

4

Territorial Borders and the Teaching of Writing in English: Lessons from Research at the University of Balamand

Samer A. Annous
UNIVERSITY OF BALAMAND (LEBANON)

Maureen O'Day Nicolas
UNIVERSITY OF BALAMAND (LEBANON)

Martha A. Townsend
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI (US)

This chapter reports on a qualitative, multi-phase project undertaken at the University of Balamand (UOB), a private university north of Beirut that uses English as a medium of instruction (EMI). Two UOB researchers sought to discover whether writing skills taught in required English courses were transferring to subsequent EMI courses. Data from a syllabus review, interviews with teachers and students, and corroboration by an external consultant in Writing across the Curriculum reveal that even though UOB was an early adopter of EMI in the MENA region, the university needs to consider much more critically the complex implications of that linguistic decision.

Keywords: territorial borders; business; writing-across-the-curriculum; qualitative research; English as a medium of instruction (EMI)

With globalization and the internationalization of education, using English as a medium of instruction has become widespread in tertiary education (Coleman, 2006; Gill & Kirkpatrick, 2013). Many studies have highlighted the challenges faced by university students writing in English as a second or other language (L₂). Evans and Morrison (2011) reported that writing is

the most challenging aspect of university study. When writing in a second or additional language, university students are struggling to develop both their proficiency in the target language and their writing strategies and skills (Astroga, 2007; Hyland, 2007). Research also suggests that L2 students require additional support in their language development beyond the language classroom (Bacha, 2012; Cox, 2011; Zamel, 1995). Zamel (1995) warns that “it is unrealistic and ultimately counterproductive to expect writing and English as second or other language programs to be responsible for providing students with the language, discourse and multiple ways of seeing required across disciplines” (p. 518).

Students in English-medium universities are required to develop their academic writing in order to “participate in their disciplines and to demonstrate their learning to readers in these disciplines” (Hyland, 2013, p. 241). “Knowledge domain” is an important factor that impacts the writing of students and leads them to use “more sophisticated strategies and the production of better-structured texts” (Crossley, Roscoe, & McNamara, 2014, p. 187). Although the value of knowledge domain and writing in the discipline has been highlighted by many researchers, many colleges and departments still do not consider teaching writing as their responsibility and often place a high value on content coverage only (Clughen & Connel, 2012; Zhu, 2004). Research has also shown that many professors feel territorial and possessive about their area of expertise (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Pawan & Ortloff, 2011; Zhu, 2004).

As is the case with most students in Lebanon, students at the University of Balamand have diverse writing experiences in English depending on their school training. (See also Jarkas & Fakhreddine; and Arnold, DeGenaro, Iskandarani, Khoury, Sinno, & Willard-Traub, this volume, for the English writing experiences of Lebanese students.) In general, English-educated students study in English, so they are usually more exposed to different genres before joining college. French-educated students, on the other hand, study English language as a subject, and writing in English is not generally emphasized. However, when it comes to discipline-specific college writing, both groups of students still face problems as they try to adapt to new forms of academic writing. Although this challenge is also faced by native speakers of English, it is intensified for L2 students.

UOB follows a genre-based model for the teaching of academic writing, in which students from different disciplines are required to take two English courses that focus on writing extended texts. Students are expected to demonstrate critical thinking, linguistic accuracy, appropriate use of in-text citations, plus skill in summarizing and paraphrasing. However, there is no evidence that the skills acquired in these two courses are transferred to their

major courses or whether professors in the different disciplines require their students to apply these writing skills in their discipline-based courses. In fact, the writing ability of UOB students has been a major cause of frustration for both teachers in the different disciplines and teachers of English.

This chapter reports on qualitative research conducted at UOB by Annous and Nicolas to assess the degree to which UOB's curriculum supports students in improving their writing in English. This chapter also reports on observations made by Townsend during a consultancy visit to UOB to determine whether embedding more writing in English in content courses might become a viable means of teaching students to learn to write in English. Annous and Nicolas are longtime UOB teachers of composition and other courses; they are also teacher trainers in the English-language-teaching graduate program. Townsend is a U.S.-based practitioner, researcher, and advocate of writing-across-the-curriculum (WAC) and writing in the disciplines (WID), whose work Annous and Nicolas had encountered during the early phase of their research.

By way of grounding Annous and Nicolas' study and Townsend's observations, which corroborate their findings, we (the three of us) first sketch a brief history of language use and instruction in the MENA region to situate the context in which UOB's students and faculty work. We follow with the methodology, findings, and discussion of Annous and Nicolas' research and, after that, observations from Townsend's visit, along with cautious recommendations for how to begin implementation of WAC in this environment. We believe the lessons we have learned have implications for other English as a medium of instruction (EMI) institutions in the MENA region.

MENA's and Lebanon's Rich Linguistic History

The MENA region is linguistically diverse. Comprised of eighteen Arab countries plus Israel and Iran, which together occupy an area larger than Europe and have a population greater than the US (Dagher & BouJaoude, 2011), the region's linguistic history is culturally vibrant. But this history and vibrancy create significant challenges for EMI institutions that hold high standards for their students. With the spread of Islam in the seventh century, Arabic became the dominant language in the Middle East, North Africa, and the Iberian Peninsula. With colonization in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, French and English became "prestige" languages in the Arab world. After Arab independence from France, Britain, and Italy, Arabic became the official language of the new Arab states, but bilingualism remained very common in many countries, especially among the elite and ur-

ban communities. English is the *lingua franca* of expatriates who make up the majority of the population in some Arab Gulf countries, such as the United Arab Emirates and Qatar. Most important, English has become a symbol of modernity, technology, and education throughout the region (Joseph, 2013). Many of the MENA region's new universities, especially in Lebanon, Jordan, and the Arab Gulf states, use English as their medium of instruction.

One of the distinctive features of the Lebanese educational system is its mosaic of schools, which consists primarily of three types: a) state schools managed by the Ministry of Education; b) religious schools under the auspices of local or foreign Christian and Muslim authorities and missionaries; and c) non-religious private schools. Some of the latter are thought of as national because, although private, they follow the government curriculum, while others follow a distinctly foreign curriculum. The private confessional schools and schools founded by missionaries, mainly Jesuit and Protestant, are the most dominant schools in Lebanon because of their historical roots dating to the nineteenth century. Most state and private schools in Lebanon use French or English as their medium of instruction.

American and British missionary schools introduced English to Lebanon in the nineteenth century. Although Lebanon was a French colony from 1920 to 1943, and French and Arabic were the official languages of Lebanon under the French mandate, English continued to survive as a major language in private schools. The 1950s oil boom in the Arab Gulf increased the number of students enrolled in EMI schools throughout the region. Lebanon also became a regional hub for Arabs who wanted to learn (in) English.

Historically, private universities in Lebanon have attracted students from all over the Arab world. Prior to the Lebanese civil war (1975-1990), Lebanon had only four private universities in addition to one state university, the Lebanese University. Established in 1866, the American University of Beirut (AUB) was the first institution to provide higher education in the region. The Lebanese American University (LAU), formerly known as the Beirut College for Women (1949-1973) and Beirut University College (1973-1994), was, like AUB, established by American Presbyterian missionaries. Both AUB and LAU adopted EMI because of their historical connection with American missionaries. Beirut Arab University, affiliated with Alexandria University in Egypt, used English and Arabic curricula. Saint Joseph University used French because of its ties to French Jesuit missionaries. Lebanese University, established in 1951, used mainly French and Arabic as its languages of instruction.

After 1990, postwar Lebanon witnessed the establishment of more than thirty universities and colleges, the majority of which use English as the me-

dium of instruction (EMI). The biggest universities in Lebanon were founded by confessional groups, with the Christian Maronites establishing Notre Dame University and the Holy Spirit University of Kaslik; the Shi'a Muslims establishing the Islamic University; and the Greek Orthodox Church founding the University of Balamand. The majority of these universities use EMI and most of the French-medium universities also offer programs in English, especially in the fields of engineering, science, and business. Many of the newly established for-profit universities use "American" or "international" in their names to attract local and international students. Lebanon is now among the top thirty host countries in the world for international students (World Bank Report, 2011). Over 11% of UOB's students are international who are seeking to study in English-medium programs.

Lebanon and the Circles of English

The Lebanese Constitution of 1990 states that Lebanon has an "Arab identity and belonging" and that Arabic is the national language of the country (Constitution Project, 2014). Moreover, the 1997 Ministry of Education curriculum reform emphasized the effective and efficient use of the Arabic language. The language-in-education policies followed by private and public schools and universities, however, contradict the constitution and the curricular reform. Using English or French as a medium of instruction has been a distinctive feature of higher education in Lebanon for more than a century; it would be nearly impossible to change this tradition. Recent studies have shown that students and educators perceive foreign languages, English in particular, as more useful than Arabic for future careers (Diab, 2000; Shaaban & Ghaith, 2002; Zakharia, 2010).

Kachru (1992) presents a persuasive model that divides the world's users of English into three circles: inner, outer, and expanding. The inner circle refers to English-speaking countries such as England, the United States, and Australia, in which English is considered the "native" language (English as the native language, or ENL). The outer circle consists of former colonies of ENL countries, such as India and Nigeria, where English is considered a "second" language (English as a Second Language, or ESL). The expanding circle comprises all other countries, such as China, Japan, and Russia, where English has become important in business, science, technology, and education. English in these contexts is considered a foreign language (English as a Foreign Language, or EFL). According to Xiaoqiong and Xianxing (2011), EFL students usually study English to communicate with nonnative speakers in the outer and expanding circles where English is used for functional pur-

poses such as finding a job, pursuing academic studies, and communicating with professional contacts.

In some contexts, the lines between the outer and expanding circles have become fuzzy (Berns, 2005). Lebanon, in particular, can be situated between the outer (ESL) and the expanding (EFL) circles. In fact, English in Lebanon is used as a second language in EMI schools and universities and as a foreign language in the community because it is not usually spoken outside the classroom (Bacha & Bahous, 2011; Nicolas & Annous, 2013). English is taught as a subject in French-medium schools and is used as a medium of instruction in EMI schools.

Consistent with the British Council's report, cited below, the adoption of EMI in Lebanon has not been sufficiently or critically explored. Characteristics that should be considered when designing EMI programs include the proficiency level of students and content teachers, the dominant language on campus and in the community, and the international students and staff. As Doiz, Lasagabaster, and Sierra (2013) warn, "the implementation of EMI programs has to be carefully planned, providing highly qualified teachers (both in content and language), as well as students with the necessary English proficiency. Yet this has not always been the case" (p. 216).

Context for the University of Balamand

UOB is a private university of 5,500 students located 75 kilometers north of Lebanon's capital, Beirut. It was founded in 1988 by the Antiochian Greek Orthodox Church as an EMI institution even though one of the founding faculties (schools), the Fine Arts Faculty, was a French-medium constituent (Lebanon's strong relationship with France under the French Mandate has influenced terminology in our system of higher education; thus, schools of specific disciplines are referred to as "Faculty"). The Fine Arts Faculty continues to use French as the medium of instruction, and some of the disciplines in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASS) have both French and English tracks. The Faculties of Engineering, Science, Medicine and Business are exclusively English medium. The university is located on a mountain overlooking the Mediterranean Sea with the country's second largest city, Tripoli, visible on the coast slightly to the north. The mountainous elevation secludes UOB and its population from urban interaction, which has implications for students' language use, a phenomenon we address later.

That UOB is an EMI institution is not surprising. Research conducted by the Oxford University Department of Education and the British Council (Dearden, 2014) shows that "a fast-moving shift" is occurring worldwide from

EFL to EMI. The shift is occurring at all levels of education, from university to secondary and primary. As the British Council report shows, however, little empirical research has been done to show how, why, and when EMI is introduced and delivered. More importantly, the consequences of EMI on teaching, learning, assessment, and teachers' professional development are likewise understudied.

In recent history, many Lebanese living in urban communities have grown up speaking both Arabic and French. For the last thirty years or so, the use of English has increased such that younger generations who are bilingual in Arabic and French are also incorporating English into their linguistic repertoire. This phenomenon, however, creates a challenging literacy conundrum. Many younger Lebanese who are *orally* communicative in multiple languages find themselves unable to produce adequate *written* communication in any of the languages they speak.

Even though Lebanon is a small country, the various linguistic abilities of its population tend to pool in certain areas. In the north, where UOB is located, Arabic is the default language. UOB's student body is primarily Arabic speaking; English is a second or even third language for many students. On UOB's campus, one is more likely to hear students speaking Arabic, or a mixture of Arabic and English, rather than English alone. Arabic is commonly used when interacting in the surrounding community.

UOB's undergraduate students typically range in age from 18 to 22. Placement into the first of two required English composition courses is based on scores from an external exam such as the TOEFL or SAT I. If students do not score at UOB's admission level (490 on the SAT I written portion and 600 on the paper-based TOEFL or 100 on the iBT TOEFL), they are placed in one of five remedial levels. UOB instructors are primarily native Arabic speakers who are fluent in English. A large majority of instructors hold post-graduate degrees from American institutions in the US. Only a small number are native English speakers.

Annous and Nicolas have first-hand knowledge of UOB's English-language curriculum. As long-time instructors at UOB, we (Annous and Nicolas) have been closely involved in designing the curriculum, and we teach many of the seven courses (two required and five remedial) that comprise the Composition and Rhetoric sequence. Our knowledge of what students are asked to do versus what they are able to do is the driving factor behind the research reported here. Our responsibility for students' ability to write in English, and our vested interest in their success, have led us to want to inform policy decisions that affect the skills students demonstrate upon graduation.

Since UOB operates within the expanding circle of Kachru's English-lan-

guage model (EFL), UOB students need a customized approach to the acquisition of English. Students' attainment of a competitive level of English requires that they receive assistance in transferring language skills to a variety of contexts. We (Annous and Nicolas) hoped our investigations would help us understand how our students are using English in UOB's EMI curriculum, some of which occurs in UOB's Cultural Studies program, but most of which occurs in the curriculum of students' major course of study. We also wanted to know what kinds of writing skills were being taught or reinforced in the EMI courses.

Methodology

To that end, we conducted a three-stage, multi-method study consisting of syllabi review, one-on-one interviews with instructors in the Faculty of Business, and one-on-one interviews with instructors and a student focus group in the Cultural Studies program. The FASS dean also commissioned an external expert observational visit, which occurred between stages one and two. Overall, we sought to discover whether English writing skills are transferring to EMI courses in the students' course of study and if not, why not. We wanted to be able to make data-driven decisions regarding how best to nurture students' acquisition of writing skill.

As a young, private teaching institution, UOB has not yet established a formal Institutional Review Board (IRB) to guide research procedures. In lieu of IRB guidelines, we needed institutional permission to conduct our research, and so approached the FASS dean, to whom we report, for permission to undertake the research. The dean supported the project and secured the necessary permission from other faculties, which granted us access to the data sources. The FASS dean also supported our request to bring in Martha Townsend, whose research on WAC we had become familiar with, for an exploratory visit to ascertain UOB's readiness for a WAC initiative.

The Participants

The participants included a total of ten students and fourteen instructors, all of whom were interviewed by both of us. The instructors' participation was solicited through an informative email. Six Business and eight Cultural Studies instructors were interviewed. Four out of the fourteen faculty respondents (approximately 29%) hold master's degrees; all others hold doctoral degrees. The students' participation was solicited by Annous, when he visited the EMI Cultural Studies classrooms to explain the project and invite volunteers to

participate in a focus-group interview. This method resulted in a random sample of ten students from four different EMI Cultural Studies courses. All participation was voluntary and participants were assured of anonymity. The interview data has been kept confidential, and we have preserved the anonymity of all participants.

Three Stages of Research

We began our study with a review of syllabi from all thirty of the Faculty of Business (FOB) courses taught in the Spring 2011 semester (see Appendix A). A content analysis was conducted on all the syllabi based on the syllabus review strategy developed by Ridley and Smith (2006). Since English is the *lingua franca* of international business, we assumed that written communication in English would be central to the business school's curriculum. We also assumed that students would be encouraged to transfer the writing skills they had acquired in UOB's English composition courses to their business courses. We began with this unobtrusive review, thinking that if the syllabi included explicit writing assignments and/or writing-to-learn activities, we could infer that the FOB was promoting writing in English beyond the required English composition classes.

The syllabus review generated stage two of the investigation. We designed an in-depth, semi-structured interview protocol to inquire about FOB instructors' thoughts about students' use of English and the instructors' role in developing students' writing skill and awareness of discipline-specific conventions. For this stage, we conducted one-on-one interviews with six instructors (see Appendix B), two of whom hold master's degrees and four of whom hold doctoral degrees. Both of us were present during the interviews, which we tape-recorded. The typed interview transcripts were subjected to member checking (Cohen & Manion, 1994), and we used an inductive matrix process (Miles & Huberman, 1994) for our transcript analysis.

The third stage of our study, which investigated general education courses offered by the Cultural Studies program at UOB, consisted of two parts: one-on-one interviews with nine instructors who teach in the program (see Appendix C), and a focus-group interview with a random sample of ten students (see Appendix D). This third stage thus added the important component of student perspectives to our work. For both sets of participants, the questions were designed to reveal the instructional methodologies used by instructors, including whether feedback was given to the students on their writing. The questions were also intended to reveal whether instructors nurtured written English through any pedagogical strategies, such as pre-writing instruction

or feedback on output. Further, the questions probed instructors' and students' opinions about how these courses contribute to improving proficiency in written English.

We jointly conducted hour-long instructor interviews using a semi-structured protocol with eight instructors who teach the required EMI Cultural Studies courses. Interview transcripts were member checked (Cohen & Manion, 1994), and an iterative process identified emergent themes, discussed below.

Annous conducted the student focus-group interview while Nicolas took notes, observing from outside. Here again, a semi-structured interview protocol was used. The focus-group interview was also recorded so we could refer to the raw data during the analysis. Students were given the choice of speaking in either Arabic or English. Several chose to speak only in Arabic, while some used both Arabic and English, which reflects the bilingual characteristics of the UOB population; several of the students spoke only in English when addressing the questions but even these students resorted to Arabic when the discussion escalated. A random sample of ten students who represent all four courses and all class levels comprised the focus group. Themes were extracted from the focus group interview through an inductive process and then combined with the instructor interviews in order to triangulate findings (see Appendix F).

Findings and Discussion

Stage One: FOB Syllabus Review

The syllabus review led us (Annous and Nicolas) to infer two very different outcomes. First, FOB instructors seem unaware of the potential of using writing as a learning strategy. Second, FOB instructors seem to lack awareness of their responsibility to train students in the writing conventions of their discipline.

The review showed that only nine of the thirty syllabi from courses offered that spring (less than one-third) mention writing of any kind. Appendix E displays those courses and shows how writing was reported as either an intended learning outcome or as an activity in the course. The table reveals that three of the courses that mention writing do not clearly state what the writing activity is. The remaining six syllabi mention an essay or report but nowhere on the syllabus is there any description of the writing requirements or the writing process. It is possible that the FOB instructors could have distributed more detailed assignment guidelines during the semester, apart

from what the syllabi indicate (although our further findings, below, do not suggest this was the case). Finally, the syllabi also do not mention whether author stance or audience perspective are stressed (Nicolas & Annous, 2013).

Stage Two: FOB Teachers' Perceptions

The iterative analysis of our in-depth, semi-structured interviews with the six FOB instructors generated five themes. These themes reveal the business instructors' opinions regarding writing in English in their classes and their attitudes toward nurturing students' English written skills in business genres. All five themes include respondent triangulation; in other words, more than one respondent needed to express a similar point of view for a theme to be generated (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The themes that emerged from this stage are:

1. FOB teachers do not believe it is their responsibility to teach or focus on language acquisition in any of the languages students use;
2. The FOB relies heavily on use of students' first language (spoken Arabic);
3. The teaching methodologies and assessment employed in FOB do not include WID tasks;
4. FOB teachers place a singular focus on subject content to the exclusion of building skill in writing; and
5. A cohesive environment that would enable the FOB and the Department of English to work toward a common goal of graduating students who are competent writers in English does not seem to exist (Annous & Nicolas, 2015).

These findings suggest that UOB is not fully preparing its English L2 students for work in an English-speaking world. The teachers in stage two of the study strongly and explicitly express a belief that students' ability to communicate in written English is not their responsibility and, furthermore, that the students have such poor language skill that the instructors are obliged to resort to Arabic in order to cover the necessary content. One respondent characterized students' English language use as "catastrophic." When probed to explain the perceived lack of language skill, participants largely blamed the prevailing culture students live in, with one saying, "This culture is not a reading culture; students do not read enough, and that's why their language suffers."

The respondents asserted a position that language and the ability to write in English is something separate from their subject domain. The interview

transcripts contain numerous comments, such as “I do not feel that my courses are the place to correct language” and “I feel the grade should reflect how well they understood finance only.”

This approach to tertiary education in an Arabic-speaking context that has adopted an EMI model of education seems to indicate isolated silos of knowledge that do not serve a student body that needs to cultivate skills required for international competitiveness. The university thus appears to have cultivated what educational theorists Becher and Trowler (2001) refer to as academic “territorial borders.” Becher and Trowler (2001) posit that, within tertiary educational institutions, different academic “tribes” function in separate territories having different knowledge distinct from other academic tribes in the same institution. This seems to us to be the position espoused by the FOB participants. They claim that it is not their job to teach English-language communication skills, and they also claim they do not have the knowledge to do so.

This finding echoes that reported in the British Council study mentioned earlier: “EMI teachers firmly believed that teaching English was not their job. They did not consider themselves responsible for their students’ level of English. . . . They did not see themselves as language teachers in any way” (Dearden, 2014, p. 6). As one of the professors interviewed for that report says, “I’m not interested in their English, I’m interested in their comprehension of [the subject being taught]” (p. 6).

With the extent of the FOB instructors’ beliefs thus revealed, we realized that we needed to investigate a different program that had further-reaching implications for the entire UOB student body. The Cultural Studies curriculum, consisting of four courses, is required of every student at UOB (except for the Fine Arts students who take a different sequence of courses). After re-establishing permission through the FASS dean to conduct additional research, this time in FASS, we set out to investigate the general education courses offered by the Cultural Studies program to learn to what degree English-writing skill development is integrated into that program.

Stage Three: Students’ and Instructors’ Perceptions of Writing in the Cultural Studies Program

The third stage of the project expanded the focus of the investigation to include communication skill in English in general. This investigation clearly revealed information germane to the development of students’ writing skill in English. The series of four required Cultural Studies courses addresses early civilization; religious studies; key philosophers, including Arab philosophers;

and contemporary thinkers. We assumed that, as with EMI courses required throughout all UOB degree programs, the Cultural Studies courses would be fostering essential skills in written English.

We constructed a matrix for each emergent theme that included supporting data (see Appendix F for examples of the matrices). Twelve themes emerged from the transcripts, which we then clustered by related themes to determine our primary findings (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Inherent in the findings from this stage of research is that the required Cultural Studies courses do not nurture students' ability to communicate in written English. The data revealed that ineffective feedback on student writing, as well as an absence of a pedagogical focus on writing, contribute to the lack of enhancement of written skill in these courses. Furthermore, students seem to believe that the courses' only value is in increasing their general knowledge base. Students were unaware that these courses could serve any other purpose, such as skill development in written English. One student sarcastically commented that, "Since our English skill is not better even after we take the two required English courses, then why would a Cultural Studies teacher be able to help us with our English?" Other students in the focus group disputed the contention that *no* improvement is achieved in the English writing courses, but they did concur that the Cultural Studies courses do not nurture their ability to a significant degree. A consensus was reached that students who come from EMI high schools already know English, so they "really don't learn anything new" at university, whereas students who come from French-medium high schools probably do improve their English through the English courses and the Cultural Studies courses simply by having to use it, by being exposed to the language.

Students also claimed to have learned the content and ideas taught in these classes but felt they could not express themselves adequately in English on written exams on the content knowledge. This claim suggests that students do not feel capable of handling the content of a cultural or philosophical nature in English, or at least they lack confidence in their ability to express their viewpoints on these topics in written English. In other words, they felt they could handle *oral* class discussions on difficult topics, but when it came to expressing their ideas *in writing*, they suffered from a lack of confidence and a lack of skill. This finding also speaks to the methodology of the courses. According to the students, not all instructors are clear about the writing conventions students should use in exams. Students claimed that even such essential assignment parameters as length and genre are unclear. Students were very expressive when revealing this last point. One young woman said that the only feedback one instructor ever gave was "more length," so she wrote a

“recipe” in the middle of her answer the next time to add length, which she claimed the instructor did not even notice. Another student, sounding very irritated, explained that no matter how hard he tried to address the “few comments” he received from his instructor on exams, he always achieved the same grade, as if the instructor did not notice the differences.

The interviews with the Cultural Studies instructors revealed a remarkably similar point of view to the instructors in the business school regarding their role as university professors. (See also Hodges & Kent, this volume, for discussion on instructors’ responses to teaching writing in their discipline.) Most of the respondents expressed a position that they “are not English teachers, after all.” One respondent was quite adamant about this point, saying, “We don’t teach how to write essays; we assume [students] have learned this in their English classes. It’s not our responsibility to teach them this as Cultural Studies teachers.” However, three of the instructors on this program also teach English and two of them emphasized their role in linking language skill to the discipline. One said, “I go very deeply in this [how to write], like verb choice, and [I] go into the essence of language . . . We analyze the language in the text and mistakes they make in their essays and explain linguistic problems they’re facing. I give feedback on speech and writing.” But the third instructor, who also teaches some English courses, agreed with the majority of respondents by saying, “I’m not into teaching them how to write an essay, because I think they know it.”

We (Annous and Nicolas) believe that the data suggest that the concept of academic territorial borders exists not only among the FOB instructors but also among both the instructors in the Cultural Studies curriculum and their students. The implications of this finding are quite far-reaching: If students unconsciously view their academic work as occurring from within academic territorial boundaries, then they will be less inclined to transfer skills and knowledge beyond these boundaries. Since the instructors confine their instruction within disciplinary borders, they will not promote student interaction with new or existing knowledge, nor will students initiate the process. As a result, students could think that the proper way of learning in tertiary education is within, rather than across, academic borders and boundaries.

Further, the findings from this stage of the study indicate that the methodologies practiced in UOB’s required Cultural Studies courses neither reinforce students’ acquisition of written English skill nor nurture other important literacy skills (such as reading), which would also contribute to better writing. UOB needs to be explicit about the purpose these courses serve in every major program. Certainly, the message—intended or not—transmitted to students is that the expansion of their general knowledge is the purpose

of the courses; that the content knowledge these courses contain is of paramount importance; and that no other benefit can be derived from the courses. At the same time, the message being transmitted to teachers is that they do not bear any responsibility for students' acquisition of written skill in this EFL/EMI context. The same message permeates the FOB curriculum. In both of these cases, the message is that *content* is the most important aspect of university study and students need to do whatever is necessary to learn it. In other words, the message being sent through the adherence to disciplinary borders with emphasis on content is that all other skills associated with academic work, particularly the acquisition of effective written skill in English in an EFL environment, is secondary or even isolated to a particular "tribe." The potential for UOB's required Cultural Studies courses to add to students' written skill in English is, therefore, lost.

The findings from this third stage of the research corroborate the findings from the first two stages. Taken together, the three stages suggest a situation whereby a tertiary educational institution functioning in an EFL environment has juxtaposed an EMI model onto a firmly established institutional structure that promotes "silos" of knowledge. We conclude that Becher and Trowler's (2001) concept of "knowledge territory" permeates the university. Instructors identify with a discipline and its content and do not acknowledge the role writing plays in the discipline or in the learning process. This phenomenon is not unique to UOB and can be found elsewhere (Bacha & Bahous, 2008; Pawan & Orloff, 2011; Plutsky & Wilson, 2001). Territorial knowledge boundaries are clearly detrimental to students' development, especially in written English communication in an EFL context.

A WAC Expert's Observations on Writing in English at UOB

Annous and Nicolas had already conducted the stage-one syllabus review before I (Townsend) visited. Annous and Nicolas' knowledge of UOB's culture and the fact that WAC is relatively uncommon outside the "inner circle" of English countries, led them to believe that UOB's composition instructors and administrators needed to know what WAC is and does if the institution were to consider implementing any form of WAC philosophy or pedagogies. They asked if I would prepare a presentation titled "What Is WAC? And Why Should Today's University Implement It?" to be delivered jointly to faculty and students enrolled in English 203, UOB's second required composition course.

Over three separate class periods, 300 students, their instructors, and assorted administrators gathered in a lecture hall to hear my talk, in which

I attempted to convey in the least pedantic manner possible the idea that what students learn in composition classes should carry over to subsequent classes as well—a problem that also vexes educators in the US. For the most part, students responded as would U.S. students in any similar forced lecture setting—with a combination of polite tolerance mixed with boredom, confusion, and curiosity.

As part of my interactive presentation, I asked students to prepare some informal writing, which I collected. I responded to some of the students' questions and comments during the presentation itself. Others I replied to in a letter that I wrote to students in return, conveyed to them via their instructors. I hoped that my letter would invite students and instructors alike to continue a conversation I tried to start with my presentation. I wanted to show them that informal writing has value. I wanted to let them know that American students ask the same questions about writing and that those questions do have reasonable answers. I wanted to suggest that staying after class to ask more questions and sharing one's writing with a complete stranger (as some had done after my presentation) can be signs of intellectual curiosity. And finally, I wanted to support the studying I knew they would soon be doing for their upcoming, in-class final exam.

Whether my letter accomplished any of these goals is unknown. But I believe that demonstrating the use of informal writing, both to students and to instructors, was important. And in writing back to them, I had hoped to reinforce that pedagogy. One student did email me later, sending along some writing she was proud of, which I interpreted as one of several signs during my visit that, with encouragement, UOB students *can* take pleasure in written discourse. In retrospect, I believe that while my presentation served some good, it actually provided a better lesson for WAC consultants who are doing international consulting. My attempting to describe the characteristics that undergird strong WAC programs for administrators, while at the same time trying to convince students to carry forward their new knowledge of writing, was simply too much, too soon, for too many audiences.

In addition to my three large-lecture presentations, I also met individually and in groups with scores of UOB instructors and students in settings that ranged from department meetings, class observations, one-on-one coffee breaks, over meals, and in individuals' offices. I sat in on a high-school teacher's oral defense of her master's degree. I met with American colleagues who were then working with the Writing Center at the American University of Beirut. And I engaged in nonstop conversation and analysis with the American friend who was then teaching at UOB and who housed me during my visit. Each conversation informed my thinking about the possibility of im-

plementing some version of WAC; each conversation added to the layers of complexity that were, at that time, not yet informed by stages two and three of Annous and Nicolas' research.

Following my visit, I submitted a six-page report to the dean, summarizing six key observations. On the positive side of the equation, I reported that, "Most professors and administrators with whom I spoke were curious and interested—even energized—about the potential for Balamand's adapting WAC theory and pedagogies to enhance teaching and learning in the curriculum" (unpublished letter, June 6, 2011). I also acknowledged the skepticism many raised about the seeming futility of teaching English composition and using WAC pedagogies. I conveyed my impression of a group of instructors deeply divided between wanting to do a good job in serving UOB's students but who, at the same time, were discouraged by students' apparent ennui, lack of interest in their English classes, and a willingness to sacrifice academic integrity to pass those courses.

I reported seeing "the potential for building alliances with professors at the American University of Beirut," with whom I had met before leaving Lebanon. They reported encountering many of the same issues that UOB faces and seemed interested in discussing mutual concerns with colleagues at their neighboring institution. Building alliances with other universities in Lebanon and the region seems to be the most productive way for all institutions to achieve better outcomes. I also identified an American colleague who was doing work on WAC with a university in Saudi Arabia, who could participate in the establishment of relevant guidelines, given his experience with WAC in the Arab world. I encouraged the dean to forge contacts and connections in the region, noting that WAC's international presence has increased in recent years and that UOB had the potential to become a leader in the region.

My report highlighted four other key conclusions: First, I wrote that UOB seems to lack a writing culture. Here, I was referring to the fact that virtually all the students I spoke with, in my presentations and in classes, reported doing little to no writing anywhere except in the required composition courses. By that time, Annous and Nicolas' syllabus study had already shown "no evidence" of writing in the FOB curriculum. My own conversations with instructors corroborated what students were telling me. Many students, in fact, had simply said they "do not need" writing in their careers.

Second, I reported that students are resistant to writing in general. They were unaware of the potential for writing to help them form thoughts and ideas. They had never considered asking their professors about the professors' own writing habits. When I asked them to write informally during my

presentation, they had groaned audibly and had to be encouraged to get out paper and pen. In response to my prompt “What does ‘writing’ mean to you?” this student’s remark was typical: “It is just work to do to have good grades and to pass my English course.” In response to my prompt “What is one question *you* have as a result of my talk today?” students wrote such things as: “Why should I pay all these [sic] money for writing?” and “Why are these classes obligatory?” A sizable number replied that they had no questions for me. Overall, the student responses I collected indicated that they see writing as a set of “skills” to master, rather than seeing writing as a way of knowing and as a means to an end that can enrich their personal and professional lives.

Third, I noted that plagiarism is a dominant theme. Throughout the week, numerous instructors had discussed with me the degree to which students’ trilingualism understandably complicates their learning to write in English. When they write, UOB students focus on correctness, especially grammar and citation format, rather than on conveying ideas and arguments. Instructors reported needing to act as “police” when grading student papers, while students adopt a “catch me if you can” attitude, with a foregone conclusion that academic dishonesty is the norm. Composition instructors require that virtually all writing be done in class, so that plagiarism is forestalled. Convinced that most students would pay for outside-of-class papers to be written for them, virtually all instructors and administrators agreed that the writing-in-class policy is necessary. Not allowing students to write outside of class because of the fear that students will have someone else do their writing for them severely limits the kind and quality of in-class writing that can be assigned.

Finally, I noted that, “These issues notwithstanding, many of the writing-related phenomena I observed at UOB exist in the US as well.” I reassured the dean that American students are not as knowledgeable about writing as we wish they would be; that our curricula are not perfect; and that we, too, struggle with plagiarism in our classrooms. I noted that it takes an entire four- or five-year undergraduate degree program in higher education for most students to become “good” writers—and that their growth in writing continues on into graduate school if students pursue graduate degrees.

I followed my 2011 UOB-specific observations to the dean with four pages of observations about WAC in general (e.g., WAC is *primarily a faculty development* initiative; transition to WAC takes time; instructors need continual support). And I offered a set of three specific recommendations that UOB might consider, elaborating on how each might be enacted:

1. Appoint a FASS WAC liaison.
2. Create a FASS WAC council to advise and assist the liaison.

3. Initiate efforts to secure one, and possibly two, Fulbright visiting professors with WAC expertise as soon as practicable.

At the time I wrote these recommendations, all three seemed reasonable and within the realm of possibility. The FASS dean was open to suggestions for addressing what he realized were genuine issues for UOB students. Having had a successful track record of bringing Fulbright faculty to campus, it was the dean who inquired about the possibility of Fulbright faculty with WAC expertise coming to help begin a WAC initiative. UOB instructors' interest was such that it could have been built upon. Momentum was noticeable. And while student resistance was high, there were signs that not every student shared that resistance. Everyone involved seemed to believe that a significant culture shift with regard to writing was both desirable and possible. Although these recommendations seemed plausible when written in 2011, political instability in the region since that time prohibits enacting the final one. The U.S. Department of State has discontinued the Fulbright program in Lebanon until further notice. Moreover, since I offered these recommendations, FASS has undergone a change in administration and UOB has begun accreditation procedures. Consequently, the momentum towards WAC implementation has halted and all programs are being evaluated in light of accreditation requirements.

Conclusion

Our chapter provides a critical look at a particular context in one EMI learning environment. The lessons could possibly have ramifications for other EMI learning environments in Arabic-speaking contexts. By knowing how, or even whether, writing in English is taught or reinforced in EMI courses, we now better understand the reasons why many students fail to exhibit effective writing skills in English during their university studies and after. Through the research conducted thus far, we (Annous and Nicholas) are also now better able to arrive at conclusions about implementing curricular reforms or policy recommendations, including the possibility of WAC, through a systematic process that would hopefully lead to UOB graduates having effective skill in written English.

The three stages of our evaluation of the institutional context have led to some major findings: Instructors are generally unaware of the role writing can play in the teaching/learning process. Writing is not utilized in the disciplines as a learning tool. Content mastery, at the expense of any other important and arguably related skill, especially in an EMI context, seems

to be of the highest value for most instructors, regardless of the discipline. Students seem to believe that they come to our EMI institution only to learn information without realizing the major skills they might learn in class, such as persuasive writing, critical thinking and public speaking. Our research reveals that students seem to have a predetermined idea that universities are made up of independent silos of knowledge where disciplinary border crossing is not even considered. We all now believe that the acquisition of effective written skill in English should be an explicit learning objective across disciplinary borders for EMI institutions like UOB that operate in non-English speaking contexts.

The ultimate challenge that UOB faces, along with many other institutions in similar contexts, is that many instructors in EMI tertiary educational institutions operating in the outer and expanding circles of English may be non-native speakers of English who lack the confidence and competence to deal with students' language acquisition. When being hired, instructors' competence in English must be foregrounded. For existing instructors at EMI institutions who are striving to improve students' English communicative skill outcomes, training and ongoing support must be provided by knowledgeable experts in the field. As the British Council's report (Dearden, 2014) shows, too little professional development is currently provided for EMI instructors. This situation is unacceptable. To reiterate Doiz, Lasagabaster, and Sierra's (2013) warning, "[T]he implementation of EMI programs has to be carefully planned, providing highly qualified teachers (both in content and language), as well as students with the necessary English proficiency" (p. 216).

Collaboration between the English department (or whichever unit houses the writing program) and instructors in other disciplines is crucial to breaking down academic territorial borders. The thirty-year history of WAC in the US shows that regular, ongoing faculty development workshops can be an effective way to bring discipline-based faculty into conversation with one another (Fulwiler, 1981; Russell, 1991; McLeod & Soven, 2006). At the University of Missouri (Townsend's home institution), for example, it was a collective complaint about student writing from faculty in many disciplines that led the university's Dean of Arts and Science to create a cross-disciplinary committee in 1984 to address the problem (Townsend, Patton, & Vogt, 2012). That committee became the university's Campus Writing Board, which still meets monthly to guide fellow faculty and Campus Writing Program staff toward the improvement of student writing. UOB chose English as the medium of instruction to meet the challenges of globalization and the demands of internationalized education. UOB was one of the first uni-

versities established in Lebanon during the region's shift to EMI; now, the university needs to consider much more critically the complex implications of its linguistic decision.

References

- Annous, S., & Nicolas, M. O. (2015). Academic territorial borders: A look at the writing ethos in business courses in an environment in which English is a foreign language. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 29(1), 93-111.
- Astroga, M. C. (2007). Teaching academic writing in the EFL context: Redesigning pedagogy. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 2(4), 251-267.
- Bacha, N. (2012). Disciplinary writing in an EFL context from teachers' and students' perspectives. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(2), 233-256.
- Bacha, N., & Bahous, R. (2008). Contrasting views of business students' writing needs in an EFL Environment. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27(1), 74-93.
- Bacha, N., & Bahous, R. (2011). Foreign language education in Lebanon: A context of cultural and curricular complexities. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(6), 1320-1328.
- Becher, T., & Trowler, P.R. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines* (2nd ed.). Buckingham, UK: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Berns, M. (2005). Expanding circle: Where do we go from here? *World Englishes*, 24(1), 85-93.
- Clughen, L., & Connell, M. (2012). Writing and resistance: Reflections on the practice of embedding writing in the curriculum. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 11, 333-345.
- Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1994). *Research methods in education* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Coleman, J. (2006). English-medium teaching in European Higher Education. *Language Teaching*, 39, 1-14.
- Constitution Project (2014). Lebanon's constitution of 1926 with amendments through 2004. Retrieved from https://www.constituteproject.org/constitution/Lebanon_2004.pdf
- 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>
- Crossley, S., Roscoe, R., & McNamara, D. (2014). What is successful writing? An investigation into multiple ways writers can write successful essays. *Written Communication*, 31(2), 184-214.
- Dagher, Z., & BouJaoude, S. (2011). Science education in Arab states: Bright future or status quo? *Studies in Science Education*, 47, 73-101.
- Dearden, J. (2014). English as a medium of instruction—A growing global phenom-

- enon: Phase 1. Interim report presented at Going Global 2014. British Council 2014/E123. Retrieved from https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/english_as_a_medium_of_instruction.pdf
- Diab, R., (2000). Political and socio-cultural factors in foreign language education: The case of Lebanon. *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education*, 5(1), 177-187.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. (2013). Future challenges for English-medium instruction at the tertiary level. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 213-221). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Evans, S., & Morrison, B. (2011). Meeting the challenges of English-medium higher education: The first-year experience in Hong Kong. *English for Specific Purposes*, 30, 198-208.
- Fulwiler, T. (1981). Showing, not telling, at a writing workshop. *College English*, 43(1), 55-58.
- Gill, S. K., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2013). English in Asian and European higher education. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 148-164.
- Hyland, K. (2013). Faculty feedback: Perceptions and practices in L2 disciplinary writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 240-253.
- Joseph, J. (2013). Signs of belonging: Culture, identity and the English language. In H. McIlwraith (Ed.), *Perspectives on English in the Middle East and North Africa* (pp. 53-72). London: British Council.
- Kachru, B. (1992). Teaching world Englishes. In B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 355-360). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- McLeod, S., & Soven M. (2006). *Composing a community: A history of writing across the curriculum*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.
- Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nicolas, M. O., & Annous, S. (2013). Assessing WAC elements in business syllabi. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 76(2), 172-187.
- Pawan, F., & Ortloff, J. (2011). Sustaining collaboration: English-as-a-second language and content-area teachers. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 27, 463-471.
- Plutsky, S., & Wilson, B. (2001). Writing across the curriculum in a college of business and economics. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 64(4), 26-41.
- Ridley, D., & Smith, E. (2006). Writing across the curriculum works: The impact of writing emphasis upon senior exit writing samples. *Research & Practice in Assessment*, 1(1), 1-5.
- Russell, D. (1991). *Writing in the academic disciplines, 1870-1990: A curricular history*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University.
- Shaaban, K., & Ghaith, G. (2002). University students' perceptions of the ethno-linguistic vitality of Arabic, French and English in Lebanon. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 6(4), 557-574.

- Townsend, M., Patton, M., & Vogt, J. (2012). Uncommon conversations: How nearly three decades of paying attention allows one WAC/WIC program to thrive. *Writing Program Administration*, 35(2), 127-159.
- World Bank (2011). *Internationalization of higher education in MENA: Policy issues associated with skills formation and mobility*. Washington, DC: World Bank. Retrieved from <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2011/01/15155739/internationalization-higher-education-mena-policy-issues-associated-skills-formation-mobility>
- Xiaoqiong, B., & Xianxing, J. (2011). Kachru's three concentric circles and English teaching fallacies in EFL and ESL contexts. *Changing English: Studies in Culture and Education*, 18(2), 219-228.
- Zakharia, Z. (2010). Language-in-education policies in contemporary Lebanon. In O. Abi-Mershed (Ed.), *Trajectories of education in the Arab World: Legacies and challenges* (pp. 157-184). New York: Routledge.
- Zamel, V. (1995). Strangers in academia: The experiences of faculty and ESL students across the curriculum. *College Composition and Communication*, 46, 506-521.
- Zhu, W. (2004). Faculty views on the importance of writing, the nature of academic writing, and teaching and responding to writing in the disciplines. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13, 29-48.

Appendices

Appendix A: Business courses included in the syllabi review

Course code and title	Brief description (abbreviated from the syllabi)
1.ACCT210: Financial Accounting I	"This course studies the accounting reports produced for financial decision making."
2.ACCT211: Financial Accounting II	"Its overall aim is to familiarize students with the different types of business organizations with an emphasis on partnerships and corporations."
3.ACCT202: Survey of Accounting and Finance	"This is a remedial course for non-business MBA candidates."
4. BUSN210: Business Communication	"A thorough introduction to business communication concepts and theories. Participants in this course will gain knowledge in written and oral skills and engage in a business class communication experience."
5. BUSN220: Managerial Economics	"This course introduces the student to the various methods used by companies in decision making taking into consideration the resource constraint."
6. BUSN221: Global Economy	"[This course will] present a comprehensive, up-to-date, and clear exposition of the theory and principles of international economics."

Course code and title	Brief description (abbreviated from the syllabi)
7. BUSN230: Strategic Management	“[This course] focuses on how firms formulate, implement, and evaluate strategies, by highlighting different issues such as the organization’s mission and vision.”
8. BUSN240: Business Law	“[This course] introduces the students to the fundamental concepts of civil and commercial law.”
9. ECON201: Survey of Economics	“[This course offers an] introduction to the field of economics and its principles, both at the micro and macro levels.”
10. ECON211: Microeconomics Theory	“[This course offers an] introduction to microeconomics concepts and analysis.”
11. ECON212: Macroeconomics	“Macroeconomics is the study of the behavior of the economy as a whole. The three major goals of macroeconomics are good level of growth, price stability and low unemployment rate.”
12. ECON247: Intermediate Macroeconomics	“[This course] will introduce and develop the main techniques and models used in macroeconomic theory.”
13. ECON293: History of Economic Thought	“[This course] will trace the evolution of economic thinking throughout history.”
14. FINE220: Managerial Finance	“[This course is] an introductory course where students acquire knowledge about basic concepts and methods used in finance.”
15. FINE230: Financial Institutions	“[This course] examines how financial markets (such as those for bonds, stocks and foreign exchange) and financial institutions (banks, insurance companies mutual funds, and other institutions) work.”
16. FINE241: Investment	“[This course] examines the theoretical issues and quantitative techniques of the financial management of the firm.”
17. HOSP200: Introduction to Travel, Tourism and Hospitality	“[This course provides] a comprehensive overview of the world’s largest and fastest growing business called the tourism and hospitality industry.”
18. HOSP213: Restaurant Management and Purchasing	“This course identifies the elements involved in operating a successful restaurant.”
19. HOSP224: Service Management	“[This course] will address the distinct needs and problems of service excellence mainly in the hospitality and tourism industry.”
20. HOSP225: Rooms Division Management	“This course introduces the student to the hotels’ rooms operations.”
21. HOSP230: Conventions, Special Events and Catering	“[This course] provides students with an understanding of the convention and meetings market.”

Course code and title	Brief description (abbreviated from the syllabi)
22. HOSP231: Hospitality Purchasing	"[This course will] promote an understanding of the managerial aspects of the hospitality purchasing activity. Emphasis is placed on strategic selection and procurement considerations based on item need, value and supplier information."
23. HOSP236: Housekeeping Management	"[This course is] designed to provide students with both classroom theoretical principles of professional housekeeping knowledge, as well as on-hand competencies and skills."
24. HOSP240: Yield Management	"This course focuses on managing the hotel's demand-side decision in order to maximize revenue and occupancy-à-vis the market and the competition."
25. MGMT 220: Principles of Management	"[This is an] introductory course covering the fundamental principles of management, including objective setting techniques, operational planning and the control process."
26. MGMT 230: Organizational Behavior	"[This course]deals with the impact of individual and team values, attitudes, perception, needs, motivation, leadership, communication, power politics, conflict, and work design on organizational behavior."
27. MGMT291: Business Ethics & Professional Responsibility	"[This course] introduces students to ethical concepts, helps them apply these concepts to business decisions and identify moral issues involved in the management of specific problem areas in business."
28. MRKT220: Principles of Marketing	"[This] course is designed to introduce students to the basic terminology, concepts and practices of contemporary marketing as applied in a variety of contexts."
29. MRKT291: Advertising and Promotion	"[This course provides an] emphasis on elements and process of developing effective advertising programs using integrated marketing communications."

Appendix B: Interview protocol—FOB instructors

1. Knowledge of writing-across-the-curriculum strategies
 - How would you define writing-across-the-curriculum strategies?
 - Can you describe some characteristics of writing-across-the-curriculum strategies?
2. Writing activities in business courses
 - Do you include writing assignments?
 - What are the written assignments?

3. General opinion about students' ability to communicate in English
 - Do you allow Arabic to be spoken?
 - Do you ever have to resort to Arabic to ensure understanding?
4. General evaluation of students' written performance
 - Are you satisfied with your students' writing? What are the problems?
 - Do you assess students' writing?
 - Is the quality of students' writing part of the grading criteria?
5. Willingness to incorporate writing activities in the future
 - What do you envision the role of a writing center should be?
 - Can you itemize some of the challenges you face when incorporating writing activities?

Appendix C: Focus-group interview protocol—CVSQ students

1. Describe a typical CVSQ session? What are the methods that the professors use? What are the typical activities?
2. What are the difficulties you are facing in the CVSQ courses?
3. What is your general perception of the CVSQ courses?
4. How do you rate your English language skills? Reading? Writing? Speaking? i.e. are you confident in your English language skills?
5. To what extent do you think the CVSQ courses help you develop your writing skills in English? Reading skills?
6. Do you receive any feedback on your writing? If yes, what kind of feedback? Are you satisfied with the kind of feedback you are receiving?

Appendix D: Interview protocol—CVSQ instructors

General methodology that could foster/hinder student communication

1. Describe a typical class session:
2. How do you begin (propose a question, begin a lecture, etc.)?
3. Any group work, student presentation of an idea or topic, etc.?
4. What language are students allowed to use in class?
5. Do you find you need to use Arabic?
6. Do you correct Arabic use and/or translate to English if need be?
7. Class exercises are mentioned on some of the course content tables and in course evaluation for some courses on the syllabi; what is the nature of these exercises?
8. Are they written or oral?

9. Multiple choice or short answers?

Discipline-specific strategies

1. Do you teach the conventions of your discipline?
2. Written conventions such as verb choice, style etc.
3. If not, how do students know about what is conventional or acceptable in this discipline?

Evaluation of students' communicative skill

1. For any written work you require of your students, are language and higher-order concerns like organization and development part of your grading rubric?
2. If no, why not?
3. If yes, are students trained by you on your expectations in this area?
4. What kind of written genre do you require?
5. How much is the written product usually weighed in the final evaluation?
6. Do students receive any training on this genre in class?
7. Do you have a pre-prepared grading rubric for written assignments? Do students know these criteria ahead of time?
8. Do you require presentations?
9. If so, how are they evaluated? What criteria do you look for?
10. If not, why not, any reason not to require a presentation?
11. On tests, midterm and final, do you assess students' language skill as part of the grade?
12. Do students know that their language is part of the final grade?
13. What about organization of paragraphs and development of ideas?
14. When class participation is counted in the final evaluation breakdown, how is it measured?
15. What type of participation (debate, discussion, etc.)?
16. Do you keep physical track of a student's participation in discussion for final evaluation?
17. Is critical thinking considered a goal of this course?
18. Is it listed as an Intended Learning Outcome (ILO)?
19. If so, how is this skill measured? Through what kinds of assignments or activities?

General perceptions of students' communication ability in English

1. How would you rate your students' overall language competence?
2. Writing, reading, speaking?
3. In your opinion, how can students' language skills be nurtured and developed?

Appendix E: Business courses that included some reference to writing in the syllabus review

Major	Course	Writing Type	Weight	Additional comments
Accounting	Intermediate Financial Accounting	Essays/reports/research project	10%	Writing is mentioned in the ILOs* Writing is a Certified Public Accountant exam requirement
Accounting	Managerial Accounting	Essays	N/A	
Accounting	Auditing	Reports and team projects	30%	Writing is mentioned in the ILOs. Writing skills are formally mentioned in the assessment section.
Hospitality	Hospitality Purchasing	Project	25%	Writing is indirectly mentioned in the ILOs: "to develop and document policies."
Management	Organizational Behavior	Book Review	20%	
Management	Business Ethics & Professional Responsibility	Cases/Assignments	55%	Not clear what the written work is
Marketing	Advertising & Promotion	Portfolio Case Study Analysis	25% 15%	

**ILO: Intended Learning Outcome*

Appendix F: Stage 3 samples of matrices arrived at through the data analysis

The primary findings matrices were arrived at through a clustering process. Matrices of individual themes were created, and then those themes were clustered together to arrive at the three primary findings that are presented first. Examples of individual theme matrices are provided below the primary findings:

Primary Finding 1, with supporting themes

The methodology of the cultural studies courses does not promote skill/literacy enhancement, explicitly or implicitly.

- “Inconsistent and ineffective group work”
- “Lack of research designed activities”
- “Use of LI in class”
- “Uneven or ineffectual feedback given to students”

Primary Finding 2, with supporting themes

Neither students nor teachers believe these courses serve to nurture English writing skills.

- “Purpose of CS is not language skill acquisition”
- “Purpose of the courses is to develop critical thinking”
- “Content courses/content coverage as the primary ILO”

Primary Finding 3, with supporting themes

Students either fail to understand the importance of reading for the development of their communicative skill or the readings do not lend themselves to this function due to their level of difficulty.

- “The texts are too difficult for the students.”
- “Students generally do not read the assigned readings and/or do not understand what they’ve read.”
- “Students rely heavily on Spark notes for comprehension”.
- “This is not a reading culture.”

Following are a sample of the matrices for the themes that informed the Primary Findings. P# refers to data from a professor and the number of the interview, and FG identifies data from the student focus group.

Matrices of data for two of the themes in Primary Finding 1:

Theme: Inconsistent and ineffective group work

- “In small groups they could take the discussion anywhere. I want the discussion to be purposeful.” P₃
- “Rarely use group work because there is a lot of material to cover—lecture and class discussion.” P₁
- “No group work—sometimes discussion but not always.” P₄

- “All lecture and discussion.” P₅
- “What happens in class depends on the ‘doctor,’ if there is group work or lecture.” FG

Theme: Uneven or ineffectual feedback given

- “I tried to do what the teacher wanted me to on the next exam but I got the same grade.” FG
- “We don’t know how grades are arrived at and how we can improve.” FG
- “Some professors just want length, so you can write a recipe in the middle of your answer and they’ll never know since they don’t read closely anyway.” FG
- “Instructors are interested in content: how much we know. They should ask us direct questions and we give direct answers (not require essay answers on exams).” FG
- “I give feedback on speech and writing.” P₂
- “I offer feedback on short assignments and presentations.” P₃
- “Why do I have to worry about their English skills? Do I have to become an English teacher?” P₁
- “I will underline language errors.” P₄
- “I have a reputation for pointing out mistakes.” P₅
- “I give group feedback after the first exam and then I mark the language pretty extensively.” P₇

Matrices of data for two of the themes in Primary Finding 2:

Theme: Instructors’ academic role

- “I am not teaching English; it’s not my purpose in these classes.” P₇
- “I will try to teach them words, but[teaching students how to write] is not my job”. P₁
- “Maybe the English courses need to be tougher. English department needs to fail more.” P₈
- “These are not English courses after all.” FG

Theme: Instructors claim that the development of ideas and critical thinking are the aims of their courses.

- “We are interested in educating them in opinions and ideas and history.” P₇
- “Critical thinking is the absolute objective.” P₅