Languaging Across the Curriculum: Why WAC Needs CLA (and Vice Versa)

SHAWNA SHAPIRO

In this article, I call for greater attention to "languaging across the curriculum," through the uptake of Critical Language Awareness (CLA) among WAC scholars and practitioners. I first offer an extended definition of CLA, highlighting three underpinning values —Access, Asset, and Agency—in relation to language/literacy in the academy. After debunking some potential myths about CLA approaches, I go on to discuss what CLA has to offer to WAC curricula and instruction, program design, and institutional advocacy and collaboration. I illustrate these affordances using examples from my own teaching repertoire, as well as from faculty and administrators at other institutions, tying each example to the Access-Asset-Agency framework. I conclude by discussing how CLA scholars might benefit from more engagement with WAC theories and approaches, to extend the reach and impact of their work.

Introduction

Over the past decade, an increasing number of scholar-practitioners have called for more uptake of Critical Language Awareness (CLA) in writing/ composition studies. Extant literature includes models for CLA-oriented curriculum design (e.g., Hankerson, 2022; Lorimer Leonard, 2021; Shapiro, 2022a), assessment (e.g., Gere et al., 2021), and professional learning for instructors, teaching assistants, and writing center staff in higher education settings (e.g., Britton & Lorimer Leonard, 2020; Weaver, 2019). This work complements the growing body of CLA scholarship centered on K-12 English/literacy curricula (e.g., Baker-Bell, 2013 and 2020; Godley & Reaser, 2018; Metz, 2021), and among world language instructors (e.g., Blyth & Dalola, 2016; Loza & Beaudrie, 2021; Quan, 2021).

However, very little recent scholarship has considered the relevance of CLA to Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) specifically. In this article, I consider what CLA and WAC have to offer to each other conceptually, methodologically, and pedagogically. I argue that CLA offers insights, tools, and strategies that can help WAC practitioners to conceptualize and work with what I call "Languaging Across the

Curriculum." By employing this framing of "languaging," I intend to invoke the notion of language as something we *do*—a dynamic process of meaning-making, rather than a static entity that is passively "acquired" (Swain 2006; see also Gere et al., 2021). This active, agentive understanding of language use is highly compatible with many of the commonplaces in WAC scholarship, including the idea that academic literacy is a powerful part of students' socialization into scholarly and professional discourse communities (Russell et al., 2009; Thaiss & Zawacki, 2022). Languaging, in other words, is—or should be—central to WAC work.

Below, I provide an extended definition of CLA, drawing on my synthesis of extant scholarship (Shapiro, 2022a). I then consider how CLA's commitment to linguistic access, asset, and agency can inform WAC work in classrooms, programs, and institutions. Finally, I consider gaps in CLA scholarship and pedagogy that might be addressed through greater dialogue and collaboration with WAC specialists.

What Is CLA?

The term "Critical Language Awareness" was first used by linguists and literacy scholars in the United Kingdom in the late 1980s. These scholars shared a common goal: to make explicit the "knowledge about language" that students and teachers needed in order to be successful both at school and in society. Although the term "language awareness" had been in use for decades prior, the descriptor "critical" was added to highlight the need for more attention to power dynamics in and around linguistic attitudes, identities, and practices.

In the 1990s and early 2000s, CLA was taken up by practitioners of many geographic and educational contexts, ranging from secondary school literacy curricula in South Africa (Janks, 1993; 2010), to English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms in Chile (Farias, 2005), to academic English programs in Hong Kong (Pennycook, 1994). In the United States, CLA was taken up by some education scholars as part of conversations about inclusion and equity for Black/African American Language speakers, within the context of the Students' Right to Their Own Language (SRTOL) movement (e.g., Alim, 2005; Baker-Bell, 2013; Smitherman, 1995; 2017).

This decades-long history has resulted in many different definitions of CLA, but most of them center on examining language through a social and political lens. Here is my own working definition, which I have shared online at a CLA resource hub I have been building (http://clacollective.org): "CLA is a mindset and a skillset for writing/literacy education with an emphasis on language, identity, privilege and power."

At the heart of CLA is a commitment to cultivating all students' ability to make informed choices as writers and language users—what I call rhetorical **agency** (Shapiro, 2022a). Part of cultivating agency, however, is promoting **access**—including

demystifying academic discourses, genres, and ways of knowing (Janks, 2010). A CLA approach to writing pedagogy is also committed to recognizing and drawing upon the linguistic **assets** that all writers—even those who consider themselves monolingual—bring to our classrooms and institutions (Lorimer Leonard, 2021). In these ways, we equip all students to be rhetorical agents who can engage confidently and skillfully in languaging across the curriculum.

This commitment to access, asset, and agency is informed by an ideological stance that Pennycook (1997) calls *critical pragmatism*— a stance that recognizes the importance of teaching students what they need in order to communicate within the academy as it is today, while also working to promote a more just and inclusive academy in the future (see also Ruecker & Shapiro, 2020). This "both/and" stance is particularly important when it comes to standardized English: Many writing teachers and administrators are aware of the harmful effect that dominant language ideologies have on multilingual and multidialectal students; we are committed to challenging those ideologies, in keeping with our commitment to anti-racism, equity, and inclusion. Yet we also know that in most academic settings—as well as many civic and professional ones—students are expected to comply with languaging norms that are considered "mainstream" or "standard." Thus, students from marginalized language backgrounds may also experience harm if they are not provided with explicit instruction in and around those norms (e.g., Smitherman, 1995; Zawacki & Habib, 2014).

A CLA approach suggests that we—and our students—do not have to choose between elevating or rejecting academic norms and linguistic standards. Rather, we "work with the tensions" (Shapiro 2022a) around those norms and standards in the writing classroom, so that students have the tools they need *both* to use standardized language conventions *and* to critique and even resist those conventions, when they choose to do so. One of the best encapsulations of this "both/and" approach I have ever heard was during an online talk given by Carmen Kynard, a writing studies scholar who specializes in African American rhetorical traditions (e.g., Kynard, 2007). Responding to a question about her stance on standardized English, Kynard (2021) said: "I teach students how to play the game, but I also tell them 'Don't let the game play you!'" (Kynard went on to trace this line to a lyric by the rapper Tupac Shakur). This nuanced positioning on norms and standards is particularly important within a WAC context, since WAC theories recognize the power of disciplinary (and interdisciplinary) genre features, discourses, conventions, and ways of knowing as part of students' academic learning and socialization (Russell et al., 2009; Thaiss & Zawacki, 2022).

Misconceptions about CLA

Before further explaining what CLA has to offer to WAC, it is important to debunk some potential misconceptions. First is that a CLA approach replaces explicit instruction in academic writing with disciplinary content from linguistics. Although it is true that many CLA practitioners draw on linguistics—particularly the subfield of sociolinguistics—as part of their curricula (e.g., Baker-Bell, 2020; Godley & Reaser, 2018; Hankerson, 2022), CLA-oriented writing pedagogy also provides explicit instruction in writing, including experience with academic genres of writing (or other professional or public genres, depending on the course objectives). But within this CLA framework, we approach these genres as sites for linguistic and rhetorical decision-making, rather than with the expectation of uncritical conformity to rules and conventions (e.g., Britton & Lorimer Leonard, 2020; Lorimer Leonard, 2021).

A second common misconception is that CLA is a replacement for other approaches—i.e., the next "new thing" in writing pedagogy. As noted earlier, CLA is not "new" at all: Even before the term was taken up more widely, scholars in writing/literacy studies were calling for more attention to issues of language and power, as reflected in CCCC/NCTE position statements about SRTOL (orig. 1974; see also Smitherman, 1995) and on English-only/Official English legislation (National Language Policy 1988). Moreover, the asset focus within CLA shares conceptual and pedagogical overlap with translingual/translanguaging and plurilingual approaches, in their commitment to drawing more fully on students' linguistic repertoires, as a means of resisting monolingual/standard language ideologies (Losey & Shuck, 2021; Schreiber & Watson, 2018; Zhang-Wu et al., 2023). Finally, in recognizing the relationship between linguistic and racial justice, CLA pedagogy meshes well with a commitment to anti-racism in writing pedagogy (Baker-Bell, 2013; Hankerson, 2022) and assessment (e.g., Gere et al., 2021).

A third misconception is that CLA focuses primarily on language at the sentence or paragraph level, overlooking the macro-level aspects of writing, such as rhetorical approach, genre, and modality. Although CLA approaches often include micro-level linguistic analysis, many iterations also deal with discourse at the macro-level, as part of a critical literacy skillset (Janks, 2010). In other words, CLA pedagogy is additive, rather than subtractive, giving us additional "tools in the toolbox" for attending to language at all levels of discourse. Thus, it responds to calls for more cross-disciplinary dialogue between rhetoric/writing studies and linguistics (e.g., Cox & Zawacki, 2011; Matsuda, 1999; Zawacki & Habib, 2014).

Finally, it is important to note that CLA has not been absent entirely from WAC scholarship. There are a number of recent publications that make reference to CLA, including Cavazos et al., (2018); Dilks & Dlayedwa (2015); Hebbard & Hernández (2020); and Sturk & Lindgren (2019). However, these are usually brief mentions,

citing CLA only as part of the conceptual foundation, rather than as a pedagogical approach in itself. Thus, there is potential for much greater integration of CLA into WAC programs and policies. It is worth noting that there are more frequent references to CLA within English for Academic Purposes (EAP) scholarship, mostly from scholars outside the United States (Cf., Fang & Jiang, 2019; Koester, 2022; Shoecraft et al., 2022). Yet as Chanock (2004) and Townsend et al. (2021) have discussed, scholarly circles for WAC and EAP tend not to overlap, despite shared theoretical orientations and pedagogical practices (see also Morrison et al., 2021). More uptake of CLA among WAC scholars, therefore, would help not only to bridge the disciplinary "division of labor" (Matsuda, 1999; Wang, 2022), between composition/writing and TESOL/applied linguistics, but also to respond to the need for more global and transnational perspectives in writing studies scholarship (e.g., Donahue, 2009; Martins, 2015). To further bolster my argument, I present below examples of how CLA's emphasis on linguistic Access, Asset, and Agency can enrich postsecondary writing curricula, policies, and institutional advocacy and collaboration.

CLA and Writing Curricula

One way that CLA approaches promote access is by demystifying academic genres and discourses, so that students understand *how language works* in the academy. Some writing studies scholars such as Laura Aull (e.g., 2020) have used linguistics frameworks to help increase instructors' knowledge of the most prominent linguistic features in various genres of academic writing, so that they, in turn, can make those features more salient to students. Other curricular foci that fall under this "access" umbrella include rhetorical grammar (e.g., Micciche, 2004; Salvatore, 2022), language play (Gegg-Harrison, 2022; Tardy, 2021) and genre translation (Bergstrom, 2021). Engaging these topics increases students' understanding the impact of other writers' linguistic choices, which in turn helps students to make more informed writerly decisions themselves.

Although I would argue that simply demystifying academic discourse is itself a "critical" move, since mystification often maintains exclusion and inequality (Bizzell, 1982; Harwood & Hadley, 2004), there are some scholars who have taken this approach a step further, engaging in more overt critique of the power dynamics in and around academic writing conventions, and exploring the possibilities for rhetorical resistance. Sarah Benesch's (2001; 2009) Critical English for Academic Purposes approach is one notable example (see also Ruecker & Shapiro, 2020), as is Schroeder et al.'s 2002 edited collection on "alternative discourses in the academy." This line of scholarship opens up possibilities for more accessible and inclusive forms of communication within the academy.

Within my own teaching repertoire, I offer an access-oriented linguistics and writing course entitled "English Grammar: Concepts and Controversies," which also counts toward our minor in Education Studies (See Chapters 5 and 7 of Shapiro [2022a], for more on this course). The first third of the course focuses on concepts and skills for analyzing written syntax in English. Then, we begin delving into linguistic controversies, exploring questions such as:

- What do particular writing conventions (e.g., use of passive voice in the methods section of a scientific article; positionality statements written in first-person "I") reveal about the values and priorities of academic disciplines that use those conventions?
- How can academic discourse be exclusionary or alienating to readers? What can make it more accessible and inclusive? And can we find examples of these alternative discourses in public or scholarly writing?
- What judgments do we tend to make of writers based on their grammatical choices—especially if there is non-standard/non-conventional language use? When might those judgments be inaccurate or unfair?

This is just one of many courses I have designed that embody the "both/and" of critical pragmatism, as discussed earlier: Students learn the metalanguage and skills for analyzing English syntax, but they also learn why judgements about people based on grammatical "correctness" are often problematic and potentially harmful.

CLA curricula with an **asset** focus are centered more heavily on recognizing and drawing on students' linguistic repertoires, including their knowledge of other languages, dialects, registers, and styles. As noted earlier, translingual/translanguaging and plurilingual scholarship offers many excellent examples of this asset orientation (e.g., Horner & Tetreault, 2017; Losey & Shuck, 2021; Schreiber et al., 2021). However, CLA pedagogy also takes seriously the concerns some scholars have raised about the dangers of an uncritical stance of linguistic "appreciation" without attention to issues of power (e.g., Matsuda, 2014; Shapiro et al., 2016). Rossen-Knill & Hancock (2021) have suggested that a "progressive agenda" for writing studies must attend closely to issues of student **agency**—a position echoed by some translingual/plurilingual scholars as well, especially when it comes to transgressive practices such as codemeshing (Lorimer Leonard, 2014; Lu & Horner, 2013; Zhang-Wu et al., 2023). A CLA approach thus invites deep inquiry into issues of writerly agency, centered on questions such as:

- How do our implicit biases shape how we interpret the linguistic choices of other writers—especially writers from language backgrounds different from our own?

- How do we decide when and how to draw on our linguistic repertoires—particularly if the aim is to challenge dominant norms and conventions?
- What factors shape the level of risk writers are willing to take in their academic work?
- How might our privileges—or lack thereof—shape our rhetorical decision-making?

One strand of CLA-informed scholarship that foregrounds both asset and agency is the Black Linguistic Justice work spearheaded by April Baker-Bell, Carmen Kynard, and others (see http://www.blacklanguagesyllabus.com/). This work is in turn informed by the decades-long body of SRTOL scholarship referenced earlier (e.g., Baker-Bell, 2013; Perryman-Clark, 2013; Smitherman, 1995; 2017).

Two of the undergraduate writing courses I teach employ this frame of "linguistic justice," but with a wider umbrella that makes space for the examination and use of many language varieties—not just Black Language. One of these is an interdisciplinary first-year seminar entitled "Language and Social Justice" (Shapiro, 2022b). The other, which counts toward a minor in linguistics and is also an elective in our Education Studies program, is entitled "The English Language in a Global Context" (Abe & Shapiro, 2021; Shapiro, 2015). The final assignment for both of these courses is called "Writing Beyond the Classroom"; it invites students to incorporate a diverse range of languages, varieties, styles, and modalities into their writing. The one "rule," in fact, is that they must write for an audience *outside* our class, and in a genre that has resonance beyond the academy. Examples of what students have done for this project include:

- Poetry, short stories, and plays highlighting the complexities of language and identity, linguistic prejudice, and other CLA topics
- Essays and spoken word pieces that incorporate multiple languages and/or dialects, in a way that furthers the student's rhetorical goals
- Informational websites, pamphlets, and posters about the benefits of bilingualism, the dangers of linguistic profiling, and other linguistic justice issues
- Letters to family members, in which students talk about language loss, linguistic marginalization, and other phenomena that they have experienced at home or in school

Throughout the writing/creation process for these projects, students are asked to reflect deeply on purpose, genre, audience, and style, including on how these factors shape their macro and micro-level use of language.

Rhetorical agency can also be centered in public writing and/or civic literacy projects (e.g., Guerra, 2016; Powell, 2004), in which students conduct in-depth analysis of genres of communication, and of the communities in which those genres circulate. Students then draw on this analysis in their rhetorical decision-making and reflection. Guerra (2016) has argued that this approach, which he calls "Writing Across Communities," is particularly valuable for promoting inclusion and sense of belonging among students who have traditionally been linguistically and/or culturally marginalized within the academy.

My own iteration of this approach is a Writing in the Disciplines course called "Narratives in the News Media," in which students learn to use Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) methods to analyze the impact of linguistic choices in journalistic writing. Students write in a variety of academic and public genres, including letters to the editor. Their final project is a public-facing resource (e.g., poster, infographic, video, prezi, etc.) that conveys something they have learned about critical media literacy to an audience of their peers. In the "Writer's Memo" that accompanies their submission, students are required to articulate how their rhetorical choices in the project reflected their understanding of genre and audience expectations.

A CLA-informed understanding of rhetorical agency also has important implications for our feedback and assessment practices. In her writing courses for STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) majors at Oregon State University, Sarah Tinker Perrault invites students to choose from a range of assignment options, in keeping with their writing goals. Perrault maintains a sustained dialogue with students throughout the term, using shared documents that serve as writing/research logs (Shapiro & Perrault, pending). When students submit drafts for feedback, Perrault encourages them to specify their needs and priorities. As the director of her institution's Writing Intensive Curriculum, Perrault also brings this focus on rhetorical agency into the program's curricular documents and teaching resources for disciplinary writing.

CLA in Program Design

The Access-Asset-Agency framework can also inform policies at the programmatic or even institutional level. As Michaud & Madsen Hardy argue in a 2023 case study of CLA-informed writing program (re)design at the University of Boston, "A CLA lens can help us unify our faculty's varied, and valuable, perspectives on language even as it allows us to make our stated commitment to justice concrete and practicable" (p. 2). The authors go on to describe how they incorporated CLA into their program's public-facing "values statement," working in tandem with their dean for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI). The current statement now includes the following two passages:

"In our classrooms, we aim to equip students with strategies to participate in academic and non-academic discourse communities, acknowledging that the norms of academic writing, and even language itself, are not static or monolithic but constantly evolving. We recognize the communication strengths of all learners and the value of multiple Englishes, especially in ways that empower our multilingual students."

"Recognizing that language can be both an instrument of oppression and a tool for freedom and justice, we value how writing and rhetoric help us learn how to listen, how to be heard, and how to change the conversation to create a culture of empathy, inquiry, and creativity."

The values of **access** and **agency** are particularly salient in the commitment to "equip[ing] students with strategies" for participation in a range of discourse communities and in the point that "writing and rhetoric help us learn how to listen, to be heard, and….to create a culture of empathy, inquiry, and creativity." The value of **asset,** moreover, is reflected in the goal of "[r]ecognizing the communication strengths of all learners and the value of multiple Englishes." It is also noteworthy that academic discourse is neither ignored nor reified, in the point that the "norms of academic writing" are "constantly evolving." These values are also echoed in the recommended syllabus language provided to instructors in the program.

Of course, this language would have little impact if it were not accompanied by other program changes informed by CLA. Some of the additional steps Michaud & Madsen Hardy (2023) have taken in this regard include:

- Offering opportunities for sustained faculty development on CLA-related topics
- Creating program lesson plans and other teaching resources to promote critical conversations about language—including the "politics of standard language" (p. 14) in the writing classroom
- Shifting placement policies for "ELL students" away from timed tests toward a directed self-placement (DSP) tool that invites students to reflect on their past experience with writing, including experiences of inclusion and/or exclusion related to language difference
- Incorporating questions about linguistic diversity and language and power into the hiring process for new faculty.

There are a number of other writing programs that have taken similar steps to integrate CLA into their policies, resources, and procedures. Three that I have consulted with directly are Bunker Hill Community College, Florida International University, and George Mason University.

CLA in Institution-Wide Work

The examples shared above help to highlight what CLA has to offer to the work we do in and around writing programs. But from a WAC context, it is also important to consider how CLA might serve us in our work with faculty, staff, and administrators in other departments and programs. In my workshops with faculty/staff who are *not* specialists in writing/language, I have found a number of aspects of CLA to be resonant, including the following, which I have again labeled with the values of Access, Asset, and Agency:

- The idea that we can examine linguistic patterns and practices in academic writing as an entryway to understanding the values and priorities of academic discourse communities (i.e., **access**)
- The recognition that all students have broad linguistic repertoires that we can draw on through our course materials and assignments—not only by inviting multiple codes into student writing, but also by broadening the range of genres in our course materials and assignment options (i.e., **asset**)
- The acknowledgement that we need to be both pragmatic and progressive in our approach to language, including around issues of grammar/ style—for example, normalizing the idea of a "written accent" (**asset** and **agency**; see Harris & Silva, 2003; Zawacki & Habib, 2014; see also https:// writtenaccents.gmu.edu/)
- The increased awareness of how our own language use—in syllabi, in classroom discussion, in written feedback, etc.—can contribute to inclusion and sense of belonging (i.e., **access** and **agency**; see Burke, 2023).

These same insights can be woven into training with writing center staff—particularly in helping tutors to employ culturally and linguistically responsive approaches (e.g., Olson, 2013; Salem, 2016). During her time as the writing center director at the University of Indianapolis, Jessica Bannon (2022) gave a conference presentation outlining some ways she was experimenting with incorporating CLA into her professional development work with tutors. In her presentation slides, she notes that CLA "offers strategies for changing our practices in order to resist harmful systems and ideologies," adding that this is particularly helpful in contextualizing conversations about "appropriate" or "standard" language use. Bannon (2022) goes on to articulate some of the key questions she engages with tutors, including:

- Why are some forms of language (e.g., "standard" English) privileged?
- Who has historically had the power to make such decisions?
- What are the implications of continuing to adhere to language standards?

With increased awareness of this historical, political, and social context, Bannon (2022) argues, tutors will be able to talk with clients in more nuanced ways about linguistic choices and their impact on readers, so as to support rhetorical agency—a helpful nuancing of the "directive versus non-directive" binary that has been heavily debated within writing center studies scholarship (e.g., Olson, 2013; Salem, 2016).

At the broader level of institutions and professional organizations, Gere et al. (2021) have discussed how CLA can help us to identify and resist harmful language ideologies that have hindered justice in assessment standards, policies, and practices. The authors illustrate the affordances of CLA by proposing changes to the "Conventions" section of the 2011 *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*, which was co-authored by members of the Council of Writing Program Administrators, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the National Writing Project. Although this document is primarily used within composition/first-year writing programs, Gere et al.'s (2021) proposed changes, which emphasize the goal of helping students to make "thoughtful, informed language choices," with "an understanding of how language is systematic, varied, and continually changing" (p. 395), could help to make the *Framework* more relevant to WAC/WID contexts, in keeping with our collective commitment to promoting students' skillful languaging across the curriculum.

Vice Versa: Why CLA Needs WAC

Thus far, I have focused on how WAC scholars and practitioners can benefit from integrating CLA into their work. To conclude this article, I wish to discuss the reverse—what CLA scholarship has to gain from greater dialogue with WAC. First, WAC specialists can help CLA practitioners to think through ways to sustain and expand their institutional impact, (e.g., Cox et al., 2018; Palmquist et al., 2020). For example, CLA scholars might draw inspiration from some of the institutional mapping work done by WAC scholars (e.g., Thaiss & Porter, 2010), to describe where CLA work is—or could be—happening at postsecondary institutions (see also Cox et al., 2018). Engaging with WAC approaches could also help CLA scholars to identify potential allies and collaborators: McPherron & An (2023), for example, have suggested that ethnic studies programs are particularly conducive to CLA-oriented inquiry, as exemplified by their case study of an Asian American Studies course in which students studied the "linguistics landscapes" in their local community (see Carr, 2019, for more on linguistic landscapes research). Business is another field where CLA might be particularly well received, since business communication often involves complex power dynamics, especially when working across geographic, cultural, and linguistic borders (e.g., Koester, 2022; Weninger & Kan, 2013). WAC scholarship can also help CLA specialists to think through the most effective ways to work with co-curricular entities such as writing centers (Pemberton, 1995; Robinson

& Hall, 2013), to promote critical conversations about languaging across the curriculum (see Schreiber et al. [2021]for a few case studies of writing centers serving this function). Thus, more engagement with WAC theories, models, and methods could help CLA scholars to leverage the assets and opportunities across their institutions and in their larger communities.

WAC scholarship can also contribute insights that would be helpful to world language programs. A number of postsecondary Spanish instructors have taken up CLA in their curricula in recent years, in part as a way to be more inclusive of heritage speakers, who may have grown up hearing and/or using Spanish colloquially but may not have learned the conventions of "standardized" or "academic" Spanish (e.g., Holguín Mendoza, 2018; Loza & Beaudrie, 2021; Quan, 2021). Students in CLA-oriented Spanish classes often investigate the ideologies and power structures that frame some varieties of Spanish (e.g., Spanglish) as "incorrect" or "inappropriate." These investigations promote an asset orientation toward heritage speakers, while also expanding all students' access to knowledge about language variation and linguistic attitudes in the Spanish-speaking world. Yet within this growing body of scholarship on CLA approaches to Spanish instruction, writing is given minimal attention; when it is discussed, the focus tends to be on sentence-level issues such as error correction (e.g., Seijas & Spino, 2023). Greater uptake of WAC frameworks and approaches could help to broaden the conversation, so that teachers of Spanish (and other world languages) are better equipped to build rhetorical awareness and agency for all of their student writers, including heritage learners (Cavazos et al., 2018; Lorimer Leonard, 2021).

There are a number of other areas shared interest among WAC and CLA scholars that could be explored collaboratively. These include questions such as:

- How can we articulate the features of academic discourse and genre conventions in a way that is generative rather than prescriptive?
- Where do public and multimodal genres of writing fit within academic writing curricula?
- How can we ensure that the threads of writing and language are not lost in institution-wide discussions about diversity, equity, inclusion, and anti-racism?

I hope I have demonstrated the promise CLA holds as a resource for promoting linguistic access, asset, and agency in and around postsecondary writing instruction. I strongly believe that greater uptake of CLA within WAC work—and vice versa—can build our own agency as teachers, administrators, scholars, and advocates. Engaging with both areas of scholarship can equip us for sustained dialogue and collaborative

action that supports powerful languaging among student writers within and across academic disciplines.

References

Abe, S., & Shapiro, S. (2021). Sociolinguistics as a pathway to global citizenship: Critically observing 'self' and 'other'. *Language Awareness*, *30*(4), 355-370.

Alim, H. S. (2005). Critical language awareness in the United States: Revisiting issues and revising pedagogies in a resegregated society. *Educational Researcher*, *34*(7), 24-31.

Aull, L. L. (2020). *How students write: A linguistic analysis*. Modern Language Association.

Baker-Bell, A. (2013). "I never really knew the history behind African American language": Critical language pedagogy in an advanced placement English language arts class. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *46*(3), 355-370.

Baker-Bell, A. (2020). *Linguistic justice: Black language, literacy, identity, and pedagogy*. Routledge.

Bannon, J. L. (2022, March 31-April 2)*Critical Language Awareness in the writing center*. [conference presentation]. East Central Writing Center Association Conference. Michigan State University.

Benesch, S. (2001). *Critical English for Academic Purposes: Theory, politics, and practice*. Routledge.

Benesch, S. (2009). Theorizing and practicing critical English for academic purposes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *8*(2), 81-85.

Bizzell, P. (1982). College composition: Initiation into the academic discourse community (review essay). *Curriculum Inquiry*, *12*(2), 191-207

Burke, C. C. (2023). Acknowledging our student's souls: a case for creating an equity-focused syllabus. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 1-24.

Blyth, C., & Dalola, A. (2016). Translingualism as an open educational language practice: Raising critical language awareness on Facebook. *Alsic. Apprentissage des Langues et Systèmes d'Information et de Communication*, *19*(1).

Britton, E. R., & Lorimer Leonard, R. (2020). The social justice potential of critical reflection and critical language awareness pedagogies for L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *50*, 100776.

Carr, J. R. C. (2019). *Linguistic landscapes. Oxford Bibliographies.* https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/display/document/obo-9780199772810/obo-9780199772810-0251.xml .

Cavazos, A. G., Hebbard, M., Hernández, J. E., Rodriguez, C., & Schwarz, G. (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://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/ trans/cavazosetal2018.pdf.

Chanock, K. (2004). A shared focus for WAC, writing tutors and EAP: Identifying the "academic purposes" in writing across the curriculum. *The WAC Journal*, *15*(1), 19-32.

Cox, M., Galin, J., & Melzer, D. (2018). Building sustainable WAC programs: A whole systems approach. *The WAC Journal*, *29*, 64-87. https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/journal/vol29/cox.pdf

Cox, M., & Zawacki, T. M. (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/.

Crookes, G. V. (2022). Critical language pedagogy. *Language Teaching*, *55*(1), 46-63.

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

Dilks, S. J., & Dlayedwa, N. C. (2015). Teaching critical discourse analysis across the disciplines. *Double Helix*, *3*.

Fang, F. G., & Jiang, L. (2019). Critical investigation of Intercultural Communication instruction: Building mainland Chinese university students' Critical Language Awareness and Intercultural Literacy. In B. L. Reynolds & J. F. Tang (Eds.). *English Literacy Instruction for Chinese Speakers* (pp. 211-227). Springer.

Gegg-Harrison, W. (2021). Encouraging playful, productive curiosity about language in the writing classroom. *Journal of Teaching Writing*, *36*(1), 159-185. https://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/teachingwriting/article/view/26246.

Godley, A. J., & Reaser, J. (2018). *Critical language pedagogy: Interrogating language, dialects, and power in teacher education*. Peter Lang.

Guerra, J. C. (2015). *Language, culture, identity and citizenship in college classrooms and communities*. Routledge.

Hankerson, S. (2022). "Why can't writing courses be taught like this fo real": Leveraging critical language awareness to promote African American Language speakers' writing skills. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *58*, 100919.

Harris, M., & Silva, T. (1993). Tutoring ESL students: Issues and options. *College Composition and Communication*, *44*(4), 525-537.

Harwood, N., & Hadley, G. (2004). Demystifying institutional practices: Critical pragmatism and the teaching of academic writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, *23*(4), 355-377.

Hebbard, M., & Hernández, Y. (2020). Becoming transfronterizo collaborators: A transdisciplinary framework for developing translingual pedagogies in WAC/WID. In L. E. Bartlett, S. L. Tarabochia, A. R Olinger, & M. J. Marshall (Eds). *Diverse approaches to teaching, learning, and Writing Across the Curriculum: IWAC at 25*. (pp. 251–73). WAC Clearinghouse.

Holguín Mendoza, C. (2018). Critical language awareness (CLA) for Spanish heritage, language programs: Implementing a complete curriculum. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 12*(2), 65–79. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2017.1401445

Horner, B., & Tetreault, L. (Eds.). (2017). *Crossing divides: Exploring translingual writing pedagogies and programs*. University Press of Colorado.

Janks, H. (1993). Developing critical language awareness materials for a post-apartheid South Africa. *English in Australia*, (106), 55-67.

Janks, H. (2010). *Literacy and power*. Routledge.

Koester, A. (2022). Critical Language Awareness and business communication. In E. Darics (Ed.). *Language awareness in business and the professions*, (pp. 139-159). Cambridge University Press.

Kynard, C. (2007). I want to be African": In search of a black radical tradition/African-American-vernacularized paradigm for" students' right to their own language," critical literacy, and" class politics. *College English*, *69*(4), 360-390.

Kynard, C. (29 September 2021). "Walk it like I talk it"/Write it like I talk it: Black language/Black rhetoric and the racial politics of communication. Online talk for Middlebury College.

Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. Routledge.

Lorimer Leonard, R. (2014). Multilingual writing as rhetorical attunement. *College English*, *76*(3), 227-247.

Lorimer Leonard, R. (2021). The role of writing in Critical Language Awareness. *College English*, *84*(2), 175-198.

Losey, K. M., & Shuck, G. (Eds.). (2021). *Plurilingual pedagogies for multilingual writing classrooms: Engaging the rich communicative repertoires of US students*. Routledge.

Loza, S., & Beaudrie, S. M. (Eds.). (2021). *Heritage language teaching: Critical language awareness perspectives for research and pedagogy*. Routledge.

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

Martins, D. S. (Ed.). (2015). *Transnational writing program administration*. University Press of Colorado.

Matsuda, P. K. (1999). Composition studies and ESL writing: A disciplinary division of labor. *College Composition and Communication*, *50*(4), 699-721.

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

McPherron, P., & An, L. (2023). Supporting Asian American multilingual college students through critical language awareness programming. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 1-19.

Metz, M. (2021). Pedagogical content knowledge for teaching critical language awareness: The importance of valuing student knowledge. *Urban Education*, *56*(9), 1456-1484.

Micciche, L. R. (2004). Making a case for rhetorical grammar. *College Composition and Communication*, 716-737.

Michaud, C., & Madsen Hardy, S. (2023). CLA and WPA: A justice-oriented approach to writing program administration. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *60*, 100991.

Morrison, B., Chen J., Lin, L., & Urmston, A. (Eds.). (2021). *English across the curriculum: Voices from around the world*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/INT-B.2021.1220 https://wac.colostate.edu/books/international/eac2018/.

Olson, B. (2013). Rethinking our work with multilingual writers: The ethics and responsibility of language teaching in the writing center. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*.

Palmquist, M., Childers, P., Maimon, E., Mullin, J., Rice, R., Russell, A., & Russell, D. R. (2020). Fifty years of WAC: Where have we been? Where are we going. *Across the Disciplines*, *17*(3/4), 5-45. https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/volume17/palmquistetal.pdf.

Pemberton, M. A. (1995). Rethinking the WAC/writing center connection. *The Writing Center Journal*, *15*(2), 116-133.

Pennycook, A. (1994). Beyond (f)utilitarianism: English "as" academic purpose. *Hong Kong Papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching*, *17*, 13-23.

Pennycook, A. (1997). Vulgar pragmatism, critical pragmatism, and EAP. *English for Specific Purposes*, *16*(4), 253–269.

Perryman-Clark, S. M. (2013). African American language, rhetoric, and students' writing: New directions for SRTOL. *College Composition and Communication*, 469-495.

Powell, P. R. (2004). Critical discourse analysis and composition studies: A study of presidential discourse and campus discord. *College Composition and Communication*, 439-469.

Quan, T. (2021). Critical approaches to Spanish language teacher education: Challenging raciolinguistic ideologies and fostering critical language awareness. *Hispania*, *104*(3), 447-459.

Robinson, H., & Hall, J. (2013). Connecting WID and the writing center: Tools for collaboration. *The WAC Journal*, *24*(1), 29-47. https://wac.colostate.edu/journal/vol24/vol24.pdf#page=30.

Rossen-Knill, D., & Hancock, C. (2021). Linguistic knowledge, effective communication, and agency: Moving forward in writing pedagogy with a progressive agenda. *Journal of Teaching Writing* 36(1), 1-10.

Rowe, M. (2008). Micro-affirmations and micro-inequities. *Journal of the International Ombudsman Association*, *1*(1), 45-48.

Ruecker, T., & Shapiro, S. (2020). Critical pragmatism as a middle ground in discussions of linguistic diversity. In T. Silva & Z. Wang (Eds.), *Reconciling translingualism and second language writing* (pp. 139–149). Routledge.

Russell, D. R., Lea, M., Parker, J., Street, B., & Donahue, T. (2009). Exploring notions of genre in "academic literacies" and "writing across the curriculum": Approaches across countries and contexts. In C. Bazerman, A. Bonini, & D. Figueiredo (Eds). *Genre in a changing world* (pp. 395-423). https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/genre/.

Salem, L. (2016). Decisions... decisions: Who chooses to use the writing center? *The Writing Center Journal*, 147-171.

Salvatore, J. (2021). Tools, not rules: Rhetorical grammar as a meaning-making tool in the creative writing workshop. *Journal of Teaching Writing*, *36*(1), 91-128. https://journals. iupui.edu/index.php/teachingwriting/article/view/26242.

Schreiber, B. R., Lee, E., Johnson, J. T., & Fahim, N. (Eds.). (2021). *Linguistic justice on campus: Pedagogy and advocacy for multilingual students*. Multilingual Matters.

Schreiber, B. R., & Watson, M. (2018). Translingualism≠ code-meshing: A response to Gevers' "Translingualism revisited" (2018). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *42*, 94-97.

Schroeder, C. L., Fox, H., & Bizzell, P. (Eds.). (2002). *ALT DIS: Alternative discourses and the academy*. Heinemann.

Seijas, J. M., & Spino, L. (2023). Written "corrective" feedback in Spanish as a heritage language: Problematizing the construct of error. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *60*, 100989.

Shapiro, S. (2022a). *Cultivating critical language awareness in the writing classroom*. Routledge.

Shapiro, S. (2022b). A kairotic moment for critical language awareness? A response to Anne Ruggles Gere et al.'s "Communal justicing: writing assessment, disciplinary infrastructure, and the case for critical language awareness." *College Composition & Communication. 70*(2), 465-471.

Shapiro, S., Cox, M., Shuck, G., & Simnitt, E. (2016). Teaching for agency: From appreciating linguistic diversity to empowering student writers. *Composition Studies*, *44*(1), 31-52.

Shapiro, S., & Perrault, S. T. (pending). A Critical Language Awareness approach to feedback and response: Critical pragmatism in action. In. J. Post, L. Tinoco, & K. Blewett (Eds.). *Reconceptualizing response: Using instructor feedback to promote equity and linguistic justice in the writing classroom.*

Shoecraft, K., Martin, J. L., & Perris, G. (2022). EAP learners as discourse analysts: Empowering emergent multilingual students. *BC TEAL Journal*, *7*(1), 23-41.

Smitherman, G. (1995). "Students' right to their own language": A Retrospective. *The English Journal*, *84*(1), 21-27.

Smitherman, G. (2017). Raciolinguistics, "mis-education," and language arts teaching in the 21st century. *Language Arts Journal of Michigan*, *32*(2), 4-12.

Sturk, E., & Lindgren, E. (2019). Discourses in teachers' talk about writing. *Written Communication*, *36*(4), 503-537.

Swain, M. (2006). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language learning. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contributions of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95–108). London, England: Continuum.

Tardy, C. M. (2021). The potential power of play in second language academic writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *53*, 100833.

Thaiss, C., & Porter, T. (2010). The state of WAC/WID in 2010: Methods and results of the US survey of the international WAC/WID mapping project. *College Composition and Communication*, 534-570.

Thaiss, C. J., & Zawacki, T. M. (2022). *Engaged writers and dynamic disciplines: Research on the academic writing life*. WAC Clearinghouse. https://wac.colostate.edu/books/landmarks/engaged/. (Originally published in 2006 by Heinemann).

Townsend, M. A., Zawacki, T. M., Palmquist, M., & Chen, J. (2021). The (transnational) past, present, and future of the Writing Across the Curriculum movement. In B. Morrison, J. Chen, L. Lin, & A Urmston (Eds.). *English Across the Curriculum: Voices from around the world* (pp. 311-329). WAC Clearinghouse. https://wac.colostate.edu/books/international/eac2018/.

Wang, Z. (2022). From disciplinary diaspora to transdisciplinarity: A home for second language writing professionals in Composition. *College English*, *84*(5), 467-490.

Weaver, M. M. (2019). "I still think there's a need for proper, academic, Standard English": Examining a teacher's negotiation of multiple language ideologies. *Linguistics and Education*, *49*, 41-51.

Weninger, C., & Kan, K. H. Y. (2013). (Critical) Language awareness in business communication. *English for Specific Purposes*, *32*(2), 59-71.

Zawacki, T. M., & Habib, A. S. (2014). Negotiating "errors" in L2 writing: Faculty dispositions and language difference. In T. M. Zawacki and M. Cox (Eds). *WAC and Second language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices* (pp. 183-210). WAC Clearinghouse/Parlor Press. Available at https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/l2/.

Zhang-Wu, Q., Wang, Z., & Shapiro, S. (2023). CLA and translingualism: A (literal) scholarly conversation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *60*, 100996.