12-2015

Recontextualizing Composition Studies: Translingual Practice, Representation, and an Enacted Methodology

Rachel Griffo
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

RECONTEXTUALIZING COMPOSITION STUDIES: TRANSLINGUAL PRACTICE, REPRESENTATION, AND AN ENACTED METHODOLOGY

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Rachel Griffo

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

December 2015

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of English

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Rachel Griffo

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Claude M. Hurlbert, D.A.
Professor of English, Retired

Sharon K. Deckert, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of English

Curtis Porter, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of English

ACCEPTED

Randy L. Martin, Ph.D.
Dean
School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: Recontextualizing Composition Studies: Translingual Practice, Representation, and an Enacted Methodology

Author: Rachel Griffo

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Claude M. Hurlbert

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Sharon K. Deckert
Dr. Curtis Porter

This project offers an examination of composition studies through the vantage point of Chinese scholars between 1987 and 2014. Some of the historical issues that these scholars have identified through personal anecdote and empirical research include, but are not limited to, the idea that home and school practices are separate and should not intersect or interfere with one another; the belief that there are absolute meanings to be found in words translated from one language to another; and the idea that difference in language is a problem that needs to be fixed. Bringing these perspectives to the present moment—a time when the field of composition is confronted by the variety of Englishes that make up its institutions—the need to recontextualize has developed greater urgency. While the ability to serve students from diverse linguistic backgrounds challenges writing teachers, institutions continue to admit students from non-English dominant countries in order to diversify their programs and supplement university-wide funding. The translingual practices examined in chapters 4, 5, and 6 are based on qualitative interviews and classroom observations. The results of this study offer a heuristic for developing better pedagogical approaches and textual practices that respond to the multiple ways that meaning is composed and communicated within and between languages.

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the members of my dissertation committee for their guidance and support. Claude Hurlbert has been a wonderful adviser. It has been an honor to be mentored by a scholar whose work I admire and respect. I know that my writing has benefitted greatly from his criticisms and requests to “be precise, be clear.” Sharon Deckert has supported my research on global Englishes in China from the time I was a student in her graduate seminar on Second Language Acquisition. I am thankful to her for holding me accountable for the methods I have used in my work and for her encouragement during the early stages of this project. Curtis Porter has contributed to my thinking about representation and ontology by pushing me towards scholarship that challenges the social turn. I am thankful to him for always being there to discuss big ideas and for reminding me, in difficult times, to find my practice.

In addition to my committee, I am indebted to those who participated in my research study, namely, Xiaoye You, Haixia Lan, and Danling Fu. While each of these individuals offered me their time and allowed me to peer into their practices as teacherscholars, I am especially grateful to Xiaoye for advising me during the early stages of this project. Knowing little about me, Xiaoye asked the right questions and offered advice about the project when it was still in an “ideas” stage. He offered feedback on early chapters of this manuscript and on related articles. His insight has contributed greatly to my understanding of English as a global language.

Writing a dissertation is work that can only be understood by those who do it. Thank you to Mashenka Prikhodko, Jack Mack, and Lynn Reid for writing beside me in coffee shops, or, “battleship style” (Jack) at home and for encouraging me at crucial moments. I am eternally grateful to my family: Ronald Griffo Sr., Paula Griffo, Ronald Griffo Jr., and Jackie Griffo for all of their love and support. Despite my family’s efforts to understand that while I was not writing books to be sold at Barnes & Noble, the work I was doing still mattered, they always encouraged me. Special thanks to Angela Jamison and the yogis at AY:A2 in Ann Arbor, MI. The spiritual support and friendship I received from this community during the summer trips I took for three years while working on this project no doubt kept me steady throughout the academic year.

Finally, I thank the students that I taught at Yangtze Normal University (YZNU) while serving as a Peace Corps Volunteer in China. These students were my teachers. I specifically recall the conversations many of us had over hot pot in Ma'an and at English Corner at YZNU that served as the initial inspiration for this project—天天快乐。I thank Huang Dongmei, the Vice Dean of International Education at YZNU who taught me Chinese. I remember one of our hour-long tutor sessions when she shared a story about her favorite Chinese word, 同桌 (*tongzhou*), "table mate," which led to a discussion about similar English phrases. These comparative discussions, in which she would often remark, "you see, we are not so different," also inspired this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

A word changes dancing in search of its roots
—Bei Dao, "Reading"

"福." Photo taken by Luo Xiaohu (AKA "Ferris"), Fengdu Gui Cheng, P.R. China. 2009.

The Search for Meaning

I am standing below a large image of the Chinese character 福 (*fu*) laid-in white tile on the outside of a red, stone temple wall, reaching with my right hand to just barely touch the bottom of it. To my left, there is a young Chinese girl, in braided pigtails, who is no more than 7 years old. She is looking up at me in curiosity and, perhaps, anticipation of my hand touching 福.

The vignette captured in the photograph above took place at the Liaoyang temple in Fengdu County, Chongqing, during my second month of service as a Peace Corps Volunteer in China. The photograph depicts a meaning triangle. In this triangle, there is a symbol that conveys meaning (福), an insider to its meaning (the little girl), and an outsider (myself). Although the vignette was captured accidentally (I don't know the little girl in the photograph), I draw attention to its symbolic representation because it conveys the kind of meaning discrepancy that arises between languages and inspires this dissertation. As I engaged with the visual aspects of 福, my understanding of this character was not absolute. As the lines in the epigraph convey, there were many ways that the character could be interpreted, but based on my limited knowledge of Chinese characters, I wrestled with the conflicting translations that appeared in my Chinese/English dictionary—"blessing," "luck," "fortune." Each of these translations, of course, does not mean the same thing. The character is a "semiotic resource that reflects and refracts a reality" (Voloshinov, 2000, p. 40), but the meaning it conveys is contingent upon the context in which it is received. It was in this very early stage of my immersion into Chinese language and culture that I began to consider the relationship between language and context. The Liaoyang temple is located within the context of an ancient ghost city where Chinese take part in cultural practices based on superstitious beliefs. For instance, my friend Xiaohu told me to "walk towards the temple wall with eyes closed and touch the character." Although I accomplished this goal, I was at a loss for understanding why I did it. The symbolic meaning of the character and the embodied practice associated with it were, ironically, out of my reach.

This photograph reminds me of the contextually bound nature of meaning. It reminds me that there is meaning that exists outside of my own frame of reference, linguistically outside of my reach. Finally, the vignette symbolizes the complexity of translation and how important it is to search for meaning in an unfamiliar linguistic frame of reference. But what, exactly, am I searching for if I do not possess the answers to the questions that puzzle me: Why is this particular character on the outside of the temple wall? What do the radicals in the character stand for? Though I have a general idea of what the English translation of the character means, how is my own understanding of the word as an English speaker different from the meaning it conveys in Chinese? How can I obtain an internal understanding of this character that can change along with each and every context? These are questions that Hurlbert (2012) asks when he writes about his own experience, as an undergraduate, engaging with an ideogram in Ezra Pound's "Mang Tsze: The Ethics of Mencius." From his experience, studying the way the lines and angles come together to form a visual representation of meaning, Hurlbert (2012) discusses what it is like to render the composing of another culture more "exotic than actual" and to later realize that "composing is more multinational, larger and more multi-natured than anyone, not Aristotle, not Edward P.J. Corbett, not anyone, despite their contribution, has written" (p. 15). That day, when I walked towards the temple wall and touched the character, I rendered the entire experience more "exotic than actual" (p. 15). I felt a sense of accomplishment that was associated with both the action and desire to position myself within the context of a Chinese social practice. Still, the young girl who stood beside me undoubtedly knew more about this practice than I did. I was an outsider to the transaction of meaning that took place, and I knew it.

My relationship to Peace Corps both aided in and added to my social position as an outsider—"one *within* a larger political-historical complex" (Abu-Lughod, 2006, p. 468 emphasis original). I was a member of the China 15s—the 15th group to be sent by Peace Corps to China since it's re-invitation in 1993. During our first two months of service in Chengdu, Peace Corps offered us intensive language and cultural training. We all took language classes in small teahouses in the Jianzhong hotel during the first few weeks and eventually moved to small classrooms at Chengdu University. The language classes were small; there were only five of us in each class. The environment became competitive and it worked; we all learned enough to verbally communicate in Mandarin. Despite my linguistic ability to communicate in daily life, the symbolic nature of language coupled with my discursive positioning created gaps between words and the extent to which I could grasp their embedded cultural implications. For instance, as Peace Corps Volunteers we were advised not to refer to ourselves as 和平對 (*heping dui*): "Peace Corps" because the phrase carried certain connotations among a generation of Chinese that were not always well received. Hessler (2013), a former member of the Peace Corps China 3s, explains it best: "the organization's character has always shifted with the American political climate, ever since President John F. Kennedy founded it in 1961, during the heart of the Cold War" (p. 161). Though I never learned the exact reason for China's discomfort with the organization back in the 1960's, I knew that during the peak of the Cultural Revolution (1967-1976), the Chinese government suspected CIA affiliates within the Peace Corps. Because of this, we were told to call ourselves 美中友好志愿 者 (*mei-zhong you hao zhi yuan zhe*): (appropriately) "U.S.-China Friendship Volunteers." I wondered how merely changing a name, a title of an organization, could change one's perception of that organization? Words are deeply embedded with histories, and histories are told and retold from one generation to another. Language is a thread that connects the past to the present. The symbolic nature of language has staying power. Symbolic orientation is "a bundle of judgments as to how things were, how they are, and how they may be" (Burke, 1984, p. 14). As a "U.S.-China Friendship Volunteer" I was free from the historical judgments placed on Peace Corps as an organization. In this role, I wanted to understand more about the relationships between language, history, and culture that surrounded my work in the context of China. Stemming from this experience, but based on practices beyond it, in *Recontextualizing Composition Studies*, I seek to explore the ways that Chinese scholars in composition studies work within this "in between" space in their scholarship and in their teaching. Taken as a whole, their work not only offers answers to questions that were, during my service as a volunteer, outside of my reach, but also extends beyond these initial questions to current practice-based issues in the field. Most of all, engaging with the work of these scholars allows me to see differently some of the practices I observed and was part of in China. Let me explain.

As a volunteer, I soon realized that my knowledge and use of Mandarin only provided me with a piece of what I needed to negotiate the many regional dialects I came into contact with in Chongqing. As a Peace Corps Volunteer, I was only trained in Mandarin, because I taught in a University and Mandarin is the dialect that is used in academic contexts. Although Mandarin is the standard language, taxi drivers, waitresses, store clerks and friendly strangers spoke a dialect other than Mandarin. My Chinese students showed me what it meant to negotiate among linguistic varieties for meaning, though, at the time, I only had a visceral understanding of what negotiation really meant. I would watch my students as they conversed in dialogue with others. I would watch their facial expressions. I noticed them pause and continue to speak. Often these negotiated interactions occurred in local restaurants with waiters or in taxis with drivers. From my own epistemological stance, these interactions would take less time. A question such as, 哪儿 *qu nar*? (where are you going?) Would be answered quickly because that is the expectation that follows this type of verbal interaction in the North American context where I am from. On several occasions; however, I noticed that these interactions took longer than I expected. My students would converse with their interlocutors for several minutes, and the conversation would move back and forth until what I recognized to be "understanding" occurred. This process of negotiation was common practice for my students who came to the university from a variety of regions in China, and it was also common practice for the local people of Fuling. It was in this context that I realized the expectation of social interaction is not to immediately obtain meaning through language (as I had been accustomed to). Instead, as Canagarajah (2013a) explains, "meaning …is produced in *practice* through negotiation strategies" (p. 40 my emphasis). Without negotiation, diverse communities would not be able to verbally communicate with one another. If the expectation were to directly receive the intended meaning upon verbal interaction, which is common in U.S. composition, communication would fail.

Purpose and Significance

So why does any of this matter? As Liu (1995) emphasizes in her book, "the crucial thing here is not whether translation between cultures is possible…or whether the 'other is knowable' or even whether an abstruse text is decipherable, but what *practical purposes* or needs…bring an ethnographer to pursue cultural translation?" (p. 2 my emphasis). Navigating the practice-based contexts of home and school is an age-old reality that students from all cultural and linguistic backgrounds face, but what is a "home" practice, and what is a "school" practice? More importantly, what do we mean when we say that students navigate these practiced contexts? Understanding the nuances of these questions and the implications they present is an important, albeit challenging, endeavor that deserves some attention.

As writing teachers, we might begin with questions that address how we should negotiate the diverse nature of practice. We may ask what practices might we engage in to allow us to serve our students? Who is enacting these practices? What do these practices look like? How do they teach us to move between the diverse practices students bring to their academic writing? Though we may ask ourselves these questions, or questions similar to them, any quest to find such answers will no doubt be informed by our own positionality and research trajectory. With this in mind, as I move forward with seeking answers to my questions, I do so recognizing that who I am and where I have been intrude upon what I do and how I do it (Mao, 2010). In other words, I am aware that my own experiences and the inescapable influence of my frame of reference not only effects the resources I seek out to find answers to my questions, but also colors my analytical perspective.

The Logic of Selves, Everyone Else, and Other Terms of Difference

> *Embedded deep in our cells is our selves and everyone else*
> —Juliana Spahr, "This Connection of Everyone With Lungs"

Despite my position as an ethnic outsider to the cultural and linguistic practices highlighted in the chapters that follow, my desire to promote a way of thinking that shrinks the space between selves and others encourages me to continue. As Smith (2008) argues, the shift of logic from binary thinking to relations between "is not to be feared because the Other is in us already if only we can see it" (p. 3). While the lines from Spahr's (2005) poem suggest an embodied connection to "everyone else," in reality, the connection between selves and others is not always easy to see. The kind of thinking required to get beyond our selves is difficult. It is difficult because language makes it too easy to draw lines, often making the logic of difference binary and opposite. When we begin from binary logic we leave little space to see our selves in others. In *Recontextualizing Composition Studies*, I offer a way of thinking and writing about others that, as Abu-Lughod (2006) suggests, "makes them seem less other" (p. 470). Using the yin and yang construct, I stretch this way of thinking so that it applies to all terms of difference. I provide specific examples, when possible, of the ways in which constructs such as, *home* and *school*, *male* and *female*, *self* and *other*, to name a few, "like the diffraction patterns illuminating the indefinite nature of boundaries—displaying shadows in "light" regions and bright spots in "dark" regions" (Barad 2003, p. 803), are not as opposite as they are thought to be. And this conversation begins with the terms, "West" and "non-West."

The West and the Rest

In Chapter 2 I draw on a variety of literature that uses the terms, "West," "non-West," "Western," and "non-Western." When I use these terms, I do so in order to honor the important scholarship from which they emanate. Although I use these terms, I do regard them as somewhat imaginary. To say it differently, these terms function as a convenient way to establish one tradition from another, but as Bhattacharya (2011) argues "the construct 'West' is geographically unstable, arbitrary, and shifting" (p. 183) and, therefore, does not serve to represent an actual "place" or geographic marker. In addition, I also find that the use of the terms "West" and "non-West" submit to tacit underpinnings of "privilege" and "non-privilege." Recognizing this as a problem, when I refer to traditions on my own, whether rhetorical, philosophical, or cultural, I am specific. For instance, when referring to my own analytical lens, I favor "frame of reference" over Western. Since the scholarship and actors in this dissertation offer cultural and linguistic insight from China to the United States, when I refer to traditions outside of my own frame of reference I use "Chinese" to be general and, when applicable, "Confucian," or "Modern Chinese" to be specific. In *Recontextualizing Composition Studies*, I attempt, when possible, to complicate the bifurcation of binary terms, what Abu-Lughod (2006) drawing on Said's (1978) erasure of "the Orient" and "the Occident," argues "is not the erasure of all differences but the recognition of *more of them* and of the complex ways in which they crosscut (p. 472 my emphasis).

Practice > Discourse

In order to present a view of communication that emphasizes change and does not limit itself to the verbal strategies practitioners use to convey meaning, I favor the word, practice over discourse. In his book, Gee (2009) differentiates between “discourse” and “Discourse.” While Gee (2009) uses *discourse* to mean the verbal interactions speakers of languages use in linguistic exchanges, he uses *Discourse* to represent the non-verbal and symbolic interactions that help the transmission of meaning. To this end, Gee (2009) defines Discourse as “language *plus*” (p. 154). His definition of Discourse includes “distinctive ways of speaking/listening and often, too, writing/reading coupled with distinctive ways of acting, interacting, valuing, feeling, dressing, thinking, believing, with other people and with various objects, tools, and technologies” (p. 155). Defined in this way, Discourse, like discourse, accounts for speaking, listening, writing, and reading, but includes embodied interaction and some of the subtler aspects of communication such as anticipating, planning, and thinking. Although I favor Gee’s (2009) notion of “Discourse” over “discourse” as it aligns with my conceptualization of communication, I seek to move beyond this term. Following Canagarajah (2013) who submits, “all that we have in communication are practices” (p. 16) and Pennycook’s (2010) development of practice “as a diverse social activity” (p. 2), I use the term *practice* instead of Discourse. By differentiating between practice and Discourse, I broaden the relationship between experience and action and emphasize the changing nature of communication, which is difficult to achieve using words alone.

The Matter of Ontology

The challenge of using words in a way that authentically conveys experience is, in part, due to language, which often represents truth in vague terms. Addressing the gap between language and its ability to authentically represent experience, some scholars (Barad, 2003; Micciche, 2014; Ahmed, 2010) problematize “the excessive power granted to language to determine what is real” (Barad, 2003, p. 802). In order to address this issue, these scholars use the word, "ontology" (singular) or "ontologies" (plural) to offset experience (being, acting, doing agency etc.) as it is actually lived, from experience as it is conveyed through words. For new materialists, a focus on "relations rather things" (Barad, 2003, p. 814), the repetition of "tending toward" (Ahmed, 2014) and "partnerships" (Micciche, 2014) are what reveals the nature of representation. For instance, in her attempt to represent the writer through his or her practice, Micciche (2014) focuses on the acknowledgements genre. According to her, the acknowledgements section of books and dissertations bring forth the relationships between writers and other people and between writers and, to use some of her examples, "animals, feelings, sound, and places…[that] reveal the very condition of writing itself" (p. 499). This condition, which is personal and idiosyncratic to the writer, cannot truly be represented without discussing the partnerships (both human and non-human) between writer and world. Following Micciche (2014), Ahmed (2010), and Barad (2003) in chapters 4, 5, and 6 of *Recontextualizing Composition Studies*, I address representation by examining and questioning the relationships between people and things, words and the phenomenon they seek to represent, and human and non-human forms of communication. In a spirit of new materialism, I use the word *ontology* in discussions that lend themselves to the differences between "the word and the thing" (Jakobson), which calls up specific issues that arise in representing persons based on words alone and by representing varieties of English based on a national boundary.

Following Hall and Ames (1995), I take an "interpretive pluralist" approach to my undertakings with the concepts and modes of communication I highlight in this work. Based on a commitment to new pragmatics, an "interpretive pluralist" approach, "denies that there is any final truth to be attained or, for that matter, anything final about the interpretive tools one uses; nor does one even believe that there is a means of listing all the necessary tools" (Hall & Ames, 1995, p. 144). In other words, as an outsider with insider experience to the cultural context from which this project emanates, I know there are limitations to how well I am able to speak for and about the practices of Chinese scholars. Mindful of these limitations, I do not attempt “to get it right,” but, rather, “‘to get on with it’ in the most responsible manner possible” (p. 119), by starting from where I am, with the knowledge and personal experience I have obtained thus far.

To this end, in this project I engage with the work of Chinese scholars in composition studies in order to illuminate the ways in which they contribute to translingual practice. My reason for seeking out the practices of these scholars, specifically, is because I believe they have provided important contributions to the field of composition studies and that these contributions shed light on the way that diverse communities might relate to one another by adopting specific practices. By positioning the work of these scholars beside translingual theory, which I outline in the following section, I hope to explicate the way their contributions have, are, and continue to align with a translingual orientation. The following criteria informs the selection of literature included in this review: 1) works by Chinese scholars who have published in the field of composition studies and 2) theoretical contributions on Chinese language and culture, Chinese English, and Chinese rhetoric. In order to situate my project in the present, in chapters 4, 5, and 6 I provide individual scholar chapters of Xiaoye You, Haixia Lan, and Danling Fu. These chapters are based on qualitative interviews and observations I conducted in order to see the ways in which these scholars adopt translingual practices to move between the diverse nature of communicative practice in their scholarship and teaching. By engaging with the theoretical and practical aspects of this project I hope to answer two major research questions:

1) How do Chinese scholars in composition studies move between practices in their scholarship and teaching?

2) How have these scholars contributed to moving the field towards a translingual approach to the teaching of writing?

Theoretical Framework

In the following chapters I use translingual theory and practice to unpack some of the implications of "moving between" as it relates to the practices of Chinese scholars in the field of composition studies. As a theory, translingualism aims to cultivate awareness, on the part of the communicative practitioner, about the more subtle aspects of practices that people do when they come into contact with one another in global and local contexts. According to Canagarajah (2013a), "Translingual social relations and communicative practices have always existed, although perhaps unacknowledged and discouraged in some times and places" (p. 33), such as academic writing, for instance. We might think of what we call translingual practice as an ontological understanding of communicative practice that we all experience when enter into social contexts. Translingualism is not a theoretical construct that aims to "reinvent the wheel" (p. 33). Instead, those who theorize translingual practice (Cangarajah 2013a, 2013b; Liu 1998; Horner et. al. 2011; Donahue 2013) draw from the past so the theoretical construct is an outgrowth of previous concepts developed with a similar trajectory in mind. Practices under the translingual model involve looking at the subtle choices individuals make or ignore when they seek to establish meaning in social contexts through interaction. By becoming aware of these choices we may also develop ways of seeing our selves in others, too.

To establish translingual practice, Liu (1998) takes an historical approach to tease out the way that Chinese and Western scholars make conclusions about Chinese terms and concepts without looking at the historical implications and transitions of the words. Although these conclusions may be rooted in evidence based on modernity, Liu's (1998) use of translingual practice examines “the process by which new words, meanings, discourses, and modes of representation arise, circulate and acquire legitimacy” (p. 26). For Liu (1998), change is the central aspect of translingalism. By drawing attention to the way that words and their meanings change, and the verbal and embodied interactions individuals rely on, we are better able to adapt to the practice-based conditions of communication.

While some scholars (Canagarajah 2013a; 2013b; 2013c; Liu, 1998) devise a theory of translingualism based on negotiation practices (e.g. recontextualization, envoicing strategies, interactional strategies) and dispositions that allow for interdependent relationships between languages users, others (Bizzell, 2014; Horner et. al, 2011; Horner, 2014; Donahue, 2009) are still working to convince rhetoric and composition audiences that standardization in written and spoken language is and has always been a myth. In the introduction to his recent publication, Horner (2014) argues that “English needs to be reworked, spurred by increasingly undeniable contradictions between the tenets of the dominant ideology of English-only monolingualism and the linguistic facts on the ground” (p. 9)—standardization does not, and never did, exist. All writers deviate from the “the standard,” but deviations that are an outgrowth of familiar writing styles are often met with acceptance.

In response to Horner et. al’s (2011) call for U.S. composition to increasingly examine the study of writing in other countries, Bou Ayash (2014) offers an example of the kind of work compositionists might engage in to diversify their understanding of language practice outside of the United States. Distinguishing between “living languages” and “language standards” in Lebanon and Singapore, she considers the economic and political forces that influence language practice and language ideology. While writing programs in Lebanon recognize the need to compose business and legal documents in multiple languages, Singapore has a different perspective. In light of the "Speak Well, Be Understood" movement launched by the Singaporean government, an emphasis on a Standard English that may be recognized nationally and internationally limits the possibility of translingual practice in academic contexts. From this comparative analysis, Bou Ayash (2014) concludes that language users "situate themselves differently in relation to various forms of living languages and have different stakes in either preserving the symbolic power of language standards or pursuing cross-language relations" (p. 124). What's more, in light of U.S. composition's preference for Standard Academic English, Bou Ayash's (2014) study suggests a closer attention to three specific areas of practice: Language relations on the ground (the sociolinguistic landscape), language relations in policies, and language relations in practices (p. 125). In Chapter 2, I provide an historical examination of language relations on the ground through the vantage point of Chinese scholars in rhetoric and composition and, in Chapters 4, 5, and 6, I examine language relations in verbal exchanges and pedagogical practices.

Why Translingualism?

Recently, the move towards translingual approaches to pedagogy has received a great deal of interest and criticism in the field of writing studies. Dubbed "an intellectual movement" of "linguistic tourism" (Matsuda, 2014, p. 478, 482), scholars who support translingualism (Canagarajah, 2013a, Horner et. al. 2011, Bizzell, 2014) have emphasized the need to move beyond the novelty of the theory towards research based on practice.

In her recent article, Bizzell (2014) uses the pedagogical model of translingualism and the textual practices of comparative rhetoric to argue for more ethical ways of reading and responding to student writing. According to Bizzell (2014) "both translingualism and comparative rhetoric contend with situations in which people are treated unethically because a potential imbalance of power allows traditional, conservative Western values to dominate" (p. 443). Bizzell (2014) suggests that practices rooted in both areas of study have the ability to shed light on the way we know our students. In *Recontextualizing Composition Studies* I suggest that the methods used in comparative rhetoric, which I discuss in Chapter 2, provide a line of thought that may be used when responding to student writing in the composition classroom. For instance, acknowledging some of the issues comparative rhetoric scholars face when they move beyond their own frame of reference, which teachers do all the time when they read student writing, Wang (2013) posits "Comparative rhetoric should focus on how we read rather than *what* we read" (p. 233). With a similar attention to approach, Canagarajah (2013a) outlines translingual dispositions that writing teachers might adopt to nurture spaces of difference in way that works towards developing "a sensitivity to similarity-in-difference. . .and difference-in-similarity" (Canagarajah, 2013b, p. 9) in students' English writing. Although both areas of study deal with addressing an imbalance of power, between self and other, or, teacher and student, more attention to practice is required to move beyond theory.

Translingual Practice and L2 Writing

It is an interesting time to be a translingual scholar. In an open letter addressed to "editors" and "organization leaders" in writing studies, Atkinson et. al. (2015) respond to "the growing misunderstanding that L2 writing and translingual writing are somehow competing with each other or, worse yet, that one is replacing the other" (p. 383). While Atkinson et. al (2015) make some important distinctions that define L2 writing by its own criteria, they conflate "translingual practice"—a broad term carrying a variety of implications—to a writing practice by naming it, "translingual writing." By doing this, they do not give attention to the aspect of approach that is associated with translingual practice and which I examine in this project. In addition, by conflating translingual writing with L2 writing they create an alignment that confirms, rather than refutes, the idea that one practice is competing with the other. Although they use this rhetorical strategy to serve their argument, they clearly understand that the theoretical implications of translingualism cannot be boiled down to a way of writing: In their letter, Atkinson et. al (2015) write "translingual writing is a particular orientation to how language is conceptualized and implicated in the study and teaching of writing" (p. 384). But if it is to be named, "translingual writing," how can it be an orientation? While L2 writing is defined as "writing in a language that is acquired later in life" (p. 384) translingual practice, though referred to as "writing," examines negotiation strategies, dispositions, and approaches that allow practitioners and writing teachers to move beyond bounded understandings of language. In *Recontextualizing Composition Studies* I provide specific examples of translingual practice that may certainly be used to compliment L2 writing pedagogies. Although the practices stem from ideological camps with different views on language and language systems, there is no reason why the dispositions and pedagogical approaches involved in translingual practice could not be used along with L2 writing pedagogy.

The Art of Recontextualization

As I proceed in this project, mindful of my frame of reference, but actively searching for meaning beyond it, I adopt a rhetorical lens that allows me to revisit critical work in the field of composition studies through the vantage point of Chinese scholars at specific historical moments. According to Mao (2010), such an approach entails "the art of recontextualization"— a "dialectical process of moving between the external and the internal, between the familiar and the unfamiliar…" (p. 332). He adds that recontextualization must "address the material and sociocultural conditions of the present, recognizing and interrogating, for example, how these conditions shape knowledge production and knowledge circulation, and how they may constrain and complicate our representations" (p. 332-333). Although Mao (2010) utilizes "the art of recontextualization" as an ethical way to do comparative rhetoric, I suggest that the lens involves translingual practice, too. For example, Canagarajah (2013a) describes recontextualization as a verbal strategy that allows interlocutors to "frame their talk in ways conducive to uptake and achieve the appropriate footing for meaning negotiation" (p. 80). To do this, interlocutors might rephrase their talk in conversation so that they meet each other half in the process and transmission of meaning. Used as a rhetorical strategy, In Chapter 2 of *Recontextualizing Composition Studies*, I use "the art of recontextualization" as a way to reframe a brief history of the field of composition and rhetoric through the vantage point of Chinese scholars. To do this, I will first review some of the early work from Chinese scholars that address the internal conflict between students' own subculture and that of the academy (Lu, 1992, "Conflict and Struggle"). From here, I look at historical moments that have given rise to the asymmetrical power relationships in regard to English as a global language and have contributed to the evolution of global Englishes in Higher Education. Finally, I examine some of the more recent work in comparative rhetoric that is being recontextualized by Chinese scholars. More than an intellectual study of non-European American rhetorics, this work offers methodical approaches for studying ethnic, Chinese, and Asian/Asian American rhetorics. I submit that the intellectual work in comparative rhetoric, from the vantage point of Chinese scholars, offers a line of thought that may be applied to how we read student writing and how we move beyond the biases of our own frame of reference when responding to and interacting with the other. By drawing on the work of Chinese scholars, specifically, I highlight their contribution to the field through their own critical vantage point.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Recontextualizing "Home" and "School" Practices

The languages that students use in the context of "home" and "school" have long been understood as both political and ideological in practice. Language is always negotiated in social and political spaces, influenced by the powerful hegemonies of nations and states. In practice, knowledge of these hegemonies, which inform and shape language, is mostly tacit knowledge—language users make linguistic choices based on an unspoken, but mindful awareness of context. These contexts are quite specific, but in practice the choices that language users make are thought of in a more general way, as the languages of "home" and "school." Scholars who are interested in the linguistic choices that students make within and between these contextually situated boundaries resist binary thinking (Gutiérrez, 2008; Scollon & Scollon, 2003; Smith 2008) and, instead, work towards developing "a sensitivity to similarity-in-difference. . .and difference-in-similarity" (Canagarajah 2013a, p. 9). In this section I review literature that foregrounds the language experiences of both Chinese scholars and students in specific contexts and historical moments in China and in the United States. By reviewing this scholarship, I hope to highlight the way that language users are always drawing on multiple forms of contextually situated variables when they write and speak in English.

In her pioneer work, Lu (1987) reflects on her multilingual upbringing in order to fill in the silences that came as a result of her education under the backdrop of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR). Lu's (1987) narrative details her linguistic experiences growing up in Shanghai and learning how to best communicate under the ideology of two conflicting worlds: home, where she used English with her family and Shanghai dialect with the servants; and school, where she would only speak Standard Chinese dialect (Mandarin). Lu's (1987) navigation of English and Chinese in different contexts complicates the idea that one language may be used in a way that is free from the interference of the other. Reflecting on her elementary education, she writes:

> The more suspicious I became about the way I read and wrote, the more guilty I felt for losing the spontaneity with which I had learned to "use" these "languages." Writing the book report made me feel that my reading and writing in the "language" of either home or school could not be free of the interference of the other. (p. 443)

The kind of linguistic experience that Lu (1987) communicates here is both the conflict and the solution. Multilingual writers need to learn to embrace the conflicting nature of their linguistic varieties and use them as a tool for negotiation in their Standard English Academic writing. Teachers of writing can support students in this process by enacting practices that encourage students to shift the role of meaning (Berthoff, 1981) from one language to another. By doing this, the nuances that occur between languages may be used as tool for learning, rather than a problem to solve.

Lu's (1987) epistemological contributions are important for understanding how discourses travel and change and how words rely on context for meaning. In the context of the GPCR Lu's (1987) understanding of "class," as a style, shifted to mean "class" as a group. But there are other meanings of class that no doubt would, in other historical or situational contexts, reveal additional meanings. These meanings may only be realized within the context of culture, situation, and the particular political climate from which they emerge. To say it differently, it is not as easy to assume that certain words just mean different things in different contexts. There is more to it than that. Moving towards an approach that nurtures these conflicting discourses, Lu

(1987) challenges teachers “to complicate the external and internal scenes of [their] students' writing” (p. 475) by including other discourses, apart from those purely academic, in the classroom. In Chapter 7 of *Recontextualizing Composition Studies*, I suggest ways that teachers of writing might respond to Lu’s (1987) challenge, which is still relevant almost two decades after this article’s publication. In addition, I suggest that such a way of thinking aligns with an awareness of the relations between language and language users (Lu & Horner 2013 p. 27), which is a central feature of a translingual orientation. It requires one to move between the discourses students bring to academic contexts, and to valorize those discourses that seem foreign or unfamiliar. Ultimately, it requires teachers of writing to create a space where students are inspired to struggle to find a common ground between their diverse linguistic repertoires.

Lu’s (1987) pioneer work published in *College English* was revolutionary for its time; it touches on an “international perspective” to the teaching of writing. It moves beyond merely addressing the issues of social and economic class differences and considers “composing from various cultural perspectives from around the globe in an attempt to better serve our students—and the world” (Hurlbert, 2012, p. 7). Lu’s (1987) argument makes a strong statement about the changing nature of language and what it means to have an active role in an argument, too. As she explains: “As it goes on through history, what we call ‘communal discourses’—arguments specific to particular political, social, economic, ethnic, sexual, and family groups-form, re-form and trans-form” (p. 445). Words change. Politics change. Discourses change, from one context to another. Being cognizant of the changing nature of discourses and the contexts from which they emerge is crucial to teaching students from different cultural, linguistic, and economic backgrounds.

The Art of 移 (*yi*)

In each chapter of her book, Lu (2001) shares stories about the lives of four women in her family (Haopo, Ahfen, Mmma, Yimin) including herself. In this personal narrative, she utilizes the concept, 移 "*yi*" as a theme that runs through the stories of her family. As she explains in the prologue, "in Chinese we call immigrants *yi min*. The literal translation for *yimin* is people (*min*) who have moved (*yi*), but the word is often used in combination with other words to mean a variety of actions, not just the act of moving to or from a place. For instance, 移 *yi* (as movement in general) might convey, "the effort to change shift, transplant, influence, transfer or give…fuse confuse and diffuse set ways of doing things (xi). In each of her four chapters, the concept 移 *yi* is used to highlight the shifting nature of word meaning, identity, and negotiation in particular contexts. It is also used to reveal Lu's (2001) own coming to terms with the past in the present. Through family stories, Lu's (2001) narrative emphasizes that change is constant. In the final chapter of her book, Lu (2001) uses the concept 移 *yi* to frame a discussion about what it means to care for people on both sides of the Pacific, by sharing stories of cultural crossings. These stories, Lu (2001) explains, help one "face rather than deny their interdependence on one another" (p. 281). In chapter 7 of *Recontextualizing Composition Studies* I suggest that the kind of 移 *yi* moments Lu (2001) discusses in her final chapter, and throughout her book, may be used to describe the act of "in-betweeness" and also an orientation towards translingual practice.

Lu's (2001) work inspires questions that are relevant for teaching writing, particularly the insight she provides on what it means to take on the responsibility to care for others on "both sides of the pacific" (p. 281). Change is just as constant as movement. With movement across time and place, meaning changes and identities shift. There is no such thing as a fixed or absolute meaning, just as there is no such thing as a fixed or absolute identity. In chapter 4, I highlight Xiaoye You's Cross-Pacific Exchange Project as a way to mobilize the concept 移 *yi* in a writing classroom. In this project, Xiaoye has students from his university in the United States share essays with students at Guangdong University in China. Students exchange their essays on an Internet forum and respond to each other's writing. Once students respond, the discrepancies between writer and reader are revealed. To nurture conversations about difference, Xiaoye has students discuss their responses using Skype and email. In addition, Xiaoye uses classroom discussion to mediate students' misunderstandings of text and to create a space where the multiple ways that meaning is composed and communicated become a topic of discussion.

Lu's (1987; 2001) works reveal that navigating the changes of different communicative contexts may, on the one hand, be accessible to students; perhaps the boundary between home and school are easy to move between. On other hands students, like Lu (1987), may find it difficult to survive the "whirlpool of crosscurrents" (p. 447) that is the nature of communicative practice. Still, these practices are always subject to a variety of linguistic and non-linguistic variables, in particular contexts. In any case, as a discipline, composition has come a long way in terms of how its practitioners—teachers of writing—and scholars respond to diversity.

Exposing the bias surrounding the treatment of the other in rhetoric and composition, Hum (1999) examines some the field's essays (see Rose, 1989; Lloyd-Jones, 1992) on diversity. From here she illuminates "how the discipline, while espousing heterglossia, is 'monovocally diverse'" (p. 573). In other words, even though compositionists profess diversity, the literature they cite is canonical and the narrative they perpetuate a repetition of familiar voices. In this early work, Hum (1999) identifies the "either/or" binary that the discipline employs in the teaching of writing: "students must choose either their native dialect or Standard English" (p. 577). Speaking from the positionality of "a Malaysian of ethnic Chinese descent" (p. 578), Hum

(1999) explains the way her initiation into the academy as a graduate student was marked not by the acceptance of diversity, but, rather, a paradoxical Otherness. In response to her own experiences and the discipline's binary thinking, Hum (1999) suggests that teacher-scholars decide how "cultural content can lead to ideological and pedagogical realignment" (p. 582), which requires working in between the varieties of Englishes students use in their academic writing and reflecting honestly and carefully on one's own positionality.

Hum's (1999) criticism of the field's monocultural thinking received attention and inspired discussions about ways to recognize similarity in difference rather than glossing over difference and maintaining a "we are all equal" perspective. For instance, in response to Hum's (1999) article, McGann (2000) reflects on his personal experiences at George Washington University to offer the way he, too, occupies "plural and conflicting positions" (p. 447) as both a white privileged male and, as a writing program instructor, a subordinate member of the English Department. While McGann's (2000) anecdote does not even scratch the surface of Hum's (1999) experience, it does reveal "a sensitivity to similarity-in-difference. . .and difference-in-similarity" (Canagarajah, 2013b, p. 9). As McGann (2000) explains, "While my experience in GWU's writing program is by no means a mirror image of Sue Hum's experience in academia, it does place both of us in subordinate positions in the academy—even if those positions are also different" (p. 447). Moving between does not mean making heroes of others or professing that all are created equal. Those actions erase and rewrite identities. Instead, moving between "disrupts the certainty of the 'either-or' and the 'both-and'" (p. Hum, 1999, p. 577) mindset.

The Two-Pronged Approach

In order to address the conflicting environments of first year composition in a global age, attention to pedagogy is crucial. For instance, it's easy enough to talk and theorize about non-dualistic approaches to pedagogy, but these ideas often evaporate once it comes to practice. History has witnessed several attempts at educational reform, but few of these attempts have met goals from beginning to end. In her influential article, "Conflict and Struggle: The Enemies or Preconditions of Basic Writing?" Lu (1992) problematizes the pedagogical trend deemed a solution to dualistic nature of the "border resident": The two-pronged approach to educational reform. This approach 1) accommodates the student and 2) dismisses teaching practices that "choose for students…their position towards conflicting cultures" (p. 901). Though this approach to education is used and was supported by teachers of writing, Lu (1992) points out that careful attention to the pedagogical practice is important. For instance, educational reform does not mean, "once the teacher accepts the students' need to be interested in racial politics and becomes "sympathetic to" –acknowledges –their "peculiar frustration," business in the writing classroom can go on as usual" (p. 902). In response to Shaughnessy's approach to Basic Writing (BW), Lu (1992) warns that Shaughnessy's essentialist view, that "words can express but will not change the essence of one's thoughts" (p. 906), is false. Words *do* have an effect on thought. Drawing on the history of BW research since CUNY's open admissions, Lu (1992) asks that compositionists continue to "read against the grain, filling in the silences of these accounts" (p. 909) in order to develop new pedagogical theories and perspectives that support and nurture students in the conflicting environments of BW. What Lu (1992) essentially suggests by asking compositionists to "read against the grain," I suggest, might also be understood as reading between—valorizing the words, phrases, and natural language that students bring to their academic writing and using it as a way to develop new pedagogies.

Between-Worlds Trope

Despite compositionists' scholarly efforts to nurture spaces of difference between students' home and school languages, several scholars (Anzaldúa, 1999; Fu, 1995; Villanueva, 1993; Hurlbert, 2012) have commented on the discipline's nationalistic orientation to writing. Responding to this issue, Hattori and Ching (2008) call for a "retirement of the between-worlds trope as both an institutional framework and a pedagogical principal in cross-cultural composition and rhetoric studies" (p. 41). It is important to note that Hattori and Ching's (2008) criticism of the between-worlds trope should not be confused with "moving between," which is an activity I seek to examine in this project. While moving between is associated with practices that nurture spaces of difference, the between-worlds trope has its roots in institutional frameworks and scholarly practices that do not adapt to recognize difference in language "as a resource for producing meaning in writing, speaking, reading and listening" (Horner et. al., 2011, p. 303). Instead, the between-worlds trope is understood as a developmental or transitional stage for learners—a stage in which competence in proverbial Standard Academic English and adaptation to the dominant culture is eventually achieved.

Drawing on her five-year experience (1997 to 2002) as a literacy specialist at the Sun Yat Sen Middle School, Fu (2003) provides layers of insight into the lives of her ESL students who live between New York City's Chinatown and the lives they left in China's Fujian province. Through student writings and personal interviews with Chinese immigrants, Fu (2003) reveals the sacrifices Chinese families make when they come to the United States. Often, parents emigrate alone and leave their children in China to be raised by grandparents. After several years, children join their parents, but are asked to leave the grandparents that raised them to move to a new country, with new schools, and, for all intents and purposes, a new family life. In addition, Fu's (2003) narrative addresses several topics that deal with the adjustment process including race, class, competency and the differences between the Chinese and English language systems that often influence the choices, viewed as "errors," Chinese students make when they write in English. Fu (2003) explains:

> Chinese characters and words are conceptually constructed. When Chinese children learn to read and write Chinese characters or words, they have to learn the relationship between their shape (or their structure) and their meaning. It differs fundamentally from English language, whose spelling corresponds with how it sounds rather than what it means (p. 131).

Almost a decade after the publication of this book, the linguistic and cultural gap between Chinese students' languages at home and school, not to mention the cultural adjustment that students must make when they come to the United States and how often teachers in academic institutions neglect this adjustment, is still a very important area of research that deserves more attention.

An additional example of the between-worlds trope is described in Hum's (2006) examination of the authenticity and inauthenticity of her Chineseness, which is based, first and foremost, on her location. In response to her friend's accusation: you are "not Chinese" (p. 446) Hum (2006) explains her Malaysian upbringing marked by her grandparents moving from China to Malaysia, and her disconnection from mainland China. She adds:

> I do not speak mandarin, the language spoken by all *real* Chinese, a primary yardstick for measuring legitimacy. However, I am trilingual, speaking English and an oral Chinese

> dialect, Hokkien, at home; in school, the language of instruction is Malay…within the cultural and spatial context of Malaysia I *am* considered Chinese. (p. 447 emphasis original).

While Hum's friend's accusation is based on a sense of homogeneity associated with being Chinese, Hum's (2006) agentive negotiations straddle relations of affiliation and disaffiliation with the Chinese identity. While the between-world's trope is viewed as a negative stance from which individuals may include and exclude based on performance, in Chapters 4, 5, and 6, I provide examples that show the complexity of living between based on a sense of identification and negotiated practice.

As I continue to bring the early work of Chinese scholars to the forefront of my dissertation, I intentionally trace their critical work—work that questions pedagogical trends and discursive "norms,"—in the particular contexts of China and the United States. By situating this research beside some of the emerging theories of translingual practice, such as, "the fluctuating character of languages and language practices within and between peoples" (Donahue, 2013, p. 156), I find that not very much has changed in terms of the direction the field of composition should move. What has changed, however, are the approaches and visions of some of these scholars. Taken together, I hope to reveal the impact these scholars have made on the field in general and on the emerging theory of translingualism in particular.

"Good Writing"

The struggle that students face when writing between languages or in their Standard English Academic writing is often the result of conflicting answers to the question, what is good writing? While some recent studies (Fu & Townsend, 2010; Guillaume, 2005; Woodrow, 2011) have looked at students' perceptions of Standard English Academic writing in cross-cultural contexts, few have addressed professors' perceptions of the same. Two studies (Li 1996; You & You 2013), separated by over a decade, look at the practices and perceptions of Chinese and United States content area professors. To explore the issues of "good writing" standards as they are practiced in both cultures, Li (1996) embarks on project that explores what is meant by "good writing" from a cross-cultural perspective. To do this, Li (1996) conducts a total of four qualitative interviews with writing teachers from China and the United States (Mr. Wang, Jack, Mr. Zhang, and Jane) who offer pieces of student writings as well as their own responses to these writings, how they graded them, and how the grade they provided is perceived in the larger academic context. The conversation Li (1996) has with these teachers provides insight into the idea of "good writing" that moves beyond the tacit nature of standards in American and Chinese academic contexts.

As discussed in the introduction to her study, six pieces of writing cannot successfully represent a quintessential model of "good writing," but unless she chose to fashion her project as an anthology, she needed to work with fewer texts. The comparative approach that Li (1996) makes between Chinese teachers' (Mr. Wang and Mr. Zhang) and American teachers' (Jack and Jane) responses to student writings sheds light on the way that language influences the choices students make in their writing and the specific characteristics of their writing. For instance, after all four teachers read one another's writing samples, Li (1996) finds that ""Natural" language is to Jack and Jane what "beautiful" and "lyrical" language is to Mr. Wang and Mr. Zhang" (p. 61). To say it differently, teachers from China and teachers from the U.S view the language features that create "natural voice" differently.

While Li (1996) looks specifically at Chinese and United States teachers' perceptions of good English writing, You and You (2013) examine the challenges and adaptive strategies nine

United States professors experience in regard to their NNES students at a summer school in Shanghai, China. To determine these strategies they draw on several sources (interviews, classroom observations written feedback on student papers, syllabi and assignments). Even though NNES students struggled with their written work in general and vocabulary in particular, You and You (2013) indicate "the professors did not simply identify their students' literacy challenges. Proactively, they developed adaptive strategies to help the students learn" (p. 266). In Chapters 4, 5, and 6 I reveal the practices that 3 scholars in composition studies use to negotiate challenges, co-construct meaning, and provide space for students to diversify their understanding about English writing.

English is a language that connects people across cultural and linguistic boundaries. For some language users, English allows for multiple forms of expression. In the United States academic context; however, the standardized nature of English writing often creates a feeling of "disconnect." For some, learning how to filter meaning through the standardized funnel of English for academic purposes is regular practice. In their article, Fu and Townsend (2010) interview 13 Chinese graduate students about their English writing and how it differs from their English writing for academic purposes in the United States context. Several Chinese students emphasized that their Chinese education taught them that writing should be "rich with beauty and taste" (p. 129). Their American education, however, favors plain, direct writing. One student comments, "When I write in English, it is just like fighting without good weapons, cutting beef with a dull knife, or searching with eyes shut-very frustrating and depressing" (p. 130). In the Chinese context, good writing means a creative use of words and phrases that gesture towards one's knowledge of a literary cannon. In the United States context, creative use of words and phrases that gesture towards a literary cannon in academic writing is viewed as vague and unoriginal. The problem that Fu and Townsend (2010) present in their article deserves the attention of those who teach writing in 21st century. As these authors explain, “What limits our abilities to teach diverse students is the kind of deficit thinking that sees differences as signposts of incompetence, ignorance, and limited proficiency” (p. 131). Rather than limit students to writing for “us” in “our” way, these authors suggest moving beyond this monolithic perspective, becoming uncomfortable, and opening ourselves to the possibilities that difference may offer.

Fu and Townsend (2010) include a table in their article that shows Chinese students’ perceptions of writing in two languages. A common theme among the perceptions listed is that English writing for academic purposes limits Chinese students’ ability to compose meaning in a natural way—a way that allows them to draw on the features of “good writing” from a Chinese perspective. Though this response to English writing is not new, similar concerns with English writing have been a struggle for students from various cultural and linguistic backgrounds, it does highlight a key feature of the values associated with composing in the Chinese context. These values are useful for writing teachers to understand, but how should composing from cross-cultural perspectives be evaluated? How can teachers honor students’ composing traditions and support them in the writing they will need to accomplish to be successful? In chapters 4, 5, and 6 of *Recontextualizing Composition Studies*, I present some of the practical responses that Chinese scholars in the field of composition make to teaching. The responsiveness of these scholars to serving students in diverse contexts is visible in the way they develop their pedagogies and understand their identities in relation to their field.

Mediating the practices of home and school presents important questions that Lu (1987; 1992; 2001) Fu (2003; 2010) Li (1996) and You and You (2013) address in their work. Lu (2001) conveys that students may have an understanding of word meanings that are embedded within their own cultural context and/or used at home, but do not carry the same meaning in academic discourse. Moreover, any discourse is bound to intrude upon another and change over time. Therefore, what we call "communal discourses…reform and transform" (p. 445). Although Lu's (1987) own experiences with English and Mandarin reveal her ability to navigate the layers of meaning in different cultural contexts—she discusses the way that her family and teachers minimized the struggle of moving between discursive contexts—Fu (2003; 2010) and Li's (1996) work reveals the difficulties students might face in regard to their enculturation into English use. When students begin to socialize into the language and culture of Standard English Academic writing, something more than language is often lost. There is a personhood that is often silenced because words affect thought, thought informs writing, and writing is acting. Writing is a performance that students invent for academic purposes. For this reason, conversations about practice often intersect with conversations about power.

Performance, Practice, and Power

The nature of one's practice is often enmeshed in what Pratt (1991) calls, "contact zones"—"social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or aftermaths as they are lived out in the world today" (p. 34). One example of such asymmetrical relations of power, in the United States context, can be seen in the case of Manuel Castillo. In July of 2008**,** Mr. Castillo was pulled over by a State Trooper and fined a hefty penalty fee of $500 for speaking English with an accent. Castillo had a commercial driver's license and was not speeding. The trooper that pulled him over did so only to monitor Castillo's use of English. Mao (2010) uses Castillo's case as an example of some of the consequences that result from the sanctioned varieties of English in the United States. The truth is, of course, that everyone speaks with an accent. The ideological standard that is imposed upon “accent free” varieties of English is a model built on an illusion. So, “why can’t other varieties of English be accepted so long as they are understandable and so long as they are communicative?” (p. 189). Mao (2010) suggests an approach or mindset that responds to the multiple varieties of English in particular contexts of use, what he calls “interdependence-in-difference.” He writes, “it is our responsibility, as teachers of writing and rhetoric, to guide our students to trace and analyze how such discursive co-presences have been historically formed and how they are being currently manifested” (p. 191). Drawing on his concept of interdependence-in-difference he asks: “What exactly can we do as teachers of writing and rhetoric to combat this Standard English ideology and to confront this discursive and cultural divide?” (p. 192).

The Standard English ideology that Mao (2010) problematizes in his essay has been at the root of cultural and linguistic negotiations of power in both the United States and China. By continuing to draw on the critical work of Chinese scholars in this work, I hope to suggest a move beyond an “English is English” mindset (Donahue, 2009, p. 220) towards pedagogical stances informed by cross-cultural and linguistic expertise. By presenting this work in a somewhat chronological manner—from the earlier work of scholars such as Lu (1987; 2001), Li (1996), and Fu (2003), to some of the more recent work—I hope to show how these works develop and work with similar themes, in regard to English use, that may be understood through cross-cultural perspectives. I hope to show that by positioning one’s self in between the cultural and discursive contexts of China and the United States, as perceived by these scholars, it is possible to see the national character that makes up the fabric of our institutions. But the national character that informs practices in United States institutions does not end at the nation’s borders. As Donahue (2009) notes, “we "import" problems (the challenges of multiliterate, multicultural students, for example) and we "export" our expertise about higher education writing instruction" (p. 226). As we export our expertise, by teaching outside of the United States, or proposing solutions to academic reform, we must remind ourselves of history. We must be mindful of the injury we impose, on our selves and others, when we sacrifice paradigms of individuality for beauty, the other for power, and the world for the nation.

Throughout history, relations of power have resulted in global conflict. Colonial relations of power between China and the United States form the basis from which You (2010) examines the teaching of English composition through various historical periods in China. According to You (2010), China's colonial history with the West suffered such extreme relations of power that to speak English meant speaking the language of the "foreign devils"— the white devils with red hair. Indeed, the rhetoric surrounding English in China sought to demonize the United States as a defense against these dynamic power relationships. One example of the way that this power interrogated the linguistic practices of Chinese students may be understood by the work of the United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia (UBCHEA). In the 1980's UBCHEA, and other Christian organizations similar to it, were invited to educate in China on the condition that they would respect the ideological religious differences between China and the West and not use their presence as a means to promote or evangelize their own religious beliefs. Despite these conditions, however, many Christian organizations did evangelize covertly through literature and private meetings with students (p. 108). The social influence of these organizations, as revealed in You's (2011) study of Chinese white collar-workers, caused students to "consciously or unconsciously negotiate with Christian values in their English discourse" (p. 415). You's (2010; 2011) work provides a good example of the way that language is rarely removed from negotiations of practice in particular contexts of use, which and contributes to translingual orientations that submit “all academic genres are literate arts of the contact zone, inviting a negotiation of different texts, codes, and voices with personal engagement” (Canagarajah, 2013c, p. 48).

Taking a closer look at that same study and another, both published in the journal *World Englishes*, will further explicate the situational nature of practice by providing specific examples of the way that Chinese writers navigate the variety of available linguistic resources when they write in English. In both of these studies, You (2008a; 2011) filters his analysis through situational context models. You’s (2008a; 2011) use of the context model provides a nuanced approach that defines specifically how Chinese writers juggle different aspects of their agentive practices when they write in English. In both studies, You (2008a; 2011) challenges what is meant by the term “multilingual.”

Multilingualism, as a term, has undergone a variety of specific and general definitions. Drawing on Cook’s (1992) term “multicompetence,” as “the compound state of mind with two grammars” (p. 557), scholars have defined and understood the terms “bilingual” and “multilingual” interchangeably. Take, for instance, Pavlenko’s (2003) definition of bilingualism, based on her study of preservice and in-service teachers, as “anyone who uses more than one language for particular purposes at some point in their daily lives” (p. 262). This understanding of bilinguals coincides with Kramsch’s (2009) definition of multilinguals: “those individuals who speak more than one language in everyday life, or those who write and publish in a language that is not their own” (p. 17). Additionally, there has been a tacit understanding that one is only multilingual if he or she speaks more than one language fluently. In his article, You (2011) uses a “domestic diaspora consciousness”—a term used to describe the social, economic, and cultural shifts that occur across regions rather than nation states (p. 412)— as a lens to reveal the way that Chinese writers draw not only on Mandarin when they write and speak in English, but also regional dialects (within China) and Internet language. The results of this study exemplify the "creative meaning potential" (p. 426)—the use of various languages, rhetorical strategies, language variations, and modalities to convey meaning—that is possible in the context of an Internet forum.

The importance of context to practice is further explicated in You's (2008a) earlier study. In this study, You (2008) problematizes the "inference model" a model that bases what Chinese might mean when they write or speak in English on what they "might" transfer from Chinese syntax and Chinese culture to English. In this article, You (2008a) looks at four specific situational contexts, which also serve as "rhetorical purposes": requesting opinions, seeking advice, sharing experiences and expressing feelings (p. 237). The data that emerges from these situational contexts reveals that user responses are embedded within culture—writers use Chinese and Western rhetorical strategies—, but the data also makes important the "situational context," which informs *which* rhetorical and linguistic choices the writers and why they make them. You's (2008a) use of context models in both studies provides evidence for ways of understanding how the term "multilingual" may not only be used to describe those individuals who speak more than one language in everyday life, but also may be used to refer to those individuals who draw on multiple conventions, modalities, dialects, rhetorics and linguistic features as regular practice to convey meaning. In addition, You's (2008a; 2011) studies reveal, like Lu's (1987) article, that practice is never static across situational contexts but, rather, is parasitic to each and every context in which it is performed.

In both studies conducted by You (2008a; 2011) writers base their responses to each other on each and every situational context on the forum. For instance, a writer on the forum named Sunshine writes about her difficult experiences adapting to a new life in Shanghai. Sunshine's posts create a situational context that revolves around "change." Because change is the focus of Sunshine's posts, her respondents seem to prescribe a frugal lifestyle reminiscent of Daoism, thus, positioning themselves as teachers, they decorate their rhetoric like sages, imitating a philosophy rooted in Daoism. The diversity of genre within the context of this forum represents the way that writers negotiate their performative practices based on purpose and need, which, like their diaspora experiences, are always becoming and adapting to each and every situation.

Addressing the diversity of linguistic and cultural varieties in Composition classrooms has been a relevant topic since the onset of CUNY's open admissions in the 1970's. Fluctuations in the global economy have historically brought with them new educational opportunities for students, but during the 1970's these changes brought a cadre of students who were, at the time, not associated with the "academic elite" admitted to CUNY's campus prior to the 1960's. Shaughnessy (1979) describes some of these students as those who had "grown up in one of New York's ethnic or social enclaves. Many had spoken other languages or dialects at home and never successfully reconciled the worlds of home and school" (p. 3). The demographic that Shaughnessy (1979) describes here is one that has grown and revealed even more linguistic and cultural varieties as a result of globalization in recent years. Additionally, navigating and further complicating the internal (home) and external (schools) scenes of students' lives through the inclusion of multiple varieties has never been more important.

Moving Between: Recontextualizing the Cultural Divide

In his essay, Hart (1999) asks the question: "How are claims in different worlds constructed from differences in words?" (p. 53). Over the past two decades scholarship in comparative rhetoric has made significant contributions to research that focuses on two imagined worlds: “China” and “the West.” The main purpose of comparative studies is to address the complexity of translation between cultures. To this end, scholars such as Mao (2003; 2006; 2009; 2010), Wang (2010; 2013), Lan (2002), and Wu (2010) have been actively engaged in discussions that seek to present the concepts and modes of communication, used in Chinese discourse, to audiences unfamiliar with it. The work of these scholars specifically responds to the complexity of studying the other from one’s own vantage point, what Garrett (1999) calls a “methodological paradox.” Addressing the paradoxical nature of moving between self and other, in regard to translation, is the result of previous scholarship rife with overgeneralizations and asymmetrical power relationships. To move between self and other in a way that nurtures spaces of difference, Wang (2013) posits, “Comparative rhetoric should focus on *how* we read rather than *what* we read: with an awareness of the situatedness of our work, the politics of reading, and the interactive and reciprocal relationship between the researcher and subject” (p. 233). As rhetoricians have adopted a more nuanced approach to their comparative initiatives, they have been forced to “search” for meaning beyond the power dynamics of binary opposition. In this section I look at some of the comparative work that Chinese scholars have recently undertaken that deconstruct terms of difference. It is my belief that studies of this nature provide tremendous insight into the complexity of cultural and linguistic translation. The “methodological paradox” has implications for responding to student texts, too. I suggest that engaging with the reciprocal nature of this work provides a way of thinking about and responding to the other in academic writing contexts. In addition, the reflective nature of this kind of work creates a cognitive path where new perspectives give way for new positions to emerge. That is, by being actively aware of the reciprocal role of self and other we may open ourselves up to something new. We may become different. If we teachers of writing can embrace these new positions we can allow them to inform the rhetorical stances from which we teach and respond to student writings.

The 2009 symposium, “Comparative Rhetorical Studies in the New Contact Zone: Chinese Rhetoric Reimagined,” provides insight into the ways that comparative approaches to rhetoric might be useful to finding new ways of addressing the multilingual contexts of our classrooms. As Mao (2009) explains in the introduction to the symposium:

> If we reexamine these Chinese rhetorical traditions and their present practices, we can better understand the habits of speaking, writing, and thinking that Chinese students bring with them to the composition classroom and can correct Westerners’ frequent misunderstandings of Chinese rhetoric today, both inside and outside the classroom. Moreover, we will then be better situated to cultivate a common ground, to create a contact zone where different rhetorical traditions can talk with one another in the classrooms and scholarship of the West. (p. W33)

I quote Mao (2009) at length here because the point he makes serves to illuminate the usefulness of studies in global rhetorics to the teaching of writing: “to cultivate a *common ground*, to create a contact zone where *different rhetorical traditions* can talk with one another in the classrooms” (p. W33, my emphasis). Studying global rhetorics allows educators to better understand the multiple ways that meaning is composed and communicated. This task, of course, is immense, as Hurlbert (2012) explains “one can devote one’s self to the study of various rhetorics for a lifetime and barely scratch the surface of one’s ignorance (no standardized testing here—we all fail and get A’s at the same time)” (p. 42). The point is to cultivate a genuine effort and openness to the meaning potential that exists outside of the Western tradition. Mao and Swearingen’s (2009) symposium, which consists of eight essays, examines the meaning potential of both

Chinese and Western discursive traditions from both ends of the "contact zone." The contributors to this collaborative work (LuMing Mao, Xiaoye You, Bo Wang, Weiguo Qu, Hui Wu, Liu Lu, C. Jan Swearingen) published by *College Composition and Communication* in 2009 focus on themes such as Chinese genre, essay writing, perspectives on Chinese rhetoric, argumentation and methodologies for examining the question, "what is Chinese rhetoric?"

Yin and Yang: A Useful Paradigm

In his essay, Mao (2009) addresses terms of opposites (binaries)—"*direct* and *indirect, deductive* and *inductive, logical* and *analogical, and speaking in one's own voice* and *speaking through one's own voice*" (p. W45), which are often associated with Western versus Eastern ways of composing meaning. Mao (2009) problematizes the hierarchal polarity that results from such binary opposition. For instance, when positioned against their Western counterparts, *indirect*, *inductive*, *analogical* and *speaking through the voice of others* carry lesser value. That is, they do not present the patterns of argument in the way that their Western counterparts do and are often viewed as "deficient." In addition, the *markedness*, a concept that describes the process whereby some social categories gain a special, default status that contrasts with the identities of other groups" (Bucholtz and Hall, 2004, p. 372), that results from binary opposition can lead to *essentialism*, whereby "reification or abstracting from particularizing occasions of use is likely to occur, inevitably giving rise to misrepresentations and stereotypes" (Mao, 2009, p. W45). It is false to assume that the Western rhetorical practices be absolute in identifying the ways that Chinese rhetoric is composed and communicated. To propose an alternative model for Chinese and Western rhetorical practices and to advance an understanding of Chinese rhetoric, Mao (2009) uses the Chinese cosmologies, yin and yang.

Framing a discussion of Chinese and Western rhetorical practices around yin and yang cosmologies provides important insight for the ways in which Chinese rhetoric may be understood. Mao (2009) explains, "The relationship between yin and yang is one of mutual interdependence and interpenetration. What is yin in one context can be yang in another, and neither can exist independent of the other" (p. W46). Mao's (2009) reference to yin and yang as a way to suggest a new framework for understanding the complexities of discourse is not new. Historically, yin and yang were used during the Warring States period (479—221 BC) to "fashion a new discourse and to help invent a new political order where the individual, the state, and the cosmos were unified and marked by resonance, harmony, and completeness" (p. W47). Mao's (2009) use of yin and yang expresses the way that balance is, in fact, achieved between these constructs "prior to initiating a new set of relationships between them" (p. W48). It is the "in between part"—the space where balance might exist that opens up opportunities to nurture discussions about linguistic, rhetorical, social or cultural difference. In this work, I seek to explore the ways that Chinese scholars in composition studies work within this in between space in their scholarship an in their teaching. This in between space is something similar to what Bhabha (1994) calls the "Third Space." He describes this space as one where a non-Western language system may be studied separately from a Western language system. Through an intervention of this space, Bhabha (1994) writes that we can "properly challenge our sense of the historical identity of culture as a homogenizing, unifying force, authenticated by the originary Past, kept alive in the national tradition of the People (p. 37). By placing ourselves within the "Third Space," or, whatever space it is that arises out of a conscious positioning of oneself to another, we avoid disrupting the tradition in which the language, domestic or foreign, is contextualized.

Mao's (2009) use of yin and yang provides a lens from which one might consider difference in educational contexts. From a Western epistemological stance, for instance, one might consider Chinese discourse "as part of an overall discursive order within its own social and cultural context" (p. W48), rather than judge it against Western terms as binary and opposite. One of the main questions I seek to explore in my individual scholar chapters is: how do Chinese scholars move between discourses in their scholarship and teaching? With this question in mind I continue to review literature that highlights the politics involved in the way one reads the writings of another. I offer examples of the way that Chinese scholars have positioned their work between discourses where new positions may emerge. These discourses may be published texts, ancient or modern, transnational or indigenous. As I move to suggest, these texts may also be working papers from students in the diverse contexts of writing classrooms around the globe.

The Space Between Self and Other

In another article, Mao (2003) addresses the important issue of speaking for and about others through an analysis of their rhetoric. Responding to a history of work in comparative studies that submits to the deficiency model, one that often views the rhetorical practices of the other as lacking. Although this work is important for its contribution to an ongoing conversation in the field, the need to move beyond the deficiency model has inspired new creative approaches for moving between self and other. For Mao (2003), one approach entails reflective encounters—practices that "call for critical interrogation and informed contextualization" (p. 412). Adapting Kenneth Pike's etic/emic methodology from anthropology, Mao (2003) articulates a way for practitioners to move between familiar (emic) and unfamiliar (etic) rhetorical scenes. Situating oneself in this process allows for a genuine engagement that nurtures both exogenous and endogenous perspectives. In addition, Mao (2003) warns against "rhetorical universals," for instance, lumping all Asian rhetorical traditions together, and emphasizes the importance of a nuanced approach that requires learning the variety of rhetorical patterns that students and writers bring to their English discourse, he explains it thus:

> Before teachers and rhetoricians can determine, for example, how organizational patterns from ESL students' home languages (mostly non-Western) interfere with or intrude upon their writing in English, they may have to understand, first of all, what these organizational patterns are; how they co-occur with other rhetorical features in that language; and why they differ from those organizational patterns in English—and much more. (p. 402)

Mao (2003) is, of course, correct, but his case presents some important questions, such as, how *should* teachers and rhetoricians proceed in their comparative undertakings with rhetorics outside of Euro-American traditions? How can teachers and rhetoricians learn about rhetorics in a way that avoids binary opposition and overgeneralizations? Leading up to these questions Mao (2003) proposes a reflective and descriptive approach based on Kenneth Pike's etic/emic methodology from anthropology, whereby the comparative rhetor (or teacher) analyses the rhetoric from a perspective inside the culture from which they are an outsider. Of course, actually "doing" this is impossible. The point is to position one's self as closely to the discourse, text, or tradition as possible. Then, after delineating, the rhetor (or teacher) turns and reflects upon his or her own interpretation to move towards a comparative approach that nurtures spaces of difference.

A recent example of a "Reflective" approach, as proposed by Mao (2003), can be seen in Schoen's (2012) historical analysis of discourse in a particular context in Botswana. In her investigation of Botswana rhetoric, the rhetoric of the Tswana people, Schoen (2012) employs a nuanced approach to her analysis by placing it in the specific rhetorical context of the *Kgotla*—a meeting place where councils were held and decisions were made (p. 274). From here, Schoen (2012) relies on historical texts to flesh out the rhetorical features of the Tswana people. After concluding her analysis, Schoen (2012) provides “preliminary conclusions”—she defines Botswana rhetoric on its own terms. After delineating the features of Botswana rhetoric, Schoen takes a “reflective” approach—using the information she acquired from her analysis, she places it up against the Western rhetorical tradition to see what similarities and differences exist, to discover places of overlap, and to nurture an inevitable discussion about difference.

Schoen’s (2012) application of Mao’s (2003) “Reflective” approach models what it means to be a reflective participant in a dialogue, a practice that I wish to highlight in this dissertation. Though her stance is, as she writes, “steeped in the Western tradition” (p. 286) she searches for meaning within the discursive context of the *Kgotla* and historical texts before taking a comparative stance. By doing this, Schoen (2012) not only shows that she is aware of the limitations from which she draws any conclusions, but is also able to situate a discussion between two traditions: the Western judicial tradition according to Aristotle and the Botswana tradition used in the specific context of the *Kgotla*.

Addressing the boundaries between self and other continues to present obstacles and calls for better instructions that respond to the steps one should take when interrogating spaces of difference. Mao (2010) addresses the questions: “What is Chinese Rhetoric?” and “Where is Chinese Rhetoric?” Mao (2010) complicates these “What” and “Where” questions stating that they “must be viewed as a response to what has been uttered before about the same topic and on the same issue” (p. 331). Therefore, any search for an answer to the question, “What is Chinese Rhetoric?” takes a comparative approach from “the whats of the Western rhetorical tradition” (p. 331). It is nearly impossible to avoid any approach that seeks out the “whats” of any non-

Western tradition that does not yield, in some way, an understanding colored and informed by the West. In an attempt to avoid any further use of the deficit model—one in which the comparative rhetor (or pedagogy) forces non-Western discursive practices like "round pegs into the square holes of Western terms and categories" (Mao, 2012, p.66)—Mao (2010), drawing on the work of Garrett (1999), suggests the "art of recontextualization"—approaching the external and internal as "coterminous and *interconnected* rather than binary and hierarchal" (p. 332 my emphasis)—in order to nurture the relationship between the inescapable present and the Other.

The art of recontextualization, as it is described in Mao's (2010) article, has implications for the teaching of writing. Just as Mao (2010) presents the question, "What is Chinese Rhetoric?" we may, in fact, ask the same question or questions similar to it (e.g., what is indigenous rhetoric? What is African American rhetoric?) in our classrooms. It is within these social spaces that *the art of recontextualization* provides a *method* for measuring the less familiar (ethnic traditions) with the more familiar (our own point of reference). As we vacillate between internal and external perspectives searching for meaning, in our students writing or in their spoken varieties, we trouble our minds to make sense of what is not there or does not come naturally. We force ourselves to see beyond the scope of our own tradition. Comparative approaches to rhetoric are important because they provide the method—the approach, for ways of engaging with and responding to the unfamiliar. But which approaches are best and how should we use them?

Using the word, "nüquanzhuyi," which carries the meaning for Chinese feminism, Wang (2010) problematizes the way that Western engagements with Chinese texts often find it feminist or not feminist, rather than feminist and different. To this end, Wang (2010) suggests that although comparative rhetoricians might be aware of the limitations of their discursive positioning, they sometimes "wittingly or unwittingly, end up hypercorrecting the Chinese texts and taking the texts out of their cultural and historical contexts" (p. 386). With this in mind, Wang (2010) explores the recent recovery of early twentieth century women's texts in mainland China to reveal the various, often hybrid, ways that women writers address the *funi wenti* (the woman question).

Using *the process of recontextualization* as a lens, Wang (2010) reclaims the voices of two specific Chinese female writers: Chen Hengzhe and Yang Zhihua. Specifically, Wang (2010) shows how these writers utilized the Chinese essay genre, *sanwen,*[1] and the strategy, redefinition,[2] to challenge ideological hegemonies surrounding women in the 1920s**.** To accomplish this through the lens of "recontextualization," Wang (2010) first looks carefully for traces of evidence in the texts of Chen and Yang that allow her to flesh out the "complex voices" that contribute to Chinese feminist discourse (p. 389). Then, she treats the early twentieth century texts of these feminist writers not as separate from female writing in earlier periods, but as "a transcendence of an older period" (p. 389). In other words, she negotiates the differences between "old" and "new" feminist discourses in order to frame and treat the discussion of Chinese feminist rhetoric by its own historical and importantly present terms and concepts. Finally, Wang (2010) looks at the way that these Chinese feminist writers "appropriated Western feminist ideas to serve their own political purposes" (p. 389). By examining these writers' use of the *sanwen* genre and the "redefinition" strategy, Wang (2010) is able to show how Chen and Yang employ a Chinese feminist rhetoric.

Through her analysis of the work of Chen and Yang, Wang (2010) notes the writers' deviation from binary opposites. Rather than submitting to the male/female gender dichotomies, these writers move towards an understanding that views each individual as having two characteristics—"the characteristics of gender and the characteristics of human" (p. 395). To say it differently, the line that separates male from female is viewed as a space of interdependence where those societal views typically associated with male might also be associated with female and vice versa.

Wu (2010) proposes an enlightened feminist rhetorical theory that “asks critics to practice responsible, respectful, and reflective research through rhetorical inquiry into the writer’s literary creation” (p. 408). Reflecting on Mao’s articulation of Chinese feminism, which emphasized sameness between genders and “desexualized women in order for them to be liberated (p. 409), Wu (2010) reveals important changes in the meaning of *nüquanzhuyi* (Chinese feminism) in a post-Mao era. One of the major changes of female representation in a post-Mao era are sexual identity and female dignity. By looking at the writing of Chinese feminists in particular Wu (2010) associates the use of the *sanwen* genre, historically associated with male writers, with female liberation. She explains that through *sanwen* “Post-Mao writers address women’s issues in their own true voices, and not through their characters. They discuss the philosophy behind their literature and women’s issues as their will takes them—a freedom that only the essay can offer” (p. 411). Though *nüquanzhuyi* and notions of Western feminism manifest differently in theory and representation, Wu (2010) points out ways that both traditions find common ground. For instance, citing Morrison (2008), Wu (2010) points out the way that both Morrison (2008) and Chinese feminists (Lu, 1996; Zhang, 1994; Hu, 1998) focus on “something real: women talking about human rights rather than sexual rights” (qtd. in p. 413). Wu’s argument contributes a nuanced approach to Chinese and Western feminism, one that moves beyond binary extremes and shows relations between Chinese and Western feminism while honoring both on their own terms.

The concept of interdependence-in-difference, which is based on yin and yang logic, receives further attention in Mao's (2006) book. Here, he situates a discussion about the features of Chinese language and culture around a product of two traditions: the Chinese fortune cookie. He explains that he often gives out Chinese fortune cookies to his students because they symbolize a rhetoric (born of two cultures) that he wishes to convey for himself and to his students. Drawing on Ang's (2001) concept of "togetherness in difference" each of the chapters in Mao's (2006) book address Chinese concepts such as 面子"*mianzi"* and 臉 "*lian*" (Chinese face), indirection versus directness, and 恕 "*shu*" (reciprocity, or putting oneself in the others place" (p. 87), which have been previously misunderstood or translated by Western terms and conditions. For instance, the notion of Chinese face has often been quickly associated with the North American concepts of "saving face" and "losing face." These North American concepts, however, do not parallel the meaning of Chinese face, but rather rest on "the individual's need to either be free or liked" (p. 38). The Chinese understanding of face is contingent not only upon the self, but the public—the community. Mao (2006) explains, 面子 "*mianzi"* "places it's primary emphasis on securing public acknowledgement of one's reputation or prestige through social performance" and 臉 "*lian*" "places the self in the judgment of others, establishing a link between integrity of self and community" (p. 39). In other words, if one lets his or her 面子 "deteriorate" he or she will lose integrity and eventually this social deterioration will adversely affect 臉.

Mao's (2006) useful insight does not end with his clarification of Chinese terms and concepts. As evidenced in You's (2008) review of the book, Mao (2006) fashions the book in a way that he *models rhetorical hybridity*. You (2008) illuminates:

Although written in English, according to Mao, the six chapters embody a preferred syntactic and paragraphic scheme in Chinese language, that is, the topic comment structure. The first five chapters cover interconnected topics, which establish a causal frame for the final chapter to complete the discourse on the making of Chinese-American rhetoric" (You, 2008, p. 119).

Mao's (2006) work models a rhetorical tradition that sets itself apart from the dominant Western tradition. His work suggests a departure from the traditional deductive patterns of the American academic institution. But Mao's (2006) work is one of few. In my dissertation I seek to establish the way Chinese scholars in the field of composition and rhetoric have made unique contributions to their field. The content and structure of Mao's (2006) book brings insight that both clarifies Chinese rhetorical concepts and challenges the deductive patterns favored by the Western essay structure. By publishing the book in a structure favored by Chinese rhetorical tradition, Mao (2006) positions it as a pioneer work, among few like it, in the field.

While Mao (2006) proposes that the making of Chinese American Rhetoric is a rhetoric of hybridity born out of two competing traditions; China and the West, Wang (2010) takes a historical approach to answer questions surrounding what *nüquanzhuyi* (feminism) means to twentieth century Chinese feminist writers, specifically, and how this concept might be properly understood from a Western lens. Like Mao (2006), Wang (2010) reveals through her careful analysis of Chen and Yang's Chinese feminist discourse that Chinese feminist rhetoric is a rhetoric of hybridity born of the rhetorical encounters between China and the West (p. 401). Although the rhetoric used by these writers comes out of two traditions, it is important to note that their understanding of *nüquanzhuyi* is a concept that evolves from within the context of China exclusively and should not be "viewed as invented or owned by Western culture" (p. 402).

Rather, these writers appropriated Western notions of feminisms that suited their own social and political needs as women and as writers.

Mao's (2004; 2006) creative approach to working between the discourses of Western and Chinese rhetoric, as well as Wang and Wu's (2010; 2010) interrogation of *nüquanzhuyi*, reveal pathways for approaching spaces of difference. The need for these approaches is crucial. As Lan (2001) notes in her essay, "Constrastive Rhetoric: A Must in Cross Cultural Inquiries," "difference is both inevitable and healthy" (p. 68). Understanding the differences between cultures, though, requires some study or understanding of the culture itself.

The key feature of practice within translingual spaces is the accommodation of "the dynamic interactions between languages and communities" (Canagarajah, 2013a, p. 7). Where the term "multilingual" is used to connote "many languages," "translingual" specifies working between those many languages and, from an educational perspective, finding new ways from which to address the multiple ways that meaning in composed and communicated. In theory, a translingual approach addresses the diversity of the global-local demographic of institutions in the United States. It also presents some serious questions that I wish to address in the chapters that follow.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction to the Study

On March 20, 2014, while writing this dissertation, I attended a panel at Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) entitled, "Investigating Translingual Practices: History Theory and Pedagogy." Each member on this panel, LuMing Mao, Weiguo Qu, Bo Wang and Bruce Horner are contributors to the theoretical body of scholarship I highlight in this dissertation. At the conference, each of these scholars gave presentations that explored, questioned, and investigated translingual practice. Where 'translingual practice' has been defined in terms of its associated dispositions and practices in theory, the scholars on this forum move towards developing the practical implications of the term, from which teaching practices may emerge. Some of the questions posed during these presentations include, but are not limited to, "what are the specific historical, cultural, and linguistic conditions for translingual practices? What forms do they take? How do we go about studying these practices? How do these practices teach us to move between?" (Mao, 2014). I use this panel as a starting point for my chapter on methodology because it allows me to transition from discussions about theory to discussions about individual practice as it relates to Chinese scholars in composition studies.

In Chapter 2, I use "the art of recontextualization" to revisit critical work in the history of composition through the vantage point of Chinese scholars. In order to connect this work with the life events that shape the practices of four Chinese scholars, I conducted qualitative research to answer the research questions that have guided this dissertation:

1) How do Chinese scholars in composition studies move between practices in their scholarship and teaching?

2) How have these scholars contributed to moving the field towards a translingual approach to the teaching of writing?

Data Sources

The data used in the following chapters came from one-on-one interviews with teacher scholars, classroom observations, reflective journals and course materials, such as, syllabi and assignment sheets. The interviews conducted with scholars were based on their past experiences as students and scholars, their mentors, and their current teaching practices. According to Yin (2014) interviews are the most common form of qualitative research. Interviews allow a researcher to get at the "why" and "how" of particular phenomena. Following Yin (2014), I accomplish this by asking my participants both Level 1 and Level 2 questions—questions that are specific to my interviewee (Level 1) and questions that are specific to the study as a whole (Level 2). In addition I also asked questions based on their published work. I observed each professor's classes at least once during the semester.

The initial motivation for the inclusion of a reflective journal was inspired by Siebler's (2008) study of feminist teacher-scholars in composition studies. In her book, *Composing Feminisms*, Siebler (2008) outlines a feminist ethnographic methodology informed by the work of Behar (1993) Kirsch (1993; 1999) and Lather (2001) to answer the question: "how are feminist scholars in composition studies enacting their beliefs in their teaching, leadership, and scholarship?" (p. 77). Siebler (2008) utilizes narrative interviews and observations in varying contexts e.g., classrooms, department meetings, and discussions with students etc. Although I do not propose to utilize an ethnographic methodology, I do find Siebler's (2008) data sources appropriate for my study. Though I do not share the same methodology as Siebler (2008), I take cues from her research design and have adopted a similar feminist approach to my own study.

Like Siebler (2008), I provided my participants with interview questions (See Appendix A) two weeks prior to visiting them so that they could think about my questions in advance. I sent my participants copies of the transcribed interview and my analysis once completed. I made it clear that if there were anything they did not want me to use I would allow them to make changes.

Why Qualitative Research?

My decision to use qualitative research was necessary to achieve a deeper understanding of the ways in which the published work of Chinese scholars informs their teaching practices. Due to the nature of academic writing, often void of personal voice or experience, scholarship often lacks the human quality. While narrative provides a way for scholars to personalize their work, a brief cameo is usually all that is included. I wanted to know these scholars as individuals. I wanted to listen to their stories from their own voices rather than in published articles. I wanted to connect to and engage with someone real. Not because they are exotic to me, but because like all scholars I'm a human first and a variety of other things after, among which "a scholar" is only one part. Qualitative research provides the available methods to engage with people in order to achieve a personal and academic goal. According to Flick, Kardoff, and Steinke (2004) "Qualitative research claims to describe lifeworlds 'from the inside out,' from the point of view of the people who participate (p. 3). These "life worlds" are just one way to describe what these authors explain are the "subjective or collective meaning patterns (such as 'lay theories', 'world-views', shared norms and values), social relationships and associated incidental life circumstances may be related to individual biographical designs, past life history and perceived possibilities for future action" (p. 7). Of these designs, I use interviews and classroom observations to develop three scholar chapters.

Teacherscholars

The scholar chapters that follow will capture what Marotzki (2004) quoting Dilthey (1968) calls individual *life units*, individual persons and their forms of expression, their words and actions (p. 102). The conceptual thinking that responds to these life units, however, is never capable of truly understanding individual experience because meaning is always given and received through reflection. As Marotzki (2004) writes, "The creation of this kind of coherence of experiences is achieved through an act of meaning attribution. From the present meaning is given to past events." (p. 103). This kind of meaning attribution entails, to use Clandinin and Connelly's (1994) words, "a living and telling of stories" (p. 153). In the field of education teaching and learning is an ongoing, cyclical process. Teachers learn through lived experiences and they teach through lived experiences. They live their stories and then they tell stories. In this way, ethnographic research is based on "experiential knowledge that is embodied in them [teachers] as persons and is enacted in their classroom practices and in their lives." (p. 149). Since teaching and learning are interdependent activities, I also recognize that teaching and scholarship are interdependent too. Because of this, following Canagarajah (2013a) and Horner (2014) I use the term, *teacherscholar* in chapters 4, 5, and 6 to gesture towards the inseparable nature of teaching and learning in the life of a scholar.

Methods

In Chapters 4, 5, and 6 I use ethnographic research methods to examine the translingual practices of the teacherscholars. Drawing on Ryle's (1968) thick description, Geertz (1971) illuminates, "the ethnographer inscribes social discourse; *he writes in down*. In doing so he turns it from a passing event, which exists only in its own moment of occurrence, in to an account, which exists in its inscriptions and can be consulted" (p. 242 emphasis original). When an event is transferred from experience to text something happens to it, certain qualities are lost and, often, some qualities are gained. In order to capture the richness of the research context, I use ethnographic perspectives. Drawing on Canagarajah (2013a) I use the word "perspective" to account for the fact that I "did not use ethnography as a full-fledged methodology" (p. 45). Instead, methods such as observation and interview allow me to get close enough to my participants to write about their practices, while thick description, as a narrative form, allows me to communicate my experience in a way that captures the moment and authentically conveys the research context from my point of view.

Data Transcription

Inscribing social discourse (Geertz, 1971) is an imperfect process, but one that is necessary in order to represent the variety of ways that language is communicated in this study. The transcription process of audio-recorded interviews to text began as soon as my interview with each participant was completed. For my interviews with Haixia and Danling, this process began when I returned to my hotel room and continued while I waited for my plane to arrive at the airport. Because my interview with Xiaoye was very close to my visit with Haixia and the *International Association of World Englishes* (IAWE) conference, the transcription of Xiaoye's interview took place over Thanksgiving break in a Starbucks close my parents home in Buffalo, New York. To make the play back process easier for all audio-recorded transcriptions, I converted each MP4 file into an MP3 file and uploaded the files to iTunes. By using iTunes as the hub for my audio recorded data, I was able to use keyboard commands to start and stop the audio file as I listened and transcribed. Using iTunes also ensured my data would be stored conveniently in iCloud.

Following Ochs (1979) and DuBois, Schuetze-Coburn, Cumming and Paolino (1993) I use a selection of symbols to convey the written performance of speech through discourse transcription (See Appendix B). Because I am not concerned with the micro level aspects of language practice that occurs between my participants, their interlocutors, and me, I do not use all of the symbols used in basic discourse transcription. Instead, the method of my transcription is broad and the criteria I follow twofold: 1) I transcribe all words and utterances used in the following chapters 2) Following Ochs (1979) and DuBois, Schuetze-Coburn, Cumming and Paolino (1993), I select and use transcription symbols to convey brief pauses, laughter, and latching. I chose to use these particular transcription methods because when read alongside the transcription key, they allow the performative text to function as something more than a text; these symbols give human qualities to the dialogue that I could not ignore.

The length of each interview ranged from about one to one and a half hours. After transcribing each interview, and listening to it through playback several times, I developed very intimate knowledge of its content. I began to sort through the transcription and put aside parts of the interview that were unrelated to my project. From here, the themes that were brought to my attention while I was transcribing the interview became clear. From these themes, I began to consider how I would look at this data, and under what lens I would analyze it. After transcribing all three interviews, I sent copies of my transcription to my participants for member checking. In addition, I sent each participant a copy of the final chapter that contained my analysis of the specific data I used from the transcript. Along with the data I emphasized that if there was anything they would like me to modify or change, I would do it.

Chinese Characters

One aspect of the writing and transcription process that I wrestled with was composing Chinese characters. While I learned Mandarin during my service as volunteer in China, my ability to read and write characters is limited. In order to include Chinese characters I used the keyboard setting on my MacBook for Traditional and Simplified Pinyin. If I was able to recognize the character by looking at it, this was not a problem. However, there were times that I could not identify the correct character and had to use Google Translate to make sure the character I chose was correct—that it conveyed the meaning I intended. While this process is not the best, it is what worked for me. On a few occasions, Xiaoye and Haixia clarified my use of Chinese characters through email, when it involved their words or projects. Because Chinese characters are larger than 12 pt. Times New Roman font, I changed their size to 9 pt. so that they did not create extra space throughout the manuscript.

Analysis

The relationship, or lack thereof, between language and ontology is the meeting place of new materialism and translingualism. While new materialism rejects the notion that words may be used to represent the individual nature of experience, translingualism emphasizes strategies that allow language users to move beyond bounded concepts and negotiate their meaning through practice. The social turn, as it is referred to, has limited the scope from which people and things are understood by focusing primarily on texts. While identity scholars who deal with representation (Bucholtz & Hall, 1998; Norton 1997; Deckert & Vickers, 2011) emphasize paying close attention to speakers' own understandings of their identities through language (Bucholtz and Hall, 2004, p. 371) a neglect for "other forms of matter" (Micciche, p. 488) has limited the scope of representational practices. In their book, Deckert & Vickers (2011) argue "when individuals construct their social reality, they move far beyond mere utterances to do so" (p. 110)—but what else do individuals *do* and what else, beyond utterances, construct social reality? In the chapters that follow, a new materialist framework (Ahmed, 2010; Barad, 2003; Grosz, 2010; Van der Tuin & Dolphijn, 2010) is used to reveal the complex nature of representation. While I use representation to account for my interpretation of the scholars in Chapters 5, 6, and 7, I submit that this framework has implications for the way we represent students (ESL, ELL, multilingual, etc.), too.

In her posthumanist critique of representation, Barad (2003) argues "performativity, properly construed, is not an invitation to turn everything (including material bodies) into words; on the contrary, performativity is precisely a contestation of the excessive power granted to language to determine what is real" (p. 802). In other words, people do not construct their agency through words alone, but through their relationships to other people, things, organizations and geographies that establish a level of comfort that creates a sense of identification. Although all we have to look at when talk is turned to text is the words actors use to describe their social reality, there are other relationships that compose the way people make up their world.

Examining the relationships between people and things, Ahmed (2010) argues, "orientations are a starting point" (p. 235). Orientations; however, should not be thought of as random relationships, between people and things, based on given contexts. As she explains "bodies tend toward some objects more than others given their tendencies. These tendencies are not originary, but are effects of the repetition of 'tending toward.'" (p. 247). The repetition of "tending toward" that Ahmed (2010) refers to is not unlike Burke's (1984) observation of piety in which he comments that the choices one makes "drive one into ruts, and these ruts in turn reënforce one's piety" (p. 78). For Burke (1984) piety is built on repetition, and repetition is an outgrowth of “the ruts of experience.” (Burke, 1984; Hawhee, 2009). In her examination of Burke’s (1984) analysis of the body, Hawhee (2009) submits, “the body generates belief” (p. 72) by observing rituals, which are the result of the body’s regular interactions with people and things.

Being that composition is a discipline that relies on words to communicate meaning across genres for specific audiences, the translingual framework (Canagarajah, 2013a; 2013b; 2013c; Cooper, 2014; Hall, 2014; You, 2015) outlined in Chapter 1 is used to demonstrate the strategies speakers of languages use to move beyond the limitations of their material reality. In other words, while a specific word, used in the English language, may not do justice to the phenomenon it seeks to represent, speakers might engage in certain negotiation strategies in order to disseminate their meaning more directly. By using the translingual framework, I suggest that these strategies are necessary in order to serve multilingual and domestic students in first year writing and beyond.

Frame of Reference

As a non-Chinese and one who has only spent a very small portion of her life in China, I come to this study aware of the limitations that are the result of my frame of reference. With this in mind, I utilize an approach to my study that Abu-Lughod (2006) outlines in her essay “Writing Against Culture.” In this essay, she asks, “Are there ways to write about lives so as to constitute others as less other?” (p. 473) Drawing on the work of Foucault (1978), Said (1978), and Smith (1987), Abu-Lughod (2006) problematizes “generalization,” writing that were previously thought to be “neutral description” (p. 473). Instead, she suggests a way of writing that better conveys the positionality of the researcher in a local manner, what she calls “Ethnographies of the particular” (p. 473) This tool for feminist anthropology requires field-based writing—the use of alternative forms such as the narrative genre, albeit unprofessional, in the spirit of the "woman's tradition" (e.g., Bowen 1982; Briggs 1970; Cesara 1982) (p. 475). These alternative genres, of which I choose the reflective journal, complement other discursive forms by providing insight to the particular aspects of experience.

The reason I chose to keep a reflective journal was to allow for a level of transparency in my research process that may not be available without the use of a journal. On their own, my data sources are the foundation of my analysis. Although this is true, there is much more to the research process than the gathering of data, such as, interactions with my participants in between interviews; the environment of the research context; and my own frame of reference, which colors my perspective. The point of view that I chose to write these journals is stream of consciousness. I chose this way of writing because I know that any kind of reflective practice is always influenced by time and perception—the conflicting nature of memory interferes with writing experience as it was lived. By using stream of consciousness as my point of view, I accept that I do not communicate my experiences exactly as they were lived, but rather provide a snap shot that may be felt through my voice at the time it was written.

Recruitment of Participants

From October 2013 to April 2014, I searched for prospective participants. During the month of October 2013, I mailed out an Informed Consent Form to Xiaoye You inviting him to participant in my study. Within a few days, he responded by email that he would participate. Because I was already acquainted with Xiaoye, he also served as a kind of mentor or, in Abu-Lughod's (2006) terms, "consultant" (p. 111). Xiaoye knew the availability of other Chinese scholars in the field. He knew who had retired, who was still teaching, who would be on sabbatical, etc. Through our conversations during my visits to State College, I began to recruit potential participants from the field based on the following four criteria:

1. Scholars who have published on Chinese language and culture, Chinese English, and Chinese rhetoric
2. Scholars who are currently teaching in university contexts in the United States
3. Scholars with cross-cultural experience, who have lived in both the Chinese and United States context
4. Scholars whose work is used and cited in the field of Composition and Rhetoric

The snowball method (Patton, 2014) combined with my criteria resulted in the recruitment and selection of the following scholars: Xiaoye You, Haixia Lan, and Danling Fu. All of these scholars are members of English or Education departments and teach composition courses at their universities. To interview these scholars and observe their teaching practices, I made arrangements to travel to visit them at their universities where I could interview them and observe their teaching practices. The location of the interviews were conducted over lunch at restaurants within walking distance to the scholar's university and, in some cases, continued over tea in their homes.

Research Contexts

Each of the scholars in chapters 4, 5, and 6 was born in China and later moved to the United States for graduate school. After completing their doctoral degrees, they accepted permanent positions in the United States and actively contribute their scholarship to the field. Each of these scholars is currently teaching at well-ranked academic institutions in the United States: Pennsylvania State University, University of Wisconsin, LaCrosse, and the University of Florida, Gainesville. In what follows I detail the relationship of each scholar to his/her university to provide a portrait of the research contexts in which my study takes place. In addition, I would like to note that the order in which my scholar chapters appear in Chapters 4, 5, and 6, is the order in which I visited them.

My observations of Xiaoye's teaching took place in room 203 of the Sacket Building and room 313 of the Health and Human Development (East) Building at PSU. These buildings are within a 5 to 10 minute walk from Xiaoye's office in Burrowes. On the day of my observation, October 15 2014, I met Xiaoye in his office before his class and then we walked to his classroom together. My interview with Xiaoye took place on October 31, 2013 at the Sichuan Bistro located within walking from his office in Burrowes. When I arrived to the PSU campus, I met Xiaoye at his office and we walked to the restaurant together. After lunch, we continued our interview on during our walk back to the Burrowes building.

My observations of Haixia took place on November 5, 2013. During the time that I was able to visit La Crosse, Haixia had only one scheduled class—Introduction to Rhetoric and Writing Studies—so it was the only class that I was able to observe. My interview with Haixia took place on November 6, 2013 at a restaurant not far from the UW-L campus and later in the evening at her house over tea and dessert. I emailed the questions I planned to ask Haixia to her two weeks before my visit. I told her that if for some reason she felt uncomfortable with any of the questions she could tell me and that I was willing to negotiate the questions with her. After looking over the questions Haixia wrote me back and said they were fine. Several of the questions I asked Haixia were similar to the questions I asked Xiaoye, though some different because they were based on her scholarship. Though I provided her with these questions ahead of time, the conversations we had prior to our interview inspired some new questions. When this happened I simply asked her if it would be ok to include these new questions in the interview and she said, yes.

I visited Danling at The University of Florida on March 7, 2014. A week before I left Pittsburgh we exchanged several emails working out the details of my visit. Danling and I decided that we would have our interview over lunch before her class at 4:30. She suggested that we meet at the Small House Restaurant, an authentic Chinese restaurant within walking distance to the campus. After our conversation over lunch, Danling and I walked to campus where I observed her class in room 2205 of Norman Hall.

CHAPTER FOUR

XIAOYE YOU

Creating Friendships at CCCC Las Vegas

On Wednesday, March 13, 2013, I attended a Workshop at CCCC entitled “Diverse Disciplines, “New” Publics: The Work of International Higher Education Writing Research” led by Cinthia Gannett and Christiane Donahue. I attended the Wednesday workshop because I had been reading Xiaoye You’s work and saw that he was to present the paper, “American content teachers’ literacy brokerage in multilingual university classrooms,” that he co-authored with his sister, Xiaoqiong.” Although I soon learned that Xiaoye would not arrive at the conference until later in the evening, I was able to meet and talk with his sister, who presented the paper in his absence. After the workshop, Xiaoqiong and I went for a walk around the Riviera, the conference hotel in Las Vegas, and then she invited me to have dinner with her and her brother.

We all met at the Banana Leaf, a pan Asian Restaurant located inside the hotel. Xiaoye arrived just as Xiaoqiong and I finished eating, but we sat together and I had the opportunity to discuss his work with him while he ate a large bowl of noodle soup. At that time, I had just finished writing a conference paper, which drew from a number of Xiaoye’s publications on topics related to China English, multilingual writing, and Chinese rhetoric. I told Xiaoye that I wanted to write my dissertation on a topic that stemmed from my experiences teaching in China, but that bridged multilingual writing in the United States. Xiaoye was gracious; he listened to me and made some suggestions about further research. After dinner we exchanged emails and stayed in touch for the next year. Xiaoye was supportive of my research interests. When it came time to select participants for my dissertation, I knew that I wanted him to be involved.

Background and Brief Overview of Scholarship

Xiaoye is an Associate Professor of English and Asian Studies at Pennsylvania State University (PSU), where his time is split between the two programs at 75% and 25% respectively. He has taught undergraduate and graduate courses such as Ethnic Rhetorics, Writing in the Social Sciences, World Englishes and the Chinese Rhetorical Tradition. He also co-taught two courses with Suresh Canagarajah; one in 2010 entitled, Rhetoric in Contact Zones; and one in 2012 entitled, Translingual Writing and Transcultural Communication in Globalization. According to Xiaoye, these courses allowed them to develop their ideas about cosmopolitanism and writing.

In his scholarship, Xiaoye examines writing across a variety of areas in rhetoric and composition and in historical and modern contexts. Although some of his publications focus on Classical Chinese rhetoric in an historical context (You & Liu, 2009; You, 2008a; 2011) this was not, initially, the work he intended to do. As he explains, "the department here is very rhetoric oriented. When I came here I had lunch with Jack Selzer, one of my colleagues, and he said try to familiarize yourself with the ethnic rhetoric camp or that community" (You, X. personal communication, October 31, 2013). While this initially "pigeon holed" him into studies in ethnic rhetoric, according to him "the experience has been very positive…right now I can read Classical Chinese very well before that I had a very hard time so it's good" (You, X. personal communication, October 31, 2013). The breadth and depth of Xiaoye's work may be seen in other publications (You, 2008a; 2011) where he examines Chinese English on an Internet forum. While these publications provide insight into multilingual creativity (You, 2008a) and a “diaspora consciousness” among white-collar workers in China (You, 2011), they also include the classical rhetorical strategies these writers use.

From the “Devil’s Tongue” to Translingual Practice

In 2011, Xiaoye won the CCCC Outstanding Book Award for his first book, *Writing in the Devil’s Tongue: A History of English Composition in China,* which was developed based on his dissertation. As the title suggests, You (2010) utilizes writing textbooks as archival research to examine the history of English writing in China. He then provides an historical analysis of writing instruction beginning in 1862 with the inauguration of the first institution for foreign language studies in Beijing, 同文館 (*Tong Wen Guan*): “Academy of Interpreters.” 同文館 served “to train agents for international communication” (p. 15) during a political crisis that resulted after China lost the opium wars to Britain and felt they needed to learn the language (English) used in treaties. Although English training at 同文館 was intended to support China’s international and domestic relations, because it was run by imperial authorities, as You (2010) explains, “its daily operation was largely colonialist in nature” (p. 16). The colonial nature of English writing continued throughout several transitions in China: although learning English served as way for China to strengthen itself in response to the political economy, its teachings were under the veil of western imperialists who had their own agendas, such as promoting Christianity and the spread of capitalism.

From the 19th century to the end of the Cultural Revolution (1967-1976), English was known as “the devil’s tongue,” a name that encapsulated the anger Chinese students felt towards their western counterparts for making them victims of the tug of war between China’s morals and the West’s colonial mission. The colonial influence on English writing in China created new rhetorical forms for essays, too. For instance, the conflation of 八股文(*baguwen*), or “eight-legged essay," which was used to teach students to write for civil service exams, and Aristotle's modes of discourse, resulted in hybridized styles of writing that were loyal to the Chinese literary tradition, but followed Aristotle's genres; narration, description, exposition, argumentation, persuasion. In addition, the influence of Christianity, proselytized by western missionaries who taught English writing after the reform, instilled a habit for Chinese writers to negotiate meaning amidst essay requirements and variations of the 洋八股 (*yang bagu*), or "westernized eight-legged style." Taken together, it is possible to see how the history of English teaching in China instilled a habit for negotiation practices among students in their English texts. With this in mind, I submit that continuing to seek out and understand the history and impact of U.S. composition in other locations of the world is key to understanding the translingual practices of students today. By inquiring into these translingual practices, we may better develop pedagogical approaches that allow for diversified forms of both composing and understanding meaning in English texts.

"Someone who is in-between"

In addition to Xiaoye's work at PSU during the regular academic year, over the summer, he teaches at Guangdong University of Foreign Studies (GUFS) in China. In this context, he teaches a one-credit course in World Englishes, or Second Language Writing, and also directs graduate students' work as needed. During our interview at the Sichuan Bistro in State College, PA, I asked Xiaoye how he identified as a teacher-scholar living and working in both the United States and China and if he identified as Chinese American:

1. Xiaoye (X): I don't identify myself as a Chinese American.
2. Rachel (R): Ok.
3. X: I don't identify myself as that, yet. Because right now in terms of my institutional status I'm still a foreigner. You know, I'm still holding my green card.

4. R: Mmhm.

5. X: And I don't have any intention to get, uh, to become an American citizen because with an American citizenship my travel my cross-national travel would be difficult.

6. R: Oh, I see.

7. X: Every time I want to go back to China then I have to get a Visa. Now with my green card and my Chinese passport I can travel very, you know freely really freely any time I want to leave and come back into the US it's no problem.

8. X: So I don't identify with that tag with that name

9. R: How do you identify?

10. X: I feel now (.) I think more about it over the last few years (.) I think I feel comfortable identifying myself as someone who is in between.

11. R: In-between (.) Ok.

12. X: As someone who is in between culturally, institutionally, so that's why I feel comfortable taking on positions in China at the same time. Yeah the Guangdong University of Foreign Studies […] I like to keep doing things like that. I like to be a person that is intellectually situated in between. (You, X. personal communication, October 31, 2013)

Xiaoye's repeated use of the word, "freely," in line 7 seems to parallel his preferred identification, as "one who is in-between," in line 10. While identifying with the Chinese American, to use his word, "tag," would mean becoming an American citizen, which would complicate his international travel, identifying as "one who is in between" offers him the freedom to embody his personal and intellectual pursuits between the United States and China.

Following Grosz (2010) I use “freedom to” “positively as the condition of, or capacity for, action in life” (p. 140). Drawing on feminist thought and a new materialist framework, Grosz (2010) problematizes the notion of freedom that carries with it philosophical underpinnings of “emancipation or to some understanding of liberation from, or removal of, an oppressive or unfair form of constraint or limitation” (p. 140). As might be obvious, the cultural marker, “Chinese American,” does not carry with it negative attributes as many Chinese living in the United States identify with it. Instead, the mobility that Xiaoye is exercising allows him to reject this category. By doing this, he is given access to “multiple possibilities of action” (p. 152) that include the ability to move freely between the United States and China, which is an important source of travel for the cross-cultural and linguistic nature of his research.

Xiaoye’s identification may be thought of as cosmopolitan, too. Cosmopolitanism is an age-old term originating with Diogenes (*kosmopolitês*) and adapted recently by scholars in light of globalization (Ang, 2003; Appiah, 2010; Vertovec & Cohen, 2002). For instance, Ang (2003) argues for hybridity, which “functions as a “heuristic device for analysing complicated entanglement” (p. 8) that occurs in contact zones. Akin to hybridity, cosmopolitanism, to use You’s (2015) definition, carries with it the understanding “that while one may be defined by kindred relations, ethnicity, nation, race, or class, as a member first of the human race, one also has moral obligations to those outside his or her categories” (2015 p. 6). Xiaoye has both modeled and embodied this type of cosmopolitanism in his scholarship (You & You, 2012; You, 2015) teaching, and even in his interactions with me as a student and researcher, which I will discuss more specifically later in this chapter. In addition, You’s (2015) view of cosmopolitanism is similar to what Canagarajah (2013b) calls, “‘dialogical cosmopolitanism,’ which is based on mutual collaboration with an acceptance of everyone’s difference” (p. 196).

Where You's (2015) understanding of cosmopolitanism focuses on ethical or even moral relations to others, Canagarajah's (2013a) definition focuses on specific dispositions that allow one to engage in cosmopolitan practices. For instance, one way to establish co-constructed forms of existence is to adopt dispositions that allow for interdependent practices of negotiation, self-reflection, and recontextualization, which I will illustrate later in this chapter and the chapters that follow. But what do these practices look like and where do they come from? To further develop the idea of translingual practices and their implication for cosmopolitanism, I will first highlight a short vignette that I believe exemplifies translingual dispositions. Then, I provide specific examples of translingual practices based on classroom observations and an excerpt from a conversation I had with Xiaoye over lunch.

Dispositions of Translingual Practice

In the introduction to his most recent manuscript, *Cosmopolitan English and Transliteracy*, You (2015) foregrounds the story of one of Confucius' disciples, Sima Niu, who is both tormented and saddened by the ideological differences between him and his brother. He mournfully concludes, "Everyone else has brothers; I alone have none." Stepping in to comfort him, his friend Zixia responds, "If a gentleman attends to business and does not idle away his time, if he behaves with courtesy to others and observes the rules of ritual, then all within the Four Seas are his brothers" (qtd. in You, 2015 p. 6). In other words, people do not need to be separated by differences imposed by ideology if they act in a way that is considerate to others, and if they develop practices that are sensitive to difference. Taking his argument a step further, You (2015) bridges the Confucian concept, 四海之内皆兄弟: "all men are brothers," with the Greek concept, *kosmopolitês* introduced by Diogenes the Cynic and bolstered by the Stoics. Connecting to the Greek paradigm, You (2015), drawing on Held (2010), explains "Allegiance is owed, first and foremost, to the moral realm of all humanity, not to the contingent groupings of nations, ethnicity, and class (p. 7). The shared connection between Confucian (四海之内皆兄弟) and Greek (*kosmopolitês)* concepts provides a historically relevant example, from the bedrock of both traditions, into how people might relate to each other despite their differences.

According to the translingual model, there are certain dispositions, or ways of being, that make the kind of practices that need to take place in order to negotiate difference possible. These dispositions, according to Canagarajah (2013a) are not unlike Bourdieu's *habitus* for they include:

> [A]n awareness of language as constituting diverse norms; a willingness to negotiate with diversity in social interactions; attitudes such as openness to difference, patience to co-construct meaning, and an acceptance of negotiated outcomes in interactions; and the ability to learn through practice and critical self reflection. (p. 5)

By laying out the dispositions of translingual practice, it is possible to see how adopting these perspectives might serve as a foundation to enact practices that bridge diverse communities, as You (2015) suggests by highlighting similarities between the Confucian and Greek ethic. The similarities among philosophical traditions are not the only example of the way people from diverse communities may find shared connections. Rather, the similarities between stories reflect qualities that are intrinsically human; both Sima and Diogenes desired human connections beyond their own frame of reference. Perhaps the desire to connect is inherent to all people, but the diverse nature of communicative practice is what makes this introduction relevant to the teaching of writing.

Combining a cosmopolitan perspective with translingual dispositions, You (2015) emphasizes, as he has in other works (You 2008; You 2011; You 2012) that "constructing a text always means negotiation between writer and reader, and alignment between the audience addressed and the audience invoked" (p. 114). Drawing on this philosophy he outlines a Cross-Pacific Exchange Project, developed to strengthen students' use of academic writing, to give them greater authority, opportunities to engage with primary and secondary sources, and to negotiate their meanings with different readers. These assignments were given to students in both Chinese and United States universities.

Exchanges in English Writing

After reading about Xiaoye's Cross-Pacific-Exchange Project in his manuscript, I wanted to talk with him about it and observe his role in the project to develop a better sense of what specific practices may be used to broker and mediate linguistic diversity in the writing classroom. Through email, we made arrangements for me to visit PSU during the fall semester of 2013.

<u>Reflective Journal 1, October 15, 2013</u>**:**

> *Even though I have spoken with Xiaoye before and corresponded with him over email, I feel intimidated to meet him in person. Many of my intimidations arise out of fear. I question what right I have to write about Xiaoye's practices, about the "in-between," about the practices of Chinese scholars in the field of composition studies, when I, myself, am not Chinese. Is my interest in this topic, enough? Is the time I spent in China and my level of proficiency in the Chinese language enough? Is my genuine desire enough? I don't have answers to these questions. As I drive down the I-99 N towards Altoona I anticipate—I think about what I will say when I arrive and how I should say it. I wonder if Xiaoye is at all concerned about what, exactly, I will take away from and write about my observation of his class. I think about the hierarchical nature of*

universities, something I never thought about until driving to PSU. Finally, I decide that everyone will probably be very serious. And then I let these thoughts go and enjoy the drive.

Prior to my visit to PSU, I had not acted on my research trajectory in a way that required me to do what I only read and talked about in my course papers. I certainly thought, many times, about the kind of research I would like to do, and I wrote papers about my work. For instance, during my first semester as a graduate student, I used the data You (2011) collected and examined in his article about Chinese white-collar workers in the diaspora and reanalyzed it using Mao's (2006) "reflective methodology," based on Kenneth Pike's emic/etic approach from applied linguistics. While I was able to illuminate a new way of seeing You's (2011) data through my own frame of reference, it wasn't mine from the start and I wanted to "walk the talk" of a researcher, so to speak.

Because of the nature of academic publishing, reading the work of a scholar and speaking to a scholar in person are different experiences, too. My peers and I would liken the scholars we put on pedestals to rock stars, placing them outside of our reach. Of course, this kind of prophetic following does not help to alleviate the intimidations that arise from the student/scholar binary we create for ourselves. In addition, when young scholars develop this type of "deer in headlights" syndrome, it becomes very difficult for them to read critically and, thus, find their own necessary place in the conversation. These are the issues I struggled with during my drive to meet Xiaoye at PSU, but, just before our interview, he said something that gave me some perspective, and the phrase stayed with me long after our meeting.

"So, why don't you ask the questions in *your* way?"

We were sitting in the Sichuan Bistro, in State College, PA, and had just ordered food. While we were waiting for the food to arrive, we started a conversation that was somewhat related to my interview questions. Having read the questions prior to my visit, Xiaoye recognized that it was a good time to begin the interview. Just after I turned on the recording device, he said: "So, why don't you ask the questions in *your* way" (You, X., personal communication, October 15, 2013). In the context of the interview, this egalitarian phrase made me relax a little, I didn't feel like I had to speak in any kind of preferred academic way, that we could just have a conversation. But afterwards, after the interview was over and I was listening to the audio recording, I had a moment of doubt. I thought to myself, what is "my way?" After all of these years of becoming indoctrinated into the academy from a blue-collar upbringing that valued a different way, do I even know what "my way" is anymore?

As I listened to my voice on the audio recording device, it didn't sound familiar. I didn't sound like me, but I had no way of knowing if Xiaoye was answering questions in "his way," either. All sorts of contestations mire the research context. Scholar's who write about new materialisms (Barad, 2008; Micciche, 2014, Coole & Frost, 2010) examine the ways that material factors (e.g., recording device, food, table ware, attire etc.) allow or disallow us to adapt to the conditions of our environment. There is nothing natural about an interview; it's a contact zone. Although some of the material aspects of our context (food, background discussion) would, ordinarily, create a space of comfort, it is thrown off by the reality of the interview marked by a recording device. While it may be easy to say, "ask the questions in your way," in reality, "my way" was difficult to do.

In addition, even though I had met Xiaoye before this visit, we did not know each other well. Our roles as researchers and institutional affiliations were, and still are, very different; he is an assistant professor at PSU who has published widely, and I am a doctoral student at IUP who is just beginning her research trajectory. Whether we like it or not, there is hierarchy. And it is the same for our students. I chose to make the practices of the academy my life, and with that decision there were choices, but what about the diverse demographic of students who are just passing through? Are they given opportunities to write, speak, and think in *their* way? I want to be a person that enacts the kind of practices that allow students from all cultural and linguistic backgrounds the opportunity to negotiate "their ways," in their Standard Academic English writing. This desire is what fueled my interest in Xiaoye's Cross-Pacific Exchange Project in general, and his role in the project in particular.

World Englishes in Language and Literature

My classroom observations of Xiaoye's teaching allowed me to see, firsthand, what a translingual approach to writing pedagogy looks like. Prior to my visit to PSU, I was simply connecting the dots, from theory to practice, on my own. When I first read Xiaoye's scholarly work (You, 2008; 2011; 2010; 2012), there was something about it that resonated with me because he was addressing issues that pushed the boundaries between Standard Academic English writing and English as it is actually used by speakers of languages around the globe. Reading Xiaoye's work caused me to question the monolingual nature of English writing—the assumption that speakers of all languages will default to meet the expectations of their "native" English speaking audience, which fortifies an "us and them" boundary, and further perpetuates binary thinking in our institutions. In reality, of course, "what is involved in student writing acts is far more complex than the simple relayance of Standard English code and the single cultural code that usually accompanies it" (You, 2015, p. 112). Before my doctoral studies, the pedagogical approaches that address, support, and nurture the complexity of multilingual students' writing to Standard Academic English, always seemed like a big secret that only a precious few educators knew, or claimed to know, about. I soon realized that the practices involved in reading, understanding, negotiating and supporting these diverse codes are far more complicated than they seem. These practices require a "multisensory orientation to meaning making" (Canagarajah, 2013c, p. 43), which involves developing an awareness of material, linguistic, and intuitive practices.

Negotiating Words and Phrases

Reflective Journal 2, October 15, 2013:

> *Students enter Xiaoye's World Englishes in Literature class and move the desks into a circle. Xiaoye takes a seat in the circle, turns on the laptop situated at his right, opens Skype, and calls students at GUFS who are waiting to be a part of this Cross-Pacific discussion from their dorm room. Prior to this class meeting students from PSU and GUFS uploaded essays to a website entitled, 英語寫作跨洋互动 "Cross-Pacific Exchange in English Writing." As it appears, several students at GUFS are in one dorm room waiting to speak with the students from PSU.*

There are eight students in the World Englishes in Literature graduate seminar at PSU, which begins at 11:15 AM. Although Chinese students at GUFS are available through the web camera and interact in the discussion, because of where I am sitting and the size of the computer screen, I am unable to tell how many students are present. During my observation of the class discussion, PSU students identified words and phrases Chinese students used in their essays that seemed unfamiliar to them. In the following discussion, I will identify the translingual practices used to negotiate two of these specific phrases:

1.) "fearful symmetry"

2.) “insects” as a metaphor.

Drawing on the meaning discrepancies that arose in relation to these phrases, I look at the negotiations the writers are making and the specific practices Xiaoye uses to move between PSU students’ responses to the words and GUFS students’ negotiation of them. Used as the main source of discussion material, these student texts, in addition to previously read scholarship (i.e. Ashcroft’s (2009) *Caliban’s Voice: The Transformation of English in Post-Colonial Literatures*, Jin (1999) *Waiting*, Achebe (1994) *Thing’s Fall Apart* and You (2012) *Writing in the Devil’s Tongue*) this particular class session represented what Moss (2007) calls a “literacy event,” “any occasion where a piece of written text plays an integral part in what is going on” (p. 40).

Xiaoye begins the seminar discussion by greeting everyone across cyber-Pacific boundaries and asks the PSU students to begin by introducing themselves so that the GUFS will know who they are, since they read their essays. In Chinese, Xiaoye turns to the computer screen and addresses the students in the dorm at GUFS to let them know the introductions will begin. Xiaoye adjusts the laptop as students from PSU introduce themselves. Some students get up out of their seats and wave hello and some students do their introductions from their desks. Afterwards Xiaoye asks his PSU students if anyone would like to comment on the essays that they read. One student begins by sharing the two essays she read from the online forum. The student stumbles slightly while attempting to pronounce the Chinese students’ names, so Xiaoye intervenes by repeating the names in Chinese so that the students at GUFS know whose essays they will discuss. Once the authors are established, the PSU student waves hello to the Chinese student. Xiaoye asks the PSU student about the major suggestions she made in response to the essay and her reflection on the comments overall.

“Fearful Symmetry”

The PSU student compliments the author of essay number 23, “The Lady or the Tiger,” but suggests changing the use of an idiom in the story. Xiaoye looks at the dialogue (from a print out of the essay website) between the two students and, in general, says that he agrees with the PSU student’s critique. However, he suggests that the Chinese student may have been drawing on creative use of the language. Xiaoye reads the Chinese student’s writing out loud stopping, occasionally, to inspire PSU students to visualize what the Chinese student is trying to describe:

> The moment he opened the door, a feeling of desperate hit him. A hungry tiger came out and stared at him fiercely. Its eyes sparkled, like a lamp at night. He wondered what immortal hand or eye could frame this fearful symmetry. He didn’t have any clues why the princess decided to send him into the hell. The tiger walked towards him with its mouth opening. He knew he was driven into a corner and he had the last glance of the princess. He closed his eyes, waiting for the death.
>
> (http://www.l2china.com/exchange/Stage10/).

Repeating the phrase in question, “he wondered what immortal hand or eye could frame this fearful symmetry,” Xiaoye adjusts the laptop so that the PSU student is speaking directly to the author via Skype and asks, why do you feel this sentence is out of place? The actions that Xiaoye takes here increase the human quality of communication between individuals. While conversations on an Internet forum and through email are somewhat personal, these modes of communication lack the kind of human connection that is only available through face-to-face interaction. By inviting students to both introduce themselves and communicate their feedback to Chinese students through face-to-face interactions, Xiaoye decreases the element of what

Goffman (1961) calls, “role distance,” asking students to be capable of receiving and transmitting communications to one another. To keep the dialogue going, Xiaoye continues to switch between Chinese and English as he addresses Chinese students over Skype at GUFS and PSU students in class.

At this point in the discussion, Xiaoye embodies, in a sense, an in-between way of doing that calls up material and discursive boundaries and aligns with some of the features of translingual practice by encouraging “relations between language, language users, and the temporal-spatial contexts and consequences of language acts as co-constructive” (Lu & Horner, 2013, p. 27). Drawing on the student’s use of creativity—her use of “fearful symmetry”—Xiaoye explains he feels that the phrase is kind of “cool” because the story is about a tiger. The tiger has a symmetrical pattern on its face. Xiaoye goes on to describe the big image of the tiger, its teeth, its face, etc. Here, and throughout the class discussion thus far, it may be said that Xiaoye is enacting the translingual strategy, *recontextualization*, by framing the literacy event so that “both interlocutors’ differing norms have to be acknowledged and an egalitarian footing adopted” (Canagarajah 2013a p. 81). Enacting this strategy inspires PSU students to see GUFS students’ writing differently, through a different lens.

One student interjects in the conversation attributing the GUFS student’s use of “symmetry” with a famous poem by William Blake, a connection that was not recognized by PSU students previously in the discussion. This realization adds an additional layer of insight into the way that students might read a text written by a Chinese speaker versus the way students might read a similar text by a writer such as William Blake. By allowing students to bring their responses to student writing to the class discussion, no matter what they are, a space is created where critical self-reflection is cultivated. That is, students may question, “how they read” and "why they read" the way that they do. Xiaoye asks if anyone else in the class has any similar examples from the essays they read by the Chinese students—anything they were initially unaware of, but now realize makes sense.

"Insects" as a Metaphor

The use of the word, "insects" is brought to the forefront of the discussion in the PSU context. It is important to note that at this point in the class, it is past 12:00 in the afternoon in State College, PA, which means it is past midnight in China. The students at GUFS only have Internet service in their dormitory until midnight, so they are no longer available through Skype. Even though these students are not present to negotiate their essays with PSU students, like Burke's (1941) parlor scene, the discussion at PSU is "still vigorously in progress" (p. 111), with an active consideration for the negotiations Chinese students made on the forum.

The essay context from which the use of the word "insects" is questioned is from a narrative essay in which the author positions herself as a prisoner in a dungeon from which she must escape. While in the dungeon, she finds a whistle with a Persian braille message carved into it that, according to the writer, translates, "use it, someone helps." After blowing the whistle, the author summons unexpected visitors. Xiaoye paraphrases this student's essay for the class in a way that a good storyteller engages an audience: paying attention to plot line, using vocal inflection, expression, etc. Then, reading directly from the transcript, he reads, verbatim, the final section of the piece that has been called into question:

> This moment will never be erased from my memory. Troops of insects in the jungle march towards the target and occupy every inch of it. I can not even see those buggers because they are all buried dead in the army.
>
> (http://www.l2china.com/exchange/Stage10/)

The PSU student's confusion about this writer's use of the word, "insects" comes from an inability to decipher whether or not it is being used as a metaphor, which is what motivates her to ask, "Are you talking about the insects as in being bugs or the enemy soldiers? A little confusing since you say they are in the jungle" (http://www.l2china.com/exchange/Stage10/). Previously in the discussion, Xiaoye explains that Chinese students tend to be really polite, so no matter what kind of feedback the PSU students provide, they will be very willing to accept it. PSU students agree with this statement, but suggest that if the Chinese students could provide the kind of feedback that Xiaoye offers, it would be helpful and allow them to understand more about the choices Chinese students have made in their writing. In actuality, Xiaoye explains, at surface level they seem "obedient," but that they do provide explanation or rationale for their use of particular phrases, which becomes evident in the dialogue surrounding this essay on the forum.

Xiaoye points out the Chinese writer's rhetorical instinct to begin her response to her interlocutor with gratitude, as he mentioned previously, she writes: "Thank you for your comment and everything. I quite appreciate that you point out the language errors, and that my story needs more background information, coherence and logic, and that the title is not closely related to my story," before becoming quite clear about her intentions:

> You mentioned about the insects. The insects I thought about were real insects, not metaphors. Maybe the plot sounds quirky, but in Chinese TV series, there's such plot. Insects are endowed with magic and could be used by humans to fight against enemies. It's the same as Voldemort using his snake in Harry Potter movies. (http://www.l2china.com/exchange/Stage10/)

The negotiation practice this writer is using shrinks the space between cultural boundaries so that her meaning may be felt by her non-Chinese reader in a familiar way. Scholars who study the translingual negotiations writers make in their English writing (Canagarajah, 2013a; Pennycook, 2008; You, 2008; 2011; Bizzell, 2014) argue that we should draw our attention to these negotiations and see how they might help or enhance our understanding of English as global language. In the context the PSU class, Xiaoye points out that this student is drawing her images from multiple cultural sources that really complicates the nature of giving this type of writing the name, “Chinese English” simply because a Chinese speaker has written it, or, American English, simply because it is written in English. Xiaoye shares that in his own writing, he struggles with whether or not it is OK to say that just because a piece of English writing is written by a person who is Japanese or Chinese, that the writing automatically becomes “Japanese English” or “Chinese English.”

Xiaoye’s role in the Cross Pacific Exchange Project reveals the way material practice contributes to a graspable understanding of social phenomena. In this case, the social phenomena are the words and phrases used by Chinese students in their essays that initially signify a boundary between PSU students’ understanding of them and vice versa. Although the terms used to describe the kind of English writing used by Chinese writers—i.e., Chinese English, World English, etc.—there is a reality that runs much deeper than the language itself. As Barad (2003) offers “reality is not composed of things-in-themselves or things behind-phenomena but things in phenomena…it is through specific intra-actions that a differential sense of being is enacted in the ongoing ebb and flow of agency” (p. 817). In other words, the phenomena in question may be the use of English by Chinese speakers. Sometimes we call this, China English, Chinese English, or World English, but, really, there is no such thing. There is no “English” that is absolute. We all speak English in different ways “in the on-going ebb and flow of agency” (p. 817). So when we are looking at what writers and speakers of languages mean based on how they use language, we are looking at something much deeper than language itself. We are looking at the intention, or sometimes the transfer of code that travels in the communicative vehicle we call English. Words only attempt to represent our ontologies, but do not always offer justice to the phenomena we experience at the end of the day. In order to get to the reality of the agentive writer or speaker, we need to develop practices that allow us to move between the phenomena in question and the writer's sense of the world. It is only through the doing of language as a social activity, or as a mediating activity, that this interdependent process is made possible.

Soup, or Sauce?

In order to further illustrate some of the verbal practices that may occur in the situated contexts of interaction and to show their implication for negotiations that take place in English writing, in this section I highlight some negotiations that took place during a conversation Xiaoye and I had about our leftovers at the Sichuan Bistro:

13. X: I think we should get a few boxes, right?

14. R: Ok

15. X: Can we have…

(Waiter): just one?

16. X: Maybe…

17. R: Maybe 2?

18. X: At least 2. And I think these two can come together and this

19. R: Yeah yeah

20. X: Yeah so you have something for tomorrow, maybe not for dinner

21. R: Do you want to take that?

22. X: You can=

23. R: =You can take it if you like.

24. X: You don't like it you don't want to eat it or is it too=

25. R: =I like it very much, but you can take it if you like

26. X: It's so easy for me to get it everyday

27. R: Ok I'll take it thank you

28. X: Do you have a bigger box?

29. R: Oh this might=

30. X: =These two are probably small I think

31. X: Too large, two big ones

32. X: Cause I think I don't know I think like Chinese they like to keep part of the sou—
    the [the]

33.   [[M: the sauce?]]

34. X: yeah, the sauce (*smiles*)

35. R: yeah

36. X: (.) Do you call it soup? We will say soup like soup @@

37. R: @@ sort of like soup, but sauce

38. X: @@ ok so it's sauce.

39. R: @@

40. X: Probably it's sauce

41. X: I mean since you don't get this as easily so why don't you take this

42. R: Thank you so much

43. X: yeah yeah yeah this is good.

The above exchanges depict negotiations that arise out of politeness and the different use of English words based on their Chinese translation. In order for communication to serve as a vehicle to counter misunderstandings speakers must negotiate what the other wants or means in situational contexts. For instance, in line 21 Xiaoye offers to give me the leftovers, but out of politeness I respond, “you can take it if you like.” If the conversation ended here it is possible that Xiaoye might have gone away thinking that I did not enjoy the food, which is evident in his response, “You don’t like it you don’t want to eat it or is it too…” On the contrary, it was the best Chinese food I had since I lived in the Sichuan province of China in 2010. By verbally dancing around the reason I offered the leftovers to him, we were both able to understand that I was, in fact, just being polite and that he would rather give the leftovers to me because he can have the food anytime he wants.

In addition to the negotiations that arise out of politeness practices, there are similar negotiations that occur in response to the different choice of words Xiaoye and I use to name the spicy liquid on the 四川水煮鱼 (*shu zhu yu*): “Sichuan boiled fish.” These negotiations arise out of the “traffic of meaning” (Pennycook, 2008) that results when English is used in the context of other languages, which is most of the time. In the Chinese language the word, 汤(*tang*): “soup” is sometimes used to represent the liquids used alone or to accompany different types of ethnic dishes. Growing up an Italian American, my mother always cooked a large pot of tomato sauce each month and froze it into individual containers. Every Sunday she would defrost a batch of sauce and we would pour it on top of pasta, usually rigatoni or penne. From my frame of reference, if the liquid goes on top, it’s sauce; if it’s the main course on its own, it’s soup. Although the sauce on top of the fish was delicious, I thought about it as something that goes on top of a main course rather than the main course itself.

The differences between my and Xiaoye's cultural and linguistic backgrounds come into contact in line 33 when he is explaining the reason Chinese like to get a larger container for their leftovers. Anticipating, perhaps, that the word in his linguistic repertoire, "soup, " may not be the same as the word I use, he stops himself from finishing and searches for a better word marked by his repetitive use of the word "the." When I realize he is doing this, I interject in line 34 with "the sauce." Moving towards my use of the word in line 35, Xiaoye affirms, "yeah, the sauce," but opens the topic for discussion:

37. X: (.) Do you call it soup? We will say soup like soup @@

38. R: @@ sort of like soup, but sauce

39. X: @@ ok so it's sauce.

40. R: @@

41. X: Probably it's sauce

Up to this point in the discussion, Xiaoye and I make space for each other's words while negotiating our own—you say potato, I say "pototo," if you will. The negotiation becomes somewhat complicated in line 39 when Xiaoye relinquishes negotiation and responds, "@@ ok so it's sauce," and then redacts slightly in line 41 with "probably it's sauce." The difficult piece of this is in recognizing whether or not his affirmation of the word, "sauce" in lines 40 and 41 are meant to acknowledge my meaning or his.

The intuitive nature of communicative practice is different for everyone. Canagarajah (2013a) uses the term, *serendipity*, "being open to unexpectedness" (p. 41), to account for the way that some language users develop practices that are conducive to collaboration. He explains that in order to adopt these dispositions "Subjects have to be radically other-centered. They have to be imaginative and alert to make on the spot decisions in relation to the forms and conventions employed by the other" (p. 41). In the context of the restaurant, Xiaoye enacted this type of "other-centered" behavior by anticipated that I might not use the same word for soup as he does. In the context of the classroom, he is always willing to speak for and negotiate thorugh meaning discrepanices that arise out of difference in language. By enacting the boundaries between both groups of students—speaking both Chinese and English, offering possibilities into what Chinese students might mean, utilizing several modalities (Skype, an Internet forum, email) asking Chinese students what they mean, asking PSU students what they mean, Xiaoye shrinks the boundary between writer and reader and move beyond a superficial understanding of English as a global language.

For many, English may be the language that feels most comfortable and is most accessible, which is OK. The "forms and conventions, employed by the other" (p. 41) do not need take place through the transfer of code across languages in order to be translingual. These variations may also take place within a local language too. This is something that Xiaoye and I discussed during our interview over lunch at the Sichuan Bistro.

Cross-Pacific Exchange Project: An Interview

42. R: I'm really interested in your Cross-Pacific Exchange Project

43. X: Mmhm

44. R: And I'm interested in what you call it because in Min-Zhan Lu's book, *Shanghai Quartet* she talks about (.) sort of (.) "caring for each other on both sides of the Pacific" and the name of your project made me think of a way to call that into action, but I wonder if I wanted to replicate this project what would be the way to prepare first year students to respond to the writing of students in China?

45. X: How to prepare them @@ that's difficult. Maybe just what I'm doing, connect them with each other's work. Critique. And then in class, we will reflect upon the critique that they offer each other. The idea is to help them understand that in writing, in general, or multilingual writing, specific, there's always an uncertainty in terms of the audience in terms of the interpretation. The meaning triangle is not fixed. We're assuming there is a sign, there is a meaning, there is a reader, a speaker, who receives the information. Its not transparent it's an interpretive process. Depending on the participants writer and reader, speaker and listener depending on sociocultural experiences they may interpret them in a very different way. So what you assume as clear, transparent, you know may be understood as vague or incomprehensible by another person because of his or her upbringing, because of his or his own contextual variables that make him or her misunderstand the original intent, but that doesn't mean the misunderstanding is invalid. So I think through discussion we call the students to uncertainty to communication in general and I think that's what we try and achieve through those cross discussions like you observed. And I think we can do that with freshman composition students come in with expectations with what is good style what is good English what is appropriate convention…something they are certain about will be questioned and then we really have to think about why it's so.

46. X: I cannot say exactly how you can implement this, so, for that purpose, we do not need to have, like, American students communicating with Chinese students. We don't need to do that. We can have them read papers done by students in another class

47. R: yeah

48. X: and then we will see (.) we will see similar things happen (.) there will be (.) like dissonance or discrepancies in terms of their communication or their understanding of each other's essay and they will have conversations and they will see the complexity in the communication between writer and reader prior experiences. So that's why in my chapter I emphasize this border crossing does not mean you have to cross national border this can be done across disciplines disciplinary border you know across ethnic border and so on.

49. R: Mmhm

50. X: but I don't think I emphasize the national so much. And that does not mean I (.) um (.) I don't like scholarship that only focus on one place I think that's good too. You know and that's the idea of translingual as you said it doesn't just mean cross language or national borders we can cross more subtle less noticeable borders too.

Discussing Xiaoye's project with him offered important perspective about how I might draw from his pedagogy in my own way, particularly as a writing teacher who uses inquiry as a method for writing instruction. Students often bring their own locally situated perspectives to class discussions, which are just as diverse as those that occur in Xiaoye's Cross-Pacific Exchange Project. Just because a student has not been afforded the experience to understand difference in language or culture doesn't mean that he or she is wrong. What's more important is to create spaces where difference can be discussed and understanding may occur.

Something that I admired about the expectations Xiaoye had for his PSU students is that he did not require them to censure their responses to Chinese students' writing. As he explains in the interview, even though students may misunderstand or have specific reactions to the writing of their Chinese interlocutors, these reactions are based on their own "contextually situated variables," which are still valid. Students need to be given the space to develop their own reactions to the diverse nature of writing and then reflect on those reactions. One suggestion I would offer in response to Xiaoye's Cross-Pacific Exchange Project is that written feedback should be given and received on both sides. In other words, while PSU students gave their feedback to students at GUFS, this did not happen in reverse. During the time that I observed the workshop, only PSU students offered their feedback to Chinese students. While PSU students may have a more developed and confident command of the English language, this does not mean that Chinese students do not have any valuable feedback to offer. As some of the verbal and written negotiations that occurred during the workshop revealed, Chinese students made creative choices in their writing that PSU students can learn from. In addition, allowing the feedback process to be a two way street evens the power relationship between students from both universities.

Preliminary Conclusion

Translingual practice has focused on writing within and between languages and considers difference not as a barrier, but as a resource from which language speakers may work towards a common ground for understanding. Thus, translingual practice requires moving between, or a sense of *in-betweeness* that "is a source of cultural permeability and vulnerability that is a necessary condition for living together in difference" (Ang, 2003, p. 8). Based on my observations of Xiaoye's teaching and my personal interactions with him during our interviews, I find that he both enacts and embodies this kind of in-betweeness that lends itself to dispositions for translingual practice. Although my conclusions are based on observations in situated teaching contexts and during our interview, the practices I observed acknowledge, accept, and inquire into the differences between English as a global language and “Edited American English” (Horner et. al., 2011, p. 306). I submit that adopting similar negotiation practices in the contexts of school and communities will create spaces for acceptance and learning, rather isolation and exclusion.

CHAPTER FIVE

HAIXIA LAN

Ends and beginnings—there are no such things.
There are only middles.
–Robert Frost, "The Homestretch"[3]

Starting in the Middle

*Over dinner, at New Taste of India, Haixia draws three characters on a napkin:*孙悟空*. The characters spell the monkey's name (Sun Wukong) from* *Journey to the West*. *Using the monkey's name, Haixia explains that one character,*悟 *(wu) is the first recognition of truth, but it is not an "ah ha" moment. After this, we are just supposed to keep going on with life and not think too much about it. In her own words, she refers to something Confucius says in the Analects 2.4: at 30 we have only so much understanding. At 40 we have something more and at 50 even more. Then finally at 70 we can move freely*[4] *(something like this). My interpretation is that absolute truth, for each person, changes and evolves over time. A reality I have come to understand in my own personal way. I ask if she would be willing to discuss this during our interview and she says, yes, of course. We gather our things and leave.*

This excerpt was taken from a reflective journal I wrote on the evening of my second day in La Crosse, Wisconsin. I open this chapter with this excerpt because it responds to questions about the incongruent relationship between words and the realities they serve to represent. Truth, according to Confucius, is not a thing we can catch, but something that evolves over time. In fact, according to the passage Haixia paraphrases from *The Analects*, it can take a lifetime to understand a single truth. The situational context that prompted Haixia to draw the monkey's name on the napkin was in response to my questions about translation in general and the photograph taken at the Liaoyang temple that I use in chapter 1 in particular. In order to explain what brought me to La Crosse and some of the questions surrounding my work, I showed Haixia the photograph, told her about my work in China, and explained some of the cultural and linguistic questions I encountered during my service. Her response challenges some of the innate tendencies of rhetoric scholars in regard to absolutism:

> There is that truth out there. The difference is that we can know it and know it once and for all and that's it. To be Chinese at all you know that the ultimate reality you know is that it's going to change… therefore you cannot get that essences, down. You can't capture it and put it in the cage and you are done with it. (Lan, H. personal communication Nov. 6 2013)

Reflecting on my experience at the Liaoyang temple that I describe in chapter 1, I am reminded of the kind of answers I was searching for—answers that would provide a way for me to "cage" the meaning of "福" so that I could internalize and apply it to other contexts I entered into. As Haixia explains, this kind of "essence capturing" is not a reality of the language and the culture and, thus, did not provide me with the answers to my questions. When faced with unfamiliar terms and concepts, translinguals understand that negotiation is an inevitable strategy for meaning interpretation. Speakers of languages who are not accustomed to translingual practices often anticipate an absolute equivalent, a word meaning that is experienced the same way in one language as it is in another. As Hall and Ames (1995) suggest in their proposal for a "richly complex" understanding of Chinese terms and concepts, "our job as translators…is to negotiate an understanding that is sensitive both to context and to this full semantic range. Any presumption to the effect that there are strictly literal meanings to be searched out would lead us astray" (p. 226). The notion that there are "literal" meanings that can be found in language is a part of a mindset that is familiar to me, and, also, a starting point for translingual practice. In fact, due to a different use of the word, "literally," in 2013, Merriam Webster announced that it was adding to the original definition—"in a literal sense or matter; actually"— an alternative meaning, "in effect; virtually," to account for the different use of the word over time. Even though speakers do not, when they use the word "literally," always mean "in a literal sense or matter" the instinct to use the word is there regardless. That the definition has changed as a result of this different use is a product of translingual practice—"literally" now, literally, has new meaning. Although Webster provides some contact for the kind of translingual practice that has been bolstered by lexicographers, how might we, teachers of writing, develop new understandings of translingual practices that have not yet been valorized? In the next section I suggest that studying rhetorical traditions outside of one's frame of reference is a place to start.

Wrong English, or Wrong Thinking?

In order to connect the intellectual study of translation with pedagogical approaches that serve the meaning discrepancies that arise within and between languages, Lan (2002) draws on the cross cultural and linguistic study of two rhetorical traditions (Confucian and Aristotelian) in order to flesh out some of the subtler similarities and differences between learning and thinking according to Confucius and how those practices might enrich how we teach US academic writing. Drawing on the popular Shakesperian phrase, "to be or not to be" Lan (2002) illustrates the way that Western notions of "the eternal and absolute is a more complicated concept to convey in Chinese" (p. 69). Understanding these discursive differences between Chinese and Western traditions, she argues, is inseparable from understanding the culture from which these practices are embedded. The choice that is offered in Shakespeare's line, "to be or not to be" is distinct, whereas "in Chinese discourse… the impulse to choose between the two is minimal" (p.

69). Rooted in Chinese culture, and stemming from Confucian ideals, Lan (2002) explains that the process of learning, which is quite individualistic in the West, "to Confucius, is eminently social. By observing, mimicking, reflecting upon ritualistic behaviors, we gradually become more and more fully participating members of our own cultural/discursive communities" (p. 71). While Lan (2002) uses the word, "social" to account for the process of learning, I submit that certain recontextualization practices, such as, negotiation, are a part of this process, too.

The problem is that, sometimes, practitioners of language are not willing to negotiate or be open to the variety of ways that meaning travels. This resistance comes as a result of the binary (native/non-native) that often drives perceptions of English language teachers based on their English. As a result, scholars who research multilingual teacher identity (Huang, 2013; Fotovatian, 2014) look at perceptions of multilingual teachers on the part of their domestic colleagues. In a recent study that examines the effect of the native/non-native binary on teachers' perceptions of themselves in relation to their environment, Huang (2013) finds that "linguistic membership is enacted to define the ideal English language teacher based upon one's country of origin and first language rather than teaching preparation." (p. 120). During our interview, Haixia spoke about some specific ways her own identity as a Chinese scholar at UW-L is felt in relation to her colleagues:

> I'm just Chinese, and … in order to have a person like me to teach you have to pay a price, that is, sometimes my English is wrong. They [some of her colleagues] just are so horrified! So embarrassed! I can never stop being Chinese, even though that Chineseness will get more and more complex as I stay here longer every time I open my mouth some Chineseness comes out @@ whether or not I want it, in every single sense including thinking. (Lan, H. personal communication, Nov. 6 2013).

As I reflect on the words Haixia used to articulate her own understanding of what it means to be a Chinese teacherscholar at UW-L, I cannot help but think that writing studies departments are hardly prepared to address the reality of English as a global language if they cannot recognize their teachers (and students) as global citizens. Put differently, what better models of English as global language do we have than those that come from the fabric of our institutions? If we, educators, value the performative nature of writing and speaking, under the veil of Standard Academic English, we need to begin asking ourselves what exactly that means and to what extent we intend to uphold these standards?

In response to these questions some scholars (Canagarajah, 2013a; Horner et al., 2011; Donahue, 2009) have argued that we "subtly pluralize writing so as to make spaces for diverse Englishes and languages" (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 109), but this will take time. During the preliminary stages of research for this project, I studied several articles published by Chinese scholars in the field. Each and every time I read one of these works I developed an internal sense of the voice of the writer. As a result, that voice became a persona, and that persona became an expectation that I associated with a sign—the name of the scholar. The personal conversations and phone calls I had with my participants made me realize how disillusioned I was about my discipline—one that values the diversity of meaning, but prefers that it travel in the vehicle of a white patriarchal idiolect. This nationalist view of composition, as Hurlbert (2012) argues "is marked by a conservative commitment to formalism and a liberal commitment to managed forms of multiculturalism. Its curricular emphasis is on teaching academically sanctioned forms and training writers to control audiences… through the employment of a white, male, liberal voice" (p. 17). Some might respond to Hurlbert's (2012) critique as an attempt to disrupt the system, and, in so doing, might do a disservice to students who need to learn the academic forms of

English writing to be successful members of their academic and professional communities. While I recognize that writing is done for variety of purposes and that the expectation of the white paper or peer-reviewed article is different from other narrative forms, the gap between the person and the scholar on the page is not always such a façade. Haixia's acknowledgement, in the above quote, of the ways in which her "Chineseness comes out" every time she opens her mouth should not be thought as something to disguise. In addition, her use of English should not be perceived as a price some of her colleagues must pay in order to have her to teach. This kind of linguistic discrimination has been taken up by several scholars (Canagarajah 1999, Lippi-Green 1997, Mao 2010, Phillipson 1992) and parallels the experiences students have on a different level. As Haixia explains:

> I used to have students who really wanted to study professional writing. They were told by graduate programs that "we can't have foreign students with the kind of English you are speaking." But they are so young; they make progress (Lan, H. personal communication, Nov. 6 2013).

The notion that a particular "kind" of English is not acceptable for admission to graduate programs that offer professional writing is wrong thinking. English language users speak varieties of the language and have for hundreds of years. In addition, at the transition from undergraduate to graduate professional, the goals should be part of trajectory that improves with time, that's why it's called school. The expectation that students will cohere to the professional forms of English writing upon entry into a program is a result of a monolingual orientation to the language that is built on an illusion. Composition is "an inherently imperial enterprise" (Prendergast, 2010, p. 230) that has marginalized unfamiliar varieties of English based on a monolingual ideology that does not exist. Professional forms of English are rhetorical costumes, crafted by those who have learned the tools and materials. al-Jahiz (1999) warns that "eloquence is a form of witchcraft" (p. 167) that, if left unexamined, may deceive, fool, and trap. What message do we send our undergraduate students when we value these edited forms of English writing over their authentic versions of the same? Writing departments need to rethink their admission criteria and their approaches to academic writing. They should ask themselves about how they might create spaces and practices for negotiating the diversity of English as global language in the classroom and encourage students to the same. One obvious place to start might be through an acceptance of the global varieties of English used by their colleagues. If teachers are confident in the linguistic varieties they use with their colleagues, it will create spaces where the varieties students bring to their writing may be valorized and better understood.

Theory, Practice, Research 1 and the 4:4

Haixia completed her graduate work at Purdue University and began teaching at the University of La Crosse, Wisconsin in 1993. At UW-L, Haixia is a Professor and the Academic Director of the 2+2 program, a program that provides students from China an opportunity to earn a bachelors degree in two years and for only two years' tuition. As a professor of English, she teaches composition courses and rhetorical traditions. When I interviewed Haixia, she spoke about her love of theory, studying with Janice Lauer at Purdue, and her passionate intellectual study of Aristotle and Confucius. Having read Haixia's work, which centers on the intersections of comparative rhetoric and the teaching of writing, I was interested in the trajectory that brought her intellectual study to find practical roots:

51. Haixia (H): I never thought I was going to teach, so I didn't have a lot of expectations. Rhetoric and Writing, the program I went through was just training for teachers, basically. I had no idea. I just loved theory so much. I was studying

18th and 19th century British literature. This is part of the reason I stayed there for so long. So I didn't know the difference between the 4:4

52. Rachel (R): Mmhm

53. H: and the research institute.

54. R: Right, right

55. H: I think probably because of my background and everything

56. R: Mmhm

57. H: 4:4 was all I could (.) uh (.) expect? But I didn't know what 4:4 meant. Everyone at the meeting was saying, oh, that's a 4:4 and I was not even listening (.) until I got here and then I found out oh, that's what 4:4 meant.

As Haixia was talking about the demands of 4:4 institutions, all I could think of was that I, too, did not know what 4:4 meant until I was well into my doctoral course work. Like Haixia, this jargon was foreign to me. I had a sense that some institutions were more prestigious than others and that institutional hierarchy exists, but I didn't know anything about the terms that were used to differentiate between them. The fault lines between theory and practice have often been criticized for leaving the field of composition to suffer in what Reynolds (2001) calls, "theoretical vapors" (p. 123). Responding to a lack of theory in practice and a lack of practice in theory, some scholars (Berthoff, 1990; Tinberg, 1991) suggest that what the field of composition needs is to resist the theory/practice dichotomy and work towards praxis, which is quite hard. Theory allows scholars to control the aims of their hypothetical, niche conversations; practice, rooted first and foremost in experience, brings "the messiness and the ad hoc nature of the classroom" (Tinberg, 1991, p. 38) to the forefront of discussion. In other words, our classroom practices may not, in reality, mirror the idealistic theories we wish to embody, and that's OK. To use, Tinberg's (1991) words, "the messiness" of what these classroom practices turn out to be should not be thought of as something to hide. When practice doesn't mirror theory, we, in composition, either move farther away from the object of study—the teaching of writing—or assume that we can perform reenactments of successful pedagogies. The truth is, of course, that practice is idiosyncratic to the individual nature of the human and we all need to find our own way. By studying theory and reflecting on its relevance to practice, writing teachers can situate themselves in scholarly conversations in the field while grounding their findings in the lived experiences that take place locally and individually in the here and now. To do this, Tinberg (1991) suggests writing teachers "view the text of class as dialogical and allegorical" all the while being mindful that "nothing that occurs in the classroom is without significance—nothing" (p. 40). In other words, combining theory with practice requires that one use the big ideas of theory and find its relevance in the quotidian. If there is no relevance, than it's not praxis.

For Haixia, bridging the gap between theory and practice means balancing the 4:4 workload with scholarship. When we spoke, she mentioned that during the academic year, it is very difficult for her to do the kind of scholarly work she is able to do over the summer. In order to stay connected to her passionate area of research throughout the year, she streamlines her intellectual studies with her classroom practices, which entails bringing a variety of perspectives to her students. These perspectives, according to her, are informed by a sense of "in-betweeness" that she notes is "so characteristically Chinese and also Western." While observing her "Introduction to Rhetoric and Writing Studies" class in computer classroom 216 of Wimberly Hall, I was able to witness some of the ways which Haixia's study of two rhetorical traditions inform her teaching. These practices, of course, are not a dramatic enactment of theory—practice rarely is—but, rather, an attempt to ground some of the practices that come out of doing comparative rhetoric and use them in the classroom.

Introduction to Rhetoric and Writing Studies

Prior to my visit, Haixia's students read and responded to an article, "Introduction to Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student" by Edward P.J. Corbett. Although students discussed this article during the class session that I observed, it was not the main text in class. In order to facilitate a discussion that brought together a variety of conceptualizations, Haixia highlighted student responses to the article on an overhead projector. Throughout the session, each student response was used as a starting point for a discussion that included the ideas in Corbett's article and transitioned to Barbara Warnick's "Judgement, Probability, and Aristotle's Rhetoric." Some of the questions that guided the discussion were: "what do rhetoricians do? (Warnick) "What does it mean to stand in the middle?" And "what is the difference between Aristotle and Postmodernists?"

Although each of the questions posed during this class session were great for a discussion at the undergraduate level, being that I seek out examples translingual practices, I was interested in responses to the question, "What does it mean to stand in the middle?" which was not explicitly answered in class. During my interview with Haixia, I asked her about this question and its relation to the in-between. From a pedagogical perspective, she explained that being in the middle "requires that we think constantly, on both sides, and help that happen among the students" (Lan, H. Personal Communication November 5 2013). Although students read a text by Corbett and engaged in a discussion about the features of Western rhetoric, by starting from their own individual responses, the boundaries between what is "Western rhetoric" according to

Corbett and Warnick is given texture by individual interpretations that are neither "Western" nor "non-Western," but local and individual.

Having observed Haixia's class, I can see how she enacts and embodies a middle ground by using students' responses to texts as the main source of discussion and utilizing their interpretations as a site for inquiry. In addition, Haixia commented in our interview that being in the middle, a space of negotiation, also requires "constantly introducing controversial issues and not making them [students] tell which side you are on too easily" (Lan, H. personal communication, Nov 5). From my perspective, the middle, or the in-between, is not something that is only accessible to some, but not to others. It is also not a stance that I exclusively associate with the Chinese; however, it does often come up in the works of Chinese scholars in the field (Mao 2003, Lu 1987, You & You 2013). Valuing the activity of moving between self and other, teacher and student, and proverbial "home" and "school" practices, to name some, is about enacting and encouraging negotiated learning, which is also one of the guiding principals of translingual practice. Encouraging students to recontextualize their understandings of rhetorical texts, according to Bizzell (2014), requires the "translingualist teacher" to try "to understand the student writers choices as intentional and meaningful, as they occur in a particular textual context, instead of simply correcting deviations from the standard" (p. 444). One example of the way that teachers of writing might practice translingualism is in their feedback to students writing. For instance, in her essay Krall-Lanoue (2013) uses a sentence from a student paper, "and yea I'm venting, but hey I'm writing isn't I?" to show the way that from one of her students to comment on the differences between error and differences in language genre. She writes "by not marking Tyler's sentence as incorrect, by not crossing out the *yea* and *isn't*, I am negotiating with the rules and my own expectations for writing" (p. 233 emphasis original). Although some may view this approach as unconventional and a departure from the standards of Academic English, the emphasis should not be on marking Tyler's sentence wrong, but, rather, teaching him how to negotiate that genre into other academic forms, which may also support him in finding an academic voice that is closer to his own.

A Move Away From the Language of Representation

Literacy events that use student texts as negotiated practice, according to Haixia, are Aristotelian in nature. In regard to her comments about "the middle," I asked Haixia if she thought that studying contrastive or comparative rhetoric would provide writing teachers with the kind of intellectual practice for moving between the variety of cultural and linguistic features students bring to their Standard English Academic writing. Her response, situated in 30 years of studying both Chinese and Aristotelian traditions, points to an in-depth study of Aristotle, rather than a comparative study of both:

> I feel that it is not realistic for American teachers to be able to speak another language in a way that they can really learn about the culture. It's not realistic. It would be really nice. I don't now how many of them could actually do it. And given that I really think that there are things in the West that are potentially really helpful. So if they really learn Western rhetoric in a complex way, and I'm thinking about Aristotle, very often people think that they are done with Aristotle's rhetoric too early. When you get into the complexity of it…When Aristotle says that rhetoric is partly like dialectic, partly like sophistical reasoning, that's the middle. (Lan, H. Personal communication, Nov. 6, 2013)

Haixia's response brings up some important points about doing comparative rhetoric and investing enough time to study one's own rhetorical tradition in a complex way. The practice of comparative rhetoric is a direct result of the incongruent nature of translation. In other words, comparative rhetoric uses the meaning discrepancies that arise out of translation as starting point for conversations about similarity and difference between rhetorical traditions, practices, and people. Therefore, in order to do comparative rhetoric well, one must speak more than one language and have extensive knowledge in more than one rhetorical tradition.

Of course, few of us, myself included, are able to approach our rhetorical inquiries from a place rooted in the kind of holistic experience that warrants our curiosity, but this does not mean that we should not do the work. As several scholars who take up cross cultural work (Abu-Lughod, 2001; Hall & Ames, 1997; Smith, 2008; Upadhyay & Schilb, 2012) have noted, there are a variety of ways the "other" may be represented, and these representations are as vast as the universe of individuality; one does not equal all. Still, the multiplicity of difference does not lessen the reality of misrepresentation when, in fact, it could take a lifetime to fully grasp the strategies and features of an historically situated "rhetorical tradition" outside of one's own. Speaking to the issue of studying global rhetorics, Haixia offered her own opinion rooted in some of the casual conversations surrounding comparative work in the field:

58. H: Many of my Chinese friends will say, Oh, they will never get it

59. R: @@ they meaning..?

60. H: Americans @@

61. R: @@ oh, yeah, @@

62. H: So just don't waste your time. I don't think they are completely wrong

63. R: Mmhm

64. H: because it is complex.

65. R: it's complex, yeah

66. H: So what are we going to do? So we just forget about it? I think one way to do it is to study West's own history and theory in a complex way instead of simplifying it, saying Ok now we know everything. Now what are we going to do? Well, philosophers who study Aristotle will never agree on exactly what he is saying. How come rhetoricians are so smart? (Lan, H. personal communication, Nov. 6 2013).

The complexity of vacillating between traditions in rhetorical studies conjures debates that stem from a history of misrepresentation on both sides. For instance, in his comment and response article, Mao (2011) criticizes Stroud's (2009) pragmatic critique of comparative rhetoric on two main grounds:

> 1.) that comparative rhetoric, in both early and recent work, is only interested in pursuing a true description of non-Western rhetorical practices or texts; and 2.) that comparative rhetoric fails "to distinguish between a descriptive or historical approach and an appropriative or reconstructive approach and for using the former to the exclusion of the latter" (qtd in Mao, 2011, p. 64).

Because Stroud (2009) uses Oliver's (1971) seminal work on the rhetoric of ancient India and China as a basis for his claims, Mao (2011) argues "not only has all other recent work on comparative rhetoric been left out in Stroud's review, but what remains has been so decontextualized that it amounts to no more than selective description or misrepresentation" (p. 65). Comparative rhetoric has come a long way since the publication of Oliver's (1971) seminal work. In order to flesh out the reasons why a modern reading of Oliver's (1971) work does not represent the practices comparatists use today, Mao (2011) and Stroud (2009; 2011) dialogue through consecutive issues of *Rhetoric Society of America*. The methodological nature of these debates has dominated recent conversations (Wang, 2013; Mao, 2013; Grabill, 2014) in contemporary comparative rhetoric to date.

For Haixia, doing comparative rhetoric provides the kind of practices that help us to better understand one another. So rather than take an approach that some comparatists take to "fight, fight, fight, those Americans" (Lan, H. Personal communication, Nov. 6 2013), Haixia explains:

> I think it's more useful to be in the middle because I'm interested in how we can connect with each other given that it's impossible for Americans to study Chinese just like it's impossible for my English to be ever at the native level. So I think we try. At the same time, we can also borrow from each cultures tradition to see maybe they can help us. (Lan, H. Personal Communication, Nov. 6 2013).

Scholars often refer to their rhetorical practices as Western or Chinese, Aristotelian or Confucian, Feminist or Marxist—but these linguistic representations have little to do with the material conditions of communicative practice. Let me explain.

Scholars who study ethnic rhetorics often adopt reflective practices to interrogate their own frame of reference in relation to the other of the study. An issue I have with these works is their need to align themselves as "rooted" or "steeped," for example, in the Western tradition in order to be honest about interpretations that result from their terministic screens—individual perceptions—as if Aristotle, Burke, or Corbett, to name a few, are really the overarching influence that colors their interpretations. It doesn't make sense. Still, we summon these scholars each and every time we align ourselves with the "Western tradition," when in reality, as Haixia notes, it's more complex than that.

Towards the Language of Everyday Life

Drawing on Barad's (2003) posthumanist approach to representation, "one that incorporates important material and discursive, social and scientific, human and nonhuman, and natural and cultural factors" (p. 808), I submit that the need to align oneself with a practice as vague as the "Western tradition" is symptomatic of a culture that relies too heavily on language to account for experience. Scholars who study activity theory (Engeström, 1999; Yamagata-Lynch, 2010) understand that human behavior is a direct result of the conditions of and practices in one's environment or "community of practice" (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Therefore, the frame of reference from which one speaks or acts is a direct result from his or her activity systems. Why must we summon a history of scholars under the veil of "tradition" to speak for and about the lens of our individual interpretations? For Barad (2003) a shift from linguistic representations (i.e. Western, Eastern, Aristotelian, Confucian) to discursive practices (i.e. doings, happenings), is a move towards what she calls, posthumanist performativity. But if we are to make this shift, to use language in a way that authentically represents our experiences, we have to value and accept the diverse communicative forms through which this knowledge is passed.

In her argument for "ethnographies of the particular," Abu-Lughod (2006) lists several feminist writers who produced "unconventional forms of writing, " but were able to be "more open about their positionality, less assertive of their scientific authority, and more focused on particular individuals and families" (p. 475). Although these women were "untrained"—the wives of anthropologists—their discourses used the language of everyday life to be more specific in a way that professional/scientific discourse cannot. With this in mind, I realize that my interlocutors might cringe at my decision to employ a narrative form in this project. As I explain in chapter 3, this choice was necessary to providing a nuanced depiction of the actors of this project and my relationship to them. For instance, without establishing a starting point for this work by employing a narrative form with a visual element, I would not be able to interrogate my frame of reference and explain why I chose to recontextualize the field of composition studies through the vantage of Chinese scholars. In addition, if I did not use my reflective journals, the intimate details of my visit, which shape my interpretive lens and detail some of the more "importantly present" interactions between Haixia and me, would be lost. Hall & Ames (1995) use the phrase "importantly present" to determine whether or not something has contributed significantly to the shaping of a cultural milieu. Here, I use the term to submit that the use of narrative form provides insight not to an interpretive lens that provides access to experience that would otherwise be lost.

<u>Reflective Journal. November 6, 2013:</u>

> *Haixia picks me up at the Howard Johnson Hotel at 12:30pm. Afterwards we drive to the Peoples Coop and go to the upstairs restaurant called Hacklberry's. We sit in a corner booth and both order Thai curry and rice. Haixia and I spend about an hour talking with each other, and though I tell her I would really love to treat her to lunch she says she will not let me pay and that I should not argue with her. We both agree that the lunch we are having is boring compared to how spicy our dinner was last night. After lunch, Haixia drives me around La Crosse to see the edges of the Mississippi river and then to see the bluffs. We stop at a bakery where she buys a few rolls she calls, "day olds." She says they are delicious and she likes to bring them to school for lunch. From here we pick up her husband who practices acupuncture at a local convent once a week, in addition to his work at the Mayor Clinic Health System, and drive back to her house in Onalaska.*

The Nonhuman Nature of Language

The Bluffs

When we arrived at Grandad Bluff Park, we hiked up to a 600-foot overlook of the Mississippi River Valley. As we walked around, we talked about publishing, the field of rhetoric, and the conferences Haixia attends biannually through *Rhetoric Society of America*. On the overlook, the landscape stretched beyond Wisconsin into Minnesota and Iowa. Miles of orange, yellow, and green foliage rolled out towards a river of royal blue that disappeared into the flat lands of Minnesota. Being that it was November, I knew weeks after my departure the landscape would undergo its own version of adaptive transition, and the local people of La Crosse would respond. Nature is a language, too.

In retrospect, thinking back to those moments on overlook with Haixia I cannot help but think of the priority we, as a discipline, interested in the social aspects of communication, give to human-human causality. As Micciche (2014) offers as the foundation of a "robust concept of matter" (p. 489) that includes the complex relationships between humans and nonhumans, "for new materialists, human exceptionalism is a dangerous fiction that distorts reality, identity, culture, and politics by giving little due to energies or actors that coexist with humans" (p. 490). A ready example of the relationship between humans and non-humans are the hats, scarves, and coats that Haixia and I wore in response to the cold weather. This choice was not so much a force of agency as it was a response to the midwestern climate of La Crosse in November. The root of negotiation practice is the ability to adapt to change. These changes may be cultural, linguistic, social or geographic, but they are changes nonetheless.

House Slippers & 八宝饭

In the introduction to his edited collection, Canagarajah (2013a) explains, "while geographical/physical *place* contextualizes literacy, even more influential are the social negotiations and rhetorical encounters that create alternative *spaces* for creativity and understanding" (p. 6). As I sat in the passenger seat of Haixia's car, I recognized that there was a sense of responsibility she felt in introducing me to her town and allowing me to peer into her life. When we walked into her house in Onalaska, Haixia handed me a pair of plastic slippers, which was reminiscent of the practices I honored in the homes of my Chinese friends and host family in China. To a certain extent these plastic slippers set a context for me—they were part of a negotiated practice that I entered into upon entering Haixia's home. As I stepped into them, I became aware of the sameness and difference between the size of my feet and the size of the slippers; as I walked around in them, I embodied a new rhetoric a place—one that was similar to, but different from, the practices I enact and embody in my own home.

When we sat down at her kitchen table, Haixia turned on a pot of Jasmine tea and showed me the box of 八宝饭 *(ba bao fan*), "sweet rice dessert" she was making for us. It looked somewhat familiar to me. During the two-year period I spent in China, I had certainly tasted something similar to the 八宝饭 *(ba bao fan*), but I did not recognize the box. Over the next hour we sipped tea, ate with chopsticks, and continued our interview. The differences between this new context and the previous context of our interview at Hacklberry's are marked by the kind of negotiations that enable practitioners "to enter a rhetors world and see it as a rhetor does" (Foss, 1995, p. 5). In other words, although I may, or may not, choose to continue to partake in the practices I became a part of in Haixia's home, as a guest I am invited to try them on and participate. Although Haixia chose the snacks and offered the slippers, the effect these nonhuman objects had on my experience are separate from her desire to invite me to enjoy them.

During the later part of the evening, Haixia's husband joined us at the table and she made another box of 八宝饭. During our discussion, her husband left the room and came back with a book—三字經 (*san zi jing*): "three character classic book"—a Confucian road map used to use to teach Chinese to kids. Her husband writes my Chinese name 高兰 *(Gao Lan) in* characters on the inside of the book, and we laugh because 兰 *(Lan*) is also their family name.

Haixia and her husband explained that since I learned to speak Chinese before I learned to read it, it might be difficult for me to use the book right away, but that in time, and, with practice, I would understand it.

Preliminary Conclusion

In this chapter, "the middle" or "the in-between," is marked by a sense of negotiation that is both linguistic and embodied. These negotiation practices are necessary in order to develop a tolerance toward difference in language and accent and as a tool for teaching the diverse nature of meaning making. Based on my conversations with Haixia and my observations of her teaching, I find that her understanding of these negotiation strategies is based on her theoretical training in rhetorical invention and comparative rhetoric. For Haixia, doing comparative rhetoric is not about fighting the perspectives that emerge from opposing traditions. Instead, her intellectual engagement with comparative rhetoric is marked by the motivation to see "some of the subtler similarities [between traditions] and being able to use that to guide students into Chinese discourse" (Lan, H. personal communication, Nov. 5 2013). Since Haixia administers the 2 + 2 program at UW-L it makes sense that her response would be specific to Chinese students. Although this is the case at her university, Haixia's application of the intellectual work of comparative rhetoric to pedagogy may be used in other contexts too.

CHAPTER SIX

DANLING FU

University of Florida, Gainesville

I left Pittsburgh, PA, for Gainesville, FL, on Sunday, April 6, at 7:00 PM. When I arrived in Gainesville, it was nearly midnight. I took a taxi from the airport to a suite I rented from a woman named Jinny through Airbnb. Jinny's home was located along the perimeter of the University of Florida's (UF) Levin College of Law. Before leaving Pittsburgh, Danling and I corresponded through email to make plans for our interview and my observation of her doctoral seminar. She said that the best place for us to have our conversation was at Small House Restaurant on University Avenue and 12th Street, which is walking distance to Norman Hall.

On the morning of April 7, I left through the back door of my suite at 505 Southwest 27th Street. Following the instructions Jinny gave me to get to UF, I hopped over a fence behind the house that placed me just outside the tennis courts on campus. The weather was 82 degrees, sunny, and humid and everywhere I looked there was Spanish moss and signs that warned: "Danger/Alligators." I walked for an hour before I asked an undergraduate student how to get to Norman Hall. He told me to take a shuttle to the School of Education because it would take too long to walk there. He said that once I exited the shuttle, I would walk through a tunnel covered in graffiti and when I came out I would be in front of Norman Hall. In reality, the directions were slightly more complicated than that, but I found my way. Once I arrived at Norman Hall I knew that Small House Restaurant would not be far, but I had a few hours before I had to meet Danling. Using Google maps on my iPhone, I found a coffee shop about a block away from the restaurant on University Avenue. Inside, I wrote, drank water, and prepared for the interview until it was time to leave.

Reflecive Journal, April 7 2014

At 1:00 pm Danling meets me at Small House Restaurant. She is wearing a green and white striped button down shirt with slacks and recognizes me immediately. I associate this recognition to be either symptomatic of Google or the power of situational context. I can't be sure either way. We decide to have the lunch buffet and walk over to choose our dishes. When we sit down to eat, she asks me if I had trouble finding the restaurant and I say, no. It wasn't difficult to find, especially since UF is such a beautiful campus. I enjoyed walking around, the trees, and the weather. She says that this is her favorite Chinese restaurant, but she has never come for lunch, only for dinner. The restaurant seems authentic; they serve dishes such as, 麻婆豆腐 *Mapo tofu,* □炒手撕包菜 *Spicy sautéed cabbage, and* 蒜蓉四季豆 *Sautéed string beans with minced garlic, which were a regular part of my diet in China. The menu and all signs are written in both Chinese and English. Upside down umbrellas in powder blue, red, white and fuchsia hang from a glass ceiling where outside light illuminates their designs. The walls and doorknobs all have feng shui adornments. Danling speaks to one of the servers in Chinese, and I realize they know each other. I soon find out that the manager of the restaurant is a former student of hers, and she knows several people on the wait staff. After we begin to eat our food our conversation transitions to topics that I recognize as relevant to my project. I ask if it would be ok for me to record our interview here as we eat. She smiles and says, yes.*

Background and Brief Overview of Scholarship

Danling is a professor in the School of Teaching and Learning at UF, where she has been teaching since 1999. She has taught Composition Theory and Research; Composition Research

Practice; Literacy, Culture, and Politics; and Literacy, Family, and Culture. Each of these courses is focused on teaching writing and speaking across disciplines and in diverse contexts.

Danling's teaching career began in China in 1978, when she taught English language for seven years at Nanjing University before moving to the United States to pursue a graduate degree at the University of New Hampshire. According to her, New Hampshire was very progressive at that time, "a program you really grow a place you really find who you are, they give you a lot of space to find yourself as a scholar. They want to nurture you but not shape you (Fu, D. personal communication, Apr. 7, 2014). Some of the people who influenced her growth as a teacher and a writer were: Tom Newkirk, Donald Graves, Jack Hansen, and Donald Murray. Murray, she notes, had retired, but was still a very close part of her cohort.

In over a decade of work that spans the fields of primary and secondary education, English, and Literacy, Danling works at the intersections of cultural adjustment and literacy for English Language Learner (ELL) students in general (Fu & Townsend, 2001; Fu, 2009;), while focusing on the importance of socializing ELLs into classroom discussions with their mainstream peers in particular (Fu, 1995; 1998; 2003). To this end, Fu (2004) argues for "diversified ways of teaching" (p. 10) that may be learned, most effectively, through collaborative efforts between classroom teachers who teach domestic students and ESL teachers (Fu 2003; 2004) and between teachers and students. As (Fu, 2010) explains, "by opening our minds to the unknown—to the "other"—we can educate ourselves by listening to our students' voices and perspectives. We can re-evaluate our roles and values as teachers and our standards in assessing our students' work" (p. 131). Stemming from years of working with ELL students, Danling's work is valuable for the thematic insight it offers about students' literacy practices from all age levels. Moreover, these contributions not only offer perspectives on approaches to teaching ELLs in English classroom contexts, but also across disciplines.

"Mixed Identity"

Having first been introduced to Danling's scholarship, specifically, *An Island of English*, as a student of secondary education in 2006, I was curious about what field she identified with as a scholar. In January 2014, shortly after I contacted her about my project, we had a phone conversation that allowed me the opportunity to ask her about her scholarly identification. On the phone, she mentioned that her work spans different fields and, because of this, her local and national identities are different. During our interview she elaborated on this:

> Local identity (.) because my training is in literacy so basically I teach in masters course and I do ESOL but then my research is very much ESOL students, but not only ESL students but also secondary because they're reading/writing= my dissertation is high school kids and the others and my work is all aimed up high. The last book is 4th grade to 12. So the outside consider I'm secondary and also ESL scholar, but inside I have nothing to do with ESOL. We already have ESOL faculty so they don't want me to step on their toes, their course, their students. Also we have secondary and elementary separate. So I'm elementary faculty. At first they put me on the secondary committee, but I said I'm really (.) inside I'm very elementary. So I have mixed identity. Good thing is you can really cross, talk to all the people. Every field can approach you. The bad is inside I can only do this work. I talk about the ESOL students in my language arts, but that is only a little component instead of everything. (Fu, D. personal communication, Apr. 7, 2014).

Danling's response offers insight about scholarly identity on the one hand, while complicating what it means to do literacy work within the boundaries of an institution or "field" on the other.

Scholars who study the translingual practices of language users often do by situating their work within a specific discipline. From here, researchers often use methods such conversation analysis and discourse analysis (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990; Fairclough, 1992) to determine the negotiations speakers make within and across languages. By situating our research within a discipline—within composition or writing studies—we only learn about the kind of talk and text that students do within that discipline. If we really want to understand language as something more than "a chunk of text removed from any broader context but as a dynamic interactional process embedded in and inseparable from the social and cultural world from which it emerges" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2008, p. 153) we may need to move beyond our disciplinary confines. In her education classroom, Danling is an invaluable resource to her graduate students who are preparing to teach multilingual students, as she explains "I present myself as ESL and my experiences learning rather than writing" (Apr. 7, 2014). In the field, her mixed identity crosses disciplinary boundaries, which may be felt through her scholarly contributions. For instance, Fu (1995; 2001; 2003) focuses on literacy education for elementary and secondary students, while Fu (1998; 2010) addresses the cultural and linguistic needs of Asian students at the college level. Her engagement with the needs of students across these disciplines makes her work valuable to all avenues of education.

English With an Accent

Despite the open door policy institutions of higher education employ to multilingual students, their ability to make space for their languages continues to be among topics from scholars (Tardy, 2011; Cooper, 2014, Hall, 2014) in the field of composition. Responding to this issue, scholars in who straddle the fields of composition, applied linguistics, and education (Matsuda et al., 2006; Canagarajah, 2010; Kirkpatrick, 2012), have noted a variety of challenges that multilingual students face. Among these challenges are: socialization into the higher education system from secondary schools, the evaluation multilingual students against their domestic peers, and issues of agency in formal academic writing. During our conversation Danling spoke with tremendous respect for her mentors who supported her growth as a writer. She specifically commented on the egalitarian nature of this mentoring, which allowed her to preserve the identity in her writing:

> My first book is my dissertation and so Tom Newkirk was my editor. He said, 'fix it, but don't kill the accent, that's the beauty of Danling.' So that's the things I always give my students as examples. Every writer even they learn English they always have their accent. The accent is their identity, but I think not many editor would be like Newkirk (Fu, D. personal communication, April 7, 2015).

Twenty years after the completion of her dissertation and first book, *My Trouble is My English: Asian Students and the American Dream*, the field of writing studies is dealing with the fact that "mainstream English is an attempt to isolate from the full set of all varieties of U.S. English those varieties which are not overtly stigmatized, and which find some degree of acceptance and favor over space and social distinctions" (Lippi-Green, 1997, p. 62). Responding to issues of stigmatized English, the modernist project has resulted in conceptual models of English varieties, such as World Englishes (Kachru, 1990; Canagarajah, 2006) and African American Vernacular English (Smitherman, 1977). Although these models have allowed practitioners to move beyond a monolithic orientation to English, to understand that in different places people use English in systematically different ways, they have also contributed to the formation of bounded concepts such as China English (He & Li, 2009), and Chinese English (Li, 1993) that identify practitioners based on a national orientation. While there is evidence that speakers often share identifiable norms, as Canagarajah (2013a) argues “we mustn’t treat culture [or national boundary] in an essentialized manner and consider all features in a speakers repertoire as deriving from his or her culture” (p. 89 addition mine). What results from this kind of essentialized thinking is an anticipation of specific differences that close off possibilities rather than make space for more.

For Instance, a Third Gender and Individualism

During a graduate seminar discussion that I observed, which I will discuss later in this chapter, Danling provided an example of the way that words limit the transmission of meaning—the word is not the thing and, therefore, there are always discrepancies to negotiate. Using the male/female binary, she illustrated an example that includes some of the limitations of language, she said, “we have female and we have male, but we do not have a word for PhD female, a third gender. In Chinese there is no word” (Apr. 7, 2014). The transformative nature of the PhD is certainly something that is not lost on me, but I never thought about it in terms of gender. Moreover, before class, Danling explained that the book her graduate students were currently reading, which I will discuss later, depicted a “Western perspective” based on the actors whose notes are being analyzed—all Euro-American artists and scientists—but that she would bring an “Eastern perspective.” Being aware of the tendency to fall into absolute forms of language, because it’s a potential effect of words, I wondered what her perspective would be. What I found is that Danling’s insight was neither “Western” nor “Eastern,” necessarily, but insightful, individual, and experienced. Let me explain.

Danling’s comment, “we do not have a word for PhD female, a third gender,” is something more than a cultural/semiotic discrepancy that results from the incongruent nature of a meaning triangle. It is an example of the way that words gain primacy over things and the way that matter—bodies, people, things—cannot be boiled down to a word. Just because there isn’t a word or phrase for PhD female doesn't mean it doesn't exist, and it doesn't mean that it doesn't exist in the way that she means it. Scholars who support theories of new materialism (Barad, 2007; Coole, 2004; Van der Tuin & Dolphijn, 2010) complicate the dissemination of truth according to modernist and postmodernist approaches that tend to take a one (modernist) or all (postmodernist) approach. Rather than submit to these extremes, new materialists question the need to represent anything at all, so "whereas a modernist scientific materialism allows for one True representation of matter, and a postmodernist cultural constructivism allows for a plethora of equally true representations, it is the shared *representationalism* that is questioned and shifted by new materialism" (Van der Tuin & Dolphijn, 2010, emphasis original, p. 13). Matter is always changing and at the very moment a word may capture the essence of a thing, that moment is gone. How and why do we continue to base our understandings of things on representations that do them little justice?

The complexity of words and the lived experiences they often fail to represent is at the heart of translingual practice, too. Examining the neologisms that resulted from translated modernity, particularly translations of the English word, "individualism," Liu (1995) submits that the translingual practices between Chinese terms and their incongruent counterparts should be the site of our analytical endeavors rather than the translated word themselves:

> The slippage of *ziwo, wo, geren, gewei, geti*, and *ji* not only inherits the slippage of meaning between "self" and "individual" in the English original but reflects the complex scenario of translingual practices and its politics in the Chinese context. Just as the concepts themselves defy fixing, the attempt to pin down the notion of individual or individualism in modern Chinese to one of two definitions will prove counterproductive. The important thing to do here is to probe into the translingual practice between East and

> West that has tried to give such a concept a name, an essence, or reality in modern Chinese. (p. 83)

I cite Liu (1995) at length here because her argument serves to bolster the importance of translingual practice to writing pedagogy: while new materialism cannot help but reject any attempt to successfully represent experience in a single word because matter is not fixed, translingualism provides the best alternative for getting to the heart of the meaning through words, which are, for better or worse, inherently precious to our discipline. The key is identifying *the strategies* speakers use to move between languages and communicative contexts and understanding why they use these strategies.

Recontextualization: "Conversationer" Strategies

One strategy, known as recontextualization, allows practitioners to adopt a footing that opens up a space for the negotiation of meaning (Canagarajah, 2013a). Akin to this practice, during our interview discussion, Danling emphasized the importance of paying close attention to the strategies bilingual writers use in their English texts. Her approach, similar to recontextualization as outlined by Canagarajah (2013a), has a careful attention to negotiation at its core. She explains:

> I think reading bilingual students writing almost have to be a conversationer—instead of looking at the product you really have to try to understand the meaning of what they try to say. So if we talk to each other when we listen to the people whose English is not first language you always pay very attention and try to say "do you mean this, do you mean this?" But when you are reading the language you cannot do that. That's what I always say, you have to really look through the surface and get whats deep there and have a conversation. Sometimes you have to say, do you mean this words? Because that's what

you do when you have a conversation. You rephrase their talk**.** (Fu, D. personal communication, April 7, 2014).

Danling's response makes a statement about the differences between negotiation strategies used in verbal exchanges and the strategies that are used in textual exchanges. Despite attempts to move beyond a process model, composition studies is an inherently product oriented discipline. Even though we, as a field, have moved beyond the process model, college composition is meant to serve students by preparing them to write for the academy—to use Standard Academic English. Although Standard Academic English is a language used in the academy, it is not one that is inherently familiar to undergraduate students, so we prepare them by offering feedback and emphasizing revision for a final product that looks and sounds like academic writing.

As teachers of writing, we cannot mirror the conversationer strategies that take place in human-human interactions in our reader response practices. Because of this, some scholarship in the field of composition explores the politics of student feedback (Straub, 1996, 1997; Spooner, 2002; Cooper, 2014). In her essay Cooper (2014) argues for an understanding of language as an interactional practice rather than an entity or code—language doesn't do things, people do things—but how, as teachers of writing, do we make the language we use in response to student writing more like the language we use in conversation? Cooper (2014) suggests that we move beyond the surface of language our students are using in their writing. She explains "we need to figure out what writers are doing in their writing: what practices they are helping to create, what the effects of these practices are, and what the writers responsibilities are for these effects" (p. 30). Essentially, we need to open up a space for dialogue and possibility through our written feedback by asking real questions—questions that allow for open ended possibilities rather than an anticipated product—, and by opening ourselves to learning something new, rather closing ourselves off to anything that looks or sounds different. This, as Danling notes, "is what you do when you have a conversation." If we are not having conversations with our students, then we are simply repeating old-fashioned top-down procedures and telling them what to do, which is unproductive, especially since around the globe most people speak a variety of languages and, thus, have developed strategies for living among linguistic diversity. We would be better prepared to serve our students if we adopted some of the strategies (e.g., negotiation, recontextualization, envoicing strategies) speakers of languages use in linguistically diverse communities in order to realize meaning intention. Moving towards a translingual orientation to pedagogy is not only important for sections of writing deemed "multilingual," but for domestic and multilingual sections alike.

Several scholars in composition studies (Horner et al. 2011; Matsuda, 2006; Donahue, 2009) have exposed the myth of monolingualism in general, while others (Canagarajah, 2013c; Cooper, 2014; Hall, 2014) have focused on what this means for the future of field. In his cleverly written essay, Hall (2014) imagines an educational universe where multilingualism is the mainstream and the monolingual student, John, is viewed as deficient—both of John's parents are monolingual and he, as a monolingual speaker, is not able to meet the institutional standards for code-meshing in his English writing. Although Hall's (2014) argument substitutes one problem for another, which he is explicit about, the thinking he offers sheds light on the bifurcated extremes that are common in U.S. composition:

> in the imagined world, a norm of multilingualism; in our real world a norm of monolingualism…when multilingual students are judged according to a system that values only literacy in English, we are obscuring at least some of their talents and achievements and missing opportunities to develop these capabilities further. (p. 35)

Taking a step back, the idea of an “all-star monolingual student,” which Hall (2014) proposes is John, is also unrealistic. There is variation in all forms of linguistic repertoire. The translingual model both recognizes and supports that language practices are always in a constant state of becoming and changing. These language practices may include exchanges that occur in global and local contexts, but language users are always negotiating meaning within and between languages, too.

Danling’s Graduate Seminar

How might we, as teachers of writing, enable students to make creative negotiations in their formal academic writing that are similar to the negotiations they make in spoken varieties? Those who advocate for an approach to writing that targets the multiple ways meaning is composed and communicated, have argued for multimodal (Fleckenstein, 2006; Kress, 2000; New London Group, 1996), multigenre (Devitt et al., 2004; Devitt, 2008; Romano, 2000) and multilingual (Garcia, 2006; Garcia & Leiva, 2014; You, 2011; You, 2008) approaches to the teaching of writing. These approaches allow for students to bolster the creative potential of their texts in a way that more authentically conveys their meaning. Prior to my observation of Danling’s graduate seminar class, which took place in Conference Room 2205 in Norman Hall at 4:30 PM on Wednesday, we discussed some of the ways in which she brings a bilingual perspective to her students, which transitioned to her talking about the books she chose for the semester. The week before my visit, students in Danling’s graduate seminar read Vera John Steiner’s *Notebook’s of the Mind: Explorations of Thinking*, which won the William James award from the American Psychological Association in 1990. Steiner’s book addresses the complexity of thought in visual and verbal thinking and in emotion. Drawing primarily on the journals of cognitive psychologists, artists, and writers such as L.S. Vygotsky, John Piaget, Diego Rivera, and Hannah Arendt and Anais Nin.

The class was made up of about 12 students of which half were Chinese students from UF and China. About 5 minutes before class, Danling introduced me to three secondary Chinese teachers who were visiting from China. She told them that I previously taught in China and that I was interested in her class and teaching methods. The teachers introduced themselves to me and explained that they were working with Danling for the semester. During our conversation, the rest of the class came into the seminar room and sat around a long rectangular table. The seminar space was comfortable and welcoming and each person brought in a snack and placed it in the center of the table. It really felt like a place where students were accustomed to having generative discussions in a relaxed environment.

When the class started, Danling introduced me to her students and allowed me to explain why I was visiting. After my introduction, a member of the class announced that she would be leading discussion on the book. Eight reproductions of paintings were laid out on the table by Raphael Soyer, Ben Shahn, Fritz Scholder, Miriam Shappiro, Paul Cezanne and Gene Newmann all of who are mentioned in Steiner's book. From these images Danling expressed that each picture has its own voice and students need to find their own voice in a similar way.

Thinking and Writing

Throughout the student's presentation, Danling contributed to discussion in both Chinese and English; Chinese with her Chinese students and English with the rest. Throughout the class session, image/word relationships between the art and the meaning it conveys were discussed in relation to individual experiences. Some of the questions that drove the discussion were: "How much universal grammar do you need to communicate with people?" How do we look at visuals? How do we learn to see and feel them?"

During our interview, Danling discussed the way she offers a bilingual perspective to her students that bridge the gap between the visual and verbal communication divide. She explains: "a lot of my students would say we're not allowed to think in English" so they write in Chinese first, and then translate. During the seminar, as a class, we began to discuss the visual nature of communication and someone asked, "which allows us to express more, visual or verbal?" Danling responded, "we use our inner eyes to see it, than use words to describe it." Elaborating on this topic she explained:

> Writing as process is in between thinking process and wording process. Because writing is you transform ideas, you generate ideas. So the whole process is thinking. You don't start with writing well, you start with very poor writing, very vague writing, very oral kind of writing and then you tweak, tweak, tweak. Sometimes you can totally destroy and start from all over again. The whole process is very recursive, but most teachers don't allow students to do this that's why they get such a poor writing come out. Flat, simple, and everybody hates writing.

Students anticipate that the writing they produce for academic purposes should meet an expectation that is beyond their reach. Many students feel that the sign of a "good writer" or "good writing" is the ability to produce spotless prose void of personality. Take, for instance, a sample of responses collected from Chinese graduate students on their experiences writing in English:

- But when I write in English, I have to imitate books, copy from articles as I have no idea how to write in English.

- I only write academic papers, scientific reports, and business letters in English. I can't express my emotion in English.
- I can write only one form of English, one voice, monotone for everything as I only read one kind of writing: textbooks and academic articles. So I can only write that way.
- I can only write essays in English, that's all I do or read, nothing else. (Fu & Townsend, 2010, p. 132)

These responses call forth questions about what it means to use academic English versus what it means use English in our everyday lives. Certainly there are plenty of ways to write in English and several genres that allow for a variety of form. In addition, several scholars publish in these multiple forms (See Villanueva, 2004; Anzaldua, 1987; Smitherman, 1999; Hurlbert, 2012). Why is U.S. composition taught in a way that evokes responses of imitation, boredom, and personal disconnect? Why do practitioners perpetuate this kind of written discourse? Who is it serving?

Instead of asking students to write "our" way, Bizzell (2014) offers that "the translingualist teacher tries to understand the student writer's choices as intentional and meaningful, as they occur in a particular textual context, instead of simply correcting deviations from the standard as would be done under the traditional paradigm" (p. 444). The problem, of course, is that there are many discrepancies about what "good writing" looks and sounds like under the traditional paradigm. Before the end of our interview, I asked Danling if she would offer her opinion about what is good writing. In her response, she commented that it really depends on what discipline you are writing for—writing for English disciplines is very different than writing in educational contexts. She explained that she can always tell what discipline a person is writing in by the way he or she writes. Drawing an example from her own departmental context at UF:

> Victoria Purcell-Gates, God, she write deep and simple. Oh that's the word. People all read and said it's so easy to read. But I said you need to read a lot of times to really get it. You just feel I understand. Then you read again and you understand different. You read again you understand differently. I think in our education, deep and simple, that's the girl should be every writer.

Leaving Gainesville

The Conversation Continues…

<u>Reflective Journal, April 8, 2014</u>

Huddling under the awning of Jinny's porch, I watch the mist from heavy rainfall and wait for my taxi to the airport to arrive. It's past 1:00 and the taxi driver has called me several times because he can't find the house and I do my best to explain to him that he has gone the wrong way on Southwest St. The driver has a thick accent so we negotiate street names the best we can over the phone. When he arrives I get into he back seat and he apologizes for being late. As he speaks more I try to identify where he is from, I can't help it. He asks me what I am doing in Gainesville and I share that I am doing research on writing, languages, and teaching. He says, that's beautiful and asks me if I can guess where he is from. I tell him I can't be sure, mostly because I don't want to say the wrong thing. We make small talk for a while and he is certain that I am only able to understand him because I am trained to listen to foreigners, but I assure him that he is quite clear. He says that many Americans say his accent is charming. Ironically, I don't catch the end of his sentence and ask, "What do Americans say?" He repeats, "charming." He tells me *his name is Tony and he is from Brazil. He's very interested in the fact that I study writing so closely and wants to know all sorts of things about his accent. I can't answer any of his questions, but I'm happy to have this type of conversation outside of academe. In fact, Tony the taxi driver just might have been the first person outside of my academic community to take interest in my work.*

Preliminary Conclusion

The present study brings some of the personal histories and pedagogical practices that contribute to a better understanding of translingualism. While the majority of Danling's scholarship is situated outside of the composition and rhetoric discipline, the relevance of her work to writing studies makes a statement about the interdisciplinary nature of translingual practice: in order to serve students from diverse backgrounds, writing teachers should familiarize themselves with work from related fields that deal with literacy and education. In addition, my conversations with Danling and observations of her teaching provide insight that moves beyond binary thinking and models negotiated interactions that may take place in classroom contexts. For instance, her conceptualization of a third gender is both agentive and negotiated in relation to a class discussion about the relationship between words and the meanings they represent. By demonstrating some of the imitations of language through an example related to gender, students are made aware of the possibilities for the negotiations they may make in the future discussions.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

This project offers an examination of composition studies through the vantage point of Chinese scholars at particular historical moments. Some of the historical issues that these scholars have identified include, but are not limited to, the idea that home and school practices are separate and should not intersect or interfere with one another; the belief that there are absolute meanings to be found in words translated from one language to another; and the idea that difference in language is a problem that needs to be eliminated. Bringing these perspectives to the present moment—a time when the field of composition is confronted by the variety of Englishes that make up its institutions—the need to recontextualize has developed greater urgency. While the ability to serve students from diverse linguistic backgrounds challenges writing teachers who are not trained to teach mutilingual students, institutions continue to admit students from non-English dominant countries in order to diversify their programs and supplement university-wide funding. The translingual practices examined in chapters 4, 5, and 6 are not meant to represent "best practices" that respond to composition's shortcomings. Instead, they offer a heuristic for developing better pedagogical approaches and textual practices that respond to the diversity of meaning within and between languages.

Findings

Having analyzed the pedagogical and communicative practices of Xiaoye, Haixia, and Danling couched within the contexts of their classrooms and individual meetings with me over lunch and dinner, I return to my original research questions:

1) How do Chinese scholars in composition studies move between practices in their scholarship and teaching?

2) How have these scholars contributed to moving the field towards a translingual approach to the teaching of writing?

By reflecting on my analyses in chapters 4, 5, and 6, I find the answer to my research questions embedded in two themes: recontextualization and negotiation. Before I delve into a discussion of these themes, I would like to make some connections between the identified space of possibility; "the in-between," and the theoretical lens; translingualism.

"The In-Between" and Translingual Practice

For over three decades, the in-between has been theorized as a "Third Space" of intervention (Bhabha, 1994), and as a form of cosmopolitanism (Appiah, 2010) that redefines the Third Space (Gutiérrez, 2008) as a pedagogy that engages "repertoires of practice" for vertical and horizontal learning (p. 149). In addition to these models, the in-between has been conceptualized as a place that cultivates "togetherness-in-difference" (Ang, 2003) and, later, using the Chinese cosmologies yin and yang, a space of "interdependence-in-difference" (Mao, 2009) where difference is nurtured by drawing on specific discursive practices (analogies and illustrations) and rhetorical strategies (inductive and deductive reasoning).

As I establish in Chapters 2, 4, 5, and 6, Chinese scholars in rhetoric and composition have highlighted the in-between in personal anecdotes (Fu, 1995; Hum, 1999; 2006; Lu, 1987; 2001), through theoretical constructs (Mao, 2009; Lu, 2001) and as a space that both nurtures and produces different subject positions (Mao, 2003; 2010; Wang, 2010). In her discussion of 移民 (*yimin*), "people who have moved," Lu (2001) modifies the meaning of the phrase by highlighting the first character, 移 and explaining how it may be combined with other characters to convey different action-oriented meanings, such as, "change shift, transplant, influence, transfer or give … fuse confuse and diffuse set ways of doing things" (xi). Lu's (2001) use of 移

establishes a line of thought that aligns with various conceptualizations of the in-between (Ang, 2003; Bhabha, 1994; Gutiérrez, 2008; Mao, 2003; 2009) as well as translingual practice. For instance, Horner and Lu (2013) explain a similar kind of movement that Lu (2001) associates with 移 in their discussion about translingual practice: “a translingual approach locates language codes or structures temporally, in history, and hence understands these as always emergent, in process” (p. 27). Based on this definition of translingual practice, language practices are always changing and require practitioners to adapt and revise their communicative strategies accordingly. When language users move beyond a superficial level of language and ask questions or reframe their talk, they enact practices that move between interpreted and intended meanings and tease out meaning discrepancies that arise within and between languages.

Xiaoye’s Cross-Pacific Exchange Project is a good example of the kind of engagement that lends itself to translingual practice and moving between. For instance, Xiaoye’s pedagogy was not only based on his ability to connect students with one another’s writing, but also the practices he enacted during the workshop, such as, helping the negotiation of words and phrases on the part of Chinese students, not taking sides, and asking questions as a way to encourage students to move beyond their contextually situated conclusions. In addition to his pedagogical practices, Xiaoye spoke about the importance of positioning himself, as a researcher, between China and the United States. There is a relationship between the scholarly work Xiaoye produces, which is sometimes an outgrowth of his summer work at Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, and the pedagogical approaches he enacts at Pennsylvania State University. Identifying as “one who is in between,” then, becomes something more than a personal affirmation—it is a position that is the result of the interdependent relationship between intellectual study and pedagogical practice between China and the Unites States.

In her Introduction to Rhetoric and Writing Class, Haixia asked the question: "What does it mean to stand in the middle?" Although this question was asked in the context of a discussion about Aristotle, Corbett, and the nature of the rhetorician, it does not end here. A comparative rhetorician, Haixia dedicates her intellectual life to examining the similarities and differences between Confucian rhetoric and Aristotle's rhetoric to see how "we can connect with one another" (Lan, H. personal communication, Nov. 6, 2013). Commenting on her study of Aristotle through the lens of a Confucian, she illuminated "When Aristotle says that rhetoric is partly like dialectic, partly like sophistical reasoning, that's the middle" (Lan, H. personal communication, Nov. 6, 2013). In other words, the space between two different methods of reasoning—truth (dialectic) and opinion (sophist)—is, according to Haixia, rhetoric. This interpretation of rhetorical practice makes "the middle" a space that needs to be identified, not only for effective rhetorical practice, but also for social goals that cultivate a sense of interdependence-in-difference (Mao, 2009) among practitioners in China and the West.

During our interview, Danling commented on her scholarly affiliation that stretches across the fields of Literacy, Education, and English. She explained that the diversity of her local and national affiliation is generally one of reward. Although she can only teach Elementary Education at UF, she views the ability to contribute to more than one field as a positive result of her expansive scholarship—she can talk to scholars in several fields about language, literacy and education. In addition to her interdisciplinary scholarship, Danling's graduate seminar examined semiotic questions that required students to move between words and the experiences they seek to represent in order to find meaning. Taking this a step further, during our interview, Danling commented on some of the strategies that teachers of writing might practice when reading bilingual student work: "you have to really look through the surface and get whats deep there and have a conversation. Sometimes you have to say, do you mean this words? Because that's what you do when you have a conversation. You rephrase their talk." (Fu, D. personal communication, April 7, 2014). While the examples Danling offers align with ways of moving between linguistic varieties, meaning discrepancies, and rhetorical traditions, they also represent "practices that conceive of language relationships in more dynamic terms" (Canagarajah, 2013b, p. 8). For instance, Canagarajah (2013b) uses the term "serendipity" to the account for an attitude toward practitioners that accepts, rather than resists, difference. He explains that in order to adopt this strategy, "subjects have to be radically other-centered. They have to be imaginative and alert to make spot on decisions in relation to the forms and conventions employed by the other" (p. 41). The process involved in being other-centered requires self-reflection, which his evident in the translingual practices I examine in chapters 4, 5, and 6. In what follows, I examine the two of these strategies.

Recontextualization

The recontextualization practices examined in these chapters are situated and contingent on the conditions of the communicative context. As a rhetorical strategy, used in chapter 2, recontextualization functions as a creative approach that provides a line of thought from the field of composition studies through the vantage point of Chinese scholars at particular historical moments. As an negotiation strategy, which may be seen in chapters 4, 5, and 6, it requires that speakers reframe their talk in order to move closer to the linguistic repertoire of their interlocutors. According to Canagarajah (2013a), "recontextualization strategies prepare the ground for negotiation" ("Negotiating" 48), but it is important to note that this process is ongoing. In verbal exchange, recontextualization may be used to frame and reframe the context.

Depending on the course of a particular discussion, recontextualization may create additional opportunities for interlocutors to negotiate their meaning.

For Haixia and Xiaoye, recontextualization is used as a pedagogical tool. By reframing the phrases written by Chinese students, Xiaoye creates opportunities for PSU students to discuss the creative meaning potential embedded in the texts of Chinese students from GUFS. Because some of the words and phrases used by Chinese students were unfamiliar to PSU students, recontextualization functioned as a gateway for useful negotiation and opportunities for new insight. As a practice that functions by reframing talk in a particular context, recontextualization not only serves as a method for learning about the unfamiliar, but also provides the conditions for speakers to vacillate between unfamiliar and familiar rhetorical scenes and learn more about their own. For instance, during the Cross-Pacific Exchange Project, Xiaoye recontextualized a creative piece written by a Chinese student. Since some PSU students were unfamiliar with some of the words and phrases Chinese students used to convey meaning, Xiaoye used these meaning discrepancies as a starting point for discussion. Focussing on her use of the phrase, “fearful symmetry, ” which was called into question by a PSU student, he asked questions and offered possibilities as to why the Chinese student might have used this phrase. By doing this, PSU students not only became more aware of meaning interpretation outside of their own frame of reference, but within it too—fearful symmetry is a phrase used by William Blake. Prior to this class discussion; however, the phrase was unfamiliar to students even though William Blake commonly appears in their literary cannon.

While Xiaoye’s practices work across cultural and linguistic borders—between Guangdong University of Foreign Studies and Pennsylvania State University—, Haixia’s pedagogy reveals the way recontextualization may be used in a local context. By using students’ responses to an Edward PJ Corbett article as the main text students are able to reframe their understanding of the article according to discourse production and interpretation. Working as a mediator, Haixia enacted recontextualization strategies to move between students' responses to the article and the article itself.

In Chapter 6 Danling commented on verbal strategies that are necessary to teaching writing to bilingual students. Although Danling refers to these practices as conversation strategies, they align with recontextualization because they require speakers to shift the frame of the conversation, by rephrasing their talk and asking questions, to move towards and away from the shared norms used in the situated context. Danling's instinct to index these strategies with verbal conversation rather than writing is, in part, due to the nature of audience, which plays an influential role in the speakers' choice of language and repertoire. In his essay, Bell (1984) utilizes a framework for audience design that details the way that "audience roles are implicationally ordered according to whether or not they are addressed, ratified, or known" (p. 159). In a face-to-face conversation where audience members are ratified and known, speakers are able to, as Danling notes, interject, ask questions and rephrase their talk in order to work around meaning discrepancies that arise within and between languages. Although these types of strategies are common in verbal interaction, they do not occur as spontaneously in writing. As Canagarajah (2013a) explains, "authors have to make more effort to frame the text suitably for varying contexts of reception and negotiation, where the text can be potentially read by unknown readers in unanticipated contexts" (p. 93). In other words, recontextualization in written communication is possible, but does not occur as spontaneously—there would need to be planning involved in the process and prior understanding of intended audience. In order to create a space for recontextualization, then, teachers of writing need to use difference in language, as it arises in student texts, as a resource for negotiating meaning and teaching students to do the same.

Negotiation

The verbal and written negotiation strategies demonstrated in these chapters are the product of the situatedness of the communicative context and the need to work beyond the words and phrases that do not, on their own, represent the material conditions of experience in the ongoing ebb and flow of agency.

Representation & Materiality

> *So now you tell me whether I am acting Chinese, American, or American Chinese Immigrant when I crave a cup of good coffee after a long department meeting ducking verbal bullets from colleagues on the left and right? …How am I acting when I sip my green tea when discussing the literary canon with my native English-speaking colleagues mulling over their coffee or with my students gulping down Coke at 8:30 in the morning?*
> Min-Zhan Lu, *Shanghai Quartet*

In the epigraph to this section I provide an excerpt from Lu (2001) in which she complicates her representation based on a relationship between matter (e.g. coffee, green tea, colleagues, students) and action (e.g. she asks, "how am I acting?"). What this excerpt serves to show is the relational contingency between matter and ontology that I seek to establish. In her essay, Ahmed (2010) argues "Orientations matter." She writes, "orientations shape how the world coheres around me. Orientations affect what is near or proximate to the body, those objects that we do things with" (p. 235). Being that matter, and our orientation to it, is always changing, as Lu (2001) suggests in the epigraph, any representation that results from observations between people and things must be thought of as interdependent not only on the context, but also the actors, objects, and arrangements within it.

In chapter 4, Xiaoye rejects the name "Chinese American." In his explanation, he remarks that identifying as "one who is in between" provides him with a more authentic representation of his status as a foreigner and work as a scholar. Identifying as "one who is in-between" functions as a way to move beyond the bounded implications that the term, "Chinese American" carries. In other words, the material realities (becoming an American citizen, obtaining a visa for travel to China) associated with the Chinese American name are not functional to Xiaoye's scholarly work. "One who is in between," then, serves as a scholarly representation as well as an embodied practice—Xiaoye's work is very much situated within and between the geographies of China and the US, whereas "Chinese American" would not allow for this mobility.

In the context of our discussion, Haixia's sense of representation is based, in part, on her orientation to and interpretation of her colleagues' perceptions of her English. The "Chineseness" she speaks of in chapter 5 is an ethnic identification as well as an embodied practice as she explains:

> I can never stop being Chinese, even though that Chineseness will get more and more complex as I stay here longer every time I open my mouth some Chineseness comes out @@ whether or not I want it, in every single sense including thinking. (Lan, H. personal communication, Nov. 6 2013).

Haixia's understanding of being Chinese is complicated by her life in the United States, but is more than just an ethnic marker. Marked by her comment, "every time I open my mouth some Chineseness comes out… in every single sense including thinking" being Chinese is associated with accent, language, and thought. It's an embodied practice. Although Haixia interprets this as a result of some of her colleagues being horrified with her wrong English, her "Chineseness" is an identifying point of reference.

Haixia's understanding of what it means to be Chinese is very much associated with an openness to change, too. As she explains in Chapter 5: "To be Chinese at all you know that the ultimate reality you know is that it's going to change… therefore you cannot get that essences, down" (Lan, H. personal communication Nov. 6 2013). Essences, or the desire to capture and define them, are a result of reliance on language to force a finite understanding of a changing phenomenon. New materialists (Barad, 2003; Coole & Frost, 2010) shift the focus "from questions about correspondence between descriptions and reality (e.g. do they mirror nature and culture?) to matters of practices/doings/actions" (Barad, 2003, p. 802). People do and are their identities everyday, and although we may put these identities into words, words on their own do them little justice.

For instance, in Chapter 6 Danling challenges the way that words fail to represent the specific needs of her relational ontologies. Her comment "there is no word for PhD female," a third gender, is based on a reality that language cannot, on its own, access and that I cannot, based on the limited amount of time I was able to spend with her, fully understand in the way that she means it. During our discussion about her local and national identity as a scholar, Danling further complicated the way that language interferes with the reality of what she actually does. Although her published work spans the intersections of ESOL and literacy in K-12 environments, in local practice her work is primarily focused on elementary education. As she explains, "we already have ESOL faculty so they don't want me to step on their toes, their course, their students" (Fu, D. personal communication, April 7, 2014). Thus, the fact that ESOL is not, as a term, part of her local identity is based on her orientation to the university, but does not mean that she does not contribute to conversations about ESOL students. In fact, as her national orientation reveals, she does.

Limitations

Sample

The small sample used in this project is based on the limitations of the snowball method used to identify participants and the limitations of my funding. In order to obtain participants, I was lucky to have the help of Xiaoye who directed me towards individuals he knew would be willing to be interviewed and observed. Because my project was focused on practice, it was important that I was able to visit the scholar at his or her institution. One suggested participant, Hui Wu, signed informed consent, but had teaching responsibilities that did not allow for physical observation. Because of this, I was not able to include her in my qualitative sample. In addition, where I would have liked to spend more time at Pennsylvania State University, The University of La Crosse, and The University of Florida, the financial obligations of these visits, and my lack of internal or external funding for this project, required brevity.

IRB

While conducting my interviews at restaurants provided an ideal context for translingual practice, I was not able to include all naturally occurring examples of translingual practice due to IRB clearance. Restaurants provide a context where conversations about language could intersect with the ordering of food in both Chinese and English. During these moments, side conversations with wait staff and unexpected visitors provided the organic material for conversation analysis, which had implications for translingual strategies. Although some of my data includes this kind of useful information from others who entered into the conversation unexpectedly, I was not able to use their input because they did not receive informed consent prior to our discussion. Because of this, implications for future research might consider creative ways to anticipate and plan for the presence of others at research sites and prepare informed consent so that their contributions, if consented, may be used.

Linguistic

As a novice practitioner of Chinese language and culture, I do not doubt that the qualitative and theoretical choices I have made throughout this work are based on the strengths and limitations of my personal experiences. Having conversational knowledge of Mandarin, I understand the incongruent nature of translation between the English and Chinese language; however, just because I have experienced these semiotic moments does not mean I experience them in the same way as Xiaoye, Haixia and Danling. Therefore, my interpretations of translingual practice, as evidenced by my analysis, are interdependent on the reciprocal nature of me as a researcher and the phenomenon brought to the forefront by my participants. For instance, in Chapter 4, Xiaoye and I have a brief exchange about what we call the liquid on the spicy Sichuan fish we are eating at the Sichuan Bistro. In my analysis, I suggest that the difference between “soup” and ‘sauce” is not just a matter of preference, but also translation. Having lived in China and learnt Mandarin, I know that the word, 湯 (tang): “soup” is used to describe both soup and sauce-like textures because I have used that word in the past. Even though I interpret this discrepancy of use as something related to translation I could be wrong. Xiaoye’s use of the word could be for a variety of reasons.

Pedagogical Implications

This study brings together a variety of practices that have implications for the teaching of writing in multilingual, local, and global contexts. In chapters 4, 5, and 6 Xiaoye, Haixia, and Danling demonstrate and model pedagogical practices that allow them to move between their students' situated understandings of meanings and those that are contingent upon texts and language. Xiaoye's Cross-Pacific Exchange Project and the practices Danling enacted during her graduate seminar revealed envoicing strategies that challenge the initial responses students bring to their texts. Haixia's pedagogy demonstrated something similar by using students' responses to rhetorical texts as the main source of inquiry during class discussion. By making student writing the center of classroom discussion and inquiry, students are made more aware of their roles as writers and authors. In addition, the variety of meanings and linguistic repertoire sharpen their sense of English as a globally diverse ecology.

Why It's Important

Critical educators might ask, why do students need to sharpen their sense of English as a globally diverse language if Standard English is what they need to learn in order to successfully write across disciplines and in their professional lives? A few months ago I arrived in my classroom early and was having a conversation with one of my students when I was distracted by another conversation that was taking place beside me. These students were discussing their frustration with a teacher from another discipline who was, in their words, "a foreigner." They expressed that they could not understand her and did not have the patience to adapt to her speaking and writing. After hearing this, I interjected and asked some questions and found that the lack of patience these students had with their teacher was based on their lack of exposure to difference in language. This moment also caused me to reflect back on a personal epigraph that Xiaoye includes in his manuscript, *Cosmopolitan English:*

> Worst teacher ever. Can't understand what he says sometimes. SO BORING. i look at the clock about 23409834 times a class. the essay examples he gives are written by exchange students, so they don't even make sense….
>
> (You, 2015, p. 3)

This feedback was given to Xiaoye on ratemyprofessor.com during his first year as an assistant professor at PSU. In his manuscript, he doesn't blame the student for responding this way, but contextualizes the comment within a discussion about the many times he, and other "exchange students," felt judged based on accent. While multilingual speakers are often criticized for their deviation from Standard English in and outside of the classroom (Lippi-Green, 2012; Mao, 2010; Rubin & Smith, 1990), as Danling reminds us in Chapter 6, "the accent is their identity."

As teachers of writing in the 21st century, we often talk about our duties to students in terms of technological literacies. For instance, Turner & Hicks (2012) problematize the common belief some educators have about technology: that students will have access to it at home and it is not the job or responsibility of the institution to teach digital writing (p. 59). Situating their discussion in the spirit of "social justice," they argue, "digital literacy is an emerging human right [and is] vital for community development and citizenship" (p. 62). Indeed, these authors are right, but there is a piece of this argument that is missing: if we are going to argue that digital literacy is a human right, English, as it is used by speakers of languages around the globe, needs to be a part of this social justice. As teachers of writing, we should think more about how we can be innovative in ways that teach digital *and* global literacies so that these practices may sharpen students' understanding of English as a global language.

Praxis

Prior to my classroom observations of Xiaoye, Haixia, and Danling I was in the process of developing a pedagogy that would allow me to address important social issues in the classroom. Under the direct tutelage of Claude Mark Hurlbert, as a graduate teaching assistant, I revised my previous model of the writing workshop and was working towards a vision for a course that was action oriented and practical. In his book, Hurlbert (2012) writes about the relational nature of composing writers from all stages of the craft use when they compose:

> When we compose we look to others: for words, but also orientations to still other words that we get from conversations, from media, and from the books on our shelves and the shelves of libraries. We look for rhetorical inspiration and strategies. We can help students learn this important lesson. (p. 206)

If we, as writing teachers, want to prepare students to be good listeners and learners in global contact zones we need to develop pedagogies that make familiar the variety of composing processes they may come into contact with during conversations, in media, and in the books on the shelves of others. If we only include those compositions that have been given latitude, difference, as Xiaoye's student expressed, will continue to "not make sense."

Neighborhoods and Communities: A Hybrid Course

While all three scholars in these chapters have contributed to my understanding of a translingual practice as an ecologically sound approach to teaching writing through social, linguistic, and sustained inquiry, the framework for my most recent course is an adaptation of Xiaoye's Cross-Pacific Exchange project.

After reading about and observing Xiaoye's project, I wanted to adopt it using the same global community in China, but I knew that this would not be possible. After analyzing Xiaoye and Danling's classroom practices carefully, I realized that their proficiency in two linguistic systems (English and Chinese) is necessary for the kind of recontextualization strategies they embodied during class discussion. Although I lived in China and can speak Chinese, my ability to navigate the nuances of meaning discrepancies in both languages would be quite hard. In order to avoid causing unintentional misrepresentation on the part of Chinese students, I wanted to adapt the Cross-Pacific Exchange Project to fit the strengths of my frame of reference. When I observed Haixia's Introduction to Rhetoric and Writing course, in which she made student texts as the main source of class discussion, I realized that I could do something similar to Xiaoye's pedagogy in local way.

My English 202 class, subtitled, "Neighborhoods and Communities" is intended to develop students' writing and rhetorical skills through informed inquiry. In order to connect students with a project that serves their social, professional, and/or academic needs I ask that they choose a particular neighborhood or community as the focus of a semester-long sequenced writing project. The class is taught as a hybrid course, which means that face-to-face classroom contact is reserved for 70% of our course meetings while the other 30% is done online on a course website that I designed called, Writing Aspects.

Course Outline

The semester-long sequenced writing project is adapted from Leki (1992) and You (2015) for teaching academic writing to multilingual and domestic students. The approach consists of five interconnected writing assignments: a research proposal, a "who I am" narrative, an introduction, interviews/observations with experts, and a final report. Since a good project requires careful thought and planning, the first three weeks of semester is dedicated to identifying community or neighborhood that will serve as a point of reference and developing a research question that will guide inquiry. In order to fulfill some of the social goals of the course by making students aware of interdependent nature of selves and others, the "who I am" narrative asks that they interrogate who they are (as insiders, outsiders, or a combination of both) in relation to their chosen community. In the introduction students provide background on their community couched in secondary research and/or personal experience. During the second half of the semester, students schedule interviews/observations with experts from their communities and engage in some of the fieldwork practices that researchers use across disciplines. By doing this, they become familiar with language, jargon, and practice used in the social sciences, humanities and beyond. Working at the intersections of composition and the social sciences provides a new way to conceptualize translingual practice. While translingualism is defined by language relationships (Canagarajah, 2013a; Horner et. al., 2011) within and between language systems, these practices may be used to support student writing across disciplines, too.

Writing Workshop

To create a sense of community in the classroom and instill necessary practices for revision that writers develop over time, students sign up for a writing workshop at the beginning of the semester. The prompts used during the workshop respond to Berthoff's (1979) argument for practices that shift the role of meaning in reader response and draw on Hurlbert's (2012) writing workshop model. During a writing workshop class session, scheduled students print 1 single-spaced page of their writing, from any of the interconnected assignments, and print enough copies for the entire class. We all sit in a circle and the student reads his or her document for the class. Afterwards, the class uses the following prompts to offer written feedback:

1. How would it change your meaning if you (#HWICYMIY)
    - Changed

- Added
- Cut
- Moved, etc.

2. I like this because…
3. I want to know more about
4. A personal note and signature

Once written feedback is given, each student shares verbal feedback in class, which promotes discussion about writing aspects such as, sentence construction, meaning, form, content and more. In addition, it allows students to become familiar with one another's projects and strengthens the overall sense of classroom community.

In order to develop a model that incorporates digital literacies, during the first half of the semester, the writing workshop takes place during our face-to-face classroom meetings. During the second half of the semester, these workshops take place online. In addition, throughout the entire semester specific class sessions are held online or have online components. Increasing the opportunities students have to engage in digital literacies provides additional occasions for translingual practice. For instance, engaging in online and in class discussions requires different practices. While students may provide verbal feedback during an in class writing workshop session and may negotiate or recontextualize their feedback with others, they have to work differently to convey their meaning on the course website. Moving between in class and online discussion, I submit, strengthens students' understanding of audience, negotiation, and sentence construction.

To increase students' sense of English as a global language, towards the end of the semester they participate in a cross-section writing project in which they exchange pieces of their work with students in a multilingual section of English 202. These exchanges take place on an online website called, Exchanges in English Writing that is linked to the course website. Since the website is private, students in both classes have to create usernames and passwords in order to login and give feedback. There are several reasons why this type of practice is useful to students and writing programs alike. First, it builds an infrastructure for an awareness of multilingual writing strategies that are useful to both teachers and students. Second, it provides students with exposure to English writing and speaking that they might not be familiar with and teaches diversity. Third, it provides Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs), and, other faculty members, who might be interested in teaching multilingual writing, with specific examples of what multilingual texts look like. So often, these examples are carefully chosen for research journals or generalized in theoretical texts. If we are to make space for global citizens in our institutions we need to recontextualize the way we teach and understand the multiple ways meaning is composed and communicated and make space for students to teach us about the way they write.

Future Research

Having concluded and delineated the translingual practices examined in Chapters 5, 6, and 7, I will now make some suggestions for future research. The following is a result of a line of thought that developed from this project that I intend to pursue in the future.

There is no doubt that Chinese scholars have made important contributions to the field of composition and rhetoric and that these contributions have moved the field forward. Still, more research is needed if we are to continue this movement. While studying the concepts and modes of communication outside of one's frame of reference is hard work, more scholars in the field need to do this so that we can develop better methodologies, practices, and understandings of meaning transmission and meaning interpretation. If we continue to study those concepts and modes of communication that are familiar to us, we will continue to work within the boundaries of "us and them" thinking. While this kind of thinking is not "bad" or "wrong" it does not contribute to interdependent relations between familiar and unfamiliar rhetorical scenes and practices. In addition, when we study the other we learn more about ourselves, and in new unexpected ways.

There is no doubt that more research projects that recontextualize understandings of writing and rhetoric through historical, comparative, or modern approaches outside the United States should be conducted. For instance, while You (2010) provides a history of English writing in China that has implications for translingual practice, Kirkpatrick and Xu (2012) contextualize a similar history from a different vantage point. What results from Kirkpatrick and Xu's (2012) contributions are ways that writing and language teachers might understand and adopt Chinese rhetoric and writing practices to better serve their students. The nuances that result from different vantage points matter just as much as the effort to know and understand difference. With this in mind, I believe the following questions provide the kind of thinking that will be useful for future research in translingual practice:

1. What specific practices in comparative rhetoric can help scholars better understand the teaching of writing outside of the US?
2. What new methodological frameworks can allow for scholars to recontextualize writing histories and rhetorical traditions outside of their frame of reference?
3. How can the intellectual work of comparative rhetoric inform pedagogy in FYC?
4. How might the relationships we establish with others in the field hold us accountable in our cross-cultural and linguistic work?

5. How do we represent or misrepresent our students in FYC and beyond?

In addition to the implications of comparative rhetoric on the teaching of writing, more research is needed to both investigate and inquire into the practices that are being used to support multilingual writers at institutions in the United States. If universities are going to admit students from non-English dominant countries someone needs to hold them accountable to support them through their undergraduate and graduate course work. In addition, if writing programs are going to hire teachers that specialize in multilingual writing to coordinate, train, and support faculty who teach multilingual writers, building infrastructure needs to be part of the mission. Without infrastructure, support will be superficial. To this end, the following questions will guide my research in this area:

1. How can English and Writing Studies departments make multilingual writing and the teaching of multilingual writing part of their infrastructure?
2. What are the best ways to train graduate teaching associates (GTAs) in composition and rhetoric programs to teach multilingual writing?
3. What can coordinators of multilingual writing programs do to establish infrastructure for multilingual students and their writing?
4. What approaches and what readings should be used to support multilingual students in their writing?

Presently, translingual practice has offered pedagogical practices and dispositions that support multilingual and domestic students in their writing. While these approaches are important, the interdisciplinary nature of the field requires writing programs to support students in their academic transitions (e.g. from writing in the humanities to writing in the social sciences). With this in mind, the following questions inform future research for translingual practice:

1. In what ways can translingual practice support students across disciplines?
2. What projects can prepare students for writing in the sciences?
3. At what level should writing in the sciences be implemented into the composition classroom?
4. What cross-disciplinary projects can support students in their academic transitions?

The implications of this research trajectory can take a lifetime, but we need to move beyond the mere conversations we are having in the field towards action based on ethical practices. While my own orientation to the teaching of writing aligns with the translingual model, I recognize that this concept, this name, is just a term that is being used to carry out a larger goal: to serve students through practices that support writing within and between languages, across disciplines, and in the temporal-spatial contexts (Lu & Horner, 2013) they enter into. Within this in mind, I submit that we need to let go of the novelty, investment, and ego involved in the concepts that will no doubt change and in the words that Sargent Shriver gave at the 25th Anniversary of Peace Corps: "serve, serve, serve…and shatter [our] mirrors!"[5]

Final Thoughts

As I conclude this project, my thoughts bring me back to the place where I began—the negotiation of meaning within the cultural and linguistic context of an ancient ghost city in Southwest China. As I reflect on that moment in time, I remember that I was in my very early stages of immersion into Chinese language and culture. Growing up in a small blue-collar city in Upstate New York, I had little foundation from which to access the language and cultural experiences I suddenly found myself a part of, but I had help. I had the help of language trainers, friendly bystanders, fellow Peace Corps Volunteers and my students. When I returned to the United States after my service, I wanted to give back some of the support I received while living abroad so I began to mentor Chinese students through the International Students and Scholars services at the University at Buffalo and in my multilingual courses at Buffalo State College. It was a humbling experience to see how quickly students are expected to adapt to the conditions of new schools, geographies, and writing practices when after six months in China I barely felt prepared to be on my own let alone write in a new language. Although I know that I can never give back the degree of support I received from people I barely knew in China, I know that encouraging the practices and strategies outlined in these chapters is a good place to start.

References

Abu-Lughod, L. (2006). Writing against culture. In H. Moore L. & T. Sanders (Eds.), *Anthropology in Theory: Issues in Epistemology* (pp. 466-479). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Ahmed, S. (2010). Orientations matter. In D. Coole and S. Frost (Eds.), *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency and Politics* (pp. 234-257). Duham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ang, I. (2003). Togetherness-in-difference: Beyond diaspora, into hybridity. *Asian Studies Review*, *27*(2), 141-154.

Anzaldua, G. (2007). *Borderlands La Frontera: The New Mestiza* (Third ed.). San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.

Appiah, K. A. (2010). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers (Issues of Our Time)*. New York, NY: Norton.

Atkinson, D., Crusan, D., Matsuda, P. K., Ortmeier-Hooper, C., Ruecker, T., Simpson, S., & Tardy, C. (2015). Clarifying the relationship between L2 writing and translingual writing: An open letter to writing studies editors and organization leaders. *College English*, *77*(4).

Ayash, Nancy Bou. "U.S. translingualism through a cross-national and cross-linguistic lens." *Reworking English in Rhetoric and Composition*. Eds. Bruce Horner and Karen Kopelson. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois, 2014. 116-28. Print.

Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. *Signs: Journal of Women, Culture and Society, 28*(3), 801-831.

Berthoff, A. (1990). Killer dichotomies: Reading in/reading out. In Kate Ronald & Roskelly, H. (Eds.), *Farther Along: Transforming Dichotomies in Rhetoric and Composition* (pp. 12-24). Portsmouth: Boynton.

Berthoff, A. (1981). *The Making of Meaning: Metaphors, Models, and Maxims for Writing Teachers*. Boynton/Cook.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Bhattacharya, U. (2011). The west in literacy. *The Berkeley Review of Education, 2*(2), 179-198. doi: http://escholarship.org/uc/item/0cr8c46r

Bizzell, P. (2014). We want to know who our students are. *Modern Language Association, 129*(3), 442-447.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). The Economics of Linguistic Exchanges. *Social Science Information, 16*(6), 645-668.

Bourdieu, P. (2004). Language and Identity. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 315-326). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Burke, K. (1984). *Permanence and Change: An Anatomy of Purpose*: University of California.

Canagarajah, S. A. (1999). Interrogating the 'native speaker fallacy': Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), "Non-native educators in English language teaching" (pp. 77-92). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Canagarajah, S. A. (2013a). Introduction. In S. A. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Literacy as Translingual Practice* (pp. 1-10). New York, NY: Routledge.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). The place of world Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication*, 586-619.

Canagarajah, S. A. (2013b). *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Canagarajah, S. A. (2013c). Negotiating translingual literacy: An enactment. *Research in the Teaching of English, 48*(1), 41-67.

Chen, H. I. (2014). Contextualizing teacher identity of non-native-English speakers in U.S. secondary ESL classrooms: A Bakhtinian perspective. *Linguistics and Education, 25*, 119-128.

C. Jan Swearingen and Mao, L. (2009). Comparative Rhetorical Studies in the New Contact Zone: Chinese Rhetoric Reimagined. *College Composition and Communication, 60*(4), W121.

Connelly, M.F. and Clandinin, J.D. (1994). Telling teaching stories. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 21*(1), 145-158.

Cook, V. (1992). Evidence for multicompetence. *Language Learning, 42*(4), 557-591.

Cooper, M. M. (2014). The being of language. In Bruce Horner & Kopelson, K. (Eds.), *Reworking English in Rhetoric and Composition Studies: Global Interrogations, Local Interventions* (pp. 13-30). Carbondale: Southern Illinois

Dao, B. (2000). *Unlock: Poems by Bei Dao* (E. Weinberger and I. Man-Cheong, Trans.). New York, NY: New Directions.

Deckert, S. K. and Vickers, C. H. (2011). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics: Society and Identity*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Devitt, A. J. (2008). *Writing Genres*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Devitt, A. J., Reiff, M. J., & Bawarshi, A. S. (2004). *Scenes of Writing: Strategies for Composing With Genres*. London, UK: Longman.

Dobrin, S. I., & Weisser, C. R. (2002). *Natural Discourse: Toward Ecocomposition*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

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

Donahue, C. (2013). Negotiation, translinguality, and cross-cultural writing research in a new composition era. In S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms* (pp. 149-161). New York, NY: Routledge.

Du Boise, J.W., Coburn, S.S., Cumming, S., Paolino, D. (1993). Outline of discourse transcription. In J. Edwards A. & M. Lampert D (Eds.), *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research* (pp. 45-91). Hillsdale, NJ: Psychology Press.

Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, *3*(2), 193-217.

Flick, U., Kardoff, E.V., and Steinke, I. (2004). What is qualitative research? An introduction to the field. In U. Flick, E. Kardoff V. & I. Steinke (Eds.), *A Companion to Qualitative Research* (pp. 1-11). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Fotovatian, S. (2014). Language, institutional identity and integration: Lived experiences of ESL teachers in Australia. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 37-41.

Fu, D. (2003). *An Island of English: Teaching ESL in Chinatown*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Fu, D. (1995). *"My Trouble is My English": Asian Students and the American Dream*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Fu, D. (2009). *Writing Between Languages: How English Language Learners Make the Transition to Fluency*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Fu, D. and. Townsend, J. S. (2010). Cross-cultural dilemmas in writing: Need for transformations in teaching and learning. *College Teaching, 46*(4), 128-133. doi: http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/vcol20

García, O., Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Torres-Guzmán, M. E. (Eds.). (2006). *Imagining multilingual schools: Languages in education and glocalization*. Clevedon, NZ: Multilingual Matters.

García, O., & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 199-216). Springer Netherlands.

Garrett, M. (1999). Some elementary methodological reflections on the study of the Chinese rhetorical tradition. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual*. 22. 53-63.

Gee, J. P. (2009). *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses* (Third ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Geertz, C. (2006). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In H. Moore. L. & T. Sanders (Eds.), *Anthropology in Theory: Issue sin Epistemology* (pp. 236-243). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Goffman, E. (1961). *Encounters*. Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.

Grabill, J. (2014). The work of rhetoric in the common places: An essay on rhetorical methodology. *Journal of Advanced Composition, 34* (1-2), 247-267.

Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43*(2), 148-164.

Hall, D. L. and Ames, R. T. (1995). *Anticipating China: Thinking Through the Narratives of Chinese and Western Culture*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Hall, J. (2014). Multilinguality is the mainstream. In Bruce Horner & Kopelson, K. (Eds.), *Reworking English in Rhetoric and Composition Studies: Global Interrogations, Local Interventions* (pp. 31-49). Carbondale: Southern Illinois.

Hart, R. (1999). Translating the untranslatable. In L. Liu H. (Ed.), *Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations* (pp. 45-73). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hattori, T. and Ching, S. (2008). Reexaming the between-worlds trope in cross-cultural composition studies. In LuMing Mao and Young, Morris (Ed.), *Representations: Doing Asian American Rhetoric* (pp. 41-61). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Hawhee, D. (2009). *Moving Bodies: Kenneth Burke at the Edges of Language*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina.

Heritage, C. and Goodwin. J. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 19*, 283-307.

Hessler, P. (2013). *Strange Stones: Dispatches from East and West*. New York, NY: Harper.

Horner, B. (2014). Introduction. In B. Horner & K. Kopelson. (Eds.), *Reworking English in Rhetoric and Composition* (pp. 1-10): Southern Illinois.

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

Hum, S. (2006). Articulating authentic Chineseness: The politics of reading race and ethnicity aesthetically. In S. Hum, P. Vandenberg & J. Lemon C. (Eds.), *442-470*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Hum, S. (1999). Yes, we eat dog back home": Contrasting disciplinary discourse and praxis on diversity. *Journal of Advanced Composition, 19*(4), 569-587.

Hurlbert, C. (2012). *National healing: Race, state, and the teaching of writing*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1990). *The Alchemy Of English: The Spread, Functions, And Models Of Non-*

Native Englishes. University of Illinois Press.

Kell, C. (2009). Literacy practices texts and meanings across time and space. In M. Baynham & M. Prinsloo (Eds.), *The future of literacy studies* (pp. 75-100). Basing-stoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kirkpatrick, A. and Xu, Z. (2012). *Chinese Rhetoric and Writing: An Introduction for Language Teachers*. Fort Collins, CO: Parlor Press.

Kramsch, C. (2009). *The Multilingual Subject*: Oxford University Press.

Lan, H. (2002). Contrastive Rhetoric: A Must in Cross-Cultural Inquiries. In H. F. Christopher Schroeder, Patricia Bizzell (Ed.), *Alt/Dis: Alternative Discourses and the Academy* (pp. 68-79). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Li, X.-M. (1996). *"Good writing" In cross-cultural context*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English With an Accent. Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States.* New York: Routledge.

Liu, L. H. (1995). *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity China 1900-1937*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Lu, M.-Z. (1992). Conflict and struggle: The enemies or preconditions of basic writing? *College English, 54*(8), 887-913.

Lu, M.-Z. (1987). From silence to words: Writing as struggle. *College English, 49*(4), 437-448

Lu, M.-Z. (2001). *Shanghai Quartet: The Crossings of Four Women of China*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Lu, M-Z. and Horner, B. (2013). Translingual literacy and matters of agency. In S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms* (pp. 26-

38). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lu, X. (2004). *Rhetoric of the Chinese Cultural Revolution: The Impact on Chinese Thought, Culture, and Communication*: University of South Carolina.

Mao, L. (2014). *Defining love and valuing difference: Enacting translingual practice*. Presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication (A.25), Indianapolis, Indiana.

Mao, L. (2011). Doing comparative rhetoric responsibly. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 41*(1), 64-69.

Mao, L. (2010). Introduction: Searching for the way: Between the whats and wheres of Chinese rhetoric. *College English, 72*(4), 329-349.

Mao, L. (2006). *Reading Chinese Fortune Cookie: The Making of Chinese American Rhetoric* Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press.

Mao, L. (2003). Reflective Encounters: Illustrating Comparative Rhetoric. *Style, 37*(4), 401-425.

Mao, L. (2005). Rhetorical Borderlands: Chinese American Rhetoric in the Making. *College Composition and Communication, 56*(3), 426-469.

Mao, L. (2007). Studying the Chinese rhetorical tradition in the present: Re-presenting the natives point of view. *College English, 69*(3), 216-237.

Mao, L. (2010). "Why don't we speak with an accent?" Practicing interdependence-in-difference. In Min.-Zhan Lu. Bruce Horner, and Paul K. Matsuda (Ed.), Cross-Language Relations in Composition (pp. 189-195). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University.

Marotzki, W. (2004). Qualitative biographical research (B. Jenner, Trans.). In Uwe Flick, Ernst von Kardoff and Ines Steinke (Eds.), *A Companion to Qualitative Research* (pp. 101-107). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

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

Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in US college composition. *College English*, 637-651.

McGann, P. (2000). Working the in-between ever more consciously: A reply to Sue Hum. *JAC*, 446-448.

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard educational review*, *66*(1), 60-93.

Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In Elinor Ochs & Bambi Schieffelin B. (Eds.), *Developmental Pragmatics*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice* (Fourth ed.). Thousand Oaks: CA: SAGE Inc.

Pavlenko, A. (2003). "I never knew I was bilingual": Reimagining teacher identities in TESOL. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 2*(4), 215-268.

Philips, S. U. (1972). Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. Functions of language in the classroom. C. B. Cazden, V. John-Steiner and D. Hymes. New York, Teacher's College Press**:** 370-394.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*: Oxford University Press.

Pratt, M. L. (1998). Arts of the contact zone. *Negotiating Academic Literacies*, 171-185.

Reynolds, F. (2001). Afterword. In C. G. Panetta (Ed.) *Contrastive Rhetoric Revisited and Refined*. (pp. 123-124). New York: Routledge.

Romano, T. (2000). Blending genre, altering style. *Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.*

Ryle, G. (1968). *The thinking of thoughts* (No. 18). [Saskatoon]: University of Saskatchewan.

Schoen, M. (2012). Rhetoric of the thirstland: An historical investigation of discourse in Botswana. *Rhetoric Review, 31*(3), 271-288.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S.W. (2003). *Discourses in Place: Language in the Material World*. London: Routledge.

Shaughnessy, M. P. (1979). *Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Siebler, K. (2008). *Composing Feminisms: How Feminists Have Shaped Composition Theories and Practices*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, INC.

Smith, D. G. (2008). "The farthest west is but the farthest east" The long way of oriental/occidental engagement. In C. Eppert and H. Wang (Eds.), *Cross-Cultural Studies in Curriculum: Eastern Thought, Educational Insights* (pp. 1-33). New York, NY: Routledge.

Smitherman, G. (1999). “CCCC’s role in the struggle for language right’s.” *College Composition and Communication*, 50(3), 349-376.

Spooner, M. (2002). "An essay we're learning to read: Responding to alt.style." In F. Schroeder and P. Bizzell (Eds.), *ALT DIS: Alternative Discourses and the Academy* (pp. 155-178). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook-Heinemann.

Straub, R. (1997). Students' reactions to teacher comments: An exploratory study. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 91-119.

Straub, R. (1996). The concept of control in teacher response: Defining the varieties of" directive" and" facilitative" commentary. *College Composition and Communication*, 223-251.

Stroud, S. R. (2009). Pragmatism and the methodology of comparative rhetoric. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 39*, 353-379.

Stroud, S. R. (2011). Useful irresponsibility? A reply to Mao on the purposes of comparative rhetoric. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 41*(1), 69-74.

Tinberg, H. (1991). "An enlargement of observation": More on theory building in the composition classroom. *College Composition and Communication, 42*(1), 36-44.

Turner, K. H., & Hicks, T. (2012). "That's not writing": Exploring the intersection of digital writing, community literacy, and social justice. *Community Literacy Journal*, 6(1), 55-78.

Van der Tuin, I., & Dolphijn, R. (2010). The transversality of new materialism. *Women: a cultural review*, *21*(2), 153-171.

Vertovec, S., & Cohen, R. (Eds.). (2002). *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: Theory, context and practice*. Oxford University Press.

Villanueva, V. (1993). *Bootstraps: From an American Academic of Color*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Villanueva, V. (2004). "'Memoria' is a friend of ours: On the discourse of color." *College English*, 9-19.

Voloshinov, V. N. (2000). Mutiaccentuality and the sign. In Lucy Burke and Tony Crowley and Alan Girvin (Eds.), *The Routledge Language and Cultural Theory Reader* (pp. 39-47). New York, NY: Routledge.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wang, B. (2013). Comparative rhetoric, postcolonial studies, and transnational feminisms: A geopolitical approach. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 43*(3), 226-242. doi: 10.1080/027773945.2013.792692

Wang, B. (2010). Engaging nüquanzhuyi: The making of a Chinese feminist rhetoric. *College English, 72*(4), 385-405.

Woodrow, L. (2011). College English writing affect: Self-efficacy and anxiety. *System*, *39*(4), 510-522.

Wu, H. (2010). Post-Mao Chinese literary women's rhetoric revisited: A case for an enlightened feminst rhetorical theory. *College English, 72*(406-423).

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case Study Research Design and Methods* (5 ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

You, X., & Liu, Y. (2009). Confucians love to argue: Policy essays in ancient China. *College Composition and Communication*, *60*(4), 41-50.

You, X. (2011). Chinese white collar workers and multilingual creativity in the diaspora. *World Englishes, 30*(3), 409-427.

You, X. (2015). *Cosmopolitan English and Transliteracy*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University (in Press).

You, X. (2008b). Review: Reading Chinese fortune cookie: The making of Chinese American rhetoric. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 38*(1), 118-121.

You, X. (2008a). Rhetorical strategies, electronic media, and China English. *World Englishes, 27*(2), 233-249.

You, X. (2010). *Writing in the Devil's Tongue: A History of English Composition in China*. Illinois: Illinois State University Press.

You, X. and You X. (2013). American content teachers' literacy brokerage in multilingual university classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*, 260-276.

APPENDIX A - INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Xiaoye You

1. When did you first begin teaching?

- What year?
- Where did you teach?
- What specific courses did you teach at that time?

2. What are some of the expectations you had about teaching before you started?

- Did these expectations inform your teaching practices?

3. Did you have mentors?

- Who were some of your mentors when you first started teaching?
- How did they come to be in your life?
- How did they shape your teaching practices?

4. What are some of the challenges you expected prior to teaching?

- Did these challenges come to fruition?

5. A lot of your research deals with both multilingual writing and comparative rhetoric. I'm thinking of the two studies of writers on 21st Century Community Forum (both published in the journal, World Englishes) as well as your article, "Confucians Love to Argue" from the 2009 Symposium.

- How might studies in comparative rhetoric aid teacher/scholars in the formulation of new approaches to the teaching of writing?
- Have your own comparative studies provided you with new ways of approaching multilingual contexts?

6. I'm interested in your cross-pacific exchange project between students at Guangdong University in China and your students at Penn State. As a teacher of writing I might want to replicate this project. How might I prepare first year composition students to *respond* to student writing across linguistic and cultural borders?

7. How can first year writing teachers in the United States prepare their students to *search for the meaning potential* in writings that emerge from translingual contexts?

8. Is it just as important to study International rhetoric as it is, to use your term, "Cosmopolitan English?"

9. LuMing Mao has written about ways that he employs a Chinese American rhetoric in the classroom. Do you, like Mao, do this as well?

10. In your book you cleverly refer to the Chinese idiom, stating that scholars have, for the most part, been armchair strategists discussing war strategies on paper. What direction does the field of writing studies need to move in order to turn strategies into actions?

11. What advice can you give to teachers of writing who have only been trained in the Western tradition and who might only speak English?

Haixia Lan

1. When did you first begin teaching?

- What year?
- Where did you teach?
- What specific courses did you teach at that time?

2. What are some of the expectations you had about teaching before you started?

- Did these expectations inform your teaching practices?

3. Did you have mentors?

- Who were some of your mentors when you first started teaching?
- How did they come to be in your life?
- How did they shape your teaching practices?

4. What are some of the challenges you expected prior to teaching? Did these challenges come to fruition?

5. Your essay, “Contrastive Rhetoric: A Must in Cross Cultural Inquiries” explores the discursive and cultural differences between China and the West and conveys that in Chinese discourse, meaning is relational to context.

- How might studies in comparative rhetoric aid teacher/scholars in the formulation of new approaches to the teaching of writing?
- Have your own comparative studies provided you with new ways of approaching multilingual/translingual contexts?

6. How can first year writing teachers in the United States prepare their students to search for the meaning potential in writings that emerge from multilingual/translingual contexts?

7. Is it just as important to study International rhetorics as it is Western rhetorics?

8. LuMing Mao has written about ways that he employs a Chinese American rhetoric in the classroom. Do you, like Mao, do this as well?

9. In your essay, you write: “reflecting on my own practice of teaching writing as inquiry, I’ve realized how the process is compatible with my own culture’s propensity for correlative thinking, correlative learning, and correlative teaching. In other words, although writing as inquiry is indeed very Western, in a rather important way, it is also Chinese” (76).

- How do you bring these correlative processes to your teaching practices?

- How might an understanding of these correlative processes be useful to all teachers of writing?

10. What advice can you give to teachers of writing who have only been trained in the Western tradition and who might only speak English?

11. In your opinion, what direction does the field of writing studies need to move in order to serve students in translingual contexts?

Danling Fu

1. When did you first begin teaching?
   - What year?
   - Where did you teach?
   - What specific courses did you teach at that time?
2. What are some of the expectations you had about teaching before you started?
   - Did these expectations inform your teaching practices?
3. Did you have mentors?
   - Who were some of your mentors when you first started teaching?
   - How did they come to be in your life?
   - How did they shape your teaching practices?
4. What are some of the challenges you expected prior to teaching?
5. When we spoke on the phone you mentioned that your local identity is different from your national identity. Do you mind talking about his a little bit?
6. A lot of your work deals with the practice of writing in between languages; Chinese and English. I'm thinking of your article, "Cross-Cultural Dilemmas in Writing," your book, *An Island of English*, and also *Writing Between Languages*. In some of these works, you mention the

struggles you encountered as a graduate student writing in English. If you were to reflect, what was it that supported your growth as a writer?

7. How have your own experiences as a multilingual writer shaped your pedagogy?

8. In your opinion, should teachers of writing study writing in languages other than English? If so, what are the best ways to do this?

9. Studies in comparative rhetoric deal primarily with translation, by bringing the concepts and modes of communication to audiences outside of a specific cultural or linguistic background.

- Do you think that studies in comparative rhetoric provide a useful heuristic for teaching writing in multilingual contexts?
- What are your experiences, if any, with comparative rhetoric?

10. How can writing teachers learn to search between languages when they read the English writing of their multilingual students?

11. How might writing teachers prepare their students to search for meaning in the writing of their multilingual peers?

12. LuMing Mao has written about ways that he employs a Chinese American rhetoric in the classroom. Do you, like Mao, do this as well?

13. What advice can you give to teachers of writing who have only been trained in the Western tradition and who might only speak one language?

APPENDIX B - TRANSCRIPTION KEY

The following transcription symbols based on Ochs (1979) and DuBois, Schuetze-Coburn, Cumming and Paolino (1993) are used to support the verbal text in chapters 4, 5, and 6:

(.) Brief pause

@ Laughter

= Latching

---

[1] According to Wang, "*sanwen* was adopted by many May Fourth intellectuals to argue for social change and to promote the new culture. As a genre, the vernacular essay [*sanwen*] is flexible and has unique potential for the writer to describe, narrate, argue, and express her political beliefs freely and directly (p. 390)

[2] "Negating old traditional mores and values to define *nüquanzhuyi* and modernity on their own terms" (p. 391).

[3] "Virgil's advice in the words of Robert Frost" (Hall & Ames, 1995, p. 3). In their comparative discussion of chaos and cosmos Hall and Ames (1995) problematize the Anglo-European notion of beginnings.

[4] In Haixia's exact words, which I obtained through email correspondence following my visit to La Crosse, she explains it thus: "At 30 I studied; at 40 I established myself; at 50 I knew *tianming*-the-cosmic order; at 60 I understood all I heard; and at 70 now I act spontaneously with nothing amiss" (electronic communication, Aug. 14, 2014).

[5] Quoted in "Sargent Shriver Peace Institute" http://www.sargentshriver.org/letters/joby-taylor