Encountering Internationalization in the Writing Classroom: Resistant Teaching and Learning Strategies

Yasmine Romero, University of Hawai'i, West O'ahu, and Ann Shivers-McNair, University of Arizona

Abstract: Student conceptions of internationalization directly impact how multilingual students, both international and domestic, engage course content within the WAC/WID classroom. For example, a student who majors in English literature may define internationalization as recreating political power, while a student who majors in business may consider internationalization as creating opportunities for the global market. This study interrogates how multilingual students, especially international, understand and relate to internationalization; moreover, what are the effects of their understandings and relationships to internationalization? Fusing critical discourse analysis and resistant genre activism to investigate spoken and written data from an intermediate undergraduate composition class for multilingual learners, three major impacts of internationalization are found: racial stereotyping, cultural differentiation, and Westernization. These effects and the conceptualizations they are founded upon form a narrative in writing classrooms that constructs global literacy as English literacy, which consequently elides multilingual students' lived experiences. By developing teaching and learning strategies that *resist* this erasure, we argue multilingual students of WAC/WID classrooms can build critical frameworks in which to encounter, challenge, and change the normative constructions and assumptions found within their disciplines.[1]

Teacher-scholars are always in the process of responding to the needs of their students; one such need is global literacy, that is, language and writing skills and strategies used to negotiate rhetorical situations across cultural, social, and multimodal contexts and genres. For multilingual students, both international and domestic, one such rhetorical situation involves the dominant discourses of the academy, as students and teachers balance disciplinary expectations with issues of power and resistance to dominant discourses, be they the specialized languages of academic disciplines, standard(ized) varieties of English, or English as an academic lingua franca. This balancing work happens increasingly in the context of internationalization, which we define not only as the phenomenon of more international students in universities, but also as the act of changing pedagogies to value international students' contributions, including resisting dominant discourses.

Approaches to balancing disciplinary expectations and resistance to dominant discourses differ. In one tradition, teacher-scholars have argued that teaching disciplinary discourses can be a way of teaching students to recognize and resist power. For example, Delpit (1993) argues that teaching students to engage with the language of the academy need not necessarily be a racist or classist endeavor, and Villanueva (2001) urges teachers to focus on translating, rather than silencing, the voices students bring with them into the academic world. Bazerman (1992, 2002) and Bazerman et al. (2005) argue that giving students access to disciplinary and specialized languages gives them access to the social power those languages represent, and that students can use that access to resist if they choose.

In another tradition, teacher-scholars have called for challenging disciplinary discourses by including other voices and languages—especially those that students bring with them. LeCourt (1996) and Kells (2007) call on teachers to be more aware and critical of the subjectivities (and exclusions) imposed on students when assignments or disciplinary expectations for writing conflict with students' cultural

identifications. LeCourt identifies the critical potential of expressivism as a way of getting at complexity, or as she describes it, "the multiplicity of voices and discursive positions constructed in contexts other than school" (p. 400). Guerra (2008), along with Kells, has called for a "Writing Across Communities" model that more fully engages the cultural, experiential, and linguistic resources students bring into the classroom. As Parks and Goldblatt (2000) argue, "If compositionists reframe WAC to reach beyond university boundaries, we can foster cross-pollination and interdisciplinary discussion of how knowledge is shaped and conveyed in culture. In short, WAC could integrate a multiplicity of writing and reading modes with a conception a literacy instruction not limited to serving the needs of established disciplines" (p. 585).

And because the rise of internationalization is paralleled with the rise of English as a lingua franca in higher education (see Annous and Nicolas, 2015; Coleman, 2006; Gill and Kirkpatrick, 2013), conversations are increasingly engaging the power not only of specialized disciplinary discourses and standardized varieties of English, but also of English itself in the academy. One commonality across the years is a concern for the role of the teacher and curriculum in how students navigate discourses. Annous and Nicholas observe cases of faculty in English-medium business writing instruction in Lebanon who emphasize the importance of English communication skills but feel they do not have the time or expertise to support those skills for their students, while Pedersen (2011) notes that in her study of students in Jordan, "mastery" of English is not seen as a necessary prerequisite for advanced academic work and writing, but opportunities for mentoring and collaboration (both in English and in Arabic), as well as application of skills, are necessary. You and You (2013) observe U.S. professors teaching at an English-medium summer school in China adapting their pedagogical strategies to non-native English speaker (NNES) students' "literacy challenges" by adjusting writing tasks, providing support for major writing assignments, and connecting to students' home cultures. You and You argue that both language teachers and content teachers should take responsibility for supporting students in their English communication skill development, and Fortanet-Gómez (2011) calls for more dialogue between language and content instructors to support each other and their students.

In the U.S., teacher-scholars have similarly wrestled with the role of WAC/WID programs and curriculum in supporting international and U.S. students for whom English is not a home language. While some, notably Janopoulos (1995) and Leki (2003), have highlighted the ways in which emphasis on writing in WAC/WID can disadvantage students for whom English is not a home language, others, like Cox (2011), see WAC/WID programs as potential sites for including and supporting multilingual students, though, as Cox observes, more collaboration between WAC/WID and language specialists and more attention to and understanding of multilingual students' experiences is needed. Indeed, as Zamel (1995) has argued, the assumptions that these students are deficient or lacking in their writing skills leads to the stigmatizing of both these students and the faculty who specialize in language instruction. As Kam and Meinema (2005) argue, when international students are asked to demonstrate their content and language proficiencies in written texts, they are being asked to navigate not only genre and linguistic conventions but also cultures and identities; thus, teachers and administrators must take these experiences into account when designing curricula. More work is being done to seek out, understand, and respond to the experiences of both faculty and students in navigating English as a lingua franca in WAC/WID (see, for example, Zamel and Spack, 2003), and we seek to contribute to this ongoing work by focusing on the multiple, dynamic, and nuanced ways in which students engage internationalization as they navigate discourses in a writing classroom.

Methodology for Exploring Relationships to Internationalization

The present study emerged from hallway conversations about teaching academic writing to students from diversified backgrounds, especially multilingual students (domestic and international); these conversations led to taking another look at spoken and written data collected from Yasmine's 200-level

composition course, which is part of a larger study on mapping intersectionality onto the language and writing classroom (see Romero, 2017). While re-examining transcriptions of classroom talk, student-teacher conferences, one-on-one interviews, and student writing, we traced the relationships being negotiated between multilingual students and internationalization using a critically reflexive framework grounded in critical discourse analysis (CDA) and resistant genre activism in rhetorical genre studies (RGS). In this way, our findings are considered from both a research and pedagogical perspective.

Pedagogical Context

Nineteen students made up Yasmine's 200-level composition course. According to a voluntary in-class survey, most students were in their first or second year of college. Their ages ranged from 18 to 25. Eleven identified as men and eight identified as women. Most identified as heterosexual. Racial identities were closely related to a student's language proficiencies and their cultural and social practices. The majority of students identified as Chinese, either Mainland Chinese or Taiwanese. Other students identified as Mexican American, Kazakhstani, Korean, Thai, and Vietnamese. One student identified as American, Jewish and Russian.

The course itself targeted research-related writing skills and strategies; students were encouraged to explore lines of inquiry related to their disciplinary fields or the fields that informed course content (applied linguistics, language, gender, and sexuality studies, and narrative inquiry). In interviews and in-class journaling, many students, such as Emma and Zoe who were psychology majors and Rider who was a gender studies minor, considered this course as a reference point for writing within their fields. All students have been given pseudonyms to insure anonymity.

Methodological Underpinnings

CDA interrogates the relationship between language and power in our social worlds; analysts in this tradition explore and challenge how discourses are shaped and reproduced by examining talk and texts. Analysts use a wide range of discourse analytic methods and techniques, which involves drawing upon various fields in addition to remaining critical and self-reflective. For instance, Reisigl and Wodak (2009) incorporate rhetorical, genre, and linguistic theory to investigate discourses of climate change, such as nomination or the discursive construction of people, things, actions, and other phenomena through deixis and tropes. Furthermore, they interrogate possible discursive impacts of these narratives on readers, such as "intended biases in representations (especially media coverage)" may impact decisions on global warming (p. 119).

Similarly, since Miller's (1984) argument for understanding genre as a form of social action, scholars using rhetorical genre studies (RGS) have engaged in an ongoing effort to understand how and why we recognize, contribute to, and disrupt patterns of rhetorical responding in a social moment. Dryer (2008) has called for more attention to the social and material relations of the contexts in which genres are taken up by arguing for a genre pedagogy that teaches resistant reading of genres in service of activism as a way of recognizing and countering the limiting, inertial, and exclusionary forces of genres. Dryer calls this a "resistant pedagogy of genre-activism, one that makes institutional genre conventions more available for reflective consideration and thus to contestation and change" (p. 504). Like many who work in CDA, Dryer draws on Bourdieu to emphasize the ways in which entrenched genres often reproduce social orders and relations. Thus, the first step is to teach students to know that a genre is a genre—to see the ways in which social and material relations are produced and reproduced in a set of conventions that are not, in fact, neutral. Then, by tracking the ways changes are and can be made in a genre, readers and writers can counter hegemonic conventions and exploit resistant, activist possibilities. We fuse these two perspectives when working with Yasmine's data both at the analytical and interpretive level.

Methodological Process

Since our project started from conversations on teaching and then shifted into a re-examination of previously collected data, we began by searching out instances in which international identities and experiences occurred. These instances included, but were not limited to, cultural and social stereotypes of international identities and discussions of English language proficiency across international contexts. Therefore, internationalization wasn't being interrogated per se, but the impacts of internationalization on students accomplishing their personal and professional goals were. Our focus shifted then to working through the complex relationship between students and these impacts of internationalization. We asked the following questions, one being research-oriented and the other being praxis-oriented:

1. Research: How are multilingual students affected by internationalization within the writing classroom? What particular experiences do they draw upon in order to negotiate and/or relate to internationalization through spoken and written genres? Do these experiences relate at all to theirs or others' English language proficiency?
2. Practice: How can interrogating student relationships to internationalization inform teaching practices that facilitate global literacy, or being able to navigate global perspectives across academic and professional contexts, within the WAC/WID classroom?

To answer our first question, we make unfamiliar the data collected from Yasmine's original study by teasing apart the intertextual and interdiscursive connections between the rhetorical and linguistic moves students make and the impacts of internationalization being discussed; in other words, we specifically locate the rhetorical strategies, according to Reisigl and Wodak (2009), that students employ to construct and orient to the impacts of internationalization. Furthermore, we consider what overarching narratives are being built as a result of these relationships to the impact of internationalization.

Impacts of Internationalization on Multilingual Students

Students discussed the impacts of internationalization on their everyday lives from racial stereotyping to Westernization. In conversation and writing, students interrogated and related to the effects from their perspectives and experiences; for instance, the notion that greater English language proficiency entails a strong Western, non-international identity. Across these exchanges, we traced the formation of a narrative: English literacy is global literacy, that is, English writing and speaking skills are what determine if a multilingual student can interact on a global scale.

Racial Stereotyping

The majority of students in the study self-identified as Chinese international students on voluntary surveys and in interviews, which shaped classroom discussions to explicitly discuss racial stereotypes. For example, Biyu, a Chinese-identifying student, had commented during a one-on-one conference with Yasmine, "I think like African American experience more discrimination than Asian cause there's a lot of Asian here." Her comment was a response to Kubota and Lin's (2009) chapter on racial identities and language learning. This reading inspired Biyu to conduct a research project on how Chinese international students perceive others and the implications of those perceptions. During Biyu's final presentation, she reflected on the impact of stereotyping practices of non-international students upon her own behavior:

> American students think that Chinese students good at math. Asians are genius. Asian are bad
> at driving, of course, I don't drive, but those other two stereotypes affect how I behave outside
> of class. I would sometimes spend more time doing my homework stuff like that or regret if I

got a really bad score so my curiosity was that would other Chinese international student behave like I did?

Biyu highlights two practices that index what "American students think." The first stereotyping practice is to construct Chinese students, in particular, as excelling in math, as well as "Asian are genius." These constructions index the model minority stereotype that is often associated with students from China, Korea and Japan (Pon et al., 2003). According to Wu (2014, p. 2), the model minority stereotype or myth categorizes "a racial group distinct from the white majority, but lauded as well assimilated, upwardly mobile, politically nonthreatening, and definitively not-black." Biyu reflects that this stereotype or myth closely impacted her academic work in that "I would [...] regret if I got a really bad score." She goes on to present her research on whether Chinese international students like her support or reject this stereotype.

The second stereotyping practice attempts to differentiate between driving ability, such that "Asians are bad at driving," and American students, presumably, are good at driving. Even though Biyu jokingly states, "of course I don't drive," this practice illustrates the myriad of stereotyping practices that impacts how Chinese and international students who identify as Asian may perceive American students and vice versa. Other students interrogated racial stereotyping in language-learning textbooks, such as Jack who describes how American life is portrayed:

> [T]he pictures in those textbooks for English second language speakers are delivering very strong messages to its audience. [...] I found most pictures about those 'American way of life' emphasized the enjoyable and positive aspect about American life. For example, even when the weather changed, it happened at the occasion that people went out sailing. [...] I believe the publishers also seek to lure the readers to study English with the wonderful lifestyle depicted in the pictures.

Jack describes on the "positive" portrayal of American life, that is, speakers of English in this particular textbook are visually represented as having an "enjoyable" life no matter the weather and activity. He reiterates this notion in his conclusion where he states most clearly how he relates to this practice: "publishers [seek] to lure the readers to study English with the wonderful lifestyle depicted in the pictures." In this way, for Jack, Biyu, and other students who interrogated racial stereotyping in Yasmine's class, this practice indexes cultural assumptions about international and domestic students. Students relate to these racial stereotyping practices in divergent ways: for Biyu this may be guilt for not matching this stereotype; for Jack, this may be rethinking how he interacts with course texts; for other students, like Hunter below, these practices merely reinforce the hierarchical relationships between international students and institutions:

> However, immersing in the environment where bias such as fix stereotypes of people expressing the same phenotype become a normal picture in textbooks, hence, the discourse (institutions) itself of such power (race) become a producer and reproducer of bias and segregation.

Racial stereotyping as an impact of internationalization and how students relate to these practices suggests that we should incorporate opportunities for students to challenge academic genres, such as language-learning textbooks, that reproduce dominant discourses. By cultivating a space for multilingual students to critique and connect to texts, and the impact of those texts, we foreground their multilingual perspectives rather than the perspectives of the texts they read.

Cultural Differentiation

Some students attempted to negotiate between racial stereotyping and legitimate differences in cultural characteristics. Emma problematizes this in her post on our online discussion forum:

> There are numerous positive or negative stereotypes that are associated with different races/ ethnicity. Of course, some of them are overgeneralized or under represented to the entire population of that specific region. However, what stood out to me is that, what started the stereotypes that associate with the different groups. For example, that Asians are good at math, blacks run fast, or sing well,...etc. And where to draw the line between stereotypes and cultural characteristics? For example, it is well-known that the western society emphasize on individualistic development, whereas, in Asia collective effort is more of the focus.

As seen above, Emma contemplates where stereotyping came from; further, she asks "where [do we] draw the line between stereotypes and cultural characteristics?" Emma presents the example of individualism versus collectivism. Race and culture are seemingly conflated into one, as seen in Emma's discussion. Jack addresses that conflation with his examination of intra-cultural differences between Chinese and Chinese American students. He writes:

> It is common for international students to speak English with a certain degree of accent, as they learn, practice and are taught in a second language environment. […] The existence of outliers who do speak like native speakers among Chinese students can be caused by non-ethnic factors such as access to education resources. Their perfect English do not make other people or themselves feel a shift in their ethnicities. And when some American students make English accent a criterion by referring classmates as 'FOB' (fresh off boat) as Li [his interviewee] mentions, it is a categorization used to distinguish international students as a whole rather than Chinese Americans setting themselves apart from students of Chinese ethnicity.

In contrast to Biyu's project concerning Asian stereotypes, specifically those targeting Chinese international students, Jack focuses on the cultural and social practices that differentiate Chinese American and Chinese international students. He finds that accent, native speaker ideologies, and non-ethnic factors contribute to the "categorization" of international students as different from Chinese American students. In this way, another impact of internationalization, or bringing more international students into WAC/WID classrooms, is the practice of cultural differentiation by way of language proficiency, that is, one's way of speaking English can determine whether or not one is culturally American or not. Furthermore this differentiation can be either intergroup (American and international) or intragroup (Chinese and Chinese American). Jack's motivations for conducting such a project for Yasmine's class is grounded in his own background and experiences:

> Jack: I used to hate that, but now I see that maybe it is nothing to be embarrassed or feel bad about. Being Chinese.
>
> Yasmine: Yeah. Embarrassed or feel bad? What do you mean?
>
> Jack: Well, I mean, I was born here. I was supposed to be American. I should be. I supposed to be like ((laughs)) be a representation of the values about American values. And the yeah I can't be American.

Jack states that he "used to hate" being Chinese, and indicates feelings of embarrassment or shame on being unable to "be American." For Jack, a Chinese identity, then, competes with an American one.

Therefore, Jack relates to the impacts of internationalization by way of his own unique personal experience and background. Most students seem to relate to internationalization in this way, which suggests that in-class practices should foreground multilingual student experiences so as to bring other identities and social and cultural practices into the classroom that can be critically read alongside representations of American "native" English-speaking identities.

Westernization

Zoe, a Chinese-identifying student, drew upon her own experiences and the experiences of her peers in multiple countries to elaborate the concept of third culture kids "as the bridges between societies and cultures" in her final project for Yasmine's course. She develops the concept by discussing how her interviewee described the importance of third culture kids: "traveling to places can help [people] to see more and better understand different perspectives." When she presented her project to the class, students debated the concept itself, attempting to break down what exactly "international" means. Long, a Vietnamese-identifying student, asked:

> So those that you know spend most of their lives in their home country, but they went to like international schools and what not, and are pretty Westernized, are those still considered third culture kids?

Long's question reconsiders how internationalization may impact one's perceptions, actions, and beliefs. That is, kids who attend international schools in their home countries are Western; moreover, they may or may not be defined as third culture kids because they will not bring a different understanding but a Western one. We see this impact revisited during the focus group for Romero's (2016) study in which Hunter's lack of accent is discussed.

> Eun: I didn't know you were international, cause […] you don't have like that that heavy accent. So you were not born here.
>
> Hunter: No. I just came here for college. This is my second year, [and] third year in the state.
>
> Eun: Oh! Interesting.
>
> Emma: And where were you before?
>
> Hunter: China. Pure Chinese.
>
> Eun: So you went to international high school? Or international. No? Just like regular […] normal?
>
> Hunter: I just came here for college. Yeah, after high school.
>
> Eun: Then how is your English so good?

Eun states at the beginning of the conversation that she did not "know" Hunter was "international," which parallels Long's definition of international; however, the two differ in that Long is speaking about international, or global, perspectives and Eun is referring to Hunter's lack of a "heavy accent." Hunter expressly rejects Eun's perception; moreover, as both women go on to ask Hunter more questions, such as where he is originally from ("where were you before?"). Hunter explicitly identifies as from "China. Pure Chinese." If seemingly unaccented English is equated with "good" English, or what we would call Westernized English, then the narrative being built is: it is not possible for a student from a non-Western

country to speak unaccented English unless they attend a Westernized institution, that is, an international school. To put this narrative another way, different varieties of English hold certain cultural and symbolic capital as Peirce (1995) proposes with the concept of investment; the cultural and symbolic freight of dominant varieties of English may, for Yasmine's students, be more desirable outside of the classroom, while non-native and less represented varieties of English may be preferred inside the classroom with other students who share similar backgrounds. Students relate to the effect of Westernization by choosing to value a particular English variety in a particular context because that variety holds more cultural and social value in that context. As an example, international students use Academic English in an American English-speaking university classroom as opposed to a variety of English they speak in their home countries, such as Japanese English, because it may give them access to opportunities to succeed abroad (see Peirce, 1995 for more about the concept of investment).

All three impacts—racial stereotyping, cultural differentiation, and Westernization—are oriented to in complex, nuanced ways by students. These relationships indicate a need to facilitate and foster spaces in which students can meaningfully engage the impacts of internationalization. To do so, we should develop pedagogical strategies for that are shaped by the lived experiences of our multilingual students (see hooks, 1994 for more on lived experiences); we should develop strategies for encountering internationalization that bring those lived experiences in.

Based upon our findings and our methodological fusion of resistant genre activism with CDA, we propose resistant teaching and learning strategies that have the potential to challenge dominant discourses surrounding internationalization in order to bring the outside—global perspectives—into writing classrooms. We consider how multilingual student incomes—experiences, skills, attitudes, values and beliefs—can become a pedagogical resource for navigating the dominant discourses of the writing classroom to answer the second question.

Strategies for Encountering Internationalization

The writing classroom can be a space for students to negotiate the impacts of internationalization. Our findings show that students wish to engage these challenging topics and work through their own assumptions, beliefs, values, and experiences. Furthermore, they wish to connect to other students who may be able to relate to their experiences, that is, student's lived experiences may determine what students are invested in exploring; therefore, multilingual student perspectives can enrich our classes. We as teacher-scholars can make this possible by encouraging resistant teaching and learning strategies that can make multilingual students' experiences a pedagogical resource in the writing classroom. Resistant teaching and learning strategies are grounded in the five common practices we found across CDA and RGS:

1. Critical
2. Kaleidoscopic
3. Metacognitive
4. Self-reflexive
5. Transformative

The first of these practices, critical, speaks to the practice of making what is familiar unfamiliar in CDA and RGS. Resistance involves critiquing or challenging taken-for-granted assumptions in talk and texts. So instead of just asking what is happening in talk and text, resistance encourages teacher-scholars and students to ask why is this happening in talk and text at this particular time and in this certain location. The kaleidoscopic practice of resistance is informed by the interdisciplinary approaches of CDA and RGS. In this sense, multiple perspectives create a dialogue that allows a more nuanced, complex understanding of talk and text. When exploring and critiquing any talk and text, this process involves being aware of each step taken and why. In other words, metacognition plays a significant role in resistance: the process

of interpreting findings is just as important as stating how the interpretation was reached. CDA and RGS both value this practice of transparency, which is why it is included in the definition of resistance being described here. Overlapping this metacognitive practice of resistance is self-reflexivity, for it is through self-reflexivity or self-critique that teacher-scholars and students can attempt to evaluate the strengths, the weaknesses, the purposes and implications of inquiry processes, resulting interpretations, and any challenges. The final practice, transformative, speaks to CDA and RGS' commitment to creating social change. Resistance, then, is not only a multilayered process of inquiry; resistance should aim for creating global and local change.

Based upon our findings and the five practices listed above, we propose three resistant teaching and learning strategies that instructors can and should incorporate into their internationalized WAC/WID curriculum—foster resistant composing and reading practices, make global-local connections, and encourage non-judgmental discourse. These strategies are in no way exhaustive and cannot suit every classroom situation. They are starting points for teacher-scholars looking for productive and alternative ways to encounter internationalization in their classrooms with their students. Situating each strategy within CDA and RGS literature, we make connections between the strategy and WAC/WID classrooms. We then provide a concrete example of how this strategy can translate into teaching practices within the multilingual writing classroom. These examples are from Yasmine's 200-level composition course.

Strategy 1: Foster *Resistant* Composing and Reading Practices

When discussing race and culture, students contemplated what these actual categories meant to them; as was shown above in Emma's discussion board post, she tackles "where to draw the line between stereotypes and cultural characteristics?" Emma's question motivates the proposal of our first strategy: foster resistant composing and reading practices through critical and kaleidoscopic inquiries. Dryer (2008) calls this a "resistant pedagogy of genre-activism, a teaching strategy that makes institutional genre conventions more available for reflective consideration and thus to contestation and change" (p. 504). He argues that this practice can facilitate a discussion of dominant discourses and conventions as well as, potentially, how to change them. Put differently, pedagogical practices facilitating the development of writing and reading strategies that resist "institutional genre conventions" and the dominant discourses that enable them allow students not only to be cognizant of their rhetorical choices, but also to utilize those choices to challenge and/or create change through rhetoric. This first strategy positions WAC/WID students to use writing to enter and modify relationships with disciplines and publics in critical ways (Weisser, 2002).

In Yasmine's 200-level composition course, students were asked to enter into conversations important to them—whether disciplinary or community-based—by examining narratives found within their communities. Because students interviewed peers and/or family members who are multilingual, many used their home languages to conduct the interviews. The experience of gathering data, translating this data into English, and analyzing this data in English led to critical perspectives on the implications of representing communities in narrative research. For instance, Jack met with Yasmine to discuss the challenges of translating Chinese into English. He used Chinese to conduct his interviews with the Chinese and Chinese American students. Jack expressed his frustration with trying to capture his interviewee's emotions and meaning in English. He said:

> [The translation] just sounds different. Sounds so plain after the translation, although it's the same meaning [...] because translation is your word choice. But when [my interviewees] are speaking that language that's their decision to using which phrase to express the same idea.

Jack's comments point to his critical and reflective processes when translating his interviewee's ideas and thoughts from Chinese into English, most particularly his comment on "translation is your word choice."

He addresses how a writer's choice of words can shape the impact of his interviewee's words on his readers. This critical and self-reflexive engagement with the genre of the interview demonstrates the exigency for teaching and learning strategies that facilitate resistant inquiry.

Strategy 2: Make Global-local Connections

Teacher-scholars strive to make global-local connections in writing classes, sometimes through citation strategies and other intertextual strategies. Resistant teaching and learning strategies would add to these practices by way of experience: teacher-scholars should explicitly foreground multilingual student experiences in order to facilitate intertextual links that can make course content meaningful. Biyu's discussion of her experience facing a racial stereotype and how that experience motivated her narrative project shows that making connections not only acknowledges students' experiences, but also challenges them to make connections between that experience and course content. For Biyu, her project allowed her to connect to scholarship on race and higher education.

This strategy builds upon multilingual students' relationships to the impacts of internationalization through a careful interrogation of concepts, contexts, and identities involved in a line of inquiry. Opportunities for discussing how students, instructors, and researchers articulate the impacts of internationalization across the disciplines must be fostered. In addition, how those articulations may shape class encounters with particular goals, concepts, and contexts should also be brought into conversation. Making global-local connections demands that course assignments and readings for WAC/WID classrooms should establish local-global connections relevant to the student's discipline and/or community. In Yasmine's course, student research projects required them to theorize a concept from the course using their lived experiences. For instance, Biyu conceptualized race using her experience navigating dominant discourses of race as an international student. Cloe, a Thai-identifying student, developed Cameron's (1999) discussion of performativity by situating it within her peer pressure experiences, both in her disciplinary and cultural communities. Both examples demonstrate how global concepts like race and performativity can shape local international contexts, such as Biyu's identity as an international Chinese student and Cloe's Thai community.

Strategy 3: Encourage Non-judgmental Discourse

When Eun, Emma and Hunter discussed Hunter's lack of "that heavy accent," they engaged the perceptions of native and non-native accents as well as what is communicated when a multilingual student speaks English without an accent: they are assumed to have come from an international high school, which was not the case with Hunter. Throughout Yasmine's course, students had to discuss similarly challenging questions, most particularly those raised by course readings. In order to foster a space in which students could engage without judgment, Yasmine held question and answer sessions at the beginning of every other class meeting in which students could discuss their confusions, frustrations, and perspectives on course content in small groups or as a whole class. Students chose what they wanted to discuss, and while they offered their perspectives, Yasmine listed each student's insight on the whiteboard. If students asked Yasmine a question directly, it was Yasmine's responsibility as a teacher-scholar to defer first to other students before giving an answer. These student-led discussions enabled the class to focus on how various understandings of a particular topic, such as race, can have multiple perspectives, historical significances, and differing impacts on one's life and community.

These practices generate an overarching need for teaching and learning strategies that create space for conflicting perspectives to come into contact: we propose Edge's (2006) concept of non-judgmental discourse where speakers and understanders cooperatively work to critically discuss self-selected issues in order to discover multiple ways of knowing. Non-judgmental discourse can facilitate a space that "make[s] respect, empathy and sincerity explicitly available to each other" (Edge, 2006, p. 116). To put

this strategy in another way, by using non-judgmental discourse, teacher-scholars can build spaces, or what some may suggest Pratt's (1991) contact zones, in which students can engage challenging topics; in the case of multilingual students, topics of race, internationalization and its impacts, and language proficiency are some important topics in which non-judgmental discourse can help facilitate resistant discussion, that is, students can move beyond a debatable topic towards one that is nuanced, complex, and situated within a particular time and space. We see this kind of facilitative work exemplified in Evans-Tokaryk's (2014) discussion of training student-researchers to conduct student focus groups on understandings of plagiarism as part of a study that led to calls for policy change at the university level. For WAC/WID classrooms specifically, this kind of practice can encourage critical discussions that interrogate disciplinary knowledge, practices, and the impacts of these practices on a students' future experiences within their disciplines.

Conclusion

Cloe, introduced in Strategy 2, discusses the effects of internationalization, race, and visual rhetoric when recounting her experience interrogating racial stereotyping in one English language textbook.

> But then that one picture I think it was about Russia. […] And that there's one picture that I feel like this is SO Russian. ((laughs)) […] It's like one of these. Are they outfits that looks like maid that works in a barn or something like that? […] Like long skirts with the—I don't know what it's called. But I feel like it looked really Russian. But I didn't really, you know. I'm not really that exposed to the Russian culture? […] So I kind of went, oh, so why do I think it was Russian, you know?

In the statement above, Cloe highlights the process of examining her conceptualizations of Russia while reading an English language-learning textbook for visual representations of Russian people. She describes the cultural implications of a woman wearing a particular kind of outfit. Cloe claims, "I kind of went oh so why do I think it was Russian you know?" Here, the ramifications of our proposal to encounter internationalization in resistant ways are evident: students, like Cloe, are able to draw upon their experiences (e.g. "exposure") all the while destabilizing the assumptions that underlie those experiences (e.g. "why").

In conclusion, the resistant teaching and learning strategies we propose are based upon findings from one 200-level composition course for multilingual students. It is for this reason that we again stress the importance of seeing these strategies as starting points for developing teaching and learning practices that bring the outside in. We have attempted to answer our questions about research and practice through a careful consideration of the impacts of internationalization and how multilingual students relate to these. We described three major impacts of internationalization that we found in student writing and conversations; we contemplated how student related to these impacts, as indicated in students' linguistic and rhetorical moves. Building upon these findings, we proposed three resistant teaching and learning strategies—fostering resistant composing and reading practices; making global-local connections; and encouraging non-judgmental discourse. For each strategy, we made connections to our findings and actual in-class practices that employ these strategies in an effort to illustrate the exigency for foregrounding multilingual students' perspectives, both domestic and international, in the writing classroom. By encountering internationalization in this way, multilingual students can navigate dominant discourses and conventions in critical, kaleidoscopic, metacognitive, self-reflexive and transformative ways: multilingual students can explore discourses, communities, and texts within the realities of their lived experiences in a globalized world.

References

Annous, Samer, & Nicolas, Maureen O'Day. (2015). Academic territorial borders: A look at the writing ethos in business courses in which English is a foreign language. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 29*(1), 93-111.

Bazerman, Charles. (1992). From cultural criticism to disciplinary participation: Living with powerful words. In A. Herrington & C. Moran (Eds.), *Writing, Teaching, and Learning in the Disciplines* (pp. 61–68). New York: MLA.

Bazerman, Charles. (2002). Distanced and refined selves: Educational tensions in writing with the power of knowledge. In M. Hewings (Ed.), *Academic writing in context* (pp. 23–29). Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press.

Bazerman, Charles, Little, Joseph, Bethel, Lisa, Chavkin, Teri, Fouquette, Danielle, & Garufis, Janet. (2005). *Reference guide to writing across the curriculum.* Retrieved from http://wac.colostate.edu/books/bazerman_wac/

Cameron, Deborah. (1999). Performing Gender Identity: Young Men's Talk and the Construction of Heterosexual Masculinity. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The Discourse Reader* (pp. 442-458). London: Routledge.

Coleman, James A. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching, 39*, 1–14.

Cox, Michelle. (2011). WAC: Closing doors or opening doors for second language writers? *Across the Disciplines, 8*(4), Retrieved from http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/ell/ cox.cfm

Delpit, Lisa. (1993). The politics of teaching literate discourse. In Theresa Perry & James W. Fraser (Eds.), *Freedom's plow: Teaching in the multicultural classroom* (pp. 285–295). New York: Routledge.

Dryer, Dylan B. (2008). Taking Up Space: On Genre Systems as Geographies of the Possible. *JAC, 28*(3-4), 503-534.

Edge, Julian. (2006). Non-Judgemental Discourse: Role and Relevance. In J. Edge (Eds.), *(Re-)locating TESOL in an Age of Empire* (pp. 104-118). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Evans-Tokaryk, Tyler. (2014, November 24). Academic integrity, remix culture, globalization: A Canadian case study of student and faculty perceptions of plagiarism. *Across the Disciplines, 11*(2). Retrieved May 23, 2016, from http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/articles/evans-tokaryk2014.cfm

Fortanet-Gómez, Immaculada. (2011). Critical components of integrating content and language in Spanish higher education. *Across the Disciplines*, *8*(3). Retrieved from: http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/clil/fortanet-gomez.cfm

Gill, Saran Kaur., & Kirkpatrick, Andy. (2013). English in Asian and European higher education. In Carol Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Guerra, Juan. (2008). Cultivating Transcultural Citizenship: A Writing Across Communities Model. *Language Arts, 85*(4), 296-304.

hooks, bell. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Janopoulos, Michael. (1995). Writing across the curriculum, writing proficiency exams, and the NNS college student. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *4*(1), 43–50.

Kam, Angeniet, & Meinema, Yvette. (2005). Teaching academic writing to international students in an interdisciplinary writing context: A pedagogical rough guide. *Across the Disciplines*, *2*. Retrieved from: http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/lds/kam_meinema.cfm

Kells, Michelle Hall. (2007). Writing across communities: Deliberation and the discursive possibilities of WAC. *Reflections*, *6*(1), 87-108.

Kubota, Ryuko, & Lin, Angel. (2009). *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice*. New York: Routledge.

LeCourt, Donna. (1996). WAC as critical pedagogy: The third stage? *Journal of Advanced Composition, 16*(3), 389-406.

Leki, Ilona. (2003). A challenge to second language writing professionals: Is writing overrated? In Barbara Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 315-332). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, Carolyn. (1984). Genre as Social Action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70: 151-167.

Parks, Steve, & Goldblatt, Eli. (2000). Writing beyond the curriculum: Fostering new Collaborations in literacy. *College English, 62*(5), 584–606.

Pedersen, Anne Marie. (2011). Writing across languages, disciplines, and sources: Second language writers in Jordan. *Across the* Disciplines, 8. Retrieved from http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/articles/pedersen2011.cfm

Peirce, Bonny Norton (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 9-31.

Pon, Gordon, Goldstein, Tara, & Schecter, Sandra R. (2003). Interrupted by silences: The contemporary education of Hong Kong-born Chinese Canadians. In Robert Bayley & Sandra R. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 114-127). Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

Pratt, Mary Louise. (1991). Arts of the Contact Zone. *Profession,* 33-40. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/25595469

Reisigl, Martin. & Wodak, Ruth. (2009). The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA). In Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 87-121). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Romero, Yasmine. (2016). *Intersectionality in the Language and Writing Classroom* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ResearchWorks Archive at the University of Washington.

Romero, Yasmine. (2017). Developing an Intersectional Framework: Engaging the Decenter in Language Studies. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 14(4), 320-346. doi: 10.1080/15427587.2017.1285205

Villanueva, Victor. (2001). The politics of literacy across the curriculum. In McLeod, et al. (Eds.), *WAC for the new millennium* (pp. 165–178). Urbana IL: NCTE.

Weisser, Christian. (2002). *Moving Beyond Academic Discourse: Composition Studies and the Public Sphere*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Wu, Ellen. (2014). *The color of success: Asian Americans and the origins of the model minority*. Oxford: Princeton University Press.

You, Xiaoye, & You, Xiaoqiong. (2013). American content teachers' literacy brokerage in multilingual university classrooms. Journal of Second Language Writing, 22(3), 260-276.

Zamel, Vivian. (1995). Strangers in academia: The experiences of faculty and ESL students across the curriculum. *College Composition and Communication*, 46(4), 506–521.

Zamel, Vivian., & Spack, Ruth. (Eds.). (2003). *Crossing the curriculum: Multilingual learners in college classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Notes

Contact Information

Yasmine Romero
Assistant Professor of English
University of Hawai'i, West O'ahu
Humanities Division, English Concentration
91-1001 Farrington Highway
Kapolei, HI 96707
Email: yromer@hawaii.edu

Ann Shivers-McNair
Assistant Professor and Director of Professional and Technical Writing
Department of English
University of Arizona
1423 E. University Blvd.

PO Box 210067
Modern Languages Bldg. Room 445
Tucson, AZ 85721-0067
Email: shiversmcnair@email.arizona.edu

Complete APA Citation

Romero, Yasmine, & Shivers-McNair, Ann. (2018, April 14). Encountering internationalizing in the writing classroom: Resistant teaching and learning strategies. [Special issue on internationalizing the WAC/WID curriculum.] *Across the Disciplines, 15*(2), 47-60. Retrieved from https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/articles/internationalizing_wac/romero-shiversmcnair2018.pdf