Centering Our Students' Languages and Cultures: WAC and a Cross-Disciplinary Collaboration

Joyce Meier
Michigan State University

Xiqiao Wang
University of Pittsburgh

Julia Kiernan
Lawrence Technological University

Cross-Disciplinary Snapshots

The writing department where this research is based has been a leader in developing translingual, transcultural, and transmodal pedagogical initiatives.[1] While the chapter authors remain engaged with pedagogical approaches that can be taken up at the curricular and program level, this contribution builds upon the understanding that the sharing of these experiences with colleagues across the university can be complicated by disciplinary contexts and approaches, as well as institutional and even political forces. Put simply: such an expansive endeavor is bound to be messy and (at times) disconnected, yet, we argue that the potential benefits in terms of student learning *and* improvement in faculty teaching writ large outweigh the various challenges. This chapter, then, begins with the disconnect and challenges felt by teachers across the university, which are captured through the following snapshots.

1. The writing professor who complains of the lack of international student participation in class discussion. They are unaware that international students often come from culturally inflected norms that do not value active engagement.
2. The sociology professor who struggles with time-tested sports metaphors. They have not considered that the explanatory power of these examples does not align with the diverse frames of references their students bring.
3. The biology professor who fails to unpack expectations to their students.

1 See. for example, Fraiberg et al. (2017), Gonzales (2015, 2018), Kiernan (2015, 2017, 2021). Kiernan et al. (2016, 2017, 2018), Meier (2018), Meier et al. (2018), Milu & Gomes (2021), Wang (2017, 2019a, 2019b, 2021).

DOI: https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-B.2023.1527.2.06

They have not realized that the nuances of many directional words such as "analyze," "synthesize," or "justify" are often lost to diverse students.

4. The anthropology professor who is concerned with lower-order language issues (e.g., subject-verb agreement) in their students' writing. They struggle to integrate an asset-based pedagogy which leverages students' languages and cultures.
5. The business professor who recognizes different levels of language expertise yet struggles to develop differentiated instruction. This results in lack of support for students with varying levels of English proficiency across modes.

We begin with these snapshots because while there has been increasing interest by rhetoric and composition scholars into translingual approaches across the disciplines, particularly in terms of language development and transfer, gaps remain in terms of what this perspective might look like in practice. As Bruce Horner (this volume) explains in the introduction to this collection, while many universities "officially claim to be 'global' in reach and foundation," there are few practical resources that enable complementary (and necessary) shifts in "curricular structures, placement practices, and support services." Moreover, as Jennifer Jenkins (2013) has argued, most academics tend to show international students tolerance rather than acceptance. These snapshots, then, not only indicate a strong need to create cross-disciplinary collaboration, as indicated in chapters in this edited collection (see for instance, Gail Shuck's discussion of the collaborative effort in revising the curriculum for a business writing course), but also inform the ways that our chapter approaches acceptance and critical awareness of difference, particularly linguistic difference. To this end, we provide university educators who seek to move away from monolingual assumptions, which position students' languages and cultures as barriers or deficits, with approaches that value difference as assets and resources for learning. Such posturing, however, is just the most recent in pedagogical discussions of deficit; as Glynda Hull et al. (1991) have noted, throughout the history of American education there has existed the perception that low-achievers are "lesser in character and fundamental ability" (p. 312). While the labelling of *who* these students are continues to shift, there remains an underlying—but often quickly accepted—stigma that certain groups of students have lower intellectual abilities. This work aligns with that of Jonathan Hall and Nela Navarro (this volume) who argue: "Transnational translingual literacies reflect not only how our students read and write, but also how we, as instructors, as staff, as administrators, *read them*. How . . . we conceive of their literacies, their identities, and how . . . these conceptions correspond—or not—to the students' own experiences of academic and personal transnational translingual literacies."

Our approach aims to extend these positionings into the WAC/WID conversation, which to date has examined a number of faculty development contexts,

including STEM (Manuel-Dupont, 1996; Zemliansky & Berry, 2017), second language writing (Cox, 2014; Lancaseter, 2011; Rose, 2016), multimodality (Duffelmeyer & Ellertson, 2005; Fodrey & Mikovits, 2020), and portfolio assessment (Peters & Robertson, 2007; Rutz & Grawe, 2009), but has paid less attention to university-wide faculty collaborations that engage translingual approaches and dispositions. We situate our work as a response to WAC/WID calls for transformative collaboration (Hall, 2009; Johns, 2001; Matsuda & Jablonski, 2000; Wolfe-Quintero & Sagade, 1999), including those voiced in various special issues and edited collections of WAC/WID scholarship (Cox & Zawacki, 2011; Hall, 2018b; Johns, 2005; Zawacki & Cox, 2014). Accordingly, this chapter, in examining the place of translingualism in WAC/WID partnerships, pushes back against the many "tried and trusted" assumptions our colleagues across the university bring with them to their teaching, arguing that these approaches are often no longer effective in classrooms populated by increasing numbers of multilingual students. Nevertheless, these outdated approaches remain because there has not been enough attention to how our pedagogies and programs—in every discipline—need to shift in order to provide courses that all students can excel in. Instead, the current monolingual status quo prevails in its maintenance of deficit models of multilingualism, which marginalizes many students (both domestic and international) as incompetent outsiders. Our chapter works to close this gap, providing evidence-based research on various strategies that acknowledge and embrace translingual approaches and dispositions, which, in turn, point to ways to foreground "mobility across borders" as "the operating condition of our work" (Horner, this volume) as teacher-researchers in WAC/WID contexts.

A Transdisciplinary Response to Translingual Exigencies

Institutional Context

Like many institutions of higher learning across the US, the university where this research is situated has witnessed a rapid and drastic increase of international students; for a five-year period, growth in the number of international students rose from 5% to 8% annually.[2] In 2017, roughly 10% of our undergraduate class (and 20% of our graduate class) were from non-U.S. countries (*International Studies*, n.d.). This overall demographic shift is felt most tellingly in the business and engineering departments. However, the writing department, where this research is grounded, is home to large numbers of international and multilingual students, who constitute roughly 80% of the students in our Preparation for College Writing

2 In the past year that number slightly declined as a result of anti-immigrant and anti-China rhetoric, as well as tightened visa-granting practices.

(PCW) bridge course. In 2012, supported by a university grant on inclusive teaching, a group of six PCW instructors and two teacher-administrators engaged in collaborative efforts to re-imagine this course. Meeting monthly for a two-year period, the group designed and refined a curriculum now featuring assignments and learning objectives that center the students' languages and cultures as sites of inquiry and resources for learning.

Faculty have worked to develop pedagogical tools that support undergraduate students' sustained examination of language difference; in many ways this work complements Hall and Navarro's work (in this collection), which calls for the development of best practices to support transnational graduate students. The undergraduate context of our research situates our pedagogical work as a way to help students complicate language difference as entangled in drastically different material conditions and contexts. In so doing, writing teachers have invited students—multilingual and monolingual, international and domestic—to recognize negotiation across languages and modes as the norm, and to develop meta-awareness and meta-vocabulary for describing and strategizing their rhetorical moves. By the same token, such pedagogies reposition writers as agents of their learning and call into question what John Trimbur (2016) calls the "unmarked hierarchies in U.S. college composition that have long assumed basic writing and second language writing were ancillary activities and institutions at the margins, orbiting around the mainstream English at the center in first-year composition" (p. 226). Similarly, these approaches invite teachers to rethink their own biases towards certain populations of students, building upon Hull et al.'s (1991) assertion that how teachers view students profoundly affects learning: "students whose teachers expect them to do well, tend to do well, while students whose teachers expect them to do poorly, do poorly" (p. 317).

Faculty Learning Commons

It is amidst such conversations of student success that the two-year Faculty Learning Commons (FLC), "Enriching the Faculty-International Student Experience," emerged. Instructors across the university, including two PCW teachers, met monthly over a two-year period with the goal of discussing the pedagogical challenges and opportunities raised by the presence of international multilingual students, which has subsequently increased the visibility of diverse learners across campus. This study diverges from other recent work in this area (Cavazos et al., 2018; Hall, 2018a, 2018b; Hartse et al., 2018; Hendricks, 2018; Horner, 2018, etc.) concerned with language and transdisciplinarity across language-centric programs (e.g., writing, composition, SLW, applied linguistics, English literature, etc.) in its attention to collaboration across disciplines spanning humanities, life and social sciences, engineering, and business. What these collaborations have surfaced

are many of the same challenges colleagues in writing programs have encountered: constraints exacerbated by an inability to engage with students whose diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds do not fit into the Western post-secondary monolingual norm. What we strive to surface in this chapter is that cultural and linguistic assumptions are regularly "inaccurate and limiting," particularly in their implications that these learners are "cognitively defective" (Hull et al., 1991, p. 299). For example, many university instructors who attended the FLC cited the difficulties of teaching "content" in classes with large numbers of multilingual students with diverse political, economic, historical, and social views; such differences were seen as further compounded by students' diversely inflected abilities in written and spoken Standard English.

Collecting and Analyzing Faculty Narratives

During the two-year FLC, which held monthly meetings, the first and second author, who participated in the conversations, generated a corpus of field notes that captured the broad flow of conversation for each meeting. Our field notes reflected our varied professional interests. Joyce's notes reflected her concerns as a writing program administrator who was leading various programmatic and pedagogical initiatives within the writing department; Xiqiao's notes reflected her interests in pedagogical innovation and teacher training, as she was an active participant of a collaborative teacher research project within the department. Following each FLC meeting, Joyce and Xiqiao met to discuss important themes emerging from the meetings, as we synthesized our notes, reconstructed problematic teaching scenarios shared by faculty across the disciplines, prepared debrief memos (eight in total) that were shared during faculty training events within the department, and worked to develop ideas for faculty development videos. In addition to notes and memos we generated, we also drew on memos (seven in total) created by the leaders of the FLC, which captured other dimensions that were missed in our individual notes.

As a research team, we engaged in triangulated reading of these strands of data (notes, memos, and conversations) to construct compelling scenarios that pointed to exigencies for faculty training in translingual pedagogy across disciplines, to unpack and interpret such teaching scenarios as embodying broader tensions between monolingual ideologies that inform instruction and messy, multilingual realities of our students, and to offer pedagogical recommendations. Our positionalities, as transnational individuals with divergent experiences with not only learning and teaching, but also our experiences with language and language negotiation across disciplinary fields, informed the approaches we take when working through our data. For instance, Joyce's extensive experiences organizing pedagogical workshops that highlight best practices within and beyond the writing program has enabled

her to identify common themes and innovative pedagogical practices; Julia's disciplinary border crossing, which was embodied in her teaching a wide array of writing courses (e.g., basic, science, engineering) across various institutional contexts, has given her insights into the unique challenges of integrating translingual principles in disciplinary fields beyond first-year writing; Xiqiao's background as a biliterate scholar and an international student has helped her identify problematic scenarios from the perspectives of multilingual students. Working recursively through our notes and memos, which were segmented at passage levels and coded inductively, we allowed themes to naturally emerge (e.g., American-centric frames of reference, disciplinary jargon, culturally inflected frames of participation, material structure, etc.), which were then interpreted through the lens of translingual theory and pedagogy, with particular attention to the

1. need to disrupt monolingual orientation manifested pedagogically, linguistically, and materially, and
2. the need to listen to students' voices and leverage their languages, cultures, and educational experiences, and
3. the benefits and challenges of not only sustaining collaborative cross-disciplinary conversations, but engaging in collaborative innovation, refinement, and dissemination of pedagogical knowledge generated therein.

This chapter describes and analyzes not only this two-year FLC, but also the subsequent initiatives that emerged from it: including a small "tool-kit" disseminated at two "teaching tailgates"; subsequent conversations between business and writing instructors; and the creation of online materials to be made available on a campus-wide virtual hub offering pedagogical resources and workshops. While the FLC provided the opportunity to discuss challenges and propose solutions across disciplinary lines, institutional responses are just beginning to emerge.

The primary goal of each initiative has been to develop cross-disciplinary pedagogical tools that center students' languages and cultures as sites of inquiry. Each of our responses positions multilingual students' knowledge as a potential learning tool that moves against hierarchical styles of classroom teaching that emphasize blanket "content coverage" over student inquiry and learning—a shift that is "good pedagogy for everyone" (Zamel, 1995, p. 519). While such strategies may seem commonplace in discussions of translingual scholarship, they have rarely moved past the disciplinary boundaries of rhetoric and composition. In positioning our research at this axis of translingual scholarship, we consider how pedagogy that employs students' skills in rhetorical attunement—the "literate understanding that assumes multiplicity and invites the negotiation of meaning across difference" (Leonard, 2014, p. 228)—can exist across disciplines.

We position such considerations against the backdrop of pedagogical theories that argue for the importance of drawing upon students' experiences, languages,

and cultures to support their learning. From a neo-Vgotskyian notion of the zone of proximal development (Eun, 2017) onward, educators have recognized that successful learners put new information in relation to what they already know. Leveraging what is known as the "learning edge momentum" (Robins, 2010, p. 40), we stress the value of scaffolding and framing new knowledge in relation to the familiar—including the students' home languages and cultural knowledge. We problematize the conflation of what is taught and how it is taught, especially when content is conceived as culturally and linguistically neutral, or when delivery is imagined through the lens of the "banking metaphor" (Freire, 1968). As Suresh Canagarajah (2016) asserts, people in the communicative process "use all the resources at their disposal . . . such as objects, gestures, and the body, for meaning-making" (p. 450). In particular, we suggest how teachers might create opportunities in their teaching for students to place what is new alongside what is familiar. Echoing Canagarajah (2016) and Laura Gonzales (2015), we emphasize the importance of incorporating alternate modes of communication in the negotiation of meaning. In describing these moves we focus on ideologies of familiarity, and present two themes from our collective sharing of and reflection on the FLC stories of struggle and success.

Situating Cross-Disciplinary Collaboration within WAC/WID Translingual Conversations

This study responds to earlier conversations concerning WAC/WID approaches to translingualism; namely, the FLC illustrates one way to "create opportunities where they [i.e., multilingual, international students] can use all their language resources as they navigate through changing academic and community contexts" (Cavazos et al., 2018, p. 23). Moreover, as Joel Heng Hartse et al. (2018) suggest, curricular development needs to involve instructors across various disciplinary backgrounds reimagining their current monolingual approaches. Despite the many voices in translingual scholarship that argue towards these ends, the prevailing attitude across the university by and large maintains that multilingual international students are coming to us with a variety of deficits. Consequently, one of the primary roles of the FLC was to question deficit models: to explain why there is a "need to sing the praises of 'minimal marking' to sometimes-skeptical instructors in disciplinary courses" (Hall, 2018b, p. 41), and to surface that "the particular rhetorical configuration that we call standardized correctness is not written in stone but rather is subject to trillions of micro-negotiations every day" (Hall, 2018b, p. 42).

In this way, we agree with Alyssa Cavazos et. al (2018) that a "translingual approach not only responds to the 'emerging exigencies of diversity' in the classroom but also provides the framework for offering teacher training across disciplines" (p. 15). Like Jerry Won Lee and Christopher Jenks (2016), however, we understand

translingual dispositions as valuable in their openness to individual linguistic and rhetorical choices, which can be transferred within and beyond language learning, specifically seen in critiques of the "division of labor model," where SLW and WAC/WID studies are separate rather than overlapping (Johns, 2000; Matsuda, 1998; Matsuda & Jablonski, 2000). We also acknowledge a translingual perspective's capacity to surface the unique linguistic and cultural abilities that students bring to writing and other communicative practices.

As Hall (2009) notes, the population of international students in U.S. classrooms continues to rise, creating a landscape he categorizes as the "Next America," a place where "living one's whole life in one language seems as odd as eating the same thing for dinner" (p. 35). In Hall's "Next America," multilingualism will be the norm—and in fact, already *is* the norm in many parts of the world as well as communities throughout the US. However, while transdisciplinary collaboration outside the field of composition and rhetoric is still emerging, our FLC work suggests that "engaging in transdisciplinary conversations with our colleagues is critical in responding to the linguistic needs and assets of our students" (Cavazos et al., 2018, p. 21). This is especially important when one considers that diverse learner experiences, particularly linguistic experiences, are regularly regarded as a "marginal, or at least technical, issue by many members of university faculty" (Jenkins, 2013, p. 11). Jenkins goes on to argue that a major driver of deficit models, especially those contingent on the usage of SWE, is the lack of critical reflection and, thus, pedagogical transformation: "A current irony of Anglophone HE [Higher Education] is that the very faculty who criticize international (particularly East Asian) students for a perceived lack of criticality are often the very same faculty who lack critical skills themselves when it comes to reflecting on the linguistic correlates of internationalization" (Jenkins, 2013, p. 13). However, our FLC experiences point to ways that colleagues across our university have opened themselves up to critical reflection and transformation. This chapter, then, offers one example of faculty who have chosen not to "remain securely ensconced in their disciplinary silos, but instead to experience friction, discomfort, ambiguity of affiliation, weakening or erasure of boundaries, learning and integration of elements from different disciplines, overlapping of intellectual territories, blurring of academic identities" (Hall, 2018a).

These translingual, cross-disciplinary collaborations are also exponentially rewarding, both for the teachers involved and the students who will reap the benefits from the hard (and often departmentally unappreciated) work of their professors. Hall warns that "[w]e may see boundary work of various kinds, complex gestures of rejection and inclusion, ambivalent acceptance and conflicted resistance, often simultaneous, in the responses of several disciplines to the translingual challenge" (2018b, p. 29). Moreover, shifts from multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary to cross-disciplinary require collaborative efforts that cannot be bound by traditional

academic silo-ing (Hendricks, 2018), and as a result must occur "between disciplinarity and the institutional material social vagaries" (Horner, 2018, p. 78). As we have noted, translingualism has often been regulated to the work of those in language-centric disciplines; however, with Hall's "Next America," there is a need to situate translingualism as also transdisciplinary. What follows are early snapshots of this impending reality.

Disrupting Norms

The following section offers two approaches that can contribute to the disruption of hierarchical monolingual assumptions and norms. We offer snapshots from faculty conversations to reveal the challenges faced when attempts to shift one's stance are made. These are followed by detailed analyses of the monolingual norms embodied in each snapshot, ending with recommendations for practice.

De-Familiarizing Language

Snapshots

Jake from the business college described an instance when he discovered that international students demonstrated a pattern of failure in responding to one essay question in particular. The question, inviting discussions of pricing strategies, relies on a business scenario for setting the prices for hard candy and chocolate candy in a grocery chain store. International students' struggles, he discovered, were not due to a lack of understanding of the business principle, but resulted from failures to distinguish American brand names commonly associated with different types of candy. Jackie, an anthropology professor, reported that she had discovered, entirely by accident, that a multilingual student had interpreted the word "transcript" (a mandatory part of the assignment) to mean his *college* transcript—and not a "transcript" of the field interviews he previously conducted. And, Mishka, a biology professor, shared an episode when she discovered that one of their common terms—"nocturnal"—was actually unfamiliar to the majority of their students. These snapshots make clear the need to examine the role of instructional language that embodies the norms and referential frames of academia, which are grounded in western cultural contexts that are too often out of reach to non-traditional students—both monolingual and multilingual.

Unpacking Language Norms of Academia

Often, classroom practices and expectations assumed as the "norm" may be presented in language that is unfamiliar to multilingual students who come from a variety of educational systems. Indeed, teachers may incorporate discursive tools such

as "piggy-back on" or "dovetailing" into classroom practices—words that along with the cultures they reflect may be inscrutable to others. "Dovetailing," for example, may be used to give affirmation to a previously stated opinion, and to gain the floor for oneself; to "piggy-back on" may suggest how one's idea builds on another's. Yet, both words reflect teaching strategies that are often unfamiliar to students with limited experiences or strategies for navigating seminar style classroom discussions that are framed in said linguistic knowledge. Consequently, instructors who use these strategies might encounter confusion and inaction on the students' part due to a profound gap between understandings of discursive and material conventions students and instructors bring to the table.

Such gaps can be informed by culturally inflected educational practices across national contexts, but it could be equally present for novice learners learning to navigate disciplinarily specific discursive conventions and modes of reasoning. Indeed, monolingual students from the US may struggle equally to engage with the type of intellectual moves embodied by instructional language. This insight is well illustrated in an informal research study conducted by graduate students in our writing department, which explored undergraduate students' stated confusion about the directional verbs so frequently used in assignment descriptions, such as "analyze," "synthesize," and "justify." As observed, both multilingual and monolingual undergraduate students expressed considerable bewilderment when asked to interpret the specific tasks required by the directional words that typify so many assignments. Similar concerns surfaced in our FLC, as professors from across campus complained that multilingual students had trouble "following the directions." Further complicating the issue for multilingual students is the lack of instructional theories embodied by such words—to say nothing of disciplinary differences (e.g., "analyzing" might embody different intellectual tasks in supply chain management versus literary studies). Furthermore, translations of directional words such as "synthesize," "summarize," and "annotate" might share the same signifier, have opaque meanings, or carry meanings in students' home languages that diverge from instructor expectations.

Recommendations

Such moments can provide opportunities for the instructor to creatively unpack and disrupt norms of participation, such as explicit instruction and modelling. To facilitate students' navigation of such discursive and material practices, instructors could spend some class time unpacking the meanings of frequently used floor-claiming words, modeling and creating opportunities for practicing such strategies, and explaining behaviors, modes of thinking, and textual practices expected therein (Hall, 2009). Such practices of unpacking can be incorporated into discussions of the instructional language used to frame assignments and activities, which are often interpreted differently by multilingual and monolingual students alike.

Another approach is to introduce a version of Think-Pair-Share that makes space for students to put these new words and practices in relationship with their own prior knowledge. For instance, Joyce, a writing professor, has incorporated a Write-Map-Draw model that highlights the "Think" part, and invites students' perspectives on a given classroom procedure that might be construed as "new" (e.g., what does it mean to "'piggy-back on" a student's comments, to "dovetail" two differing strands of arguments, or to "incorporate" one idea within another?).

Additionally, multimodal examples, such as a visual illustration of a person riding on the back of another, can further clarify the discursive practice of "piggy-back on." Xiqiao, a writing instructor, has also worked with students to construct visual maps of classrooms as culturally inflected spaces, in which spatial arrangements of artifacts, texts, and bodies often reflect cultural conventions for participation. Integrating multiple modes of exploring and representing language practices of the classroom can be particularly useful in facilitating instructors' learning about their students' linguistic, educational, and cultural backgrounds. In this way, leveraging multimodal tools of representation can also help instructors to meet their multilingual students halfway. Moving between modes as well as between languages assumes, as Rebecca Lorimer Leonard and Rebecca Nowacek (2016) put it, a translingual approach that positions "language difference as a locus of meaning rather than a problem. . . . a norm of language-in-practice, one of its meaning-making functions" (p. 260, p. 261). Moving (writing) teachers across the discipline toward such an approach—what Leonard and Nowacek cite as a "more tolerant attitude toward language varieties"—has the potential not only to "affect a writer's sense of options and actual choices" (p. 260), but to deepen their disciplinary vocabulary and knowledge.

Together, these strategies work in concert to provide space for the students' own perspectives or interpretations of such words, as well as class exercises that ask students to imagine what they think the expectations of a given assignment might be. Students could be invited to share their sense of what a given directional word might mean with a partner, and then bring forward an example of how one practices it to the larger class. Such activities make visible the student's understanding, encourage modeling and explicit instruction, allowing students and teacher alike to come to a shared understanding of the given task, and help enable transfer across contexts**.** Such strategies, which focus on unpacking and demystifying both language and classroom practices, can be especially useful to students who might operate with alternative cultural norms for classroom participation.

Informed by such thinking is a pedagogical theme that our evolving ITeach web resource explores: the collaborative identification and construction of a list of pedagogical language and disciplinary jargon (Gentil, 2018), which can then be used to create a shared baseline that students can refer to, raise questions about, and use to organize their conversations. In the cross-disciplinary examples cited at the beginning

of this section, visual illustration of the word "nocturnal," along with an image of night and the collective decision to enter the word into a shared classroom glossary could help cement students' understanding of its meaning, thereby addressing a gap that prevents students from grappling with an important threshold concept in the discipline.

In writing classrooms, we have also found embodied learning a useful pedagogical tool in unpacking and facilitating students' understanding of disciplinary concepts. For example, Joyce now uses the visual symbol of "a chain," both embodied through a frequently recycled gesture of her interlocked hands and a visual illustration of knots in a chain, to introduce the pragmatic functions of transitional strategies. To facilitate students' understanding of tense inflection, Xiqiao uses a timeline activity, which invites students to position their bodies in line to indicate nodes in time. While the class reads a narrative, students step forward and backward to indicate shifts in time and therefore the need for verbs to undergo tense inflection. Doing so allows for collective exploration of what Jody Shipka calls the "potentials of alternative, hybrid, mixed, and experimental forms of discourse" (Shipka, 2011, p. 3).

In turn, students might be invited to use more than one means in communicating their understanding of class material back to the instructor. Jessica, a faculty member from the School of Planning, Design and Construction, discussed her ongoing effort to revise her pedagogy in response to shifting demographics. Working to surface student knowledge in ways that conventional practice (e.g., verbal participation) fails to achieve, Jessica instituted an impromptu speaking component, where students were invited to present their ideas on certain topics. She found upon initial trial that this activity allowed differentiation between the students who exercise high capability in language versus those who do not. Furthermore, such assessment revealed the inherent heterogeneity within a seemingly homogeneous group of students: a reticent student can be a strong writer and a careful reader; conversely an outspoken student might struggle with written modes of communication. Opening up the classroom space to include/mix multiple modes of communication (e.g., inviting short writing before verbal sharing; using drawing to represent procedures and ideas; pairing students with differential levels of speaking, writing, listening, and reading capacities in jigsaw models; inviting students to map/diagram key class concepts) allows for multiple opportunities for students to leverage their linguistic repertoire, and thereby ensure that course grades reflect a realistic assessment of students' level of mastery of a full breadth of required knowledge and competence.

Defamiliarizing Culture

Snapshots

Jessie, an anthropology faculty member, expressed frustration with her Chinese students who struggled to engage with her reference to "kinship" as analogous to

the relationship between siblings. For years, Jessie has incorporated such tried-and-true analogies into class lectures, with the understanding that these "familiar" comparisons will aid her students' learning of new (course) concepts. Now faced with an increasing number of international students in her classes, though, Jessie encounters blank stares when she introduces these ideas to her students by way of her familiar analogies. Similarly, Max, a business professor, bemoans the fact that his trusted baseball metaphors—artfully sprinkled throughout his lectures—leave his (now mostly Chinese) students lost. In both cases, the issue is not the professor's well-intentioned desire to build on the students' prior knowledge, and to introduce the unfamiliar by way of the familiar, but rather that their analogies are based on cultural assumptions and practices that may be unknown to non-U.S. students with different cultural backgrounds.

Disrupting Taken-for-granted Academic and Cultural Norms

For many faculty members, the need for pedagogical change is most tellingly felt when familiar cultural references, examples, and allusions stop working. In such moments, students must not only unpack task- and disciplinary-related language, but also cultural allusions and knowledge that is Western-centric. The problem, however, is not that these cultural references are used, but that they go unexplained, when ironically, the teacher using them sees these as the very means by which a particular concept may be clarified. That is, drawing on neo-Vygotskian notions of the zone of proximal development, the teacher chooses these allusions in order to aid student understanding, so that the student may put the new information into relationship with what is perceived as common knowledge. However, in Jessie's case, it was only through conversing with students outside of class that they discovered students' struggles with the concept of "kinship," which were deeply rooted in unique cultural family structures. For students raised in a single-child family typical for Chinese millennials and Generation Z, the notion of kinship may often be experienced differently—as extended family; for many of our Arabic students, kinship may be tribal. Differences such as these also surface in the writing classroom.

When Joyce designed a service-learning component that encouraged multilingual, international writers to share a cultural story in a third-grade classroom, many of her (mostly Chinese) students expressed apprehension about working with the children because of limited experiences with siblings. As a result, Joyce created teams of students, where a self-identified "child-expert" was placed with a group of students who felt less experienced. The point is that cultural assumptions based on Western notions of family structure may cause experiences of unnecessary disjuncture and confusion on the part of students from other cultures. Moments such as these encourage educators to challenge taken-for-granted frames of reference that may be inaccessible. Students learn on the edge of what they already know; the very point of using an analogy or example is to help put the unfamiliar (e.g., course

content) in relationship to the familiar (e.g., lived experience). Yet ironically, when instructors rely on cultural allusions that are often unfamiliar to their students, they create a kind of "double learning" challenge—students must master not only the disciplinary content but also the unfamiliar cultural reference.

Recommendations

One solution is for the instructor to make the cultural allusion itself more available to the students through verbal explanation or multimodal demonstration. In the FLC, for example, a biology instructor described how he had brought a rose (a relatively "Western" plant) to class and passed it around for the students to feel. This (in many ways exemplary) multimodal experience was intended to give students unfamiliar with this particular plant the opportunity to feel it (thorns included), before the professor launched into his lecture on the means by which such plants both propagate and protect themselves. Clearly, this is an instance of the teacher taking the time to make a more abstract concept (plant propagation and protection) familiar to his students, vis-a-vis multimodality, especially since he was not sure that the mostly non-U.S. students in his biology class would be familiar with such a plant.

Another suggestion is that instructors learn to shift their frames of reference to include input from the students themselves. For example, in a faculty workshop held on our campus several years ago, an art history professor expressed frustration at how few of their international students seemed to understand the cultural impact of the Renaissance—that is, until they invited them to name their own culture's "Renaissance." Asking her (mostly non-U.S.) students to name a historical moment or time that had changed the trajectory of their home cultures, they then had them make these moments visible on a class timeline marked by the centuries. The resulting class timeline ended up demonstrating a world history that instantly became much more complex and actually quite ancient—predating the Western-based Renaissance by centuries— thus making visible the very "oldness" of the Chinese, African, and Arabic histories thus delineated. Finally, by putting the Western "Renaissance" in relationship to their own prior knowledge and histories, the students were able to more fully grasp the concept at hand.

Thus, we encourage instructors to incorporate students' own examples and analogies. For instance, as writing instructors we have worked to leverage the students' own linguistic, rhetorical, and cultural resources through a translation narrative assignment in first-year writing, which invites students' individual translation of cultural texts from their home language into English (Kiernan et al., 2015). Student-generated cultural idioms, stories, and lyrics as well as disciplinary texts written in other languages become sites of inquiry as monolingual *and* multilingual students examine the intersection of multiple perspectives, interpretative frames, rhetorical traditions, and linguistic forms. In so doing, teachers can support students' development of translingual dispositions and practices by surfacing purposeful movements

across languages and cultures. Students in such classes engage in focused analysis of the exigencies and consequences of linguistic and cultural crossing.

Responding to such pedagogical challenges, our team has been working to develop teacher-training modules for faculty members across disciplinary backgrounds and to facilitate sustained pedagogical inquiry. Working in collaboration with a Chinese undergraduate student, hired as co-researcher and videographer over the course of spring 2019, the team produced the first training module in an upcoming series which will feature a fictional scenario (grounded in examples provided by students) that illustrates the urgent need for instructors to shift—or at the very least unpack—their cultural frames of reference.

The scenario depicts a group of international students expressing befuddlement when their economics instructor introduces the classic supply-and-demand curve by making an analogy to football's alternating lines of scrimmage (e.g., where defense players adjust to the shifting offence positions). In the video, the depiction makes visible the "untranslatability" of cultural references in facilitating the learning of a complicated disciplinary concept. The video portrays the layering of these complex, culturally inflected references, and the resulting cognitive confusion of the students, before going on to suggest alternative practices that instead draw more on the students' own cultural perspectives—in other words, drawing on the students' own "funds of knowledge" (Gonzalez et al., 2005; Paris, 2012). Thus, the video argues for the peril of relying on U.S.-centric frames of reference, which not only can cause cognitive overload for students who must juggle two unfamiliar cultural/disciplinary concepts at the same time, but also risks silencing and dismissing students' languages and cultures as irrelevant for disciplinary learning.

When instructors across the disciplines open up their classrooms to include and appreciate the multiple learning-based and identity-based cultures that are embodied by the students' own knowledge, they also make more transparent classroom and learning expectations. Implementing such pedagogies ensures that students have the opportunities to leverage their cultural repertoire as a whole, thereby ensuring that course grades reflect a realistic assessment of students' level of mastery of required knowledge and competence. In other words, once more we second Zamel's (1995) thought here: adopting such practices in the express interest of better teaching of multilingual students translates as "good pedagogy for everyone" (p. 519).

Concluding Thoughts on Recognizing and Challenging Deficit Pedagogy

As we have argued, every department across every university will be impacted by the upswing in undergraduate international students, domestic multilinguals, and non-traditional monolingual students. The shift in student demographics does not,

however, need to be positioned as a detriment to our teaching. Instead, reflecting upon and repositioning our pedagogical approaches in light of understanding how to teach to increasingly diverse groups of students, how to identify their goals and aspirations, and how to stay true to disciplinary and institutional traditions, standards, and expectations will enable educators across the university to design classroom spaces that are rich in engagement and inclusivity.

The cross-disciplinary conversations that this chapter has grown out of illustrate how collaborative initiatives that build upon the sharing of pedagogical experiences are able to shape not only the contexts and the exigencies of particular disciplines, but also the larger cultural and linguistic contexts of the university. For instance, while the broad goals of the FLC collaboration were to invite faculty input for extant practices in accommodating international students enrolled in their classes—to discuss benefits and challenges, to identify areas for cross-unit coordination, and to generate best practices—an unexpected advantage of this work was collaborating with colleagues across the university, with whom we rarely engage in our professional lives. Hence, while the siloing of our academic disciplines continues to be a major challenge in disseminating and adopting translingual approaches, our colleagues across the university were open to engaging with pedagogies that expressed a "willingness to explore with students what they care to advance about people, languages and cultures in which they are identified and may identify, and how and why and when to do it" (Lu & Horner, 2013, p. 600). It is this willingness that lies at the center of such collaborative success, and it is this willingness that we suggest you seek out at your own institutions. And, yes, while this process will continue to be frustrating and messy—with many starts and stops—we hold firm that it will be rewarding for both faculty *and* students, which we position as a central tenet of our own engagement with translingual approaches and adoption of translingual dispositions.

References

Canagarajah, Suresh. (2016). First-person singular: Crossing borders, addressing diversity. *Language Teaching*, *49*(3), 438-454.

Cavazos, Alyssa, Hebbard, Marcela, Hernández, Jose, Rodriguez, Crystal, & Schwarz, Geoffrey. (2018). Advancing a transnational, transdisciplinary and translingual framework: A professional development series for teaching assistants in writing and Spanish programs. *Across the Disciplines*, *15*(3), 11-27. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2018.15.3.09

Cox, Michelle. (2014). In response to today's "felt need": WAC, faculty development, and second language writers. In Terry M. Zawacki & Michelle Cox (Eds.), *WAC and second language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices* WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. (pp. 299-326). https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2014.0551.2.12

Cox, Michelle, & Zawacki, Terry Myers (Eds.). (2011). WAC and second language writing: Cross-field research, theory, and program development [Special issue]. *Across the Disciplines, 8*(4). https://wac.colostate.edu/atd/special/ell/

Duffelmeyer, Barb Blakely, & Ellertson, Anthony. (2005). Critical visual literacy: Multimodal communication across the curriculum. *Across the Disciplines*, *3*. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2006.3.2.02

Eun, Barohny. (2019). The zone of proximal development as an overarching concept: A framework for synthesizing Vgotsky's ideas. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 51*(1), 18-30.

Fodrey, Crystal N., & Meg Mikovits. (2020). Theorizing WAC faculty development in multimodal project design. *Across the Disciplines*, *17*(1/2), 42-58. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2020.17.1-2.04

Fraiberg, Steven, Wang, Wiziao, & You, Xiaoye. (2017). *Inventing the world grant university*: *Chinese international students' mobilities, literacies, and identities.* Utah State University Press.

Freire, Paulo. (2008, 1968). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* (M. Ramos, Trans.) (1970). Continuum.

Gonzales, Laura. (2015). Multimodality, translingualism, and rhetorical genre studies. *Composition Forum*, *31*. http://compositionforum.com/issue/31/multimodality.php

Gonzales, Laura. (2018). *Sites of translation: What multilinguals can teach us about digital writing and rhetoric.* University of Michigan Press.

González, Norma, Moll, Luis C., & Amanti, Cathy. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms.* Routledge.

Hall, Jonathan. (2009). WAC/WID in the next America: Redefining professional identity in the age of the multilingual majority. *The WAC Journal*, *20*(3), 33-40. https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2009.20.1.03

Hall, Jonathan. (2018a). Introduction to the special issue: Rewriting disciplines, rewriting boundaries. *Across the Disciplines*, *15*(3), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2018.15.3.08

Hall, Jonathan. (2018b). The translingual challenge: Boundary work in rhetoric & composition, second language writing, and WAC/WID. *Across the Disciplines*, *15*(3), 28-47. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2018.15.3.10

International Studies & Programs. Office for International Students and Scholars: Statistical Report. (n.d.). Retrieved October 14, 2022, from https://oiss.isp.msu.edu/about/statistical-report/

Heng Hartse, Joel, Lockett, Michael, & Ortabasi, Melek. (2018). Languaging about language in an interdisciplinary writing-intensive course. *Across the Disciplines*, *15*(3), 89–102. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2018.15.3.14

Hendricks, C. C. (2018). WAC/WID and transfer: Towards a transdisciplinary view of academic writing. *Across the Disciplines*, *15*(3), 48-62. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2018.15.3.11

Horner, Bruce. (2018). Translinguality and disciplinary reinvention. *Across the Disciplines*, *15*(3), 76-88. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2018.15.3.13

Hull, Glynda, Rose, Mike, Fraser, Kay Losey, & Castellano, Marisa. (1991). Remediation as social construct: Perspectives from an analysis of classroom discourse. *College Composition and Communication*, *42*(3), 299-329.

Hynd, Cynthia, Holsehuh, Jodi Patrick, & Hubbard, Betty P. (2004). Thinking like a historian: College students' reading of multiple historical documents. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *36*(2), 141-176.

Jenkins, Jennifer. (2013). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. Routledge.

Johns, Ann M. (2001). ESL students and WAC programs: Varied populations and diverse needs. In Susan H. McLeod, Eric Miraglia, Margot Soven, & Christopher Thaiss. (Eds.), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing writing-across-the-curriculum programs.* NCTE.

Johns, Ann M. (2005). The linguistically-diverse student: Challenges and possibilities across the curriculum [Special issue]. *Across the Disciplines*, *2.* https://wac.colostate.edu/atd/special/lds/

Kiernan, Julia, Meier, Joyce, & Wang, Xiqiao (Eds.). (2018). "Introduction." [Special issue on transnational pedagogy]. *Journal of Global Literacies, Technologies, and Emerging Pedagogies, 4(*3), 647-654.

Kiernan, Julia, Meier, Joyce, & Wang, Xiqiao. (2017). Curricular shifts in reading and writing: Centering students' languages and cultures within reflective practices of translation. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, *17,* 1-18.

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

Kiernan, Julia. (2021). A framework for linguistically inclusive course design. In Julia Kiernan, Alanna Frost, & Suzanne Blum Malley, (Eds.), *Translingual pedagogical perspectives: Teaching writing in the North American composition classroom*. Utah State University Press.

Kiernan, Julia. (2017). Translation narratives: Engaging second language learners in transnational literacy practices. In David M. Palfreyman & Christa van der Walt (Eds.), *Academic biliteracies: Translanguaging and multilingual repertoires in higher education settings.* Multilingual Matters.

Kiernan, Julia. (2015). Multimodal and translingual composing practices: A culturally based needs assessment of second language learners. *Journal of Global Literacies, Technologies, and Emerging Pedagogies, 3*(1), 302-321.

Lancaster, Zak. (2011). Interpersonal stance in L1 and L2 students' argumentative writing in economics: Implications for faculty development in WAC/WID programs. *Across the Disciplines*, *8*(4), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2011.8.4.22

Lee, Jerry Won, & Jenks, Christopher. (2016). Doing translingual dispositions. *College Composition and Communication*, *68*(2), 317-344.

Leonard, Rebecca Lorimer, and Rebecca Nowacek. (2016). Transfer and translingualism. *College English, 78*(3), 258-264.

Manuel-Dupont, Sonia. (1996). Writing-across-the-curriculum in an engineering program. *Journal of Engineering Education*, *85*(1), 35-40.

Matsuda, Paul Kei, and Jeffrey Jablonski. (2000). Beyond the L2 metaphor: Towards a mutually transformative model of ESL/WAC collaboration. *academic.writing, 1*.

Meier, Joyce. (2018). Multimodal, embodied learning and listening: ELLs and intercultural dialogue in two community projects. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, *18*(2), 147-164.

Meier, Joyce, Gannon, Bree, Caesar, Cheryl, & Medei, David. (2018). Translingual pedagogy, rhetorical listening, and multimodal experiences in a first-year writing conference that fosters intercultural learning. [Special issue]. *Journal of Global Literacies, Technologies, and Emerging Pedagogies, 4*(3), 714-740.

Milu, Esther, & Gomes, Matt. (2021). "Hay un tiempo y un lugar para todo": Students' writing and rhetorical strategies in a translingual pedagogy. In Julia Kiernan, Alanna Frost, & Suzanne Blum Malley (Eds.), *Translingual pedagogical perspectives: Engaging domestic and international students in the composition classroom*. Utah State University Press.

Paris, Django. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher, 41*(3), 93-97.

Peters, Brad, & Robertson, Julie Fisher. (2007). Portfolio partnerships between faculty and WAC: Lessons from disciplinary practice, reflection, and transformation. *College Composition and Communication*, *59*(2), 206-236.

Robins, Anthony. (2010). Learning edge momentum: A new account of outcomes in CS1. *Computer Science Education, 20*(1), 37-71.

Rutz, Carol, & Grawe, Nathan D. (2009). Pairing WAC and quantitative reasoning through portfolio assessment and faculty development. *Across the Disciplines*, *6*(2). https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2009.6.1.04

Shanahan, Timothy, & Shanahan, Cynthia. (2012). What is disciplinary literacy and why does it matter? *Topics in language disorders*, *32*(1), 7-18.

Shipka, Jody. (2011). *Toward a composition made whole*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Trimbur, John. (2016). Translingualism and close reading. *College English, 78*(3), 219-227.

Wang, Xiqiao. (2021). Writing-theory cartoon: Toward a translingual and multimodal pedagogy. In Julia Kiernan, Alanna Frost, & Suzanne Blum Malley, (Eds.), *Translingual pedagogical perspectives: Teaching writing in the North American composition classroom*. Utah State University Press.

Wang, Xiqiao. (2019a). Observing literacy learning across WeChat and first-year writing: A scalar analysis of one transnational student's multilingualism. *Computers and Composition, 52*, 253-271.

Wang, Xiqiao. (2019b). Tracing connections and disconnects: Reading, writing, and digital literacies across contexts. *College Composition and Communication, 70*(4), 560-589.

Wang, Xiqiao. (2017). Developing translingual disposition through a writing theory cartoon assignment. *Journal of Basic Writing, 36*(1), 44-73. https://doi.org/10.37514/JBW-J.2017.36.1.04

Wolfe-Quintero, Kate, & Segade, Gabriela. (1999). University support for second-language writers across the curriculum. In Linda Harklau, Kay M. Losey, & Meryl Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 191-209). Routledge.

Zamel, Vivian. (1995). Strangers in academia: The experiences of faculty and ESL students across the curriculum. *College Composition and Communication, 46*(4), 506-521.

Zawacki, Terry Myers & Cox, Michelle. (Eds.). (2014). *WAC and second language writers: research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices*. The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2014.0551

Zemliansky, Pavel, & Berry, Landon. (2017). A writing-across-the-curriculum faculty development program: An experience report. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, *60*(3), 306-316.