Why This Volume

This collection of papers focuses on the challenges and opportunities faced by adminstrators and instructors in higher education in the U.S. working to support the significant number of students who use English as an additional language (EAL). The increase in multilingual students is a result of the convergence of a number of factors, including active recruiting of international students by institutions to address fiscal and diversification pressures. The net effect of these rapid changes is that while universities and colleges have seen exponential growth in the enrollment of multilingual students, this increase has not always engendered conversations, collaborations, or innovations among and across disciplines, units, and programs. This collection describes challenges, offers critiques of existing practices, and explores opportunities for achieving the synergetic potential of working across disciplines, units, and programs in order to rethink what is required or will be required to meet the goals of educating an increasingly linguistically diverse student population.

International student enrollment in U.S. higher education has increased to 974,296 according to 2015 Open Doors data.[1] There is every indication that students continue to prefer U.S. higher education above all others (Institute of International Education, 2015a), and that many of the students the U.S. attracts are satisfied with the education they receive. No doubt certain factors have encouraged families to invest in what is seen as the best education that they can afford; these factors include the status of the United States as a global super power; global appropriations of English; the extensive proliferation and reach of U.S. media and popular culture; mass migration; the opportunities now available in emerging economies such as India, China, and Brazil; and the concomitant growth of an affluent upper-middle class worldwide. Indeed, as the 2014/2015 Open Doors data demonstrates, 63 percent of all international students rely primarily on families to fund their education (Institute of International Education, 2015b). Further, according to U.S. Census Bureau data, 60.6 million Americans live in a household where a language other than English is spoken at home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013).[2] These two indicators demonstrate that the number of students who use English as an additional language is significant and is likely to continue to grow.

When U.S. higher education was expanded to include larger numbers of middle-class students after World War II, the curriculum was restructured to emphasize new models of writing instruction and courses tailored to the needs of a new kind of college student. This was a decades-long project, of course, and it is not yet completed. If there is a similar adjustment underway to respond to the growth of students who use English as an additional language, it is still in its very early stages and clearly a work-in-progress. In their introduction to *Globalization's Muse: Universities and Higher Education's Systems in a Changing World*, Douglass, King, and Feller (2009) attribute this slow response to a residual tendency toward isolationism, and to a kind of imperial provincialism: "our reliance on being the lonely super-power who cannot be informed by the progress of other nations" (p. 3). On the other hand, institutions of higher education celebrate the presence of multilingual faculty, recent immigrant students, and international students as evidence of a commitment to diversification and internationalization. These efforts enrich yet complicate the academic, linguistic, and cultural landscapes of campuses and, if leveraged intentionally and strategically, could help higher education institutions to meet their frequently stated missions and goals related to education for a global context, cultural understanding, and effective communication. There have been tensions around language use on campuses, but these should not be treated as sidebars to larger issues such as budgets (Barker, 2015; Redden, 2015).

How academic communities deal with resources and create responses to the language issues we face in our increasingly multilingual environments are, instead, indicators of the level of commitment to the learning goals set for students and the institutional missions. The essays in this volume demonstrate that language-related issues define us, and that these issues present grounds for revising practices.

Overview of the Volume

The complexities, tensions, and contradictions in institutional approaches to issues surrounding multilingualism will be immediately apparent to readers of this collection, including those who know fairly little about the language-related experiences of L2 learners in U.S. universities; those who have a great deal of expertise in either L1 only or L2 only; those who have some expertise with both L1 and L2; and those who locate themselves somewhere among all these. As a group, the contributors have come at the issues related to supporting students who use English as an additional language from the familiar practices of our institutions and disciplines—while also providing insights into what might be (counter)productive about these practices.

Structurally, this book includes four parts: Program-Level Challenges and Opportunities, Opportunities for Enhancing Teacher Training, Multilingualism and the Revision of First-Year Writing, and Integrating Writing Center Insights. Collectively, the papers present a variety of methods for identifying and responding to the issues raised by the reality of increased multilingualism at our institutions. The content of these essays and these varied methodologies create productive responses to those realities. Readers will find herein examples of institutional research, primary research, secondary research, collaborative action research, and research based on experience that, taken together, remind us of the importance of using multiple methods to create contexts for and productive responses to the realities around language use in institutions of higher education in the U.S.

Part 1: Program-Level Challenges and Opportunities

Papers in this part highlight the programmatic possibilities and challenges of working across boundaries. Ehlers-Zavala, Didier, and Berry (Chapter 1) describe the process of creating a joint venture between their public university and a private organization hired to facilitate the process of internationalization. They focus on the challenges of creating such a partnership, including those related to affective responses that need to be addressed if cross-campus support is to be secured. As they present the building of the partnership at their own institution, these authors clarify for all of us the real need for cross-unit collaborations in the establishment of effective, ethical language programs for institutions that rely on internationalization as a mechanism for diversification.

Jordan and Jensen (Chapter 2) explore the more general ways that partnerships with private companies affect institutional practices. Focusing on the process of internationalizing our campuses as in need of more integrated approaches, they bring to light how writing program administrators and others involved in the recruitment, orientation, and retention of international students are affected by the outsourcing of English language programs, and how such programs affect student access to resources and success. In the end, they encourage writing program administrators to be proactive members of the policies, procedures, and processes that affect the internationalization of higher education in the U.S., urging us to insist that our professional organizations do the same.

Gass and Walters (Chapter 3) present a historical view to provide some background to the emergence of patterns and programs focused on in-house approaches to supporting multilingual users, and to the changes and challenges one program faced as it met the "new normal" of increased internationalization of the undergraduate population. They categorize the major forms of in-house program approaches, inviting us to think about change within the context of institutional realities even as we press against those realities. Their essay is a good reminder of the ways that our ideologies about language underlie our decisions about the types of approaches we take to addressing the challenges and opportunities of multilingualism on our campuses. Additionally, their conversation encourages us to consider the well-being of all members of the community who support the success of multilingual language users even as we keep the needs of students at the center of our work; this is an important consideration as we develop new approaches to in-house and other cross-collaborative partnerships.

Taken together these chapters present a variety of ways to think about and enact public/private, inter-unit, and cross-unit collaborations that shift us toward putting the opportunities presented to us as our campuses become increasingly multilingual at the center of our often very challenging work. These essays create powerful frames for rethinking the realities of multiple Englishes as opportunities for communication programs to support inclusive language practices in ways that enhance the success of all community members.[3]

Part 2: Opportunities For Enhancing Teacher Training

With Karla Kitalong (Chapter 4) we consider the implications for training and mentoring faced by writing program administrators who lead programs that increasingly admit multilanguage users on teaching assistantships. Specifically, the chapter shows ways that understanding multilanguage use—particularly Englishes—can affect our training and mentoring of international graduate students who teach first-year writing as part of their funding packages. This is an area that has not been part of the professional conversation, but it should be.

Meier, Choi, and Cushman (Chapter 5) describe the process of designing, implementing, and assessing a collaboration that paired English secondary education students with classes of students who are preparing to enter mainstream first-year writing courses at their institution. Known as "Preparation for College Writing," this course is peopled primarily by international students who have not yet met the requirements for entry into the next-level first-year writing course required for graduation.

The three authors argue that these partnerships not only open conversations that prepare secondary English Education majors to deal with language diversity in positive ways, they also create mentoring and tutoring opportunities between and among all of the people in the course. Their work encourages us to think about the ways that our approaches to multilingualism and multilingual students extend beyond our own educational contexts, especially as we educate future teachers.

We hope that Part 2 of this volume opens up dialogue that contributes to how we imagine new ways of creating productive relationships between programs aimed at enhancing graduate and undergraduate teacher training and at developing increased understanding of what it means for multilingual users to meet across undergraduate and graduate education.

Part 3: Multilingualism and the Revision of First-Year Writing

This part of the volume focuses on innovative approaches to curriculum design that support multilingual students as they make the transition to higher education in the U.S., especially those who do so through required writing courses. These papers explore the theoretical and pedagogic interventions that can be brought into conversation as we rethink models, strategies, and approaches for constructive engagement around multiple first-year writing issues. Of particular interest are the ways that required writing courses can become instrumental in creating new ground for how we come to understand the literacy lives of our multilingual students and how we create innovative, effective approaches to their success as language users during their time in higher education in the U.S.

Kim, Hammill, and Matsuda (Chapter 6) discuss the need for bridging the gap between IEP/EAP courses and and first-year composition programs, presenting a frame for understanding these needs that extends the discussion from Chapter 5 from more individual approaches to more programmatic approaches.

They identify the theoretical and pedagogical differences in approaches to language education that inform different programs for multilingual students and the training of those who work in these programs. The authors illustrate how developing a shared knowledge base for L2 pedagogies requires curricular and structural administrative support as we enhance the ways that we engage with the opportunities afforded us by the increasingly rich language histories of our students and colleagues.

In Chapter 7, the discussion moves to one of learning about multilingual users' extracurricular literacy activities, and how that knowledge-building might affect our ideas about curriculum and evaluation. Fraiberg, Wang, and Wen observe two international students who use extracurricular forms of literacy expertise to negotiate the linguistic expectations in a first-year writing course. They present one way to put into practice what Canagarajah (2013) suggests about attention to translingual strategies, practices, and systems for meaning-making. Their study opens up new ground for the discussion of form and style that drive the evaluation of student writing in light of the internationalization of undergraduate education in the U.S.[4]

Shapiro and Siczek (Chapter 8) then describe particular approaches to integrated global studies that "draw on the expertise of instructors who specialize in working with second language (L2) writers." They include discussions of the challenges and opportunities for collaboration and innovation that emerge when we understand English language diversity as an opportunity for more integrated and sustainable global studies curricula.

Part 4: Integrating Writing Center Insights

Scott Chien-Hsiung Chiu (Chapter 9) discusses a case study of how one graduate student's experiences illuminate the tensions that exist between (1) writing center pedagogies and tutoring practices and (2) the assumptions and expectations for L2 learners' classroom language performance. He illustrates the direct effects these tensions have on individuals and structures and creates a plan for designing stronger connections across these two units that so often touch the lives of multi-language users on our campuses.

The volume closes with a chapter featuring the responses the volume editors received from experts about their hopes and dreams for the future of writing centers as those centers respond to the needs of multilingual clients. Tutor training, relationships with ESL programs and teachers, resources, reputation, understanding assessment practices experienced by multilingual clients, the role of the writing center in preparing graduate students for employment markets, and how to bridge the divide between L1 and L2/multilingual faculty, staff, and students are all explored from the perspective of writing center directors at a variety of institutions. This piece reminds us of the importance of listening to one another, reaching out to include issues that may not otherwise get addressed, and committing to methodologies that allow us to do so.

Conclusion

Discussions about the needs of multilingual language users have been ongoing for some time now with more recent discussions about the opportunities for productive change across communication and literacy studies resulting from increased internationalization of higher education in the U.S. (Atkinson et al., 2015; Ruecker et al., 2014; Lu & Horner, 2013; Jordan, 2012; Horner et al., 2011). The contributions illustrate that these opportunities include rethinking structures, pedagogies, assessment and evaluation practices, and teacher training for graduate and undergraduate students who will teach writing and other forms of communication. The chapters present models for the kinds of collaboration that will be needed to move forward with intelligence and compassion. We are grateful that they agreed to share their work with us and equally grateful to our Editor, Kelly Sippell, for her steadfast support of this project.

Notes

1. The Institute for International Education's Open Doors data shows there has been a steady increase in the number of new international student enrollments (students who have temporary visas) in U.S. institutions over the last fifteen years. IIE estimates that some 819, 644 international students attended higher education institutions in the U.S. in 2012-2013 (http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors). It is estimated that this population contributes "nearly 24.7 billion dollars annually to the U.S. Economy" (http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/Economic-Impact-of-International-Students).
2. U.S. Census Bureau data and demographic projections demonstrate that the number of people above the age of 5 who speak only English at home is decreasing (see http://www.census.gov/hhes/socdemo/language/ for more information on language use in the United States).
3. "Englishes" references the sub-discipline that works from Kachru's classic initial paradigm that the English language is best understood not as a monolithic one owned by so-called "native speakers" but rather as representing "a repertoire of cultures" (Smith 2011, p. ix). The approach works with the premise that "new" varieties of the language are continuing to follow the same sociolinguistic processes that resulted in the establishment of the so-called standard. The designation draws attention to "the natures, statuses, and functions of varieties of English in regions and nations across the world" (Nelson, 2011, p. xi). See also Jenkins (2010).
4. See Inoue and Poe, "Introduction" (2012).

References

Atkinson, D., Crusan, D., Matsuda, P. K., Ortmeier-Hooper, C., Ruecker, T., Simpson, S., & Tardy, C. (2015). Clarifying the relationship between L2 writing and translingual writing: An open letter to writing studies editors and organization leaders. *College English*, *77*(4), 383.

Barker, A. (2015, October 19). Are Chinese students driving educational imperialism? www.insidehighered.com/views/2015/10/19/professors-experience-unprepared-chinese-students-essay

Bowerman, B. (2012). Michigan public universities FY 2012–13 performance funding/tuition restraint. www.senate.michigan.gov/sfa/Publications/Notes/2012Notes/NotesFal12bb.pdf

Canagarajah, A.S. (2006a). The place of World Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication*, *57*(4), 586–619.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006b). Toward a writing pedagogy of shuttling between languages: Learning from multilingual writers. *College English, 68*(6), 589–604.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). Negotiating Translingual Literacy: An Enactment. *Research in the Teaching of English, 48*(1), 40–67.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2015). "Blessed in my own way": Pedagogical affordances for dialogical voice construction in multilingual student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 27,* 122–139.

Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) (2014). Statement on second language writing and writers. www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/secondlangwriting

Council of Writing Program Administrators. (2014). http://wpacouncil.org/whitepaper.

Douglass, J. A., King, C. J., & Feller, I. (Eds.). (2009). *Globalization's muse: Universities and higher education systems in a changing world.* Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Public Policy Press.

Horner, B., & Trimbur, J. (2002). English only and U.S. college composition. *College Composition and Communication*, *53*(4), 594–630.

Horner, B., Lu, M. Z., Royster, J. J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Language difference in writing: Toward a translingual approach. *College English*, *73*(3), 303–321.

Institute of International Education. (2015a). Student enrollment trends. www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/International-Students/Enrollment-Trends

Institute of International Education. (2015b). Open doors 2014: Report on international educational exchange. www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/International-Students/Infographic

Inoue, A. B., & Poe, M. (2012). *Race and writing assessment. Studies in composition and rhetoric. Volume 7.* New York: Peter Lang.

Jenkins, J. (2010). *World Englishes: A resource book for students (*2nd Ed.). New York: Routledge.

Jordan, J. (2012). *Redesigning composition for multilingual realities.* Urbana-Champaign, IL: CCCC/NCTE.

Lu, M. Z., & Horner, B. (2013). Translingual literacy, language difference, and matters of agency. *College English*, *75*(6), 582–607.

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., & Jablonski, J. (2000). Beyond the L2 metaphor: Towards a mutually transformative model of ESL/WAC collaboration. *Academic Writing,* 1.

Matsuda, P. K. (2001). Voice in Japanese written discourse: Implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *10*(1), 35–53.

Matsuda, P.K. (2003a). Composition studies and ESL writing: A disciplinary division of labor. *College Composition and Communication*, *50*(4), 699–721.

Matsuda, P.K. (2003b). Process and post-process: A discursive history. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *12*(1), 65–83.

Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in U.S. college composition. *College English, 68*(6), 637–651.

Matsuda, P. K., Cox, M., Jordan, J. & Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (2010). *Second-language writing in the composition classroom: A critical sourcebook.* New York: St. Martin's.

Matsuda, P. K., & Jeffery, J. V. (2012). Voice in student essays. In K. Hyland and C. Sancho Guinda (Eds.), *Stance and voice in academic discourse (*pp. 151–156). Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

National Council Teachers of English. 1974. www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Groups/CCCC/NewSRTOL.pdf

Nelson, C. L. (2011). *Intelligibility in world Englishes: Theory and application*. New York: Routledge.

Redden, E. (2015, March). Persona non grata. www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/03/18/nyu-professor-denied-entry-uae-where-university-has-campus

Ruecker, T., Shapiro, S., Johnson, E. N., & Tardy, C. M. (2014). Exploring the linguistic and institutional contexts of writing instruction in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, *48*(2), 401–412.

Smith, L.E. (2011). Foreword. In Nelson, C.L. (Ed.), *Intelligibility in world Englishes: Theory and application*. New York: Routledge.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2013). "Language use." www.census.gov/topics/population/language-use/data.html