

## CHAPTER 13

# DEVELOPING WRITING-INTENSIVE COURSES FOR A GLOBALIZED CURRICULUM THROUGH WAC-TESOL COLLABORATIONS

**Megan Siczek**

George Washington University

**Shawna Shapiro**

Middlebury College

*This chapter makes the argument that WAC and TESOL should work together to create new curricular spaces for enacting an institution's commitment to diversity, inclusion, and global perspectives. Though internationalization is often touted as an institutional goal, universities tend to overlook the potential contributions of students—particularly second language writers—toward this goal. TESOL faculty are similarly excluded from conversations about how to cultivate global competence across the curriculum. The authors make the case for writing-intensive, globally-oriented courses that are developed through coordination between WAC and TESOL programs. The first section provides a framework for internationalization, articulating its relationship to diversity and inclusion. The second section describes the persistent disciplinary segregation between WAC and TESOL and explains why their collaboration provides a viable means of contributing to an inclusive and globally-relevant curriculum. The third section offers a WAC course model that unites internationalization goals with this collaborative potential.*

## INTERNATIONALIZATION: A MISSED OPPORTUNITY?

There is little doubt that “internationalization” has become a buzzword across most US college campuses. Most institutional mission statements include

phrasing such as “global perspectives,” “global citizenship,” “cross-cultural understanding,” and “engaging the world,” implying that this ethos is indeed embedded in their philosophy and practice. The rationale for this movement toward a global orientation stems in part from a recognition of increasing global interdependence. We can look at this interconnectedness in humanistic terms, as indicated by the American Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU)’s endorsement of global education “to prepare students for ... [a] shared future marked by justice, security, equality, human rights, and economic sustainability” (Stromquist, 2007, p. 82). We can also regard this impetus in highly practical terms, motivated by “a firm grasp of practical and competitive realities in the contemporary world” (Taylor, 2004, p. 153). The overarching goal of internationalization in higher education, then, is to prepare students to inhabit a shared world community.

Internationalized practices may take many forms, including branch campuses in other countries, joint degree programs with other institutions, study abroad programs, learning of foreign languages, globalized curricular content, and the enrollment of international students in US institutions (see, for example, Craig and Lavalley & Shima [this volume]). The assumption behind these practices is that they cultivate global competency, which Olson and Kroeger (2001) define as “substantive knowledge, perceptual understanding, and intercultural communication skills [needed] to effectively interact in our globally interdependent world” (p. 117). In essence, global competency involves developing skill sets—such as global analysis and intercultural communication—as well as mindsets for critical inquiry, global consciousness, and appreciation of diversity. Students must be given the opportunity to interrogate their own understandings of the world, to consider how and why others may perceive things differently, and to position themselves and their own experiences in the context of the “other.” Ultimately, according to Mezirow, this can result in “transformative learning,” whereby students change their “structures of habitual expectation to make possible a more inclusive, discriminating, and integrating perspective” and then begin to act according to this perspective (as cited in Van Gyn, Schuerholz-Lehr, Caws, & Preece, 2009, p. 29).

Unfortunately, many of the internationalization initiatives undertaken at US colleges and universities fall short in meeting this ideal of transformative, globally-competent education. Often, internationalization is interpreted to mean simply that US students should be encouraged to spend time abroad or that campuses should recruit more foreign-born students. This attitude allows internationalization to remain external to the classroom experience of many students and faculty. Jones and Killick (2007) have mined the literature in the field to identify some of the features of a truly internationalized curriculum: it

should “demand culturally inclusive behavior ... engage critically with the global plurality of knowledge ... [develop] an awareness of [students’] own culture and perspectives ... recognize and appreciate different cultural perspectives on the same issue ... [and] apply critical thinking skills to problems with an international or intercultural dimension ...” (p. 112). However, much of the literature concedes that curricular responses to internationalization tend to be tacked on, rather than thoughtfully embedded across disciplinary spaces. Although there may be specific programs, departments, or individuals devoted to teaching about international perspectives, this orientation is generally not sustained throughout the curriculum. As a result, few students graduate with a solid grounding in global competency. Citing decades of research, Hunter, White, and Godbey (2006) have concluded that “few American college graduates are competent to function in different cultures, speak another language, or have any significant understanding of the world beyond US borders” (p. 272).

In order to be longstanding and transformative, internationalization must be an integrative *process*. It must be guided by a vision that is “ongoing, future oriented, multi-dimensional, interdisciplinary, leadership-driven” and “involves many stakeholders working to change the internal dynamics of an institution” (Ellingboe, 1998, as cited in Taylor, 2004, p. 150). Internationalization must not only be outward-looking, but also inward-looking. It requires that we acknowledge the diverse values and perspectives within our own institutions, and take into account who might be excluded or marginalized by our existing institutional practices. It also asks that we consider how institutional diversity might be tapped as a resource for cultivating global competency. In this way, internationalization is closely tied to another recent buzzword in higher education: *inclusion*. As Jones and Killick (2007) point out, a diverse student body is “the most obvious, and perhaps least utilized” mechanism for improving teaching and learning for global purposes (p. 113). Taking advantage of the potential contributions of our student body requires pedagogical practices that are inclusive of diverse backgrounds and viewpoints.

Rarely, however, do institutions recognize the link between internationalization and inclusion. All too often, the students who have the most to offer to a globally-oriented curriculum—particularly second language writers—are excluded from the mainstream, segregated into language support or remediation programs. As a result, many institutions ignore the diversity that exists within their walls, and instead operate “in isolation of the wider world,” creating a space “where the student body, staff, curriculum context and supporting materials all reflect a single dominant culture” (Caruana, 2012, p. 34; also see Matsuda, 2006). Ironically, we may miss an opportunity to engage second language writers in globalizing our classrooms, despite the fact that

they have crossed multiple cultural, linguistic, national, and epistemological boundaries to become members of our college communities. TESOL specialists—who also have a great deal to offer to an inclusive, internationalized curriculum, tend to be similarly segregated—often operating in isolation from more mainstream academic programs such as WAC.

Thus despite the rhetoric of internationalization, our schools are missing an opportunity to draw on the cultural and linguistic diversity that actually exists within our campuses, and to create a curriculum that is both inclusive and globally-oriented. In this chapter, we argue that WAC and TESOL can lead the way in developing courses that take advantage of what second language writers bring to institutions of higher education, and can thereby implement a more transformative and inclusive approach to internationalization. We articulate a rationale for collaboration between the two disciplines, and present a course model that provides rigorous writing instruction while at the same time recognizing and building on the global competencies of multilingual students. Such a course demonstrates the value of pedagogical and political alliances between WAC and TESOL.

## WHY WAC AND TESOL?

Both of these disciplines have a great deal to contribute toward the aims of internationalization and global competency: they are both invested in promoting more inclusive, democratic institutional practice, and in supporting students who have traditionally been excluded from the curriculum (Matsuda & Jablonski, 2000). Both are concerned with issues of cultural and linguistic diversity as they relate to power and privilege. Moreover, both fields have in recent years become increasingly aware of the impact of globalization and internationalization on their work, as evidenced by trends in scholarship and pedagogy (see, for example, the CCCC Committee on Globalization established in March 2012). The two fields also complement each other in what they bring to a globally-oriented curriculum: TESOL offers a rich understanding of students as language users, and of the intersections between language, culture, identity, and power. WAC offers insights into literacy practices as they vary across disciplines and discourse communities, as well as strategies for how to embed literacy instruction throughout the academic curriculum. Together, the two disciplines offer a multi-dimensional framework for exploring language and literacy within a global context.

Before we discuss in greater detail the contributions that TESOL can make to WAC, it is important to consider what keeps them apart. One of the main reasons that these two fields rarely collaborate is disciplinary history. Although both fields draw a great deal on research methodology from the social sciences,

they have historically been associated with different disciplines—TESOL with applied linguistics, and composition-rhetoric (which includes WAC) with English. As the two fields began to professionalize, they did so within separate institutional spaces, forming separate pedagogical alliances. This has resulted in what Paul Kei Matsuda (1999) calls a “disciplinary division of labor” in regard to the teaching of writing: “Language” is thought of as the domain of TESOL and “Writing” the domain of composition-rhetoric.

While the division of labor between WAC and TESOL is somewhat understandable given this disciplinary history, the persistence of that division has harmful effects. If language is conceived of as separate from writing, then the composition classroom is assumed to be a monolingual space, and the contributions of second language writers are likely to be overlooked (Matsuda, 2006). Language difference therefore comes to be thought of as deficiency, rather than a resource (Canagarajah, 2006). Multilingualism is then treated as “a problem to be solved, a disease to be cured” (Hall, 2009, p. 37). Another negative byproduct of disciplinary division of labor is curricular misalignment. Comparative case studies have found that the writing instruction in ESL courses is often approached from a “remedial” or “basic skills” perspective, and may diverge significantly from what is expected in first-year composition, writing-intensive courses, or other courses across the curriculum (Atkinson & Ramanathan, 1995; Braine, 1996; Harklau, 1994). This divergence is reflected in course policies as well: ESL coursework is often non-credit and may cost additional fees beyond regular tuition (Shapiro, 2012; Van Meter, 1990; also see TESOL, 2012). As a result, many students come to resent their ESL coursework, feeling that it is irrelevant to their academic goals and is more of a hindrance than a help (Leki, 2007; Roberge, Harklau, & Siegal, 2009; Shapiro, 2012).

Part of what prevents more equitable policies, as well as a more integrated curriculum, is the institutional alienation of TESOL professionals themselves. Research has found that many feel they are accorded “second class status” at their institutions, and that their work is considered “remedial” and/or “less academic” compared to that of other departments (Blumenthal, 2002, p. 48; Gray, Rolph, & Melamid, 1996, p. 77-78). This low status is instantiated in very tangible ways: ESL instructors tend to have lower pay, higher teaching loads, less job security, and fewer professional development opportunities compared with faculty in other disciplines (Blumenthal, 2002; Ignash, 1995; Williams, 1995; also see Shapiro, 2012). Given these dynamics, it is not surprising that faculty specializing in second language writing have little if any opportunity for cross-disciplinary collaboration.

Clearly, TESOL stands to benefit both pedagogically and politically from increased institutional integration and could be greatly aided in this aim

through an alliance with WAC. This alliance might also help WAC to respond more proactively to the exigencies of internationalization and meet the needs of second language writers. As Jonathan Hall (2009) has pointed out, although WAC prides itself on promoting innovative pedagogical practices, it appears to have a blind spot of its own in failing to prepare for “the next America”—a “new psychic and pedagogical landscape” where multilingualism is the norm, rather than the exception (p. 34). “The future of WAC,” Hall explains, “is indissolubly tied to the ways in which higher education will have to, willingly or unwillingly, evolve in the wake of globalization and in response to the increasing linguistic diversity of our student population” (p. 34). By turning to TESOL for insights on the implications of multilingualism and internationalization for its work, WAC can lead, rather than follow, in cultivating global competency and inclusive teaching across the curriculum. In sum, alliances between these two disciplines can help both of them to become further institutionally integrated.

We are not the first authors to discuss the possibilities for a reciprocal relationship between WAC and TESOL. Matsuda and Jablonski (2000) have called for a “mutually transformative” relationship between the disciplines, which they characterize as involving not only interdisciplinary borrowing but also collective action. The authors point out that such a relationship has political as well as pedagogical benefits: “By working together in the service of improving teaching and learning,” they explain, “WAC and ESL could ... aid one another in securing increased institutional status” (p. 6). These and other scholars have enumerated a variety of possibilities for collaborative work between the disciplines. (A website put together by Michelle Cox has an excellent set of strategies and resources. See also Mallett and Zghreib [this volume] who offer a vivid illustration of how this kind of collaboration can result in a deeply thoughtful and carefully designed curriculum for international students.) However, there is a need for more articulation of models at the course level that draw on the expertise of both fields (Zawacki & Cox, 2011). The existing literature tends to focus on how the two can work together to support second language writers in other content areas, rather than on how they might themselves add to the curriculum through content-based, writing-intensive courses with a global orientation. As the landscape of higher education is being shaped by internationalization, there is tremendous opportunity for WAC and TESOL to make ground-level contributions, drawing on their collective expertise. Jonathan Hall (2009) has framed the opportunity that lies before us in this way: “We need to ask ourselves: how can WAC/WID programs more effectively encourage *Multilingual Learning Across the Curriculum?*” (p. 37). In the section that follows, we present a course model that responds to this question.

## A CURRICULAR RESPONSE: WRITING ABOUT GLOBAL ENGLISH

We have made the argument that the rhetoric of internationalization must be translated into inclusive opportunities to develop global competencies and global mindedness for students on our campuses. This entails leveraging the resource of student diversity and exploring avenues for coordination between TESOL and WAC programs. This particular model of coordination is a writing-intensive course about English as a global language designed and taught by a TESOL specialist, with support and input from WAC programs. The course content, global English, was selected because it crossed geographic and disciplinary boundaries, and also because it allowed for the inclusion of multiple/critical perspectives. We present this as an example of globally-relevant curricular content that can be academically purposed through WAC programs while at the same time being “international and relevant to the needs to all student groups” (Leask, 2001, p. 101). Variations of this course have been piloted at two institutions—George Washington University and Middlebury College. Although the two variations are quite similar, they differ in two respects—the mix of students (L2-only vs. mixed L1/L2) and their approach to writing instruction.

The course at George Washington University (GW) responds directly to the institution’s mission statement, which highlights the core value of cultivating “a dynamic, student-focused community stimulated by cultural and intellectual diversity and built upon a foundation of integrity, creativity, and openness to the exploration of new ideas” (<http://www.gwu.edu/~ire/info/mission.htm>). This statement represents the potential for transcending the monolingual/monocultural classroom, as well as the institutional boundaries that can limit cross-disciplinary collaboration. In regard to international engagement, the university also aims to “promote the process of lifelong learning from both global and integrative perspectives” by “provid[ing] a stimulating intellectual environment for its diverse students and faculty.” This emphasis brings to light the university’s commitment to engage with diverse perspectives and global-mindedness in both teaching and learning.

While the writing program at GW endeavors to foster a “stimulating intellectual environment,” the global perspectives and respect for diversity articulated in the university mission statement are not always evident in the course options it puts forward. First-year writing course options tend to be humanities-oriented and skewed toward American cultural themes. This can disadvantage second language writers who may lack the cultural knowledge base of their US counterparts as well as overlook the development of global competencies that are so necessary in our interconnected society. Among the writing-intensive

(WI) courses offered, global options can be similarly limited. At the time this course was designed, many of the WI courses available were in the humanities, particularly British and American literature, and the few social science options on the schedule had a focus on the American perspective, such as US diplomatic history and American politics and government. Courses with global content were most likely to be offered through departments of foreign languages or international affairs. Thus, second language writers at the university faced limited opportunities to take composition and writing-intensive courses that were inclusive of their diverse experiences and perspectives.

Though the TESOL and WI programs were part of separate departments in the institution, with TESOL instruction housed in the credit-bearing English for Academic Purposes (EAP) program and WI located in the University Writing Program (UWP), they were aligned in particular ways. Both programs focused on writing only, and the second language writers who took an EAP writing class went on to complete the full series of required courses in the University Writing Program. This literacy series included a rigorous first-year writing course and two WI courses that were grounded in the content of particular academic disciplines but had a significant writing component “designed to facilitate student involvement with particular bodies of knowledge, their methods of scholarship, and modes of communication” (<http://www.gwu.edu/~uwp/wid/wid-about.html>). At least one of the WI courses needed to be taken within a student’s major, but the other course could be from another field of study. Because the writing courses were connected in this way, both the EAP program and the University Writing Program had a stake in the success of second language writers. In addition, the two programs shared a physical space, and this proximity created a collegial atmosphere and many opportunities for the sharing of experiences and ideas. This cross-pollination at GW led to the development of a social science WI course for international students called “English in a Global Context.”

The rationale for this particular course was in part based on the challenges second language writers faced in WI courses at the university and the potential contribution of EAP’s pedagogical approach, which tends to make explicit the practices, skills, and textual conventions associated with academic writing in English. The course was broadly described as an interdisciplinary examination of the global use of English, a subject matter that was particularly accessible to international students who had spent their lives operating in the arena of “global English.” Course content included a study of the historical context that engendered the growth of English, a treatment of how English functions in global society, and an examination of cultural attitudes about the hegemonic power of English in the modern world. Course materials were drawn from a



range of social science disciplines—including sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, anthropology, culture studies, and education—and represented the extent to which global English has become a subfield of increasing scholarly interest.

The objectives of this global English course linked content expectations with social science research and writing expectations. In keeping with the university's WI guidelines, students were expected to use critical reading strategies to analyze an interdisciplinary set of course materials; to develop research techniques relevant to the social sciences; to assess writing situations to compose for diverse purposes and audiences; and to produce 15-20 pages of finished text that demonstrated the conventions of social science writing including style, language use, and APA documentation format. The course objectives also emphasized scholarly collaboration and revision.

Specific assignments were designed to build on both the global theme and on the social science skill set and included four short papers that highlighted writing for diverse purposes and audiences (language profile, critical article review, policy memo, reflective writing), and two larger projects that focused on research—a survey analysis project and an annotated bibliography project. The survey analysis project was considered original social science research and required students to develop and administer a survey about English language use that considered practices and/or attitudes. The results of this survey were analyzed and presented in the form of a social science research article. Conducting original research and linking it to scholarly work in the field helped students realize the value of diverse experiences and develop their own voices as writers, completing projects with titles such as “Why English Cannot Dominate the World” and “Is an Initially Positive Experience with the English Language a Strong Factor in Motivating One to Learn the Language?” The other major assignment was an annotated bibliography on an independently conceived topic relevant to the course theme. For this project, students translated their own experiences and interests into an academic research focus, and topics included hybridized language use, English language educational practices, and the role of technology in the spread of English. This course, though initially designed via an experimental course designation, has been approved as a permanent WI offering.

Another variation on this course model has been implemented at Middlebury College, which, like George Washington University, sees internationalization as central to its mission: The college “strives ... to cultivate the intellectual, creative, physical, ethical, and social qualities essential for leadership in a rapidly changing global community” (Middlebury College). Middlebury seeks students who wish to “engage the world”—a phrase that is used frequently in its promotional materials. This emphasis on global understanding is reflected in the strong emphasis on foreign language study, international perspectives, and

study abroad throughout the curriculum. It is also reflected in the strong representation from international students, who comprise 10% of the student body.

The writing-intensive World English course at Middlebury was designed to mesh with this commitment to internationalization, but also to meet a need for increased L2 writing support. As part of their undergraduate degree, all Middlebury students are required to take two College Writing (CW) courses, which are usually taught by faculty in the disciplines. Faculty in the Writing Program (WRPR) offer additional, supplementary courses for students who wish to receive more attention from a composition specialist. Many L2 writers had been encouraged by their faculty advisers to take a WRPR course but were reluctant to do so since those courses did not fulfill general education distributions or other graduation requirements and were not tied to their academic interests.

The World English course at Middlebury was designed to appeal more directly to L2 writers, by offering content that was more globally-oriented than that in other WRPR courses, and also met requirements for general education distributions. It was hoped that such a course would attract a mix of stronger and weaker writers, as well a range of cultural and linguistic backgrounds and academic interests. The course was open to L1 writers as well—in essence, responding the call put forth by Jonathan Hall (2009): “How can we develop differentiated instruction methods so that both monolingual English speakers and MLLs [multilingual language learners] simultaneously have a rich and satisfying classroom experience in the same writing classroom?” (p. 45). We hoped that a course with these attributes would be an ideal space for students who might be hesitant to select an “ESL” or “remedial” course.

The course we created, “The English Language in a Global Context,” fulfills two general education requirements—one in social analysis and another in comparative cultures—and has been approved as an elective option for minors in Linguistics and Education Studies. The course is advertised to students in the syllabus as an interdisciplinary content course in English language/ sociolinguistics that helps students “develop a deeper understanding of the relationship between language and socio-political dynamics.” It also fulfills the goals of the Writing Program, which include teaching “critical and creative thinking, conventions of academic discourse, and persuasive argumentation” (Middlebury College). As with other WRPR offerings, this course teaches writing via a process approach, offering multiple opportunities for feedback and revision. This particular WRPR course put greater emphasis, however, on critical reading, use of source texts, genre, and other disciplinary conventions.

Course material for this variation of the global English course included articles and essays from the social sciences, as well as supplementary material from the humanities, including poetry, prose, creative nonfiction, film, and

other digital media. As with the GW model, the writing assignments for this course required research, analysis, and argumentation: For the first assignment, students researched and reported on a particular variety of English, drawing on course readings and outside sources, as necessary. Topics for this assignment included US-focused varieties, such as Boston English, Chicano English, or African American Vernacular, as well as Englishes in “outer” and “expanding” circle countries, such as Jamaica, Singapore, France, and China. Students presented their findings orally and in a written report. The second assignment was a position paper on a controversial question, such as one of the following: “How serious a problem is linguistic imperialism?” “Should the US (or another country) adopt English as its official language?” “What if anything should be done about language death, particularly if English is a contributing factor?” These assignments gave students the opportunity to practice expository and persuasive writing, as well as to improve their use of textual borrowing practices and academic register. The final project, entitled “World Englishes and Social Justice,” took a more creative turn. Students wrote for a public audience in response to an issue or problem that had been raised throughout the semester, such as bilingual education, language loss, or linguistic prejudice. Student work for this project included autobiographical essays, editorial letters, informational pamphlets, public speeches, and works of fiction. For all three of these major assignments, students completed multiple revisions, receiving feedback from peers, peer tutors, and the instructor. They also reflected on what they had learned, in a Writer’s Memo submitted with the final draft. (See <http://shawn-ashapiro.com> for more course materials).

The global English course model we have proposed and piloted in these two variations has been successful in a number of regards: It has drawn students from a diverse array of linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and has created the space for them to put their personal experience into dialogue with the course material. It has caused students to question their own assumptions about language, identity, and power, and to write in thoughtful and critical ways about complex concepts. Below, we discuss in greater detail how this course responds to our call for a more inclusive response to internationalization.

## **CULTIVATING GLOBAL COMPETENCY**

This course model embodies the goals of internationalization by embedding curricular content that is global in nature. The spread and current use of the English language has been driven by global forces and is sometimes used as a symbol of our interconnected world. At the same time, this course speaks to both the humanist and the practical rationales for internationalization,

as articulated earlier. A course on global English allows us to identify—and question—the structures of power that have enabled English to rise to its hegemonic position. Interrogating our own assumptions and asking questions about who “owns” English, as well as who may be advantaged or disadvantaged by its use in a global setting, can help students uncover global inequalities and perhaps envision the world as a community with a shared future. In terms of the global marketplace, this type of course offers a perspective on the language of global commerce and what it means to interact with those who speak the same language in very different contexts. Students in both variations of the course have commented on how it has expanded their global perspective. One student in the GW course said in the course evaluation that the most valuable aspect of the class was “to come to understand the vague term ‘English as a Global Language’ in a historical, sociological way.” One of the Middlebury students wrote, “I loved this course, because it made me think about things I had never thought about before.” Another Middlebury student said, “I learned to look at systems of power in the world more critically.”

### **INCLUSIVENESS AND RELEVANCE FOR DIVERSE STUDENT POPULATIONS**

Because this course model offers curricular material that is deeply global in nature, it can be inclusive of the experiences and needs of diverse student populations. The content of the course is relevant to students of any cultural and linguistic background but what truly distinguishes this course is that, by its very nature, it invites different perspectives and points of view. The classroom can become a shared space in which L1 and L2 students are co-creators of knowledge, with each drawing authority from his/her own experience and cultural background and interacting to make meaning of globally relevant concepts. Native speakers of English, who may have been socialized in monolingual, monocultural classrooms, are forced to look beyond their own understanding of the language, and to consider how it is perceived in other contexts (a benefit of linguistically diverse classes that was also noted by graduate students in Fredericksen & Mangelsdorf [this volume]). This awareness was reflected in the comments from students in the Middlebury course who said they appreciated the diversity of backgrounds represented in the course: “This course taught me to question my own culture,” said one Middlebury student, “because I never thought that any English beside my own was correct.” An L1 writer explained in a reflective assignment, “I have never had experience with losing my identity or culture because of language.” For this reason, she wrote her final project about the cognitive benefits of being bilingual, in order to “help other people like me, who have not experienced that double identity, still appreciate and encourage bilingualism.”

Second language writers in both variations of the course commented that the global content empowered them to share their personal experience more than they had in most of their other classes. One of the GW students said, “We can bring in our own learning experience to this class to make the class more diverse.” This course is “very helpful for international students,” explained another, “because they have more chances to express their opinions [and are] able to participate in class more vigorously.” Making these sorts of connections helped L2 writers to understand themselves better. Similarly, one of the Middlebury students said the course “allowed me to tap in to my heritage and identity” (See Hirsch [this volume] and Phillips [this volume] for more evidence that curricula that invited L2 students to draw on their multicultural experiences as resources is beneficial to L2 writing development). Another wrote that the course helped him/her to “understand about the challenges I have been facing.” When all students have an equal – though perhaps different— stake in the course content, we move away from the assimilationist assumptions that can disadvantage or silence students who are outside of the mainstream. In interacting with course content and peers, students are able to engage in reciprocal and transformative learning. This is where we can move from the skills of global competence into a deeper conception of global mindedness, one that is oriented toward diversity as a strength rather than a deficiency.

An additional benefit of the course derived from its approach to writing instruction which was responsive to students’ needs as writers. According to Jonathan Hall (2009), the “hallmark of the EAP approach is a rigorous and detailed breakdown of common academic tasks into their components, which are examined independently and taught sequentially” (p. 44). The pedagogical expertise of the instructor as a TESOL specialist helped enable students to attend actively to the processes and practices of writing. One GW student remarked that “This class actually helps international students to develop their writing skills, while other WI classes just make students to write without teaching them how to.” Another commented that the most valuable aspect of the class was being able to understand how to do social science research and writing, and another mentioned the benefit of the process-oriented approach and the high level of support offered in the class: “My writing only gets improved when I keep practicing and refining with comments from my instructor.” (For examples of WI syllabi and curricula that effectively make use of WAC pedagogies to scaffold writing instruction for L2 students, see Hirsch [this volume]).

## **IT INTEGRATES CROSS-DISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES**

Another benefit of the English in a global context course model is that it does not pretend to occupy a single discipline. Because the topic of global English is

inherently interdisciplinary, this course creates opportunities for coordination across programs and departments. We describe the materials for this model course as being drawn from a range of social science disciplines, because it would be impossible to say that global English fits into only one space. We can speak of it as a linguistic phenomenon, or define it in anthropological terms, or policy terms, or economic terms, but putting this topic into a single disciplinary space limits our perspective on the issue. In other words, the English language is *global* in nature and its implications are complex and far-reaching. Creating an inclusive and interdisciplinary space for this course allows us to honor its complexity and diversity.

Building a course around a theme that is interdisciplinary in nature makes it much easier to fulfill the cross-disciplinary goals of WAC, and therefore to build more institutional alliances. Though our colleges and universities often operate on a model of disciplinary division, the WAC framework offers one way to enter cross-disciplinary territory by embedding writing instruction across the curriculum. Inviting L2 writing specialists into that space enhances the level of writing support for multilingual writers, and can in turn reduce the isolation of TESOL faculty. This support for interdisciplinary interaction also extends to students' classroom experiences. As a result of this class, students learn to think about global English, and about the act of writing, from multiple disciplinary perspectives: one student who took the WI course at GW said, "I learned the style and form of social science writing (ex. APA) and social science (especially sociological, anthropological, a little linguistic) way of analyzing information." Another said, similarly, "I learned ... the fields that social science study, how to read these articles and analyze, how to interact with scholars' ideas." An international student at Middlebury commented in an email, "Now, I can write different type of papers, academic, research and directed to public audience ones. I am not going to say that I have been perfect in writing, but I know that, what I learned in this class was a lot!" This responsiveness to rhetorical situations is a hallmark of WAC writing instruction, and adding the element of global perspectives heightens our students' ability to interact across cultural spaces.

## **ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Our global English courses are one means by which TESOL specialists can contribute to the curricular offerings of WAC programs. In the section below, we offer suggestions for institutions looking to encourage more of these sorts of contributions from TESOL specialists, as well as for instructors looking to

incorporate internationalized content, such as the global English theme, into their writing-intensive courses.

First, it is important to tailor the course to each institutional context. Colleges and universities whose mission statements and strategic priorities emphasize global competency may be particularly open to developing globally-oriented curricular options and tapping into TESOL specialists and L2 writers as resources. Schools should also consider their departmental framework and academic culture. In both variations of this course model, there was an infrastructure in place for cross-departmental coordination, as well as a general understanding of the struggles and needs of diverse writers across the campus, which created opportunities for dialogue between writing programs and TESOL programs. Institutions were further willing to approve innovative course offerings that diversified the curriculum and strengthened the level of support for multilingual writers, while at the same time fulfilling requirements. For this sort of coordination to be effective, institutions must recognize that TESOL specialists are often untapped resources in the academic community.

An additional consideration for a course of this kind is deciding who has the interest and expertise to teach it. In both variations of the course model described here, a TESOL specialist designed and taught the course, with input and support from the WAC program. Scholars such as Ruth Spack (1988), however, have warned TESOL specialists about the dangers of building courses around content areas in which they are not proficient. Though such instructors may be highly qualified in teaching the rhetorical principles and skills of writing, they may find that they have “little basis for dealing with the content ... [or] find themselves in the uncomfortable position of being less knowledgeable than their students” (p. 37). For a course like this to be successful, TESOL faculty should be fluent in the methods of inquiry, textual conventions, and scholarly interactions of the field, so that students can be “immerse[d] in the subject matter ... by participating in the field, by doing, by sharing, and by talking about it with those who know more” (Spack, 1988, p. 40). Faculty who have some reservations about teaching global English may wish to pilot a single unit on global English for an existing course, before developing an entirely new course on the topic. It is also important for TESOL specialists to draw on the expertise of colleagues in writing programs, as well as to connect with instructional librarians for support in accessing research materials appropriate to the course content.

The intended mix of students (L2-only or mixed L1/L2) also depends on the institutional setting, as well on the goals of the program offering the course. There are advantages to both options: In an L2-only course, for example, students feel more confident expressing themselves in class. One GW student commented

that L2 students “get more active in class when there are only international students,” and another offered a remark on the affective environment of the L2-only class: “I think ‘international only’ is good. This can be contradicted with UW (university writing) because most of my friends don’t say anything in that class.” However, one of the second language writers in the GW class made the point that it would be valuable to have L1 students in the class as well “because local students can share their views on global status of English.” Another reason to consider a mixed classroom is to reduce the stigma of segregation, since many multilingual writers (particularly those who are US-educated) are resistant to “ESL” labels (Ortmeier-Hooper, 2008). Although it can be difficult to address all of the literacy needs present in a mixed class, the diversity of the student population certainly enriches students’ understanding of course material, as well as their overall sense of institutional integration.

## CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

In this chapter, we have argued that the phenomenon of internationalization presents new pedagogical opportunities within higher education. In order for internationalization to have a transformative impact on students, however, a global orientation must be integrated throughout the curriculum, and must be linked to other institutional goals of diversity and inclusion. WAC and TESOL have a great deal to offer to institutions seeking the integration of internationalization throughout the curriculum, because each has a historical commitment to curricular innovation and inclusive pedagogy. Yet rarely do the two disciplines have the opportunity to partner together in this regard. The writing-intensive global English course is certainly not the only form such a partnership might take, but it offers tremendous potential toward the goal of inclusion—not just for students, but also for TESOL professionals. A course of this kind allows the disciplines to work together as institutional allies, toward a more democratic and globally-competent curriculum for all students.

## REFERENCES

- Atkinson, D., & Ramanathan, V. (1995). Cultures of writing: An ethnographic comparison of L1 and L2 university writing/language programs. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 539-568.
- Braine, G. (1996). ESL students in first-year writing courses: ESL versus main-stream classes. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5(1), 91-107.



- Blumenthal, A. J. (2002). English as a second language at the community college: An exploration of contexts and concerns. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 117, 45-53.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). Toward a writing pedagogy of shuttling between languages: Learning from multilingual writers. *College English*, 68(6), 589-604.
- Caruana, V. (2010). The relevance of the internationalised curriculum to graduate capability. In E. Jones (Ed.), *Internationalisation and the student voice: Higher education perspectives* (pp. 30-43). New York/ London: Routledge.
- Cox, M. (n.d.). *WAC and second-language writing*. WAC Clearinghouse. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/slw/>
- The George Washington University (n.d.). *Writing in the Disciplines*. Retrieved from <http://www.gwu.edu/~uwp/wid/wid-about.html>
- Gray, M. J., Rolph, E. S., & Melamid, E. (1996). *Immigration and higher education: Institutional responses to changing demographics*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Hall, J. (2009). WAC/WID in the next America: Redefining professional identity in the age of the multilingual majority. *The WAC Journal*, 20, 33-49.
- Harklau, L. (1994). ESL and mainstream classes: Contrasting second language learning contexts. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 241-272.
- Hunter, B., White, G., & Godbey, G. (2006). What does it mean to be globally competent? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 267-285.
- Ignash, J. M. (1995). Encouraging ESL student persistence: The influence of policy on design. *Community College Review*, 23(3), 17-34.
- Jones, E. & Killick, D. (2007). Internationalisation of the curriculum. In E. Jones & S. Brown (Eds.), *Internationalising higher education* (pp. 109-119). New York/ London: Routledge.
- Leask, B. (2001). Bridging the gap: Internationalizing university curricula. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5(2), 100-115.
- Leki, I. (2007). *Undergraduates in a second language: Challenges and complexities of academic literacy development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Matsuda, P. K. (1999). Composition Studies and ESL writing: A disciplinary division of labor. *College Composition and Communication*, 50(4), 699-721.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in US college composition. *College English* 68(6), 637-51.
- Matsuda, P. K., & Jablonski, J. (2000). Beyond the L2 metaphor: Towards a mutually transformative model of ESL/WAC collaboration. *Academic Writing*, 1. Retrieved from [http://wac.colostate.edu/aw/articles/matsuda\\_jablonski2000.htm](http://wac.colostate.edu/aw/articles/matsuda_jablonski2000.htm)
- Middlebury College (n.d.) *Middlebury's Mission Statement*. Retrieved from <http://www.middlebury.edu/about/mission>

- Olson, C. L., & Kroeger, K. R. (2001). Global competency and intercultural sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5, 116-137.
- Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (2008). English may be my second language, but I'm not ESL. *College Composition and Communication*, 59(3), 389-419.
- Roberge, M., Harklau, L., & Siegal, M. (2009). *Generation 1.5 in college composition: Teaching ESL to US-educated learners of ESL*. New York: Routledge.
- Shapiro, S. (2012). Stuck in the remedial rut: Confronting resistance to ESL curriculum reform. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 30(2), 24-52.
- Shapiro, S. (2012). Citizens vs. aliens: How institutional policies construct linguistic minority students. In Y. Kanno & L. Harklau (Eds). *Linguistic minority students go to college: Preparation, access, and persistence* (pp. 238-254). New York: Routledge.
- Shapiro, S. (n.d.). *Curriculum Vitae*. Retrieved from <http://shawnashapiro.com>
- Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly*, 22(1), 29-51.
- Stromquist, N. P. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education*, 53(1), 81-105.
- Taylor, J. (2004). Toward a strategy for internationalisation: Lessons and practice from four universities. *Journal of Studies In International Education*, 8(2), 149-171.
- TESOL (2012). *Position statement on academic and degree-granting credit for ESOL courses in postsecondary education*. Retrieved from <http://www.tesol.org/docs/pdf/academic-credit-for-esl-in-postsecondary-institutions.pdf?sfvrsn=0>
- Van Gyn, G., Schuerholz-Lehr, S., Caws, C., & Preece, A. (2009). Education for world-mindedness: Beyond superficial notions of internationalization. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Internationalizing the curriculum in higher education* (pp. 25-38). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Van Meter, J. (1990). Academic credit for ESL classes? *Review of Research in Developmental Education*, 8(1), 2-6.
- Williams, J. (1995). ESL composition program administration in the United States. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 4(2), 157-179.
- Zawacki, T. M., & Cox, M. (2011). Introduction to WAC and second language writing. *Across the Disciplines*, 8(4). Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/ell/zawacki-cox.cfm>