

WAC/WID in the Next America: Redefining Professional Identity in the Age of the Multilingual Majority

JONATHAN HALL
YORK COLLEGE, CUNY

AS PROFESSIONALS IN WAC/WID programs, we frequently see ourselves as agents of change on our campuses. We see ourselves as advocates for the advancement of pedagogy, where teaching methods are influenced by new research and instructors are engaged with the larger world beyond the campus, and where student needs are assessed and addressed in a progressive manner. As WAC professionals, we frequently challenge our colleagues to reconceptualize their classroom approach in order to include more writing, and to take responsibility for inviting students into their disciplines. When we make these requests, we are asking a lot. A rethinking of a faculty member's professional identity is at stake when WAC/WID is taken seriously.

What I'd like to suggest here is that we need to challenge ourselves to make a transformation in our own thinking, procedures, and pedagogy, as well as in our own professional identity, that is just as radical a shift *for us* as the one we have been asking of our colleagues in the disciplines. Just as WAC requires a transformation of traditional content-based pedagogy, meeting the challenge of teaching multilingual learners well requires as thorough and fundamental a transformation of WAC.

In recent years, the WAC/WID community, along with college writing faculty more broadly, has become more aware of the pedagogical implications of increasing cultural and linguistic diversity. The work of Paul Kei Matsuda, Vivian Zamel, Ann Johns, and others¹ has opened up a dialogue between WAC professionals and specialists in other fields, such as TESOL, L2 writing, applied linguistics, language acquisition and learning theories, contrastive rhetoric, English for Academic Purposes, and K-12 bilingual education, among others. But as Matsuda has suggested, we are still operating under a model of "division of labor," where we may consult with our colleagues in other

disciplines, and perhaps borrow some of their techniques and expertise, without fully entering into a mutually transformative relationship.

The future of WAC, I will argue, 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. I will begin by briefly addressing three phenomena that already affect and increasingly will impact our teaching and our research in ways that we have not yet, in my view, even begun to come to terms with. I will call these, for concision's sake, "The New Linguistic Majority," "The New Latin," and "The New Student." All of them are different faces and aspects of the globalization of education and the internationalization of English. Put together, they form a new psychic and pedagogical landscape that I call "The Next America," which is where our teaching and our research is going to take place in the near future. Let me just briefly sketch them in, and then concentrate on what I think the effects and consequences and implications are for our pedagogy as U.S.-based teachers of college writing, and more specifically for our efforts at providing professional development opportunities for WAC/WID faculty.

I. THE NEXT AMERICA: THE NEW LINGUISTIC MAJORITY, THE NEW LATIN, AND THE NEW STUDENT

...within a decade or so, the number of people who speak English as a second language will exceed the number of native speakers.

—David Graddol, "The Future of English" (1997) (2)

As English has increasingly become the *lingua franca* of business, academia, and other global endeavors, it is probably now—or at least soon will be—the case that more people in the world speak English as a second language than as a first language. It was David Graddol's seminal report for the British Council, *The Future of English?*, that first pointed out this trend some twelve years ago,² but American higher education has not yet come to terms with the implications for our pedagogy. Who "owns" English? What does this de-centering of the authority of the native speaker—who now is only one among multiple users of a "global resource" (Graddol 3) to our notions of a universally correct standard English—or standard business English, standard academic English, etc.? How are the various "Englishes" related to each other?

The consequences for pedagogical practice in higher education may be captured in two seemingly contradictory—but both essential—principles:

- An undiminished—if anything increased—need for thorough mastery of advanced English language skills in writing, reading, and critical thinking for every undergraduate, because strong communication skills in English are more than ever a

prerequisite for success in fields which involve interaction with global partners and competitors—i.e., *every* field.

- The monolingual English speaker is at a disadvantage in today's global market place. While English is the language of many elite financial and intellectual transactions, most of the world's population—including an increasing number of multilingual Americans who maintain complex cultural ties both with countries of origin and with vibrant immigrant communities within the American mosaic—live a dual existence in multiple languages and cultures which remain invisible and not fully understood by those who do not share the advantages of multilingual learning.

The “Next America” is a place where living one's whole life in one language seems as odd as eating the same thing for dinner every day. In the Next America, conversations shift in mid-sentence from one language to another, and every strolling group of students constitutes a micro-culture of multiple intermixed language backgrounds. In the Next America, the Worldwide Web is truly worldwide; the filter is not set to English only, but embraces a global panoply of local knowledge and cultural specificity.

At campuses across the country, the Next America is already here:

- In some urban settings, students from non-English language backgrounds constitute a majority of entering students (Wurr 15).

- *The New York Times* recently reported that at the K-12 level, English language learners are the fastest-growing segment of the school population—and not only in large urban districts.³

- From 1979 to 1999, the percentage of 5 to 24-year-olds who spoke a language other than English at home increased by 118% (Wurr 14).

- As of 2000, 18% of Americans live in households where English is not the primary language. (Wurr 14)

But these numbers do not fully catch the complexity of the New Student. The term “multilingual learners” encompasses a wide variety of linguistic experiences and educational backgrounds. They include the traditional international students with an education in their original language and country, but they also include long-time immigrants and children of immigrants, sometimes called “Generation 1.5” (Roberge, Harklau) or “emergent English-dominant learners, ‘children of immigrants who have oral competency in English and the cultural references of native English speakers.’” (Johns 141).⁴ The exact mixture will be different on every campus, and so each WAC program needs to rigorously assess local needs and trends. We need to catch up with this new reality—our students are way ahead of us on this because they are already living, day by day, in a world in which functioning in more than one language is increasingly

becoming the rule rather than the exception. The pedagogical task before us, then, is to produce and test strategies for negotiating the gap between a system of higher education that was founded in the previous America, and the one that needs to work in the next America.

One of the many paradoxical effects of globalization is that it makes the local all the more important and all the more precious. We can see this in the movement to eat locally-grown food, which is partly a response to environmental concerns but is also an affirmation of regional identity. We could see this as a reaction against globalization, but it could just as well be construed as part of a considered response to globalization, and even as an essential part of the process. There has been a lot of discussion in scholarly and political channels of “pushing back” against globalization, but I prefer A. Suresh Canagarajah’s less confrontational phrase, “negotiating the local.” He applies it at the macro level, to the struggle of national cultures to establish a balance between the importance of international English to their economic future and the claims of local languages and customs. He also applies it at the micro level, to the ways in which individual speakers and writers employ various strategies to combine elements of local cultures and languages with the structures of English and the standardized rhetorics of Western academia and business.

One would think, on the surface, that the adoption of English around the world would be cause for satisfaction among native English speakers, who will, for example, find it easier to travel than in the days when English speakers abroad were scarcer. But the globalization of English has paradoxically resulted in anxiety *here* as well. There is a sense that as more and more people are using English, we are starting to lose control of it, and it is starting to seem less “ours.” As English becomes a new Latin or a new Esperanto, we begin envisioning an embarrassing conversation a monolingual English speaker may have in the future with someone from somewhere else. Asked what languages she speaks, the monolingual English speaker would answer, “English,” to which her interlocutor might reply, “Well, of course. But what’s your *real* language?”

We no longer own English. In fact, we never did. In fact, nobody does. And in that continuing process of reluctant abdication of our lingering claims of control, we have our own local identity crisis to work through here.

In past waves of immigration, under the “melting-pot” metaphor, the general expectation was that as immigrants learned English, they would cease to use their previous language as they attempted to assimilate fully into American society, and it was likely that their offspring, often by the third generation, would eventually not speak any language other than English at all. This model, which linguists call *subtractive*

bilingualism, in which the second language replaces and supplants the first one, is *not* the norm in most of the world, where the majority are multilingual. The opposite phenomenon, *additive bilingualism*, is more common among educated people who aspire to learn a second language, sometimes going to considerable expense, inconvenience, and effort to do so (through formal instruction, study abroad, etc.), either as a means of personal development (“I want to read the poems of Rimbaud in the original”) or for pragmatic purposes (as, for example, millions of people around the world are currently learning English). Additive bilinguals have no intention of ceasing to use their first language; rather, they perceive multilingualism as an advantage in a complex post-modern landscape.

The question for us, as higher education professionals, is whether we are still operating under the older subtractive expectation, whether in our administrative structures and our curricula we are still simply *assuming* that the other language is a problem to be solved, a disease to be cured, a difficult transition to be nourished, but that at some point all of our students will be “simply” speakers of English, and we can then teach them in the same way that we always have taught our classes that we still assume are primarily full of monolingual English speakers. The question we have not yet asked ourselves is this: Do our students who continue to function in more than one language learn differently—learn content differently, learn writing differently—than English monolinguals? Do we need to change the way that we teach them?

The assumption that the mainstream college student is monolingual is so pervasive and so seemingly obvious that we don’t even think of it as an assumption, most of the time. But the shifting demographics of U.S. college students are ready to take us to a reversal of the idea of who are the “outliers”⁵ in our thinking about our students and how we should teach them. The new reality to which we must adjust in U.S. higher education is that *multilingual learners are part of the mainstream*. It will take some adjustment in our attitudes and assumptions to realize, and to plan our curricula on the basis of, the fact that speaking another language in addition to English is not a deficit or a disadvantage but rather a normal phenomenon, and one that should be actively cultivated. We need to ask ourselves: how can WAC/WID programs more effectively encourage *Multilingual Learning Across the Curriculum*? How can we find opportunities, within our existing courses or in new ones that we create for the purpose, to allow students to *use* those multilingual skills in an academic context? Instructors should look for opportunities to challenge students to make use of their linguistic abilities: why not, for example, have students with Russian language literacy write a history paper based on sources that are only available in Russian? Our every classroom offers the possibility of bringing

multiple perspectives to bear by making use of our students' existing multilingual capabilities, or those which they are in the process of developing.

What I want to suggest is that the college writing classroom is one of those locations in which “the local” needs to be negotiated with the “global”: it is a crossing, an intersection, a place where collisions and near-collisions occur; it is a place where the multicultural, multilingual, multifaceted experiences and identities of our students meet the equally varied and complex academic discourses, which are themselves implicated in global dialogues, which are products of multinational conversation and cooperation and conflict. Who is the global, really, and who is the local in this interaction of faculty and student? Who is the immigrant and who, if anyone, is at home in this new world of new Latins and new Englishes, of new students and—dare we hope?—a new kind of faculty?

II. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR WAC/WID FACULTY IN THE NEXT AMERICA

WAC administrators can help faculty recognize the variety of needs, language proficiencies, and cultural contributions among linguistically diverse students, and to understand that linguistically diverse students' notions about academic writing and writing in the disciplines may differ from those of the dominant university culture. —Ann Johns (148-149)

Both WAC and the pedagogy of teaching academic English to multilingual learners (hereafter MLLs) are unavoidable issues for anyone in any field in today's university environment, and for that matter in today's high school and community college environments, as well. And yet many faculty do try to avoid these issues because of their ability to make faculty feel uncomfortable. Due to resource limitations, WAC faculty are, unfortunately, sometimes asked to teach writing intensive courses without being provided with sufficient professional development support so that they feel comfortable teaching the writing process in their discipline. And faculty often find themselves faced with a student who is struggling with continuing MLL issues well into their careers—and here it is almost always the case that faculty have not received the training they need to help them handle these issues properly.

Where there is discomfort, there are myths, both about WAC and about MLLs. Where traditionally the teaching of writing is thought to be the exclusive province of the Writing Program or the English Department, the teaching of MLLs is still generally conceived as the job of the ESL program. In both cases, of course, it's *everybody's* job. Where WAC has had to contend with the argument that teaching writing in upper-level courses would water down the content, MLL pedagogy faces the parallel notion that

attention to MLL issues is “dumbing down” the course. Once again, these new pedagogies offer new methods of addressing the most complex or recalcitrant content. And both WAC and MLL have to contend with some faculty’s presupposition that “writing” is equivalent to “grammar”: while sentence-level issues may be a way that second language issues first present themselves, MLL pedagogy includes much more than this.⁶

There is already a considerable tradition within the WAC community of describing the student’s journey into various disciplinary communities using “the L2 Metaphor”—learning an academic discipline is compared to learning a language. Matsuda and Jablonski, however, worry that “when the L2 metaphor is used as a way of explaining the difficulty of learning to write in the disciplines for native English speakers, there is no language left to explain the experience of second-language writers, who are literally learning a second language in addition to learning various disciplinary ‘languages.’”⁷ We must be careful not to lose sight of the particular experience of MLLs as they move through our writing courses—but we must also be careful not to essentialize or stereotype their supposed cultural presuppositions.

There are many parallels between WAC and MLL that give reason for WAC to support MLL—both are pedagogical movements, both are change agents, and both are misunderstood by many faculty. Here are some things that WAC programs and faculty can advocate for to support MLL:

- As we develop WAC support services, in concert with the Writing Center or other entities, make sure that the needs of MLLs are addressed centrally, not just as an add-on.
- Train *all* writing faculty, including WAC faculty in the disciplines, in appropriate pedagogical techniques for reaching MLLs.

But what, exactly, do our faculty need to know about MLLs in order to teach WAC/WID courses more effectively? Here are four preliminary principles that we can stress to our instructors:

1. MLLs in advanced courses, including writing intensive courses, will continue to be multilingual, and they will continue to be language learners.

In their 2001 statement on second-language writing, the executive committee of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC)⁸ observes that:

Although providing additional linguistic support in the forms of intensive language programs and special second-language sections of writing courses may be helpful, they will not remove the responsibility of writing teachers, researchers,

and administrators to address second-language issues because the acquisition of a second language and second-language literacy is a time-consuming process that will continue through students' academic careers and beyond. (229)

The CCCC here emphasizes what is perhaps the single most salient fact about MLLs in WAC/WID courses: although we are mostly concerned with more advanced courses, usually taken after a student has already completed a freshman composition course (and perhaps basic writing and/or ESL courses before that), this does not mean that we can expect MLLs to have completed their language acquisition process. Students in upper-level courses may still be in the process of acquiring academic language proficiency, even if their spoken English has become fluent and colloquial. This continuing reality of language acquisition is often expressed using Jim Cummins' central distinction between BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) and CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency). While BICS may be acquired relatively quickly, CALP often takes seven years or more—which means that many of our students will be undergoing that process throughout the entire period that we see them—and it won't even be over then.

2. MLLs in writing intensive courses are *successful* college students, not struggling language learners. Since in most institutions completion of freshman composition is a prerequisite for writing intensive courses, the students who are enrolled in WAC have proven that they are capable of college-level writing. Whatever their linguistic and educational history, they have successfully completed freshman composition and are now launched on their careers in a major. Not only have they enrolled in college, but they have also survived freshman year, which of course is the best indicator that they will eventually graduate.

It is in the balance between these first two principles that our professional development presentation needs to be most nuanced: students are still learning the language, and instructors need to be cognizant of that fact as they design their courses and choose their pedagogical approach, but at the same time it is important to treat the ideas and writings of these students with as much seriousness as those of native English speakers. This can be a very difficult line to walk. Remember that your multilingual students' experience and education may have been different from yours, but avoid reducing them to that experience and ignoring what they do in the present classroom.

3. All students, not just MLLs, may experience a falling-off, usually temporary, in their writing skills when they are asked to produce documents in a new genre or a new discipline, especially when more advanced cognitive demands are being

made of them at the same time. This increased stress on a student's battery of reading and writing strategies pretty much defines the rhetorical situation for all students in a writing intensive course. In the case of multilingual learners, this may manifest itself in increased grammar or sentence-level issues, which are the types of errors that instructors, especially those who are not writing teachers by training, tend to notice first. Johanne Myles notes that "depending on proficiency level, the more content-rich and creative the text, the greater the possibility there is for errors at the morphosyntactic level." Furthermore, the course of MLL language acquisition and writing proficiency development seldom progresses smoothly or linearly: "repeating a previous error, or backsliding, is a common occurrence in L2 writing" notes Myles, and Johns similarly notes that "complex assignments sometimes result in error-ridden papers" (146). Of course, this does not mean that faculty should withhold cognitively demanding or creative assignments from MLLs, only that the level of error in a particular paper does not necessarily represent a permanent deficiency in a student's writing competency—nor does an error-free assignment necessarily mean that a new native-like plateau has been achieved. For that matter, even among native English speakers, writing proficiency is not a permanent achieved state, and students' proficiency can wax or wane depending on the cognitive demands of an individual assignment and how well-prepared they are to handle it. Being explicit about disciplinary conventions and consciously calling attention to elements of previous writing education that may transfer, and elements that will *not* transfer, can help both multilingual and monolingual writers to make adjustments more quickly.

4. MLLs may have certain advantages over monolingual English speakers in learning new forms and adapting to novel rhetorical situations. After all, they've had the experience of learning a new language at least once, and if they first learned to read and write in an alternate educational system, then they have already made a successful adaptation to the U.S. system. Compared to the adjustments that they have already managed, the movement from one sub-dialect to another within academic discourse—say from the humanities to the natural sciences—may appear much less daunting to many MLLs than it does to a monolingual English speaker who has never been asked to write outside a fairly narrow range of assignments.

It is well-established that people who have successfully learned a second language find it easier to learn a third.⁹ A certain level of linguistic adaptability is established, and the language-learning process can transfer from one language to another. Similarly, what college students in the U.S. system must do is learn to adapt to multiple disciplinary

conventions and perspectives as they progress through their college writing career. We can learn from MLLs, and the research on them, about how to structure, assess, and support that process of adaptation.

We need to be very careful about how we present a new MLL-active WAC/WID model to faculty who may be teaching discipline-based writing courses. As Sarah Rich has argued, many well-intentioned attempts to train faculty to be sensitive to cross-cultural currents in the classroom have the paradoxical effect that students end up being reduced to their language differences; faculty make so many allowances for cultural differences that they do not see the rapid adjustments that actual individual students are making in the local classroom. Rich's solution is deceptively simple: ask the MLLs what their experience has been. And then ask them again, later on in their college careers, because that experience changes as they move from course to course and progress in their education.

III. RE-EDUCATING OURSELVES: TOWARD A NEW MLL-ACTIVE WAC/WID PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY

As we redesign and retool WAC/WID for the multilingual future of the next America, our first task is to re-educate ourselves. Many of us, including myself, emerged from a rhetoric, composition or literature base and came to WAC in mid-career, and from that disciplinary perspective the issues raised by ongoing research in many different linguistics-based fields surrounding multilingualism can often seem not only daunting in their volume and complexity but also foreign to the academic traditions in which we feel most comfortable. Fortunately, we don't have to start from scratch in this endeavor. Various fields of study provide curricular and pedagogical models, both theoretical and practical, that are potentially relevant to the new role of WAC/WID in the age of the new multilingual student.

The literature in the various fields that might be pertinent to WAC/WID is vast, multifarious, and exciting, and the following suggestions are necessarily far—extremely far—from an exhaustive list of resources and possible models for the MLL-active WAC/WID programs of the future. They may only scrape the surface, but they do provide examples of the kinds of ideas that WAC professionals should be considering as we begin to re-think everything that we do to meet the new realities that we face on our campuses and in our classrooms. Like everything in WAC, none of these models can be adopted off the shelf, but need to be adapted to local conditions at each institution.

A) *Second Language Studies and L2 Writing Theory and Practice*

The most obvious place to start looking for a more sophisticated model of writing pedagogy for MLLs is in the voluminous literature in the field of second language

studies. In recent years, as freshman composition programs have begun to engage with MLL issues, a dialogue has begun between L1 and L2 writing pedagogies. Some key areas that have already been identified as of particular interest to college writing instructors are second language acquisition, contrastive rhetoric, error analysis, cognitive factors, and sociocultural factors.¹⁰

B) K-12 Bilingual Education Pedagogy and Classroom Techniques for Mixed Classes of Monolingual and Multilingual Students

Research on MLL issues, at least in a U.S. context, was founded on early studies involving young children, progressed (somewhat fitfully) through studies involving high school students, and has only recently been identified as a key issue for college pedagogy. Thus K-12 pedagogy is more advanced on these issues than college pedagogy, and studies of first-year college writing, in developmental or freshman composition courses, have proceeded at a more urgent pace than more advanced studies directly relevant to WAC/WID. Among many other areas where we might benefit from K-12 research, WAC/WID programs might consider the two-way bilingual model,¹¹ and K-12 techniques for teaching mixed populations of multilingual students and native speakers (Zehler).

C) Language Across the Curriculum and Content-based Language Instruction

The Language Across the Curriculum movement (LAC or sometimes LxC) has modeled itself on the success of WAC,¹² but has so far not made as much progress. The reasons for this are fairly obvious: the centrality of college writing proficiency is by now pretty much universally acknowledged by higher education institutions, but there is no corresponding consensus on the urgency or benefits of multilinguality. The problem that LAC is designed to address is one that will be extremely familiar to WAC professionals: most of the effort in terms of language education has been concentrated at the introductory level, with few subsequent opportunities for practice of language skills, especially at the intermediate level. LAC suggests that the middle ground should not be limited to language departments, but made available in many different academic contexts across the campus.

The models developed by LAC practitioners are potentially of great interest to WAC programs (see Wake Forest). In addition to expanding the multidisciplinary approach of WAC to language instruction, LAC also draws upon the “content-based language instruction movement” (Straight).¹³ While LAC’s primary focus is on improving foreign language instruction for native English speakers, content-based language instruction has also taken root in ESL contexts, especially—and most relevantly for

WAC/WID—in preparing MLLs for the demands of academic writing. May Shih envisions an ESL composition model “in which writing is linked to concurrent study of specific subject matter in one or more academic disciplines” (617).

D) English for Academic Purposes” (EAP)

The most direct counterpart to WAC/WID in the world of second language studies is a well-developed discipline and pedagogical movement, better known in British Commonwealth countries than in the United States, known as English for Academic Purposes (EAP). Gavin Melles summarizes the relationship between EAP and WAC: “One difference between the two is the foregrounding of ESL/EFL issues and the linguistic consequences of cross-cultural learning in EAP. A key similarity is the enthusiasm among some in both fields for genre-based teaching as a pedagogical tool.” In this formulation, it sounds like EAP has exactly what the doctor ordered for our present purposes: a roadmap toward a more multilingual-conscious WAC program and an MLL-active writing pedagogy.

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. Joy Reid focuses on the absolute necessity of “multiple-needs analyses in curriculum design—before, during, and after,” and emphasizes that this needs to be done locally, by each WAC program, because “the results of analyses in one institution cannot easily or accurately be transferred to others” (154). Rather than focusing primarily on writing, as WAC/WID does, EAP takes a four-skills approach, including speaking, listening, and reading as central aspects of the student’s academic experience.¹⁴

We in WAC/WID are at the very beginning of the essential process of educating ourselves about the intersection between writing pedagogy and language pedagogy, and working toward a new synthesis of what we know, from our particular background, with what has been done in the disciplines of TESOL and applied linguistics and language acquisition and language teaching. This process will not be a passive, one-way exchange in which we take notes and defer to the experts in other disciplines; rather, it will need to be a true two-way interdisciplinary dialogue, for our colleagues in these other fields have something to learn from us, as well, about college writing pedagogy in theory and practice. We need to find a way to finally approach that mutually transformative model of interaction between the fields that Matsuda and Jablonski have pointed us toward. As Vivian Zamel insists, “What faculty ought to be doing to enhance the learning of ESOL students is not a concession, a capitulation, a giving up of standards....What ESOL students need....is good pedagogy for everyone” (14). Zamel

suggests that basic WAC pedagogy is central to MLL pedagogy as well.¹⁵ Using the tools of WAC and of TESOL and of various other active learning, student-centered approaches, we must find new approaches to create a classroom that is inclusive. That will help us teach the students we now have more effectively, and take them from where they are to where they need to go.

Establishing a working and fruitful pedagogical collaboration between the campus WAC program and its ESL or linguistics or language instruction faculty is one aspect of negotiating the local in the context of global linguistic trends. You cannot get more local than the students in our particular classrooms on our particular campus, but interpreting the results depends on a critical perception of the global trends I mentioned in the opening of this article, as well as an understanding of the academic context within which these students must function: the goals, procedures, tasks, and cultural environment within which college writing instruction and learning take place.

Our MLL pedagogy will always need to build upon what has been shown to apply to various other populations, while focusing in on the unique characteristics of our own students on a particular campus and in a particular classroom. Our research will need to begin with an analysis of a particular local student population: what can we find out about their linguistic backgrounds,¹⁶ their educational histories, and the interaction between the two? The next step would be to connect this demographic data with an analysis of their actual writing achievement, in the context of the particular assignments that are given in our WAC/WID courses, and the underlying competencies—in reading, writing, speaking, listening, critical thinking, and research—that are called for by these assignments. Which of these are going to be most challenging to the particular population of students we have identified? How can we find ways to help them succeed?

More broadly, our research must address a key pedagogical problem which has not yet been fully cracked by researchers in WAC/WID or in TESOL or in rhetoric and composition or in K-12 studies or in any other discipline: How can we develop differentiated instruction methods so that *both* monolingual English speakers and MLLs simultaneously have a rich and satisfying classroom experience *in the same writing classroom*? In the Next America, multilingual issues will not be confined to the ESL program or the ESL sections of freshman composition or to the Writing Center; rather, they will be in every classroom in every subject on every campus, and every faculty member will be responsible for teaching MLLs. WAC/WID programs will need to be in the forefront of researching and developing the MLL-active writing pedagogy of the

Next America. I don't think anyone is yet able to say with certainty exactly what that pedagogy will look like, but the first—and perhaps most difficult—step is to give up forever the lingering idea that it is not our job.

NOTES

1. A good sampling of this dialogue may be found in Matsuda et al., *Second-Language Writing in the Composition Classroom: A Critical Sourcebook*. See also Harklau et al.

2. Graddol followed-up on, updated, and further developed these ideas in his second report, *English Next*.

3. The *New York Times* has an interactive map showing this trend nationwide: see <http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2009/03/13/us/ELL-students.html>.

4. For the quoted passage, Johns cites *California Pathways: The Second Language Student in Public High Schools, Colleges, and Universities*. Glendale, CA: CALTESOL 1997,19.

5. Paul Kei Matsuda argues that “In conducting empirical studies, composition researchers should acknowledge the presence of ESL writers in writing classrooms and try to include second-language writers in their research design, analysis, and discussion of implications—rather than excluding them as “outliers” or “exceptions,” as many researchers have done” (716).

6. The WAC/WID myths are partly adapted from Maharaj's “Misconceptions about WAC.”

7. See Palmquist for a spirited exchange between WAC and second-language specialists further developing some of the ideas surrounding Matsuda and Jablonski's article.

8. This statement, which was also endorsed by the TESOL (Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages) board of directors, notes that “second-language writers are found in writing programs at all levels—from basic writing and first-year composition to professional writing and writing across the curriculum.”

9. See Keshavarz and Astaneh (295-297) for a summary of this research.

10. Among many other possible starting points, see the articles by Silva, Leki, and Carson; and by Johns, as well as the anthology edited by Matsuda et al. Hinkel provides a succinct summary and introduction to several linguistic approaches to second language text.

11. For models of two-way bilingual programs, see Howard et al's “Guiding Principles” report from the Center for Applied Linguistics and especially Lindholm-Leary's *Biliteracy for Global Society*.

12. See Straight for a discussion of LAC theory, history, and challenges, including a discussion of its relationship to WAC. For a comparison of LAC with Communication Across the Curriculum programs, see Morris.

13. Snow and Brinton connect the roots of content-based language instruction not only to LAC but also to “English for specific purposes,” and to experiments at the elementary school level in which “monolingual English-speaking children in immersion programs receive the majority of their elementary education through the medium of content presented in the foreign language” (556).

14. For an overview of EAP, see Jordan. For more connections between WAC and EAP, see Channock. Andy Gillett's excellent EAP website includes an "EAP Needs Analysis" survey to be filled out by prospective students, which asks them to rate which academic activities are most important to their particular course of study, and also to rate their capabilities in each of them.

15. Zamel emphasizes several basics of WAC pedagogy in her description of MLL pedagogy. She begins by calling for "multiple opportunities to use language and write-to-learn" (14). She emphasizes as well the importance of building on background knowledge, "course work that draws on and values what students already know" (14)—from previous courses such as freshman composition, from their life experience, from their years of study, perhaps in other educational systems. She advocates explicit introduction of the disciplinary culture: "classroom exchanges and assignments that promote the acquisition of unfamiliar language, concepts and approaches to inquiry" (14). And finally, Zamel suggests that we need to see student assessment as a learning opportunity: "evaluation that allows students to demonstrate genuine understanding" (14). Give all students, including MLLs, the opportunity to explain what they know—in writing. It's important for multilingual learners to have multiple opportunities to use language actively.

16. For one instrument on language background, see Marian et al.

WORKS CITED

- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. "Negotiating the Local in English as a Lingua Franca." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 26 (2006): 197–218. Print.
- CCCC Committee on Second-Language Writing. "CCCC Statement on Second-language Writing and Writers." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10.4 (2001): 229-233. Print.
- Channock, Kate. "A Shared Focus for WAC, Writing Tutors and EAP: Identifying the 'Academic Purposes' in Writing Across the Curriculum." *The WAC Journal* 15 (2004): 19-32. Print.
- Cummins, Jim. "Cognitive/academic Language Proficiency, Linguistic Interdependence, the Optimum Age Question and Some Other Matters." *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 19 (1979): 121-129. Print.
- Gillett, Andy. "Using English for Academic Purposes: A Guide for Students in Higher Education." 21 Feb 2009. Web.
- Graddol, David. *The Future of English?* (Commissioned by the British Council), 1997. Web.
- Graddol, David. *English Next* (Commissioned by the British Council), 2006. Web.
- Harklau, Linda., Kay M. Losey, & Meryl Siegal, M. (Eds.). *Generation 1.5 Meets College Composition: Issues in the Teaching of Writing to U.S.-educated Learners of ESL*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlrich Associates, 1999. Print.
- Hinkel, Eli. "Analyses of Second Language Text and What Can Be Learned From Them." *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Ed. Eli Hinkel. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2005. 615-628. Print.
- Howard, E.R. et al. *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education*. 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 2007. Web. 25 Feb 2009.

- Johns, Ann M. "ESL Students and WAC Programs: Varied Populations and Diverse Needs." In *WAC for the New Millennium: Strategies for Continuing Writing-Across-the Curriculum Programs*. Ed. Susan H. McLeod, Eric Miraglia, Margot Soven, and Christopher Thaiss. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE, 2001: 141-164. Print.
- Jordan, Robert R. *English for Academic Purposes: A Guide and Resource Book for Teachers*. Cambridge University Press, 1997. Print.
- Keshavarz, Mohammad Hossein, and Hamideh Astaneh. "The Impact of Bilinguality on the Learning of English Vocabulary as a Foreign Language (L3)." *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 7.4 (2004): 295-302. Print.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. *Biliteracy for Global Society: An Idea Book on Dual Language Education*. Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 2000. Web. 25 Feb 2009.
- Maharaj, Sati. "Misconceptions about WAC/WID." Appalachian College Association's Writing Across the Curriculum. Web. 28 Jan 2009.
- Marian, Viorica, Henrike K. Blumenfeld, and Margarita Kaushanskaya. "The Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (LEAP-Q): Assessing Language Profiles in Bilinguals and Multilinguals.." *Journal of Speech, Language & Hearing Research* 50.4 (2007): 940-967. Print.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei. "Composition Studies and ESL Writing: A Disciplinary Division of Labor." *College Composition and Communication* 50 (1999): 699-721. Print.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei, Michelle Cox, Jay Jordan, & Christina Ortmeier-Hooper, ed. *Second-Language Writing in the Composition Classroom: A Critical Sourcebook*. New York: Bedford/ St. Martin's 2006. Print.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei and Jeff Jablonksi. "Beyond the L2 Metaphor: Towards a Mutually Transformative Model of ESL/WAC Collaboration." *Academic Writing: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Communication Across the Curriculum*. 1 (2000). Web.
- Melles, Gavin. "Familiarizing Postgraduate ESL Students with the Literature Review in a WAC/ EAP Engineering Classroom." *Across the Disciplines: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Language, Learning, and Academic Writing*. 2 (2005). Web.
- Morris, Michael A. "CAC and FLAC Compared." *Communication Across the Curriculum* (Clemson University), re-published on Brown University's "Languages Across the Curriculum" Web. 25 Feb .2009.
- Myles, Johanne. "Second Language Writing and Research: The Writing Process and Error Analysis in Student Texts." *TESL-EJ: Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* 6.2 (2002). Web. 22 Feb. 2009.
- Palmquist, Mike (moderator). *Forum: Connecting WAC and ESL?* Participants: Joel Bloch, William Condon, Dona Hickey, Paul Kei Matsuda, Leland McCleary, and Sarah Rilling, 2001. Web.
- Reid, Joy. "Advanced EAP Writing and Curriculum Design: What Do We Need to Know?" In *On Second Language Writing*. Ed. Tony Silva and Paul Kei Matsuda. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001: 143-160. Print.

- Rich, Sarah. "Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students' Views of Successful Classroom Practices." *Across the Disciplines: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Language, Learning, and Academic Writing* 2 (2005). Web.
- Roberge, Mark. "Generation 1.5 Immigrant Students: What Special Experiences, Characteristics and Educational Needs Do They Bring to Our English Classes?" 37th Annual TESOL Convention, 27 March 2003, Baltimore, MD. Web.
- Shih, May. "Content-Based Approaches to Teaching Academic Writing." *TESOL Quarterly* 20.4 (1986): 617-648. Print.
- Silva, Tony, Ilona Leki, and Joanne Carson. "Broadening the Perspective of Mainstream Composition Studies: Some Thoughts from the Disciplinary Margins." *Written Communication* 14.3 (1997): 398-428. Print.
- Snow, Marguerite Ann, and Donna M. Brinton. "Content-based Language Instruction: Investigating the Effectiveness of the Adjunct Model." *TESOL Quarterly* 22.4 (1988): 553-574. Print.
- Straight, H. Stephen. "Languages across the Curriculum." ERIC Digest. Web. 23 Feb. 2009. Wake Forest University. "LAC/LxC Modelos/Models." Department of Romance Languages. Web. 23 Feb. 2009.
- Wurr, Adrian. "English Studies and Generation 1.5: Writing Program Administration at the Crossroads." *The Reading Matrix* 4 (2004): 14-23. Print.
- Zamel, Vivian. "Strangers in Academia: The Experiences of Faculty and ESOL Students Across the Curriculum." *Crossing the Curriculum: Multilingual Learners in College Classrooms*. Ed. Ruth Spack & Vivian Zamel. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004. 3-17. Print.
- Zehler, Annette. "Working with English Language Learners: Strategies for Elementary and Middle School Teachers." NCBE Information Series, Guide No. 19.1994.