach to teaching would inevitably implicate a discussion of language and writing standards. Although Biswas' focus is solely on the FYW programs, other scholars suggest a more expansive integration of multilingual and global perspectives in other courses such as literature (Nezami), or special topics seminars, such as the one proposed by Shyam Sharma on global citizenship.

Methods of Writing Instruction and Assignments

In addition to challenging beliefs and ideologies of language, several transnational scholars from U.S. institutions discussed and often con-

tested established writing instruction methods in traditional U.S. writing classrooms. Some critiqued the discussion-based seminar (Khadka), the teaching of grammar as a set of rules of U.S. standard English (Biswas), or argument-driven assignments that fail to consider alternatives (Khadka; Sharma). In the following section, I examine in more detail Khadka's critique of the discussion-based seminar and argument essay promoted in many U.S. writing classrooms, and Biswas' proposition to teach grammar rhetorically.

Discussion-based Seminar and the Argument Paper

In terms of pedagogy, Khadka challenges two pedagogical practices in the U.S. classroom: the discussion-based seminar and argument-driven writing. As an international multilingual student, Khadka recounts his difficulty with open style, conversation-based seminars that served as a springboard for diverse opinions. Affirming that silence in the classroom is wrongly associated with being deficient, Khadka shows that in home cultures like his, power relationships between student and teachers are clearly hierarchical and should be respected. The voicing of alternative views to that of the teacher are often a mark of interference and disrespect. Although indirectly expressed, Khadka found speaking openly an ineffective teaching strategy in the classroom. As an international student, with lack of knowledge of local practices, it seemed unwarranted to advance and make public informed opinion while still holding the position of a novice.

A second pedagogical critique shows the international student's difficulty with writing argument or thesis-driven models of writing. Khadka's position is not against this form of writing, yet he wants to acknowledge other approaches and the time needed to learn new genres. Juxtaposing his past writing experiences in Nepal against the argument-driven, source-based U.S. discourse, he notes two things: 1) there are writing practices in other countries that differ from U.S. argument essays; 2) the notion of time: to learn new writing strategies one needs to practice a process that Khadka calls, "trial and error." These observations ask instructors to acknowledge and familiarize themselves with the presence of other discursive traditions, and, with this knowledge, to build a foundation for new writing practices such as argument-based writing.

In critiquing the two methods of instruction—discussion-based seminar and the argument-driven essay— Khadka draws attention to the deficit labels often affixed to international students. But he simultaneously proposes new ways of acting and adapting to U.S. academic genres. Khadka's actions

toward linguistic pluralism are deployed through a rhetoric of negotiation, or in Khadka's exact words, "adaptations." *Multiplicity and adaptations* are the emergent discursive strategies, and there is clear connection between the two. In naming his diverse background a series of "*inter*cultural," "*inter*-linguistic," and "*inter*-academic adaptations" the repetition of the prefix *inter*-indexes pluralism and interactions among cultures, languages, and academic as well as non-academic experiences. Thusly, Khadka proposes a pedagogy of change that acknowledges relationships between cultures and languages. Embedded in these relationships is a sense of inequality invoked in the very fact that adjustments and changes are necessary. Different from Biswas' earlier proposition that challenged beliefs about language, Khadka's approach calls for adaptability of old and new knowledge depending on one's context and purpose.

Rhetorical Grammar and the Nuances of Languages

Linking her experience to recommended pedagogical practices, Biswas regards as valuable what has been largely marginalized or ignored in the U.S. college composition: 1) the teaching of grammar, 2) multilingualism, and 3) writing education prior to college. Understanding the U.S. attitudes toward the teaching of grammar in a writing class, Biswas includes an extended explanation on the teaching of grammar not as a set of rules, but serving rhetorical ends. When learned and taught rhetorically, grammar can change a student's relationship to language, Biswas explains, since language becomes alive and a support for learning other languages as well. Her attention to grammar instruction is an expression of calling into question strict obedience to rules as she proposes a *rhetorical approach* to grammar. Biswas' goal in teaching grammar rhetorically is to introduce her students to "nuances of language." Drawing on her language pluralism repertoire (English, Bengali, and Hindi), Biswas further discusses nuances in language in light of India's postcolonial past,

> I remember the times I got funny looks in class for pronouncing "niche" as "neesh" and "pastiche" as "pasteesh," which are the French ways of pronouncing them as I had "learnt" (not "learned") in India.

This discussion of conformity to one standard of acceptable grammar and rules has deeper implications than initially noticed. Citing Victor Villanueva's (1993) *Bootstraps*, Biswas continues, "I become "raceless" through "consensus" when subjected to "acculturative and assimilationist forces" (113). Such im-

positions of language, grammar, and white English as lingua franca controls and regulates not only communicative practices but identities that become reduced to one size fits all.

The undoing of rules of grammar, or of the monolingual, standardized writing practices she has called out, are all part of her desire to advance a pedagogy of change. Her account of her multi-literate experience in India is for the sake of language pluralism, that is to advance linguistic justice not just for herself, but for her students studying at an institution bordering Mexico. In the last segment of her blog entry, Biswas proposes a specific pedagogical activity that breaks the rules of standard grammar—code-meshing. She introduces the TED talk of Jamila Lyiscott, "Tri-tongued Orator," a multimodal tool that advances linguistic justice. The multiple codes that facilitate an intimate connection to friends, academy, and parents reveal Lyiscott's purposeful use of so-called "broken English." Lyiscott's advocacy message: "Yes, I have decided to treat all three of my languages as equal," calls for a reassessment of rules and correct grammar.

"Grammar ceases to be lifeless," Biswas explains when the rules become compliant to the rhetor's intentions rather than the other way around. However, the challenge for many instructors is to identify and familiarize themselves with the students' intentions and varieties of English and codes. Biswas explains that many writing instructors in the US may lack awareness of the "student's tone, style, organization, or in other words, manner of expression" which leads to what Canagarajah describes as an "[instinctive] turn to the first language (L_1) or "native" culture (C_1)" as the default standard for that context.

Cross-Cultural, Globally-Oriented Curriculum, Global Citizenship

Two transnational scholars from U.S. institutions, Shyam Sharma and Rita Nezami, concentrated their pedagogical suggestions on cross-cultural reconceptualization of the curriculum. Unlike previous discussions of methods of instruction and assignments, these texts propose a comprehensive, cross-cultural approach to writing instruction. In other words, Sharma and Nezami offer pedagogical suggestions and cross-cultural activities in a series of courses rather than one single class. When proposing a reorientation of monolingual practices, a linguistic justice approach may call for a revision of an entire curriculum. As the examples below show, adopting a global and cross-cultural approach is no longer limited to one assignment or one pedagogical approach. Rather, it encompasses and reframes the curriculum within and across disciplines.

Cross-Cultural Approaches of Transnational Scholars in the US

Sharma begins by discussing the activities and assignments in a special topics seminar, "Global Citizenship," in the Department of Global Studies and Human Development, then discusses "Intermediate Writing Workshop," a First-Year Writing general education course. In his "Global Citizenship" course, Sharma covers class activities such as image-search for a "universal" idea and the description of three assignments (essay on a "seemingly universal idea," multimodal collaborative presentation on communicative/rhetorical practices, and reading responses to various rhetorical traditions). In offering this comprehensive list of activities and types of assignments for students to engage with, he proposes a curricular approach to cross-cultural knowledge and writing. In the second course, the "Intermediate Writing Workshop," Sharma gives examples of activities that focus on "untranslatable" words as well as research projects and peer review that incorporates multiple perspectives. In these activities, Sharma asks students to think, write, and respond "across language, cultural, and epistemological borders/ barriers." The focus of this curricular approach is demonstrated in repeated words and phrases, such as cross-cultural, diverse, transcultural, translingual, diverse audiences, global citizenship, perspectives, knowledges, and communities.

Rita Nezami takes a similar approach to Sharma as she integrates global citizenship themes in both her intermediate writing course and upper-division course, "International Literature." From class discussions focused on current, international events such as the Arab Spring, the use of technologies and visual rhetoric, to reading texts and doing research on global issues,[6] Nezami encourages her students to break away from their "customized digital cocoons that keep the world out." In taking this approach, Nezami shifts her entire curriculum toward global issues and as students discuss, research, or respond to these issues, they have opportunities to expand their rhetorical repertoires.

Thus far, in the previous sections, the focus has been on decentering, critiquing, and dismantling old ideologies and practices of monolingualism. However, a language justice approach also needs to build and advocate for new practices in which plurilingual, transnational orientations reconfigure the curriculum. This restructuring of the curriculum does not limit itself to isolated changes—modify an assignment here or there, introduce one or two

---

6   Some of the global issues covered in Nezami's course include: immigrant experience (Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie, Nigeria); the Arab Spring and dictatorship (Tahar Ben Jelloun, Morocco); post 9/11 discrimination/racism toward Muslims (Mohsin Hamid, Pakistan); immigrant workers/cheap labor (Elaine Chiew, Malaysia); Taliban terror, fundamentalism, human repression (Yasmina Khadra, Algeria).

global readings, etc. Instead, it asks instructors to fundamentally change and to plan an entire course with an orientation toward cross-cultural and global discourses.

Cross-Linguistic Approaches of Transnational Scholars in International Settings

In this section, I treat the work of transnational scholars located in international contexts as a distinct category due to their emphasis on geopolitical contexts and macrodiscourses, which I find to be fundamentally different from U.S.-based scholars' attention to micro-level classroom practices. In response to a call I launched as mentioned earlier, the blog entries studied here come from a series of connected posts focused on Eastern Europe, titled "Writing Perspectives from Eastern Europe." The authors, academics from Lithuania, Russia, Serbia, and indirectly from Switzerland and Hungary (one blog post reported on an email exchange I had with the respective scholars), bring forth cross-cultural perspectives in the teaching of writing in international contexts. Rather than classroom practices, this group of scholars approach pedagogy as shaped by larger institutional, national, and global contingencies. In doing so, they engage with larger discourses of power that impact the teaching of writing in their classroom.

Rhetorical Traditions, National, and Global Reforms

In the introductory blog post that I facilitated and authored, I sought to engage with two established scholars teaching writing in Europe, Otto Kruse (Switzerland) and John Harbord (Hungary) who were asked to address the question, "Can we talk about an Eastern European rhetoric?"

In the blog post (Mihut, 2015), I report and synthesize the conversation between these scholars, and their remarks on the presence (or absence) of an Eastern European rhetoric. At first, Kruse cast doubt on identifying a "homogeneous writing culture" in the region, yet he later notes a "transformation lag" in writing in Eastern European countries compared to Western Europe, thus pointing to the familiar center-periphery model presented earlier (as quoted in Mihut, 2015). Moving away from defining the writing culture in this region in terms of advancement, regression, or stagnation, Harbord explains this culture in terms of values and affiliation with various writing traditions: the German, French, and Anglo-Saxon. He identifies the influence of the German Humboldtian university and in doing so, describes a writing/rhetoric from this region that celebrates "complexity of phrase, wide vocabulary, virtuosity of language mastery" adopting a reader responsible approach

(as quoted in Mihut, 2015). He offers further details on the preferred genres in the German tradition compared to the Anglo-Saxon with the former showing preference for "the seminar writing and thesis writing genres which rely heavily on the sources" while the latter is dominated by the argument-driven approach (as quoted in Mihut, 2015).

In a subsequent blog entry, I reiterate a similar line of argument, taking Romania as a specific case and its affiliation with the French intellectual tradition. With each tradition, different aspects and purposes are emphasized: "to advance a theory, to engage in dialog, and display for eloquence," which correspond to the German, Anglo-Saxon, French traditions, respectively. This identification with historical writing traditions in Europe—the German, French, and Anglo-Saxon—all ultimately located in Western Europe, is balanced with an attempt to establish a particular identity. Harbord (2010) mentions, for instance, anecdotal evidence about writing the "Russian way" and the emergence of "Serbian rhetoric." From an email exchange with a Georgian scholar, he learned that

> Georgian doesn't have its own culture of academic scholarship. The way we have written until now is the Russian way, which was imposed upon us as part of the Russian empire in the 19th century and the Soviet emprise in the 20th. (as cited in Harbord, 2010)

From the conversation with Kruse and Harbord as well as from other posts (see for instance, Natalia Smirnova's "Personal Reflections on Writing Instruction in Russia," 2015), awareness of various writing and intellectual traditions and writing in multiple languages are dominant in writing instruction in Eastern Europe. The teaching and research of writing is situated across geopolitical contexts and, often, across disciplines. Smirnova, for instance, explains that L1 writing appears "fragmented and localized" and this distributed approach to writing is taken up in a number of disciplines that address the teaching of writing: literary studies, linguistics, teaching foreign languages, education, and pedagogy (2015). Although attention to L1, L2, and writing in the various language-related disciplines is an asset in this region, much of the national and global reforms such as the Bologna process are challenging the teaching of writing toward a more universal model which often entails the adoption of and adaption to Western writing traditions. Pressures from national and global forces have also shaped the teaching of writing largely as a means to an end—"to produce (essays, research articles, theses)"—rather than as a process (Smirnova, 2015). In Russia, recent educational reforms ask faculty to produce scholarship and publish in English so as to make their

work more visible on a global scale, and by extension to increase their universities' global recognition (Eubanks).

The pedagogies professed by scholars in international settings remain attuned to larger reforms at the national and global level. These pedagogies, thus, engage discourses of power, pressures of and resistance to various forms of standardization often couched in beneficial global rewards. Pedagogies grounded in a linguistic justice model would necessarily be equally responsive to macrodiscourses and global pressures. For instance, knowledge of rhetorical traditions of Anglo-Saxon, German, or French origin would facilitate an understanding of how scholars in Eastern Europe borrow, resist, and adapt pedagogical practices from these established discourses. Less concerned with individual classroom practices, these scholars look at how top decision agents establish educational pathways that impact their own in the classroom. This connectivity between local, institutional, national, and global forces is necessary in a linguistic justice approach as it situates our practice in concrete socio- and geopolitical realities.

Conclusion

Given this overview of pedagogical practices and approaches to language pluralism and cross-cultural rhetorics, rather than advocate for one single model especially in light of local and translocal contingencies, I propose the linguistic justice approach that comprises elements from all of the pedagogical models advanced by the transnational scholars discussed herein. A linguistic justice approach implicates, on the one hand, the undoing of monolingual thinking and practices, and on the other, actions that would advocate for a plurality of languages, writing, and pedagogies. To situate the transnational/translingual approach within a linguistic justice frame is essential. First, linguistic justice, an enactment of the politics of difference, underscores the contingent nature of difference, exposing the reality of language power relationships and identities. Certainly, the models discussed earlier—the business model, the geopolitical, and the sovereignty frame—are extremely useful in exposing unequal relationships as well. They reveal the intricate connections between language/writing and economies of mobility, languages of the center vs. languages of the margins, and geopolitical contexts. Yet, as noted in a Biswas' blog post, in the constant tug between Western and Eastern rhetoric, there is a need to directly call out the inequality between discourses and languages and formulate ways to remedy such disparities which is what a linguistic justice approach does. In "Theorizing and Enacting Translanguaging for Social Justice," Garcia and Leiva (2014) explain that "it is not enough to claim that languaging

consists of social practices and actions; it is important to question and change these when they reproduce inequalities" (p. 203). Garcia and Leiva (2014) define languaging or translanguaging as "the flexible use of linguistic resources by bilinguals in order to make sense of their worlds" and they deploy the term mostly in classroom settings for its "potential in liberating the voices of language minoritized students" (p. 200). A language justice approach, then, demands a critique and action toward change. And that is what many of these blog entries reveal—a call to dismantle oppressive discursive standards and strategies to build more equitable practices.

Specifically, in these public texts linguistic justice exposes monolithic pedagogies and promotes pedagogies of difference. Notably, pedagogies of difference do not come packaged in one shape. They are intrinsically heterogeneous. Each blog post exposed and proposed a pedagogy of difference contingent on one's personal, professional, institutional, or global experiences and contexts. While all writers affirm language and cultural differences in the writing classroom, each does so in a different manner. Biswas questions *standards* of writing communication, Khadka advocates for pluri-pedagogies as *adaptations* to a diverse student body, Sharma and Nezami implement cross-cultural rhetorics in the curriculum, and Mihut centers the work of Eastern European scholars as a way to allow different writing cultures, such as the Russian or Serbian way of writing, to become visible. The action items emerging from these public texts include challenging standards and embracing adaptations and cross-cultural approaches across the curriculum. In the writing classroom, we may acknowledge, discuss, and encourage the writing of *linguistically diverse texts*, global Englishes and texts that employ varieties of English. These might include literacy memoirs and texts that unveil ideologies and unequal relationships between languages and registers (e.g., Geneva Smitherman's (1974) "Soul 'n Style"), as well as multimodal and multilingual texts such as the one shared by Biswas. We may also introduce argument-based writing along with *other non-argument-based genres of writing*. We may include multiple rhetorical traditions, Chinese, Serbian, Russian, German, French, etc. We may also create spaces for our students' public texts to circulate and engage with larger discourses, as seen in the series of blog entries from Eastern Europe that feature scholars from this region. However, we also have to explicitly discuss standards and strategies for adapting to different rhetorical contexts. Writing cannot be fully socially situated unless we dynamically expose and address structural aspects of language difference and power.

To close, I will briefly address the role of personal experience in prompting linguistic justice. In several of these public texts, personal experience served as

a catalyst for change—it was the glue that connected the self to others, and then, to pedagogies of language difference. Three of the transnational scholars in the US referred to their personal experience directly (Moushumi Biswas, Santosh Khadka, and Rita Nezami), and I did so indirectly as facilitator of the conversation about Eastern European writing culture when I used my transnational experience to challenge stereotypes about Eastern Europe's value being measured against the Western standard. Personal experience manifests in one's identity as an international student, in one's formal citizenship based on country of origin, in one's identity as a multilingual speaker and writer, and all these identities bring valuable knowledge. In an exposition on autoethnography as a research tool in multilingual writing, Canagarajah (2012) explains that personal experience facilitates a depiction of writing and writing pedagogy as contextually-based and distinctive. It also facilitates "cross-cultural understanding" (Canagarajah, 2012, p. 117). While the personal may come in conflict with the academia's values of objectivity and rational discourse, these transnational scholars' personal experiences and geopolitical positionalities are less concerned with when and to what extent a scholar should reveal personal details. Rather personal or pedagogical experiences aim to unveil socio-economic and political structures that shape identities, languages, and cultures—and, implicitly, individual life trajectories. In calling for focused attention to economic, political, and social structures and their impact on language and discourse, transnational scholars and their texts enact linguistic justice at their local institutions and across geographical contexts.

References

Bawarshi, A. S., & Reiff, M. (2010). *Genre: An introduction to history, theory, research, andpedagogy.* Parlor Press; The WAC Clearinghouse. https://wac.colostate.edu/books/referenceguides/bawarshi-reiff/

Bazerman, C. (2002). Genre and identity: Citizenship in the age of the Internet and the age of global capitalism. In R. M. Coe, L. Lingard, & T. Teslenko (Eds), *The rhetoric and ideology of genre: Strategies for stability and change* (pp. 13-35). Hampton Press.

Berry, P. W., Hawisher, G. E., & Selfe, C. L. (2012). *Transnational literate lives in digital times*. Computers and Composition Digital Press. http://ccdigitalpress.org/transnational

Biswas, M. (2015, March 20). Transnational writing [Blog post.] *Transnational Writing*. https://transnationalwriting.wordpress.com/2015/03/10/transnational-writing-blog-post/

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: key topics in sociolinguistics*. Cambridge University Press.

Brandt, D., Cushman, E., Gere, A. R., Herrington, A., Miller, R. E., Villanueva, V., & Kirsch, G. (2001). The politics of the personal: Storying our lives against the grain. Symposium collective. *College English*, *64*(1), 41-62.

Canagarajah, S. A (2002). *A Geopolitics of academic writing*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Canagarajah, S. A. (2006). Toward a writing pedagogy of shuttling between languages: Learning from multilingual writers. *College English, 68*(6), 589-604.

Canagarajah, S. A. (2012). Autoethnography in the study of multilingual writers. In L. Nickoson & M. P. Sheridan (Eds.), *Writing studies research in practice: Methods and Methodologies* (pp. 113-124). Southern Illinois University Press.

Canagarajah, S. A. (2015). *Clarifying the relationship between translingual practice and L2 writing: Addressing learner identities*. [Pre-publication manuscript]. https://transnationalwriting.files.wordpress.com/2015/09/transnational-writing-file.pdf

Donahue, C. (2009). "Internationalization" and composition studies: Reorienting the discourse. *College Composition and Communication*, *61*(2), 212-243.

Eubanks, I. (2015, April 11). Writing perspectives from Eastern Europe: Blog three *Transnational Writing*. https://transnationalwriting.wordpress.com/2015/04/11/writing-perspectives-from-eastern-europe-blog-three/

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.

Ferris, D. R. (2014). Review: "English Only" and multilingualism in composition studies: Policies, philosophy, and practice. *College English, 77*(1), 73-83.

Garcia, O., & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 199-216). Springer.

Grafton, K., & Mauer, E. (2007). Engaging with and arranging for publics in blog genres. *Linguistics and the Human Sciences, 3*(1), 47-66.

Harbord, J. (2010). Writing in Central and Eastern Europe: Stakeholders and directions in initiating change. *Across the Disciplines, 7*. https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/articles/harbord2010.pdf

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

Khadka, S. (2015, January 26). Navigating the U.S. academy [Blog post]. *Transnational Writing*. https://transnationalwriting.wordpress.com/2015/01/26/navigating-us-academy/

Khadka, S. (2013). In/variability in research methods/ methodologies of trans/national compositionists. *Journal of Global Literacies, Technologies, and Emerging Pedagogies, 1*(2), 71-88.

Lillis, T., & M. Curry. (2006). Professional academic writing by multilingual scholars: Interactions with literacy brokers in the production of English-medium texts. *Written Communication, 23*(1), 3-35.

Lorimer Leonard, R. (2013). Travelling literacies: Multilingual writing on the move. *Research in the Teaching of English, 48*(1), 13-39.

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

Martins, D. (Ed.). (2015). *Transnational writing programs*. Utah State University Press.

Matsuda, P. K. (2014). The lure of translingual writing. *PMLA, 129*(3), 478-483.

Matsuda, P. K. (2013). It's the wild west out there: A new linguistic frontier in U.S. college composition. In A. S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and classrooms* (pp. 128-138). Routledge.

Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Coming to voice: Publishing as a graduate student. In C. P. Casanave & S. Vandrick (Eds.), *Writing for publication: Behind the scenes in language education* (pp. 39-51). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mihut, L. (2015, March 27). Writing perspectives from Eastern Europe: Blog one [Blog post]. *Transnational Writing*. https://transnationalwriting.wordpress.com/2015/03/27/writing-perspectives-from-eastern-europe/

Miller, C. R., & Shepherd, D. (2004). Blogging as social action: A genre analysis of the weblog. In L. J. Gurak, S. Antonijevic, L. Johnson, C. Ratliff, & J. Reyman (Eds.), *Into the blogosphere: Rhetoric, community and culture of weblogs.* Digital Conservancy. http://hdl.handle.net/11299/172840

Milson-Whyte, V. (2013). Pedagogical and socio-political implications of code-meshing in classrooms: Some considerations for a translingual orientation to writing. In A. S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Literacy as translingual practice* (pp. 115-127). Routledge.

Nezami, R. S. (2015, June 26). Bringing global issues into the writing class. *Transnational Writing*. https://transnationalwriting.wordpress.com/2015/06/26/bringing-global-issues-into-the-writing-class/

Pandey, I. P. (2006). Literate lives across the digital divide. *Computers and Composition, 23*, 246-257.

Reynolds, N. (2004). *Geographies of writing: Inhabiting places and encountering difference*. Southern Illinois Press.

Sharma, G. (2013). Third eye: An exhibit of literacy narratives from Nepal. A multimodal book chapter. In H. L. Ulman, S. L. DeWitt, & C. Selfe (Eds.), *Stories that speak to us: Exhibits from the digital archive of literacy narratives*. Computers and Composition Digital Press. https://ccdigitalpress.org/book/stories/sharma.html

Sharma, G. (2015). Cultural schemas and pedagogical uses of literacy narratives: A reflection on my own journey with reading and writing. *College Composition and Communication, 67*(1), 104-110.

Sharma, G. (2015, February 26). Part I: Translingual, transcultural, transnational—From buzzwords to teaching strategies [Blog post]. *Transnational Writing*. https://transnationalwriting.wordpress.com/2015/02/26/part-i-translingual-transcultural-transnational-from-buzzwords-to-teaching-strategies/

Sharma, G. (2015, February 26). Part II: Translingual, transcultural, transnational—From buzzwords to teaching strategies. *Transnational Writing*. https://transnationalwriting.wordpress.com/2015/02/26/part-ii-translingual-transcultural-transnational-from-buzzwords-to-teaching-strategies/

Smirnova, N. V. (2015, April 11). Writing perspectives from Eastern Europe: Blog three. *Transnational Writing*. https://transnationalwriting.wordpress.com/2015/04/11/writing-perspectives-from-eastern-europe-blog-three/

Tardy, C. (2015). Discourses of internationalization and diversity in U.S. universities and programs In Martins, D. (Ed.), *Transnational writing program* (pp. 243-264). Utah State University Press.

Van Parijs, P. (2002). Linguistic justice. *Politics, Philosophy, and Economics, 1*(1), 59-74.

Appendix

The table comprises a list of the authors, the title, focus, and data of publication of the blog posts analyzed in this chapter. The posts addressing pedagogy are marked in a shade of gray.

Author	Title of blog post	Focus	Publication Date
Santosh Khadka	"Navigating the US Academy"	Pedagogy	January 26, 2015
Shyam Sharma	"Translingual, Transcultural, Transnational-From Buzzwords to Teaching Strategies" (2 posts)	Pedagogy	February 26, 2015
Shyam Sharma	"Transnational Presenters and Sessions at 4Cs15" (2 posts)	Announcement/ Dissemination	March 10, 2015
Moushumi Biswas	"Transnational Writing Blog Post"	Pedagogy	March 10, 2015
Ligia Mihut (facilitator and author) Monique Yoder Brooke Ricker Schreiber Ligia Mihut Natalia V. Smirnova Ivan Eubanks	"Writing Perspectives from Eastern Europe" blog series (3 posts) "The Importance of Writing Instruction: A Lithuanian Perspective" "EFL Writing Instruction in Serbia: One Perspective on Emerging Trends" "Perspectives on Writing from Romania" "Personal Reflections on Writing Instruction in Russia" "Academic Writing in Russia: A Writing Center Perspective"	Pedagogy/ Writing Traditions	March 27, 2015 April 11, 2015 April 11, 2015 April 11, 2015 April 11, 2015 April 11, 2015
Rita S. Nezami	"Bringing Global Issues into the Writing Class"	Pedagogy	June 26, 2015

Author	Title of blog post	Focus	Publication Date
Suresh Canagarajah/ Sara Alvarez Interview by Shakil Rabbi	Suresh Canagarajah on Translingualism: A (a four-part interview)	Theory	August 4, 2015; August 11, 2015; September 25, 2015
Suresh Canagarajah	Canagarajah's Discussion on Translingualism Extended: Predraft on Forthcoming Publication	Theory	September 20, 2015
Bruce Horner	"Moving Slowly: Transnational Composition"	History	April 2, 2016
Xiaoye You	"Taking Risks in Cross-Border Scholarship"	Theory and Research	April 22, 2016
Carrie Kilfoil	"What's the Difference Between "Translingual" and "Transnational" Composition?: Clarifying the Relationship between two Terms"	Theory	September 9, 2016