

Translingual Academic Writing at Internationalised Universities: Learning From Scholars

Melanie Brinkschulte
Göttingen University, Germany

Ella Grieshammer
Göttingen University, Germany

Monica-Elena Stoian
Göttingen University, Germany

Abstract

Due to the internationalisation of universities and the globalisation of academic cultures, academic writing is influenced by several writing traditions, heterogeneous reader expectations, as well as internal and external multilingualism. The programme *MultiConText* (Multilingual Writing in Academic Contexts) at the International Writing Centre at Göttingen University offers a pedagogical approach which deals with these aspects and aims at fostering writing skills for international, multilingual contexts. Writing workshops within the programme target students of all faculties, especially students of international study programmes. The pedagogical approach takes into account Canagarajah's (2013) idea of translingual practice and the concept of language repertoires (Busch 2017), encouraging students to use all available language codes as a resource in writing. In order to strengthen this approach's foundation, interviews with scholars working in international research teams were conducted. These interviews focused on the strategies scholars use when writing for publication, especially those for writing in multilingual contexts. Results from the interviews were adapted for classroom use to show students a variety of possibilities to deal with multilingualism in writing. This article makes a suggestion as to how theoretical concepts of multilingualism may be investigated in interviews and how they might be put into practice in writing assignments.

Introduction

The globalisation of scientific cultures and the internationalisation of universities are accompanied by processes of internationalisation and heterogenisation of academic writing traditions. Therefore, internationalised universities need to address these changes both in academic writing and in writing pedagogy. One attempt to do so is the pedagogical approach inspired from the concept of translingual practice (Canagarajah 2013) and adapted for the programme *MultiConText* (Multilingual Writing in Academic Contexts), which is offered by the International Writing Centre (IWC) at Göttingen University, Germany. Courses within this programme are directed to students in international study programmes as well as to all students who write and act in multiple languages, for example, due to writing in English or German as a foreign language or due to using more than one language when reading and producing text. With our pedagogical concept we focus on enabling students to use their multilingualism as a resource in academic writing and to amplify their writing skills for internationalised academic contexts.

This article aims to demonstrate this translingual pedagogical approach with its theoretical framework and some empirical foundation. It does not convey an empirical study of the success of certain writing instructions or tasks, but gives an insight into how a perspective on multilingual writing, which takes not a deficit-oriented but rather a holistic stance, is put into practice. With this contribution, we hope to encourage writing advisors and instructors to adopt this stance and to set some impulses for dealing with the processes of the internationalisation of academic writing as mentioned above.

In order to explain the pragmatic background of our approach, we will firstly describe the sociolinguistic situation in which students write their academic texts at German universities that undergo processes of internationalisation. We will then describe the philosophy of the IWC at Göttingen University, which aims to enable speakers of any language and any academic background to use their previous academic experiences and their languages as resources in the writing process. We then present the programme *MultiConText* offered by the IWC and its theoretical framework of a general translingual approach to teaching and learning academic writing. In order to explain how our approach is based on empirical data and how this empirical data is used as workshop material at the same time, we will present data from interviews with scholars reflecting their individual multilingual writing process. In our analysis we focus on one scholar's writing strategies in multilingual contexts to be able to transfer his strategies as an example for our translingual academic writing pedagogy. We will also explain how we adapt the results from this study for the writing classroom. To conclude, we discuss which learning outcomes our translingual approach might have and how it contributes to the internationalisation shift at European universities.

Academic Writing at Internationalised Universities

Bachelor students at German universities such as Göttingen University mostly write their academic texts in German. At Master's level, there is a shift from German to English as the language of writing in many programmes, especially in the Sciences (Brinkschulte, Stoian and Borges 2015: 18-19). But knowing the target language of a written assignment does not mean knowing which writing tradition the requirements for the text stem from. For example, because study programmes change to English in Master's programmes, most of the academic assignments are expected to be written in English in internationalised Master's programmes. Nevertheless, the question of whether Anglo-Saxon text conventions, for example genre, structure or linguistic choices, are expected to be realised in these assignments, or if the characteristics of German academic texts are expected to be transferred to English, will probably depend on the lecturer's experiences and sociocultural background. Often, lecturers are possibly not aware of their expectations. It can also be assumed that sometimes hybrid forms of text are expected and produced by students. Those heterogeneous expectations are probably not only to be found in international master's programmes, but develop in all contexts in which teaching staff is culturally diverse or where teachers bring in their academic experiences from abroad. At the same time, texts produced by students, especially by those who bring with them academic experiences from contexts other than German universities, are influenced by their knowledge of different writing traditions.

Thus, students at internationalised universities have to deal with multiple heterogeneous expectations on academic texts, which are formed by diverse academic cultures. Another characteristic of the writing situation at internationalised universities is the fact that most students are multilingual writers. This means that they know more than one language which can be used in the different stages of the writing process (Brinkschulte 2018: 383-384).

The International Writing Centre at Göttingen University: Concept

The International Writing Centre (IWC) is located at Göttingen University, a large German university with programmes ranging from the humanities to the natural sciences. The IWC is open to all students studying at Göttingen University, regardless of their faculty or cultural and linguistic background. Besides individual writing tutoring, the IWC offers a large range of

courses, most of them organised as two- or three-day-courses, addressing specific disciplines, specific tasks within the writing process or specific genres. Students can gain credit points within the field of key competences¹ if they successfully write a portfolio.²

Part of the IWC's philosophy is an inclusive approach, teaching students with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds together, for example, students with German as a native language and students with other native languages. This inclusive approach implies that students with different backgrounds have different resources which can be used in writing: For example, while native-speaking students may have a better intuition for pragmatic aspects of language, non-native students often have more explicit knowledge of linguistic rules.

It also implies that students with different resources are able to learn together and from each other, thus being able to work on collaborative assignments. The team of IWC avoids regarding students who do not write in their native language as writers with deficits, which is, unfortunately, how they often perceive themselves or are perceived by university teachers who focus on linguistic features in their texts that differ from those by native writers. Instead, we focus on multilingualism as a resource that can be used effectively within the academic writing process.

The IWC tries to take into account resources of multilingual writing. That means, for example, that students actively reflect on the academic cultures they come from or have made contact with and consider how they can be drawn on in the new academic culture. Students continue these reflections within the portfolios they have to write as a final assignment.

Academic and discipline-specific conventions also play an important role in the IWC's courses. Students are asked to find out which conventions are important in their fields, but we also discuss the function of these conventions, to enable and simplify communication within a discipline. Thus, writing is taught as a combination of standardised formulations and one's own voice. Following the conventions of a scientific community brings a type of positive feedback because the reader's expectations are fulfilled. Students rely on strategies developed throughout the time in different communities of scientific practices. The pedagogic concept of the IWC has been strengthened by the empirically based pedagogic concept of *MultiConText*. Its theoretical background and data sources are introduced in the next section.

Theoretical Framework of *MultiConText*

The *MultiConText* programme is advertised bilingually in German and English. Participants should have proficient knowledge in either German or English; at the beginning of a workshop, they are asked to negotiate how classroom communication should be handled: The classroom language can be either German or English or a combination of both, depending on the participants' preference. Participants are also encouraged to use other languages within the classroom, for example in group work or in written assignments. This explicit integration of various languages reflects the programme's idea of taking multilingualism seriously and of perceiving it as a resource rather than an impediment.

To understand the pedagogy we apply to the *MultiConText* programme, it is essential to differentiate between the terms translingualism, and multilingualism. We use the terms *translingual(ism)* and *multilingual(ism)* in distinctive ways: *Translingual(ism)* refers to a deliberate use of multilingual resources and is mainly used to describe our pedagogical goals.

¹ Key competences (in German *Schlüsselkompetenzen*) describe those skills students are required to acquire besides discipline-specific skills, such as social skills or methodological skills.

² A portfolio is a genre at German universities used to document the learning process during and after a class. In most cases, it consists of a number of assignments in which students are asked to reflect on their learning experience and to transfer the contents of the class to a new context.

Multilingual(ism) refers to writers' backgrounds and contexts which are influenced by more than one language.

In our pedagogy, we rely on Canagarajah's (2011, 2013) concept of translingual practice within language practice. His fundamental notion, translingual practice, which is a key concept for our teaching, can be understood as a reflective application of a multilingual pragmatic competence in communication. It is a synergy of languages and goes beyond language itself (Canagarajah 2013: 8f). Influenced by García's (2009) understanding of translingualism, Canagarajah's (2013) translingual practice considers complexities of languages in a constructive way, fitting the current dynamics of literacy. Canagarajah's approach to languages involves a multiplicity of thoughts, agents, voices, and perspectives, as well as the willingness to rethink the current discourse of academic writing. Languages, in this case, are only to be used in plural because they complement one another rather than limiting one's capacity to cross the border from one language to another and from one pattern of thinking to another. According to Canagarajah, there is no border between languages and codes. The agentive writer is, in Canagarajah's concept, capable of negotiating the meaning of her/his text with the reader, assuming that the reader is capable of doing the same, as both are equally important in constructing or what Canagarajah calls 'co-constructing' the text. For Canagarajah (2013), text is co-constructed in time and space and performed rather than pre-constructed. This applies to our practice; since we do not offer finite products as models of academic writing, this means that we do not offer pre-constructed texts, but allow the students to produce their own strategies by co-constructing texts and developing their own writing style when producing the text. One of the goals of *MultiConText* is to help students become writers who actively co-construct the text's meaning in cooperation with the reader and who shuffle flexibly between languages, genres and reader expectations in multilingual academic contexts.

What is also essential to our pedagogy is our understanding of language(s) and of writing strategies. On the one hand, we differentiate between language(s) repertoires (verbal repertoire) - 'the totality of linguistic forms regularly employed in the course of socially significant interaction' (Gumperz 1964: 137, Busch 2013), and repertoire of languages as a command of different languages (Council of Europe 2018). On the other hand, writing strategies vary individually and situationally depending on the context of the writing project (Chandler 1995, Dengerscherz 2017, Keseling 2004, Lange 2012, Lange 2015, Ortner 2000). In multilingual writing, where obviously more than one language is being used, these strategies involve using all repertoires for the whole writing process.

The notion that multilingualism can be a resource in academic writing is based on several observations. One is that multilingualism implies different kinds of awareness which come with different (meta-)cognitive competences (Brinkschulte 2016). Halliday's (1975) concept of language awareness is one of the resources that multilingualism carries. Multilingual writers often have profound understanding of the systematic nature of language and explicit knowledge of semantics, lexis, and syntax in various languages. This should not be seen as comparable to a 'native speaker' and her/his knowledge of languages since multilinguals have different knowledge of context, language(s) and most of all they differentiate in language affluence, when reflecting on the use of their language(s). This reflexive knowledge helps them to choose expressions and structures deliberately, which can be an advantage in academic writing. Language awareness in the context of multilingual academic writing also means that multilingual writers are often aware of genres and text types and of their cultural specificities. The concept of language learning awareness and its benefits can also be applied to multilingual writing by referring to an explicit knowledge of different language learning strategies and the ability to use them in acquiring other languages (Knapp-Potthoff 1997: 13-15). This sort of awareness means, within the context of academic writing, that writers are able to use writing strategies that they have acquired in one language for writing in another language (Cumming 1989, Hyland 2011, Raimes 1987, Wolff 1992).

Another resource is the existence of different languages, which can be used beneficially within the writing process. Since writing in an additional language is always a multilingual process (Krings 1992, Wang 2003, Wen and Wang 2002, Woodall 2002), several languages can be used in the planning, generating ideas or structuring stages, writing a first draft or reflecting on

possible revisions. The use of several languages can make way for new thoughts, connections or ideas that could not have been developed in a monolingual setting (Knorr et al. 2015: 322-332).

Methods of a Qualitative Study for *MultiConText*

Our pedagogical approach is based not only on the theoretical assumptions explained above, but also on results from a qualitative study we conducted with scholars and students. The research design for the study contained two project phases:

The first phase lasted from winter semester 2012 to summer semester 2015. It included conducting interviews with 12 students attending our first courses and 13 scholars in natural sciences. Data were gained from problem-centred interviews (Witzel 2000) that offer informants the freedom to explain their individual cultural academic backgrounds, their development in academic communities and their academic writing practice. In addition, we analysed 57 portfolios by Qualitative Content Analysis (Mayring 2010) written by students in order to earn credits in their study programmes (Brinkschulte, Stoian and Borges 2015).

The second phase of the research started in the summer semester 2015 with our course programme *MultiConText*. Based on the results from the first phase we developed a wider programme of courses on translingual academic writing for students of all faculties, especially of international study programmes. In order to learn more about students' translingual academic writing skills and what kind of modification our programme might need, we audiotaped a few units of translingual practice in the courses, analysed more portfolios and conducted surveys with students' evaluations. Table 1 shows an overview of the collected data basis.

Table 1: Data base for the project *MultiConText*

	Students [n]		scientists
Project phase 1 2012-2015 (5 courses for students of Natural Sciences; n = 69)	Interviews	12	Interviews 13
	Portfolios	57	
	Evaluation survey	61	

In this article, we focus our data analysis on the scientists' descriptions of their collaborative multilingual writing processes, with a view to adapting their writing strategies to our translingual writing pedagogy.

The 13 interviews took place with scholars with international educational or work experiences from various scientific disciplines (see table 2) working in international research teams at Göttingen Campus, an alliance of Göttingen University and several other local research institutions. Another criterion for choosing our informants was work experience at a German university. The informants worked in different positions, from postdoctoral fellow to professor or director of a research institute. All of them had at least two years of research experience and had published at least five papers in scientific journals. All interview partners signed a consent form in which the purpose of the interviews was explained and in which participants received information on how their data were handled. The handling of the data included for example the anonymisation of the data (all names are pseudonyms) and the use for scientific purposes only.

The interviews were conducted and audio-recorded in a language with which the interviewer and informants were familiar: German, English or Romanian. The data were analysed using Qualitative Content Analysis (Mayring 2010) to identify information about the informants' attitudes and experiences towards translingual academic writing. The results serve as material

for our courses as well, as we explain later. Table 2 shows an overview of the informants and their biographical data.

Table 2: Biographical information of interviewed scholars

Pseudonym, discipline	L1	Scientific Languages	Work experiences
Daniel – postdoc in Neurosciences	German, Italian	English, German, (Italian)	Germany, USA
Carina – professor in chemistry	German	English, German	Austria, Switzerland, USA, Germany
Martina – postdoc in agriculture	German	English, German	Germany, Australia
Terence – professor in neuroscience	Portuguese	English, Portuguese, (Spanish, Italian, French, German)	Portugal, USA, Germany
Dirk – associate professor in physics	German	English, German, Danish, Swedish	Germany, Sweden, Denmark
Elke – post doc in physics	German	German, English	Germany, Switzerland, USA
Rita – post doc in forest botany	Romanian	English, German, Romanian	Germany, Romania, USA
Esther – post doc in forest botany	German	English, German	Germany, Switzerland, UK
Manuel – professor in chemistry	German, Romanian	German, English	Germany, USA, Romania
Luca – post doc in biology	Spanish	English, (German, Spanish)	Germany, Spain
Nick – associate professor in biology	Danish	English, Swedish, Danish (German)	Sweden, Germany, Denmark
Hayyan – professor in molecular medicine	Berber, French	French, German, English, Arabic (Norwegian, Berber)	Germany, Morocco, Serbia
Helge – professor in forest botany	German	English, German, French	Germany, USA, Switzerland, France

Through Qualitative Content Analysis, we used inductive and deductive techniques to develop categories concerning the scholars' scientific writing strategies in multilingual contexts. The categories include strategies like organising the collaborative writing process by using the experts' knowledge (for example, to analyse data) or by discussing drafts with their research team and the language choice. The analysis of the data offers insights in scholars' individual writing strategies concerning the way of integrating the individual language repertoires in the writing process.

Exemplary Results: A Scientist's Multilingual Thinking and Writing

As mentioned above, we analysed the interviews conducted with scientists working in international research teams to receive insights in their multilingual writing strategies when writing for publication. These results are the basis for developing writing assignments for our translingual academic writing pedagogy (*MultiConText*) to offer students possibilities to explore and reflect on multilingual writing strategies. In the following analysis, we focus on one scholar's individual writing strategies during the writing process (Dengscherz 2018 in press) and how he integrates his individual language repertoire in his writing practice to produce a text in a target language (in most cases in English).

Daniel is a physicist and works as a postdoc in an international research team at Max Planck Institute for neurosciences in Göttingen. He grew up bilingually with Tyrolean dialect, Italian and German in Tyrol. He started learning English at school and continued improving his language skills during his studies and research activities, e.g. in the USA. For research, he uses all three of his available languages, but English is his most frequent language for scientific writing, as he publishes mainly in English. To describe his usage of multilingualism more precisely, in his daily contact with other researchers he speaks English, German and Italian. He integrates his three available languages in his thinking and writing process. Daniel points out the entity of his language repertoire and how he uses his language repertoire for thinking, speaking and writing:

Yes, totally, all the time, it happens all the time in fact, also because I now face all three languages almost on a daily-basis, and that in all directions, I think, I speak German, I think of a word in Italian, mostly, also in English sometimes or the other way around, with Italian I think of a word in English, I mean all the directions it happens. (#00:24:44-00:25:14#) Ah, yes, sometimes I do that, I add a word in German, for example, in a text in English. (#00:25:35-00:25:39# Daniel, physicist, postdoc in neurosciences)

Daniel focuses the dense and highly connected net of his language repertoire. His statement about his use of several languages may be interpreted as demonstrating that he does not perceive the languages he uses as separate systems, rather using them as one entity to produce a text or to speak about a subject in his discipline. As Daniel uses his three languages in his daily work he feels familiar with them and is able to decide which expression might be the most precise one to describe the content. For his individual writing he uses his available languages for writing a draft, keeping in mind the necessity to translate it into the target language English when he wants the paper to be published.

Dengscherz (2017, 2018 in press) points out a similar case in her data of multilingual writing practices. One of her informants uses her multilingualism to compensate lexical deficits during her writing by using one or more languages to fill lexical items. Dengscherz calls it a compensational strategy, helping writers to concentrate on the content and not forget important topics by looking up the precise expression in a dictionary. This way of writing a draft, by using available languages, is one of the cognitive strategies many multilingual writers benefit from. This strategy enables writers to concentrate on content first, neglecting language choice and accuracy while writing a draft (Lange 2012). It could be helpful for writers with a lower language proficiency in the target language or for writers feeling uncomfortable in expressing themselves academically in a target language. Writers can explore their individual language repertoire as a resource for a fluent writing process by using available languages to express the content. In a following process of revising the draft writers can look for precise expressions in the target language and the genre.

Daniel's example may also point to the close relationship of his language repertoire in his mental activities and his way of formulating the content. The possibility of dealing with a variety of languages enables him to reflect on underlying concepts based on the language system and/or on the socio-cultural context. Daniel balances the informative value of expressions by contrasting them in his available languages or by mixing them in a kind of code-meshing. His interest to express precisely what he wants to say possibly leads him to deeply think about expressions, phrases and eventually needed explanations for the readers. This reflective writing strategy of balancing consists of finding a precise form of expression by the assistance of the language repertoire.

Both strategies activate multilingualism for academic writing and may help writers to concentrate on the topics they want to write about. They belong to strategies offering a multicompetence (Franceschini 2016) multilingual writers are able to benefit from during their writing process. Nevertheless, in most cases writers need to translate their multilingual draft into a target language as normally multilingual texts are not accepted by publishers or readers.

The analysis of the scholar Daniel's data above shows how an advanced writer uses writing strategies in multilingual contexts. Due to the complexity of scientific writing, and especially in multilingual contexts, these cognitive and metacognitive writing strategies are only a brief insight in the writer's expertise and skills. However, the quotation might serve as an incentive to multilingual students who have to write in a multilingual environment. The scholar's statements demonstrate that he has to simultaneously handle several languages in his writing processes and also show constructive ways of using these languages. Of course, different writers need different writing strategies; hence presenting Daniel's or other scholars' strategies to students does not necessarily mean that students should adopt them. Nevertheless, having students reflect on these writing strategies may provide them with a better understanding of the various options multilingual writers have in handling their writing process. Therefore, we integrated Daniel's quotation and some of other interviewed scholars into writing arrangements for our courses in the *MultiConText* programme as shown in the next paragraph.

Assignment to Reflect on Writing Strategies for Multilingual Contexts

As described above, the *MultiConText* writing classes are open to students in international study programmes. The teaching languages are German and English, sometimes accompanied by other languages. Multilingual teaching offers a multilingual learning environment and atmosphere, so students feel engaged to activate their individual language(s) repertoires. Multilingualism for academic writing is a learning goal. Thus, multilingualism is used as medium for understanding in the classroom and translanguaging writing skills are one central learning outcome. Therefore, students work with quotations from the interviewed scholars as experts in writing in multilingual contexts. The learning goal is to develop awareness of multilingual writing strategies, to become able to choose deliberately multilingual writing strategies for a first draft and to reflect on one's own writing strategies.

Following the pedagogical concept of situated writing arrangements (Bräuer and Schindler 2011), first, students are asked to activate their knowledge about academic writing in a multilingual setting. With a partner they discuss their writing experiences in foreign languages or in multilingual environments. They are asked to discuss writing strategies they used for writing a first draft in a multilingual context, for example, for dealing with literature in more than one language.

As a next step, students change working groups and read Daniel's quotation as an example of scholars' writing strategies. They identify scholars' writing strategies in multilingual writing environments and compare them with their writing practice. Students fulfil this arrangement either individually or in small groups. In this sequence, learners explore new or other writing strategies, become aware of their already used writing strategies and share them. To sum up, by using the interview quotation as an impulse, students are asked to compare their own writing strategies to those of experienced writers in multilingual settings.

The next learning step is about applying multilingual writing strategies for writing a first draft. Students are asked to focus on the content they want to express, leaving normative aspects aside. Depending on the course topics, students can either work on their individual writing projects, adapting multilingual writing strategies to their writing situation, or they work on a writing assignment fitting to the course topic, for example, with literature in more than one language. They are asked to activate their available languages for writing a first draft multilingually. On the basis of this writing experience, participants write an individual reflection. For this, students are provided with questions (for example: *What did you do during your writing process? How did you feel when using your available languages? What did you like most?, and What did you dislike in this writing situation?*).

This sequence of adapting and reflecting on multilingual writing strategies is followed by a unit of giving and receiving feedback on the first drafts. Groups of approximately three students give feedback to each other. As the drafts might be partly written in languages readers are not able to understand, it is necessary that the authors read their drafts aloud, explain paragraphs and define wishes for feedback, for example, which kind of explanations the readers are missing.

The readers read each draft again silently and write their individual feedback on an extra sheet. Finally, the authors get to read this feedback, and, taking into account the feedback, writers revise their first draft.

Depending on the group size, students' reflections can be either discussed with the whole group or in smaller groups. Reflections are private texts and might include topics students do not want to share. Therefore, participants decide what issues they want to discuss in public. This discussion can include various issues related to multilingual writing, for example, students talk about first experiences with new multilingual writing strategies, or they discuss advantages and disadvantages of writing in a target language, or experiences in using multilingual writing as compensational strategies or for a deeper thinking to find precise expressions. The discussion offers insights in the diversity of writers' decisions about choosing multilingual writing strategies depending on writer's attitudes, the writing situation and the context of the writing project. As an outcome, students come to know a variety of writing strategies for multilingual contexts so they can deliberately decide which one fits to their writing situation.

This assignment shows one learning unit of our translingual writing pedagogy which offers students a learning environment to develop writing and reflection skills for academic writing in a globalised scientific community.

Conclusions: Implementing Translingual Academic Writing Pedagogy

In the *MultiConText* programme at Göttingen University, we offer writing courses which help students to become aware of text genres, complex academic writing processes and writing strategies in multilingual contexts. We focus on enabling students to activate their multilingual resources for their individual writing processes and to choose suitable writing strategies according to their writing situation and writing context. In order to do so, we work with multilingual writing strategies used by scholars in writing assignments (see for example, Barczaitis, Brinkschulte and Grieshammer 2017: 243-245, Barczaitis and Grieshammer in press). By using that approach, we move away from a deficit-oriented stance that is often prevalent when it comes to (teaching) multilingual writing, and towards a stance that perceives multilingualism as a chance.

Up to now, the *MultiConText* courses are part of the university-wide key competences programme, meaning that students gain credit points when they successfully attend courses in the *MultiConText* programme. While the advantage of this integration is that students can choose courses according to their needs and interests, this can also be seen as a disadvantage. Educating students to become competent writers in a globalised discourse and for an internationalised job market should be systematically integrated into the discipline's curricula. This would also mean that writing skills could be taught in stronger connection with discipline-specific content and that writing could be taught as a learning tool to acquire discipline-specific content. Integrating units of translingual academic writing pedagogy in curricular courses, such as reflections on readers' expectations according to their sociocultural and disciplinary background or mutual peer feedback, would highlight the value of translingual pedagogy in academic writing.

Hence, offering translingual academic writing courses as key competence classes is only a first step for implementing a translingual writing education at internationalised universities. As curricula are becoming more and more internationalised, fostering translingual academic writing skills should become essential in curricular development.

References

- Barczaitis, I., and Grieshammer, E. (in press) ‚Mehrsprachig Texte für verschiedene Zielgruppen verfassen. Aufgabenarrangements zur Förderung mehrsprachiger akademischer Schreibkompetenz‘. *Fachsprache - The International Journal of LSP* (41)
- Barczaitis, I., Brinkschulte, M., and Grieshammer, E. (2017) ‚MultiConText: Ein Konzept zur Förderung akademischer Schreibkompetenz für mehrsprachige Wissenschaftskontexte‘. in *Internationalisierung der Curricula an Hochschulen: Konzepte, Initiativen, Maßnahmen*. ed. by Casper-Hehne, H., and Reiffenrath, T. Bielefeld: WBV, 234-249
- Brinkschulte, M. (2018) ‚DaZ-Schreibdidaktik an der Hochschule‘. in *Schreiben in der Zweitsprache Deutsch*. ed. by Griebhaber, G., Schmolzer-Eibinger, S., Roll, H., and Schramm, K. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 380-393
- Brinkschulte, M. (2016) ‚Mehrsprachigkeit als Ressource für akademisches Schreiben‘. in *Schreibberatung und Schreibtraining in Theorie, Empirie und Praxis*. ed. by Ballweg, S. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 97-114
- Brinkschulte, M., Stoian, M. E., and Borges, E. (2015) ‚Resource-Focused Research for Multilingual Competence in Scientific Writing‘. *Journal of Academic Writing* [online] 5 (1), 17-28. available from <<http://e-learning.coventry.ac.uk/ojs/index.php/joaw/article/view/159>> [25 September 2018]
- Bräuer, G., and Schindler, K. (2011) ‚Authentische Schreibaufgaben – ein Konzept‘. in *Schreibarrangements für Schule, Hochschule und Beruf*. ed. by Bräuer, G., and Schindler, K. Freiburg i. Br.: Fillibach, 12-63
- Busch, B. (2017) *Mehrsprachigkeit*. Wien: Facultas
- Canagarajah, S. (2013) *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. London and New York: Routledge
- Canagarajah, S. (2011) ‚Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging‘. *The Modern Journal* 95 (iii), 401-417
- Chandler, D. (1995) *The Act of Writing: A Media Theory Approach*. Aberystwyth: University of Wales Aberystwyth
- Council of Europe (2018) *Council of Europe Language Policy Portal*. [online] available from <https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Guide_curricula_EN.asp> [25 September 2018]
- Cumming, A. (1989) ‚Writing Expertise and Second Language Proficiency‘. *Language Learning* 39 (1) 81-141
- Dengscherz, S. (2018 in press) ‚Schreibprozesse – mehrsprachig – gestalten. Zwei Fallstudien aus dem Projekt PROSIMS‘. in *Academic Writing Across Languages: Multilingual and Contrastive Approaches in Higher Education*. ed by Hu, A., Huemer, B., Deroey, K., and Lejot, E. Wien: Böhlau
- Dengscherz, S. (2017) ‚Strategien und Routinen für wissenschaftliches Schreiben in der L2 Deutsch. Zwischenergebnisse aus dem Projekt PROSIMS‘. *ÖDaF-Mitteilungen* 33 (1), 157-173
- García, O. (2009) ‚Educating, Multilingualism and Translanguaging in the 21st century‘. in *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local*. ed. by Ajit, M., Minati, P., Phillipson, R., and Skutnabb-Kangas, T. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 140-158

- Gumperz, J. G. (1964) 'Linguistic and Social Interaction in Two Communities'. *American Anthropologist* 66 (6-2), 137-153
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1975) *Learning How to Mean*. London: Edward Arnold
- Hyland, K. (2011) 'Disciplines and Discourses: Social Interactions in the Construction of Knowledge'. in *Writing in the Knowledge Society*. ed. by Starke-Meyerring, D., Paré, A., Artemeva, N., Horne, M., and Yousoubova, L. West Lafayette: In Parlor Press and The WAC Clearinghouse, 193-214
- Keseling, G. (2004) *Die Einsamkeit des Schreibers. Wie Schreibblockaden entstehen und erfolgreich bearbeitet werden können*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften
- Knapp-Potthoff, A. (1997) 'Sprach(lern)bewußtheit im Kontext'. *Fremdsprachen lehren und lernen* 26, 9-24
- Knorr, D., Andresen, M., Alagöz-Bakan, Ö., and Tilmans, A. (2015) 'Mehrsprachigkeit – Ressource für SchreiberInnen und Ratsuchende'. in *Impulse für die Migrationsgesellschaft. Bildung, Politik und Religion*. ed. by Dirim, I., Gogolin, I., Knorr, D., and Krüger-Potratz, M. Münster: Waxmann, 318-338
- Krings, H. P. (1992) 'Empirische Untersuchungen zu fremdsprachlichen Schreibprozessen – Ein Forschungsüberblick'. in *Schreiben in der Fremdsprache: Prozeß und Text, Lehren und Lernen*. ed. by Börner, W., and Vogel, K. Bochum: AKS, 47-77
- Lange, U. (2015) 'Mehrsprachige Wege zu einsprachigen Texten. Eine Unterrichtsreihe mit Schreibstationen'. *Informationen zur deutschdidaktik. Zeitschrift für den Deutschunterricht in Wissenschaft und Schule* 4, 133-141
- Lange, U. (2012) 'Strategien für das wissenschaftliche Schreiben in mehrsprachigen Umgebungen. Eine didaktische Analyse'. in *Schreiben unter Bedingungen von Mehrsprachigkeit*. ed. by Knorr, D. and Verhein-Jarren, A. Frankfurt/Main u.a.: Peter Lang, 139-156
- Mayring, P. (2010) *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken*. Weinheim: Beltz
- Ortner, H. (2000) *Schreiben und Denken*. Tübingen: Niemeyer
- Raimes, A. (1987) 'Language Proficiency, Writing Ability, and Composing Strategies: A Study of ESL College Student Writers'. *Language Learning* 37 (3), 439-467
- Wang, L. (2003) 'Switching to First Language Among Writers with Differing Second-Language Proficiency'. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 12 (4), 347-375
- Wang, W., and Wen, Q. (2002) 'L1 Use in the L2 Composing Process: An Exploratory Study of 16 Chinese EFL Writers'. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 11, 225-246
- Witzel, A. (2000) 'The Problem-Centered Interview'. [online] *Forum Qualitative Social Research* 1 (1) available from
<<http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1132/2521>> [25 September 2018]
- Wolff, D. (1992) 'Zur Förderung der Fremdsprachlichen Schreibfähigkeit'. in *Schreiben in der Fremdsprache: Prozess und Text, Lehren und Lernen*. ed. by Börner, W., and Vogel, K. Bochum: AKS, 110-134
- Woodall, B. R. (2002) 'Language Switching: Using the First Language While Writing in a Second Language'. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 11 (1), 7-28