

INTRODUCTION

Michelle Cox

Dartmouth College

Terry Myers Zawacki

George Mason University

ESL students can become very fluent writers of English, but they may never become indistinguishable from a native speaker, and it is unclear why they should. A current movement among ESL writing teachers is to argue that, beyond a certain level of proficiency in English writing, it is not the students' texts that need to change; rather it is the native-speaking readers and evaluators (particularly in educational institutions) that need to learn to read more broadly, with a more cosmopolitan, less parochial eye. The infusion of life brought by these ESL students' different perspectives on the world can only benefit a pluralistic society which is courageous enough truly to embrace its definition of itself.

—Ilona Leki, *Understanding ESL Writers:
A Guide for Teachers* (pp. 132-133)

Ilona Leki made the observation that begins our introduction in 1992.¹ While much attention has been paid by composition and second language (L2) writing scholars in the intervening years to the “movement” to read the writing of our English second language (L2)² students with a “less parochial eye,” we still see significant gaps in the WAC/WID literature on how L2 students experience writing in the disciplines, how teachers across the curriculum read the writing of their L2 students, and what constitutes an effective and linguistically and culturally inclusive pedagogy. With our co-edited special issue of *Across the Disciplines*—“Writing across the Curriculum and Second Language Writers: Cross-Field Research, Theory, and Program Development”—we brought attention to these gaps and the need for WAC theory and research that addresses the realities of what Jonathan Hall (2009) has called “the multilingual majority” at our institutions. In this collection, we extend that conversation, by including

chapters that investigate more widely and deeply the experiences of L2 writers across the undergraduate and graduate curriculum, faculty expectations for these students, and courses and programs that have been developed to support both students and faculty.

While the chapters we've brought together here are primarily oriented towards research, our goal in assembling the collection was also to provide a wealth of pedagogical, curricular, and programmatic practices, a goal realized in each of the chapters. We've also been interested in presenting a range of perspectives and institutional locations and so the chapters here offer perspectives from students and faculty at large public universities, community colleges, smaller liberal arts colleges, a for-profit English language school, and locations outside of the US, including China, Sweden, Lebanon, and, virtually, Singapore. And, because L2 writing at the graduate level is increasingly becoming a focus for WAC programmatic efforts, we've included a number of chapters addressing this exciting and relatively new area of research and practice. Finally, the extensive lists of references provided at the end of each of the chapters offer an abundance of resources for further research and practice.

The overarching goal that drives this collection is this: that WAC theory, research, and practice must be expanded to include and “embrace,” to echo Leki, the differing perspectives, educational experiences, and written voices of second language writers. As we noted at the outset, this is not a new argument, and, for that reason, we think it's important to review the second language writing (SLW) scholarship that has elaborated on this valuing-difference stance, a stance also endorsed by the authors in this collection. Organizing the eighteen chapters that make up the book into three discrete sections was no easy task, given that the themes and foci, not surprisingly, often overlapped in the authors' discussion of their research findings and the resulting programs and practices. To highlight these overlapping themes and findings, we took the liberty as editors—with the authors' consent—of embedding connections among these as relevant in each of the chapters.

Before turning to our review of the SLW literature and a description of our sections and chapters, we want to lay out three guiding principles that are integral to the work we do as WAC/WID professionals but that also, we believe, need to be interrogated and expanded in light of the diverse linguistic, educational, and cultural backgrounds of the L2 writers who are more and more the majority at our institutions. Derived from the WAC/WID literature, three key principles we see underlying WAC/WID work are:

- Writing is a powerful mode of learning and communication, with writers' and teachers' goals for the writing calling for varied writing processes and teaching approaches.

- Writing is situated, with structural, rhetorical, epistemological, and discursive features varying according to the context of the writing (discipline, profession, activity system). These differences need to be taught and respected (i.e. writing across the curriculum is not writing-as-an-English-major across the curriculum).
- By promoting a paradigm shift in how writing is valued, understood, and taught, WAC programs can have transformative and widespread effects on pedagogy and wider campus cultures around teaching and learning.

When we consider these principles with an awareness of our students' multilinguality, we ask, as many L2 writing practitioners have asked, whether the same writing-to-learn approaches are equally beneficial to students who use English as a first language (L1) and L2 students. How might the writing and revision processes of L1 and L2 students differ and how can these differences be supported pedagogically? How might learned and culturally different rhetorical approaches be reflected in the academic writing L2 students produce? How do we WAC professionals and WID practitioners need to adjust our practices to make them more accessible to and inclusive of L2 writers? What language acquisition theories and research do we need to emphasize in our faculty development work? What information do faculty, even those versed in WAC practices, need to be given to help them understand their L2 writers and work with their writing more effectively? Regarding the latter, for example, Terry and Michelle have both worked with well-meaning faculty who focus predominantly on editing when giving feedback to L2 students, something they do not do when responding to the same kinds of writing activities by L1 students. We suggest, then, that each of the principles we've set out above need to be expanded to include the following awarenesses and practices (which is by no means an exhaustive list and which also reiterates principles articulated in the *CCCC Statement on Second Language Writing and Writers* [2009] and much of the SLW literature):

- Differences in Englishes should be respected. These Englishes include interlanguage (the language a language learner develops while learning a language), World Englishes, dialects of English, and the varieties of English students develop through code-meshing.
- Writing programs, courses, assignments, activities, and assessments should be constructed in such a way that linguistically and culturally diverse students have the potential to be as successful as L1 students and that allow them to draw on their cross-cultural and cross-linguistic resources.
- By promoting a difference-as-resource academic writing culture rather than programs and pedagogical practices aimed at assimilating L2 stu-

dents to Western culture and standard written English (SWE) norms, WAC programs can have a transformative and widespread effect on the ways faculty teach with writing across the disciplines and respond to the writing of all multilingual writers, whether students or colleagues.

As we noted, these principles are not original to us, but, in fact, have a long history in SLW scholarship, to which we now turn with our review of the literature organized according to the bulleted list above.

DIFFERENCES IN ENGLISHES SHOULD BE RESPECTED

In SLW scholarship, it has long been recognized that L2 writing differs in salient ways from L1 writing (for a succinct review of literature that examines these differences, see Silva, 1993). Second language acquisition is a long process, and, as the writer acquires the second language, their writing will reflect their “interlanguage” (Selinker, 1977) —a continuum that reflects the writer’s developing understanding of the language as s/he “moves successfully toward closer and closer approximations of the target language” (Silva, Leki, & Carson, 1997, p. 405). How close these approximations ultimately become depends on a number of factors, but very few adult learners of second languages—researchers estimate only 5%—will develop a proficiency in the language that matches that of a native speaker, though “many if not most will attain the ability to communicate relative to their needs” (Silva, Leki, & Carson, 1997, p. 413).

As Leki suggests in our opening quote, SLW scholars have questioned the goal of L2 students writing like native speakers of the language. In 1979, Del Hymes proposed the goal of “communicative competence” for English Language Teaching (ELT), a pedagogical theory that focused on communication in the target language appropriate for a particular use and rhetorical situation. While this theory shifted the emphasis away from perfection in form to effectiveness of the language used for communicating within a particular situation, it was critiqued for leading to pedagogies focused too narrowly on particular tasks and on the rules and conventions for communicating within particular domains. Bronwyn Norton Peirce (1989), for example, critiqued communicative competence pedagogies for seeking to assimilate students to the norms in particular arenas (such as academic writing) without giving them the means to query those norms, and for limiting students to narrow arenas of writing without giving them the means to write in other arenas (such as civic writing). He acknowledges, however, that those who teach from a communicative competence stance do so with students’ best interests in mind. To illustrate this stance, he quotes Braj Kachru (1986) who writes: “Knowing English is like

possessing the fabled Aladdin's lamp, which permits one to open, as it were, the linguistic gates of international business, technology, science, and travel. In short, English provides linguistic power" (as quoted in Peirce, 1989, p. 402). But, he argues, English can be seen as a "Trojan horse" because, quoting David Cooke (1988), it is a language of "cultural intrusion ... [I]n a very real way, English is the property of elites, expressing the interests of the dominant classes" (as quoted in Peirce, 1989, p. 402). In light of Kachru and Cooke's positions, Peirce elaborates on the moral dilemma that faces English language teachers: "Are we contributing to the demise of certain languages or linguistic communities? Does the teaching of ESL or EFL (English as a Foreign Language) serve to entrench the power of an elite, privileged group of people who may have little interest in the welfare of the majority of the people in the country? Do teachers of ESL sometimes participate in [this] process?" (1989, p. 402).

It is this recognition of English language teaching as political, as endorsing a particular stance toward English and a particular variety of English, that has led to critical approaches to ELT. Echoing Cooke and Peirce, A. Suresh Canagarajah (1993) states that, "In practicing academic writing, students are acquiring not only a skill, certain cognitive processes, or communicative competence, but also the set of preferred values, discourses, and knowledge content of the academic community" (p. 303) and that, for L2 writers, the attempt to join the academic community may have detrimental consequences:

Apart from the identity crisis or rootlessness this encounter will create, the community allegiances of students will also be affected as they face the danger of being ostracized by either their native or the academic community. That is, if they insist on membership in their native community (and maintain the identities and values associated with it) they will be judged unfit for the academic community, or vice versa. Even if they gain membership in the academic community, at whatever psychological or social costs, the chances are that they will be provided only negative subject positions by its discourse, such as being cognitively deficient, deviant, or even pathological. (p. 303)

Canagarajah (1993) argues for ELT pedagogies that "enable students to employ their local knowledge and counter-discourses to resist ideological domination, forge positive subject positions, and engage in emancipatory interests" (p. 303), goals he further elaborates in his later publications (Canagarajah, 1999; 2002; 2004; 2006a; 2006b).

SLW scholars have also questioned the focus on Standard Written English (SWE), a variety of English rooted in the US in Anglo-American English, arguing that this focus devalues the many other varieties of Englishes that L2 students use. These Englishes include varieties that have developed in other nations, such as Nepali English (Daniloff-Merrill, 2010), and Englishes created by L2 writers as they “code-mesh” (Canagarajah, 2011), drawing from their many linguistic, cultural, and rhetorical resources. SLW scholars have also argued that teachers should pay attention to the needs and goals of the students for learning English. For instance, Tony Silva, Ilona Leki, and Joan Carson (1997) argue that we should

acknowledge that those who are learning to write in a second language in an institutional setting may be doing so only to satisfy the requirements of the institutional setting and may never again need to write, or perhaps even to read, a single word in their second language in the rest of their lifetimes, particularly if these learners return to their native countries. (p. 413)

Placing an emphasis on the formalities of academic American English for the writing of these students, they say, may lead to an “inappropriate negative evaluation of those who do not become particularly proficient” (p. 413).

It’s important to note that this insistence on SWE has also been challenged on many fronts in the literature from composition studies: from process movement advocates (see, for example, Ken Macrorie’s attack on “English” in *Uptought*, 1970), from arguments around valuing black English vernacular (see, for example, Geneva Smitherman’s *Talkin and Testifyin: The Language of Black America*, 1977), from “alternate discourse” perspectives (see, for example, Pat Bizzell, Chris Schroeder, and Helen Fox’s collection *Alt Dis: Alternative Discourses in the Academy*, 2002), and from “translingual” writing perspectives (see Horner, Lu, Royster, & Trimbur, 2011; Horner, NeCamp, & Donahue, 2011).

Indeed, in 1974, a position statement from the Conference of College Composition and Communication, *Students’ Right to Their Own Language*, asserted that dialectic variations in student writing should be respected and honored. Mina Shaughnessy (1979) helped composition scholars and teachers see differences in the writing of basic writers as windows into the mind of the writer, by showing the logic behind what would typically be seen only as errors. And, most recently, Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, Jackie Royster, and John Trimbur (2011) have argued that “difference in language” should not be seen

as “a barrier to overcome or as a problem to manage, but as a resource for producing meaning in writing, speaking, reading, and listening” (p. 303-304). These views are in concert with the stance toward L2 writing that we propose WAC endorse.

LINGUISTICALLY AND CULTURALLY INCLUSIVE WRITING PROGRAMS, COURSES, ASSIGNMENTS, ACTIVITIES, AND ASSESSMENTS

Related to the second bullet point in our list of expanded WAC/L2 principles, we turn now to another strand of research in SLW that has focused on the writing experiences of L2 students as they write in courses and contexts across the curriculum. Michelle Cox’s (2011) review of this longitudinal research revealed that second language writers often struggle due to writing assignments that “assume deep cultural and historical knowledge of the US” (para. 9), the lack of scaffolding of assignments, the lack of time for completing the heavy reading and writing required by a project, and evaluation methods that focus too heavily on standard written English. There’s also an abundance of SLW literature on developing linguistically and culturally inclusive assignments and writing curricula, noting especially the contributions made by Dana Ferris on teaching L2 writing (2004, 2009) and, in WAC contexts, Leki’s pedagogical recommendations in her extensive body of work on L2 writers across disciplines. Also related to WAC contexts, Joy Reid and Barbara Kroll (1995) analyze eleven assignment descriptions from across the curriculum for accessibility and equity to L2 students, and then make recommendations for creating assignments that are more conducive for L2 student success. In their scholarship, SLW practitioners also address other faculty who work with L2 students, including composition instructors (such examples include work already cited, particularly Leki, 1992; Silva, Leki, & Carson, 1995) and WAC program administrators (see Cox, 2011; Hall, 2009; Johns, 2001; Matsuda & Jablonski, 2000; Zamel, 1995; Zamel & Spack, 2004).

Assessments of L2 writing have also been given a great deal of attention in the SLW literature considering the range of potentially detrimental effects of these assessments on L2 writers. Research in this area has focused on how L2 writers are evaluated in relation to their L1 peers (Lindsey & Crusan, 2011; Rubin & William-James, 1997; Song & Caruso, 1996), what features of L2 writing are particularly “irritating” to faculty (Santos, 1988; Vann, Meyer, & Lorenz, 1984), and how the background of the evaluator affects his/her evaluation of L2 writers (Weigle, Boldt, & Valsecchi, 2003). Another research area focuses on

the ideological aspects of evaluation. Robert E. Land, Jr. and Catherine Whitley (1989), for example, argue that to evaluate an L2 student's essay according to the norms of SWE and Western rhetorical patterns not only disempowers the student, but ignores the realities of an increasingly pluralistic US culture and language and the rise of World Englishes. Other SLW scholars have argued that, given the additional cognitive load of reading and writing in a second language and the inevitability of what we may see as written accent in L2 writing (Leki, 1992, p. 129), it should be fair to assess L2 students differently in comparison to their L1 peers, by extending deadlines, adjusting page-length requirements, and not being as particular about SWE.

TRANSFORMATIVE EFFECT OF MULTILINGUAL AND MULTICULTURAL STUDENTS ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Our assertion—that multilingual multicultural students have the potential to transform academic writing and teaching practices across institutions—can also be traced to L2 writing professionals who have often placed advocacy for L2 writers at the center of their work by partnering with students in their efforts to negotiate with “institutions that refuse to accommodate diversity” (Leki, 2002, p. 59). Why is it that the student is seen as needing to change, but not the institution? they ask. Sarah Benesch (1994), who is credited with bringing critical pedagogy to ELT, questioned why it is seen as “unrealistic to expect the university to adopt itself to the cultures, world views, and languages of nonnative-speaking students” and “realistic” for L2 students to adopt the cultures, world views, and language variety of the university (p. 711). To combat this tendency, L2 writing teachers have proposed pedagogies that invite L2 students to investigate relationships among language, power, and privilege (for one particularly innovative example, see Zamel, 2002), so that, as Vivian Zamel (2002) explains, the institutions themselves “can foster the language and critical thinking of students” and recognize “the ways in which these students, with their multicultures and their multivoices, can contribute to and transform the very institutions they inhabit and thereby enrich the lives of all of us who work there” (p. 339).

As will be clear in this collection, we and all of the authors who've contributed chapters are greatly indebted to this work and transformative vision as we carry on these vital WAC/L2 writing conversations and collaborations.

The eighteen chapters in this collection are organized into three sections, each corresponding to the three WAC/L2 writing-inclusive principles we described earlier, the first related to students as writers, the second to the contexts in which students write and faculty teach, and the third to the programmatic practices that have the potential to transform writing and teaching practices across the curriculum: Section I. “Learning from/with L2 Students: Student Strengths, Coping Strategies, and Experiences as They Write Across the Curriculum”; Section II. “Faculty Concerns and Expectations for Multilingual Writers”; and Section III. “WAC Programs and Practices Transformed.” Along with the foreword by Jonathan Hall, the book closes with an afterword by Christopher Thaiss.

SECTION I: LEARNING FROM/WITH L2 STUDENTS: STUDENT STRENGTHS, COPING STRATEGIES, AND EXPERIENCES AS THEY WRITE ACROSS THE CURRICULUM

Each of the chapters in Section I features research that focuses on the resources multilingual writers bring to US undergraduate and graduate classrooms: their strengths as writers and rhetoricians, the ways in which they adapt writing knowledge for new writing situations, and the coping strategies they develop as they traverse and negotiate the US college and university curriculum. Framing this section is Michael-John DePalma and Jeffrey Ringer’s investigation of how multilingual writers negotiate the various rhetorical situations in which they find themselves and how they transfer, apply, adapt or reshape the writing knowledge they’ve learned in one context for other different contexts. In “Adaptive Transfer, Writing Across the Curriculum, and Second Language Writing: Implications for Research and Teaching,” the authors provide an extensive review of the research on transfer and then go on to show how instructors can support L2 students’ agency as writers by valuing the ways they may be reshaping and transforming prior writing knowledge for their own linguistic and cultural purposes. Regarding the latter, their chapter offers a provocative rereading of Leki’s central argument in her landmark study, “Coping Strategies of ESL Students in Writing Tasks Across the Curriculum” (1995), an article that is also referenced by other authors in this section. Addressing WAC researchers who wish to investigate the kinds and processes of adaptive transfer, DePalma and Ringer provide lists of questions that can be asked of students to discover the adaptive strategies they use in WID contexts. Such research and the adaptive transfer framework, they suggest, will help WAC professionals and WID teachers complicate their expectations for the writing knowledge students should have transferred from prior courses.

The next three chapters all show how students are adapting lessons learned in other courses, as well as creating new strategies that are self-taught. In “Resources for Success: A Case Study of a Multilingual Graduate Writer,” Talinn Phillips presents a longitudinal case study of a multilingual graduate student to showcase the remarkable initiative he took to manage writing tasks successfully in his courses. Chozin, the student she follows, is, in many ways, an example of the kind of adaptative transfer Depalma and Ringer want readers and teachers to recognize. As with DePalma and Ringer, Phillips uses Leki’s (1995) taxonomy of coping strategies as a pivotal point for her discussion, but she deepens Leki’s categories by showing how Chozin benefitted by both positive and negative experiences around writing. What is particularly moving about this chapter, we think, is that Chozin is not a student that Phillips, who was his writing tutor, or his advisor expected to succeed given that he had “one of the lowest proficiency levels [she]’d encountered in over five years of tutoring [the] campus’s multilingual graduate students” (p. 73). Due to the strategies this student developed, however, not only did he graduate successfully from the program, but he did so on time and with an outstanding thesis prize in hand.

The next chapter, Carole Center and Michelle Niestepski’s “‘Hey, Did You Get That?’: L2 Student Reading Across the Curriculum,” focuses on the strategies undergraduate L2 students develop to manage their heavy reading load, many of which are strikingly similar, as the authors note, to the coping strategies Leki (1995) reported. In an appendix, the authors provide a valuable inventory of reading practices useful as a guide for understanding the degree to which students write informally while reading, such as taking notes and marking and annotating passages they don’t understand. Their chapter also gives us reasons to be optimistic as it shows faculty across disciplines being sensitive to their students’ different cultural and linguistic backgrounds by allowing them to draw on their own cultural locations and experiences and making other accommodations to help them learn the material.

Qian Du’s “Bridging the Gap between ESL Composition Programs and Disciplinary Writing: The Teaching and Learning of Summarization Skill” continues the focus on the reading-writing connection and the ability of L2 students to adapt their reading methods to learn the material, this time with research on one particular writing-to-read strategy: summary writing. In this chapter, Du describes the benefits, challenges, and complexity of summary writing, according to the literature and for the students she studied. For L2 students in particular, as she shows, summary writing (in response to test questions, in reporting on their reading and research, and so on) is a particularly complex process, requiring an understanding of different levels of information in a wide range of texts (e.g. oral lectures or multimedia productions in addition

to print), along with the ability to represent the original text accurately and concisely. As such, the process of summary writing is a valuable learning tool; yet, as she argues, a summary is not a context-free genre and so must be taught by teachers in disciplines providing guidelines and support for the task.

With Kathryn Nielsen's chapter "On Class, Race, and the Dynamics of Privilege: Supporting Generation 1.5 Writers Across the Curriculum," we turn to a different kind of adaptation among a specific population of L2 writers—resident immigrant students, often termed generation 1.5 students. Although many of these students may face some of the same language and writing challenges as international students, they are also acutely aware of their linguistically and culturally in-between status and how this status might affect the way they are treated by their teachers and peers, as Nielsen's chapter shows. Nielsen argues that there are still large L2 writing areas that are not being sufficiently addressed, specifically how the variables of race, class, and gender, combined with culture and language, may affect the way the student writer is respected by peers and evaluated by teachers. With her research on the perceptions of five underserved generation 1.5 students from the Dominican Republic enrolled in a predominately white liberal arts college in the northeast, Nielsen begins to address the areas of class and race as important variables in how some L2 students experience writing and writing-intensive (WI) classrooms. She shows how they have adapted to a classroom and campus climate that they perceive as less than supportive when it came to peer review, group work and collaborative assignments, teachers' evaluation practices, and, overall, the classroom dynamic.

The final chapter of this section, Linda Hirsh's "Writing Intensively: An Examination of the Performance of L2 Writers Across the Curriculum at an Urban Community College," compares the success rates of L2 students enrolled in WI sections (sections L2 students were previously blocked from taking) and non-WI sections of the same course, examining the impact of WI courses on L2 students and the pedagogical practices that help them succeed. While Hirsch is looking at a community college context, the questions she's asking about the fairness of enrolling students in demanding WI courses are relevant at all levels, as are her surprising findings that L2 students in WI sections that provided language-support and scaffolded writing instruction passed the course at a higher rate than did ESL students enrolled in non-WI sections of the same course. Her chapter, which analyzes the strategies, techniques, and assignments that seemed to facilitate student learning, brings together many of the themes discussed in this section by speaking to both the coping strategies that students initiate and the faculty's responsibility for creating environments in which L2 students can succeed.

SECTION II: FACULTY CONCERNS AND EXPECTATIONS FOR MULTILINGUAL WRITERS

With Section II, we shift the focus from students to faculty with chapters exploring faculty perceptions of and reactions to L2 writing, their openness to professional development related to L2 writing, and approaches to WAC faculty development. In “Negotiating ‘Errors’ in L2 Writing: Faculty Dispositions and Language Difference,” Terry Myers Zawacki and Anna Habib investigate faculty reactions to perceived error in L2 student writing, particularly “*how* they described the errors and *why* they seemed to be ‘disturbed’ by particular kinds of errors.” While Zawacki and Habib agree with the translanguaging approach that values difference in writing, they wanted to see how theory met practice, particularly the practices of faculty across the curriculum. Their analysis reveals many of the complexities in the interaction between faculty and L2 writing, including concerns about students’ comprehension of the material and the fairness of assessing the work of L2 students by a different standard than that for L1 students. As Zawacki and Habib report, however, they also found that the faculty who seemed least willing to negotiate meaning in L2 writing were also often the faculty who were most willing to spend time working with L2 writers on their writing. Further, they show that, while some faculty exhibited little tolerance for written accents, the majority expressed uncertainty about how to respond to and evaluate the writing in ways that would be most beneficial to the L2 student.

The chapter “‘I Don’t Know if That Was the Right Thing to Do’: Faculty Respond to Multilingual Writers in the Disciplines,” collectively researched and authored by graduate students at the University of New Mexico—Lindsey Ives, Elizabeth Leahy, Anni Leming, Tom Pierce, and Michael Schwartz—also takes up questions around faculty perceptions of L2 writing and writers. While Zawacki and Habib’s investigation occurred at a research university with a large international student population in the mid-Atlantic region, Ives et al.’s research is based in a state university and neighboring community college in the southwest, an area that is historically bilingual. Like the faculty in Zawacki and Habib’s study, however, the faculty that participated in Ives et al.’s study expressed conflicted feelings in relation to L2 writing. When presented with two sample pieces of student writing—one by an L2 student that exhibited some depth of thought but many surface-level errors and one constructed by the research team that was error-free but lacked depth—faculty unanimously rated the passage written by the research team more highly, indicating that surface errors prevented faculty from appreciating content. However, during interviews, faculty revealed that they expect that writing from L2 students will

be accented and assess accordingly and are open to and interested in faculty development related to L2 writing.

Set in a university in China, the next chapter, Wu Dan's "Let's See Where Your Chinese Students Come From: A Qualitative Descriptive Study of Writing in the Disciplines in China," shows faculty across the curriculum voicing concerns about the quality of student writing and their own preparation for teaching with writing that are strikingly similar to those heard in the previous chapters in this section. Unlike so many disciplinary faculty in the US, however, these faculty do not say that students should have learned to write in someone else's course or earlier on in their student careers. As Wu Dan explains, China has had a turbulent higher education history with little time or attention given to teaching and learning processes and no tradition of general education; at the same time, however, as she points out, there has always been a deep regard for good writing in Chinese, giving her cause to be optimistic about the WAC concepts and practices she's introducing to her Chinese colleagues. While the broader purpose of Wu Dan's study was to examine the perceptions of Chinese faculty of the role of writing in learning and students' competence as writers in the disciplines at their Chinese institutions, she is also deeply committed to helping US faculty understand the educational and writing backgrounds of the increasingly large numbers of Chinese students who are coming to study at our institutions.

In "English Is Not a Spectator Sport: Privileged Second Language Learners and the For-Profit ESOL Classroom," Marino Fernandes introduces another, very different, educational context for teaching writing to L2 writers. His article describes the curriculum and typical student body of for-profit ESOL programs, which many international students attend in order to boost their TOEFL scores and English language fluency before either applying to or entering US colleges and universities. While the for-profit curriculum is tightly regimented and focused on rote language learning, as Fernandes describes it, he has found ways to deepen the learning experience of the students in his writing classes by adapting WAC pedagogies, particularly critical reading and writing approaches and process pedagogies, to fit the cultural and educational backgrounds of his students. As an immigrant English-language learner himself, Fernandes learned firsthand the difference between merely knowing how to speak in English and using English to achieve one's own educational dreams and aspirations. Now, as a master's student in language and linguistics, he is passionate about the need for even those students whom Vandrick (2002) calls "the global elite," who tend to be the majority population at for-profit language schools, to be engaged and critical participants in their English language learning. Writing is a means of acquiring agency, he argues, not just an exercise in learning a language. That this

is the case for Fernandes is exemplified by his being a recipient of a 2012 CCCC Scholars of the Dream award. By happy circumstance, we had both gone to hear the panel on which Fernandes was presenting, and, after his presentation, we turned to each other to say that we should invite him to submit his paper to us for a chapter in our collection. This chapter, we are pleased to note, is an adaptation of the paper he delivered at the conference, his first publication.

In the remaining two chapters in this section, we shift from a focus on faculty concerns about student writing to approaches faculty can use to address these concerns. In “Making Stance Explicit for Second Language Writers in the Disciplines: What Faculty Need to Know about the Language of Stance-Taking,” Zak Lancaster focuses on one rhetorical move that, when not done effectively, is often perceived as error—stance taking. L2 writers, in particular, he shows, are often judged as having problems with “thinking, understanding, or even effort” when they are unsuccessful in appropriating the stances and voices expected by their teachers. His analysis of the linguistic intricacies of appropriate stance-taking draws our attention to the importance for faculty to be more aware of their discipline-embedded but largely implicit expectations for the stances student writers should take when they express a position, make claims, present evidence, or use their “own” voice. While his is one of the longest chapters in the collection, we think it is also one of the most important in terms of bringing a systemic functional linguistics perspective to our work with faculty. Faculty make judgments all the time about which students are “good” writers at the sentence level and which are not, and yet most lack a nuanced vocabulary to explain how they arrive at this evaluation. Lancaster shows us at the sentence and phrase level what makes some writers sound like they are in control of the language and others sound unsure or unsophisticated. Although most faculty may not have the time or inclination to do the kind of close linguistic analysis Lancaster demonstrates, we think there is enormous value for our readers in understanding how to talk with faculty about the ways writers position themselves linguistically in their texts, and, by the stance-taking styles they choose, also position readers in certain ways.

While Lancaster focuses on a particular aspect of L2 writing and area of faculty development, Michelle Cox’s chapter, “In Response to Today’s ‘Felt Need’: WAC, Faculty Development, and Second Language Writers,” which concludes this section, offers a wealth of suggestions for faculty development related to varied aspects of student writing, including writing processes, writing to learn activities, writing assignment design, peer review, and responding to and assessing L2 student writing. Cox argues that, while many faculty will initially take a “difference-as-deficit” stance in relation to student writing—a stance we see evidence of in Zawacki and Habib and Ives et al.’s chapters—WAC

programs can, through faculty development, move faculty toward a “difference-accommodated” stance, and, ultimately, to what Canagarajah (2002) calls a “difference-as-resource” stance. One of the main stumbling blocks to offering faculty development on L2 writing, however, is that WAC program directors often don’t feel equipped to do so. To address this concern, Cox describes approaches to collaborating with others on campus who advocate for L2 writers and where to gather information about these writers. She provides evidence from a wide range of SLW research for the effectiveness for L2 writers of the WAC pedagogies she recommends, such as those described in Hirsch’s chapter, while also describing how these can be altered to accommodate L2 students by drawing explicitly on the linguistic and cultural resources they bring to the classroom. We intend for this chapter to provide a useful starting point for WAC program directors interested in transforming a campus to become more linguistically and culturally inclusive.

SECTION III: WAC PRACTICES AND PEDAGOGIES TRANSFORMED

The chapters in this final section all demonstrate the kinds of transformations to classrooms and programs that are possible when attention is paid to creating inclusive and supportive L2 writing and learning environments.

The two chapters that open the section focus on academic writing courses the authors developed to support L2 undergraduate and graduate writers as writers in and across disciplines. Megan Siczek and Shawna Shapiro’s “Developing Writing-Intensive Courses for a Globalized Curriculum through WAC-TESOL Collaborations” describes a model for a writing-intensive course designed by TESOL specialists. The authors describe two variations of the course, one taught at George Washington University in Washington, D.C. and open only to L2 students and the other taught at Middlebury College in Vermont and offered to both L1 and L2 students. They discuss the benefits and drawbacks of each model, describe the types of writing projects and readings assigned in each, and draw from course evaluations to share student perspectives of the benefits of the courses. But more than that, they also describe the obstacles that have prevented TESOL practitioners from making valuable L2-informed contributions to WAC programs and pedagogies. As they argue, the “persistent disciplinary segregation between WAC and TESOL” means that institutions whose missions increasingly focus on internationalizing their campuses are overlooking the expertise that TESOL faculty bring to conversations about cultivating global competence in their students. When TESOL and WAC program administrators and faculty collaborate, as they show, the resulting actions, such as the globally

oriented courses they describe, can be educationally meaningful to all involved, perhaps most importantly to the students. Because they make such a powerful argument for putting into practice the institutional “buzzword” of “inclusiveness” when it comes to an institution’s globalizing efforts, we’ve put their chapter first in this section to provide a frame for the other chapters, which illustrate, in varied ways, the transformative potential of innovative, collaborative courses and program curricula designed to support student writers across disciplines and institutional contexts.

While Sizcek and Shapiro focus on an undergraduate classroom, with the next chapter we turn to graduate student writing. As the chapter “Graduate Writing Workshops: Crossing Languages and Disciplines” by Elaine Fredericksen and Kate Mangelsdorf suggests, designing courses that support graduate-level writing is notoriously challenging, given the specialized nature of graduate study, the fact that graduate students who take such courses are at different points in their careers, and that such courses are often not credit-bearing, so attendance and commitment to the course can be issues. In their chapter, the authors offer a model for such a course that resolves some of these problems—a cross-disciplinary, linguistically mixed (English L1, L2, and bilingual) graduate writing workshop designed and taught by English department faculty at the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP). What is notable about this course, in addition to the mixed population it serves, is its flexibility. In the first two weeks of the course, students develop a contract that determines their writing assignments and goals for the workshop, an approach to course design that highlights student agency; the course instructors also collaborate with the students’ other teachers to offer instruction at the point of need. The authors report survey results from 26 graduate students who have taken the course on their perceptions of the effectiveness of the structural and pedagogical choices the authors made in designing and teaching the course.

Jennifer Craig’s “Teaching Writing in a Globally Networked Learning Environment (GNLE): Diverse Students at a Distance” offers another model of graduate student writing support, but one that differs in salient ways from the one developed at UTEP. Unlike UTEP’s course, the course Craig developed at MIT was not mixed L1/L2/bilingual, but was created only for international students; was not multidisciplinary, but was offered only to students enrolled in the Master of Engineering program created in collaboration with universities in Singapore; and was held not on campus but in a virtual learning space, a globally networked learning environment (GNLE) that used synchronous and asynchronous technologies to interact with students. Language and writing are central to GNLEs, as Craig points out, because the environment itself requires high levels of written interaction among the participants. The expectations for

that interaction on the part of the students and her assumptions about how writing and talk about writing would take place in that environment are the focus of her chapter. As she explains, her analysis was first motivated by the students' reticence during course meetings and conferences, a reticence that she had previously been able to counter in her face-to-face interactions with students through the use of WAC pedagogical approaches. Drawing on her own critical self-reflection and on a student survey that explored student backgrounds and which aspects of the course were effective for their learning, she uncovered the assumptions she had brought to the course, how her goals and her students' were sometimes at odds, and how the many "distances" created by the technology affected not only writing instruction but also the classroom dynamic. Craig's chapter has important implications for graduate student writing support as well as for teaching in a GNLE, a model that is increasingly being used by institutions to offer courses to students in classroom locations around the world.

The last three chapters of this section broaden the focus from the classroom to the program level to provide models of cross-disciplinary, cross-cultural programs whose development and design is informed by research and practice from linguistics, L2 writing, and WAC/WID and which are coordinated and/or taught by administrators and faculty from all of these areas to enact a "difference-as-resource" approach to L2 writers and writing.

In "Campus Internationalization: A Center-Based Model for ESL-Ready Programs," Karyn Mallet and Ghania Zgheib describe a language supported, cross-disciplinary program—ACCESS—that transcends the "persistent disciplinary segregation" between TESOL and composition/WAC studies that Siczek and Shapiro critique. Developed collaboratively by WAC, composition, and ESL/applied linguistics faculty, ACCESS offers heavily recruited international students who've been provisionally admitted to the university the opportunity to enroll in a team-taught (by composition and ESL faculty) first-year writing course and introductory content courses, all of which include intensive language support and tutoring for students and faculty development for participating instructors. Drawing on survey and interview data, Mallett and Zgheib demonstrate that the program has benefitted both faculty and students involved, with students expressing satisfaction with the collaboration among writing and disciplinary teachers and faculty reporting an increased awareness of and sensitivity to the challenges faced by L2 writers, which, many said, carried over to the other courses they also regularly teach. More than just developing awareness and sensitivity, however, all of the participating faculty said they modified their course curriculum and pedagogical approaches throughout the semester to fit the needs of their L2 students. Because the participating faculty

had numerous opportunities to talk together, through required workshops and planning meetings, they also shared their expectations for student writers with one another, and, in the process, these too were modified, a benefit that students also reported in focus groups and interviews. While not all institutions with globalization missions will be able, or even willing, to allocate significant resources to set up programs like ACCESS, Mallett and Zgheib's chapter provides a valuable model of an "ESL-ready" program with components that can be adapted to fit local contexts and available funding.

In the final two chapters, the context shifts from writing programs in the US to programs in two different international contexts. In "Reconstructing Teacher Roles through a Transnational Lens: Learning with/in the American University of Beirut," Amy Zenger, Joan Mullin, and Carol Peterson Haviland discuss the challenges of designing a writing program that positively recognizes students' cultural and linguistic differences. In a setting where administrators and many faculty have conservative understandings of acceptable academic writing in English, the authors explain how they worked against this "status-quo gatekeeping" by actively engaging with institutional language policies in the revision of an academic writing course for graduate students and the curriculum of the undergraduate general education program. The authors begin their chapter by describing the complex language histories and identities the students bring to AUB, which typically include speaking and writing experiences in two or more languages and Arabic dialects. While the students come with rich language backgrounds, the traditional pedagogies employed in the academic writing course seemed to define them as linguistically "deficient" by focusing on what the students lacked as writers in English. To better understand the students' strengths, the authors surveyed students about their language backgrounds and how they *feel* when they write in English and their other languages in their disciplines, among other questions. (The full survey is included in an appendix to their chapter.) The survey data, along with the translingual theories and practices they endorse, informed the authors' reconceptualization of the academic writing course and their approach to infusing more writing into the general education curriculum, an approach that relies on the varied language expertise of faculty across the disciplines. The authors' end goal for this WID-based pedagogical approach, as they write, is for faculty and administrators "to construct knowledge about writers collaboratively, to conceive of multilingualism as an asset, and to think transnationally."

With the final chapter, Thomas Lavelle and Alan Shima's "Writing Histories: Lingua Franca English in a Swedish Graduate Program," we provide an example of a program that has managed to embody a translingual ideal in the ways faculty

collaborate across cultures and disciplines to read their students' theses with an appreciation for their scholarly contributions and a "let it pass" approach to surface errors. This readerly mindset can be at least partly ascribed to the writing support offered to students and the faculty development and assessment activities Lavelle and Shima provide as "semi-embedded" academic writing instructors. The interdisciplinary Roads to Democracy history program the authors describe is offered through a collaboration among Uppsala University in Sweden, Coimbra University in Portugal, and Siegen University in Germany. The fully international program, as they explain, enrolls students from over twenty different countries (though none from Sweden) and shares some common on-line courses while requiring students to take at least fifteen credits from two of the partner institutions although each institution grants its own degree. Understandably, then, given this enormous linguistic diversity, instruction at all three institutions occurs in lingua franca English in "contact situations" where writers employ and readers expect "flexible codes, semantic negotiations, and tolerance for temporary unintelligibility" How writing instruction occurs in the program offered at Uppsala and how participating faculty negotiate their expectations for the required thesis are the focus of their chapter, which draws on data collected from their multi-method case study of the Roads program. We have chosen to close this final section with this chapter, as it illustrates a program that has, to use Lavelle and Shima's words, "successfully created a context where multilingualism is an asset, not a deficit"—a goal shared by so many authors in this collection.

§

As we close, we want to recognize the challenges inherent in transforming writing courses, curricula, and programs to become linguistically and culturally inclusive. Even modest changes to the pedagogy of a single course require time and energy on behalf of a faculty member, difficult to find in this period of increasing faculty workloads without corresponding increases in compensation. Changes at the curricular and programmatic level require strong administrative support and the time and energy of writing program administrators, all of which are in short supply in the face of cutbacks in funding, increasing course caps, and shortage of tenured positions for both Composition Studies and TESOL professionals. The comprehensive ACCESS program for international students at George Mason University, as described by Karyn Mallet and Ghania Zgheib, for example, requires enormous support from many levels of administration and faculty. However, given the multilingualism and multiculturalism of

today's students, we believe that the vision of linguistically and culturally inclusive writing courses, curricula and programs is a worthy goal, no matter how incremental the steps are that can be taken in any one classroom, college, or university at any given time.

Research into the ways in which L2 writers negotiate academic writing on US campuses, into US faculty expectations for and experiences with L2 writers across the curriculum, into approaches for faculty development in creating linguistically and culturally inclusive pedagogy, into the effects of particular approaches to structuring writing programs, and into the ways in which WAC pedagogies and practices get translated into online teaching environments and in writing programs abroad, such as presented in this collection, help pave the way for making this goal a reality for more students at more institutions of higher education. In closing, we return to the words from Ilona Leki with which we started: "The infusion of life brought by these ESL students' different perspectives on the world can only benefit a pluralistic society which is courageous enough truly to embrace its definition of itself" (1992, p. 133). We believe that WAC is, indeed, courageous enough to be transformed by the multilingualism and multiculturalism of our students.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Finally, we want to recommend some avenues for future research based on the topics and concerns explored by the chapters in this collection as well as by larger conversations occurring in composition studies, WAC, and L2 writing around the implications for our fields of increasing populations of US resident L2 writers (what we've called "globalism at home" [Zawacki & Cox, 2011]); increasing numbers of international L2 students on US campuses; and increased globalization of US institutions of higher education through partnerships with institutions abroad and the establishment of branch campuses outside of the US. We've organized these according to the section themes.

SECTION I RELATED TO L2 STUDENTS' EXPERIENCES:

- How do L2 students write across the curriculum in different institutional contexts?
- How do the dynamics of race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, and class affect L2 students and their writing development?
- How do L2 students use aspects of "multicompetence" to read and write about texts, to complete assignments, and to do research. What resources

do they draw on? What strategies are they using? How can we help them “activate multicompetence” (Hall & Navarro, 2011, n.p.)?

- How and what writing and rhetorical knowledge are L2 students transferring from other sites, contexts, and educational experiences? How are they adapting this knowledge? How might they be using this knowledge to resist US conventions of writing and rhetoric? (See, for example, Chris Tardy, 2009, and much of Mark James’ work on transfer and L2 students.)

SECTION II RELATED TO FACULTY PERCEPTIONS AND TEACHING PRACTICES AROUND L2 WRITING:

- How do the presence and contributions of L2 students affect campus and classroom climate? With increased populations of L2 students, do faculty reexamine their focus on SWE and Western rhetorical norms or tighten their grip on them?
- How are faculty reading, responding to, and assessing L2 students’ texts in diverse locations within and outside of the US?
- What are faculty expectations for L2 students at the graduate level, within and outside of the US? And, related to this, what are expectations for L2 writing in professional contexts, within and outside of academia?
- How do the response and assessment practices of L1 and L2 faculty differ, if they do? In comparison with L1 faculty, are L2 faculty more sympathetic to the challenges that L2 students face or do they push them harder? From what perspective—lingua franca English or SWE or other—do L2 faculty tend to read?
- What kinds of faculty development work related to L2 writing are needed? What models and approaches have proven to be effective?

SECTION III RELATED TO A FOCUS ON COURSES, CURRICULUM, AND PROGRAMS:

- What “ESL-ready” courses and programs are being developed at institutions in and outside of the US? Are there models of pedagogies and programs that embrace lingua franca English as the norm (rather than, for example, SWE) and that draw on L2 writers’ resources and strengths?
- What writing pedagogies have L2 students experienced before entering US undergraduate and graduate programs and at US secondary schools, English language institutes, for-profit English language schools, and secondary education outside of the US?

**AND, FINALLY, IN THINKING ABOUT THE IMPLICATIONS
OF THE COLLECTION AS A WHOLE:**

- What research has been/is being carried out on WID and English L2 outside of the US? (The newly inaugurated series *International Exchanges on the Study of Writing*, published by the WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press, is inviting book-length manuscripts that address worldwide perspectives on writing, writers, teaching with writing, and scholarly writing practices, specifically those that draw on scholarship across national and disciplinary borders to challenge parochial understandings of all of the above.)
- What research has been/is being carried out on tutoring writing in the disciplines at English-medium institutions outside of the US?

What collaborations between writing scholars are occurring/should be occurring and on what topics and across what disciplinary and national borders? (On the WAC Clearinghouse, see, for example, Bazerman et al.'s *International Advances in Writing Research: Cultures, Places, Measures* (2012) with chapters selected from the more than 500 presentations at the Writing Research Across Borders II Conference in 2011. Also see *Writing Programs Worldwide: Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places* (2012) with chapters emerging from the WAC/WID International Mapping Project.)

NOTES

1. Throughout this project and our previous project, the special issue of *Across the Disciplines*, our collaboration has been rich, productive, and even joyful. We have discovered that we make wonderful partners, matched in our work ethics and complementary in our strengths. In order to equally share credit for our collaborative work, in the *ATD* issue, we decided to list Michelle as first editor of the collection and Terry as first author of the introduction. With this project, we did the reverse, and listed Terry as first editor of the collection and Michelle as first author of the introduction.

2. We realize that the designator “English as a Second Language” is problematic, in that English may be the third, fourth, etc, language of the students we’re referring to. We have chosen to use this designation, however, to connect the work in this collection to the wider scholarship of second language writing studies. For a further rationale for using this designation, see Matsuda, 2012.

REFERENCES

- Bazerman, C., Dean, C., Early, J., Lunsford, K., Null, S., Rogers, P., & Stansell, A. (Eds.). (2012). *International advances in writing research: Cultures, places, measures*. Fort Collins, CO: WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/books/wrab2011/>
- Benesch, S. (1994). ESL, ideology, and the politics of pragmatics. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 705-716.
- Bizzell, P., Schroeder, C. & Fox, H. (Eds.). (2002). *Alt Dis: Alternative discourses in the academy*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1993). Comments on Ann Raimes' "Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing." *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 300-306.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2004). Language rights and postmodern conditions, *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 3(2), pp. 140-145.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006a). Toward a writing pedagogy of shuttling between languages: Learning from multilingual writers, *College English*, 68(6), 589-604.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006b). The place of World Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued, *College Composition and Communication*, 57(4), 586-619.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging, *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 401-417.
- Conference of College Composition and Communication. (1974). *Students' right to their own language*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/library/NC-TEFiles/Groups/CCCC/NewSRTOL.pdf>
- Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2009). *CCCC Statement on Second Language Writing and Writers*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/secondlangwriting>
- Cox, M. (2011). WAC: Closing doors or opening doors for second language writers? *Across the Disciplines*, 8(4). Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/ell/cox.cfm>
- Ferris, D. (2004). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Ferris, D. (2009). *Teaching college writing to diverse student populations*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press/ELT.

- Hall, J. (2009). WAC/WID in the next America: Redefining professional identity in the age of the multilingual majority. *The WAC Journal*, 20, 33-49. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/journal/vol20/hall.pdf>
- Hall, J., & Navarro, N. (2011). Lessons for WAC/WID from language learning research: Multicompetence, register acquisition, and the college writing student. *Across the Disciplines*, 8(4). Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/ell/hall-navarro.cfm>
- Horner, B., Lu, M.-Z., Royster, J., & Trumbur, J. (2011). Language difference in writing: Toward a translanguaging approach. *College English*, 73, 303-321.
- Horner, B., NeCamp, S., & Donahue, T. (2011). Toward a multilingual composition scholarship: From English Only to a translanguaging norm. *College Composition and Communication*, 63(2), 269-300.
- Hymes, D. (1979). On communicative competence. In C. Brumfit & K. Johnson (Eds.), *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching* (pp. 183-191). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- James, M. (2010). An investigation of learning transfer in English-for-general-academic-purposes writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 183-206.
- James, M. (2008). Learning transfer in second language writing education: The impact of task similarity/difference. *Written Communication*, 25, 76-103.
- Johns, A. M. (2001). ESL students and WAC programs: Varied populations and diverse needs. In S. H. McLeod, E. Miraglia, M. Soven, & C. Thaiss (Eds.), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing writing-across-the-curriculum programs* (pp. 141-164). Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Land, R., & Whitley, C. (1989). Evaluating second-language essays in regular composition classes: Toward a pluralistic U. S. rhetoric. In D. Johnson & D. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 284-293). New York: Longman.
- Leki, I. (1992). *Understanding ESL writers: A Guide for teachers*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Leki, I. (1995). Coping strategies of ESL students in writing tasks across the curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 235-260.
- Leki, I. (2002). Not the end of history. In L. Blanton & B. Kroll (Eds.), *ESL Composition Tales: Reflections on Teaching* (pp. 49-62). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Lindsey, P. & Crusan, D. (2011). How faculty attitudes and expectations toward student nationality affect writing assessment. *Across the Disciplines*, 8(4). Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/ell/lindsey-crusan.cfm>
- Macrorie, K. (1970). *Uptaught*. Rochelle Park, NJ: Hayden.

- Matsuda, P. K. (2012). Teaching composition in the multilingual world: Second language writing in composition studies. In K. Ritter & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Exploring composition studies: Sites, issues, and perspectives* (pp. 36-51). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- Matsuda, P. K., & Jablonksi, J. (2000). Beyond the L2 metaphor: Towards a mutually transformative model of ESL/WAC collaboration. *Academic Writing, 1*. Retrieved from http://wac.colostate.edu/aw/articles/matsuda_jablonksi2000.pdf
- Peirce, B. N. (1989). Toward a pedagogy of possibility in the teaching of English internationally: People's English in South Africa, *TESOL Quarterly, 23*(3), 401-420.
- Reid, J. & Kroll, B. (1995). Designing and assessing effective classroom writing assignments for NES and ESL students, *Journal of Second Language Writing, 4*(1), 17-41.
- Rubin, D. L. & William-James, M. (1997). The impact of writer nationality on mainstream teachers' judgments of composition quality, *Journal of Second Language Writing, 6*(2), 139-153.
- Santos, T. (1988). Professors' reactions to the academic writing of non-native speaking students, *TESOL Quarterly, 22*(1), 69-90.
- Selinker, L. (1977). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10*, 209-231.
- Shaughnessy, M. (1979). *Errors and expectations: A guide for the teacher of basic writing*. New York: Oxford.
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(4), 657-677.
- Silva, T., Leki, I., & Carson, J. (1997). Broadening the perspective of mainstream composition studies: Some thoughts from the disciplinary margins, *Written Communication, 14*(3), 398-428.
- Smitherman, G. (1977). *Talkin and testifyin: The language of black America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Song, B., & Caruso, I. (1996). Do English and ESL faculty differ in evaluating the essays of native English-speaking and ESL students? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5*(2), 163-182.
- Tardy, C. (2009). *Building genre knowledge: Writing L2*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.
- Thaiss, C., Bräuer, G., Carlino, P., Ganobcsik-Williams, L., & Sinha, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Writing programs worldwide: Profiles of academic writing in many places*. Fort Collins, CO: WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/books/wpww/>

- Vann, R. J., Meyer, D. E., & Lorenz, F. O. (1984). Error gravity: A study of faculty opinion of ESL errors. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18(3), 427-440.
- Weigle, S. C., Boldt, H., & Valsecchi, M. I. (2003). Effects of task and rater background on the evaluation of ESL writing: A pilot study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(2), 345-354.
- Zamel, V. (1995). Strangers in academia: The experiences of faculty and ESL students across the curriculum. *College Composition and Communication*, 46(4), 506-521.
- Zamel, V. (2002). From the margins to the center. In V. Zamel & R. Spack (Eds.), *Enriching ESOL pedagogy: Readings and activities for engagement, reflection, and inquiry* (pp. 331-340). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Zamel, V., & Spack, R. (Eds.). (2004). *Crossing the curriculum: Multilingual learners in college classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Zawacki, T. M., & Cox, M. (2011). Introduction to WAC and second language writing, *Across the Disciplines*, 8(4). Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/ell/zawacki-cox.cfm>