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Abstract: Despite a multiliteracies turn to understanding L2 writing activities, most scholars in China have continued to adopt a cognitive perspective to study Chinese students’ English composing. In this article, we argue that Chinese students have always composed English writing in a multilingual and multimodal fashion. Then, drawing on recent discussions in literacy and composition studies, we propose a multilingual and multimodal framework to study L2 composing, using both historical and practice-based approaches.
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1 Introduction

Writing teachers and researchers have long been subjugated by the monolingual modernist ideology. Dictated by educational mandates and state examinations, teachers have to make sure that students can write to the level of certain benchmarks in the national language. Researchers study the characteristics of student writing and the needs of student writers with the hope of helping them meet these benchmarks. In the United States, for example, under an English monolingual ideology, students are supposed to master Standard English, the de facto national language, regardless of their linguistic and cultural backgrounds. An idealized linguistic system, Standard English codifies the modernist ideal that a nation is defined by its national language and literature (Edward, 1994). U.S. college writing classes have been one of those places to inculcate the monolingual modernist ideology (Horner & Trimbur, 2002; Matsuda, 2006). In countries where English is taught as a second or foreign language, such as China, teachers and researchers tend to adopt the linguistic standards set in Anglo-American nations, absorbing elements of the monolingual ideology into their work (You, 2004; 2010).

One problem of monolingualism is the neglect among writing teachers and researchers of the multiple languages, dialects, and media that are potentially involved in second language (L2) writing. First language has for a long time been perceived as interference in one’s learning and use of L2. Only in recent years have scholars recognized the positive role that first language can play in the L2 composing process (Liu, 2009; Roca de Larios, Murphy, & Manchon, 1999; Wang & Wen, 2002; Wang, 2005; Zhang, 1995). Still, influenced by monolingualism, many teachers are reluctant to acknowledge that L2 writers draw on multiple languages not only as the “means” but also as the “ends” of their writing. L2 writers employ multiple languages in their thinking and composing processes; they could also use these languages in their texts, by means of code-switching and code-mashing, to signify their voices and identities (Buell, 2004; Canagarajah, 2011; You, 2011). In addition, encouraged by the wide availability of digital technologies, nowadays writers could also use non-linguistic representational systems, such as images, sounds, and performance.

As a result, writing teachers and researchers need to reorient their work to a multilingual and multimodal framework. In the
last decade, researchers started taking this perspective to examine both L2 composing processes and written products, using case studies, ethnography, and discourse analysis. However, most scholars in China have continued to adopt the cognitive psychology perspective to study students’ English composing, using case studies. In this article, we will first review a multiliteracies turn in writing studies, pointing out the increasing attention that scholars have devoted to understanding L2 writers’ deployment of multilingual and multimodal resources. Then, we propose a multilingual and multimodal approach to study L2 composing process in the Chinese context, using both historical and practice-based approaches.

2 L2 writing as a situated multilingual and multimodal practice

In writing studies, scholars have increasingly embraced the multiliteracies turn, partly initiated by the New London Group. The group argues that traditional literacy pedagogy is inadequate in the post-Fordism era in which communication channels and media have multiplied and cultural and linguistic diversity have increased. A pedagogy of multiliteracies assumes that “language and other modes of meaning are dynamic representational resources, constantly being remade by their users as they work to achieve their various cultural purposes” (Cope & Kalantzis, p. 5). One implication of the notion of multiliteracies is that as writing researchers and teachers we need to attend to the diverse ways that writers deploy the available representational resources, both linguistic and non-linguistic, to construct meaning. This is a shift towards a broader framework that the New London Group identifies as design, an activity that entails the interplay between available designs (the grammars of various semiotic systems), designing (the act of transforming those systems) and the redesigned (the transformed sign, symbol, object). This broader conceptualization locates writing as one resource within a wider rhetorical repertoire (Selfe, 2009) and shifts frameworks for teaching and research towards a “design grammar” (Gee, 2003) that locates all signs, symbols, and objects within deeply cultural and historical contexts.

Recent research in writing studies has increasingly paid attention to the multilingual and multimodal resources that L2 writers draw on in their composing process (Blommaert, 2008; Fu, 1995, 2003; Fraiberg, 2010; Lee, 2002, 2007a, 2007b; Shin & Cimasko, 2008; Yi, 2010; You, 2007, 2011). These studies offer important insight into the complex relationship between languages and between modalities involved in the composing processes and written products. For example, in out-of-school contexts, Lee (2002) studied emails and instant messaging (IM) texts produced by a group of youths in Hong Kong. She identified both Cantonese-based shortenings mixed with English and various grammatical “errors” as the key feature of the youths’ online discourse. After analyzing chat texts, interviews, and logbooks collected from 19 college students in Hong Kong, Lee (2007a, 2007b) further found that writing practices in IM are influenced by the students’ perceived affordances of the IM technology and the available linguistic resources. Yi (2010) reported a two-year ethnographic study of an adolescent multilingual writer, focusing on her transitions between in-school and out-of-school writing contexts in the United States. Yi’s study reveals that the adolescent’s writing activities in these contexts influenced each other in the areas of topics, genres, and languages (English and
Korean). You (2011) studied Chinese college graduates’ creativity when they sought to represent themselves as a dislocated group of white collar workers on an electronic bulletin board. His analysis reveals that the college graduates developed communicative/writing strategies by drawing on multiple languages (Standard English, Standard Mandarin, Chinese regional dialects, and Internet language) and the multimodal functions of the digital technologies.

These studies have unveiled a major gap between L2 literacy practice and the teaching of L2 writing. Focusing on the standard linguistic code and academic genres, writing teachers have not adequately attended to the linguistic and non-linguistic resources that are available or should be made available to their students. Lee (2002, 2007a, 2007b), Yi (2010), and You (2011) demonstrate convincingly that contemporary young people actively utilize their multilingual resources in out-of-school literacy activities. In school contexts, Fu (1995, 2003), Gentil (2005), Kibler (2010), Zhang (1995), and Wang & Wen (2002) show that despite being expected to write in English only, students utilize their first language to guide their thoughts, to deliberate word choices, and to generate ideas. These findings have encouraged L2 writing teachers and researchers to bridge the gap between in-school and out-of-school literacy practices.

Research in students’ L2 composing processes in China has been enlightening to bilingual writing practice; however, most of it has continued to adopt a cognitive perspective. For example, modeling studies of L1 composing by Flower & Hayes (1981) and Perl (1979) and L2 composing by Zamel (1983), Chinese scholars used think-aloud protocols to trace students’ mental activities and cognitive strategies (Wang & Wen, 2002; Wang & Wen, 2004; Wang, 2005; Wen & Guo, 1998; Zhang, 1995). Different from their American peers using a cognitive perspective, who had only focused on composing in English, Chinese researchers typically sought the differences between students writing in both Chinese and English or the role played by Chinese in English composing process. An early study was conducted by Zhang (1995) involving sixteen non-English majors. Zhang asked the students to think aloud when composing two writing tasks, one in Chinese and the other in English. He found that the composing processes in both languages were recursive and that all students went through the prewriting, writing, and revision phases. However, students revised more frequently on both the syntactic-lexical and semantic levels than on any other levels when they were writing in English. When composing in Chinese, they often used clauses or sentences when thinking aloud to approach a complete discourse, whereas they tended to use words or phrases to think aloud when composing in English and often used Chinese to guide their thoughts and to deliberate on word choices. Substitution and avoidance were two common strategies that students used when unsure of how to express an idea in English. Focusing on the use of Chinese in the composing process, Wang and Wen (2002) conducted another think-aloud study involving English majors who represented different English proficiency levels. They found that students tended to depend on Chinese when managing their writing processes and generating and organizing ideas but were more likely to use English when undertaking task-examining and text-generating activities. The use of Chinese declined as a student’s English proficiency level increased. Both studies confirmed findings about ESL writing processes in other countries, such as the
nature of composing processes and the similarities and differences in writers when composing in their first and second languages. More importantly, both studies show that Chinese plays a positive, enabling role in students’ English writing processes.

In the rest of the paper, taking a multilingual and multimodal framework, we will propose both historical and practice-based approaches to studying L2 writing. Both approaches are grounded in an understanding of language as deeply historical, or as Valentine Voloshinov argues, language “is a purely historical phenomenon” (p. 82). The historical approach locates semiotic practices within wider social, cultural, global, and contexts methodologically drawing on archival research and oral histories. The practice-based approach focuses more squarely to the context of the here-and-now with more attention to real-time composing as it unfolds in an ongoing, dynamic, and emergent process co-constituted by a dynamic array of actors, texts, and objects. In this manner, the latter approach attends to history-in-the making as meanings are (re)produced. This process is a dialogue or struggle with historically situated meanings that are materialized or embodied in an array of signs-symbols (historically) sedimented with ideologies, meanings, values, and orientations that have accumulated through their use over time. In this manner, both historical and practice-based approaches foreground the complex manner in which a range of semiotic practices shape and are shaped by wider social structures in an ongoing, dynamic process. In this manner, we argue that the field of L2 writing needs to consider a broader restructuring of its approach with a focus on situated practices in which language is located as one resource within a wider rhetorical repertoire.

3 A historical approach to studying L2 writing practice

When students write in a second or foreign language, they cannot be completely divorced from the influence of their first language, a phenomenon SLA scholars have traditionally viewed as interference in L2 learning. Only recently have L2 writing researchers uncovered the positive effects that a first language can have in the L2 composing process. In a particular socio-cultural context, L1 often sneaks in and forms a complex relationship with L2. Archival research and student narratives in Duffy (2007), Fu (1995, 2003), Leki (2007), Shen (1989), Silva, Reichelt, Chikuma, Duval-Couetil, Mo, Velze-Rendon, & Wood (2002), and Spack (1998) have underscored the entanglement of multilingual and multicultural issues in ESL students’ learning of academic writing in the United States. Historical data shows that the L1 and L2 relationship cannot simply be described as interference or facilitation, as multiple cultural forces and writing technologies work through the nexus of the two (or more than two) linguistic systems and complicate their relations. Historically, L2 students composed their writing not only through the print medium but also via electronic technologies and stage performance delivered in front of a viewing audience (You, 2010, p. 157-161). Writing in English as a second language is a process in which one comes to terms with often conflicting or competing cultural forces and discourses.

The complex language relations and cultural forces wedded in L2 writing can be illustrated in a confessional tale told in the Chinese context. Established in 1879, St. John’s University (圣约翰大学) was one of thirteen American mission colleges in
Republican China (1912-1949), and one of the first schools in the country to teach English. Its student newspaper *St. John’s Echo*, founded as a bimonthly publication in 1890, claimed to be “the first paper published in the Orient by Chinese youths in a tongue foreign to them and only acquired after hard years of study” (“Greeting,” 1890, p. 1). Most articles published in the early years were originally written in English classes. Some students were fully engaged in the editorship. Writing and reasoning in English, however, was extremely challenging. One of the student editors recalled the amusing difficulty of having to negotiate with both Chinese and English and the imposing colonial forces:

To those who desired to make contributions to *The Echo* and aspired to become editors, they made resort to the Library a great deal in order to read current news from the English papers and also to read a large number of standard novels, especially those by Scott, Lytton, Washington Irving and the like. Once a young editor was assigned the political subject of the “Open Door Policy and the Spheres of Influence.” He worried for days and mumbled to himself their Chinese translation as “the way of opening a door and balls of powers.” He thought to himself the best [way] was to turn the knob in order to open the door and that to develop balls of power, all that was necessary was to learn to pitch hard. (St. John’s University, 1929, p. 49)

The essay topic dealt with the fact that after the Second Opium War in 1862 the Chinese market was forced open by Western powers who claimed exclusive trading rights in certain parts of the country, or “spheres of influence.” The quite tragicomic acts of turning the knob and pitching the ball ironically capture the complexity of transculturation, the process whereby the subordinated or marginalized select and invent from materials and discourses transmitted by a metropolitan culture. “Open door policy” and “spheres of influence” were both political terms too foreign and complex for the student to decode. For students struggling with the basics of English, writing for *St. John’s Echo* was a recursive process of translating between multiple cultural and linguistic codes. They tried to understand an English topic by translating it into their mother tongue; and they formulated ideas in Chinese and translated them into English.

In the above case, the publication outlets had some positive bearing in the L2 composing process. The media’s potential reach to other cultures and peoples influenced the student’s choice of topics and language. The editorials were composed for a magazine with a circulation not only in China but also in Western nations. The magazine stated in its first issue, “The West is still ignorant of many things concerning the Chinese nation, its literature and customs, and we will strive to tell you something about them in a simple and unpretentious way” (“Greeting,” 1890, p. 1). To enlighten the West about China, the students were assigned to address issues that would potentially engage a Western audience. English conjured up a sense of cosmopolitanism in the students, a sense of writing to a reader of ethnic, linguistic, and cultural differences. ESL and EFL writers are customarily told to address the so-called native speakers, although their writings are usually read by their teachers and peers. The young *St. John’s Echo* writer, however, truly wrote for native speakers. The attention to the circulation of the print media is a first step to consider multimodality in L2 writing from a historical perspective.

4 A practice-based approach to studying L2 writing processes

To develop a theoretical and methodological framework for studying writing
processes first and foremost necessitates an interrogation of the term writing itself. Traditionally more narrowly understood as single acts of inscription occurring in bounded moments, scholars such as Prior (1998) and Blommaert argue that these traditional representations of writing are often too compressed and mask a much wider, more complex process: “The complexity that is hidden by the simple word ‘writing’ is tremendous, and many studies of writing have been plagued by the legacies of this suggestive simplicity, assuming a degree of homogeneity in the practices of writing, and their products and functions, which can no longer be sustained” (p. 4). This more complex understanding necessitates a broader definition of writing more widely conceived of as an assemblage or constellation of practices. For instance, the writing of an article by a Chinese scholar for an academic English language journal may involve an array of multilingual activities: conversations in conferences or at dinner table (in Chinese), email exchanges (in a mixture of Chinese and English), readings and research across academic journals (in English), jottings and notes (in Chinese), comments from editors (in English), instant messages, phone conversations, internet searches, and an array of other activities. Mapping out these activities is necessary to develop a more comprehensive understanding of writers in multilingual and multimodal (text, talk, image, gesture) contexts.

**Ecologies.** First and foremost this framework adopts an ecological approach. This is a move away from static and bounded definitions of language and towards one as dynamic, changing, and co-constituted by the participants. In this manner, we might understand language as writers are situated within complex ecologies shaping and shaped by their everyday practices. At the broadest level, useful for understanding the manner in which writers are situated within wider institutional, cultural, and global contexts is what Hawisher et al. refer to as cultural ecologies:

“In both global and local contexts the relationships among digital technologies, language, literacy, and an array of opportunities are complexly structured and articulated within a constellation of existing, social, cultural, economic, historical, and ideological factors that constitute a cultural ecology of literacy. These ecological systems continually shape, and are shaped by people (Giddens)—at a variety of levels and in arrange of ways—as they live out their daily lives in technological and cultural settings. (p. 619)

The study of writing then requires attention to the ways that literate activities (a term referring to the practices surrounding writing including notes, talk, reading, etc.) are deeply woven into a constellation of factors intersecting with gender, nationality, ethnicity that shape and are shaped by everyday language practices (broadly defined). These ecologies are always a “site of contestation between emerging, competing, changing, accumulating, and fading languages and literacies” (p. 629). These wider cultural ecologies can further be mapped onto what Clay
Spinuzzi refers to as genre ecologies. This concept refers to the manner in which complex constellations of texts coordinate activity. For instance, one might observe the ways classroom activity is jointly coordinated by student laptops, blackboards, notepads, textbooks, and assignment sheets. While Spinuzzi was referring primarily to durable texts within institutional contexts, we might further examine the ways non-durable and evanescent texts are also part of these genre ecologies, such as the classroom genre Initiation-Respond-Evaluate (IRE), in which the teacher initiates a question, the students respond, and the teacher evaluates. It is important to emphasize that such structures are not conceived of as static or bounded, but as “stabilized for now” (Schryer) or fluid, fuzzy, dynamic, and dialogic. By further mapping on Hawisher et al.’s concept of cultural ecologies, we can complicate this analysis through closer attention to the blending of constellations of wider historical, social, cultural, national, and global factors.

**Knotworking.** The second concept is the notion of knotworking (Engeström, Engeström, & Vähäaho) or the continual tying and untying of genres, objects, texts, and people. This is the process through which ecologies are co-constituted, improvised, shaped, and re-formed. As Fleckenstein et al. argue, the ecological metaphor imagines writing as a web of interlocking social, material, and semiotic relationships and practices conceptualized as clusters or “knots” (394). This framework is key for studying literacy practices as the “knotty” nature of such interdiscursive complexity is what we must seek to understand” (Irvine, “Knots” 72). To illustrate with an example from a classroom, for instance, we might examine how a classroom conversation in Chinese is rewoven into student notes in English and how those notes are later used at home as part of a new “knot” (in conjunction with other texts) to write a paper. These knots furthermore shape the fluid and fuzzy pathways shaping the fluid of discourse, the alignments and positioning of the participants, and topics taken up for discussion.

**Entextualization.** Third, to trace the circulation of signs-symbols across the fluid, fuzzy pathways created by knotworking, we draw on Baumann and Brigg’s (1990) “entextualization” or the lifting of language (broadly defined) out of one context and relocating it in another (as illustrated in the classroom example). In this manner, one can trace the ways that signs and symbols—including English—are rewoven, reworked, and remediated across space and time. While there have been a number of related concepts used to describe this phenomenon, particularly useful for conceptualizing this process is Bakhtin’s double voicing (foregrounding the ways that language is socially charged with “tastes” and “accents”). This concept challenges the myth of the individual speaking with only his or her own voice, but instead language is always “double voiced” or charged with the “tastes” and “accents” of the wider culture in a process that involves tension, friction, and struggle. Extending the notion to all signs-symbols—including sound, gesture, image—one might move for instance from the concept of “double voicing” to “double vision” as a lens for conceptualizing all designs as redesigns or responses to earlier designs (New London Group, 2000).

**Actant-Network Theory.** Fourth, Latour’s actant-network theory erases the binary between objects and people; together the tools and individuals make up what he calls a third agent, as individuals shape the tools and in turn the tools shape the individuals. This
move expands our notion of conversation; human actors are no longer only in dialogue with one another, but also with other texts and tools. In the classroom, for instance, we might understand students and teachers as engaged in a (multilingual) dialogue with textbooks, webpages, assignment sheets, conversations inside and outside classroom, and so forth. Each of these texts and objects is imbued with “affordances” that shape and are shaped by their uptake. Space then is not a static backdrop or stage against which activity takes place, but co-constituted by the participants and deeply bound up in a process of entextualization.

In sum, these four analytic perspectives provide a framework for examining the links between structure and agency with L2 writers conceptualized as “knotworkers” tying and untying languages, objects, texts, and people. This process is an ongoing struggle as individuals act on the tools, and the tools act on them with multilingualism and multimodality deeply bound up in this process. Methodologically this framework necessitates tracing activity across texts and talk as language is continually woven and rewoven into everyday practices.

To provide an example of how this works in practice we draw on Fraiberg’s (in press) ethnographic research on the high-tech industry in Israeli society. The snapshot is from a high-tech startup company that was newly formed and occupied four back rooms on the seventh floor of an investment bank overlooking the high-tech center buildings outside central Tel Aviv. Centered on the production of a Web 2.0 application, the workers were busily engaged in an array of multilingual and multimodal practices as they composed emails, instant messages, text messages, notes, information on white boards, and conversed on wireless phones and face-to-face conversations with each other about workplace and non-workplace issues (often involving stories, jokes, gossip). English and Hebrew were deeply bound up in these practices co-constituting fluid and dynamic ecologies. These ecologies were further distributed across other spaces as the workers moved from room to room for interactions and meetings (in a mixture of Hebrew-English). These activities also spilled into conversations over business lunches at the local restaurants that catered to the high-tech clientele. A situated approach necessitates tracing this activity across all of these contexts with attention to the manner in which they form complex ecologies that mediate everyday workplace practices and shape the “flow” of signs and symbols.

The primary activities at the company centered around designing online polls with a question and five answers. To briefly provide a snap shot of this activity, I turn to a primary hub within the company—a sparse room housing three of the participants—serving as a focal point in a fluid, complex ecology. Developing these polls typically involved searching, selecting, filtering, and repurposing videos, blogs, gossip columns, newspapers, and an array other texts that were part of an ever-changing (and sometimes seemingly never-changing) popular culture scene. One example, for instance, was a poll incorporating a picture of a man and a small plastic figurine in his likeness. Placed over this picture was this question, “Would you pay $425 to have your action figure?” In this case, action figure was an American term that referred to plastic replicas of superheroes that boys commonly play with. The user could vote on one of three English options and view the tallied results.

The following is a brief excerpt of a conversation involved in the construction of
In this everyday mundane and routine example, the two participants were looking at the website itself as they reviewed it to explore the content and determine if it would provide suitable material for a poll. The activity, which involved frequent comments about the text and images, was jointly coordinated as they read English text from the screen and then discussed it in Hebrew.

Yafit: po roim beikar dogmaot shel... lo mukarim.

Here we see [scrolling through the site], mostly samples [of characters of dolls] not well known [famous].

…. Is it possible [to say], “Would you pay this amount?”

ah ve za kol copy ze arbaim dolar im ata roze kama.

Ah, and then each copy is forty dollars if you want additional.

az ma ata omer, she ze yehiye kaxa o she would you pay ze ve ze.

So what do you say, should we leave it like that? Or would you pay this and this?

Gal: Would you pay kesef? // looks over at the screen and reads

Would you pay money?

Yafit: et ha shum haze, make your [not understood] o sheela aheret?

This amount, make your [not understood] or a different question?

Such mundane interactions were part of a jointly mediated collaborative composing process. The online form on which polls were created also allowed the users—or “pollsters” as they were called—to embed videos, sounds, and links along with a question and five answers. This template for creating these polls then served as a stabilized-for-now genre that structured (and was structured by) the activities. There were also other structures, spaces, actors, and languages (including Hebrew and English)—sedimented with ideologies, orientations, and affordances—jointly mediating this activity as part of a fluid, dynamic, and changing ecology. It was not uncommon, for instance, for other participants to join in an contribute to the poll or for the various participants to use an online Hebrew-English dictionaries. Further complicating these scenes, the participants would regularly contact colleagues in the United States as they requested help with translations through email and online chats (typically in a mixture of Hebrew-English). These exchanges often occurred in conjunction with other chats (with as many as three occurring simultaneously) and emails with those physically present in the room (as electronic and face-to-face exchanges intermixed). Attention to this weaving and reweaving is key for developing a more comprehensive picture of multilingual and multimodal activity. Collecting data for such activities might entail audio recordings, screen captures, video recordings, the collection of sticky notes, images on white boards, emails, and interviews to develop a thick description. The aim would be provide a sense of the ways that space, gestures, objects, language, and texts shaped and coordinated the alignments and activities of the various participants in the interaction. It is furthermore through close attention to this process that we could trace the flow of language (and other signs-symbols) as they were taken up, resisted, and transformed across physical and virtual spaces. In this manner, we might understand the manner in which English was glocalized into situated practice.
5 Conclusion

The socio-constructive and multiliteracies turns have increasingly called our attention to the complex language relations in L2 writers’ composing process. Research on L2 writing and literacy studies has convincingly showed that L2 composing processes are mediated by multiple languages and often by several non-linguistic representational systems. The incorporation of the insights of multilingual writing research into the L2 writing class remains a critical issue. The challenges of knowledge transfer have come partly from the prevalence of a monolingual, nationalist ideology which privileges a single linguistic code standardized based on native speakers. This ideology negates or downplays the positive role of other languages, dialects, tools, and modalities in student writing.

In this paper, we proposed a multilingual and multimodal framework for studying L2 writing processes using historical and practice-based approaches. Using archival research and oral histories, an historical approach will help uncover how historically writers have mobilized their multilingual and multimodal resources while negotiating with the imposing monolingual, modernist ideology. The practice-based approach offers four major theoretical constructs to examine how L2 writers tie or untie genres, objects, texts, and people in and across texts within cultural ecologies. By proposing a multilingual and multimodal framework, we hope that both researchers and teachers can more consciously combat the monolingual, modernist ideology and better connect students’ in-school and out-of-school literacy practice in their research and teaching.

Notes:
1 Spinuzzi uses genre ecologies to examine micro, meso, and macroscopic levels of activity within institutional contexts. In his work, the contradictions at one scope (e.g., macro-institutional policies) are linked to breakdowns at another (e.g., micro-incorrect key stroke). This research extends the application of genre ecologies to show the ways they are linked not only to institutional but also to cultural, national, and global contexts. In addition, this research shows how the concept can be extended to the study multilingualism and the tracing of linguistic and cultural flows.
2 This process has been variously referred to by scholars as compound mediation (Spinuzzi), textual coordination (Slattery), and environmental selection and structuring practices (Prior and Shipka).

References:


Selfe, C. (2009). The movement of air, the breath of meaning: Aurality and multimodal composing. College Composition and Communication,60 (4), 616-663.


St. John’s University. (1929). *St. John’s University, 1879–1929*. Shanghai.


Wang, W., & Wen, Q. (2002). L1 use in the L2 composing process: An exploratory study of 16


**作者简介**：游晓晔，美国宾夕法尼亚州立大学英语系副教授，博士。

**研究方向**：比较修辞学、多语写作。