Introduction: Current and Emerging Realities

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. It began in earnest after the gains of the U.S. social movements of the 1960s and 1970s when higher education institutions began constructing context-appropriate support to facilitate the academic success of students who had up until then found the academy inaccessible. Still, some 50 years later, the debates about language and dialect variation and what they mean in higher education are by no means settled. The education community, specifically higher education, and the larger culture into which it is embedded still debate about the ways to respond to language and dialect variation (Canagarajah, 2006a, 2006b; Delpit, 1988; Gilyard, 1996, 2000; Jordan, 2012; Milson-Whyte 2013; Young, 2007, 2009; Young and Martinez 2011; Young, Barrett, and Lovejoy, 2013; SRTOL[1]). As Kimberly S. Anderson notes throughout *War or Common Cause?: A Critical Ethnography of Language Education Policy, Race, and Cultural Citizenship* (2009), language education and the language of education have long been associated with an ideology founded on the idea that

1

one form of English, a form that devalued linguistic diversity, is vital to citizenship in the U.S. The increase in U.S.-bound students and faculty and the internationalization of higher education are occurring then, within the context of a history in which English, the language of the university, is, operationally, a static, stable variable.

Since at least the 2000s the internationalization of higher education in the U.S. occurs not only within broader debates about language education, but also within the context of shrinking state (and federal) support of public higher education (see Mortenson, 2012). According to the Institute of International Education's Open Doors data, in 2014 roughly 293,766 new international students enrolled in U.S colleges and universities, an increase of 8.8 percent over the previous year's 819,644 (2015a). These numbers become significant as public funding decreases. In fact, these budgetary pressures and the influx of economic resources by international students are significant forces propelling active international student recruitment and enrollment for many institutions, especially as U.S. universities and colleges face declining numbers of domestic college-age enrollment. The decline in numbers of high school graduates over the next decade is expected to be a challenge for universities (Jen, 2013). As a result, institutions in many states are turning to international recruiting and enrollment to address declining enrollments that also have fiscal consequences.

For example, in Michigan, where the editors of this collection both teach, state support for the 15 public universities has decreased dramatically. Between fiscal year 2000–2001 and fiscal year 2013–2014 state appropriations fell by about 30 percent on a per-student basis while the average tuition and fee rate for in-state tuition increased by 150 percent (Jen, 2013). Michigan's annual appropriation now typically "accounts for less than a quarter of university general fund revenue" (Jen, 2013, p. 1). This is true more generally because among public colleges and universities, there are limits to politically acceptable tuition and fee charges for in-state students (see Bowerman, 2012).[2] International students, however, pay out-of-state tuition

and additional surcharges, and they generally do not require institutional financial aid support. The economic impact of international students nationally is significant: International students infused $30.5 billion in the U.S. economy in 2014 (Institute of International Education, 2015c). Given these economic realities, it is not coincidental that Michigan Technological University, Michigan State University, and the thirteen other Michigan public institutions enroll sizable numbers of international students; the state ranks among the nine top destinations of international students (Institute of International Education, 2015b). At Michigan Tech, a campus of 7,000, 1,507 of the students are of international origin. At Michigan State, 6,759 of the student body of 50,085 is international. The Association of International Educators' analysis of international students' economic impact to the State of Michigan estimates an infusion of more than one billion dollars in 2014. If these trends continue under new federal administrations, international student tuition dollars and economic support of local campuses and other businesses may become the foundation for the economic survival of many institutions of higher education in the U.S. (There is some indication that these trends may change under new political administration policies and attitudes. See, for example, Guzman-Lopez, 2017.)

As the variety of avenues for entrance have expanded, disciplinary and other institutional boundaries become ineffective and transparent. For example, to get an edge in the competitive recruitment for international students, institutions have established 2 + 2, or even 3 + 1, agreements through which students start programs in their home institutions and transfer credits to U.S. institutions. This way, students secure degrees from U.S. institutions without studying in the country for the full duration of their educational degree program. Institutions have also set up off-shore campuses, used outsourced or in-house intensive language programs to prepare non-matriculated students for degree seeking status, or entered into internationalization partnerships with the private sector.

As many of the papers in this volume illustrate, systemic boundaries across admissions, orientation procedures,

disciplinary programs, and support structures for multi-language users inform our histories and challenge us to create more flexible structures and approaches within these current realities. The recruitment, enrollment, and education of multilingual language users clearly present opportunities as we learn how to cross those boundaries. Doing so challenges the prevailing narrative of multilingualism as a "problem," advocating instead for engaging multiple language use on campuses as an opportunity to restructure and to open new avenues of collaboration with the goal of ethical and improved approaches to meeting the needs of multilingual members of our campus communities. The papers in this volume illustrate how understanding current structures as the real problem illustrates the ways that those fragmented structures cannot serve students whose language diversity is never contemplated in initial planning that then position multilingualism as a problem. The result is that units such as intensive English, first-year writing programs, writing across the curriculum programs, and other general education programs position faculty as gatekeepers who are asked to work with students who require specific kinds of language support that instructor training and the structures that position them so do not support. Faculty frustration and anxiety in the face of internationalization are repressed and left unaddressed in any structural way. Ignoring these issues within the larger contexts of international students' experiences and performances throughout their time in U.S. higher education can no longer help us understand and access all of the opportunities presented to us by the inclusion of international students in our institutions. The configuration of the structures, rather than multilingualism, as the place for needed revision reveals the untapped opportunities of multilingualism.

The tensions created by unchallenged fragmented approaches are real. Students who are left without the resources they need to succeed can develop attitudes of *I paid for X and was promised X and therefore I should have X*. Faculty members responsible for a variety of types of language instruction sometimes find that admissions and enrollment management officers do

not work as partners. Frustrated faculty zero in on colleagues in language and communications disciplines for not "preparing" multilingual international students to function effectively in their classrooms. These frames shore up narratives of the "problem" of internationalization, but while these issues challenge us they also create opportunities, and it is the opportunities they open up that the papers in this volume seek to take up.

The conversation about curricular fragmentation that separates institutional learning goals from specific programs is central; a specific example is general education. Even though general education is the gateway to undergraduate education, and even though for all institutions communication and global or cultural awareness are critical anchors of the undergraduate learning experience, the fact is that resource allocation tends to favor assessments that devalue multilingualism. In most cases, learning goals work with a monolingual ideology that is left unexamined. Thus, while students get credit for taking courses in foreign languages (French, Spanish, German, Chinese, assuming it is not a student's first language) on most campuses, intensive English classes bear no degree-seeking credit for multilingual users. We have set learning some "standard" form of English as a goal for international students, but we have not devised a mechanism to acknowledge the assets of multilingualism within broader institutional contexts such as diversity and cultural understanding. But, seen in the context of campus goals related to cultural understanding and diversity, fragmented structures that limit our ability to acknowledge the assets of multilingualism reveal lost opportunities for our campus communities to meet those goals. Positioning multilingualism as an asset invites us to examine international enrollment not only as a financial solution, but also as a possible response to learning goals. To engage these opportunities it is as important to acknowledge and challenge disciplinary boundaries as it is to address structural boundaries.

Fortunately, professionalization and the "disciplinary division of labor" (Matsuda, 1999) it has erected between and among composition, rhetoric, writing studies, and writing in

a second or a foreign language are now being (re)examined. Scholars such as Canagarajah, Horner, Matsuda, and Silva position their work at strategic intersections of these disciplines and thereby encourage cross-disciplinary engagement on key issues.[3] Alister Cumming (2011) has added to this conversation, noting in his preface *to Learning-to-Write and Writing-to-Learn* that, "Studies of writing, composition or rhetoric have tended to assume that a single language (often English) is constant, . ." (p. ix), but the influx of multilingual students and work in the disciplines of applied linguistics and second language writing studies challenge such a premise. The L2 writing studies literature demonstrates the extent to which "language and cultural variability and change are increasingly the norms around the world, particularly in academic and work situations" (Cumming, 2011, p. ix); these cross-disciplinary analyses have implications for any robust support infrastructure around language use on university campuses. A focus on multilingual students' needs highlights the intersections of current disciplinary inquiry. Cumming notes,

> Language, literacy, and learning have to be recognized to function at multiple levels, ranging from micro-levels of words, orthographies, punctuation, morphology, syntax, and ideas to macro-levels of register, rhetoric, positioning oneself in discourse communities, establishing identities, acculturation, and social action. (p. x)

The foregrounding of the needs of multilingual students has resulted in an acknowledgment of a need for a shift toward cross-disciplinary inquiry, cross-unit collaborations, and clarification of perspectives for all language education and for the institutional contexts in which it occurs. This shift offers specific opportunities for rethinking the relationships between and among disciplinary structures and ethical commitments to SRTOL.

One key opportunity is the chance to create cross-disciplinary approaches to language-based disciplinary structures for L2 studies and its intersections with other institutional structures,

especially those that prepare international students for successful study of the English language. For example, work in L2 writing studies, particularly in L2 writing studies' engagement with L1 writing, offers useful heuristics and approaches that can augment the work of composition teachers—including the graduate teaching assistants and adjunct faculty who deliver most of that instruction. One such resource is a collection of essays by Manchón (2011) grounded in perspectives on L2 writing that deploy the heuristic of learning-to-write (LW), writing-to-learn language (WLL), and writing-to-learn content (WLC). Manchón acknowledges our "disciplinary compartmentalization" and argues for "the theoretical and pedagogical relevance of jointly exploring these various learning-to-write and writing-to-learn dimensions of writing development . . ." (p. 4). Using that heuristic, the Manchón collection maps out the intersections of L2 writing studies in its various dimensions, often connecting this to L1 writing studies in order to offer insights into research and practice in L2. The work in this collection also demonstrates how exploring both L1 and L2 perspectives affords opportunities for collaborations and innovations that would be more sensitive to the needs of multilingual students in the L1 settings of university campuses. Another example of current L2-focused explorations that have relevance for discipline-based constructions of our understandings of language use on campuses is work on the issue of voice (Canagarajah, 2015; Guinda & Hyland, 2012; Matsuda, 2001; Matsuda & Jeffery, 2012). Canagarajah (2015) points out that influential studies in this area have been based on L1 writers and/or texts, not L2 writers. He argues for appropriate research on voice in the writing of multilingual learners in order to not only define voice in its complexity but also to ensure that insights on voice are informed by "actual experiences of teachers and students" (p. 122). Expanding research and pedagogical perspectives that explore voice within the context of multilingualism is a conversation this volume invites us to take up as an important project. Heuristics that support the development of voice within this context is clearly an area for synergetic collaboration across units and disciplines, and a frame for understanding the

opportunities afforded us by multilingual studies in relation to literacy studies more generally.

Such opportunities give us clear ideas about the ways we might restructure current support infrastructures that lack a systematic mechanism for offering expertise and/or access to the expertise of applied linguists and English language teachers to writing faculty, including faculty who teach writing in the disciplines. Training and faculty development are vital pieces of the puzzle. Writing faculty and graduate teaching assistants by and large have no training in teaching multilingual learners. Indeed, most graduate programs in rhetoric and composition and communication studies still do not offer students any training in applied linguistics, second language acquisition, writing in an additional language, or cross-language work, even when such training is available through other units or programs. Teachers of ESL often work in stand-alone intensive English programs (IEPs) or outsourced programs that have no structural relationship to the academic disciplines that focus on writing and communication studies. They may exist as separate units altogether. In cases where IEPs reside in academic units, they may not be incorporated into the academic mission of departments beyond training non-matriculated students, nor is the expertise of their faculty systematically tapped for curricular and instructional design or support in relation to general education requirements such as first-year writing, writing in the disciplines, and writing across the curriculum. Campus writing centers and centers for teaching often work in isolation. But cross-disciplinary approaches to language studies give us ways not only to identify institutional boarders that limit our opportunities, as the papers in this collection illustrate, in doing so they also offer us ground for restructuring and revision.

A Note about Terminology

Throughout professional discussions about community members who are multilingual we have used terms such as *second language users*, *language users*, *multiple language users*, *users of English as an additional language,* and *multilingual students*. The discussions have also implicitly identified "English" as the language of campuses and universities. Drawing on Jordan (2012) and Cenoz (2013), we selected the terms *user* and *multilingual* for a number of reasons. Language learning and use, as Jordan (2012) demonstrates, "is less a matter of shifting to an appreciably standard variety and more a matter of maintaining skills in the face of language as a living construct" (p. 12). Language shifts and skill maintenance are not moves performed by additional language users alone; they are part of what all users do, though multilingual users have what Cook terms *multicompetence*, abilities connected to how such language users negotiate between their first and second, or third, languages.[4] And while *user* in the Cook (1996, 1999) deployment of the term references a speaker, we are drawn to Jordan's mapping of Lu's 2004 articulation of a connection of *user* to the act of composing. As Jordan notes, Lu "invokes" the term to espouse "a view of symbolic production" that is "at once multimodal and forward thinking . . ." but "anticipate[s] how English is spreading and changing" (p. 14). The term *user*, then, implies agency that *second language learner* does not have.

Our use of the term *multilingual* also merits discussion. As Cenoz (2013) points out, "Globalization has increased the value of multilingualism," and though there have been different perspectives on multilingualism, and some discussions of the limitations of the term (see Canagarajah, 2013), we are drawn to what it provides for our current purposes. The European Commission (2006) defines multilingualism as "the ability of societies, institutions, groups and individuals to engage, on a regular basis, with more than one language in their day-to-day lives" (p. 6). We accept that this version of multilingualism is in the process of becoming the norm on U.S. campuses. This is because all

language users either use multiple languages or have contact with others in settings where multiple languages are used (Jordan, 2012). In addition, *multilingualism* also acknowledges the varieties of Englishes used on campuses, though we are by no means suggesting that the privileged variety is either fixed in time or is a recognizable neutral "standard" to all users, even as we acknowledge that there is some version that disciplinary communities see as "standard" and that faculty members expect students to be able to use effortlessly.

The papers in this volume demonstrate that teaching effective communication skills to *all* students in ways that recognize the needs of multiple language users requires a shift in perspective that reconfigures multilingualism as an opportunity that is enhanced by the internationalization of higher education in the U.S. because it makes transparent the problems of current structures and disciplinary approaches in accessing those opportunities. As a collection, the papers herein address the economic, structural, disciplinary, and pedagogical challenges of making this shift in bold and compassionate ways. We hope that they invite you to start conversations at your own institutions and to join in dialogues with colleagues across institutions to support the multilingual members of your communities.

Notes

1. National Council of Teachers of English and the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) released the statement, *Students' Right to Their Own Language*, in 1974. The statement affirmed the value of different dialects of English and asserted the professional responsibility of teachers to learn about and respect language variation.
2. Bowerman (2012) notes that state university appropriations often take into consideration the extent to which institutions exercise tuition hike restraint. http://www.senate.michigan.gov/sfa/Publications/Notes/2012Notes/NotesFal12bb.pdf
3. With the increase in the number of multiple language users and users of different Englishes, discussions about language use has increasingly acknowledged the value and responsibility of the profession to the needs of second or multiple language

users. CCCC released the "CCCC Statement on Second-Language Writing and Writers" in 2001 (see http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions, January 2001, revised November 2009). There is a history of scholars (such as Matsuda, Canagarajah, and Horner) and organizations (such as NCTE, CCCC, TESOL, AAAL and the International Reading Association) arguing for structural responses to the Englishes and the projects of teaching and learning in educational settings (see also Horner, Lu, Royster, & Trimbur, 2011, in *College English*). The Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA) has recently offered a whitepaper on cross-language issues http://wpacouncil.org/whitepaper. The teaching of oral communication is a critical part of general education on many campuses. Some campuses foreground the relationships between the written and oral communication curricula while others do not. An important difference is the response of the oral communication professional community to multilingual language users. Those who teach oral communication and the professional association that represents most of them, the National Communication Association (NCA), do not have whitepapers or position statements on cross-language users in the academy.

Overwhelmingly applied linguists who work in second language studies, especially second language writing, and teachers of English as a second language gather in disciplinary forums such as TESOL or AAAL and share ideas in their disciplinary journals. Meanwhile, writing studies–affiliated scholars largely responsible for teaching the first-year writing courses required at most institutions of higher education in the U.S. gather at CCCC and NCTE and share ideas in their disciplinary journals with members of the WPA that manage first-year written communication programs. Writing Center scholars either have sub-disciplinary discussions of their own and/or participate at CCCC or NCTE. The establishment of interest groups such as the Committee on Second Language Writing at CCCC and the Second Language Writing Special Interest Section at TESOL, plus the increase in conference presentations on cross-language issues, suggests an ongoing positive shift.

4. Scholars across language-focused disciplines have rightly noted that the focus on language learning does not in fact apply only to multiple language users. The so-called "native speaker" is also a learner of the English language across the lifespan (see Horner, Lu, Royster, & Trimbur, 2011; Jordan, 2012).

References

Anderson, K. S. (2009). *War or common cause? A critical ethnography of language education policy, race, and cultural citizenship.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

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.

Cenoz, J. (2013). Defining multilingualism. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 33,* 3–18.

Cook, V. (1996). Competence and multi-competence. *Performance and Competence in Second Language Acquisition*, *57.*

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*(2), 185–209.

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

Cumming, A. (2011). Preface. In M. R. Manchon (Ed.), *Learning to write and writing to learn in an additional language* (pp.ix–xii). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, *58*(3), 280–299.

European Commission. (2006). Commission of the European Communities High Level Group on Multilingualism Final Report. https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=Commission+of+the+European+Communities+High+Level+Group+on+Multilingualism+FINAL+REPORT

Gilyard, K. (1996). *Let's flip the script: An African American discourse on language, literature, and learning.* Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

Gilyard, K. (2000). Literacy, identity, imagination, flight. *College Composition and Communication*, 260–272.

Guinda, C. S., & Hyland, K. (2012). Introduction: A context-sensitive approach to stance and voice. In *Stance and voice in written academic genres* (pp. 1–11). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Guinda, C. S., & Hyland, K. (Eds.). (2012). *Stance and voice in written academic genres.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Guzman-Lopez, A. (2017). http://www.wbur.org/hereandnow/2017/06/20/universities-applications-trump?utm_source=iosnewsapp&utm_medium=Email&utm_campaign=app

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). Open doors 2014: International students data highlight. www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/International-Students/Infographic

Institute of International Education. (2015b). Fact sheet by state. www.iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Open-Doors/Fact-Sheets-and-Infographics/US-State-Fact-Sheets

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

Jen, K. (2013). Fiscal focus: State appropriations, tuition, and public university operating costs. www.house.mi.gov/hfa/PDF/HigherEducation/State_Appropriations_Tuition,and_Public_University_OperatingCosts.pdf

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

Manchon, R.M. (Ed.). (2011). *Learning to write and writing to learn in an additional language.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

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

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.

Michigan State University. https://msu.edu/about/thisismsu/facts.html

Michigan Technological University. www.mtu.edu/umc/resources/media-kit/fast-facts/

Milson-Whyte, V. (2013). Pedagogical and socio-political implications of code-meshing in classrooms: Some considerations for a translingual orientation to writing. *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and classrooms*, 115–127.

Mortenson, T.G. (2012). State funding: A race to the bottom. http://www.acenet.edu/the-presidency/columns-and-features/Pages/state-funding-a-race-to-the-bottom.aspx

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

Silva, T., & Leki, I. (2004). Family matters: The influence of applied linguistics and composition studies on second language writing studies—past, present, and future. *Modern Language Journal, 88*(1), 1–13.

Silva, T., & Matsuda, P. K. (2010). *Practicing theory in second language writing.* West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.

Young, V.A. (2007). *Your average nigga: Performing race, literacy, and masculinity*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

Young, V.A. (2009). "Nah, We Straight": An argument against code switching. *JAC*, 49–76.

Young, V. A., & Martinez, A. (Eds.) (2011). *Code-meshing as world English: Pedagogy, policy, performance*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Young, V. A., Barrett, R., & Lovejoy, K. B. (2013). *Other people's English: Code-meshing, code-switching, and African American literacy*. New York: Teachers College Press.