Christian Donahue

“Internationalization” and Composition Studies: Reorienting the Discourse

While internationalization has become a buzzword in composition scholarship and teaching, our discourses tend toward fuzzy uses and understandings of the term and its multiple implications. We tend to focus on how our U.S. experience is being internationalized: how English and its teaching are spreading; how other countries, different in their approaches or rhetorics, appear to lack what we have; and how we might avoid colonialist intervention or offer consultation. These import/export focal points create key blind spots in our awareness of deep and rich writing research and programming traditions internationally, of how we fit—or do not fit—into this broader world, and of missed opportunities for self-reflection and growth.

Within the broader U.S. movement toward internationalizing higher education, the field of composition has been staking its claims; the “internationalization” label has become a hot commodity. Different scholars’ experiences have led them to different conclusions, however, about what “internationalization” might mean to the field of composition studies. Interest in international questions has created a diverse patchwork of reporting on internationalized practices and research traditions. Which “internationalization” are we evoking? Faced with the bewildering and exciting mass of ideas, movements, exchanges, and projects lumped into the “internationalizing” framework, how can we begin
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to tease out strands and facets, identify each in its own framing, and clarify paths for future exploration and productive exchange?

The attention to internationalization and its relatives, globalization and cross-cultural comparison, has tended so far to focus on the increasingly global nature of U.S. classrooms and U.S. students or students attending U.S. universities—the internationalizing of our world, whether through theorized ESL explorations, contrastive rhetorical analysis to explicate difference, or discussions of cultural, ideological, or political encounters in U.S. composition classrooms and in anecdotal encounters overseas. A few scholars have also turned their attention to broader questions about academic writing in other countries and the complicated linguistic relationships that are evolving there.

Activities currently organized under the “internationalization” rubric can be arranged in at least three groupings; the first two will be the focus of this article.

• Teaching writing, speech, and academic or scientific language (in the United States, in other countries, at U.S. institution campuses in other countries, in English, in the language of the country; comparing, exchanging about teaching; theorizing the teaching through research or scholarly reflection; addressing multiculturalism in reading and writing)

• Scholarly work (attending conferences, giving papers, learning, understanding; reading each other’s work, scholarship from other contexts; studying institutions and writing in other contexts, recognizing political-cultural settings and effects; collaborating on research projects)

• Consulting (about teaching, about program development, about research, about English for Academic Purposes, about writing across the curriculum or in the disciplines; guest lectures on teaching, on research or theory)

In each of these domains, U.S. composition scholars’ various claims to unique knowledge, expertise, and ownership of writing instruction and writing research in higher education underlie frequent comments about “rapidly expanding” or “exploding” writing research scholarship outside of the United States. At the same time, claims about the absence of writing instruction—and in particular, first-year or introductory writing courses—in countries outside of the United States are common currency. These claims have had the effect of simultaneously presenting the United States to the world as a homogeneous
nation-state with universal courses, sovereign philosophies and pedagogies, and agreed-on language requirements, while “othering” countries that have different, complex, but well-established traditions in both writing research and writing instruction, presenting these countries as somehow lacking or behind the times. Some traditional approaches to contrastive rhetoric have contributed to this “othering” by focusing our attention on aspects of writing that differentiate texts based on cultural norms, expectations, or linguistic features, although also helping us to pay attention to English as a Second Language issues and to race, class, and culture within our institutional practices, and de-normalizing our rhetorical patterns and discursive forms. We have also been engaged for decades in a brisk trade of English teachers heading into ESL positions in higher education around the globe, another avenue of cross-pollination.

All of these U.S. forms of attention to internationalization, while important, well-intentioned, and often groundbreaking, represent only part of the international question. The U.S. picture of writing around the globe—its teaching, its learning, and our theories about these—has been highly partial, portraying the issue in particular ways, largely export-based, that I believe might create obstacles for U.S. scholars’ thinking and thus impede effective collaboration or “hearing” of work across borders.

I will tell a different story, one that considers, critiques, and reorients the discourse of internationalization from different perspectives while highlighting global work in writing studies. As we struggle with the complexity of effective and ethical writing instruction in contexts that cannot possibly remain insular, both Cinthia Gannett and Jonathan Monroe have pointed out in international conference presentations in the past few years that we cannot not pay attention. If we need, as Bruce Horner suggests, to resituate composition globally (572), we need as well to resituate our self-portrait around the world. We need, essentially, to begin thinking about where our work fits in the world rather than where the world’s work fits into ours, and move beyond an “us-them” paradigm, in particular as it appears in “discovery of difference” scholarship. While sweeping comparisons have served us well as preliminary attention-getters, they must be seen as tentative first steps in a deeper and broader questioning of contextual work, political influence, heterogeneous national contexts, dominant models, interdisciplinarity, and diverse research methods.

This article offers a lateral view of such questioning, first by reviewing some of the different discourses of internationalization and then by describing projects that illustrate a different way to think about internationalization and writing studies in higher education, using primarily European examples.
The perspectives offered here should encourage us to remember our radical nature as a field, our long social history, potentially jeopardized now by uncritical adoption of the economic import/export language of globalization and the sweeping use of the internationalization label. I will suggest that the language issue is far more complex than it may seem at first glance, and that the fundamental problem of imagining internationalizing composition as export is that this is precisely its source as colonialist activity. We might focus on internationalizing by opening up our understanding about what is happening elsewhere to adapt, resituate, perhaps decenter our contexts. I will map out some of the linguistic, cultural, and discursive challenges in the discourses of internationalizing composition studies and how they suggest we might be mis-imagining our global roles and positions. In so doing, I hope to both clarify and reorient the discourse of various developments grouped under the “international” or “global” umbrella. I do not propose here a comprehensive survey of the trends described—impossible in this short space, surely as partial as every other treatment of the topic, surely missing as much as it catches—but a suggestive overview, a preliminary regrouping of trends, and a provocative focused questioning that will, I hope, spark broad and much-needed debate.

I. Discourses of Internationalizing in the Broader Context of Higher Education

To understand the question of internationalization for composition, we need to situate composition in the larger context of current internationalizing activities and discourses about these activities. The internationalization of higher education in general is defined by Knight as the process of integrating international or intercultural dimensions into the teaching, research, and service functions of higher education institutions (qtd. in Ninnes and Hellsten 3). Traditional student exchange programs, active seeking out of international students (who generally pay full tuition), and similar efforts have been augmented in the past few decades by the establishment of U.S. university campuses in overseas locations, the development of consulting services, geographic barrier-erasing distance education models, and curriculum exportation. These activities, described and criticized in an excellent collection of articles in Internationalizing Higher Education (2005), mix issues of internationalization with issues of market-force globalization; globalization masked as internationalization is becoming a mainstream way of doing academic work, a strategic corporate activity. It results in global commodification of teaching and learning, including the distribution of learning through “offshore” programs. Peter Ninnes
suggests there are unrecognized political, economic, and social concerns with the international work and partnerships that are being formed. Some effects on higher education in general include a shift in “what counts as knowledge, content, and process . . . redefined in contexts in which economics governs” (Donahue, “Cautionary” 540), homogenized curricula, slippage toward higher enrollments in distance education models, and discourses of assessment and administration uncritically imported by other countries.2

The net effect is that U.S. faculty feel, directly or indirectly, the various forces at work. Universities and their student bodies exist and work in increasingly complex configurations, as English as a Second Language (ESL) scholarship has been pointing out for decades.3 Language use and, more specifically, writing are always central factors in these configurations, even as the discussion of language in general often mixes indiscriminately with the specific foci on academic discourses in writing or speaking. Faculty and students’ social and linguistic experiences need careful study in ways that expose the naive “[e]ducational policies, pedagogies, and politics that promote ‘travel,’ ‘boundary-crossing,’ or ‘contact’ [that] tend to have self-evident, uncontested virtues” (Singh 29).

These evocative terms of virtue are not foreign to composition studies; on the contrary, they capture much of our fruitful discussions of international and intercultural factors in our classrooms and scholarly work, as in, for example, what happens when international students bring intercultures into U.S. classrooms, or even when students from diverse subpopulations within the United States begin, as Mary Louise Pratt has suggested, to claim membership on their own terms. Let us turn to how these issues play out in teaching, scholarship, and related linguistic factors in writing studies.

II. “There is no freshman French”4: Discourses of Internationalization and Writing Instruction

U.S. compositionists generally discuss internationalization and higher education writing instruction in terms of the changing nature of our U.S. writing classes, teaching academic English composition around the globe in national MA programs, exchanges about teaching, or broadening U.S. knowledge about mother tongue5 writing instruction in other countries.

1. Import-Export of Students in the U.S. Writing Classroom

Internationalization, often associated with intercultural and multicultural discourses, is shaping U.S. writing classes in increasingly embedded ways. It
shows up thematically in our attention to multiculturalism through the literary and expository authors we introduce or even more explicitly when we do readings with students about internationalization, globalization, and their effects. In fact, multiculturalism is itself a potential category in our discussion of the meanings of “internationalization,” although it does not appear frequently in current discussion. If we take “internationalization” to mean looking at the intercultural or international dimensions of our “mainstream” classrooms and students here in the United States, then attention to issues of linguistically diverse students has certainly been paid in the rich, deep field of ESL, well before becoming a popular theme in other composition domains. I will not review the work in this field in a systematic way, mentioning only a few aspects that are specific to my discussion.

In a special 2005 issue of *Across the Disciplines*, guest editor Ann Johns focused attention on the linguistically diverse student, foregrounding many of the complications faced by both teachers and students in our classes. Her introductory overview highlights the two distinct fields of ESL and EFL (English as a foreign language, focused on English instruction for individuals who will use English in home contexts). Johns moves us beyond the simple integrative model to one that accounts for complexities: “Many linguistically-diverse students object to, or are intimidated by, the subjugation of their lives and habits to academic languages and discourses,” she suggests (3), in particular in terms of certain kinds of grammatical errors or problems with plagiarism.

Other recent scholarship has raised the issues of implicit monolingual policies, furthered by most composition classes as well as by the unrecognized multilinguality in our composition classes. This scholarship brings much-needed attention to our cultural-linguistic blinders. Jonathan Hall, in his presentation on the “next America” at the 2008 INWAC conference, suggests that ESL will soon exceed “home” English as the language of higher education, and he wonders why we are not all paying more attention to this already in our writing classes. In the past few years, *CCC* and *College English* in particular have devoted space to several articles developing issues of multilinguality (Horner; Lu; Matsuda) and English-only assumptions (Horner and Trimbur). Paul Kei Matsuda reminds us that our imagined English-dominated classes are out of tune with reality, as we default to the idea that “most college students are native speakers of privileged English” (638). Min-Zhan Lu, although certainly not focused on only U.S. students or language-users, calls us to action with her passionate study of the ways in which the politics of capitalism and dominance affect experiences of students, “users whose Englishes have been systematically
pushed to the periphery by the English we have committed ourselves to study” (“Essay” 18). And Hall warns of a looming tipping point toward multilingual speakers as the advantaged group in the coming years, both in the United States and around the world.

Mary Muchiri et al. suggested as early as 1995 that bilingualism and code-switching are natural language abilities for many university students outside the United States, and we now recognize this as true for many students in the United States. Negotiating relationships with international Englishes will be far more productive, Hall suggests, citing A. Suresh Canagarajah, than continuing to imagine English in a monolithic form. I would add that a related broadly ignored area of composition work is that of U.S. monolingual students’ experiences when they go overseas to study or work and find themselves in universities and workplaces with different rhetorical, discursive, and sociolinguistic expectations, whether that work is being done in English or in another language. An “English is English” mindset seems uniquely inappropriate for current international contexts.

Writing program administrators have also taken note, as is demonstrated in a special 2006 WPA issue, Second Language Writers and Writing Program Administrators. This issue explores the linguistically diverse student in terms of issues WPAs must address: programmatic concerns, course sequences and designs, the construction of ESL positions in programs, and particular issues in terms of the changing needs U.S. institutions face.

2. English in Degree Programs around the Globe

The articles just referenced, while engaging key ideas and offering rich discussion, have generally explored and emphasized issues facing a country in which English in one form or another has traditionally been the school-imposed language for writing. In other settings, and here I will use Europe generally as an example, internationalization takes on a different face: What does it mean for writing in higher education when coursework, written and spoken language, and publication become the only required second language across hugely diverse national and local contexts? This domain is more rarely considered or referenced in the U.S. composition literature and, as I will develop later in this article, U.S. scholars and teachers often do not have easy access to the work on this subject published regularly around the globe.

In the past few decades, particular international phenomena have accelerated. Some European Union countries are shifting graduate work entirely to English as a result of the homogenization and unification imposed by the
Bologna Agreement and the subsequently developed “quality assurance” projects. A growing number of MA-level degree programs are now entirely in English. The export of teaching practices to other countries working with larger and larger groups of the English language learners who enter academic degree programs is widespread, in particular in the context of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) or English for Specific Purposes (ESP) work (see Muchiri et al.).

The writing developed in EAP or ESP courses is often discipline-specific and thus tunes us in to both the ways disciplinary writing is constructed in other countries and the influences of the dominant scientific models of published writing in Anglo Saxon traditions on what students and young researchers are learning to do. Mya Poe has pointed out that EAP/ESP teaching is most often the delivery of scientific and technical communication instruction (“Reporting” 4). Johns underscores the EAP/ESP model’s value to EFL students, who “need to have rapid, focused access to the language and discourses of their academic disciplines; and in the sciences, technology, and medicine in particular, current disciplinary research and textbooks were available principally in English” (2).

Much of the work on genre features as a way to offer students support in developing both awareness of and access to culturally specific or discipline-specific genres has come out of this domain (Tardy and Swales 566). At the same time, scholars are beginning to explore the fact that university students around the world are not looking to learn English generally or culturally, but practically, for access to and production in specific disciplinary contexts (Johns). Jonathan Harbord suggests, for example, that “social scientists . . . seem less concerned about cultural heritage and more interested in obtaining effective tools for doing their job. Which culture these tools come from appears largely unimportant to them.”

3. Import-Export of Teaching Expertise

Matsuda suggested in the 2008 CCCC presentation “Internationalizing Composition: A Reality Check” that some countries seek out U.S. expertise and input as they develop their attention to English language and writing. EAP/ESP practices have introduced, overseas, some aspects of composition theory or instruction. However, the question is more complicated. Lu, in the same session, pointed to the ethical problems of institutions feeling that they need to “in-source” expertise about English, underscoring the way these trends also marginalize users of various Englishes.

In addition, while academic English teachers in higher education in some contexts might be seeking out U.S. English writing scholars and practitioners,
it is far less clear that writing teachers of Dutch or Russian or Finnish or French are. In fact, teachers from some different national-cultural situations are neither asking our help nor seeking our models, a point far less frequently made in the United States. They have developed their own programs and teaching models. Rich, diverse work outside of the United States about teaching writing in higher education is discussed in multiple national and international organizations of teachers and scholars, and many teachers resist importing U.S. expertise, whether through public corrections about U.S. statements or scholarly work questioning the usefulness of U.S. terms and practices. For example, the Academic Literacies field in the UK challenges dominant U.S. acculturation models in writing in the disciplines work, suggesting that the emphasis should be on the nature of student writing in relation to institutional practices, power relations, and identities (Lea, Parker, Russell, and Street; Ganobcsik-Williams) and French scholarship on the term literacy challenges its value in French contexts where equivalent terms with culturally appropriate nuances are well developed (see Barré-de Miniac; Reuter). U.S. composition instructors do not often report being in the position of adopting teaching practices from these other contexts around the globe. We might ask ourselves why.

4. U.S. Attention to Teaching Mother Tongue Writing in Other Countries
I concur with scholars such as Matsuda or Hall; it is shocking that U.S. higher education has not yet fully realized the degree to which ESL is not an “outside of the mainstream” question. But ESL work is not the only U.S. voice of “internationalization.” U.S.-sponsored explorations of teaching writing in the languages of other countries—not ESL, nor EAP/ESP, but writing development in French or German or Turkish, or in English in the context of English-speaking countries—have been marked by their degree of serious acceptance of the U.S. need to learn from others, to accept other traditions on their own terms. The perspectives offered in David Foster and David Russell’s 1997 edited collection Writing in Cross-National Perspective laid the groundwork for attentive scholarship. Recent trends include more broad U.S. announcements of teaching conferences developed in China, Japan, Latin America, the Middle East, and Europe and increased attendance by U.S. scholars interested in learning from them. Fruitful partnerships have resulted: the Thinking-Writing project at Queen Mary, University of London; the Sabanci University Writing Center visiting scholars program; the Freiburg University international tutor exchange program, to name just a few. Some scholars have looked at the unique hybrid situations of writing instruction in U.S. universities abroad. A relatively small
group of U.S. scholars has participated in research about writing, teaching, and learning in writing centers, writing classrooms, professional training programs, graduate schools, and so on, in international research collaborations. And finally, an equally small number of U.S. institutions, such as Cornell through its Consortium on Writing in the Disciplines, have fostered direct exchange among university writing teachers from several countries.

U.S. composition and rhetoric journals have paid some attention to comparative exploration of teaching or programming, with a special issue, for example, in Language and Learning across the Disciplines (LLAD; WAC in International Contexts, 2002) and occasional articles in journals such as Written Communication. The LLAD special issue’s announced goal was to provide descriptions of WAC work in other settings to help U.S. scholars and teachers see their own work differently, and to understand the degree to which all international or cross-cultural work must be situated, understood as culturally constructed (McLeod 7). The special issue included articles about WAC in England (Ellis and Le Court), Writing Center models in Germany (Brauer), WAC in Bulgaria (DeDominicis and Santa), WAC and action research in New Zealand (Emerson, MacKay, Funnell, and MacKay), WAC at a comprehensive Chinese university (Townsend), and WAC in two universities located in London, UK, and Paris, France (Monroe).

International journals such as Written Communication have also published issues and articles on teaching academic writing in a variety of global contexts, most notably with a special issue in 2002 dedicated to teaching academic writing in Norway. Some of the same authors were involved in the non-U.S.-sponsored edited collection Teaching Academic Writing in European Higher Education, presenting detailed descriptions of practice and theory in European countries. Certainly Lisa Ganobscik-Williams’s 2006 Teaching Academic Writing in UK Higher Education stands out as a resource for understanding the challenges and advances in higher education writing instruction in the UK, Australia, and South Africa.

These edited collections highlight complicated points that most U.S. teachers and scholars have not considered in contexts outside of U.S. borders: what the teaching of academic writing might look like elsewhere, its forms, its teachers. Countries have, indeed, traditions of mother tongue university student writing courses, or popular large courses in student support centers, or writing centers, WiD programs, technical and business writing. The absence of an “industry” of first-year composition, Muchiri et al. point out, is not the absence of the study and teaching of higher education writing. After all, what
do we make of a conference roundtable at the European Association of Teachers of Academic Writing in 2007 and again in 2009 about the history of higher education writing instruction—with presenters beginning their histories in the 1700s in some cases—if we are to believe that the subject is new?

The more pertinent question might be, Where is this instruction, and who delivers it? Harbord, basing his remarks on a study of writing instruction in higher education in six Eastern and Central European countries, suggested in his talk at the 2008 INWAC conference that the “academic writing teacher” as higher education composition specialist is not yet a recognized figure in these countries; his remarks corroborate Matsuda’s conclusions. “Who initiates academic writing?” asks Harbord. “The most common initiators of change are ‘foreign experts,’ as is the case in CEU and LCC (both American institutions), and Szeged and Lviv English departments. These people are almost always teachers of English as a foreign language. What it looks like, from my research, is that programmes initiated by ‘foreign experts’ are more likely to experiment with a range of western approaches.” The imposition of English is itself sometimes depicted as a colonizing act (interestingly, more often by the English speakers doing the imposing), and the teaching of written English is in some locales heavily influenced by U.S. models and theories for a variety of local politico-pedagogical reasons (You).

In other contexts, however, internal expertise dominates. In France, it is the field of la didactique de l’écrit that might end up fostering university writing faculty, along with faculty in education who are responsible for secondary school teacher preparation; in the UK, it might more often be linguists, literature faculty, or language specialists, while in countries such as Norway, “didactics” faculty and faculty in semiotics or other linguistics areas take the lead. Surely there are major embedded political, economic, and historical factors at work in each context. These will matter a great deal to those interested in understanding how writing is taught and why, in contexts around the globe, and how that might inform our own approaches rather than the other way around.

As writing centers have evolved in other countries, discussions across national boundaries have increased as well. It is interesting to note that the writing center conversation, one particularly supportive of both the challenges of writing in the disciplines and the challenges for students learning to do disciplinary work in English, has been the strongest development to date in terms of exchanges of teaching practice and pedagogical framing, always explored in context. This makes eminent sense, given the nature of the curriculum in
many non-U.S. university systems, which tend toward disciplinary focus from year one and fairly well-aligned secondary/postsecondary configurations.

III. Discourses of Linguistic-Cultural Difference: International Research about Writing in Higher Education

If we focus on the U.S. composition use of the term *internationalization* to refer to research about texts and learning in higher education, rather than about programmatic and teaching practices, we find higher education writing scholarship done beyond our borders, and comparative studies of written texts in other national contexts through contrastive, comparative, and intercultural rhetorics. Some of this work is known broadly, but much more of it appears to remain on the margins to U.S. compositionists not regularly reading ESL scholarship.

One of the places for growing attention to the scholarship being produced overseas about writing in higher education has been the frequent *Research in the Teaching of English* bibliographies, edited by an international panel. Recent U.S. conference activity, most notably the 2008 Writing Research across Borders conference, has assembled researchers from around the world to present and exchange work. This has been coupled, as is the case with explorations of teaching, with attendance by U.S. scholars at conferences overseas focused on writing research and travel by scholars from around the world to some U.S. research conferences to present work. The increase in exchange via publications should follow. The work carried out in other national contexts and heard by U.S. scholars represents a tiny proportion, however, in the overall amount of scholarly production consumed by U.S. readers, at least partly for reasons I will cover in section IV.

Interestingly, many of our composition theories and conceptualizations have been grounded over decades, and in this sense “internationalized,” in the work of scholarly authors from other countries from a variety of fields other than what we might designate as “composition.” This is a topic I can only hint at here, given space constraints, but it is worth pursuing—we need only think, for example, of the broad impact Canadian genre theorists or French literary theorists have had on U.S. composition scholarship. U.S. theoretical or research perspectives on composition, on the other hand, have seen far less spread abroad, notable exceptions including Linda Flower and John Hayes, Carl Bereiter and Marlene Scardamalia, Anne Dyson, and Charles Bazerman, most from a cognitive perspective in tune with existing international frames.
Most of the research more broadly read in the United States has been informed by studies in applied linguistics and contrastive rhetoric, providing extensive specifically cross-cultural work. I will only briefly draw its broad lines to acknowledge its role and point to what it might not include. Contrastive rhetoric evolved specifically out of second-language teaching concerns (see Kaplan) and contributed to knowledge about “preferred patterns of writing in ESP situations” (Connor) but has been applied to other domains, including African American, queer, and feminist communities (Panetta 76-77; see also Bizzell, Fox, and Schroeder). In his 2002 introduction to *Contrastive Rhetoric Revised and Revisited*, Robert Kaplan overviews the textual specificities and patterns in academic writing that contrastive rhetoric studies have established in terms of several typical discourse features: genres, text types, patterns of organization, syntactic choices, and so on. Contrastive rhetoric used the term *world Englishes* before this area of inquiry caught broader attention. In 1999, Kaplan suggested that “English is no longer the property of English speakers; on the contrary, many varieties of English have developed across the world” (3); earlier still, in 1990, Braj Kachru employed the term, using an applied linguistics approach to discuss the complex web of issues involving the diffusion of English, in an article in the journal he cofounded of the same name, *World Englishes*.

Several in-depth articles building out cultural differences have been published since the 1990s in *Written Communication*, including treatment of francophone biliteracy in Canadian university students (Gentil), effects of the type of writing task and the use of first or second language in Chinese students’ borrowing of words from source texts (Shi), the negative effects of implicit language ideologies and the attitudes expressed in U.S. classrooms on biliterate Mexican-Americans (Hall Kells), the priority of content over cultural difference in Japanese university students’ critical-thinking abilities (Stapleton), or international students’ needs and the value of explicit discussion of differences in academic writing conventions across cultures (Angelova and Riazantseva⁹).

Matsuda suggested, again in his 2008 CCCC presentation, that contrastive rhetoric has been associated with oversimplified cultural stereotypes, and Connor argued at the 2008 Writing Research across Borders conference for replacing “contrastive rhetoric” with “intercultural rhetoric” partly for that reason, although the term was already in use in the 1990s (see Folman and Sarig). Contrastive rhetoric has been criticized for its lack of a multi-layered contextual approach, tending instead toward analysis of one feature or cluster of features at a time and equating language and identity in a seamless relationship (Horner and Trimbur 619) that leads to broad and often operationalized
generalizations about students from a given culture preferring certain moves or choices. The studies of influences of students’ first-language writing (style, rhetorical framing, and so on) on their second-language writing have also been challenged in recent scholarship, because they have often construed culture as homogeneous (Connor qtd. in Mao, “Reflective” 403) or have attributed L2 patterns to L1 influences without evidence (Canagarajah 2006). While the generalities established by contrastive rhetoric studies are interesting, they are complicated: differences exist, of course, but must be understood in quite partial and specific ways, grounded in genres, subject matter, and motives. Poe suggests that we tend to erase multicultural, multilingual heterogeneity when we encounter the overseas other, in particular in terms of the race and class issues we study so carefully at home (personal communication, 2009), and Mao points out that contrastive rhetorics have been primarily discussed from a U.S.-centric or at least Western point of departure.

Further complications arise in linguistic contexts we know little about, as seen in this comment from informant Marine Chitashvili, a Georgian psychologist, reported by Harbord: “Georgian doesn’t have its own culture of academic scholarship. The way we have written until now is the Russian way, which was imposed upon us as part of the Russian empire in the 19th century and the Soviet empire in the 20th. We have the choice to keep the Russian way of writing which is not ours, or exchange it for the Anglo-Saxon way of writing, which is also not inherently Georgian” (INWAC Conference presentation).

Many U.S. teachers have become familiar with some contrastive rhetoric material through the short sections in U.S. business and technical writing textbooks that are dedicated to exposing different cultural norms for writers and speakers around the globe, or in quick news bites about helping international students at U.S. universities to avoid plagiarism. It is important to point out that these oversimplified characterizations are not necessarily from contrastive rhetoric work itself, but from the ways it gets taken up, read for highlights, essentialized, digested by practitioners looking for usable ways to support international students in U.S. classrooms or market economy issues, and unfortunately often furthered by the oversimplified narratives of cultural discovery that have appeared in the past decade.

**IV. Our Language, Ourselves: Revisiting the Discourses of Colonization and the Question of a Lingua Franca**

Both in teaching practices, as we saw in section II, and in scholarship, as we’ve just seen in section III, the “internationalization” label in the United States has
most often, although not always, been associated with either U.S.-focused issues of interaction between English and non-English, or U.S. discovery of practices and patterns in other cultural contexts. The growing attention thus calls out the complicated question of the language of the academy, for students (in our U.S. classes, in overseas programs, in home country graduate study) and for scholars around the world for whom publishing in English has long been a way to be read and is fast becoming the only way to receive credit for their work.

We might first revisit our own discourse: Notice that we “import” problems (the challenges of multiliterate, multicultural students, for example) and we “export” our expertise about higher education writing instruction. Because international work for U.S. compositionists has so often meant teaching ESL or EAP or developing U.S.-style programs in a variety of overseas contexts, U.S. scholars’ perspectives are particularly colored by the English language issue, to the detriment of awareness of any of the work mentioned already about teaching and researching writing in higher education in home languages. We are not often in the position to integrate writing research results or teaching practices from other contexts, unless these are in English or have been translated, and even then we generally remain uninvolved in citing international work. Australian scholars point out that CCC and College English authors rarely cite anyone outside of North America, even though the English language barrier is not a factor in our access to Australian writing scholarship (on the topic of geolinguistics and citation practices, see Lillis, Hewings, Vladimirou, and Curry).

We can question the dominance of a particular kind of English in teaching in the United States; see in particular Min-Zhan Lu’s work on making room for many Englishes, not just because it is the ethical approach but because there is nothing inherently better in the version often taught as “Standard” English and there are in fact many things Standard English does less well. Lu argued in the previously referenced 2008 CCC presentation that we need to retool the way we see other Englishes, other uses, moving beyond even “tolerance” to recognizing that they are often more beautiful or more appropriate than our own. The “Living English” work Lu suggests includes denaturalizing our rules, listening to the logic of “alien” Englishes, and calling attention to the material cost to speakers who have to submit, around the world, to a particular English. Others have urged us to consider these issues in our teaching, including Peter Elbow, whose attention to dialects within languages has brought him to argue more broadly for democratization (or “mothertongueification”) in writing and for encouraging students to write in their initial or “heritage” language. His
argument fits the broader suggestion that U.S. English, if we are ready to accept that such an entity exists, should not be considered a globally dominant mode. Then there is the fact that U.S. composition theorists and teachers are often monolingual, unlike much of the rest of the world. Our classrooms may well be multilingual, but our writing faculty and scholars are quite often not. In the United States, the language requirement for PhDs in composition-rhetoric is slowly disappearing in an era when it should be increasingly emphasized. This is an issue that has been studied in much less depth, in particular in terms of college composition. Teachers looking for practices that help when confronted with classroom diversity may not always connect their needs to the material produced by researchers looking to theorize the intercultural aspects of teaching multilingual student bodies.

Scholars around the world are confronted by language issues arising from the demand to publish in English. Theresa Lillis and Mary Jane Curry speak of “literacy brokers,” the growing body of bi- or multilingual consultants who work with scholars seeking to translate their publications into acceptable English. Lillis and Curry expose the influence of these brokers on scholars’ texts and on academic knowledge production. Complicated issues of language dominance and political, market, and disciplinary memberships and hierarchies deeply affect who gets heard. Our own lack of access to much scholarship handicaps us, as we have no way of knowing whose methodologies are adopted or marginalized, from which disciplines, and whose theories are read, disseminated, and used.

What if the most appropriate theory remains untranslated into English? Consider how long it took to translate Bakhtin, who was widely read in France sooner than in the United States and who is translated in sometimes fundamentally different ways in the two languages. We might also consider the ways in which theories develop and spread. Do certain mobile scholars begin to embody particular cultural stories—the “usual suspects” rounded up at various events? Do frequently cited voices echo each other? Phenomena appear, can be traced to particular figures at moments in time or to translations, as in the case of Bakhtin, or even to seminal conferences.

Some scholars worldwide argue for protecting home languages and writing; others argue that to communicate, we must all use same language. And yet this approach is equally fraught with danger in terms of intellectual advancement. As we know from extensive work on language and literacy—as our own expertise tells us in so many scholarly reflections and studies—lan-
language is not the transparent medium of thought, but intricately bound up in thinking and processing. What are we losing when scholars worldwide must translate their work or craft text in English? The field would do well to study in depth the ways in which our understanding that language is not an autonomous or an a-contextual medium can inform our decisions about whether to seek “communication” or something deeper.13 This question is bound up in much more complicated issues of translation and transparency, themselves an underexplored domain in U.S. composition. On a more practical note, Kjersti Flottum has pointed to the increasing difficulty, in the twenty-first century, of comparing scientific writing conventions or linguistic constructions in different languages. So much European scientific writing is now done in English that an adequate comparative corpus is hard to come by, she suggests.

We slip into discussing English as the de facto language for enabling the spread of research and scholarship, while the value, intellectually, cognitively, culturally, of being bi- or trilingual is apparently not taken into account.14 Studies have shown how complex—indeed, indexical—the terminological differences can be in scholarly exchange (Donahue, “False”). The issue of whether we should use English or other languages is thus a reflection of our beliefs about language at the heart of our interests and not simply a practical decision about whose language should be used.

The discourse of postcolonial studies, inspired by literary theory and cultural studies, is a “given” in U.S. composition work but is far less readily used in writing studies circles in other countries. Our cautions about colonizing are quite telling: They imply an assumed dominance. If we tell ourselves to be careful not to colonize, we must be seeing ourselves as a dominant group. Assuming this dominance has led to reduced awareness of blind spots, domains to which composition theory has not stayed attuned and which are extensively and highly effectively developed in other national-cultural and/or disciplinary writing studies traditions. As Mao suggests, we often suffer from a methodological bias in comparative efforts that “focus on what is absent, rather than on what is present” (“Reflective” 420) in the other. In just the briefest of examples:

• Attention to spoken discourse and its relations to written discourse. The U.S. field has focused on these questions, from Ong to Elbow, in part through its deep explorations of literacy, and far more often in the discipline of linguistics. In other research traditions, however, the topic is both ongoing and the object of extensive studies, including studies questioning the primacy of writing. Elisabeth Nonnon has developed the question of language use in general as the foundation of thinking:
others have explored the over-emphasis of recent scholars on writing as a particularly powerful key to thinking.

• Discourse analysis. To take just one country-specific example, Dominique Maingueneau’s work in France has created a foundation for close analysis of any text, and has been used by some French scholars in order to study power relationships in secondary school or international assessment writing (Bautier and Rayou); Bakhtin’s dialogic framework has informed extensive, explicit, and rigorous analysis of French university students’ management of sources in their writing (see the 2001 special issue of the French linguistics journal *LIDIL*); Françoise Boch and Annie Piolat have studied note-taking as a fundamental and underexplored writing activity in the construction of both knowledge and formal written texts. Contrast this to the relatively weak U.S. attention to text analysis, as suggested by Ball and Ellis, among others, and to the fact that most work on the grammatical features of written texts has grown out of linguistics or the ESP field (see Schleppegrell’s 2008 review).

• Cognitive work, strong in the beginning of composition’s development as a field, today is rarely presented in the United States in terms of post-secondary writing development, while growing as a foundation of the research about higher education writing done in most of the rest of the world: studies of the role of working memory in writing production, of motivational factors in learning, of keystroke logging and eye-and-pen movements, and so on. Yet the recent CCCC conferences have featured only a smattering of cognitive sessions, and the bibliography for the chapter on writing and cognition by Deborah McCutchen, Paul Teske, and Catherine Bankston in the 2008 *Handbook of Research on Writing* relied heavily on authors from outside of the United States or outside of mainstream composition. This kind of work is exchanged, reported on, developed at a multitude of sites outside the United States: the European Association of Research in Learning and Instruction’s writing SIG, the German network of writing teachers, Kluwer Academic Publishing’s writing series, and so on.

To be sure, none of these domains is absent from U.S. composition work, and there is work here that is more rare beyond our borders, including longitudinal studies of university student writing. We do have much to learn as a field, however, from other traditions. Research about testing and assessment in the
United States, for example, is quite insular, in spite of the massive international scholarship on the subject (Poe). Writing research, in the social science sense of this term, has been, until recently, relegated to the back corners of U.S. composition studies, in spite of its prominence at the start of the composition studies trajectory decades ago. In 2005, Richard Haswell suggested that the field’s journals had actually carried out a “war” on empirical writing research over decades; the lack of replicable studies producing aggregable data is striking.

Haswell’s observations are supported by a review in 2006 of general trends in writing research across all age groups, from preschool to adult education, and across disciplines (“Writing into the 21st Century: An Overview of Research on Writing; 1999–2004,” Juzwik et al.). In this review, Juzwik et al. identified three key recent areas of focus in published research about writing: social context and writing practices, bi- or multilingualism and writing, and writing instruction. The research on bi- or multilingualism includes 309 articles across the time period observed, covering “immersion programs; peer and teacher feedback; cooperative learning; beliefs about writers, readers, texts, contexts, and pedagogy in teaching and learning English as a second language; English as a foreign language; and English for academic purposes” (464). They suggest that interpretive methodologies are the most prominent (467), including discourse analysis, interviews, focus or discussion groups, observations, case studies, ethnographic research, and thematic analysis and error analysis, while approximately 22% of studies use experimental or quasi-experimental, correlational, or historical approaches (467). However, Juzwik et al. identify the four key composition journals *CCC*, *Language Arts*, *RTE*, and *TETYC* as accounting for only 64 articles across the five-year period studied, out of their sample size of 1,502 articles about writing research (471). Many of the journals in the Juzwik et al. study are not typically considered part of the field of composition studies (for example, *Foreign Language Annals, Aphasiology*, or *Language and Education*). Perhaps even more interesting for our purposes here, the top three journals publishing research articles about writing between 1999 and 2004 were *The Journal of Second-Language Writing, English for Specific Purposes*, and the internationally focused journal *Written Communication*.

The term *research* in other national or disciplinary traditions is often more readily recognized as systematic inquiry using recognizable, reliable, and replicable data-gathering approaches. U.S. composition teachers hold a longstanding suspicion of this systematic inquiry, in part because of the field’s evolution out of teaching practices and concerns for students (Horner, personal communication, 2008), in part out of its sense of marginalization.
and desire to establish its own research and theory agendas (and sometimes in spite of our best efforts; see, for example, Rebecca Moore Howard’s bibliographies of research methods for composition, http://wrt-howard.syr.edu/Bibs/ResearchMeths.htm, or the recently developed Research Exchange tool, http://wac.colostate.edu/research/). In the United States, the question is further complicated by the lack of a clear understanding of the difference between research and assessment. The methods and approaches developed in Europe, in linguistics and didactics, for example, are a model for writing research, and as many U.S. scholars are scrambling to learn research methods, the depth of the work in Europe could be a key resource—if we open ourselves to this expertise d’ailleurs.

As the field of composition contends with its gaps and skips, the idea that our less rigorously researched theoretical stances might dominate—as interesting as they may be—becomes indeed questionable. These are precisely the domains for which traditions beyond composition studies exist, not always for university writing but more generally in ways that make the move toward the study or teaching of university writing solidly grounded. Isabelle Delcambre and Yves Reuter (in press) argue, for example, that the deep work in secondary writing research enables a grounded approach to writing in the new contexts of higher education. Yves Reuter and Dominique Lahanier-Reuter suggest that the notions of “disciplinary awarenesses” and “disciplinary configurations” developed in their study of primary school students learning to use notebooks and assignments to create their understanding of disciplines can offer a highly useful frame for postsecondary research.

V. Moving toward Equal Trade Models of Exchange

A recent international and bilingual conference about university discourses, “Les Discours Universitaires: Formes, Pratiques, Mutations,” highlights the degree to which U.S. scholars talking of internationalization might not be aware of global work, in both teaching and research. The conference highlighted discourse analysis as an analytic approach that begs our attention, given its strength in helping us to read and study discourses. The objects of analysis presented at the conference included students’ writing (for example, dissertations, undergraduate essays, discipline-specific texts), professors’ speech during course lectures, institutional documents (including PR material in the rapidly changing higher education context in Europe), feedback on student work, abstracts of scientific publications, students’ underground newspapers, first sentences of academic journal articles. Of particular note was the number of
scholars presenting studies of student work produced in university first-year writing courses—the ones so many U.S. publications or talks have suggested do not exist. Scholars at the conference evoked practices that work across boundaries, from what is known as “transversal” writing (of the generic first-year composition variety) to what is required in different disciplines. This work is bound up in both practitioner and research-theory debates and tensions that are perhaps comfortingly familiar to U.S. composition colleagues. “Who owns the expertise?” Francine Thirion challenged her colleagues in the room, from across the disciplines. “But who am I to teach writing?” replied audience members. The systematic picture being developed around the globe through the body of research in discourse analysis, and the text- and discourse-based discussions it is engendering, is a clear example of the kind of sustained research attention the field of composition studies has not yet developed.

Just as there is nothing “naturally better” about our English, as Lu suggests, there is nothing naturally better about our perspectives on teaching and situating university students’ writing in various national contexts. In 1995, Muchiri et al. called for U.S. compositionists to, at the least, make claims in contextualized fashion, to remind themselves of what they take for granted (195). International work “de-naturalizes” our assumptions and stances. How then can we begin to tease out the different meanings of “internationalization” in composition, become more self-conscious about the ways we use terminology, and resist an import-export model for an equitable exchange one? How might we foster more work in some of our underdeveloped areas, in collaboration with and in a learning position with respect to our colleagues around the globe? The language issue, and even more, the broad contextual differences, dominate. We must recognize that U.S. framings are always culturally, geographically, and historically located and loaded. Our frames of reference may or may not be meaningful in contexts with different histories or structures (see Lillis and Scott for a particularly insightful discussion of this subject). For linguistic, political, rhetorical, and institutional reasons, we cannot simply forge ahead, asking questions across national contexts about these different writing issues and assuming we understand our colleagues’ answers. In fact, we may not even be ready to recognize the right questions to ask, and naive inquiry can burn as many bridges as it creates.

This short final section will offer just a few brief hopeful examples of the kinds of writing studies work that might open up new definitions of internationalization while helping us to distinguish among the current meanings. These examples point toward a variety of promising ways to move away from
an import-export model. They illustrate in some cases the kinds of questions not yet being considered in the internationalization discussion sweeping the field. They are U.S. and European projects and are not intended to be representative of global work—only glimpses of the potential offered by displacing ourselves in long-term projects, importing research methods for studies of students’ writing and students’ perspectives, and learning to do collaborative research across borders.

One area of change is in the evolution of comparative rhetoric, a retooling of contrastive rhetoric, although this work has claimed neither teaching nor higher education writing as its only or even its primary domains. Insightful and culturally powerful monographs from comparative rhetoric scholars, themselves often bilingual and bicultural, have given U.S. compositionists the opportunity to begin understanding the degree to which our point of departure for comparisons, sunk in Western rhetoric, is always already problematic. In “Reflective Encounters: Illustrating Comparative Rhetoric,” billed as a brief history of the young discipline (401), LuMing Mao critiques Matalene’s 1985 essay on Chinese rhetoric: “It is one thing to call our attention to… important differences between Chinese and Western rhetorical practices; it is another to describe them in binary or one-dimensional terms” (412).16 Linguists in France have similarly argued for considering contrasts in terms of “open-ended families of culturo-linguistic possibility” rather than “languages” or “rhetorics” (François) as one way to render more flexible our understandings of contrast and similarity. Frédéric François also points out that the reception of a discourse, and the rhetorical flexibility of the recipient, determine its features as much as its production; the differences might not be “rhetorical” but “modes of relationship to the world, more or less well translated into discursive forms” (personal communication).

Research methods drawn from other cultural or disciplinary traditions can transfer work in composition studies. One such method is the discourse analysis used in French studies of student work, informed by functional linguistics, mentioned in section IV. This method offers concrete analytic tools to effect the generous reading of student work encouraged through the years by U.S. scholars such as David Bartholomae, Nancy Sommers, James Slevin and Susan Wall, as students invent the university, as they become members of a (partially) new literate environment, as they make their way into disciplines and reinvent themselves. That generous reading involves careful attention to what students are doing in their texts, rather than what they are not doing: studying “student writing as student writing” in Bartholomae’s words at his 2004 CCCC
presentation, and it is a particularly valid approach for intercultural analysis (see Donahue, “Cross-Cultural”). U.S. scholars have done far less in terms of systematically studying the multiple specific movements of negotiation that can indeed be localized and identified in students’ texts, as studied in “textual context”—that is, at the least, in their response to both the assignment and the texts read in preparation for the assignment, a set of factors that might in fact offer a better basis for comparison, contrast, and discovery of shared purpose. For example, an extended research project analyzing 250 French and U.S. texts within the institutional contexts of writing assignments in late high school and the start of college, published in France in 2008, suggests that students’ texts in both countries, as they make their way from secondary into postsecondary education, used similar discursive strategies, similar negotiating textual movements. The work resists the urge to distill difference and gloss over other factors at work, including the nature of institutionalization, globalization, ideological dominance, beginner-expert relationships, transnational blurring of boundaries, and massification of higher education across multiple contexts (Donahue, *Ecrire*).

There has been growth, as well, in real international collaboration in recent years: shared research, comparative research, and collaborative research. One such project in France, a three-year project titled *Ecrits Universitaires: Inventaire, Pratiques, Methodes* funded by the French government, is studying students’ writing in five disciplines at three universities. The project uses teams from the United States and the U.K. as respondents to its stages of research and results, and it brings together members from all three countries periodically. This project specifically targets cross-pollination; the French researchers involved have extensively studied and developed theoretical models for writing in the disciplines, but have not offered courses or programs for university students, while the U.S. and U.K. collaborators knew little about the French body of research and have interacted at key points of the study as audience, sounding board, and learners.

Another example of productive U.S. contextual work is Terry Zawacki’s interest in the experiences of her international students in the United States that led her to detailed explorations of both English and mother-tongue writing instruction in Sweden, Italy, and Korea, with site visits and interviews, as well as to narratives by her students about their home and U.S. experiences. Several of the students in her group contributed to a 2007 publication titled *Valuing Written Accents: Non-native Students Talk about Identity, Academic Writing, and Meeting Teachers’ Expectations*, a volume that allows international
students to talk specifically about school writing in their home countries and languages as well as in the United States.

Other projects take the approach of individual research in different countries, pursuing a shared research question framed by both different and common theories, and comparing results periodically. A research group with representation from the U.K., the United States, Australia, France, and Qatar, for example, has begun exploring the ways students in different contexts transition from one educational level to another (secondary—postsecondary; undergraduate—graduate); the team has worked closely to identify research questions, instruments, and methods that will allow intercultural discussions throughout the research (Chris Anson, Mya Poe, Rob Oliver, Mary Scott, Claire Woods, Paul Skrebels, Mohana Rajakumar, and Christiane Donahue).

While, as the team reported at the European Association of Research in Learning and Instruction’s 2008 conference, most transnational research on writing in higher education has been carried out from the particular cultural stance of the lead researcher, even when it calls on insiders from particular groups to collaborate, the collaborative project suggests that writing researchers also need to recognize a complex multilayered understanding of context and to assume it as the basis for cross-cultural work. The participants in the project argue that an understanding of “context” has become a necessary multilayered resource for students and faculty involved in border-crossing. They believe that it is becoming increasingly important to develop rigorous practices and a grounded vocabulary for collaborative literacy research across national contexts, taking into account this same kind of cultural inquiry. Even more important, they believe that researchers from different cultural contexts are best positioned to carry out such inquiry, using methods collaboratively developed but locally shaped. This requires attention to language and to bilingual or multilingual publications (the bilingual Canadian Journal for Studies in Discourse and Writing is a model), support for translation, and interdisciplinary work on the nature of these linguistic and discursive riches.

**Conclusions**

Our motives are clearly a factor in how each of us situates himself or herself, why we need to know what is happening in other cultural contexts, the reasons for interest, and the ways we handle that interest. These motives should be foregrounded as we interact with other traditions. U.S. scholars assume roles of expertise. And we should; we have strong traditions in pedagogy, in critical theory, in genre studies, and so on. But we are certainly not the only ones. We
have not developed the power inherent in building a body of research, a shared pool out of which we develop direction, nor the power inherent in multilinguality (at least not in the “mainstream” represented by many academics). As U.S. scholars we must reorient ourselves and our discourses, adapting to the idea that our field is not the sole source of writing theory in higher education. The suggestion that we must cautiously not dominate is itself a blinder, preventing us from seeing the traditions beyond our own, as well as our areas of non-expertise, our domains of marginalization in the global scene.

Recently, U.S. scholar Chris Anson asked, “what do we give and what do we get when we do international work in composition?” He suggested, with a bit of guilt, that those of us who do work internationally advance in our careers in the United States because of the international appeal of our work, and I believe that is true. He was not so sure he could articulate accurately what we give. But the question might instead be: What do we need to receive? What can we, as a field, no longer do without, that is thoroughly grounded and developed in other national-cultural contexts? What learning must we take on?

We need international work because we can no longer do without deep understanding as the world shifts and slips. We need the ability to negotiate that comes from deep intercultural awareness; the ability to shift in understanding of our global position; the research trends and strong methods other scholars have developed; the deep familiarity with other systems and contexts, developed in so much more than the occasional encounter, fulfilling but exotic; the suspicion about market forces at work in the more glib general discussions about the value in internationalizing higher education. Without these, our “internationalizing” efforts will remain stuck in a-historical, a-contextual, and highly partial modes of intellectual tourism.

Notes

1. And, of course, which “composition studies”? The broad set of interests this field encompasses makes the conversation even more complex, as does the decidedly U.S.-centric term composition.

2. Through the Bologna Process in the European Union, so named because it first convened in Bologna, Italy, nations are moving toward standardizing curricula and assessments across borders in order to facilitate credit transfer and student movement throughout the E.U.

3. Consider Matsuda’s extensive body of work, or Hall’s presentation at the International Writing across the Curriculum conference in 2008, “Teaching College Writing in the Next America: Pedagogical Implications of The New Latin,” “The
New Linguistic Majority.’ and ‘The New Student.’ Teachers face linguistically heterogeneous student bodies: multilingual, Generation 1.5, bi-dialectal, to evoke a few.

4. This often-repeated phrase first appeared in Susan McLeod’s introduction to a 2002 special issue of Language and Learning across the Disciplines focused on WAC in international contexts. It has come to stand for the general U.S. impression of writing overseas.

5. I use “mother tongue” or “home” language throughout this article with an acknowledgment of its vexed status. Currently “heritage” language is a useful term. But many of my sources used “mother tongue” or “home” and so that appears more accurate to me as I report on this work. The issue of “mother tongue” is more complicated as globally, early bilingualism become more the norm than monolingualism, and variations of emphasis evolve around the world: second-, third-, or fourth-language speakers, generation 1.5 speakers, diverse cultural dialect speakers are all in the mix.

6. Writing Center Associations in Europe, the Middle East, and other regions host conferences that draw scholars, teachers, and tutors from around the world. The internationalization of the U.S. Writing Centers Association and the U.S. Writing Across the Curriculum group, as well as discussion about internationalization of the U.S. Council of Writing Program Administrators, has raised another set of questions: What does it mean to internationalize an association or a conference, and to whose benefit? What has been different as a result of the choice to proclaim internationalization?

7. The “research”-“practice” division is partly arbitrary, but it is an interesting shift given the trend in some European circles of avoiding “applying” research directly to practice.


9. A subject developed by Helen Fox as well in her 1994 work, Listening to the World.

10. A recent exploration of Chinese students’ academic writing in two Chinese universities and a U.K. university is a welcome addition to the literature (Xing, Wang, and Spencer).

11. As with many of the domains briefly mentioned in this article, there is a much broader body of work about the question. Here, the idea that U.S. English is in no way dominant has been treated in the “world Englishes” research that is often neither produced in the United States nor widely read here.
12. See, for example, the brilliant French volume *French Theory* by François Cusset, an exploration of the ways in which the perspectives of French intellectuals seen in France as fundamentally different were lumped together in the United States as “French theory.”

13. Consider, for example, the work on autonomous models of literacy (Lea and Street, “Academic” and “Student”) or the extensive body of translation theory.

14. The scholarship on the cognitive, social, or intellectual benefits of multilinguality includes work in both composition theory and language learning (see Ogulnik; Skutnabb-Kangas and Cummins).

15. A note here on research and the humanities: there is a long-standing tension among the broad groupings of humanities, social sciences, and sciences with respect to what constitutes “research.” Each domain has its own claims and strengths. Composition research certainly should be able to make its own way, but it must understand itself in the broader research contexts and be prepared to articulate its methods, values, and limitations.

16. See the 2009 special issues of both *CCC* and *College English* devoted to this domain, and Mao’s *Reading Chinese Fortune Cookie: The Making of Chinese American Rhetoric*.
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