

CHAPTER 1.

**ORIGINS, AIMS, AND USES
OF *WRITING PROGRAMS*
WORLDWIDE: PROFILES OF
ACADEMIC WRITING IN MANY
PLACES**

By Chris Thaiss

University of California, Davis (US)

To introduce Writing Programs Worldwide, this essay describes and analyzes major reasons for this project to be undertaken and its primary goals. It also presents findings and analysis of the ongoing (since 2006) International WAC/WID Mapping Project, specifically of its “international survey” of writing programs and initiatives, which has received responses from more than 330 institutions on six continents. The essay describes how the survey results led to the choice of the universities invited to contribute profile chapters to this collection, as well as to the topics and emphases in the profiles themselves. The essay suggests reasons why teachers, program developers, administrators, and scholars might benefit from exploring the “many places” described and reflected on in the array of contributions to this ongoing project.

We intend this book, in its print and online versions, to inform decision-making by teachers, program managers, and college/university administrators in regard to how writing is conceived of, managed, funded, and taught in higher education. We intend it, also, to contribute to the growing research literature in the shaping of writing programs.

In our title, “Writing Programs Worldwide,” and in our subtitle, “Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places,” we have tried to join three aims of scholarship. The first of these, embodied in the term “worldwide,” is to further the effort to build a transnational community of writing scholars, teachers, and program administrators who can share for their mutual benefit the discoveries of individuals and small teams. This aim has been exemplified by the growth

of such collectives as the European Association for the Teaching of Academic Writing (EATAW), the International Writing Centers Association (IWCA), and the newly-formed (2011) International Society for the Advancement of Writing Research (<http://www.isawr.org>), formed by the transnational scientific committee of the conferences on Writing Research Across Borders.¹

The second aim is to identify generalizable trends, patterns, and models that may be said to characterize initiatives in the teaching of academic writing at tertiary and postgraduate levels at this point in the transnational history of this growing movement. A main purpose of this introduction and of the three essays (at the end of the volume) by individual editors is to synthesize examples from many of the profiles toward such responsible generalizations. Later in this essay, for example, I will report trends from the International Survey of the International WAC/WID Mapping Project, this survey being instrumental in the development of this publishing project.

The third aim, embodied in the term “many places,” is to honor the variety and rich complexity of persons, languages, traditions, geographies, conditions, and purposes that both inspire and constrain the writing pedagogies and research of these individuals and teams. To recognize the uniqueness of each effort described in this project, as the writers and editors have striven to do, works against the tendency to homogenize, hence reduce, all such efforts to a few “typical” principles and practices, motives and mechanisms. While there is, of course, value in the well-reasoned generalization, the presence of (in the case of this project) more than forty profiles of individual locales offers an alternative to *reductio ad absurdum*. The French winemakers’ principle of *terroir* might be invoked to capture the feel of this respect for the local. Even if the palate—or the ability to read for nuance—limits one’s ability to appreciate that uniqueness, accepting *terroir* means that, to read one of these profiles, one gains insight into the geographic, cultural, and personal histories and ambitions that have gone into creating each of these complex experiences. That this project makes use on our Web site of photos by our authors of their locales is meant to heighten this respect and feel for difference.

In “programs” (or its variant “programmes”)² we’ve embodied our focus on how an institution—or at least some of its members—conceives of the needs of its students in regard to learning a discipline, “writing,” that in basic ways crosses all disciplines and aids learning in all of them. Some of our essays describe individual classrooms and subjects; a few are able to describe individual students. But our overriding aim as individual (or team) writers has been to understand and to attempt to convey to a transnational readership how and why the universities in which we labor attend to (or have neglected) “academic writing” as a complex set of skills to be learned by students—and to be used as a vital tool in their learning of their major disciplines.

To look at the teaching of writing at the programmatic level is to engage in a rich subfield of writing research. This inquiry differs from, though it draws from, such other subfields of writing research as individual student learning and cognitive/social/emotional development, or description and assessment of specific teacher interventions. In regard to continental Europe, it is not much of a leap to say that the interest in how higher education systematically organizes its literacy education, including writing, goes back at least to Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* of 95 CE, and to Plato's much earlier critical comparison (e.g., in the Protagoras) of Socrates' school with the methods of the Sophists. In China, the ancient tradition of the written exams for the civil service, beginning before the sixth century CE, provoked intense interest in formal preparation for these exams and institutional structures to support it (Man-Cheong, 2004). Would that we could discover how the Mesopotamian bureaucracies of the fourth (and earlier) millennia BCE organized instruction in the learning of the earliest extant transcription system, the variously-shaped clay "counters" that Schmandt-Besserat (1996) has described as the first writing. We do know that by the third millennium BCE Sumerian culture had built a formal education system for scribes, young men (and some women) from wealthy families (Veldhuis, 1997; Robson, 2001).

In more recent centuries, in the United Kingdom, the highly-valued "tutorial system" of individualized/small-group teaching in place at Oxford and Cambridge historically has ensured that at these elite institutions students are provided with continuous feedback on their academic writing and that their writing develops in tandem with their disciplinary knowledge and learning (Palfreyman, 2008). In the United States, deep interest in the characteristics of organizational structures for the teaching of writing go back to well before the founding of the National Council of Teachers of English in 1919 (see, e.g., Brereton, 1996; Miller, 2011; Russell, 2002). As the reference lists of the individual profile essays show, research and theory from diverse traditions have been brought to bear in designing and sustaining these initiatives.

However, recent and truly international concern about structures for teaching writing has emerged from two primary sources: the internationalizing of the teaching of English for academic and professional purposes and the explosion of internet-accessible resources and models for the teaching of writing. In Europe, the Bologna Process, begun in 1999, has been another spur to transnational sharing of structural ideas, as universities have made their curricula accessible to students from across Europe.³ These three related phenomena, of which the power of the internet is arguably the most important, have made possible and perhaps necessary the rise of the international organizations named earlier, as well as a burgeoning number of international conferences on many aspects of literacy. Further, national literacy-focused organizations have, because of the

web and email, become *de facto* transnational, while the regional and even local have become noticed and relevant much outside their original terroir.

Particularly pertinent to this publishing project is the example of the former National (US) Network of Writing-across-the-Curriculum (WAC) Programs, which began in 1979 with a handful of US colleges and universities, gained Canadian members in the 1980s, and was centered on annual meetings at the (US) National Council of Teachers of English conventions and the conventions of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (Thaiss, 2006). It became the International Network after 2005, when it partnered with the Web-based WAC Clearinghouse (<http://wac.colostate.edu>) to extend its visibility across the digisphere. The research initiative spun off from the Network and named the International WAC/WID Mapping Project (<http://mappingproject.ucdavis.edu>), which began in 2006, has been to this point an almost-purely digispheric entity: the surveys, survey responses, requests for essays, essays themselves, Skype calls, photographs, and countless other messages traverse cyberspace and are “housed” in digital databases. The Mapping Project has come to terra firma only for physical presentations at conferences in Europe and North America. The transnationality of the group of editors and contributing writers and the translanguality of the survey and survey responses could only have happened through web reality.

WHY INTEREST IN THE SHAPES OF WRITING PROGRAMS ACROSS BORDERS?

A basic question to ask about this cross-borders interest in writing programs is why? —as in why should anyone be interested in how the teaching of writing is organized and formalized in settings outside one’s own nation or region? (Editor Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams also takes up this question in her section essay in this volume, while the section essays by editors Gerd Bräuer and Paula Carlinio describe specific transnational collaborations.) The whys may be obvious to those already convinced of the value of learning from traditions and practices in other cultures, or to those who see themselves helping to shape educational policy at a national level. But they may not be obvious to teachers focused on student learners in a given place, or to literacy scholars immersed in the methods of design in specific inquiries, or even to university and college department heads and administrators trying to understand and manage particular faculties and contend with ominous directives from supervisors.

The basic why is the increasing transnationality of most education, wherever it occurs. For example, many profiles in this project deal at least in part

with the imposing presence of learning English, even if that language is not the medium of instruction in the university and the methods described in the profiles are not devoted to teaching writing in English. Moreover, the drives to become literate and, therefore, to teach literacy, usually in advanced forms, is sparked in almost every case by student and staff desires for academic recognition in the international research community or by desire for career success in the global economy. Third, the students and teachers in the universities profiled here, while sometimes representing a fairly homogeneous ethnicity, more often exemplify a range of linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Fourth, even in those locales where language and ethnicity are fairly uniform, students and teachers bring every day to their learning the internet and other mass culture influences that shape the writing educations they desire and are offered. Global social networking is but the latest dramatic manifestation of a long trend to bridge distances, borders, oceans, and mountains. Yet, its immediacy and its multi-sensory power, aided by translation software, to bring billions of individuals into literate contact with one another means that we cannot ignore how literacy is taught and learned around the world.

Other reasons also make a collection such as this intriguing and, we believe, useful:

- The desire of universities throughout the world to internationalize their student populations, whether through the Bologna Process or other forces, should spark interest in the cultural attitudes toward written literacy that students bring with them to new places and to very different learning environments.
- Transnational collaborations between universities that encourage movement of students and teachers, as well as creation of joint curricula and credit standards, need to be informed by understanding differing traditions and practices in literacy education.
- Lead teachers, administrators, and curriculum planners can learn from the experiences of their counterparts in different areas of the world who have faced struggles similar to their own—and the Internet makes surprisingly easy transnational and transoceanic conversation and collaboration. Language differences are somewhat of a barrier, but two factors: (1) the spread of versions of English and (2) the increasing accuracy of free or low-cost translation software, are making it much easier for willing and persistent conversants to overcome language differences.
- The profiles in this project describe a great variety of subject (course), modular, tutorial, collaborative, formal and informal organizational structures that can be adapted to different universities and learning environments. These may have derived from local conditions and traditions,

but reading about a successful curricular experiment in, say, the Netherlands, Canada, Argentina, China, South Africa, or Australia (among the 28 countries represented here) can spark the imagination of teachers and administrators in any country toward changes to better support student writing and learning development in their own universities.

THE MUTUAL INFLUENCES OF THE LOCAL AND THE GLOBAL

As you read the profiles, you will note how each of the authors tries to achieve this balance between, on the one hand, generalization and, on the other, concentration on the specific and local. While we have asked the writers to try to convey to our international audience, what is distinctive about institutional history, locale, and mission, and distinctive about the people of their particular university, the question itself asks for generalizations about these matters. Though we have not asked for a higher level of generalization, the authors frequently place their universities within their sense of the national or broader cultural and historical context: these writers conceive of their universities as not local or regional institutions only, but as having national and even international relevance--and striving for more.

Moreover, as scholars of literacy, they frequently explain their motives, theories, and practices within national, regional, or transnational research. Indeed, as you read these profiles, you will see that in most instances the writers are either explicitly aware of the transnational writing research community or are implicitly adapting goals and techniques that exist elsewhere. In order to give priority to their descriptions of place, history, and program structures, we have asked writers to be sparing in their citations. Nevertheless, even in profiles that offer very short lists of references, the influence of trends and models from other places is clear, though perhaps implicit within the body of the profile.

THE QUESTIONS AND TOPICS GUIDING THE PROFILES

In giving guidance to the authors who accepted our invitation to submit profiles, we asked that their essays address at least several of the following questions and topics. Items 4 through 7 derive directly from the International Survey of the International WAC/WID Mapping Project (<http://mappingproject.ucdavis.edu>). All of the questions and topics reflect the three aims described earlier. Given that we were restricting the profiles in length, we allowed authors

to choose which of our questions and topics they would not be able to address. Moreover, we encouraged authors to focus more narrowly, if they wished, on specific initiatives within a larger program, or to explain their efforts more broadly but less deeply within the short-essay limits. Hence, some of the profiles clearly address many of the guiding questions, while others follow our guidance in spirit but list headings that fit their more specific focus. Nevertheless, in working with our authors on refinement of their drafts, we ensured that every essay addressed implicitly, if not explicitly, most of our guiding concerns. The questions and topics are as follows:

- The size, brief history, and mission of the institution
- Most salient geographic, economic, and cultural features of its location
- What “literacy” and especially “writing” mean to students and teachers in this institution: why they write, in what languages and dialects, in relation to what goals?
- Where and what students write in the institution—disciplines, genres, assignments*
- Who “cares” in the institution about student growth in and through writing? How is this concern—or lack of concern—shown in funding, requirements, attitudes, actions?*
- When and how have groups of teachers met to discuss and perhaps plan ways to help students grow as writers? What has resulted?*
- On what models, theories, authors, and principles have courses or methods been based?*
- What have been your and the institution’s successes in teaching writing?
- What have been your unfulfilled ambitions in regard to student literacy/writing?
- Can you describe individual students or events that embody or illustrate these successes and frustrations?

* *Questions derived from the International Survey of the International WAC/WID Mapping Project*

EMERGENCE OF THE PROFILES FROM THE INTERNATIONAL SURVEY RESEARCH

The profile essays in *Writing Programs Worldwide* allow not only rich context, but encourage personal voices to emerge and the sense of the locale, the terroir, to come through. The profile essays may be thought of as delving more deeply into the evidence from the more than 350 responses (from 54 coun-

tries, 2007-10) to the International Survey (<http://mappingproject.ucdavis.edu/preliminarysurvey>), much as interviews of a sample of respondents typically follow the collection of survey data. The question structure of this survey gives promise of a regularity and comparability of responses and language that encourages generalization, even as it also hints at the diversity and uniqueness beneath. While the survey responses did encourage generalizations (as shown in the following paragraphs), the profile essays, as described above and in the section “Choosing the Profiles” to follow, elaborate on the responses to the survey questions and encourage further questions from the reader. Where the survey responses to the five open-ended questions varied greatly in the depth and detail of the answers, and suggest a complexity that the question format did not allow, the profile allows the writer not only to address the questions more fully, but also to create an integrated essay with a vision of past, present, and future.

BACKGROUND AND METHODS OF THE SURVEY

The idea of the survey began in 2005, as an offshoot of the National (US) WAC Network’s becoming “international” in name as well as in fact, this change itself a result of the increasing attendance by scholars and teachers from diverse nations at the annual WAC Network meetings at the Conference on College Composition and Communication. I had begun planning survey work on characteristics of US and Canadian writing programs earlier that same year (Thaiss & Porter, 2010), and extending this work internationally seemed not only interesting but possible, given Internet accessibility. I asked the help of two colleagues, Terry Myers Zawacki (of George Mason University) and Christiane Donahue (now of Dartmouth College) in designing an appropriate international survey, and, following two very helpful focus groups conducted by Donahue in Europe in 2006, the questions and topics on the survey emerged.

With help from graduate student researchers Erin Steinke and Melissa Mack and from web designers Paul Nozicka and Elliott Pollard at the University of California, Davis, the survey established a presence on the web and began to attract respondents in 2007. It had been my intention from the beginning to have the survey available in multiple languages, and between 2007 and 2009, I was fortunate to have the assistance of the following colleagues in making the survey available in Spanish, German, French, Russian, and Chinese: Paula Carlinio (Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina), Constanza Padilla (CONICET, Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, Argentina), Manuela Cartolari (CONICET, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina), Ana Brown (Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina), Annette Verhein (Hochschule für Technik, Rapper-

swil, Switzerland), Céline Beaudet (Université de Sherbrooke, Canada), Sylvie Plane (Université Paris-Sorbonne, France), Nina Shevchuk-Murray (University of Nebraska, US), and Huahui Zhao (Umeå University, Sweden). Thus far, 82% of responses have been in English, with 15% in Spanish and 3% divided among the other four languages.

Recruiting respondents (2007-09) was handled in several ways:

- A paper survey completed by participants in a Mapping Project workshop in 2007 at the EATAW Conference in Bochum, Germany, plus several interviews conducted by Zawacki, Donahue, and me gave us the first twenty-five respondents.
- The initial email contact list was built by graduate researcher Steinke (2007) from the EATAW and European Writing Centers Association (EWCA) listserves and the speakers list from the 2008 Writing Research Across Borders conference (Santa Barbara, California, US)
- Study of university websites by Steinke and graduate researcher Melissa Mack (2008-09) added further contacts.
- By far the most successful method of recruiting respondents has been through friends and colleagues of respondents in professional and regional networks.

TRENDS IN THE SURVEY RESPONSES, BY QUESTION⁴

Total: 330 institutions (365 respondents), 54 countries

Most frequent responses, by country: 177 of the 330 institutions, 14 of the 54 countries represented

United Kingdom	45
Argentina	19
Germany	16
Colombia	13
Australia	13
Spain	11
Switzerland	11
Netherlands	10
Israel	8
Turkey	7
France	6
South Africa	6
Venezuela	6
Mexico	6

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO EACH QUESTION:

Analyzing the responses by question allows the generalizations that follow.

1. Where are students writing in your institution, either in a first language of instruction or in English? In what genres and circumstances?

Seventy percent (70%) of the responses, from across countries, indicate that much writing is being required of undergraduate (tertiary) and graduate (post-graduate) students in all or most disciplines. This proportion may actually be higher, because in the remaining 30% of responses half (15%) either (1) focus their remarks on only one or two disciplines with which the respondents are associated (approx. 10%), or (2) do not address this question (5%). Only 10% of the total explicitly say that little or no writing is required of undergraduate (tertiary) students across their fields, or that writing is required only in language courses.

The length of the response largely determines the range and specificity of assignments named. A longer response, such as the following, might name several genres, differentiated by area of the curriculum:

Technical and business writing predominate. Science and engineering students . . . are writing reports, experimental plans, and the rare essay. Business students are also writing reports. Academic essays are used in the social sciences and the humanities. In 2009, an academic writing course (a.k.a. FYC) will be required of all bachelor of arts students for the first time. Creative writing is taught as an elective to English majors and as a requirement of students in the bachelor of communications (a joint humanities and business degree). Oral communication is taught in many of the same courses as writing. There are, of course, variations on this quick gloss, but this is the most obvious profile of student writing.

Typical brief responses are the following:

(Response 1) All departments, all engineering disciplines, in groups and individually, BSc-MSc-PhD level (i.e., writing in English)

(Response 2) All years of study—1st to 5th. Genres: Essays, research papers, theses, (articles and web-)

Most respondents, even in shorter responses, describe writing in academic genres, usually appropriate to the discipline; for example, “essays” and “reports” of various kinds are mentioned, as well as “seminar papers,” another popular term. “Exams” and “theses” are two other terms used in many responses. Writing for publication in disciplinary journals is frequently mentioned in responses that focus on postgraduate programs.

2. Who cares in your institution about the improvement of student writing or student learning through writing? Is improvement in student writing an objective of certain courses/modules/subjects in a discipline or of the overall curriculum? How and why?

Ninety-nine percent (99%) of responses are from language professionals who teach and/or conduct research in linguistics and/or literacy in various languages, are in teacher education, or work in academic writing/language support, such as writing centers. More than 50% of respondents feel that their own concern—“care”—for student writing development is not shared by many others in their institutions—even though, as the responses to Question 1 show, most of these institutions do require writing in most disciplines—and even though many of these universities have some form of writing support service.

What is important to keep in mind about these relatively negative responses is that lack of “care” is most often interpreted as lack of active attention or funding for programs—not as lack of awareness or concern. The following responses are typical:

(Response 1) A few people: student service center: often a non-obligated course, for the “weak” writers, not related to curricula, for a few students. Language center: some courses, in other languages not related to the curricula, for a few students. We have a very small writing center, run by one of my colleagues (with no funding!), a couple of tutor-sessions per week. Some subject teachers here and there. Some managers here and there. Great diversity, no one and everyone.

(Response 2) There is much complaining in our university about how the level of . . . student writing at the university level has deteriorated. Yet little is being done about the problem in the departments nor are there sufficient resources given to address the issue. The Language Centre of the university is mainly seen as the responsible element and yet we get insufficient money to create new courses.

In sharp contrast: in almost 40% of cases reported, writing growth is noted as an institutional goal and can take many curricular forms: tutoring, workshops, elective courses/modules, writing embedded in many disciplinary courses, modules attached to disciplinary courses, required courses/modules. Indeed, respondents from several countries, such as the United Kingdom, Australia, the Netherlands, and Norway, frame their own institutions' commitment within a national goal of building student communication competence.

As might be expected, the profiles in this book were more frequently invited from among this almost 40% of respondents, though not always so. We have striven to include a significant fraction from institutions where the authors perceive their concern for student writing unshared by most colleagues and rare in the region.

3. Have any teachers in/across disciplines met to talk about these issues or made an effort to plan curricula in relation to student writing?

Note that this question is very different from Questions 2 and 3, and gets at a precise concern related to an institution's sense of shared responsibility for student writing. It asks about explicit cross-faculties planning, not about programs or initiatives for writing instruction in the institution. Positive answers to Question 4 reflect collaboration by different faculties and offices rather than, for example, administrative funding of a writing initiative carried out by one unit or establishment of a student service. Thus, whereas almost 40% of responses to Question 2 were positive to enthusiastic, only 25% of responses to Question 4 were mild to emphatic "yeses"—and the responses to this question tended to be the shortest among the five categories surveyed, because, presumably, the respondents have relatively little to report about cross-departmental collaboration in planning for student writing instruction.

What I call "mild positives" include such statements as

- "A few teachers in ___ are talking"
- "We have regular meetings with___"
- "We co-plan with staff in ___ ___ ___"

The emphatic "yeses" (roughly 10% of the total) describe staff/faculty workshops, collaborative curriculum planning, and/or collaborative research.

In contrast, negative responses (75%) tend to be short and sharp, from terse "No" to mildly hopeful "Not yet" to more hopeful "Meetings are planned between"

Overall, taken together with the responses to Questions 2 and 3, the responses to Question 4 indicate that in this sample of 330 institutions, active attention to student writing development is most often carried out by staff and faculty

members working independently or in small clusters or units. Truly collaborative efforts within an institution stand out within the sample. Again, the profiles in *Writing Programs Worldwide* tend to highlight such examples. Nevertheless, several of the profiles show individual teachers or small groups working mostly alone. These profiles show how the authors and perhaps a few colleagues have created structures to support student writing even in difficult circumstances.

4. What is the source of their interest and what models of student writing/learning development (e.g., articles, books, other documents), if any, help guide these discussions?

This question produced by far the most varied responses by type, though, as in answers to the other questions, responses varied greatly in length, and, therefore, in detail. Fifteen percent (15%) of respondents did not answer this question.

A shorter response might merely credit, for example, “books, articles, websites” as influences on the thinking of staff about teaching methods, whereas a longer response would name specific scholars or textbook authors. Indeed, close to one hundred authors were named in the approximately 25% of responses that include names, with no single author being named more than seven times.

Much more significant than specific texts or authors, and much more indicative of influences on the respondents’ thinking, were two types of responses that follow from the phrasing of the question:

1. reasons for interest in student writing by teachers and administrators, and
2. theoretical/pedagogical models that guide the work of those designing centers and other initiatives.

In those responses that addressed reasons for interest, easily the most common (approx. 30% of total responses) was perception by teachers across disciplines of deficits in student writing proficiency. This perception was sometimes coupled in responses with explicit mention (10%) of certain pressures (proficiency exams, disciplinary accreditation, expectations of employers) that raised teacher anxiety about writing performance in disciplines. Less often mentioned (5% of responses) were the need to prepare students for publication in their fields and faculty members’ awareness of the value of writing as a tool of learning in their disciplines. Thus, the drive to improve student writing proficiency within their disciplinary courses dominated teacher interest in supporting structures for writing.

When respondents articulated the theories that guided their work with colleagues across disciplines and their students, two terms appeared most frequent-

ly: “process” (10%) and “genre” (10%), with both sometimes appearing in the same response; for example,

For engineers on their way out to industries, the programmes have needed to provide the necessary skills, like report writing and oral presentations. Predictably, they often assume there is a template. Our unwillingness to provide such templates has pushed us in the direction of genre-informed pedagogy and, of course, writing process pedagogy.

“Academic literacies,” “English for Academic Purposes,” “WAC,” “ESL,” and “linguistics” were among other terms appearing in a few responses in relation to guiding theories and methods. However, fewer than 50% of all responses named either a well-known approach or an author. Equally common were mentions of highly practical materials produced by a center or by a group of teachers for use only in the local context: e.g., sample student essays and reports, “writing guides,” citation models, “teaching methods.”

Overall, what comes through most strongly in answers to Question 5 is the respondents’ conviction that they are trying, using whatever theoretical and practical means they know and can learn, to address a massive need in an atmosphere of anxiety about student preparedness. The responses across all the questions reinforce the sense of great variation in how well institutions are addressing this need. The profiles in *Writing Programs Worldwide*, while reflecting this range, in almost every case provide models intended to help institutions in this effort.

CHOOSING THE PROFILES

In building from these 350+ respondents the list of contributors to *Writing Programs Worldwide*, each of whom was invited by at least one of the editors, we were guided by several principles. Recognizing that the number of potential profiles far exceeded the scope of a print book and a reasonable publication schedule, we chose as a target forty articles, with no more than two from a given country, as a reasonable and representative number. We also kept in mind that in coordinating with the WAC Clearinghouse we were making possible and, we hoped, systematic, a way to expand the list of profiles after publication of the print volume.

Second, in striving for a representative collection, we wanted essays from six continents. Though, as you can see from our map (pp. 2-3), Western Europe is easily the most heavily-represented region in the book (as it is in survey re-

sponses), writing initiatives on all continents are represented, and, we hope, will increase interest in “filling in the map” through further publication.

Third, we wanted our collection of profiles to include (1) some that might serve as models for an institution’s steady and thoughtful building over years of strong and diversified services to students and staff; (2) others that focused on a more recent initiative and its plans for expansion; (3) still others that saw themselves as new and quite limited, striving by small steps to affect a university culture in which “academic writing” was not yet regarded as a subject for serious study—or for university spending. Even in the case of the most-established programs, we wanted writers to convey honestly a sense of struggle, of unfulfilled ambitions, lest any reader think that any multi-faceted program had been born that way! Thus, even the contributors from the most successful programs clearly convey a realistic sense of the stability of their funding, especially in bad budget times.

Fourth, almost all the profiles come from among the 350+ respondents to the International Survey of the International WAC/WID Mapping Project, though some of those whom we invited were also previously known to one or more of the editors through their publications or their presentations on their initiatives at conferences. Several were invited based on the uniqueness of their initiatives or in order to broaden the geographic representativeness of the collection.

Fifth, we strove for balance and diversity in the features of the initiatives portrayed. It is safe to say that each profile is unique in its history and in the details of the functions described. However, we also strove to represent a range of broader structural categories: among them,

- Writing centers (*with diverse remits and components*)
- Subjects/courses/modules in aspects of writing
- Workshops and modules for specific faculties
- Peer tutoring and writing fellows
- Informal tutoring and consulting
- Writing instruction embedded in disciplinary courses
- Training for disciplinary teachers in how to assign and respond to student writing
- Writing “minors” and “majors”
- Postgraduate courses/subjects in theory and pedagogy
- Regional networks and consortia of universities

Individual profiles illustrate major differences within these categories. For example, there are described in the collection numerous “centers” that directly reach students in support of their growth as writers in their major disciplines. So it has been important for us that these “writing centers” be individualized in the profiles to show how really different they are in their histories, functions,

and motives—how they address their specific student and staff populations, concerns, and political realities, even as they share some common practices.

THE PLACE AND PROJECTION OF *WRITING PROGRAMS WORLDWIDE* IN THE ONGOING RESEARCH

The publication of *Writing Programs Worldwide* in both print (Parlor Press) and digital formats (as part of the WAC Clearinghouse at <http://wac.colostate.edu>) signifies our intent to continue to build profiles of initiatives in the teaching of writing after publication. For many years, the Clearinghouse, under the imaginative leadership of Mike Palmquist, has served the WAC/WID movement in the US as a destination site for descriptions of college and university WAC/WID programs. De facto, the Clearinghouse is an international site, as its ever-increasing body of materials is accessed by users from many countries. We see *Writing Programs Worldwide* significantly augmenting the transnational content of the Clearinghouse—and providing a template for profiles of more and more institutions. Moreover, the online version of *Writing Programs Worldwide* will give us the flexibility to publish profiles in diverse languages, just as the WAC/WID Mapping Project has encouraged responses in several languages. In these ways, both this research project and the Clearinghouse will help to expand the international community of writing scholars, teachers, and program designers.

A NOTE ON VARIANTS IN SPELLING AND USAGE

The editors have retained as often as possible variants in spelling, as well as elements of syntax and usage, that reflect the different versions of English (“Englishes”) most often used by our authors (or their translators) in their academic writing in that language. In most cases, readers will find a particular variant (e.g., “centre” or “center”) used consistently within an essay. In a few instances, uses of more than one variant in an essay reflect the author’s “code meshing” (Canagarajah, 2006) from different cultural contexts in the essay.

NOTES

1. The first conference of EATAW was held in 2000 (<http://www.eataw.eu>). The IWCA (<http://writingcenters.edu>) was founded in 1982 as the National (US) Writing

Centers Association and became the IWCA in 1998, with the founding of the affiliated European Writing Centers Association (<http://ewca.sabanciuniv.edu>). The initial Writing Research Across Borders Conference was held in 2008; the transnational steering committee was elected following the 2nd conference, held 2011 (<http://www.writing.ucsb.edu/wrconf11>).

2. See the “Note on Variants in Spelling and Usage” on the final page of this essay.

3. See the official website of the Bologna Process 2010-2012 (<http://www.ehea.info/>) for information on the history, key documents, and procedures of this ongoing initiative. The Bologna Declaration was signed by ministers of 30 European countries in 1999. As of 2011, there are 47 signatories. According to the website, “At its inception, the Bologna Process was meant to strengthen the competitiveness and attractiveness of European higher education and to foster student mobility and employability through the introduction of a system based on undergraduate and postgraduate studies with easily readable programmes and degrees” (<http://www.ehea.info/article-details.aspx?ArticleId=3>).

4. Summaries of partial results from this survey were published in *Zeitschrift Schreiben* (Thaiss 2008) and *Traditions of Writing Research*, eds Bazerman et al. (Thaiss 2010).

REFERENCES

- Brereton, J. (1996). *The origins of composition studies in the American college, 1875-1925: A documentary history*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). The place of world Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication*, 57(4), 586-619.
- European Association for the Teaching of Academic Writing. (n.d.). *EATAW—European association for the teaching of academic writing*. Retrieved from <http://www.eataw.eu>
- European Higher Education Area website 2010-2020| EHEA. (n.d.). *European higher education area website 2010-2020| EHEA*. Retrieved from <http://www.ehea.info/>
- Man-Cheong, I. (2004). *The class of 1761: Examinations, the state, and elites in eighteenth century China*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Miller, T. (2011). *The evolution of college English: Literacy studies from the Puritans to the postmoderns*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Palfreyman, D., ed. (2008). *The Oxford tutorial: “Thanks, you taught me how to think.”* Oxford, UK: Oxford Center for Higher Education Policy Studies.
- Plato (2008). *Protagoras*. (N. Denyer, Ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Quintilian (1980). *Institutio oratoria: Books I-III* (Loeb Classical Library). (H. E. Butler, Trans.) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Robson, E. (2001). The tablet house: A scribal school in Old Babylonian Nippur. *Revue d'Assyriologie et D'Archeologie Orientale* 95(1), 39-66.
- Russell, D. (2002). *Writing in the academic disciplines: A curricular history. (2nd ed.)* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Schmandt-Besserat, D. (1996). *How writing came about*. Austin: University of Texas.
- Thaiss, C. (2006). "Still a good place to be": More than twenty years of the National Network of Writing-across-the-Curriculum Programs. In S. McLeod & M. Soven (Eds.), *Composing a community: A history of writing across the curriculum*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press, 126-41.
- Thaiss, C. (2008). The International WAC/WID Mapping Project: Objectives and methods. *Zeitschrift Schreiben*. 18/6/2008. Retrieved from <http://www.zeitschrift-schreiben.eu>
- Thaiss, C. (2010). The International WAC/WID Mapping Project: Objectives, methods, and early results. In C. Bazerman, et al. (Eds.), *Traditions of writing research (pp. 251-65)*. New York & Oxford: Routledge.
- Thaiss, C., & T. Porter (2010). The state of WAC/WID in 2010: Methods and results of the US survey of the International WAC/WID Mapping Project. *College Composition and Communication*, 61(3), 534-70.
- Veldhuis, N. (1997). Elementary education at Nippur: The lists of trees and wooden objects. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Groningen.