

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments vii

Transnational Writing Program Administration: An Introduction
David S. Martins 1

PART I: TRANSNATIONAL POSITIONING

- 1 Deconstructing “Writing Program Administration” in an International Context
Chris M. Anson and Christiane Donahue 21
 - 2 Tech Travels: Connecting Writing Classes across Continents
Alyssa O’Brien and Christine Alfano 48
 - 3 The First-Year Writing Seminar Program at Weill Cornell Medical College – Qatar: Balancing Tradition, Culture, and Innovation in Transnational Writing Instruction
Alan S. Weber, Krystyna Golkowska, Ian Miller, Rodney Sharkey, Mary Ann Rishel, and Autumn Watts 72
 - 4 Adaptation across Space and Time: Revealing Pedagogical Assumptions
Danielle Zawodny Wetzel and Dudley W. Reynolds 93
 - 5 So Close, Yet So Far: Administering a Writing Program with a Bahamian Campus
Shanti Bruce 117
 - 6 Exploring the Contexts of US–Mexican Border Writing Programs
Beth Brunk-Chavez, Kate Mangelsdorf, Patricia Wojahn, Alfredo Urzua-Beltran, Omar Montoya, Barry Thatcher, and Kathryn Valentine 138
- ## **PART II: TRANSNATIONAL LANGUAGE**
- 7 Global Writing Theory and Application on the US–Mexico Border
Barry Thatcher, Omar Montoya, and Kelly Medina-López 163
 - 8 Globalization and Language Difference: A Mesodiscursive Approach
Hem Paudel 202

- 9 (Re-)Situating Translingual Work for Writing Program Administration in Cross-National and Cross-Language Perspectives from Lebanon and Singapore

Nancy Bou Ayash 226

- 10 Discourses of Internationalization and Diversity in US Universities and Writing Programs

Christine M. Tardy 243

PART III: TRANSNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT

- 11 Disposable Drudgery: Outsourcing Goes to College

Rebecca Dingo, Rachel Riedner, and Jennifer Wingard 265

- 12 Economies of Composition: Mapping Transnational Writing Programs in US Community Colleges

Wendy Olson 289

- 13 From “Educating the Other” to Cross-Boundary Knowledge-Making: Globally Networked Learning Environments as Critical Sites of Writing Program Administration

Doreen Starke-Meyerring 307

Afterword

Bruce Horner 332

About the Contributors 343

Index 345

TRANSNATIONAL WRITING PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

An Introduction

David S. Martins

- A professor in the United States “outsources” the grading of student writing to Bangalore, India
- Globally networked learning environments (GNLEs) connect students located in multiple countries, speaking different languages, to collaborate on writing
- Multicultural and multilingual students increasingly enroll at US-based community colleges and universities
- Student learning outcomes focused on cultural and language difference aim to “internationalize” first-year composition (FYC) curricula
- US-based colleges and universities establish international branch campuses
- Writing Program Administrations (WPAs) from the United States travel to countries around the globe to consult with faculty and administrators on developing writing programs
- Institutional and writing program websites target global and local audiences

The scenarios above provide just a few examples of how the “global” shapes and impacts the “local” contexts for writing programs. While local conditions remain at the forefront of WPA, transnational activities are thoroughly shifting the questions we ask about writing curricula, the space and place in which writing happens, and the cultural and linguistic issues at the heart of the relationships forged in literacy work. In the global expansion of higher education, the tension between economic and pedagogical interests strongly influences decisions made about what kinds of programs to offer and how to offer them. Writing teachers and administrators involved in the creation or development of international programs must negotiate these tensions based upon what they know and value about learning, teaching, and writing. This collection of essays demonstrates how “transnational writing program administration” challenges taken-for-granted assumptions regarding

program identity, curriculum and pedagogical effectiveness, logistics and quality assurance, faculty and student demographics, innovative partnerships and research, and the infrastructure needed to support writing instruction in higher education. In the process, *Transnational Writing Program Administration* extends the theoretical underpinnings of WPA to consider programs, activities, and institutions that involve students and faculty from two or more countries working together and highlights the situated practices of such efforts. The collection brings multilingual graduate students at the forefront of writing studies together with established administrators, teachers, and researchers and examines the practices and theories that impact our conceptions of WPA as transnational.

My own introduction to transnational WPA came in 2009, when I started work at Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT) as the FYC program director. Although I knew the institute had multiple international branch locations, I was not thinking about them in relation to the first-year writing program until I received an email from a faculty member at RIT Croatia, in Dubrovnik, Croatia, asking permission to alter the RIT first-year writing curriculum to be more appropriate for the Croatian students in her class. Until that question was asked, I had not realized the specific ways my administrative work was, and would need to be, shaped by international contexts. Exemplifying the speeds at which globalization produces changes in higher education, my colleagues and supervisors at the time were initially unable to clarify my responsibilities with respect to curriculum development, assessment, or faculty development for RIT's branch locations. As the WPA, I was clearly working in conditions not of my own making, conditions which seemed increasingly influenced more by economic interests (e.g., potential revenue and risk management) than educational ones (e.g., student learning and faculty engagement).

By posing a simple question about her freedom to restructure the assignments in the course she teaches, my Dubrovnik colleague revealed two distinct, yet ultimately productive tensions: (1) the efficacy of current curricular structures for writing instruction at the two campuses, and (2) the degree of autonomy and control experienced by faculty teaching in the writing program. As the new FYC program director, I didn't understand the curricular connections between the two schools and was not at all clear about my role at any of the three branch campuses with respect to program assessment, curriculum design, and faculty professional development. Receiving these questions as I did challenged what had been a comfortable sense of the nature and scope of

my work. But even more provocative was my uncertainty about the relevance of the learning outcomes and activities of FYC for the students enrolled at RIT and its branch campuses.¹

Much has changed for me since my introduction to transnational WPA work. Since 2009, the administrators, faculty, students, and staff at RIT have been learning together about the rapidly changing transnational contexts of our teaching, learning, and literacy practice. Now, as the director of the university writing program, which includes FYC, writing across the curriculum (WAC), and a writing commons, I continually reframe and challenge the habits of thinking that inform my decisions about structuring writing programs. This collection represents my attempt to draw together some of the generative work being done in an emerging area of inquiry in writing program administration.

It is now taken for granted that, in the twenty-first century, US higher education is changing dramatically. According to the Institute of International Education (2010), there were 723,277 international students studying in the United States, a 32% increase since 2000/2001. The number of US students studying abroad has more than doubled in the last decade, with 270,604 in 2009/2010 compared to 129,770 in 1998/1999. The number of international branch campuses (IBCs) has also increased dramatically: according to a survey conducted by the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education, there were 200 degree-granting IBCs in 2011, compared to 162 branches identified in 2009, and less than 82 in 2006 (Lawton and Katsomitros 2012). Although there appears to be a slowdown in the number of IBCs being established, the kinds of partnerships being developed in countries like China and India are expanding, where national regulations restrict the type of relationships foreign institutions can have in those countries (Lewin 2012). For example, according to the Council of Graduate Schools, in 2008, 38% of US grad schools had international joint or dual-degree programs, up from 29% in 2007. An additional 31% of programs were instituted in 2009 (Skorton 2012). As the numbers of students traveling abroad—both to and from the United States—increases, as the number of cross-border programs also increases, and as online education becomes a more integrated facet of higher education, it is even more critical for WPAs to understand the specific opportunities and challenges of doing their work in transnational contexts.

“Transnational” can mean many different things. In their book *Transnational Education: Issues and Trends in Offshore Higher Education*, Grant McBurnie and Christopher Ziguras define transnational education as

“any education delivered by an institution based in one country to students located in another” (McBurnie and Ziguras 2007, 1). While this notion of “transnational” clearly signals a changing relationship between institutions and students, its presumption of a one-way flow maintains a hierarchical relationship that privileges the position of the *delivering* institution, its pedagogical and curricular ideologies, its administrative structures, and often its labor and workplace practices. Unlike “global” or “international,” the term “transnational” typically invokes a more critical, analytical orientation like that described by Wendy S. Hesford and Eileen E. Schell in the introduction to their *College English* special issue on transnational feminist rhetorics. Hesford and Schell (2008) argue that in rhetoric and composition, the term “transnational” has too often not been used in ways that recognize how “transnationality challenges traditional understandings of context” or “how all national formations are constructed within and often solidified by transnational connectivities” (464). The chapters in this collection do challenge our understanding of context, and draw specific attention to the connections forged in transnational work, by providing rich, critical descriptions of emerging activities of writing programs and deliberately paying attention to the relationships—personal and institutional, educational and economic—that produce those activities. Each chapter draws from and extends rhetoric and composition scholarship, and each aims to present a variety of methods and approaches for contributing to a more nuanced conversation about learning, teaching, and administration in transnational contexts.

Since the mid-1990s, there have been a growing number of publications in fields related to WPA discussing internationalization and the impact of globalization on writing instruction. In-press discussions have focused on a broad range of issues. Ever present in these discussions is a keen awareness of and attention to changes in the “local” contexts of writing programs, and of the ideological and political positioning that enables WPAs to serve as agents in bringing about meaningful change for students, faculty, and institutions. What these conversations reveal is that a prevalent activity for researchers and scholars in writing program-related fields has been a form of reckoning with disciplinary and institutional histories. Authors have historicized, come to terms with, critiqued, and attempted to rearticulate the various assumptions—about writing, learning, work, education, capitalism, politics, identity—that have shaped the narratives and practices of disciplinary research, pedagogy, and administration, as well as institutional structures and positions. This collection participates in this disciplinary ethos. Specifically, three

interrelated themes shape the organization of this book: transnational positioning, transnational language, and transnational engagement.

TRANSNATIONAL POSITIONING

One lesson learned over the past twenty years of scholarship in rhetoric and composition is that, by offering writing teachers and administrators opportunities to see the localness of their work, transnational writing programs counter assumptions of the universality of writing instruction. For example, in 1995, Muchiri, Mulamba, Myers, and Ndoloi (1995, 176) dramatically demonstrated what composition researchers, teachers, and administrators “take for granted what is local to their institutions and nation.” The authors describe a range of experiences that students in Kenya, Tanzania, and Zaire often have as they journey from their homes to the major city centers where the universities they are attending are located. The authors also highlight the experiences of faculty, who may themselves have extremely limited access to academic resources for research; there simply isn’t access to academic texts, and the texts that are available may be dated. Within such contexts, the ability of students to see themselves engaged in a “world of research and debate” cannot be taken for granted: “The ‘research site’ that takes up so much of many composition handbooks seems to assume the student links into a network of new knowledge, through the library and the teacher. Composition teachers may forget just how fragile these links are” (188). Effectively, Muchiri and her colleagues remind all writing instructors and program administrators of the limitations of approaching US composition activities and structures from a narrow, local, privileged, Western view.

Extending the work of Murchiri and her colleagues in “Beyond These Shores: An Argument for Internationalizing Composition,” Mark Schaub draws from his seven-year experience as a US-trained WPA working in Egypt to show how composition is an “isolationist discipline” (Schaub 2003, 89–95), and offers suggestions for (1) “how the field of composition can expand its horizons beyond North America,” and (2) how to “make our classrooms more global.” After noticing a waning of energy and urgency to internationalize writing instruction following the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, Schaub aims to encourage writing teachers and administrators to avoid “returning to isolationist thinking in our classrooms.” Significantly, such isolationist thinking remains prevalent, but energetic voices have reinvigorated efforts to combat such thinking by offering clear methods of analysis and strategies for changing practices.

Christiane Donahue (2009), for example, critiques what she terms the “discourses of internationalization” as they relate to scholarly work and the teaching of writing, speech, and academic or scientific writing activities. She argues, “The U.S. picture of writing around the globe—its teaching, its learning, and our theories about these—has been highly partial, portraying the issue in particular ways, largely export-based, that I believe might create obstacles for U.S. scholars’ thinking and thus impede effective collaboration or ‘hearing’ of work across borders” (214). She presents a provocative and complex portrait of “some of the linguistic, cultural, and discursive challenges in the discourses of internationalizing composition studies and how they suggest we might be misimagining our global roles and positions” (215). In this way, Donahue foregrounds the location of US composition teaching and scholarly work and attempts to reinvigorate the broader conversation about writing instruction and research. Donahue concludes her article by answering the question, “What can we, as a field, no longer do without?”:

We need international work because we can no longer do without deep understanding as the world shifts and slips. We need the ability to negotiate that comes from deep intercultural awareness; the ability to shift in understanding of our global position; the research trends and strong methods other scholars have developed; the deep familiarity with other systems and contexts, developed in so much more than the occasional encounter, fulfilling but exotic; the suspicion about market forces at work in the more glib general discussions about the value in internationalizing higher education. Without these, our “internationalizing” efforts will remain stuck in a-historical, a-contextual, and highly partial modes of intellectual tourism. (236)

In calling for deep intercultural awareness, familiarity with other relevant research trends and methods, other systems and contexts for education and research, and continued vigilance of economic factors, Donahue asserts her commitment to an ideal of self-awareness that relates to broader, cross-cultural, cross-linguistic understanding and experience. While the day-to-day pressures of teaching in and administering a writing program keep attention focused on “local” issues, concerns and problems, Donahue encourages an expanded sense of location.²

The recent publication of *Writing Programs Worldwide: Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places* (Thaiss et al. 2012) presents an amazing portrait of writing instruction worldwide. As Chris Thaiss explains in his introduction, the editors’ intent for the collection, in both its print and online versions, was “to inform decision-making by teachers, program managers, and college/university administrators in regard to how

writing is conceived of, managed, funded and taught in higher education” (5). Through their efforts to build community, identify trends, and present rich diversity, the editors have provided an explicit presence to the expanding locations of writing instruction. Similarly, the chapters that comprise part 1 of this book further demonstrate the problems of the “export model” of international higher education, revealing an emerging internationalist perspective on the design and delivery of writing programs. In the process, these chapters effectively call into being new geographies and actualize new visions of teaching and learning.

Starting with a challenge to the basic definitions, Chris Anson and Christiane Donahue argue in chapter 1 that the common association of the term “writing program” with the teaching of college composition in the United States blinds us to the complex ways in which writing is programmatically woven into the teaching and research missions of higher education institutions around the world. Their chapter first complicates the standard historical narrative of WPA positions and works to construct a framework for analyzing the three sample “programs” they profile. Then, drawing on their experiences visiting and consulting at two institutions in Europe and one in Saudi Arabia, Anson and Donahue demonstrate the ways in which methods of instruction and research on writing are created from and adapt to the context-specific educational, curricular, and cultural needs and interests of their institutions. Chapter 1 demonstrates the value added from a different kind of conversation, one that does not focus on identifying where the “writing programs” are or who the “WPAs” are, but rather explores from a global perspective—and across institutional contexts—the activities, disciplines, and institutional structures and missions that utilize, study, and support writing in higher education.

The role of technology in the expansion of transnational locations of writing classrooms is significant. In chapter 2, “Tech Travels: Connecting Writing Classes across Continents,” Alyssa O’Brien and Christine Alfano report on research funded through a grant from the Wallenberg Global Learning Network (WGLN). Their chapter describes the technological and pedagogical accommodations required when students work in globally-distributed teams on writing. Building on five years of work connecting university students across Asia, Europe, and the Middle East, O’Brien and Alfano share their research on writing in multimodal formats through virtual connections—not only blogging and video conferences, but also gaming and Second Life sessions engaging students in Sweden, Egypt, and the United States; Skype-facilitated peer review exchanges between Stanford and Singapore; and Polycom, class-to-class

collaborative activities between Russia and the United States. In addition to its focus on strategies for adapting practices of traditional institutional settings and modifying technological apparatuses for collaborative learning in multimodal classrooms, chapter 2 explores the learning that can make such collaborations so much more than “simply” an exciting experience.

Cultural expectations for education are highlighted in the export of US-style education practices to the Middle East, as shown in two related chapters. For example, Alan S. Weber, Krystyna Golkowska, Ian Miller, Mary Ann Rishel, Rodney Sharkey, and Autumn Watts present a reflective case study in chapter 3, “The First-Year Writing Seminar Program at Weill Cornell Medical College—Qatar: Balancing Tradition, Culture, and Innovation in Transnational Writing Instruction.” Based explicitly on the curricula of the main campus of Cornell University in Ithaca, New York, the faculty of the newly formed program has struggled to adapt the American-style writing instruction developed at the Knight Writing Institute in Ithaca for their unique group of learners. The authors conclude their chapter by describing efforts to promote the development of a literacy culture in which faculty and students negotiate strikingly different attitudes toward literature, identity, and textuality. In the second chapter focusing on writing programs in Qatar, Danielle Zawodny Wetzel and Dudley W. Reynolds trace four years of course materials from the FYC program at Carnegie Mellon University’s Pittsburgh and Qatar campuses. Paying particular attention to the changes made over four years, their analysis of the linguistic and pedagogical assumptions behind those materials reveals an evolution in perspectives on curriculum, placement policy, program structure, and staffing. While the earlier course materials show a strong, unidirectional influence from the Pittsburgh campus to the Qatar campus, the later materials show a bidirectional influence between the two campuses, supporting the definition of a transnational program as one that is emergent, dynamic, and a site for collaboration. Zawodny Wetzel and Reynolds argue that perhaps one of the greatest challenges for transnational programs is determining the relationship between campuses and to what extent a global program is or needs to be homogeneous across campuses. Chapter 4 concludes that aspects of such relationships are determined contractually, but most of the relationship is negotiated between faculty at each location based on their perceptions of local and contextualized needs. “Adaptation Across Space and Time: Revealing Pedagogical Assumptions” argues that writing program administrators must approach a transnational writing program as dynamic and emergent rather than static or homogeneous.

Leadership is another compelling factor influencing the development of transnational writing programs. In chapter 5, “So Close, Yet So Far: Administering a Writing Program with a Bahamian Campus,” Shanti Bruce encourages transnational WPAs to take what leadership scholars call an “unnatural leadership” approach and teach in an international classroom themselves in order to understand how the program works locally. Chapter 5 focuses on Nova Southeastern University’s Bahamian campus, and includes discussions of various factors that significantly influence the design, experience, and impact of transnational writing programs: the international commute, “island time,” classroom culture and language differences, and even weather conditions. Bruce urges WPAs to acknowledge the material consequences of seemingly trivial factors on pedagogy and program effectiveness.

The last chapter of part I highlights the importance of developing writing program infrastructure based on complex understanding of language difference among international and domestic students. In “Exploring the Contexts of US-Mexican Border Writing Programs,” Beth Brunk-Chavez, Kate Mangelsdorf, Patricia Wojahn, Alfredo Urzua-Beltran, Omar Montoya, Barry Thatcher, and Kathryn Valentine highlight productive, programmatic responses to the ideological blinders that too often lead institutions to create more robust structures (though also often still inadequate) for supporting international students, leaving domestic students for whom English is not a first language with insufficient support. For these authors, the US-Mexico border region is a dynamic rhetorical space, presenting WPAs with a variety of challenges and opportunities to create effective placement mechanisms, develop dynamic curricula and writing pedagogies, identify productive institutional and programmatic collaborations, and design additional structures for supporting linguistic and culturally diverse students. Still, with all the efforts these authors document from their work in two border institutions, they acknowledge that much more work in this area is needed.

TRANSNATIONAL LANGUAGE

One immediate implication of transnational education, and one that has received critical attention within rhetoric and composition, is language difference. Part II: Transnational Language addresses language difference by expanding upon disciplinary discussions that have focused on “monolingualistic ideologies” in the teaching of college composition (see Canagarajah 2002; Horner and Lu 2008; Horner, Lu, and Matsuda 2010;

Horner, Lu, Royster, and Trimbur 2011; Horner and Trimbur 2002; Shuck 2006) and second language writers (Matsuda 1997; Matsuda, Fruit, Lee, and Lamm 2006; Silva 1990). These chapters provide provocative new methods for analyzing and understanding language differences in specific, transnational contexts.

Transnational writing programs offer particularly compelling opportunities to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the heterogeneity and fluctuating nature of the writing experienced in writing classes, and ultimately the efficacy of individual courses and program curricula. Still, the challenge for transnational writing teachers and administrators will be to take advantage of these opportunities. In the companion piece to the earlier chapter on border institutions, Barry Thatcher, Omar Montoya, and Kelly Medina-López offer a method and practice for taking advantage of those opportunities by developing a more nuanced understanding of language difference in writing classes. Drawing on analytical methods from linguistics and contrastive rhetoric, chapter 7 presents an “etic-then-emic” approach that enables the authors to engage meaningfully with “the predominant features of US writing curriculum as exemplified on the US-Mexico border.” After characterizing varied border rhetorics and their related groups of students, the authors examine how these six groups might bring dynamic, contested, and complex rhetorical combinations of border rhetoric to the US writing classroom. The chapter concludes by briefly evaluating current curricula at New Mexico State University and The University of Texas at El Paso.

In their opinion essay appearing in *College English*, “Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach,” Horner, Lu, Royster, and Trimbur (2011) called for a new disciplinary and pedagogical schema. The authors counter what they term as “traditional” and “accommodationist” approaches to language difference with a “translingual approach” that “sees difference in language not as a barrier to overcome or as a problem to manage, but as a resource for producing meaning in writing, speaking, reading, and listening” (303). Transnational writing programs expand meaning-making activities by offering writing teachers and administrators opportunities to develop new approaches to language difference in the writing classroom.

Hem Sharma Paudel develops just such a new approach to language difference in chapter 8, “Globalization and Language Difference: A Mesodiscursive Approach.” Through a critique of four major approaches to language difference—world Englishes, English as a lingua franca, defense of national language, and the numerical model of

multilingualism—Paudel endeavors to “develop a theory of translanguaging agency that, first, seeks to go beyond the paradigms of the dominant language theories that regard languages as discrete and stable entities and, second, also critiques the romanticized version of multilingual agency, where multilinguals are represented as naturally capable of shuttling across languages.” He proposes a “mesodiscursive” approach to language difference that acknowledges the intermediary space between the poles of language fixity and radical contingency, and focuses on how language users create subtle differences in meaning while also imitating dominant discourse patterns. Such an approach enables writing teachers and administrators to see the difficulty of transforming language practice, due to the stabilizing forces that largely limit transformative potentials of language users.

Since the publication of “English Only and College Composition” (Horner and Trimbur 2002), WPAs have continued to extend and elaborate on the role of linguistic ideologies in the development of writing programs, their policies, and their related infrastructure. In the process, these conversations have set the stage for more systematic change in US writing instruction. On the level of institutional practice, for example, Gail Shuck (2006) takes seriously the challenge offered by Horner and Trimbur, and works to implement the ideas they articulate. By doing so, she demonstrates the immense task faced by transnational WPAs. As coordinator of the English language support programs at Boise State University, Shuck describes her efforts (1) to counter a monolingual ideology, while at the same time (2) acknowledging her complicity in that ideology because of its pervasive structuration of institutional positions, curricular structures, and placement and assessment practices. Throughout her essay, Shuck speaks to the infrastructures of composition that can be rethought in direct response to the classroom and institutional activities imagined as a counter to *monolingual ideologies*.

The last two chapters in part 2 focus on the relationship between language and writing program infrastructure. In chapter 9, “(Re-)Situating Translanguaging Work for Writing Program Administration in Cross-National and Cross-Language Perspectives from Lebanon and Singapore,” Nancy Bou Ayash situates issues of (1) the multiplicity of language use “on the ground,” (2) language policies, and (3) writing pedagogy within broader sociocultural, geopolitical, and economic changes. Paying special attention to how each issue informs and is informed by the other, she presents cross-national and cross-linguistic perspectives from the multilingual sites of the US, Singapore, and Lebanon. Exploring the differential treatment of language difference in policies and practices

in these different locations, this comparative analysis offers US WPAs a more nuanced understanding of the possibilities for developing and institutionalizing translanguaging in US-based writing programs.

In chapter 10, “Discourses of Internationalization and Diversity in US Universities and Writing Programs,” Christine M. Tardy explores the dominant discourses surrounding internationalization and diversity, which are created and reinforced in US higher education through the public texts of university and writing program websites. While such genres have a primarily promotional aim, and their expressions of identity and ideology may or may not reflect actual institutional practices, these public texts are important for their role in establishing privileged norms and ideologies. Tardy presents a multimodal critical discourse analysis of the public websites of twenty-eight US universities and their writing programs, aiming to identify (1) the dominant discourses of internationalization and diversity as presented through these texts, and (2) the place and role of language within these discourses. Her findings illustrate a general neglect of language and relatively little emphasis on internationalization within the websites of writing programs. The chapter concludes by considering the ways in which writing programs are influenced by dominant university discourses, as well as how they might appropriate or disrupt these discourses to reflect program values that are desirable for meeting the challenges of writing in a globalized world.

TRANSNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT

Disciplinary conversations in composition, rhetoric, and literacy studies reveal a strong commitment to understanding the politics and pedagogy, the theory and practice, and the technologies and languages of literacy education conceived in globalized terms. Along with the recent discussions concerning “English only” or “monolingual ideologies” mentioned above, rhetoric and composition scholars have engaged directly with critiques of what Wendy Hesford (2006) calls the “global turn” in disciplinary activities. Margaret Himley (2003), for example, writes in “Writing Programs and Pedagogies in a Globalized Landscape” about her critical review of the required FYC sequence at Syracuse University. She describes what a writing program can teach about authorship in a world organized by fast capitalism and saturated with texts and networked connections. Himley poses many questions for WPAs to consider, encouraging writing instructors and administrators to engage each other and the students in their classes in an “archaeological analysis,” which she describes as “an intellectual process that works

to excavate the many meanings of events, artifacts, and texts, [which] is a nonlinear process of framing and reframing the object of analysis in order to understand it from many perspectives and through many interconnections” (63). It is a critical way of thinking, Himley explains,

that recognizes what Eileen Schell calls “transnational linkages.” It is a way of thinking and writing that locates us within emerging, [d]ynamic and global economic, cultural, political, and social systems of meaning. It is a way of thinking that values the dynamic nexus of the personal and the global as interconnected and complex networks of discursive and material meaning-making and that locates us all as global citizens. (64)

Hesford and Schell (2008, 464) elaborate on such an approach in their *College English* special issue on “transnational feminist rhetoric,” which aims “to understand the ‘cultural logics that inform and structure border crossings as well as state strategies’ (Ong 1999, 5).”

The call for such transnational engagement has become even stronger: Darin Payne and Daphne Desser’s *Teaching Writing in Globalization* offers chapters that “exemplify a critical remapping of disciplinary work as both a response to and an intervention into processes and products of globalization, at least insofar as they relate to writing and writing instruction in higher education today” (Payne and Desser 2012, 6). Bruce Horner’s (2012) “The WPA as Broker: Globalization and the Composition Program” argues that WPAs must “take into account the global context in which their brokering is conducted in order to resist those effects of globalization that threaten the value of the work of writing and its learning and teaching” (58). In “Anxieties of Globalization: Networked Subjects in Rhetoric and Composition Studies,” Rebecca Dingo and Donna Strickland strive “not to identify the bad (or good) effects of globalization, but to demonstrate the affectively driven rhetorical moves that link and sustain three subject positions shaped by globalization and central to the continued emergence and sustenance of rhetoric and composition studies: student, contingent worker, and administrator” (Dingo and Strickland 2012, 80). Responding to such calls, transnational writing programs can be seen as a way to counter masked complicity by offering writing teachers and administrators the opportunity to be deliberate about the ideology embodied by curricula and institutional practices.

Enacting a critical, transnational engagement, the chapters presented in Part III: Transnational Engagement extend the discussion of the cultural logics, contexts, and rhetorical moves shaping cross-border writing instruction and administration by drawing attention to labor practices, community colleges, and globally-networked learning

environments. In chapter 11, Rebecca Dingo, Rachel Riedner, and Jennifer Wingard ground their discussion of WAC/WID (writing across the curriculum/writing in the disciplines) practices in a concrete example from the University of Houston, where a business professor outsourced grading from a WID class to Bangalore, India. In “Disposable Drudgery: Outsourcing Goes to College,” the authors use the UH example to demonstrate why WAC/WID practitioners should map how local decisions are linked and have repercussions nationally and globally. To demonstrate these connections, Dingo, Riedner, and Wingard develop a transnational feminist framework that reveals linkages between specific labor sites of WAC/WID programs and ideologies of neoliberalism. Examination of the material, institutional, and ideological conditions in which WAC/WID practices occur enables them to show how UH’s outsourcing proves local monetary decisions create unequal economic exchange, unequal power, and supranational effects. These practices sustain unequal and different iterations of material power that reinforce inequality across disciplines, departments, and, in this instance, global work sites. Through their analysis, the authors illustrate the significance of WAC/WID practitioners engaging in transnational feminist analysis.

In “Economies of Composition: Mapping Transnational Writing Programs in US Community Colleges,” Wendy Olson demonstrates the importance of understanding how English language instruction functions in two-year colleges. Olson conducts her study of English language programs at two-year colleges in Washington State—specifically the pre-college writing classes “wherein students are introduced to academic writing expectations and conventions”—by focusing on what program descriptions and brochures, curricula, goals and objectives, and college missions reveal about course design, alignment with best practices in composition theory, and the pedagogical implications of curricular and programmatic formations. Accordingly, Olson examines the discrete ways in which economic globalization has shaped English as a literacy commodity for international students, within these particular open admissions institutions in the United States. As such, chapter 12 unpacks the complicated, and often contradictory, rise of language-intensive programs within the distinct, yet often overlooked, site of US community colleges.

Finally, Doreen Starke-Meyerring observes in chapter 13 that, as dwindling public funding for higher education pushes institutions to position themselves in global markets, WPAs are increasingly called upon to facilitate dominant neoliberal approaches to globalizing higher education through expansionist programs, which are designed to generate revenues

from international tuition dollars. She argues that these approaches largely reproduce and repackage traditional, local, institutionally-bounded courses and programs—predominantly from the Anglophone West—for one-way sales in online or offshore global markets. In light of these pressures, “From ‘Educating the Other’ to Cross-Boundary Knowledge-Making: Globally Networked Learning Environments as Critical Sites of Writing Program Administration” offers an exploration of emerging globally networked learning environments (GNLEs) for their potential as critical sites for rethinking and repositioning writing programs and WPA work in higher education. By examining five dimensions of these emerging, partnered learning environments, Starke-Meyerring illustrates how GNLEs enable a critical engagement and allow writing teachers and administrators to carve out alternative learning spaces that can help question, redirect, and reshape dominant transmission models of “educating the Other.”

As revealed in the controversy over Yale University’s announcement that it had partnered with the National University of Singapore to form Yale-NUS College, the emerging activities of higher education in the twenty-first century are challenging taken-for-granted notions of academic administration (see Redden 2012; Smith 2012). Transnational higher education is raising high-stakes questions about faculty governance and decision making, academic standards and values, curriculum and pedagogy, and faculty and staff labor. WPAs adept at working in conditions not of their own making can bring clarity to these issues. The chapters in this collection raise provocative questions, provide insightful analyses, and present compelling models for teaching, research, and administration in transnational contexts. I know that each chapter productively challenged my own understanding of how to do my job.

In order to influence the conversations about international education on our campuses, WPAs have more work to do in rectifying our own historical and disciplinary limitations with prevalent linguistic ideologies, as well as disciplinary knowledge gaps. Challenging conventional practices, the essays in this collection demonstrate that transnational approaches to teaching and administering writing in global contexts require renewed, critical attention to shifting realities of higher education. Transnational approaches, as shown by each contributor, mean much more than simply focusing on “any education delivered by an institution based in one country to students located in another” (McBurnie and Ziguras 2007, 1); each author learns from the interaction of students and faculty across normally conceived borders—for

example, between languages, cultures, economies, and institutions. Because the specific details of any transnational writing program present unique opportunities and challenges, the contributions to this collection do not offer sourcebook-like arguments for how to deliver cross-border programs. Instead, each chapter demonstrates the authors' critical perspectives on the infrastructures of WPA for global contexts, their theories of language and literacy produced in cross-cultural and cross-linguistic exchange, and their approaches to research suited for transnational pedagogy and writing studies.

While there are strong forces at work in maintaining the ideological commitments to specific configurations of curricular and administrative infrastructure—and which will make it even more difficult to enact changes to current models of teaching, learning, and writing—the globalization of higher education does offer opportunities to rethink and, therefore, restructure the delivery of higher education. Without such a rethinking, a business model of economic efficiency will dominate the discussion, while concerns of educational models will either be muted or remain secondary.

Notes

1. See Martins and Reed (forthcoming) for an extended argument about new models for teaching, learning, and writing in transnational contexts.
2. See also Horner, NeCamp, and Donahue (2011) for a discussion of “Multilingual Composition Scholarship,” yet another way shifting locations impacts writing instruction and administration.

References

- Canagarajah, Suresh. 2002. *The Geopolitics of Academic Writing*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Dingo, Rebecca, and Donna Strickland. 2012. “Anxieties of Globalization: Networked Subjects in Rhetoric and Composition Studies.” In *Teaching Writing in Globalization: Remapping Disciplinary Work*, ed. Darin Payne and Daphne Desser, 79–93. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Donahue, Christiane. 2009. “‘Internationalization’ and Composition Studies: Reorienting the Discourse.” *College Composition and Communication* 61 (2): 212–43.
- Hesford, Wendy S. 2006. “Global Turns and Cautions in Rhetoric and Composition Studies.” *PMLA* 121 (3): 787–801. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25486354>.
- Hesford, Wendy S., and Eileen E. Schell. 2008. “Configurations of Transnationality: Locating Feminist Rhetorics.” *College English* 70 (5): 461–70.
- Himley, Margaret. 2003. “Writing Programs and Pedagogies in a Globalized Landscape.” *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 26 (3): 49–66.
- Horner, Bruce. 2012. “The WPA as Broker: Globalization and the Composition Program.” In *Teaching Writing in Globalization: Remapping Disciplinary Work*, ed. Darin Payne and Daphne Desser, 57–78. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

- Horner, Bruce, and John Trimbur. 2002. "English Only and College Composition." *College Composition and Communication* 53 (4): 594–630. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1512118>.
- Horner, Bruce, and Min-Zhan Lu. 2008. "Resisting Monolingualism in 'English': Reading and Writing the Politics of Language." In *Rethinking English in Schools: Towards a New and Constructive Stage*, ed. Viv Ellis, Carol Fox, and Brian Street, 140–57. New York: Continuum International Pub. Group.
- Horner, Bruce, Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Kei Matsuda, eds. 2010. *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Horner, Bruce, Min-Zhan Lu, Jacqueline Jones Royster, and John Trimbur. 2011. "Opinion: Language Difference in Writing—Toward a Translingual Approach." *College English* 73 (3): 303–21. <https://login.ezproxy.rit.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/851229387?accountid=108> and <http://www.ncte.org/journals/ce/issues/v73-3>, accessed March 30, 2011.
- Horner, Bruce, Samantha NeCamp, and Christiane Donahue. 2011. "Toward a Multilingual Composition Scholarship: From English Only to a Translingual Norm." *College Composition and Communication* 63 (3): 269–300.
- Institute of International Education. 2010. "Open Doors 2010 Fast Facts." *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors>, accessed July 23, 2012.
- Lawton, William, and Alex Katsomitros. 2012. *International Branch Campuses: Data and Developments*. Redhill: The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education.
- Lewin, Tamar. 2012. "Colleges Slower to Branch Out Abroad." *New York Times*, January 12. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/12/education/colleges-slower-to-branch-out-abroad.html?_r=1&ref=tamarlewin.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei, Maria Fruit, Tamara Lee, and Burton Lamm, eds. 2006. "Second Language Writers and Writing Program Administrators" *WPA* 30 (1–2).
- Matsuda, Paul Kei. 1997. "Contrastive Rhetoric in Context: A Dynamic Model of L2 Writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 6 (1): 45–60. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(97\)90005-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(97)90005-9).
- McBurnie, Grant, and Christopher Ziguras. 2007. *Transnational Education: Issues and Trends in Offshore Higher Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Muchiri, Mary N., Nshindi G. Mulamba, Greg Myers, and Deoscorous B. Ndoloi. 1995. "Importing Composition: Teaching and Researching Academic Writing Beyond North America." *CCC* 46 (2): 175–198. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/i215234>, accessed March 4, 2011.
- Ong, Aihwa. 1999. *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Payne, Darin, and Daphne Desser, eds. 2012. *Teaching Writing in Globalization: Remapping Disciplinary Work*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Schaub, Mark. 2003. "Beyond these Shores: An Argument for Internationalizing Composition." *Pedagogy* 3 (1): 85–98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/15314200-3-1-85>.
- Shuck, Gail. 2006. "Combating Monolingualism." *WPA* 30 (1–2): 59–82.
- Silva, Tony. 1990. "Second Language Composition Instruction: Developments, Issues, and Directions in ESL." In *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom*, ed. Barbara Kroll, 11–23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524551.005>.
- Redden, Elizabeth. 2012. "Whose Yale College?" *Inside Higher Ed*, published March 28. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/03/28/yale-faculty-raise-governance-questions-about-decision-open-branch-singapore>.

- Skorton, David. 2012. "Bringing Cornell to the World and the World to Cornell: A Presidential White Paper." Cornell University, Office of the President. <http://president.cornell.edu/speeches/>, accessed July 23, 2012.
- Smith, Mitch. 2012. "A Call to Respect Rights" *Inside Higher Ed*, published April 6. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/04/06/yale-faculty-resolution-expresses-concern-about-singapore-campus>.
- Thaiss, Chris, Gerd Bräuer, Paula Carlino, Lisa Ganobscik-Williams, and Aparna Sinha, eds. 2012. *Writing Programs Worldwide: Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places*. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.