If reinhabitation involves learning to live well socially and ecologically in places that have been disrupted and injured, decolonization involves learning to recognize disruption and injury and to address their causes. From an educational perspective, it means unlearning much of what dominant culture and school teaches, and learning more socially just and ecologically sustainable ways of being in the world. (9)

A substantial portion in the ADOHP course taught at the University of Arkansas examines the political and economic forces that have shaped the delta and tries to ferret out the causes of the "disruption and injury" the region has experienced. A major emphasis in the conversations, both online and face-to-face, between the U of A mentors and the delta high school students is consistently on how both the students and their communities can take steps toward revitalization and sustainability. Gruenewald concurs with the position underlying the ADOHP, namely that recovering and revering the past can support reinhabitation in the present and future:

Decolonization as an act of resistance must not be limited to rejecting and transforming dominant ideas; it also depends on recovering and renewing traditional, non-commodified cultural patterns such as mentoring and intergenerational relationships. In other words, reinhabitation and decolonization depend on each other. A critical pedagogy of place aims to (a) identify, recover, and create material spaces and places that teach us how to live well in our total environments (reinhabitation); and (b) identify and change ways of thinking that injure and exploit other people and places (decolonization)..(9)

The give-and-take between decolonization and reinhabitation is the glue that has bonded the U of A mentors and the delta high school students over the first five years of the project. "Let's recover the places and legends that have made the delta worth saving," all parties say. "Let's scrutinize the forces that have led to the changes in the delta," all parties ultimately say, after some discomfort. "Let's promote what we see as future sustainability and viability for a region we admire," all parties concur. The teachable moments abound.

Notes

1. On the web, see the U.S. Census Bureau, "Arkansas Quick Facts from the U.S. Census Bureau," 3 June 2011 (accessed 6 Sept. 2011).
2. See the program's website at www.arkansaspreservation.com.
3. Personal communication, 8 May 2006.

12.
RETHINKING MARKEDNESS
Grammaticality Judgments of Korean ESL Students' Writing

Junghyun Hwag and Joel Hardman

"JUNGHYUN, I THINK I understand what you try to say but still some of your sentences sound strange, because we, native English speakers, never say it like that."

"Then what should I do with this?"

One of the authors of this paper comes from Korea. When she asks her native English-speaking friends to proofread her papers, she often wonders about her friends' remarks, such as those above. This study attempts to place these types of remarks in a larger context in which various groups of English users are involved. We were interested in the "strange-looking" sentences written by nonnative English speakers, and the primary purpose of our investigation has been to look into native English speakers' perceptions of the writing of nonnative speakers of English from Korea studying in an academic setting. We had three questions driving the first part of our research:

- Were the "marked" sentences produced by the Korean writers perceived as ungrammatical by native speakers of English?
- Were the "marked" sentences understood by native speakers of English?
- Was there a difference in the perception of the sentences written by the Korean writers and of the control sentences produced by expert writers of English?

Following the gathering of data through a survey to answer these questions, we developed one more: how would the Korean writers respond to the judgments of the native speakers who responded to the survey? To make the current study meaningful, we will begin with an overview of the situation of English in the world today.

The Situation of English Today

The global situation of English is rapidly changing. At the same time that its influence is growing around the world, there is (contrarily) growing diversity of forms and use. As Min-Zhan Lu claims, "Even as English is becoming a language of international commerce, media, and politics, it is breaking into multiple and increasingly differentiated englishes marked by accents, national origins, and cultural and professional or technical affiliations" ("Essay" 21). That is, the dominance of "center English" (U.S. and U.K. English) is simultaneously growing and shrinking. Again, according to Lu, "English is best defined as an unstable process kept alive by the intense intra- and international struggle between and across English and diverse languages" (24). At the same time that there has been a new understanding of hybrid Englishes, there is also an awareness that even the English of native speakers has "translingual" elements (Horner et al., "Language Difference"), as "all discourses are ultimately hybrid or mixed" (Matsuda, "Alternative" 192). However, despite the increasing acceptance of diversity and hybridity in speech, there isn't a similar move toward the acceptance in writing.

Perceptions of Markedness

In the context of this project, we have not been focused on the exact *causes* of markedness but on the *perceptions* of markedness and *perceptions* of its causes. As Suresh Canagarajah asks, "How do teachers and researchers of English writing orient to linguistic and cultural difference in the essays they read?" Canagarajah proposes the "inference" model, which describes the way such readers tend to ascribe causal properties to the writers' L1 or "native" culture for marked elements in second-language writing in tone, style, organization, and discourse ("Toward" 589).

Furthermore, we have been interested in comparing native-speaker perceptions of markedness in both NNSE (nonnative speakers of English) and NSE (native speakers of English) writing. We suspected that certain NSE texts could be perceived as marked if their origins weren't known *or* if they were understood to be NNSE texts. Paul Kei Matsuda remarks that "the key difference between mainstream and alternative discourses is that the hybridity of the former is unmarked in the eyes of the audience whereas that of the latter is marked, thus inviting the labels such as hybrid, mixed, and alternative" ("Alternative" 192). We see that unmarked hybridity, or perhaps

even invisible markedness, as a kind of native-speaker privilege. That is, we were interested in looking at how markedness is not simply *in* the text but is partly created in the mind of the reader, similar to how transactional reading theory describes meaning generally as not lying within the text but as created by the interaction of reader and text.

Finally, we have been interested in what a "positive" orientation to markedness would look like as a form of language enrichment. Matsuda remarks that "the goal of writing instruction has been construed as helping students to create texts that are unmarked in the eyes of the native speakers of certain varieties of English." Such a perspective is based in a negative assumption about the nature of markedness: that it is always linked with error and, as Matsuda goes on to say, that "the context of academic discourse practices is static and unchanging" ("Alternative" 193). We would like to entertain the possibility that the new translingual diversity of forms in academic writing changes academic discourse for the better.

Method and Procedures

This study employed two major procedures: a survey to investigate reactions of native English speakers to Korean ESL students' writing and a post-interview with Korean writers to collect their opinions on the survey results.

Survey

Korean student writers' sentences were collected from their first-year composition essays, and we chose seven sentences that showed "markedness" in the presentation of intended meaning but did not present overt grammatical errors.[1] At the same time, we included three control sentences written by expert native English writers, without indication of the authors, which were slightly modified for length (and one, from Mark Twain, was slightly updated to not be overtly marked as "old-fashioned"). Therefore, ten sentences were provided in the survey, and if applicable, their linguistic contexts were also presented. Each sentence was followed by a set of questions: respondents were asked which of two choices would be closer to the meaning of the "marked" sentence, and then a question regarding intelligibility and grammaticality followed, using 4-point Likert scales. A question at the beginning of the survey asked whether the respondent was a native English speaker or not, and we used data only from respondents who identified themselves as native English speakers.

Post-interview

After acquiring results from the survey, we conducted e-mail interviews with the three Korean writers who provided the original sentences. We showed them the native English speakers' reactions to their own sentences and asked them the following questions:

- How do you feel about the survey results?
- Where does the "markedness" in your sentences come from?
- Why do you or do you not want to rephrase the sentences?
- What is your overall reflection on writing in English?

Also, we invited "code-meshing" (Young, "Nah," 60) by allowing responses in English and/or Korean in order to obtain more accurate and vivid data. At the same time, we asked student writers not to worry about grammar or the tone of writing. There was one e-mail interview that was translated from Korean into English by one of the researchers.

Findings

Survey

We received responses from 104 native English speakers and tabulated the results, as seen in tables 12.1 and 12.2.

The sentences written by Korean writers and the control sentences written by native English speakers were well understood (92.5 percent and 93.4 percent), while the sentences of the native speakers were less likely (69 percent to 80 percent) to be *perceived* as intelligible. Also, the respondents were generally split on their perception of the NSE control sentences as ungrammatical (45 percent grammatical, 55 percent ungrammatical), due in part to the very low perception of the one control sentence by Mark Twain ("no, nothing that is . . ."), which contains an obvious double-negative (a deploying of southern dialectal features).[2] If that sentence is removed, the percentages change a bit.[3] Meanwhile, sentences written by the Korean writers were perceived as slightly more grammatical than the control sentences (62 percent to 45 percent).

The sentence written by Wallace[4] ("when it can suddenly . . .") may be seen as awkwardly long, certainly as making demands on the attention of the reader. The Bloor and Bloor[5] sentence presents a couple of awkward structures ("difference to how we talk" and a complex nominal clause structure) that are perhaps more familiar to a British ear. As noted, Twain's double-negative

Table 12.1. Intelligibility

No.	Sentence/phrase	Correct answer (%)	Intelligible (%)	Not/less intelligible (%)
1	. . . in our world, schools have to be gun-free zones.	77.0	88.8	11.2
2	. . . I had a dream about becoming a professional soccer player.	91.8	94.1	5.9
3	. . . when it can suddenly and for no reason occur to you that you've been getting out of bed every morning without the slightest doubt that the floor would support you.	94.9	82.5	17.5
4	. . . I could learn that some painters used the camera obscura.	94.8	75.9	24.1
5	"Do you like Korea or the US?"	98.7	89.7	10.3
6	. . . some students like to study for a short time to better focus from distractions and to prevent themselves from getting bored.	94.8	77.6	22.4
7	The context makes a big difference to how we talk and how far we think in advance what we are going to say.	98.7	78.0	22.0
8	Study habits are different in individuals and vary in different results.	91.9	53.9	46.1
9	. . . younger people must conduct themselves accordingly.	98.7	80.6	19.4
10	. . . no, nothing that is proper to approaching matrimony.	86.7	46.8	53.2
	Overall	92.8	76.8	23.2
	NSE texts only	93.4	69.1	30.9
	Korean students' texts only	92.5	80.1	19.9

is clearly marked. However, in context and with full knowledge that these writers are expert speakers of English, such markedness would go largely unnoticed or simply be treated as an example of the writer's "style," which we argue below is an aspect of native-speaker privilege.

Table 12.2. Grammaticality

No.	Sentence/phrase	Correct (%)	Incorrect (%)
1	...in our world, schools have to be gun-free zones.	87.6	12.4
2	...I had a dream about becoming a professional soccer player.	90.5	9.5
3	...when it can suddenly and for no reason occur to you that you've been getting out of bed every morning without the slightest doubt that the floor would support you.	70.8	29.2
4	...I could learn that some painters used the camera obscura.	28.9	71.1
5	"Do you like Korea or the US?"	75.7	24.3
6	...some students like to study for a short time to better focus from distractions and to prevent themselves from getting bored.	52.0	48.0
7	The context makes a big difference to how we talk and how far we think in advance what we are going to say.	44.2	55.8
8	Study habits are different in individuals and vary in different results.	25.0	75.0
9	...younger people must conduct themselves accordingly.	76.7	23.3
10	...no, nothing that is proper to approaching matrimony.	20.2	79.8
	Overall	57.2	42.8
	NSE texts only	45.1	54.9
	Korean students' texts only	62.3	37.7

Post-interview

The reactions of Korean writers to the survey results can be categorized as follows:

- Positive attitudes toward their own writing (their sense of the clarity of their sentences, importance of comprehensibility): "I think my sentences are fine because I can still understand what I meant"; and "As long as the sentences are understandable to me and to others, I would not change it."

- Attitudes toward the obligations of native English-speaking readers: "There would be no problem with understanding my sentences if the native speakers read my sentences with their minds open and little more carefully"; and "I do not care they didn't like it or not as long as they understood my sentence."

- Frustration with the task of sounding unmarked (critique of the writing center, the challenge of translation): "If I was wrong, where does the grammar that the native English speaking professor and writing center staffs use come from?"; and "The words in Korean are not always directly related to or have the same meaning in English."

- Translingual intentionality: "However, I wanted to show my identity—the third person, or a foreigner (but still concerned) by using the word 'world'"; "My sentences in the way it is could also be just my opinion and thoughts"; and "Those sentences were written by ME to express MY opinions."

- Critique of the "centeredness" of native speakers: "I found that even native English speaking students make a lot of grammar mistakes, and that really comforts me"; and "It is funny that although some respondents said my sentence was hard to understand or impossible, most of them respond they understood the meaning of the sentence."

- Hybridity of all language: "I think there is not a perfect or right way to express your feeling because all of the people in the United States can't describe their feeling in one certain way."

Discussion of Findings

Our investigation into the reaction of the ESL writers to the judgment of native speakers showed that the markedness in Korean ESL students' texts tends to be perceived negatively, being associated with grammar errors. These

negative grammaticality judgments are distinct from the actual *comprehensibility* of the sentences, which as noted earlier was quite high. That is, there is a mismatch between *actual* and *perceived* intelligibility. Interestingly, when the readers were not provided with information on the authors, the responses to the expert native speakers' texts didn't exhibit any significant differences from those to Korean ESL students' texts, with respect to either intelligibility or grammaticality. The findings support divergent attitudes toward writing—"approaching the writings of 'beginners' or 'outsiders' in a manner different from the approach we take to the writings of 'experts'" (Lu, "Professing" 443). Lu explains "the criteria used by 'educated america' when dealing with an idiosyncratic style. These criteria are (a) the writer's 'knowledge of English,' which is seen as somehow dependent on whether she is a native speaker, and (b) the writer's 'experience in writing,' which is seen as related to whether she has been [im]perfectly educated" (444). In other words, the criteria are based on extra-linguistic factors, which often trigger a certain attitudinal and psychological state.

Meanwhile, the interviews with the Korean ESL student writers provide valuable sources of exploring the process of translingual writing while indicating the writers' awareness of their own agency. We can see that they purposefully used markedness as part of their rhetorical strategies and claimed their right to produce idiosyncratic styles. Also, some of their remarks question the legitimacy of "correct" usage, which has been considered native speakers' exclusive property, and suggest the idea that, eventually, one's language is hybrid—the mixture of different discourses, repertoires, and languages.

Considering both these remarks and the survey results, it could be proposed that, to some extent, "markedness" is created in the mind of readers—even native English speakers' texts can be marked, but often in invisible ways. Much of what we are arguing here regarding "markedness" in writing has nearly a half-century lineage, going back at least to Wallace Lambert's matched-guise research in 1967, which demonstrated how listener judgments toward people were shaped by speakers' accents, rather than by other aspects of an utterance. More pointedly, a study by Donald Rubin suggests that listeners "stereotypically attributed accent differences—differences that did not exist in truth—to the [nonnative English-speaking] instructors' speech" (519). So, we are seeing in readers a similar perception of markedness where none may exist.

More important, the Korean writers showed how they try hard to communicate to achieve *jiao*, which Lu interprets as "showing the necessity and possibility of responsive and responsible uses of language . . . in a world

rife with and riven by systems and relations of injustice" ("Essay" 18). The writers also demanded a critical reflection on readers' attitudes by saying, "There would be no problem with understanding my sentences if the native speakers read my sentences with their minds open and little more carefully." The student's voice can be better heard, respected, and resonant when we redefine language fluency in a translingual frame. Bruce Horner and his colleagues ask us to direct our efforts toward fluency in translingual communication in order to improve "processes of making and conveying meaning—processes that, particularly when they belong to less powerful communities, sometimes appear opaque to individual readers and listeners" ("Language Difference" 307).

The dialogue between NSE reactions and Korean students' reactions to the NSE reactions challenges the notion of native speaker proficiency in writing and proposes a need for a change among readers; they "need to learn to read more broadly, with a more cosmopolitan and less parochial eye" (Leki 133). If the ESL writers are considered "beginners/outsiders," the insiders/hosts should welcome them with additional efforts, such as "patience, tolerance, and humility to negotiate the differences" (Canagarajah, "Place" 593). In doing so, the ESL student writers would feel less "tongue-tied" (Lu, "Living-English" 46) and would add their unique potential to the dynamicity of the English language itself and to relevant discourse communities. Also, when readers/insiders have open minds and try to "listen to" what the outsiders/beginners try to say, they may be able to appreciate or even enjoy the translingual diversity embedded in those "strange-looking" sentences.

Conclusions

The markedness of the writing of NNSEs can be viewed as rendering that form inferior to native speakers' writing due to the visible "accent," or one can look at how that accent enriches the text, bringing a distinct voice and point of view. John Flowerdew notes some of the positive attributes of the writing of NNSEs, including language awareness and cross-cultural pragmatics (127). Matsuda and Christine Tardy have investigated the connection between markedness and voice in readers' judgments of multilingual discourse (246). Reimagining "accent" as "voice" goes a long way toward helping readers see what multilingual writers bring to texts.

As Canagarajah argues, "[Multilingual writers] are not linguistically or culturally conditioned to write only in one particular way; rather, they can

be rhetorically creative" ("Toward" 601–2). If one acknowledges agency in the textual decisions of multilingual writers (as Lu does, in "Professing"), a realm opens up for reimagining how these writers "carve out a space for themselves within conflicting discourses" (Canagarajah, "Toward" 601). Such a view does involve the risk of misinterpreting error for agency, but one should not view that as a greater problem than misinterpreting agency for error. The attention of multilingual writers and writing instructors needs to shift from strategies for *avoiding* difference/markedness toward "strategies for negotiating differences in discourse practices" (Matsuda, "Alternative" 196).

It should be further explored how those "strategies for negotiating" are actualized in practice. According to Matsuda and his colleagues, Lu's pioneering study on negotiating multilingualism in her writing class ("Professing") is considered to pose a critical question regarding "whether we shouldn't go to the extent of accommodating creative uses of language in our practice of multilingualism in education" ("Changing" 158). Matsuda and Michelle Cox discuss "a broader definition of what counts as 'good writing'" (8), which suggests a possibility of incorporating "accented English" as part of its spectrum. They also propose an active use of the "unexpected" that is found in ESL students' writing as a way to reflect on what has been already "expected." In a similar vein, Hwag and Hardman also argue for a closer examination of elements that traditionally constitute "good writing" and imagine a writing teacher's role as an empathetic supporter rather than a gatekeeper.

Those discussions, as well as the current research findings, call for re-evaluation of approaches to teaching second language writing that pays more attention to *appropriate* proficiency in English writing (McKay and Bokhorst-Heng), a proficiency that allows writers to communicate effectively yet still be "accented." David Graddol argues for a view of accent being put into practice with writing (*English Next*). Accented writing, as we have discussed in this paper, can be understood perfectly well and adhere to the genre expectations that mark a piece of writing as appropriate to a given community of practice, yet still also mark the writer as a nonnative speaker, mark his or her voice.

Along with an understanding of how translingual writing is itself enriched by the multilingual background of the writer, it can also be noted that the entire community of practice that the multilingual writer seeks to participate in benefits. As Matsuda argues, "Learning from other rhetorical practices can enrich U.S. academic discourse by expanding the socially

available repertoire for scholarly communication" ("Alternative" 194). Such change won't come easily. Theresa Lillis and Mary Jane Curry describe the challenges for multilingual writers trying to enter scholarly communities of practice, focusing on the mediational role of "literacy brokers" ("Professional" 12) and the ongoing privileging of center English. Change in the available repertoire for a community of practice may not benefit all in that community (certainly the power of some in the community is contingent on the repertoire never changing), but a more diverse set of discourse possibilities would benefit all whose writing is marked/hybrid/accented, which includes almost all writers, not just second language writers.

This tension between the power of the status quo and change can be understood within Pierre Bourdieu's framework of *habitus*, which "produces practices which tend to reproduce the regularities immanent in the objective conditions of the production of their generative principle, while adjusting to the demands inscribed as objective potentialities in the situation" (*Outline* 78). That is, habitus prompts practices that are typical (regular) for a given community but can adapt and change in response to changes in the community, such as when multilingual writers enter the community of practice of academia. According to Bourdieu, we need a balance between constructs of agency and social determinism. Both are necessary for understanding how social action is partly determined by structuring structures but is also in part a potential rebellion against those structures. So, the status quo for expectations of practice within a community "structures" action but is also subject to emergent processes driven by changing membership of the community.

Last, it must be acknowledged that the type of change in attitudes being advocated here cannot occur in a vacuum. Changes in the workings of the community of academic discourses cannot be accomplished by second-language writers and writing instructors alone. Attention also needs to be directed to the general audience/reader, particularly to native speaker audience/reader judgments, to understand how those judgments can change. There has been increasing interest in how native speaker accommodation/cooperation is an important (often missing) element in native speaker / nonnative speaker communication (House, "Developing"; Roberts and Canagarajah), and the focus there should help generate an understanding of what is needed to prompt native-speaking participants in a community of practice to be more generous in their attitudes toward the translingual texts in their midst.

Notes

1. See appendix for the entire survey.
2. The sentence was taken from Mark Twain, *The Innocents Abroad, or the New Pilgrim's Progress* (1869), The Electric Text Center, ed. Alan Eliasen, University of Virginia Library, n.d., web, 10 July 2009.
3. We calculated the percentage when the Twain was removed, and the results are the following: NNSE and NSE sentences were well understood (92.5 percent and 96.8 percent); they were perceived less intelligible (80 percent and 80.2 percent) than their actual intelligibility; the perception of grammaticality of the NSE control sentences was 57.5 percent grammatical and 42.5 percent ungrammatical; and the perception of grammaticality of the NNSE and NSE sentences was 62.2 percent and 57.5 percent each.
4. From David Foster Wallace, *Everything and More: A Compact History of Infinity*, 2nd ed. (New York: Norton, 2004), print.
5. From Thomas Bloor and Meriel Bloor, *The Functional Analysis of English* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995) print.

13.
RELOCALIZED LISTENING
Responding to All Student Texts from a Translingual Starting Point

Vanessa Kraemer Sohan

AT PRESENT, RHETORIC and composition scholars are asking how we can respond appropriately to code-meshed texts in the classroom. In their recent opinion piece, Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, Jacqueline Jones Royster, and John Trimbur propose one possible answer: a translingual approach to composition that "sees difference in language not as a barrier to overcome or a problem to manage, but as a resource for producing meaning in writing, speaking, reading, and listening" (303). Although somewhat new to rhetoric and composition, the translingual approach to language difference is not a wholly unprecedented phenomenon either inside or outside of the discipline: monolingual, multilingual, and native speaker norms have been redefined and challenged in the fields of applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, second language acquisition, and education. Scholars have employed a number of terms—transculturalism (Gilyard), plurilingualism (Council of Europe), *interculturalité* (Blanchet and Coste), *diversalité* and *créolité* (Bernabé, Chamoiseau, and Confiant), translanguaging (Canagarajah, "Codemeshing," "Multilingual Strategies," "Translanguaging"), translingualism itself (Horner et al., "Language Difference"; Matsuda, "Translingual")—to describe the move away from monolingualist ideologies toward new conceptions of what users of language "do" (Horner, "(Re)Writing English"). While language scholars may focus on different terms and different aspects of these terms, collectively the movement away from a monolingual framework requires more than emphasizing the importance of glossodiversity (diversity of languages); such a move means stressing the importance of semiodiversity (diversity in language meaning) so as to promote better cross-, trans-, inter-, and plurilingual/cultural understandings (Kramsch, "Traffic"; Pennycook, *Language*).