

1

Cultivating Collective Research Capacity through International Exchanges about Higher Education Writing Research

Tiane Donahue

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE, USA, AND UNIVERSITÉ DE LILLE,
FRANCE

Cinthia Gannett

FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY, USA

Joan Mullin

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA - CHARLOTTE, USA

Situating the Collection in Scholarly Exchanges

Various disciplines offer ways “in” to questions of research and writing around the world via studies of writing and writers “whose life-work and life experiences transgress and surpass the national boundaries that existed or emerged in the 20th century” (Boter et al., 2020, book cover), or through studies of knowledge-making itself in transnational contexts, underscoring that “the view that knowledge circulates by itself in a flat world, unimpeded by national boundaries, is a myth. The transnational movement of knowledge is a social accomplishment, requiring negotiation, accommodation, and adaptation to the specificities of local contexts” (Krige, 2019).¹

This compilation of essays uniquely addresses critical international and transnational writing studies (cf. Björk et al., 2003; Boter et al., 2020; Chitez & Kruse, 2012; Gorska, 2012; Graham & Harbord 2010; Harbord, 2010; Kramer-Dahl, 2003; Merman-Jozwiak, 2014; Muchiri et al., 1995; Nesi & Gardner, 2012; Okuda, 2018; Rijlaarsdam, 2005). While the studies themselves contribute to the robust field of international studies of writing, the

1 Please read the opening statement for this collection, “Editing in US-Based International Publications: A Position Statement,” before reading this introduction (<https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/books/supporting/statement.pdf>).

collection overall is a window on a particular event that began in 2008 as a response to the recognition that there was no clear place at the College Conference on Composition and Communication for international work, no comfortable way to welcome international scholars, no existing approach at CCCC for the in-depth exploration (rather than brief presentation formats) that international exchange demands, and no clarity about questions of inter-, trans-, or multinational and -lingual work. This collection, then, rather than being guided by a thematic thread, national coverage, or methodological strands is intended to show the kinds of work shared at the International Researchers Consortium over the years. The creation of this collection thus continues the very question raised 18 years ago at the first IRC workshop: how might we exchange, fully understand, and respect research from within and across international borders? We are still working through the answers, and this compilation also exemplifies the difficult discussions that need to continue.

As is the case with other international collections, each of the projects and researchers has a unique research tradition and history; however, the essays published here were crafted for or further developed through a set of shared experiences over the course of nearly twenty years at the annual International Researchers Consortium (IRC) workshop at CCCC. This collection, then, is a unique enactment of an ongoing and evolving initiative, one that has attempted to cultivate collective research capacity through extended, committed, mutual international dialogue about specific projects *and about the very nature of international and transnational writing studies research itself*. The studies offered here represent a range of what enacted research across borders looks like.

The late 1990s and early 2000s saw a series of efforts to put several theoretical and applied strands of language and literacy scholarship from around the world into conversation, exploring what they might teach each other and how they might be aligned or divergent. By necessity, these developing conversations included questions of language, culture, and power. They exposed some of the previously largely invisible U.S. beliefs about Anglophone (and even more, US-Anglophone) institutions and practices as the dominant engines of scholarship, when in fact the wealth of work around questions of writing research and teaching is richer and more varied. In sum, a host of projects took shape to encourage international research conversations, support new scholarship, and take up questions about the nature of scholarship itself.

In this brief review section, we look at a selection of US- or UK-based collections or articles that attend to gathering multisite scholarship, ones which in some way address questions of transnational, international, or

cross-national work. Some studies have the express purpose of comparing practices or projects across borders; other studies aim to collect multiple sources or types of data to situate this Anglophone collection in that particular landscape. We then identify some key articles or collections from contexts not limited to the US or UK. Finally, we draw on a sampling of work not published in English that addresses issues aligned with the ones in this volume. There is work in many languages from many contexts, often not published in English; studying it all would be a project of its own. Therefore, the discussion here is truly just a sampling, meant to inspire further attention and exploration. We encouraged authors of these chapters to cite work not in English and their bibliographies offer an excellent starting point. We look forward to learning more about the wealth of non-Anglophone work which can inform Anglophone scholarship in both familiar and unexpected ways.

In the US we have certainly come a long way since texts such as the 1956 CCCC's "The Foreign Student in the Freshman Course" (though certainly that article was already well ahead of its time). Publications in the past thirty years or so have clustered around the topics of writing research and instruction in different ways. 2002 saw Foster and Russell's *Writing and Learning in Cross-national Perspective: Transitions from Secondary to Higher Education*, featuring authors from various countries exploring writing instruction at the crucial secondary/post-secondary threshold. In addition, some edited collections feature multiple authors and disciplines, but all within a particular country or small set of Anglophone countries, as in *Writing in the Disciplines* (Deane & O'Neill, 2011); *International Students Negotiating Higher Education: Critical Perspectives* (Sovic & Blythman, 2012); *Genres across the Disciplines: Student Writing in Higher Education* (Nesi & Gardner, 2012); *Teaching Academic Writing in UK Higher Education: Theories, Practices, and Models* (Ganobscik-Williams, 2017); *Negotiating the Intersections of Writing and Writing Instruction* (Gustafsson & Eriksson, 2022)

Other works in English have focused on collecting research from a variety of contexts around the world, such as John Harbord's 2010 chapter, "Writing in Central and Eastern Europe," which explores practices in a variety of institutions and the paths their writing programs have taken. Lennart Björk and colleagues' 2003 edited collection *Teaching Academic Writing in European Higher Education* offers chapters on multiple writing instruction approaches in different European contexts. Montserrat Castello and Tiane Donahue's volume *University Writing: Selves and Texts in Academic Societies* (2012) also features chapters from multiple countries about writing instruction and research in different contexts. In that same year, Madalina Chitez and Otto Kruse published an in-depth exploration of practices in multiple European

countries in “Writing Cultures and Genres in European Higher Education,” (See also Kruse et al., 2016), and later *University writing in central and eastern Europe: Tradition, transition, and innovation* (Chitez, Dorohoschi, Kruse, and Salski (2018)). In 2016, Steve Graham and Gert Rijlaarsdam called for a new international study of writing, one better equipped to take into account the differences (and similarities) in writing practices around the globe, as they highlight in their text. We also see attention to writing centers around the world, as studied by scholars such as Osman Barnawi with his focus on the Arabian Gulf (2018) or Tomoyo Okuda with her 2017 dissertation focused on writing centers as global pedagogy. That dissertation is referenced in a 2023 description of Japanese writing centers, including the realities and the challenges they are facing in *WLN: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship*. It also mentions the 13th Symposium on Writing Centers in Asia in the context of a 20-year history, suggesting a rich, extensive research context.

Some studies focus in-depth on one particular context: *Chinese Rhetoric and Writing: An Introduction for Language Teachers* (Kirkpatrick & Xu, 2012) or *Emerging Writing Research from the Russian Federation* (Squires, 2021). Ernest Pineteh’s case study of South Africa’s undergraduate students’ writing challenges (2014), published in the *International Journal of Higher Education*, reminds us that “writing” journals and presses are not the only ones to publish about higher education writing instruction and research.

We also see collections, articles, and other publications focused on understanding the US role in global contexts, whether from what arrives in the US, what U.S. writers experience in non-U.S. contexts, or what U.S. composition does in interaction with global contexts. Mary Muchiri et al. (1995) paved the way for later work, such as their contributions to the 2016 *Composition Studies* special issue “Composition’s Global Turn” or some of the chapters in Bruce Horner and Donahue’s 2022 collection, *Teaching and Studying Transnational Composition*. Jay Jordan’s examination of South Korea and transnational writing partnerships for writing in the disciplines “closely describes and theorizes the intellectual, social, and material complexities of cross-border educational efforts” which address the “differing expectations, national aspirations, and individual and collective goals and anxieties richly nuanc[ing] the argument that literacies can never be reduced to classroom or curricular plans (back matter)” (2022).

This volume is an appropriate place for highlighting some of the ways the subject matter is developed in volumes and articles published in languages that are not English. It also takes into account that the subject of writing research is often labeled or disciplinarily organized in different ways. Some of the work reported here focuses on writing within a given non-Anglophone

setting, and some focuses on comparisons across national or regional lines, or on the nature and value of transnational work itself. Latin America, Europe, and South Africa provide some rich examples. This work is being heard in these contexts, but rarely in Anglophone ones; we would like to honor these voices in our volume as well.

Latin American work on higher education writing in general, published in Portuguese, Spanish, or French, is widespread (cf. work by authors such as Navarro, Ávila Reyes, Gonzales, Brunner, Miranda, Calle-Arango, Chiroleu, Marquina, Lovera Falcon, Gajardo, Montes, Lizama, Moyano, Natale, Colombi, Pereira, Tapia Ladino, Alves Assis.) For an excellent summary, see the 2021 “On the Teaching of University Writing in Latin America,” Ávila Reyes and Navarro. A trilingual 2019 volume focused on *Práticas discursivas em letramento acadêmico: Questões em estudo* exposes transnational work via essential studies in France and Brazil, including work on formative aspects of academic literacy (Goncalves Correa, 2019); the interaction between disciplinary context and written production (Delcambre, 2019); web-based writing’s discursive practices (Rodriguez & Silva, 2019); or reading-writing relationships in academia (Neves de Brito, 2019).

Research on international exchange programs take place in many languages across non-Anglophone countries, such as the Brazil-Switzerland exchange described by Finardi and colleagues in their 2024 article “Global citizenship and internationalization at home: Insights from the BRASUIS virtual exchange project.” Our project fits into larger themes Finardi and her colleagues pursue, focused on language itself and its central role in the internationalization of higher education. Kyria Finardi and colleagues studied the ways in which epistemologies of the global South and the global North, seen in eleven different countries (most non-English-speaking), can help us to question the role of languages in the production and dissemination of global knowledge. While this broader interest is not directly about writing, it informs the literacy questions that interest transnational writing scholars.²

A new Latin American journal of writing research, *Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios de la Escritura* (RLEE, <https://wac.colostate.edu/rlee/>), is raising awareness of work in multiple contexts. Its goal of publishing in Spanish, Portuguese, and English is borne out in its first edition, with topics from several countries and research traditions side-by-side. Other extended research looking across national borders can be found in *Un estudio de las habilidades de los estudiantes de América Latina y el Caribe* (2010) overseen by Ana

2 This particular article is published in English, but Finardi publishes extensively on the same topics in Spanish.

Attoresi, exploring both process and textual product across 16 Latin American, Mexican, and Caribbean higher education contexts. This work, built from earlier research by the same agency in the 1990s, reports on students' writing in transnational settings via writing tests. The study's final report "offers data on relevant aspects of the writing process and product, such as what is transformed between the draft and the text, the coherence of the information in the final version, the appropriateness of the topic and its adjustment to the communicative situation, the use of lexis and spelling correction, among others" (2010, p. 12) (translation by authors, DeepL assisted).

Research in this part of the world has sometimes been grounded in questions of linguistics and language teaching, as we see in the edited collection serving as proceedings of a 2015 Latin American conference focusing on multilingualism, interculturality and language teaching: *Plurilinguismo, interculturalidad, y enseñanza de lenguas: Lingüística contrastiva y traducción* (Baduy et al., 2015). The volume draws together chapters on diverse facets of plurilingualism, language competence, the teaching of writing, and the necessity for intercultural communication. Other networks are focused on academic literacies in various Latin American contexts. For example, *Universidades en red en torno a las prácticas letradas: aportes a la construcción de saberes en el marco de la integralidad de funciones universitarias* (Giammarini et al., 2023) is grounded in the past twenty years of Latin American research.

The International Exchanges: Latin America book series, established under the WAC Clearinghouse's International Exchanges on the Study of Writing series with lead editor Federico Navarro, highlights years of the region's scholars and their writing research, having secured permissions to make available eleven landmark volumes via open access (see <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/international/la/> and <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/international/>). The series publishes in Spanish, Portuguese and English, with classic volumes such as Giovanni Parodi's 2010 compilation of thirty scholars from Latin America and Spain, *Alfabetización académica y profesional en el siglo xxi: Leer y escribir desde las disciplinas*, Judith Kalman and Brian Street's 2009 compilation on literacy and numeracy in Latin America, *Lectura, escritura y matemáticas como prácticas sociales: Dialogos con América Latina*, and the recent publication of *Centros y programas de escritura en América Latina: Opciones teóricas y pedagógicas para la enseñanza de la escritura disciplinar* (Moyano & Lizamo, 2023). These monographs and collections suggest the range and wealth of research and program development across countries in this part of the world.

Moving to European examples, we might consider Swedish research that highlights the pedagogical choices made in writing centers working with

diverse students. Studies using interviews, observations, writing center documents, students' texts, and videos of tutoring sessions underscore findings that

writing centers have potential to be sites for pedagogical development where tutors can share, with students and staff, their expertise gained when working with a diverse student population. To strengthen writing centers' position at universities, professionalization of tutors is needed and most importantly research needs to be conducted in writing centers. Students from diverse backgrounds are entering higher education and to value their knowledge and experiences is crucial, not least from a democratic perspective. The writing center can play an important role in this effort. (Lennartson-Hokkanen, 2016, abstract)

The studies in Lennartson-Hokkanen's work highlight tutor marginalization and issues with "skills"-based models of writing, while documenting writing centers as sources for significant meaning-making and engagement.

Other Swedish scholars have offered ethnographic insights into the discourses of students, researchers, faculty, and administrators in Swedish universities. Luke Holmes, in his 2022 dissertation (supervisors C. Kerfoot and L. Salo) highlights "potential new ways of engaging, learning, and knowing that might be more justifiably described as ethical and multilingual" (p. iii). This work uncovers the vast multilingual practices at play in a "truly international" modern context.

A special issue in 2020 of the journal *Tijdschrift voor Taalbeheersing* (whose abstract notes that the (sub)discipline *Taalbeheersing* [Discourse Studies] was founded around fifty years ago) addressed current concerns about writing skills of students entering higher education. It outlines key strands of academic literacies research, exploring them "as a process and as a result, as a condition and as an outcome, and from a social as well as from an individual perspective" (p. 224; authors' translation with DeepL support). In that special issue, the 2020 article "Het schrijfcentrum als onderzoeksobject. Een brede verkenning van effectstudies" explores Dutch writing centers in the context of writing centers worldwide and underscores the widely-shared challenge of studying writing center effectiveness empirically. The impact of classroom translanguaging strategies on students is the focus of *Is translanguaging een duurzame strategie voor het hogere onderwijs in Zuid-Afrika?* wherein Adelia Carstens explores student perspectives in the translingual-transnational context of South Africa (2019), one that has often been seen as highly fraught. The author suggests that all learners benefit from translanguaging in the classroom, though differently according to whether the student or the teacher introduces it.

Elke Gilin et al. (2021) investigate assumptions about the linguistic proficiency of what they label L1 and L2 students in the Belgian area of Flanders, where Dutch is the official language, in *Een taalvaardigheidstest voor anderstaligen voorgelegd aan leerlingen in het Nederlandstalig middelbaar onderwijs. Een onverwacht effect?* Studying non-L2 Flemish secondary students who took the Dutch as a Foreign Language university entrance test, she found that non-L2 writers did not necessarily fare better than their L2 counterparts, for whom the test is required. This provocative result could lead to widespread rethinking of questions of linguistic proficiency and “deficiency” in different national contexts.

We discover in German publications, as well, a wealth of coverage. A recent example is the 2020 volume *Schreibwissenschaft. Eine neue Disziplin* by Birgit Huemer et al., which brings works about writing in higher education primarily from Austria, Switzerland, and Germany into transnational conversation with each other. Stephanie Dreyfürst and Nadja Sennewald’s 2014 volume, *Schreiben. Grundlagentexte zur Theorie, Didaktik und Beratung*, represents a cross-national collection of texts exploring central writing studies’ theories and practices from outside of Germany.

Close analysis of academic writing differences in the Baltic States has been at the heart of work by research teams including Anni Jürine et al. (2021); Helen Hint et al. (2023); Anna Ruskan (2020), Dzintra Lele-Rozentāle et al. (2021) among others. As with the others, research by Djuddah Leijen and colleagues explores rhetorical and linguistic structures in these countries, seeking to “address the lack of an empirically grounded holistic understanding of non-Anglophone writing traditions by mapping the academic writing traditions in the national languages of the Baltic States: Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian” (2021, abstract). Hint et al.’s 2022 article “*Eestikeelse akadeemilise teksti tunnustest*” focuses specifically on academic language in Estonian but lays the theoretical and methodological groundwork for the cross-national comparative work that has followed. We underline the fact that analyzing students’ academic writing in Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian contexts has much to offer in terms of research approach and evidence.. Indeed, the article notes that the team seeks to provide an understanding of the essence of an Estonian writing tradition and offers an extensive literature review of the work in this area.

This brief sample of research underscores the value of seeking, recognizing, and engaging with research published not in English or not focused on Anglo-Saxon traditions, actions we see as philosophically aligned with Navarro et al.’s statement about the right to hold conference presentations in languages that are not English (Navarro et al., 2022) Scholars concerned

with transnational/multilingual/translingual and linguistic difference must seek out and read research that arises from non-Anglo-Saxon orientations and is published not in English. But this is also true for those who teach students from countries where writing scholarship has long research traditions: what better ways to understand, think differently about, or design methodology for studying and teaching populations with linguistic differences? For the vibrancy and growth of our field—and to ensure the field does not close in on itself—the Anglo-Saxon writing research community must interrogate its own English-only research world, and not discount other rich and well-developed ways of working and knowing. This includes resisting the tendency to discount research we see as not in our landscape of interest.

The Story of the International Researchers Consortium: Origins, Contexts and Founders

As co-editors of this volume and sponsors of the first full decade of work, we met at one of the early Cornell Consortia for Writing in the Disciplines in 2003, hosted by Jonathan Monroe, which had just begun to feature selected international programs in its multi-day discussions. Donahue, a bilingual/bicultural researcher at a French linguistics research *laboratoire* (*THEODILE*) and faculty member of a U.S. university, and Gannett, a Composition-Rhetoric, Writing Center/WAC faculty with a masters in Applied Linguistics from the US, were on a panel together. We gave our first international panel together in 2005 at the European Writing Center Association (EWCA) conference in Halkidiki, Greece, organized by Anna Challenger.

Cynthia Gannett: While I had taught ESL and tried to be mindful of supporting international and multilingual writers and scholars' many competences and resources in writing courses, writing center, and writing program work, this full immersion into a multi-lingual, multicultural non-US-based literacy studies conference first opened me to the lingering parochial traces of my Anglocentric perspectives about the nature of writing and writing research. It was enormously—and simultaneously—disorienting and exhilarating. These new networks drew me more and more into international conversations and projects, including the developing Writing Development in Higher Education organization and the Academic Literacies movement in the UK, as well as the broad array of language, education and literacy projects in the research centers network across France, and later the European Association of Teachers of Academic Writing (EATAW), International Writing Center Association (IWCA), Writing Research Across Borders (WRAB),

and the International Society for Academic Writing Research (ISAWR). Each of these encounters brought increasing insight, and unequal measure, increasing humility in the face what I needed to learn to participate more fully in this developing area of study world.

Tiane Donahue: My journey started much earlier: my intimate imbrication in all the questions and challenges of the current multi/transnational moment has accompanied me as a bilingual/bi-cultural student and scholar across my whole life. As a dual citizen of France and the United States, I had studied in France at both the secondary and post-secondary levels, ultimately pursuing my PhD at l'Université René Descartes (Paris V) in Linguistics. My dissertation focused on close analysis of French and U.S. student writing, which entailed studying the scholarship and landscape of European and U.S. work on writing in higher education. That experience convinced me that many of the myths circulating in U.S. composition and rhetoric about university writing outside the US needed debunking, and that deep reservoirs of scholarship in those contexts needed to be made visible to U.S. scholars and teachers. I joined a French university research laboratory at l'Université de Lille while remaining faculty for teaching in the US and began various initiatives to foster equal exchange and collaboration between Europe and the US.

Increasingly, we both felt the need to create a specific venue for such conversations at the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), one of our major U.S. professional associations, to allow for greater mutuality of cross-cultural scholarly exchange, and to work to replace export models of knowledge production that were more common in early cross-national encounters. We also felt a strong need to help U.S. scholars and teachers attending the CCCC to begin to see the rich work from outside of the US and to help international scholars at the CCCC to engage more effectively with the CCCC experience.

Equally, we wanted to move away from models of academic research that privilege scholars working alone or in small teams to “perform” publication in the form of high-stakes monologic presentations at scholarly conferences and to produce a continuous stream of articles and monographs regardless of the actual time and resources researchers need to do their work. We realized the short conference presentation format prevented audiences from entering into the complex and multi-tiered contexts (institutional, theoretical, methodological, in practice) that come with international exchange. We wanted to honor individual researchers and projects and their specific contexts, but also create larger transnational communities of practice. Here is what we came up with.

The International Researchers Consortium Workshop: Structure and Development

Responding to the CCCC call for greater “reciprocal relations with international colleagues,” for example, our session description for 2010 aimed for

sustained contact with writing scholars from around the globe who have been engaged in their own novel and situated research projects on essential questions of writing theory, praxis, and pedagogy.... Dialogue with international colleagues requires by its very nature, time for processing and extended discussion, as well as defined protocols for opening up the various cultural, theoretical, and linguistic differences that may prevent scholars from fully engaging or appreciating the larger intellectual, cultural, linguistic-discursive frames and traditions in which the projects take place and produce meaning.

The sustained contact approach, including the reading of each other’s work in advance, was modeled after European approaches to conferences that Donahue had frequently observed and participated in.

The whole process that culminated in the workshop would begin the previous year with a call to all the international list-serves we could locate, as well as networks from previous presenters. We invited very brief descriptions of research projects at any stage of development and corresponded often with all the scholars as they formalized their proposals. We welcomed early-stage projects-in-progress, because those might benefit more from an international set of respondents. We wanted to create a space for cultivating research capacity—to create an enduring community of practice that works to open the conversation on writing research in all kinds of ways—fostering serious, mutual, and sustainable cross-cultural conversation that questions and remakes restrictive notions and practices. In order to traverse the enormous variation in international institutional, cultural, and scholarly-research traditions across national boundaries, and to ensure that respondents were mindful of the situatedness of projects outside their immediate scope of understanding, we asked them to post: (1) Institutional descriptions and contexts, (2) a glossary of context, culture-specific, or research-specific terms, and (3) a digest of key theories, theorists or frames used in the study along with their drafts-in-progress. These were posted on the International Writing Studies CompFAQ wiki many weeks before the workshop, so everyone could read across all the projects that would be discussed during the workshop. Presenters could also

correspond with other presenters ahead of time if they found connections, new research, or new questions to take up, to begin to develop a sense of community and mutuality. The key aim was that participants would engage with each other's work ahead of the full-day event so that informed conversation about the projects and their contexts could take place.

For the workshop itself, rather than using expert workshop leaders to present their work to a receptive audience, everyone was a presenter-facilitator of a discussion about their own work, as well as a willing, better-prepared respondent for several other papers across a range of subjects and research traditions throughout the day. And while the workshop took place primarily in English, the various projects and researcher's language practices required an openness to many kinds of language meshing. Everyone had to agree to be comfortable with being uncomfortable. Over time, the maxim "We are all experts; we are all novices." became a mantra for the workshop. Thus, we attempted to build the workshop to create a series of spaces for immersive cross-national conversation and to establish supportive environments for scholars at every professional level to interact as equals. We very intentionally set aside the notion that writing research was a U.S.-only domain of expertise and created a space where U.S. researchers could begin to understand the research being done in other locations world-wide.

The collaborative exchange at the heart of the workshop, both in advance of the meeting and in person, was also intended to invite metacommentary on the complexities of attempting—and attending to—international writing research itself. To that end, we included multiple full group encounters across the day to harvest our insights, findings and ongoing questions. We used four overarching areas of interactive questions to structure these broader dynamic conversations each year:

1. What is research? What counts for research or credible research methodology in different contexts? What are the fields in which the writing research can be found? How are they linked to where and how writing is taught, learned, and practiced across the world?
2. Which populations, sites and demographics are studied and why? What kinds of courses, programs, interventions, concerns, or practices are objects of research within or across contexts and cultures?
3. How do questions about a particular language complicate our work geopolitically, linguistically and rhetorically? Or the necessity of working across and through multiple languages? And what about seemingly transparent textual practices (like citation or other standard conventions)?

4. What do we take as the evolving meanings of “international” or “global” or “transnational” for our concerns? How do local cultural and institutional frames shape these meanings and vice versa?

As each workshop ended, we also asked the participants to share the kinds of resources they could cultivate for themselves and with others in the coming year—new research interests and resources, new colleagues, future opportunities for collaboration, presentations, consulting, and publication. Responses to these questions thread through the chapters in this collection.

Participants were also invited to return in future years as their own work developed or in the company of new researchers who could benefit from this special kind of research community—in essence to continue the work of cultivating collective research capacity. Of course, the International Researchers Consortium developed and evolved in new directions over the next dozen years. Originally it was allied structurally with the CCCC Committee on Globalization, and later the Second Language and the Transnational groups, but these alliances did not guarantee a slot in the conference, and the process of designing and organizing yearly full-day workshops disclosed hidden structures of exclusion that created significant obstacles.

Over time, it became clear that the CCCC was not a perfect vehicle to host this type of international gathering. Even with provisional acceptance to the workshop, acceptances were sometimes sent too late for international scholars to arrange for travel. One year, a CCCC committee accepted the morning half of the conference, but not the afternoon half of the SAME workshop, so we had to rent our own space and serve everyone lunch to allow for the time frame needed. Lack of clear signage and other informational resources made it much harder for multilingual scholars to navigate the locations, or even find coffee after very long travels. On several occasions, the CCCC administrative process did not issue all the presenters’ individual invitations until we requested them, nor were all individuals identified fully in print and online conference programs, simple but essential requirements for international travelers to get funding and travel visas. Later, when the conference went fully online because of COVID, the time slots given would not work—not only for the time required for the workshop itself, but also because international work requires coordination across many time zones. Working through these issues explicitly reminded us, and those running the CCCC across the years, about the many invisible challenges involved in attempting inclusive work across borders.

Even with institutional challenges, the workshop evolved in terms of international participation and scope as well. In the first two years, our multi-national

scholars were more often located in the US or UK or had connections to U.S. or UK scholars or institutions. In 2009, for example, the workshop drew sixteen scholars including Chris Anson, Kathy Cain, and Joan Mullin from the US and several well-known researchers from the UK: Mary Deane, Rebecca O'Rourke, Joelle Adams, Mary McKeever, Margo Blythman, Mary Scott, and Joan Turner, as well as Dilek Tokay (Turkey), Gerd Braüer (Switzerland) and Susan Thomas (Australia). The research studies included a variety of international populations and study sites in Turkey, Ireland, Switzerland, Lebanon, Australia, and Sweden. By 2010, we had 18 scholars representing 12 countries, and by 2011, we had 38 scholars from 18 countries participating! Eight years into the project, by 2014, the workshop was hosting 40 scholars from 24 countries working on 33 separate projects. Even with all its warts, the scholars found the experience so worthwhile that they promoted it in other international groups and networks, and several scholars have returned with later versions or new projects and brought their colleagues. We understood, too, when researchers could not travel to join us, often for institutional, cultural, and political reasons, and invited them back for the next year. We always appreciated the enormous efforts of these scholars who came at very considerable cost to themselves in time, energy and other resources in order to share with each other and to renew/remake scholarship for U.S. scholars who had much to learn from them. In October 2014, our proposal to become a "Standing Group" of the CCCC was accepted, so we could create a larger international board, begin new initiatives, and have a guaranteed slot on the program from 2015 on (though in 2021 that guarantee was not honored and we hosted the workshop independently).

In 2014, to assess the workshops' effectiveness and determine how to direct future efforts, the new IRC Standing Group surveyed 180 participants of previous workshops from 45 countries to find out what they found important or distinctive about the work of the IRC. Here is a representative sample of responses that speak to aspects of the IRC found most valuable in the community:

Pavel Zemliansky: The most useful and inspiring aspect of these workshops (I have participated in 3 so far) is the ability to meet with colleagues from across the world and discuss issues in writing instruction in various countries. I am always reminded that writing instruction and writing research are local, and affected by larger social, educational, and even political forces. I am also reminded that we as a profession need to get beyond the U.S.-centric view of writing studies and that we have much to learn from colleagues abroad, as they have much to learn from us.

Zsuzsanna Palmer: The workshop made me realize that we work in different institutional and national contexts. Opening up a dialog about the most

effective ways we can teach our writing students exposed each participant to a much wider array of teaching approaches. In addition, I learned about writing scholarship widely known in other countries that is relevant to my research but is not well represented in North American professional journals. Through the international writing workshop I was able to widen both my teaching and research horizons.

Baldur Sigurðsson: The international workshop 2014 was an enriching experience, a unique opportunity to meet researchers from many countries presenting their papers or drafts in a relaxed atmosphere, characterized by shared interests and confidence. Thanks to the stimulating organizers, that conducted the workshop with firm hand, based on a solid experience. I think everybody got the most possible positive feedback on what they were doing. Very good memories.

Mary McKeever: I will never forget my first visit to CCCC. I felt overwhelmed by the sheer scale of the event, the huge number of participants and the seemingly impossible choices to be made. The international consortium, which met before the conference started, helped me to simultaneously lose my bearings and to find my feet. It gave me an awareness of the limitations of my own parochial, Anglo-centric world and at the same time helped me narrow down the field and select the best presentations of the conference—many of which were by participants in the group.

Connie Kendall Theado: The format of this workshop—share drafts prior to the conference so that those in attendance can preview their colleagues' work ahead of time and, as a result, spend the workshop time in deeper conversation with one another—is a particular (and I'd add, unique!) benefit to participants. For those of us just launching a study, the feedback received from colleagues is immeasurably helpful. The first time I participated in this workshop, I received this kind of feedback and when I returned to Cincinnati, I was able to modify my IRB protocol to gather better data. All good!

Montserrat Castelló: I have great memories of the Workshop. It was amazing to join those people from over the world, read their work and have the opportunity to engage in a really fruitful discussion during the workshop! I will be back again soon.

Jennifer Craig: I participated in a pre-conference workshop in 2012 re: International Writing Research, and that exchange was the most valuable experience I had during the 2012 CCCC conference. I think it was so powerful because of the caliber of the people who participated, but also the dynamic discussion of information.

Brooke Ricker: I'm currently in Serbia doing my dissertation research, and my internet access is somewhat limited, but I wanted to be in support of

your efforts, if it's still useful. I had a wonderful experience with the International Research workshop in 2013; I received wonderful feedback from the group and was also able to connect with another scholar who was putting together an edited collection on writing instruction in post-Communist contexts and invited me to contribute a chapter. As a novice academic, this was an important moment for my involvement in the field of writing studies, as it encouraged me to continue pursuing international research.

Vasiliki Khourbani: First of all, I am deeply grateful for you both for your vision in initiating this collaboration which allows participants to get in touch with best practices and promote their research in the emerging global knowledge economy of the 21st century. Having attended the CCCC Conference for the first time, I really enjoyed the International Research Workshop which gave me the chance to present my research data, delve deeper into wonderfully raised and engaging topics and interact with participants from different linguistic, institutional, geographic, and pedagogical places.

Cecile Badenhorst: As a scholar from the global South, now working in North America, I found the International Research Workshop to be invaluable in helping me integrate in this context.... I have made connections and developed colleagues working on similar research areas which has led to further successful projects. I found it an invaluable forum for showcasing research and networking.

Melanie Brinkschulte: I attended the workshop at the CCCC in 2010. It was the most inspiring workshop I had because I met so many international researchers and got the chance to establish a network of international working researchers.

Amy Zenger: I have attended the international research workshop several times. Over the years it has become increasingly diverse, and more and more exciting because of this. The diversity emerges not only through the identities of researchers or locations of teaching; programs may approach their work from a different perspective, and research methods may be new to me—perhaps because the methods are practiced in a related field. I was especially happy to discuss archival research one year with a scholar working in Romania; we were studying archives in Beirut. I also love seeing projects at all sorts of stages—they have ranged from a generative set of ideas scrawled on a few pages to publication-ready studies. The structure of the workshop is what I find most invigorating, however. Having to share papers ahead of time and read each other's work makes substantive discussions more likely and allows more voices to participate.

Ligia Mihut: In 2012, I shared a draft of my first experience of doing work in the archives in Romania. My draft was about the literacy education in 1980s in

Communist Romania. Although it was a difficult text to write and read, I found a very patient audience at International Research workshop at the CCCC. They helped me sort through murky ideas and center my work on relevant issues. Also, my work did not seem to fit in any other “categories” of interest: it was international, historical, ethnographic, and highly political. Yet, this workshop welcomed mixed methods and a challenging research topic.

As much as our participants and we ourselves had enjoyed the marvelous and meaningful work of coordinating the IRC by ourselves for so many years, we (Tiane and Cinthia) realized that to ensure the international/transnational possibilities of the IRC both within and beyond the CCCs, we needed to create a truly international steering committee and be willing to step down from that advisory group over time. By its ten-year anniversary in 2018, the IRC had begun to transform itself in a variety of new directions: we now had an excellent International Steering Committee: Magnus Gustafsson (Sweden), Lance Cummings (US), Steffen Guenzel (US/Germany), Anne-Marie Eriksson (Sweden), Violeta Molina (Colombia), Monserrat Castelló (Spain), Tiane Donahue (US/France). We began to experiment with different ways to record and preserve our rich conversations during the workshop itself, as well as piloting some forms of virtual participation.

The IRC has also begun to extend its work well beyond the CCCCs format to increase participation for international scholars who cannot travel to the U.S. by planning events in international spaces, realizing its original mission even more fully than we could have imagined in 2008. A small group of IRC researchers met at the WRAB meeting in Bogota, Colombia in 2016. And other planned workshops have been held in Porto, Portugal at the European Literacy Network Conference in 2018, and in Gothenburg, Sweden in July 2019 in connection with the tenth EATAW conference. In addition to a CCCC meeting in 2023, the IRC board hosted an international workshop in conjunction with the WRAB Conference in Trondheim, Norway in February of that year.

The challenges faced by the IRC have also brought successes: The development of a virtual platform proved prescient as COVID swept across the globe in 2020. The profound effects of the global pandemic over the last few years made daily and academic life enormously difficult for everyone: the 2020 conference was canceled and the 2021 conference was reduced and delivered only as a virtual workshop. The 2022 conference remained virtual as well and faced several challenges because the CCCC's virtual conference structure permitted only two-hour meetings rather than full day workshops and required other accommodations which forced several researchers to withdraw. More broadly, the massive disruptions to family, social, economic, and academic life brought much of the work of the IRC to a halt, for an extended time

including the work on this collection. Even so, we are heartened by the subsequent expansion of the IRC and pleased to be able to bring this book project to fruition after many years of work, grateful for the intellectual resilience and persistence of the authors, and thankful for the International Exchanges book series editors who accompanied us throughout this extended, humbling, and turbulent journey.

The Collection: Cultivating Collective Research Capacity Through International Exchanges about Higher Education Research

Cultivating Collective Research Capacity has been under discussion as a key project for the IRC since the earliest workshops. The manuscript process began in earnest in 2019 with the initial proposal to the WAC Clearinghouse's International Exchanges in the Studies of Writing book series, and despite many setbacks for the authors and editors during this period, the small silver lining is that the extended time gave all the authors needed periods for rethinking and revision, and as editors, we had the chance to let the essays teach us as they developed. That process taught us even more about international collaboration, in this case in times of global stress, and while this is the first book that thoughtfully reflects on the results of IRC researchers, we hope it is not the last that draws on IRC experience. In keeping with the original IRC workshop, the authors have included small sections on key terms and theories, institutional contexts, and reflective commentaries on their experiences in researching and writing. We also asked writers to comment on their engagements with the IRC workshop itself, to give readers a more holistic view of the scholars, their larger scholarship, their histories, and their situations, continuing the practice of "metacommentary as research/ research as metacommentary" so central to the habitus of the IRC.

The nine essays from nineteen scholars featured here span three continents and several countries, including Colombia, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, China, the UAE, France, Lebanon, the US, Estonia, and Romania. There are several comparative studies, such as the one by Narváez and her colleagues, or the chapter by Leijen, Hint, and Jürine. Most, in the spirit of Chitez and Kruse (2012) or Björk, Bräuer, Rienecker, and Stray Jörgensen (2003), are not comparing U.S. writing projects to international writing projects, but rather working across their own national boundaries as the IRC workshop always encouraged. Others focus entirely on a situation within a specific country, also in the spirit of IRC, in some cases including U.S. perspectives, but not setting

them as the standard of comparison. This collection is organized generally from those that take on broad multi- or transnational projects to those that have more specific objectives or sites of study. More importantly, it is meant to spark readers' own linkages and alignments and encourage all of us to question the basis of our national frames as we work with students and researchers across borders.

We start this collection with Ligia A. Mihut's research, which complicates questions surrounding multiple, interactive European writing traditions across personal, institutional, national, and transnational levels by considering how they operate simultaneously and in different proportions for different faculty within a single location, the West University of Timisoara (UVT) in Romania. She examines how Romania's own historical predisposition towards an "ethos of learning" and its more recent history of Romanian communist education with its "mutilated curriculum" is complicated by two additional factors. The institutional culture is composed of faculty who, despite the Romanian context, call on German, French and Anglo-Saxon writing tradition models in wide circulation across Europe. Added to this complexity of approaches to writing are EU multilingual policies installed since the Bologna Declaration in 1999 that bring both standardization as well as flexibility in discursive education.

To make sense of the interactions, Mihut maps the interactive dynamics of these influences through accounts of specific faculty who teach writing at UVT. Using richly coded interview data from eight extended interviews, she focuses on three writing faculty who call on their multiple "affinities" with language, national culture, linguistic, and pedagogical features to describe their own theories and practices as they negotiate the current EU guidelines. Building on her earlier work with the concept of affinity to understand "how transnational mobility is enacted," she demonstrates that scholars' affinities with particular traditions evolve, as they "adopt a certain global discourse in their teaching and research, while also maintaining their own local and national identities." She developed these theories of affinity in part through years of participation at the IRC and the Transnational Group at the CCCCs, where she also helped create and sustain new networks of international researchers, such as the larger cross-cultural, multi-sited collaborative study of writing in four countries (Colombia, Nepal, India, and Romania) of which this project is a part.

Otto Kruse also examines how writing cultures are central to understanding differences across local cultures, in this case, across disciplines. After exploring the notion of "culture" more generally, Kruse offers a frame for *writing cultures* that includes interrelated dimensions of writing practices,

languages, genres, beliefs, skills, and support that make up their defining core. He focuses on the dimensions of beliefs, skills, and support in three disciplines: mathematics and sciences, humanities, and the social science of economics, policy, and the law.

Using a European Writing Survey developed to identify features of writing cultures (with responses from 438 undergraduate students and 144 faculty), he compares what faculty value in student writing, what they consider “good writing” to be, and what students value and consider. While the study finds a fair degree of coherence between faculty and students overall in terms of what’s valued, gaps were evident between the two populations’ perceived actual competence in the areas valued. In comparing the data across populations, Kruse also found in-depth and provocative descriptions of disciplinary differences, particularly in terms of critical thinking and constructing convincing arguments.

Kruse underscores the value of interacting with scholars not just from different regions, but also from different institutional contexts and levels of resource. And his reflective piece highlights several points, among them, that encounters with other scholars can prompt our thinking and help us to question our research design and assumptions. He mentions the IRC collaboration helped him to move beyond his own “Euro-centered” perspective. Reading his comments about these differences underscores the necessity of scholars’ reflection on their home traditions, whatever they may be.

The large collaborative research project authored by Elizabeth Narváez, Ingrid Luengas, Marisol Gómez, Luz Ángela García, Blanca González, and Hermínsul Jiménez provides yet another lens on international writing studies projects as it contributes to the field of studies on higher education literacy research in Latin-American Spanish-speaking countries—as well as international Literacy Studies. An established network of researchers at four public and private Colombian universities from different regions of the country developed an extensive literature review and mapped out the history of writing research in this context, surveying the rich number of studies from the early 1980s. Most of the studies have focused on varied disciplinary and institutional descriptions of writing development, identified as “immersive” training, rather than a defined sequence of courses across the vertical curriculum. While there are important studies of workplace and professional writing conducted in Spanish, the authors note that very few of the studies treat the actual workplace writing experiences from the perspective of alumni. An additional exigence for this study came in the form of a new national generic writing assessment (2010) for all advanced undergraduates, one which claimed to be useful for assessing success in later workplace writing.

Well-versed international researchers, Narváez, Luengas, Gómez, García, González, and Jiménez made use of the new transnational conversations to consider multiple theoretical and conceptual methodologies to incorporate, create, and analyze “panoramic” data to build large, but nuanced understandings of the multiple lives of writing. In this research study, they decided to consider how a single essay from a single student prompt could address the varieties of interdisciplinary and team-based workplace writing situations alumni would find themselves in. Using models from activity theory and communities of practice research, they characterized many specific ecologies of workplace writing in four professional fields through detailed survey and case study findings for alumni from all four institutions. This study will help create aggregate data on alumni workplace writing in Colombia, and the findings suggest that the type of assessment currently enacted might need to be reconsidered if it is intended to inform claims of student workplace writing effectiveness.

Sabine Dengscherz continues the volume with a seemingly simple and general claim, “Writing is a collective phenomenon.” But her essay is a sophisticated treatment of the specific, multi-layered, and multilingual manifestations of that phenomenon through her site of study, her theoretical fellow travelers, and the actual encounters that led her to a set of research studies on writing processes and strategies. In her work at the University of Vienna’s Center for Translation Studies (CTS) she has been attempting to understand the complex forms of professional writing strategies that students undertake in at least two or three working languages. In mixed method studies (case studies, analyzed student discussions, interviews, and survey questionnaires), she explored writing processes in German, English, French, and Hungarian against the background of individual stories of writing development. While the context is local in one regard, the situation is clearly international and transnational in scope.

Adapting her colleague M Knappik’s work on *viability* as a key social construct (from Judith Butler’s notion of the viable, legitimized writing subject), Dengscherz uses both theory from several language and cultural traditions and insights from her empirical work to posit a new stage in viability development, one that moves beyond writer’s competent submission to standards and conventions and into the enactment of real discursive agency. Interestingly, she also claims that the IRC aims and practices themselves can act to sponsor “writing through viability” in the way that they create a community that is both academic and professional but also open to multiple insights and perspectives on language use that counter typical forms of hegemonic academic discourse. In Dengscherz’s reflections, she notes that presenting her early scholarship at the 2016 IRC gave her important new insights on

professional multilingual writing development as the conversations helped open up the term “professional” from several perspectives and engaged her more fully with other international researchers on multilingual writing development. This enriched perspective promoted the rich theoretical frame she developed over the next several years.

In Djuddah Leijen, Helen Hint, and Anni Jürine’s chapter, researchers at a relatively newly established multilingual writing center at the University of Tartu in Estonia found themselves working to identify and negotiate what appeared to be implicit Anglo-American notions of writing acting as default models both for Estonian writers and for writers from other language backgrounds. When Leijen, Hint, and Jürine brought an early part of the project to the IRC in 2018—on creating an Academic Phrasebank for writing in Estonian as an aid for students—the conversation led them to question what they actually knew or understood to be an Estonian writing tradition, and they decided to explore the research literature on that subject. Given how little literature was available, they determined to understand the foundations of these multiple, and divergent orientations, and how to address them by taking up the critical and sometimes vexed set of questions relating to what constitutes a “writing tradition” within and across languages and cultures and how that knowledge could help them—and other international scholar-teachers—create more informed pedagogical choices.

They first identify some key issues: the dominance of studies in and about English as the privileged source for contrast, the lack of studies on writing traditions in other languages, and the overarching lack of methodological systematicity in considering different levels of textual and genre features (micro, meso, and macro). To begin to address these serious issues, they undertake a rich, detailed, and comprehensive literature review and synthesis across several regional languages and cultures to identify features which can be used to create a broader, more coherent, and more equitable model, one which allows for diversity and variation without privileging a single language or set of dominant languages. The research synthesis is enormously valuable for the diversity of fields and approaches it draws on, and the consequent first full draft of a model provides an excellent framework for productive international/cross-national scholarly and pedagogical work. Their next step is to collaborate with a network of other Baltic State scholars to use their findings to map out the writing and language traditions of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, each quite distinctive, but also sharing geographical proximity, and other historical and cultural experiences. Thus, the questions raised in a single writing center in Estonia promise to make important contributions to international writing studies regionally, as well as globally.

While Dengscherz takes up the large construct of viability in writing studies, Xiqiao Wang, Lifang Bai, and Yixuan Juang treat the notion of *literacy mobility* as it expresses itself at the intersection of digital technologies and global migration processes. They note that most such research to date has focused on migrants, positioning literacy as a key component of global migration, but migration also occurs in the less-examined context of intra-national migration. Their rich case study is of one multilingual writer in a Chinese university who “works with, through, and against national initiatives, regional development plans, and institutional practices to manage her own geographic, academic, social and professional movement.” This case study offers key insights into the literacy context in China, one that needs to be much more fully understood. The authors suggest that Jan Blommaert’s framing of “scale” is particularly generative in this context and in the broader work of studying multilingual practices and identities. They use five scales of mobility—geographic, literate, imaginary, disciplinary, and social/class-based—to pull apart the layers of mobility in play. The case of graduate student Yi, chosen for the study, offers evidence of multilingual repertoires evolving alongside school- and self-sponsored literacies. The wealth of data collected—semi-structured interviews, field notes/audio recordings both in class and outside of classroom activity, drafting activities, and actual writing—built a deep resource for studying every aspect of the literate development in question. Their careful analysis of these aspects, informed by theories of literacy mobility developed in Rebecca Lorimer Leonard’s work, highlights a profile of someone who could be seen as an unusual and extraordinary individual. However, as we read, we see that Yi is an example of the typical richness and complexity in all literate activity and the sophisticated, strategic ways in which multilinguals mobilize and weave semiotic resources to achieve contingent rhetorical goals as they work across boundaries of various types, in both fluid and frictioned moments. In some ways, the reflection offered by Xiqiao about her IRC workshop experiences (as the author who attended) is its own example of the multilingual literate mobility she studies in Yi. The workshop also set the stage for her partnerships with the future co-authors, via layered discourses across the contexts they navigated.

In her chapter, an intervention study of French student writers, Dyanne Escorcía also draws on metacognitive and sociocultural /contextual theory and framing in ways resonant with the work of Kruse or Leijen, Hint, and Jürine on “writing traditions.” She explores the ways a specific intervention helps college students to improve their writing, situating her work in the French domain of *littéracies universitaires*, which underscores resistance to a deficit model of writing (any difficulties are “part of the integration processes

that students display while learning the diverse writing practices in HE”). Her project invited students to join a pilot program of writing instruction designed to address needs that had been identified by faculty. The study was grounded in already well-researched support for the value of metacognition, in particular, that student awareness of difficulties leads to improvement. The study tested three approaches: developing metacognitive awareness; teaching students about planning and revising processes they can control; and inviting them to tutor each other. Using pre- and post-writing samples, Escorcia was able to demonstrate that some features improved (“relevance” and “syntax”), while their “coherence” and mastery of their author-roles did not. The chapter also confirmed the existence of a history of writing instruction in France, though not under that name.

Escorcia’s reflection about participation in the IRC workshop suggests that it supported both her research approach and her options for approaching teaching. The same benefits she describes from her participation in the workshop are the benefits readers can draw from this volume, and that we as editors can see for ourselves: encountering scholars from different countries and contexts; finding in-depth treatments of writing support; seeing the diversity of disciplinary angles to our common questions.

While many of the studies in the collection consider local, national or regional institutions (students, faculty, curricula) managing complex writing, speaking, language and other discursive traditions, both historical and current, the study offered by Lynne Ronesi and Maria Eleftheriou has a different twist, as its site is an American university in the United Arab Emirates—the American University of Sharjah (AUS)—a superdiverse institution of over 70 student nationalities, negotiating its American identities, structure, practices, and pedagogies in a MENA (Middle East North African) context. Inspired by her first experience at 2017 IRC workshop, Ronesi committed to returning in 2018 with a proposal to study a phenomenon that had long intrigued her as the AUS writing center tutor trainer: the commitment of engineering-major writing center tutors (EMWTs) in view of the “technical-social dualism” through which disciplines like engineering often privilege technical over social and communicative discursive competences. Given that this tension is amplified in MENA countries which attach higher social status to technical fields and lower status to the humanities, she and Maria, the AUS writing center director, determined to understand more about how EMWTs negotiate their writing center and disciplinary identities and experiences, and how they might be able to help others negotiate those multiple and potentially conflicting spaces. The eight research subjects (4 male, 4 female) from several countries— some dual nationality, all with heritage languages other

than English and from varied high school curricula, underwent recorded semi-structured interviews which were transcribed and collaboratively coded. Their analysis found that while the EMWTs' academic experiences did not emphasize literacy and social learning skills, those very skills were noted and appreciated by fellow engineering students, their professors, and prospective employers. Moreover, the study identified epistemological similarities between engineering education and writing tutor training that affirm the potential for mutual interdisciplinary exchange between the engineering department and the writing center.

The final essay in the collection directly takes up one of our central ongoing questions, "What constitutes research?" for writing and literacy teaching and research in this new era of international, transnational, and global higher education. Belinda Walzer and Paula Abboud Habre seek to critique some of the more traditional quantitative and qualitative methodologies often used in writing studies. Instead, they theorize their international collaboration—what they call a *collaboratory*—as the deliverable itself. Rather than their international partnership across the US and Lebanese contexts resulting in quantifiable outcomes and data generalizations, they conclude that the value of their collaboratory is the ongoing, sustained relationship they built over the years and the mutual knowledge-making process itself. Both writing center directors at their respective institutions in the US and Lebanon at the time of the study, Walzer and Habre connected at the 2017 International Research Colloquium after collaborating virtually for several years. It was at the IRC where they discovered both what was unique about their situation, but also that they were part of a "much larger existing conversation and network of international research partnerships."

The essay details the particular challenges they met as they attempted to conduct a large, ambitious, empirical research study virtually across institutions and their growing realization that "producing" a piece of standard published research was not workable, and indeed, not the final aim of their scholarly partnership. "Post-qualitative research," which they explain in depth, thus allowed them a methodology to understand the ways in which their "collaboratory" became the subject of the inquiry itself, demonstrating how it provided the kind of intellectually and personally supportive and generative "third space" where they could problem solve, share resources, and partner in writing center practice to support genuine transnational insights for themselves, their pedagogy, their writing centers, and their changing multicultural and multilingual institutional contexts. In other words, their research was the praxis; a kind of action research. Tracing the longer arc of their intellectual partnership, they show how their scholarly and personal relationship

has extended beyond their original institutions and positions and continues to enrich their professional and pedagogical work to this day. In sum, they make the case that establishing (and studying) these long term inter- and transnational partnerships on a meta-critical level is a vital, if often invisible aspect of international writing studies, and they argue that their own collaborative is, in essence, a clear instance of the value of the larger extended dialogic network of the IRC.

Looking Back, Looking Forward: “Every seed bursts its container.”

In an important sense, the collection acts as testament to our collective devotion to the first incarnation of the IRC—we hope it will be one milestone in a robust and supportive network for decades to come. We see the work presented here as contributing to a strong tradition of publications across national and international geographic contexts. While transnationalism is not an explicit frame for this collection, we remember, too, that transnationalism is neither new nor the sole purview of writing studies (!), and that there is a wealth of scholarship about writing, everywhere, often not in English.

As our position statement situated before this Introduction indicated, we have tried to be mindful of publishing and editing processes that balance various privileged forms of “standardization” and reader conventions with the imperative to be mindful of the variety of language and genre conventions readily and appropriately at play in international scholarly exchange. The International Exchanges series co-editors and the editors of this collection conducted long conversations and email exchanges about what kind of editing would respect those Englishes used outside of standard U.S. academic circles; about whether Standard American English-speaking academics would dismiss a chapter that did not meet preconceived ideas of how an academic article in English should read; about whether we could press against that attitude and help readers to reorient their expectations; and whether academic readers would reject or be curious about references that were not in current SAE canons. Just as in the IRC workshops, we editors had to negotiate our own blind spots and work out how we would enact ethical publication standards.

We invite readers to do the same, that is to examine their own systemically embedded assumptions about how we exchange, collaborate on and respect communicative practices across borders and languages. We invite readers to interrogate their own academic and cultural screens: what might the application of western academic traditions erase? While much work has emerged on students’ linguistic agency within classrooms and institutions, how can that

work expand to academics open to new ways of listening to and coding our knowledge construction as academic researchers?

And as we consider the future of the IRC, we understand (to paraphrase the early 20th century American diarist Florida Scott-Maxwell) that every seed bursts its container or else there would be no growth. The CCCCs IRC will no longer be the sole “container” for our work as we seek new forums and associations to move our work forward. This first formal collection marks the end of the era of our collective work and launches us into the next incarnation of this dynamic, but continuous scholarly community. We celebrate this opportunity to honor the invaluable contributions of these international authors, who have so much to offer us all; we know that readers will engage them in the spirit of the IRC workshops—reading with full attention and with open hearts and minds.

References

- Attoresi, A. (Ed.). (2010). *Un estudio de las habilidades de los estudiantes de américa latina y el caribe*. OREALC. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/search/79c0a2a3-6d88-4ff2-a316-0356351ee0d8>
- Avila-Reyes, N., & Navarro, F. (2021). On the teaching of university writing in Latin America. *Composition Studies*, 49(3), 171-175. <https://tinyurl.com/yc4kt7vr>
- Baduy, M., Bogliotti, A. M., Ledesma, M. M., Pérez, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Plurilingüismo, Interculturalidad, y Enseñanza de Lenguas 6: Lingüística Contrastiva y Traducción*. [Minutes of the XV Conference and II Latin American Congress on the Teaching of Foreign Languages at the Higher Level. Volume 6, Multilingualism, interculturality and language teaching; contrastive linguistics and translation]. <http://hdl.handle.net/11086/5574>
- Barnawi, O. (2018). *Writing centers in the higher education landscape of the Arabian Gulf*. Palgrave MacMillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-55366-5>
- Björk, L., Bräuer, G., Rienecker, L., & Stray Jörgensen, P. (Eds.). (2003). *Teaching academic writing in European higher education*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Boter, C., Rensen, M., & Scott-Smith, G. (2020). *Unhinging the national framework: Perspectives on transnational life writing*. Sidestone Press.
- Carstens A. (2019) Is translanguaging een duurzame strategie voor het hoger onderwijs in zuid-afrika? *Tijdschrift voor Taalbeheersing*, 41(1), 33-46. <https://doi.org/10.5117/TVT2019.1.003.CARS>
- Castello, M., & Donahue, C. (Eds.). (2012). *University writing: Selves and texts in academic societies*. Emerald.
- Conference on College Composition and Communication. (1956). The foreign student in the freshman course. *College Composition and Communication*, 7(3), 122-124. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/355150>
- Chitez, M., Dorohoschi, C., Kruse, O., & Salski, L. (2018). *University writing in central and eastern Europe: Tradition, transition, and innovation*. Springer.

- Chitez, M., & Kruse, O. (2012). Writing cultures and genres in European higher education. In M. Castello, & C. Donahue (Eds.), *University writing: Selves and texts in academic societies* (pp. 151-175). Emerald.
- Deane, M., & O'Neill, P. (Eds.). (2011). *Writing in the disciplines*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Delcambre, I. (2019). Contexte(s) et production d'écrits à l'université. In F. Komesu & J. Alves Assis (Eds.), *Práticas discursivas em letramento acadêmico: Questões em estudo* (pp. 29-46). Editora Puc Minas.
- Donahue, C., & Horner, B. (Eds.). (2022). *Teaching and studying transnational composition*. Modern Language Association
- Dreyfurst, S., & Sennewald, N. (2014). Schreiben. Grundlagentexte zur theorie, didaktik und beratung. UTB GmbH.
- Finardi, K., Amorim, G., Sarmiento, S. (2024). Internationalization of higher education and the role of languages: Insights from the Global North and the Global South. Education and Linguistics Research. Macrothink Institute. <https://doi.org/10.5296/elr.v10i1.22006>
- Finardi, K., Salvadori, J., Wehrli, A. (2024). Global citizenship and internationalization at home: Insights from the BRASUIS Virtual Exchange Project. *Studies in English Language Teaching*, 12, 59-72.
- Foster, D., & Russell, D. (Eds.). (2002). *Writing and learning in cross-national perspective: transitions from secondary to higher education*. Routledge.
- Ganobcsik-Williams, L. (Ed.). (2017). *Teaching academic writing in UK higher education: Theories, practices, and models*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Giammarini, G. L., Waigandt, D., Castagno, F., & Ávila, X. (2023). Universidades en red en torno a las prácticas letradas: Aportes a la construcción de saberes en el marco de la integralidad de funciones universitarias. +E: *Revista De Extensión Universitaria*, 13(19. Jul-Dic) e0009. <https://doi.org/10.14409/extension.2023.19.Jul-Dic.e0009>
- Gilin, E., Heeren, J., & De Wachter, L. (2021). Een taalvaardigheidstest voor anderstaligen voorgelegd aan leerlingen in het nederlandstalig middelbaar onderwijs. een onverwacht effect? *Tijdschrift voor Taalbeheersing, Internationale Neerlandistiek*, 59(2), 99-113. <https://doi.org/10.5117/IN2021.2.001.GILI>
- Goncalves Correa, M. (2019). Aspectos formadores do letramento acadêmico: ler segundo diferentes perspectivas linguísticas. In F. Komesu & J. Alves Assis (Eds.), *Práticas discursivas em letramento acadêmico: Questões em estudo* (pp. 14-29). Editora Puc Minas.
- Gorska, E. (2012). Writing centers in Central and Eastern Europe. In C. Thaiss, G. Bräuer, P. Carlino, L. Ganobcsik-Williams, & A. Sinha (Eds.), *Writing programs worldwide: Profiles of academic writing in many places* (pp. 263-276). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2012.0346>
- Graham, S., Rijlaarsdam, G. (2016). Writing education around the globe: Introduction and call for a new global analysis. *Reading and Writing*, 29, 781-792. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-016-9640-1>
- Gustafsson, Magnus, & Eriksson, Andreas (Eds.). (2022). *Negotiating the intersections of writing and writing instruction*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/INT-B.2022.1466>

- Harbord, J. (2010). Writing in Central and Eastern Europe: Stakeholders and directions in initiating change. *Across the Disciplines*, 7(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2010.7.1.03>
- Hint, H., Leijen, D., & Jürine, A. (2022). Eestikeelse akadeemilise teksti tunnustest. *Keel Ja Kirjandus*. <https://doi.org/10.54013/kk772a3>
- Hint, H., Lemendik, H., Johansson, C., Leijen, D. (2023). Metadiscourse markers in Estonian academic text: What are they like and where can they be found. *SSRN Electronic Journal*
- Holmes, L. (2022). Of ethics and multilingualism in internationalizing academia: Ethical events in Swedish university life. [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. University of the West of Scotland.
- Huemer, B., Doleschal, U., Wiederkehr, R., Girgensohn, K., Dengerscherz S., Brinkschulte, M., & Mertlitsch, C. (2020). *Schreibwissenschaft. Eine neue disziplin*. Schreiwissenschaft – Band 002
- Jordan, S. (2022). *Grounded literacies in a transnational WAC/WID ecology: A Korean–U.S. study*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/INT-B.2022.1503>
- Jürine, A., Leijen, D., Hint, H., Šinkūnienė, J., Laiveniece, D., Johansson, C., & Groom, N. (2021). Academic writing in the Baltic States: Introducing the Bwrite Project. *Educare*, (1), 27-37. <https://doi.org/10.24834/educare.2021.1.3>
- Kalman, J., & Street, B. (Eds.). (2022). *Lectura, escritura y matemáticas como prácticas sociales: Dialogos con américa latina*. The WAC Clearinghouse. <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/international/la/sociales/> (Originally published in print in 2009 by Siglo XXI Editores)
- Kirkpatrick, Andy, & Xu, Zhichang. (2012). *Chinese rhetoric and writing: An introduction for language teachers*. The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2012.2393>
- Kramer-Dahl, A. (2003). Reading the “Singlish debate”: Construction of a crisis of language standards and language teaching in Singapore. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 2(3), 159-190. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327701JLIE0203_2
- Krige, J. (Ed). (2019). *How knowledge moves: Writing and the transnational history of science and technology*. University of Chicago Press.
- Kruse, O., & Chitez, M. (2012). Contrastive genre mapping in academic contexts: An intercultural approach, *Journal of Academic Writing*, 2(1), 59-73.
- Kruse, O., Chitez, M., Rodriguez, B., Castelló, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Exploring European writing cultures: Country reports on genres, writing practices and languages used in European higher education*. Working Papers in Applied Linguistics, the ZHAW School of Applied Linguistics, Switzerland. <https://tinyurl.com/34nz64sb>
- Lele-Rozentāle, D., Laiveniece, D., Dubova, A., & Egle, B., (2021). Possibility of determining argumentation in social science articles: The case of Latvian. *Proceedings of CBU in Social Sciences*, (2), 223-229. <https://doi.org/10.12955/pss.v2.225>
- Lennartson-Hokkanen, I. (2016). *Organisation, attityder, lärandepotential: Ett skripedagogiskt samarbete mellan en akademisk utbildning och en språkverkstad*.

- [Doctoral thesis, Stockholm University, Faculty of Humanities, Department of Swedish Language and Multilingualism]. <https://tinyurl.com/4ebrcjy3>
- Merman-Jozwiak, E. (2014). Transnational Latino/a writing, and American and Latino/a studies. *Lat Stud*, 12, 111-133. <https://doi.org/10.1057/lst.2014.4>
- Moyano, Estela Inés, & Lizama, Margarita Vidal (Eds.). (2023). *Centros y programas de escritura en América Latina: Opciones teóricas y pedagógicas para la enseñanza de la escritura disciplinar*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/INT-B.2023.1749>
- Muchiri, M. N., Mulamba, N. G., Myers, D. A., & Ndoloi, J. M. (1995). Importing composition: Teaching and researching academic writing beyond North America. *College Composition and Communication*, 46(2), 175-198.
- Navarro, F., Lillis, T., Donahue, T., Curry, M. J., Reyes, N. Á., Gustafsson, M., Zavala, V., Lauría, D., Lukin, A., McKinney, C., Feng, H., & Motta-Roth, D. (2022). Rethinking English as a lingua franca in scientific-academic contexts: A position statement. *Journal of English for Research Publication Purposes*, 3(1), 143-153. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jerpp.21012.nav>
- Nesi, H., & Gardner, S. (2012). *Genres across the disciplines: Student writing in higher education*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009030199>
- Neves de Brito, L. A. (2019). Noto escrevendo na esfera acadêmica: Atando “nos” e construindo sentidos. *Práticas Discursivas em Letramento Acadêmico: Questões em Estudo*, 1, 90-105.
- Okuda, T. (2017). *The writing center as a global pedagogy: A case study of a Japanese university seeking internationalization* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. The University of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Parodi, G. (Ed.). (2022). *Alfabetización académica y profesional en el siglo xxi: Leer y escribir desde las disciplinas*. The WAC Clearinghouse. <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/international/la/parodi/> (Originally published 2010 by Editorial Planeta Chilena)
- Pineteh, E. (2014). The academic writing challenges of undergraduate students: A case study from South Africa. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 3(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v3n1p12>
- Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios de la Escritura. (2024). <https://wac.colostate.edu/rlee/>
- Rijlaarsdam, G., van den Bergh, H., Couzijn, M. (Eds.). (2005). *Effective learning and teaching of writing: A handbook of writing in education* (2nd ed.). Kluwer.
- Rodriguez, D., & Silva, J. (2019). *O ensino da escrita de artigo acadêmico na web: Suas práticas discursivas e jogos de verdade* [Web-based writing’s discursive practices]. In F. Komesu & J. Assis (Eds.), *Práticas discursivas em letramento acadêmico: Questões em estudo* (pp. 46-63). PUC Minas.
- Ruskan, A. (2020). *Attitudinal and epistemic dimensions of evaluation: Form, meaning and discursive contexts*. Vilnius University Press.
- Sovic, S., & Blythman, M. (Eds.). (2012). *International students negotiating higher education: Critical perspectives*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203817483>
- Squires, L. Ashley (Ed.). (2021). *Emerging writing research from the Russian Federation*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/INT-B.2021.1428>

Waanders, W. (2020). Het schrijfcentrum als onderzoeksobject. Een brede verkenning van effectstudies. *Tijdschrift voor taalbeheersing*, 42(3), 227-247. <https://doi.org/10.5117/TVT2020.3.001.WAAN>

Appendix

Development of IRC and List of Workshops International Research Colloquium on Writing in Higher Education

- 2008: “Proceed with Caution: Working with and Working on Inter-trans-cross-national- institutional-global-cultural Writing Research,” (no record of number of participants; we estimate 25)
- 2009: International Writing Scholarship and Collaborative Research: Attending to the Waves Between Continents: (16 Participants)
- 2010: Revisiting and Revising the CCCs through Exchanging International Post-Secondary Writing Research (10 countries, several cross-national studies, 19 scholars)
- 2011: New Webs of Relationships: International Dialogue about Higher Education research (18 countries, 38 scholars)
- 2011: Early Book Planning Discussions
- 2012: Accessing the Future of Writing Studies: Disruption and Dialogue via International Higher Education Writing Research (15 countries, 26 scholars, 19 projects)
- 2013: Diverse Disciplines, “New Publics”: The Work of International Writing Research (24 countries, 37 projects, 50 scholars)
- 2014: Unwritten and Rewritten: Spaces for International Dialogue and Higher Education Writing Research. (24 countries, 33 projects, 40 scholars)
- 2014: Proposal to be CCCC Standing Group Submitted for 2015
- 2014: Creation of IRC Wiki on CompPile: <https://wac.colostate.edu/community/international-writing-studies/>
- 2015: Deep Rewards and Serious Risks: Working through International Higher Education Writing Research Exchanges: (30 researchers, 19 countries, 27 Projects)
- 2016: Responsible Action: International Higher Education Writing Research Exchange (39 researchers, 28 countries, 27 projects)
- 2017: Cultivating Research Capacity through International Exchanges about Higher Education Research (35 researchers, 24 countries, 26 projects)
- 2018: The Transformative Laboring and Languageing of International Exchanges About Higher Education Writing Research (29 researchers, 11 projects, 20 countries) Several could not attend.

- 2019: Co-Exploring International Writing Research and Rehearsing Scholarly Performances (32 scholars, 21 projects, 19 countries) Proposal work begins on collection
- 2020: Probing Commonplaces in International Writing Research (9 presentations)
- Cancelled for COVID
- 2021 Redefining the Common Place: Dialogue on Teaching and Learning in International Writing Research. (14 researchers, 12 projects, 12 countries) Online
- 2022: Committed to an Inclusive Discipline: Broadening CCCC Conversations with Researchers and Contexts. (31 researchers, 28 projects, 24 countries) Online
- 2023: Texts, Institutional Contexts, Framing Theories (4 researchers, 4 projects, 4 countries; occurred simultaneously with the WRAB conference in Norway which significantly impacted U.S. CCCC participants)
- 2024: Research Abundance Outside the U.S. Writing Context (20 researchers, 12 projects, 14 countries)