Remapping Writing Instruction at the Borders of Modern Languages, Bilingual Education, and Translation Studies: A Canadian Proposal for a Transnational Conversation

Guillaume Gentil
Carleton University

As in the US and other countries, postsecondary institutions in Canada have been enrolling linguistically and culturally diverse student populations through their endeavor both to attract international students in a competitive and globalized academic market and to reach out to increasingly diverse pools of domestic students.[1] At the same time, the politics and policies surrounding such diversity present interesting differences north and south of the border. Notably, the co-existence in Canada of two official languages, English and French, along with federal and provincial policies to promote French as a language of higher education and scholarship, have created demands for bilingual English-French writing in the disciplines, at least in some parts of the country. With these demands come a number of challenges, not only for student writers but also for the institutions and programs that are supposed to support them. Indeed, in many ways the challenges of bilingual academic writing development offer a case in point for the need to rewrite disciplinary and departmental boundaries in academic writing instruction, notably by bringing together modern languages, translation studies, and writing instruction in order to adequately support academic literacy development in two languages or more.

It is from this particular Canadian vantage point that I propose to explore the transdisciplinary, translingual, and transnational challenges for writing across the curriculum (WAC) and writing in the discipline (WID). While each national and regional context of education faces unique exigencies, it is my hope that the arguments and strategies I offer in the Canadian context will resonate with scholars and educators in other contexts as well. A transnational perspective on the teaching of academic writing invites an exploration of problems and solutions that may

1 An earlier version of this chapter appeared as Gentil, G. (2018). Modern languages, bilingual education, and translation studies: The next frontiers in WAC/WID research and instruction. *Across the Disciplines, 15*(3), 114-129. The text was revised and reframed for the transnational theme of this collection.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-B.2023.1527.2.03

transcend national borders by attending to the specificities and sensitivities of one's and others' national contexts; ignoring these specificities is a recipe for importing curricular options in unproductive ways. As a member of the Francophonie and the Commonwealth with close ties to the US, Britain, France, and the rest of the English- and French-speaking world, Canada offers an interesting example of the potential and challenge for student writers and teachers of writing to negotiate disciplinary conversations and affiliations across linguistic, national, and geopolitical lines. As a large country with pronounced regional differences, Canada further illustrates that variability can also be found within a national context. Indeed, the complex makeup of Canada as a country problematizes the relations among statehood, nationhood, and language. Canada can be characterized as a polyethnic multinational state (Kymlicka, 1995). For example, the Canadian parliament recognized "the Québécois" as forming "a nation within a united Canada" (House of Commons, 2006), and the term "First Nations" is preferred over "Indians" to refer to "one of the three distinct groups recognized as "Aboriginal" in the Constitution Act of 1982 (Assembly of First Nations, n.d.). A shared linguistic heritage is an important unifying element of such national minorities, and yet can be problematic in itself: Are English Quebeckers, the English-speaking minority of Quebec, part of the Québécois nation? Should French-speaking Canadians living outside of Quebec (e.g., the Franco-Ontarians, the Franco-Albertans, the Acadians) also be recognized as a nation or a group of nations? And to what extent are the very concepts of nations, national identities, and nationhood themselves the means and products of a settler, and rather recent, reading of Canada's history?

While delving into such complexity is beyond the scope of this chapter, it is useful to bear it in mind as a backdrop for understanding the case I make here for redefining curricular arrangements in WAC/WID instruction to better support academic literacy development in more than one language. Therefore, in this chapter, I first elaborate on this backdrop to the extent that it helps to situate the demands and practices of bi- and multilingual disciplinary writing in Canadian postsecondary institutions within the country's broader demographic and legal contexts. I then illustrate the challenges of bilingual English-French WID in a particular institutional context by means of a case study, followed by the description of a pedagogical initiative I recently had the opportunity to develop in order to provide instructional support for bilingual WAC/WID development. These two specific examples will help to anchor a more theoretical discussion on how the biliteracy and translanguaging approach to WAC/WID that I propose here may relate and contribute to a translingual and transnational perspective on the teaching of academic writing.

Before I begin, however, I would like to clarify my use of terminology. Specifically, I will stay away from the use of "translingual" until my more theoretical conclusion. The main reason for this is that this term seems to have created some confusion and even tension, notably in the dialogue that WAC/WID has opened

with the field of second language writing (Atkinson et al., 2015; Gevers, 2018; Horner & Alvarez, 2019). Indeed, one goal of this paper is to suggest ways to move this dialogue forward by clarifying terminology and bringing in other terms and associated approaches, such as translanguaging and biliteracy, which I see as more helpful for capturing WID/WAC practices in the Canadian context I describe. Until this juncture, I will simply refer to writing in two languages as bilingual writing, writing in three languages as trilingual writing, and writing in more than one language as multilingual writing. To these terms I will add biliteracy, as a synonym of bilingual literacy or dual literacy—the ability to speak, read, and write with confidence in two languages, and "transliteracy" as "the added ability to move confidently and smoothly between languages for different purposes" (Estyn, cited in Lewis et al., 2012, p. 646). As I will show, it is not uncommon for bilingual academic writers, in the Canadian context, to write in French (e.g., a dissertation) from sources in English (e.g., published research articles), and then to reverse languages (e.g., to publish in English the results of a dissertation composed in French), all the while mixing, switching, or meshing languages when talking about written texts. I refer to this constant shuttling between languages within and across modes as "crosslingual" work. I realize that such terminology oversimplifies the complexity of language interaction and participates in the construction, and some may argue the reification and essentialization, of linguistic resources into well-bounded language systems, a point to which I will return. I offer more nuanced definitions, notably of biliteracy, later on. However, this terminology does help in describing essential aspects of WID practice in the prevailing linguistic orders within which Canadian multilingual university writers seem to operate.

WID Needs and Practices in Canada's Linguistic Landscape

Canada is a country with pronounced regional disparities, making it hazardous to paint a broad-brush picture of its linguistic landscape. Nonetheless, Statistics Canada, the agency that oversees the quinquennial national census, distinguishes three main language groups based on mother tongue (defined as the first learned at home in childhood and still understood, Statistics Canada, 2015): English mother-tongue speakers, or Anglophones (58% of the population), French mother-tongue speakers, or Francophones (21% of the population), and speakers of other mother tongues, or Allophones (23%; Statistics Canada, 2017).[2] The latter group is disparate, comprising a great number of languages, notably Punjabi,

2 The percentages do not quite add up to 100% because they exclude respondents with more than one mother tongue; they are also rounded up.

varieties of Chinese, Spanish, German, Italian, Arabic, Tagalog, none of which represent more than 1.5% of the Canadian population but which collectively comprise about 20% of the population. In addition to language groups originating from various waves of immigration, Allophones also include speakers of Indigenous languages (11 language groups and 65 languages and dialects). However, despite recent steps to reverse a long history of language suppression and assimilation policies, less than 1% of Canadians reported an Indigenous language as their mother tongue, with only Cree, Inuktitut, and Ojibway having large enough populations to be considered viable in the long term (Statistics Canada, 2001).

Canada's current demographic makeup reflects the country's history: European settlements decimating Indigenous populations, the persistence of a sizable French-speaking minority after the British Conquest of New France (1763) and the birth of the Canadian confederation (1867), and more recent immigration from around the world (Gillmor et al., 2001). It is thus useful, as Kymlicka (1995) does, to distinguish two main sources of linguistic diversity: the incorporation of previously self-governing "national minorities" (French Canadians, First Nations, Inuit, and Métis), with their own languages, institutions, and cultures, into a large state; and the emergence of "ethnic groups" resulting from individual and familial immigration. This distinction helps to explain the privileged legal status given to English and French as the two official languages of Canada (Official Languages Act, 1985) relative to other languages. The Canadian Multiculturalism Act (1982) aims to "facilitate the acquisition, retention and use of all languages that contribute to the multicultural heritage of Canada" (Section 5(1f)) and yet also seeks to "strengthen the status and use of the official languages of Canada" (Section 3(1i)). Implied in Article 35 the Canadian constitution, rights related to indigenous languages have recently been recognized explicitly by Canadian law, with the passing of the Indigenous Languages Act in June 2019 (https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/I-7.85/page-1.html). One key purpose of the act is to "support the efforts of Indigenous people to reclaim, revitalize, maintain and strengthen Indigenous languages" (2019, Article 5b).

Against this demographic and legal backdrop, most Canadian postsecondary institutions offer instruction in only one of the official languages, with the exception of language courses. The language in which students learn to write in their disciplines is thus largely dependent on their university's medium of instruction. That being said, while English-medium institutions offer few opportunities for writing in the disciplines in languages other than English, in the province of Quebec they technically allow submission of written work in either English or French. Although this policy can be difficult to implement when the instructor cannot read French, some Francophone students will claim their right to French, particularly in the humanities and social sciences where disciplinary discourses are still produced in this language (Gentil, 2005). Conversely, Francophone and

Allophone students in French-medium universities will be motivated or pressured to read and write in English, notably in the STEM disciplines as well as in business and administration, given the quasi-hegemony of English as a language of scholarship in these disciplines. These students will thus be exposed to the specialized literature of their disciplines in English, especially in the upper years, while receiving instruction and writing exams (mostly) in French. Graduate students in Quebec's French-medium universities who wish to write a dissertation as a coherent compilation of research publications will generally be expected to write their published papers in English but to contextualize them within a frame (i.e., introducing, linking, and concluding chapters) in French, as per university regulations aimed at preserving French as a language of higher education and scholarship (Dion, 2012). Such practices and policies create great demands on Francophone and French-dominant Allophone students for biliteracy and translitеracy. In contrast, English-dominant students will generally not learn to write in their disciplines in French unless they elect to enroll in a French-medium university or in French studies.

There also exist a handful of officially bilingual universities and colleges. Again, the unequal language balance of power is reflected in institutional linguistic arrangements and individual linguistic choices, with French-dominant students having generally greater motivation and more opportunities to develop bilingual (and sometimes trilingual) academic literacy than English-dominant students (Gentil, 2006b).

What emerges from this picture is that the linguistic demands of writing (and talking, reading, and learning) in the disciplines depend largely on four interacting main dimensions: the student's language background, the institution's language regime, the discipline, and the language dynamics at play within and among regional, national, and international contexts. As is common in asymmetrical situations of language contact, the costs, and benefits, of bi- or multilingualism fall on the linguistic minorities. Indeed, within the country as a whole, English-French bilingualism is more prevalent among Francophones (44%) than Anglophones (8%) or Allophones (12%), whereas the reverse is true for the French-dominant province of Quebec (Anglophones: 66%, Allophones: 50%, and Francophones: 36.6%, as per University of Ottawa, n.d.). One can expect demands and opportunities for bilingual writing in the disciplines to be highest among university students who have already developed bi- or multilingual repertoires at home and in school.

Unfortunately, whether in bilingual or monolingual universities, prevailing institutional arrangements are generally not optimal for bi- or multilingual academic literacy development. Part of the reason for this is the compartmentalization of instruction into departments and programs that sequester available resources away from students (Gentil, 2006a). I illustrate this in the next section, by means of a case study.

A Case Study of Bilingual WID Practice

I have reported on this case study in some detail elsewhere (Gentil, 2005). I focus here only on the aspects that illustrate the participant's multilingual WID practices, challenges, and contexts, in order to later draw theoretical, curricular, and pedagogical implications for the teaching of academic writing in higher education. At the time of the study, from 1999 to 2002, Katia[3] was a Francophone student of cultural studies in an English-medium university in Quebec (henceforth "the University"). What was particularly remarkable was her strong commitment to developing academic biliteracy in both English and French. Indeed, she was determined to make her doctoral dissertation available in both English and French, either by translating it as a whole or by reworking the original English version into a French book for a larger audience. Her motivation for this came from a complex interplay between her desire to learn English to fulfil personal and professional aspirations and equally strong feelings of linguistic loyalty to her French-speaking community. When she began her doctoral studies, she had completed her K-12 education entirely in French but had received her previous postsecondary education in both French-medium and English-medium institutions—a remarkable trajectory considering her modest roots. However, the challenges she experienced while composing three comprehensive examination essays soon put her biliteracy commitment to the test. Availing herself of her student right to submit work in either English or French, she chose to write the first and third essays in English but the second in French (after ensuring that her doctoral committee could indeed read French). After much struggle through the first essay, she expected the second essay to be easier to compose since she understandably felt much more fluent in French. That hope was dashed, however. One reason for this, she quickly realized, was that most of the literature she was drawing on was in English. She thus found herself having to reconceptualize English disciplinary discourse into French, a challenging task for which she was ill-prepared.

This short excerpt from her first draft provides a glimpse into both her writing process and challenge:

> … l'idéologie liée au développement conçoit celui-ci comme étant neutre au niveau du sex [sic] (gender-neutral). . . . De nos jours, le développement n'est plus gender-neutral mais la question des femmes est souvent considérée comme étant une catégorie qui doit être ajoutée aux autres catégories. Au Pakistan […] les programmes qui concernent les femmes se retrouvent surtout dans les programmes de sécurité sociale (welfare) . . .

3 A pseudonym. IRB approval was received for the research reported on in this chapter.

> Cette tendance est née lors du basic needs approach, philosophie développementaliste élaborée au milieu des années '70.

This text could be variously theorized as an example of codemixing, codemeshing, or translingual practice. I will return to these distinctions later. For now, I will only observe that Katia appears to draw on her entire linguistic repertoire to develop and express her ideas. More specifically, she appears to be using lexical resources that can be labelled as "English language" within an overall textual frame that can be recognized as "French language." Moreover, her use of English seems to be limited to simple or compound terms (*gender neutral, welfare, basic needs approach*), sometimes juxtaposed with their literal translations in brackets (*programmes de sécurité sociale*) or in the main text (*neutre au niveau du sex*).

During the interviews, Katia complained about the French language, notably its relative dearth of terminological resources compared to English:

> Il y a plus de termes exacts en anglais qu'en français . . . Juste le terme **gender studies**. On dirait qu'en anglais ça veut dire quelque chose, mais en français, études sur les genres, c'est comme . . . tu sais le concept n'est pas autant connu. Je trouve qu'en anglais, il y a plus de termes qui vont exprimer précisément une idée. En français, peut-être que c'est une impression, mais j'ai l'impression que je suis obligée d'utiliser beaucoup de mots pour mettre en contexte, pour exprimer ce que je veux dire alors qu'en anglais, tu as juste qu'un mot.
>
> There are more exact terms in English than in French . . . Take the term *gender studies*. It seems that in English, it means something, but in French, *études sur les genres*, it's like . . . the concept is not as well known. I find that in English there are more terms that can express an idea precisely. In French, maybe it's just an impression, but I feel that I have to use many more words to contextualize, to express what I want to say, whereas in English, you just need one word.

Rendering the concept of *gender* and its derivatives (e.g., *gender-neutral*) in French proved to be particularly challenging yet essential for Katia because her second essay was a critical literature review on gender studies of relevance to her doctoral project. In order to develop her argument despite these terminological challenges, Katia simply postponed those terminological issues until later in the composing processing, and simply resorted to English terms (and tentative literal translations) while composing her first draft in French. This turned out to be a successful strategy. Had she tried to repress English (in both her text and her mind), she would probably have experienced a writer's block. However, in the later drafts

she submitted for assessment, she reworked her text entirely in French, in keeping with her understanding of her professors' expectations.

In the case studies I conducted of French-English university writers, several participants reported similar challenges in finding French equivalents of English terms in their disciplines, which also led to devaluing French as a language of scholarship (Gentil, 2003). A consequence of the dominance of English as a language of science and scholarship is that knowledge and thus terms are developed in English, with terminology in other languages thus lagging behind (Ammon, 1996). At the same time, multilingual terminology development and management is central to the language work of translation specialists working for international organizations such as the United Nations and the institutions of the European Union, and a main area of research within translation studies. Translation specialists have developed a number of resources that could be extremely useful for multilingual writing in the disciplines. Indeed, an entire book has been devoted to the translation of terms related to gender equity in international discourse as a means to illustrate challenges, developments, and resources in multilingual terminology (Raus, 2013). One such resource includes terminology banks, such as TERMIUM and *Le grand dictionnaire terminologique*, which inventory terminological equivalents per domain found by terminologists in well-documented sources.

These terminological banks could have been very useful for Katia, notably in proposing equivalents for *gender* and derived compound terms such as *gender-neutral policy*. Multilingual terminological banks, however, have a number of shortcomings: they are labor and cost intensive to maintain, and therefore are often incomplete and quickly obsolete, not keeping up with fast-paced terminological advances. Bilingual concordancers such as Linguee, Tradooit, and Webitext help to overcome these shortcomings by using algorithms to search the web for bilingual texts and extract not only translation equivalents of search terms or phrases but also paragraph-long bilingual texts ("bitexts") that show parallel language use in context. An added advantage of such bilingual concordancers is thus to assist bilingual writers not only in finding equivalent terminology or lexis but also appropriate phraseology (another challenge of Katia's). Nonetheless, bilingual writers, like students of translation, should also be made aware of the limitations of these tools, such as text alignment and phrase extraction errors, translations or source texts of questionable quality, and the inability to filter searches per domain or expand the corpus to genres and discourses of interest (Raus, 2013). For investigation of specialized terminology and phraseology in their disciplines, academic writers might thus be better off creating their own specialized corpora and research them using monolingual or bilingual concordancers such as Antconc or SketchEngine (see, e.g., Gavioli, 1996).

Other resources routinely used by translation specialists that would have been useful to Katia include awareness of translation strategies at the phrase- and

text-level, including the understanding that the primary translation unit is generally considered to be semantic and pragmatic (the idea, the message, and the effect) rather than lexical (the word) (Delisle, 2013). There is also within translation studies a well-established body of work in comparative stylistics that documents English-French differences in syntactic and stylistic preferences (including the pioneering and now classic work of Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet, 1995).

However helpful such translation resources might have been to Katia in her crosslingual WID practices, she did not have access to them despite the existence of a translation program within the University. Her case illustrates the deleterious impact on multilingual WID of the compartmentalization of the curriculum into disciplines, languages, and programs. Because she was not a student of translation studies, she could not take courses in translation studies without additional cost (as a continuing education student). In fact, she wasn't even aware of them and of what they could offer. She could not take courses in French academic writing either, because these were reserved for French-as-a-second-language writers or French majors. Interestingly, while WAC/WID programs are not as well established in Canada as in the US (Graves & Graves, 2012; Turner & Kearns, 2012), the Writing Centre of the University did offer lower-year and upper-year courses in effective written communication for students in disciplines such as education, business, and engineering. However, because Katia's home department had not entered into an agreement with the Writing Centre, these WID style courses were not available to her either. The only writing course that was on offer was an English-as-a-Second-Language course in academic graduate writing open to Francophone and Allophone students from all disciplines. While Katia did benefit from this form of instruction, it was exclusively in English and did not touch on strategies for the kind of crosslingual WID work she was engaged with.

A Transciplinary Experiment in Biliteracy Instruction

Thus far, I have tried to illustrate some of the challenges of WID practice, as well as to suggest how resources and strategies developed in translation studies may help overcome them, provided that they become an integral part of the multilingual WAC/WID curriculum. I now would like to describe what may be considered a transdisciplinary experiment in biliteracy instruction. My hope in doing so is to suggest ways to develop instruction for bi- or multilingual WAC/WID despite institutional and disciplinary strictures that separate out writing instruction in a modern language from English writing in the disciplines and translation studies.

The opportunity for this pilot project arose in the fall of 2016 within my institution, an English-medium university in Ottawa, Canada's capital city. This university is located within a predominantly English-speaking part of the city and serves

a mostly anglophone or English-dominant student population, but the proximity of Quebec less than six kilometers away and the central role of the federal service in the local economy make French quite present in the university's regional context. Again because of departmental compartmentalization, as a professor of (English) applied linguistics, I could not teach courses in the French language or through the medium of French unless the Department of French negotiated my release from my home unit, the School of Linguistics (I have since become cross-appointed in order to be able to teach in both English and French annually). As a colleague's sabbatical created a curricular gap that justified the release, I was asked to teach a special topics course in applied linguistics in French at the fourth-year level, and I developed FREN4414 *Bilittératie: Recherches, Pratiques et Pédagogie* (Biliteracy: Research, Practices, and Pedagogy).

The main objective of the course was to draw on biliteracy research at the crossover of bilingual education, literacy, translation, and writing studies in order to help students develop biliteracy strategies adapted to their own contexts and needs. Specifically, the course encouraged the students not only to read about biliteracy but also to reflect on their own biliteracy practices and experiment with strategies for multi- and crosslingual writing in light of the readings and class discussion. From a theoretical standpoint, the course was informed by Christine Tardy's (2009) integrated model of genre knowledge as reconceptualized within a biliteracy perspective (Gentil, 2011). It was thus structured around different genres (notably, the assignments) and the four components of genre knowledge as identified by Tardy: content, formal, rhetorical, and process knowledge.

Each component was the focus of one or two weeks, with special attention given to bi- and transliteracy considerations. With regard to content knowledge, the course readings provided a common knowledge base for the class and coursework, beginning with an introduction to key concepts in biliteracy studies and a review of research on the crosslinguistic transfer of writing. Readings and activities related to formal knowledge emphasized the lexical, terminological, and phraseological strategies for crosslingual work that I had seen Katia and other bilingual writers needing the most, such as assessing and using terminological banks and concordancers to find terminological and phraseological equivalents across languages (Raus, 2013). The development of formal knowledge also included, at the sentence level, an initiation to comparative French-English stylistics (e.g., Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995) and, at the text level, a crosslingual comparison of coherence, cohesion, and information management in English and French (emphasizing similarities beyond linguistic specificities, drawing on Marie-Odile Hidden's 2013 textbook). The classes on rhetorical knowledge aimed to foster a critical reflection on contrastive/intercultural rhetoric work (e.g., Rozycki et al., 2008) by having students compare instructions given by English and French composition textbooks on how to introduce a paper with actual writing samples. One underlying goal was to

raise awareness of the possibility that the textual patterns observed may have more to do with exigencies in genres and rhetorical situations (e.g., introducing an essay for a course vs. a research journal article for a national audience vs. a book chapter for an international audience) than with the language of composing. As for process knowledge, activities drew attention to similarities and differences in L1, L2 (and L3) composing strategies, as well as the strategic use of one's entire linguistic repertoire to write in a language in which one's command was weaker.

To these four knowledge dimensions, a fifth was added, namely technological knowledge—comfort with the computer technologies that commonly mediate academic and professional writing today. To this end, several classes took place in the computer lab. In addition to practice with the terminological and lexicographic online resources and software described above (Antconc, Tradooit, Linguee), the lab sessions also introduced a video screen capture tool, TechSmith Relay, to allow students to share short videos of selected aspects of their writing processes, for instance illustrating a writing strategy such as the use of an online resource while writing.

The main assignments progressed from narrative to expository as well as shorter to longer, more complex genres. First, a biliteracy autobiography, inspired by Diane Belcher and Ulla Connor (2001), prompted the students to narrate how, in what contexts, and what types of texts they had learned to read and write in English, French, and other languages. A second assignment, linked to terminology work, asked students to contribute one entry to the class' bilingual glossary by selecting a term of interest and documenting its definitions, collocations, uses, and translations. Three short reports, distributed throughout the term, required reflective accounts of selected in-class activities, for example assessing the affordances and constraints of selected online lexicographic resources for finding translation equivalents of *gender, literacy*, and derived compound terms (e.g., *gender parity, literacy practices*). These shorter assignments, along with the course readings and workshop-style class activities, aimed to prepare for the term paper, an 1,800-word self-case study research report on a selected aspect of the student's own biliteracy practices. For this final report, students were encouraged to use TechSmith Relay to include links to videos as a way to document and research, and thus become self-reflective of, their writing processes (Hamel et al., 2015). They were free to use other data sources as well, such as a corpus of texts they wrote. The overall intent of these assignments was to foster self-awareness of one's strategies, resources, and challenges as a student writer learning to write in English, French, and possibly other languages in specific disciplinary, professional, and social contexts and genres.

In keeping with a translanguaging (Gentil, 2019; Lewis et al., 2012) approach and to help develop strategies for transliteracy, I would have liked to alternate between English and French for reading, writing, and talking, for example planning a class discussion and a writing activity in English on a French text, and then switching languages for the next sequence. Because the course was part of a BA

program in French, however, the language of instruction and evaluation had to be French. Nonetheless, in consultation with the chair of the French department, some course readings were assigned in English, which gave an opportunity to discuss and practice French writing from English sources. Furthermore, students were also encouraged to reflect on their English writing experiences in other courses and bring writing samples from these courses. The use of English as a resource when composing in French was also a subject of class discussion, to the apparent surprise of some students who had been taught to repress it; informal testimonials suggested that this discussion gave students permission to use English more freely in their French prewriting and found it to be helpful (on the use of the L1 while composing in an L2, see, e.g., Manchón, 2013). That being said, given that all the students were much more at ease in English than in French and yet had enrolled in an advanced French class ostensibly with the goal to improve their French, it was important as well to give them opportunities to push themselves in French, in effect asking them to suspend their linguistic privilege as English speakers in an English-medium university. As Roy Lyster (2019) and Susan Ballinger et al. (2017) convincingly argue in the Canadian French immersion context, language status should be an important consideration in crosslinguistic pedagogy. While encouraging minority language users to draw on their whole linguistic repertoire can support learning and biliteracy in English-medium programs, pushing English speakers *not* to use English is equally important in foreign/second language classes and bilingual programs as a means of counteracting the overriding tendency toward increased use of English at the expense of languages of lesser ease and status. For these reasons, while English was allowed and occasionally used in the class, noticeably in small group conversations and to enable conceptual links across languages, instruction and class discussion were predominantly in French.

One challenge in designing the course was to find relevant and appropriate course readings. Reflecting disciplinary divisions of labor, available textbooks were geared at English or French writing, or bilingual education, or translation. In the end, I adopted Hidden (2013) as a course text, a textbook in French writing instruction aimed at teacher development in French as a foreign language. Even if most students did not consider a career as French teachers (although some had plans to teach English in France), my rationale for choosing this text was that drawing attention to research-based approaches to the teaching of writing would contribute to developing students' metacognitive self-awareness as multilingual writers, a key objective of the course. Naturally, the textbook had to be complemented with selected readings in translation studies, biliteracy, bilingual education, and L2 writing studies.

Another challenge was to find French translation equivalents of concepts and terminology needed for the course. In many ways, I found myself in a situation similar to Katia and my students of being exposed to specialized literatures in

English and yet having to write and talk about them in French, a point which I emphasized in class. I thus had ample opportunities to illustrate the translation strategies I aimed to teach. Whenever a question arose that I could not address on the spot (e.g., how to render *creative writing* or *learning curve* into French), this became a terminological problem for us to solve.

Despite these challenges and constraints, the course appeared to have been helpful, at least based on the students' formal and informal evaluations as well as their self-reflective reports. The class turned out to be small, only 10 students (the French BA program itself is fairly small). This allowed for individualized attention. Most students were Anglophones who had learned French in school, but a few had more complex linguistic repertoires and histories, including one student who was already well on his way to developing advanced literacy in Mandarin, French, and English for work. One student commented that the course had been useful not only for French writing but for English writing as well, adding that she had not been aware of stylistic differences between English and French essay writing before. Several students reflected on how they came to appreciate similarities and also differences in their composing processes in English and French (and sometimes other languages as well), such as not to let concerns over accuracy impede their idea development in French. Other students shared their appreciations of translation strategies beyond literal translation, of the potential and limitations of online translation, writing, and editing tools, and of the use of video screen capture as a self-evaluation tool to access and assess their own writing processes. Only one student used video screen capture in his final report to offer a detailed account of his composing processes in English and French while writing a comparable text in each language. Several other students, however, shared interesting analyses of their English and French writing based on writing samples, notably comparing how they structured introductions to argumentative texts in different disciplines.

Together, the students' coursework and reflections suggest that the course helped promote writing development by following two of the main principles of WAC/WID instruction (Kiefer et al., 2021): (1) the use of writing as a means to learn and (2) familiarizing students with the writing conventions and genres of their disciplines. In the context of the course, writing to learn meant using writing (biliteracy autobiography, reflective reports, self-case studies) as a tool for learning about oneself as a strategic multilingual writer responding to specific writing contexts and demands; writing in the disciplines meant learning to write in French for a course in applied linguistics. While students had had opportunities to write literary analyses or essays in French, writing a research report, let alone a self-case study, was an unfamiliar genre to them, in French at least. I also hope that by fostering awareness of genres and composing strategies across disciplinary and linguistic contexts, the course also promoted the students' writing development across their curriculum as well, in both English and French.

Translingual, Transnational, Translanguaging, and Biliteracy Approaches to WAC/WID

The course in biliteracy I just described is but a small pilot experiment. More systematic research is needed to show to what extent and how initiatives of this sort can help promote bilingual writing development in and across disciplines. Such research may in turn help make a case for developing a bi/multilingual WAC/WID curriculum on a larger scale that more fully integrates writing instruction in English with translation studies and modern languages. Nonetheless, I hope to have illustrated the need for such integration to better support academic biliteracy development, especially in national and institutional contexts with sizable language minorities such as Francophones in Canada (Spanish speakers in the US may also have similar needs). With this Canadian example in mind, I would like to conclude with some reflections on a more theoretical level in an attempt to clarify how the biliteracy approach to WAC/WID I just described can relate to translanguaging, translingual, and transnational approaches.

In the introduction, I defined biliteracy simply as a synonym of bilingual literacy, the ability to read and write in two languages. In keeping with more sophisticated characterizations of the construct I have provided elsewhere (e.g., Gentil, 2011), I would add that such ability must be understood as situated within the social, cultural, ideological, national, geopolitical, and historical contexts that construct it as ability. In other words, biliteracy is not only a matter of individual skill over languages in reading and writing, but also the social validation of such savoir-faire across linguistic, cultural, and national contexts. To take a culinary analogy, however skillful, a French chef serving boeuf bourguignon will not satisfy a customer who ordered beef curry in a Thai restaurant. Similarly, as research in intercultural rhetoric suggests, a writer's skill in delivering a given genre in one context may not be appreciated in another; success in exploiting and expanding writing expertise across linguistic, cultural, national, and disciplinary communities is contingent on writers finding contexts that validate their genre knowledge. For example, Connor (2003) reports how a Senegalese student's skill in introducing an argumentative essay by problematizing the question in the prompt, based on a French rhetoric tradition, may be poorly received by an American target audience expecting a thesis statement. To successfully frame her argument for her doctoral committee, Katia came to realize that she needed to be cautious about citing French-medium disciplinary discourse her target audience may not be familiar with, privileging English-medium discourse instead (even when writing in French). Biliteracy thus requires not only the ability to read and write in two languages but also rhetorical flexibility, cultural sensitivity, and brokering skill in negotiating texts and seeking recognition of what may count as skillful writing in a given context.

To bring this point home was a main objective in encouraging my students to compare introductions to term papers and research articles in different languages, disciplines, and national contexts (France and Canada). However, no matter how skillful a biliterate writer may be, biliteracy requires an enabling context. It would thus seem unlikely that Spanish heritage speakers in the US would attempt what Katia did with French unless Spanish gains prestige, recognition, and support in that country in both academic and non-academic settings.

A criticism that may be levelled at the biliteracy approach, from a translingual perspective, is that it tends to consider literacy, even though socioculturally situated, still in binary terms: English and/or French; by treating languages as discrete, a biliteracy approach may be seen as "aligned with the ideology of monolingualism" (Horner et al., 2011, p. 307). It is on this point perhaps that the biliteracy approach may be more closely allied to (some versions of) translanguaging than translingualism or translingual literacy (on the various, weak and strong versions of translanguaging and the rapprochement between biliteracy and translanguaging, see Gentil, 2019; Hornberger & Link, 2012). The term *translanguaging* was first coined in Welsh to refer to a bilingual education strategy aimed at developing dual literacy in both English and Welsh, with "the added ability to move confidently and smoothly between languages for different purposes" by means of the purposeful concurrent uses of two languages in the classroom (Estyn, cited in Lewis et al., 2012, p. 246). However, the term has since been expanded to refer to "an approach to the use of language, bilingualism and the education of bilinguals that considers the language practices of bilinguals not as two autonomous language systems as have been traditionally the case, but *as one linguistic repertoire with features that have been societally constructed as belonging to separate languages*" (García & Li, 2014, p. 2, my emphasis).

This definition captures the tension between the desire to consider the linguistic resources of multilinguals as interacting and mixing in complex, dynamic ways and forming one linguistic repertoire on the one hand, and a prevailing backdrop of assumptions, practices, and discourses that continue to create them as separate languages on the other. I acknowledge the permeability of linguistic boundaries and see much value in a translingual approach to language difference that sees language difference as continually (re)produced in moment-to-moment iterations of language use (Lu & Horner, 2013). At the same time, I would contend that the fluidity of languages and language boundaries may at times be somewhat overplayed in the translingual literature (e.g., Horner et al., 2011) and at odds with the language dynamics that seem to be at play in the Canadian contexts of multilingual WID development that I described in this paper. In the successive moments of meaning making, the use of linguistic resources may aptly be described as a flux of meaning in which language systems are both constantly drawn upon and reshaped in minute ways. However,

languages appear to evolve on a different time scale. English and French as we know them today, for example, are the products of several centuries of a codification process that has instituted them into distinct systems despite a long history of contact and reciprocal influence. It is not surprising, then, that in the time scale of a person's life, it may take years for a speaker raised in one linguistic tradition to learn another. It would thus seem important not to conflate the historical, ontogenetic, and moment-to-moment time scales of language change. To take another social category, gender, as an example, while gender categories may indeed be made and remade in the repetition of performative acts (Butler, 1999), transgender testimonials are poignant reminders of how changing or transgressing one's gender in a gendered society can be a long and arduous process in a person's life. Becoming translingual within a well-entrenched order of linguistic nationalism may well be as challenging as transitioning into a new gender within a heteronormative order.

Part of the rigidity of language boundaries derives from the "sedimentation of language practices" (Lu & Horner, 2013, p. 288) into linguistic patterns, systems, and categories that become reified and taken for granted in habitual ways of using and conceiving of language(s)—what Bourdieu refers to as a linguistic habitus. More precisely, language boundaries tend to be produced and reproduced in what Bourdieu (1998) sees as the "ontological complicity" (p. 77) or convergence between *habitus*, conceived as mostly unconscious mental and embodied structures that predispose language users to conceive of languages as bounded, and the objective structures of the social space that construct and reify languages as bounded. Importantly, some of these social structures predate and will likely outlive any given individual language user, which contributes to the enduring codification of languages as bounded systems on a historical scale. Examples of such durable structures include the taken-for-granted use of –ed as a past-tense marker in English, the continued institutional presence of the French Academy since its founding in 1635, and nation states built along linguistic lines (on language as both structure and usage, see also Kecskes, 2010).

To return to Katia's struggles with reconceptualizing American gender theories from English to French, it is interesting that her first draft provides a glimpse into the sort of language meshing that goes on in her mind while composing, unlike the later drafts in which all traces of such meshing are erased. The participant in Suresh Canagarajah's (2011) study of codemeshing in in a U.S. state university context, Buthainah, did the opposite: she codemeshed only in the later drafts, after she had sensed that her professor would be open to it. Whether consciously or not, Katia reproduced the boundedness of English and French linguistic resources in her instance of writing, whereas Buthainah played with and at the language boundaries. The reasons for this difference are open for interpretation but point to student writers' intuitive and mostly tacit sense of the different valences assigned to specific languages and their mixing in their respective Canadian and U.S. contexts. During

our interviews, Katia did not bring up her rationale for erasing English traces from her later French drafts, nor did I probe the subject specifically. The focus was on the challenges to find translation equivalents, and the necessity for doing so was just taken for granted. Such taken-for-granted necessity of translation and the resulting unquestioned self-policing of one's linguistic behaviour at the language boundary is precisely what contributes to the reproduction of languages as separate systems. As Nancy Bou Ayash (2016) vividly illustrates in the context of first-year writing instruction at an American university in Lebanon, explicitly interrogating the often unquestioned representations that students and instructors have about languages and language relations can help them realize and thus negotiate how these representations can facilitate or impede their abilities and practices with languages. Raising student writers' attention to the unattended conditions and unintended consequences of their language uses can help them make more informed choices, thus empowering their agency. However, it will arguably not be sufficient to undo the prevailing historical, economic, geopolitical, and ideological conditions that constitute the linguistic order within which they operate.

A case could be made for academic writing to be more open to codemeshing, and to language difference more generally, than it currently is, given the linguistic diversity of student populations and the globalized construction of disciplinary knowledge. At the same time, two lines of arguments could be made in favor of upholding language boundaries. First, from an identity perspective, it can be important for language minorities to preserve the linguistic distinctiveness that helps them index and maintain their identities. The ambivalence toward the use of English words in Quebec and French Canada reflects the power imbalance of French and English, with English being pervasive, appealing, and yet threatening for Francophone minorities. This may explain the relative sensitivity of French speakers in Quebec toward obvious English borrowings, such as *parking, shopping, week-end* (spelled with a hyphen in standard French), which are widely used in France, even though other, often more covert types of English influence can be documented at the level of syntax and semantics as being more prevalent in Canadian than European French usage (Bouchard, 1999). Katia and the other research participants from Quebec expressed their attachment to their French mother tongue in strong affective terms, insisting on how it gave them a sense of identity and belonging and emphasizing the importance of not "drowning it with Anglicisms" for the sake of its "survival" given that Quebec was the "last francophone entrenchment" in North America (Gentil, 2005). These affective valuations fuel the desire to keep language boundaries where they are (or appear to be). While codemeshing may be seen as desirable in some contexts, for communicative expediency or as an act of resistance against monolingualist ideology, it can also exacerbate a sense of threat posed by an overpowering language on one's language of affiliation and allegiance (on the less desirable implications of codemeshing for denigrated language varieties and

minoritized language users such as speakers of Jamaican Creole in the Jamaican context or Native Americans in the U.S. context, see Milson-Whyte, 2014).

Second, from a cognitive perspective, one should not underestimate the potential for deeper learning of having to rethink knowledge through two languages. One difficulty in rendering concepts such as *gender* and *literacy* from English to French is that they don't have one-to-one equivalents. It may thus be tempting to borrow the English term, either as is, by keeping its native English form, or by translating it literally (e.g., *littératie*). Another solution is a semantic loan, expanding the meaning of a closely related term. Thus, under the influence of English-based gender theory, the uses of the French word *genre* have expanded from a mere linguistic category in French grammar (masculine vs. feminine) to a more complex sociological concept that developed along with a reconfiguration of feminist studies and politics in France (Parini, 2010). However, it can be productive as well to try to render a concept with the available resources of a given language. For example, in the Swiss context, Laurent Gajo (2007; Gajo et al., 2013) showed examples of how professors helped to deepen understanding of key concepts in law or physics by comparing and contrasting terms and metaphors used by German and French. Similarly, I have tried to illustrate how translanguaging about translanguaging, that is, trying to understand the concept of translanguaging through more than one linguistic lens, by bringing various linguistic resources to bear on, dissect, and expand its multi-layered meanings, can help to deepen one's understanding of this complex notion (Gentil, 2019).

Even when terms are borrowed or translated, they tend to be restricted to specialist use, at first at least, and need to be explicated: unlike *literacy,* which is a common word in English, *littératie* was only recently introduced in one general reference dictionary and remains puzzling to Francophone readers beyond education circles, even though it began to make inroads into French-medium scholarly conversations back in the 1990s (Gentil, 2019). Interestingly, the introduction of the *literacy* concept into French-speaking academic circles, while resisted at first, led to productive discussion as to what it could mean and what its added value could be (see, e.g., Lépine & Hébert, 2013). Furthermore, even if they spread beyond academic circles, borrowed concepts tend to have more limited usage than in the original language. This can be seen in derived compound terms, which do not always translate literally. For example, while *literacy* may be rendered as *littératie* in academic contexts, *literacy campaign* will be rendered as *campagne d'alphabétisation*; similarly, terminological banks may document *genre* as the equivalent of *gender* as a simple term, but *équilibre entre les sexes* (literally *balance between the sexes*) as the equivalent of *gender balance.* Multilingual writers can be puzzled by this, and as Katia did, see their first language as somewhat deficient by its apparent lack of terminological resources. It may thus be helpful, in the context of bilingual WID instruction, to open a discussion about how different languages, each conceived as a set of linguistic systems constituting a certain meaning potential, can offer distinctive yet complementary lenses on the world (on the

complex relationship between thought and cognition in multilinguals, see Kecskes, 2010; MacSwan, 2017; Pavlenko, 2005).

As Bruce Horner and Elliot Tetreault (2016) have convincingly argued and illustrated in the context of U.S. college composition, "teaching writing as translation" can be a fruitful strategy to make visible the workings of normative language ideologies and how these produce and reproduce language difference. Julia Kiernan et al. (2016) further illustrate practical strategies for implementing a translation assignment in an English first-year composition course, as well as the practical benefits of translation for fostering audience awareness, metalinguistic skills, and cultural sensitivities while positioning multilingual students as experts in their own languages and cultures. Both papers propose intralingual translation activities (such as paraphrasing or translating into a new style, genre, or register) as a way to address the challenges of instructors or students being monolingual or not sharing common language pairs. I fully embrace these initiatives but propose to extend them in two ways. First, while inter- and intralingual translation (e.g., Jakobson, 1959/2000) share certain similarities as a making-meaning process involving rewording and recontextualizing, the loss at which monolinguals find themselves in working out meaning across languages underscores the additional challenges of interlingual translation that multilingual writers like Katia must overcome. Second, Kiernan et al. (2016) describe how useful it can be for students to explore and reflect on the translation strategies they have found by themselves. However, it could be valuable as well to encourage students to compare the translation strategies they have figured out by themselves with the translation strategies recommended and practiced in professional translation training programs. Indeed, it would seem a pity to have multilingual students in English composition courses reinvent the wheel rather than tapping into the wealth of theoretical and practical knowledge developed over the last 60 years in translation studies.

Admittedly, one difficulty for composition specialists to borrow from translation studies is that they cannot be expected to be translation specialists themselves. Furthermore, a great number of the more practical pedagogical resources are available in languages other than English, for the simple reason that, reflecting the power imbalance between English and other languages, translation has traditionally been more prevalent out of than into English. In Canada, for example, there is more of a need to translate out of English and into French, which explains why programs and materials for translator training were developed first in French (for a staple text with several editions, see Delisle, 2013) and are still more abundant in French (Mareschal, 2005). Similarly, European countries have each developed programs and materials for translation training in and into their respective national language(s). Unless English composition instructors can read other languages, they would not be able to access these resources. However, this challenge may be overcome by means of interdisciplinary collaboration with modern language and translation studies departments, along the same kind of participatory models (e.g.,

team-teaching, modules, workshops) that composition specialists have adopted with other disciplines in WAC/WID programs. Indeed, the time seems all the more ripe for collaborative, interdisciplinary programs involving modern languages and composition now that translation itself, after being much maligned in second and foreign language pedagogy, is being rehabilitated both as a valuable skill to develop (Cook, 2010) and as a means of developing "translingual and transcultural competence" conceived of as the "ability to operate between languages" and "to reflect on the world and [oneself] through the lens of another language and culture" (MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages, 2007). An added advantage of expanding WID/WAC programs to modern language departments is that it would facilitate the structuring of instruction so as to promote bi- and transliteracy work in language pairs (e.g., Spanish-English, English-Mandarin) and in directions (e.g., Spanish to English and English to Spanish) that are meaningful for the students.

There nonetheless exist a number of interesting resources in English for translating into English, such as Baker (2011), the somewhat dated but still useful Lonsdale (1996), and Routledge's Thinking Translation series. Anthony Pym's (2016) *Translation Solutions for Many Languages* may also be particularly useful for introducing translation into linguistically diverse English composition courses because it offers a framework for seven translation strategies or "solution types" derived from an exhaustive list of such strategies developed independently for a number of language pairs. Whenever using a translation assignment in an English composition course, Pym's proposed typology of solution types could be helpful as a framework for students not only to analyze their spontaneous translation approaches but also to consider other strategies they may not have thought of.

In short, the translanguaging and biliteracy approach to WID/WAC instruction that I have tried to outline here aims not only to help bilingual writers learn to write in their disciplines in and across two languages, but also to harness the potential of bilingual and crosslingual writing for learning (in) the disciplines. In other words, it aims not only to create the conditions of learning to write bi- and crosslingually in the disciplines, but also to exploit the facilitative role of writing bi- and crosslingually to learn. Despite some differences in emphasis, translingual, translanguaging, and biliteracy approaches to WAC/WID have this in common: they aim to develop in student writers a "deftness in deploying a broad and diverse repertoire of language resources, and responsiveness to the diverse range of readers, social positions and ideological perspectives" (Horner et al., 2011, p. 308). The main difference, perhaps, lies in how this diverse repertoire of language resources is conceived, with a biliteracy approach underscoring the value of distinguishing language difference at the level of registers, genres, and languages, and across historical, ontogenetic, and moment-to-moment time scales. It can be practical and valuable in some contexts of monolingual WID/WAC instruction to introduce translation as the recontextualizing of meaning across varieties of one language

(e.g., Horner & Tetreault, 2016; Horner et al., 2011). At the same time, I also hope to have illustrated the value for WID/WAC instruction to cross-pollinate and collaborate with modern languages, bilingual education, and translation studies in order for student writers to learn to translate and translate to learn across languages.

Lastly and importantly, I also hope to have illustrated the importance of anchoring a transnational conversation on writing instruction in a deep understanding of national specificities. While some scholars point to a transition toward a postnational or transnational order (as Heller, 2008, 2011, 2015 does in the French-Canadian context), Canadian political philosopher Will Kymlicka (2004) warns against the "myth of transnational citizenship." As he convincingly argues, there is no denying the intensification of transnational exchanges, but what shapes borders are not the increasingly transnational forces people are subjected to, but the communities with which they identify as they respond, and globalization does not seem to have eroded the sense that nation states form distinctive communities of destiny and solidarity when responding to transnational challenges and opportunities (2004). For example, while there is a tempting parallel between English-French biliteracy in Canada and English-Spanish biliteracy in the US, the negotiation and valuation of biliteracy takes place against an entirely different historical, demographic, and political landscape; mobilizing for biliteracy thus requires "context-appropriate" (Ballinger et al., 2017) national strategies. The need to enable biliteracy by creating conditions for its validation and safeguarding a space for the minority language may well transcend national contexts, but the modalities of how this can be done are likely to vary nationally and locally. Furthermore, the condition of being without nationality is no more enviable than having lost the language of one's childhood or Elders. At the same time, Francophone communities also illustrate how affiliations, actions, and discourses can be negotiated by mobilizing around a shared language across nation-state borders. In the academic domain, there is a wealth of research into the transnational circulation of ideas between and within the English- and French-speaking world, notably in language and literacy education (Gentil, 2019; Liddicoat & Zarate, 2009), multilingualism (Moore & Gajo, 2009), gender studies (Parini, 2010), and writing instruction (Brereton et al., 2009). What this research suggests is that writing across national contexts entails negotiating positive reception by translating ideas not only across languages (e.g., French and English), but also across geopolitical communities that may share a language and yet differ in their reference points, rhetorical preferences, and disciplinary conversations (e.g., French-medium scholarship in France, Belgium, or Canada). A transnational translingual approach to the teaching of academic writing in higher education has thus much to offer by helping students identify the conversations they want to contribute to as they learn to problematize the language-nation-identity link while leveraging their linguistic and national moorings to affirm their voices.

References

Ammon, Ulrich (Ed.). (1996). *The dominance of English as a language of science: Effects on other languages and language communities*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Assembly of First Nations. (n.d.). About AFN. Retrieved September 15, 2022 from https://www.afn.ca/about-afn/

Atkinson, Dwight, Crusan, Deborah, Matsuda, Paul Kei, Ortmeier-Hooper, Christina, Ruecker, Todd, Simpson, Steve, & Tardy, Christine M. (2015). Clarifying the relationship between L2 writing and translingual writing: An open letter to writing studies editors and organization leaders. *College English, 77*(4), 383-383.

Baker, Mona. (2011). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Ballinger, Susan, Lyster, Roy, Sterzuk, Andrea, & Genesee, Fred. (2017). Context-appropriate crosslinguistic pedagogy: Considering the role of language status in immersion education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education, 5*(1), 30-57.

Belcher, D., & Connor, U. (2001). *Reflections on multilerate lives*. Multilingual Matters.

Bou Ayash, Nancy. (2016). Conditions of (im)possibility: Postmonolingual language representations in academic literacies. *College English, 78*(4), 555-577.

Bouchard, Chantal. (1999). *On n'emprunte qu'aux riches: La valeur sociolinguistique et symbolique des emprunts*. Éditions Fides.

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1998). *Practical reason: On the theory of action*. Stanford University Press.

Brereton, John, Donahue, Christiane, Gannett, Cinthia, Lillis, Theresa M., & Scott, Mary. (2009). *La circulation des perspectives socioculturelles états-uniennes et britanniques: traitements de l'écrit dans le supérieur*. In Bertrand B. Daunay, I. Delcambre, & Y. Reuter (Eds.), *Didactique du français, le socioculturel en question* (pp. 51-68). Presses universitaires du Septentrion.

Canagarajah, Suresh. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 401-417.

Connor, Ulla. (2003). Changing current in contrastive rhetoric. In Barbara Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 218-241). Cambridge University Press.

Cook, Guy. (2010). *Translation in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Delisle, Jean. (2013). *La traduction raisonnée: manuel d'initiation à la traduction professionnelle de l'anglais vers le français.* (3rd ed.). Les Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa.

Dion, Jennifer. (2012). *Le défi de former une relève scientifique d'expression française* . Conseil supérieur de la langue française, Gouvernement du Québec.

Gajo, Laurent. (2007). Linguistic knowledge and subject knowledge: How does bilingualism contribute to subject development? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 10*(5), 563-581.

Gajo, Laurent, Grobet, Anne, Serra, Cecilia, Steffen, Gabriela, Müller, Gabriele, & Berthoud, Anne-Claude. (2013). Plurilingualisms and knowledge construction in higher education. In Anne-Claude Berthoud, François Grin, & Georges Lüdi (Eds.), *Exploring the dynamics of multilingualism: The DYLAN project* (pp. 279-298). John Benjamins.

García, Ofelia, & Li, Wei. (2014). *Translanguaging: language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Gavioli, Laura. (1996). *Exploring corpora for ESP learning*. John Benjamins.
Gentil, Guillaume. (2003). *Identity construction and academic biliteracy: Case studies of francophone science writers* [Unpublished dissertation]. McGill University. Montréal, QC, Canada.
Gentil, Guillaume. (2005). Commitments to academic biliteracy: Case studies of Francophone university writers. *Written Communication, 22*(4), 421-471.
Gentil, Guillaume. (2006a). EAP and technical writing without borders: The impact of departmentalization on the teaching and learning of academic writing in a first and second language. In Paul Matsuda, Christina Ortmeier-Hooper, & Xiaoye You (Eds.), *The politics of second language writing: in search of the promised land* (pp. 147-167). Parlor Press.
Gentil, Guillaume. (2006b). Variation in goals and activities for multilingual writing. In Alister Cumming (Ed.), *Goals for writing in university: English as a second language students and their instructors* (pp. 142-156). John Benjamins.
Gentil, Guillaume. (2011). A biliteracy agenda for genre research. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 20*(1), 6-23.
Gentil, Guillaume. (2019). Translanguaging and multilingual academic literacies: How do we translate that into French? Should we? *Pour en faire quoi ?* (*et pourquoi s'en faire*?. *Cahiers de l'ILOB/OLBI Working Papers*, 3-41. https://uottawa.scholarsportal.info/ottawa/index.php/ILOB-OLBI/article/view/3831
Gevers, Jeroen. (2018). Translingualism revisited: Language difference and hybridity in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 40*, 73-83.
Gillmor, Don, Michaud, Achille, & Turgeon, Pierre. (2001). *Canada: A people's history.* McClelland & Stewart.
Graves, Roger, & Graves, Heather. (2012). Writing programs worldwide: One Canadian perspective. In Chris Thais, Gerd Bräuer, Paula Carlino, Lisa Ganobscisk-Williams, & Aparna Sinha (Eds.), *Writing programs worldwide: Profiles of academic writing in many places* (pp. 117-127). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2012.0346.2.10
Hamel, Marie-Josée, Séror, Jérémie, & Dion, Chantal. (2015). *Writers in action: Modelling and scaffolding second-language learners' writing process*. Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario.
Heller, Monica. (2008). *Repenser le plurilinguisme: langue, postnationalisme et la nouvelle économie mondialisée*. *Diversité urbaine*, 163-176.
Heller, Monica. (2011). *Paths to post-nationalism: A critical ethnography of language and identity* Oxford University Press.
Heller, Monica. (2015). *Sustaining the nation: The making and moving of language and nation*. Oxford University Press.
Hidden, Marie-Odile. (2013). *Pratiques d'écriture: Apprendre à rédiger en langue étrangère*. Hachette.
Hornberger, Nancy H., & Link, Holly. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: a biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 15*(3), 261-278.
Horner, Bruce, & Alvarez, Sara P. (2019). Defining translinguality. *Literacy in Composition Studies, 7*(2), 1-30.

Horner, Bruce, Lu, Min-Zhan, Royster, Jacqueline Jones, & Trimbur, John. (2011). Language difference in writing: Toward a translingual approach. *College English, 73*(3), 303-321.

Horner, Bruce, & Tetreault, Elliot. (2016). Translation as (global) writing. *Composition Studies, 44*(1), 13-30.

Jakobson, Roman. (1959/2000). On linguistic aspects of translation. In Lawrence Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 113-118). Routledge.

Kecskes, Istvan. (2010). Dual and multilanguage systems. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 7*(2), 91-109.

Kiefer, K., Palmquist, M., Carbone, N., Cox, M., & Melzer, D. (2021). *An Introduction to Writing Across the Curriculum*. https://wac.colostate.edu/resources/wac/intro/

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

Kymlicka, Will. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship*. Clarendon Press.

Kymlicka, Will. (2004). *Le mythe de la citoyenneté transnationale*. *Critique internationale* (23), 97-111.

Lépine, Martin, & Hébert, Manon. (2013). De l'intérêt de la notion de littératie en francophonie : un état des lieux en sciences de l'éducation. [On the relevance of the notion of literacy in Francophone countries: the situation in the field of education]. *Globe, 16*(1), 25-43.

Lewis, Gwyn, Jones, Bryn, & Baker, Colin. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*(7), 641-654.

Liddicoat, Anthony, & Zarate, Geneviève. (2009). *La didactique des langues et des cultures face à la circulation internationale des idées*. *Le français dans le mode,* 9-15.

Lonsdale, Allison Beeby. (1996). *Teaching translation from Spanish to English: Worlds beyond words*. University of Ottawa Press.

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

Lyster, Roy. (2019). Translanguaging in immersion: Cognitive support or social prestige? *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne des Langues Vivantes, 75*(4), 340-352.

MacSwan, Jeff. (2017). A Multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal, 54*(1), 167-201

Manchón, Rosa M. (2013). Writing. In François Grosjean & Ping Li (Eds.), *The psycholinguistics of bilingualism* (pp. 100-115). Wiley-Blackwell.

Mareschal, Geneviève. (2005). *L'enseignement de la traduction au Canada*. [The teaching of translation in Canada]. *Meta, 50*(1), 250-262.

Milson-Whyte, Vivette. (2014). Working English through code-meshing: implications for denigrated language varieties and their users. In Bruce Horner & Karen Kopelson (Eds.), *Reworking English in rhetoric and composition: Global interrogations, local interventions* (pp. 103-115). Southern Illinois University Press.

MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). *Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world*. https://www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Teaching-Enrollments-and-Programs/Foreign-Languages-and-Higher-Education-New-Structures-for-a-Changed-World

Moore, Danièle, & Gajo, Laurent. (2009). French voices on plurilingualism and pluriculturalism: Theory, significance and perspectives [Special Issue]. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 6*(2), 137-227.

Parini, Lorena. (2010). *Le concept de genre: constitution d'un champ d'analyse, controverses épistémologiques, linguistiques et politiques*. *Socio-logos. Revue de l'association française de sociologie,* (5).

Pavlenko, Aneta. (2005). Bilingualism and thought. In Judith Kroll & Annette De Groot (Eds.), *Handbook of bilingualism: Psycholinguistic approaches* (pp. 433-453). Oxford University Press.

Pym, Anthony. (2016). *Translation solutions for many languages: Histories of a flawed dream*. Bloomsbury.

Raus, Rachele. (2013). *La terminologie multilingue: La traduction des termes de l'égalité H/F dans le discours international*. de Boeck.

Rozycki, William V., Nagelhout, Ed, & Connor, Ulla. (2008). *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric* (Vol. 169). John Benjamins.

Statistics Canada. (2001). *Aboriginal languages (from Catalogue no. 89-589-XIE: Aboriginal Peoples Survey 2001—initial findings).* http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-589-x/4067801-eng.htm

Statistics Canada. (2015). Mother tongue of a person. Retrieved August 16, 2022 from https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3Var.pl?Function=DEC&Id=34023

Statistics Canada. (2017, August 31. Proportion of mother tongue responses for various regions in Canada, 2016 Canada. https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/dv-vd/lang/index-eng.cfm

Tardy, Christine M. (2009). *Building genre knowledge*. Parlor Press.

Turner, Brian, & Kearns, Judith. (2012). Department of rhetoric, writing, and communications at the University of Winnipeg. In Chris Thais, Gerd Bräuer, Paula Carlino, Lisa Ganobscisk-Williams, & Aparna Sinha (Eds.), *Writing programs worldwide: Profiles of academic writing in many places* (pp. 129-138). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2012.0346.2.11

Vinay, Jean-Paul, & Darbelnet, Jean. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation*. John Benjamins.